

PLANNING AND TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE

Tuesday, 15 December 2020

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

Present

Members:

Deputy Alastair Moss (Chair)	Alderman Robert Hughes-Penney
Oliver Sells QC (Deputy Chairman)	Deputy Jamie Ingham Clark
Randall Anderson	Shravan Joshi
Peter Bennett	Alderswoman Susan Langley
Mark Bostock	Andrew Mayer
Deputy Keith Bottomley	Deputy Brian Mooney (Chief Commoner)
Alderman Emma Edhem	Barbara Newman
John Edwards	Graham Packham
Helen Fentimen	Susan Pearson
Marianne Fredericks	Judith Pleasance
Tracey Graham	Deputy Henry Pollard
Graeme Harrower	James de Sausmarez
Sheriff Christopher Hayward	William Upton QC
Christopher Hill	Alderman Sir David Wootton
Michael Hudson	

Officers:

Gemma Stokley	- Town Clerk's Department
Angela Roach	- Assistant Town Clerk
Rhiannon Leary	- Town Clerk's Department
Christopher Rumbles	- Town Clerk's Department
Shani Annand-Baron	- Media Officer
Aqib Hussain	- Technology Support Partner
Simon Owen	- Chamberlain's Department
Dipti Patel	- Chamberlain's Department
Deborah Cluett	- Comptroller and City Solicitor's Department
Jessica Lees	- City Surveyor's Department
Gwyn Richards	- Interim Chief Planning Officer and Development Director
David Horkan	- Department of the Built Environment
Gordon Roy	- Department of the Built Environment
Elisabeth Hannah	- Department of the Built Environment
Paul Monaghan	- Department of the Built Environment
Bhakti Depala	- Department of the Built Environment
Peter Shadbolt	- Department of the Built Environment
Bruce McVean	- Department of the Built Environment
Matt Ball	- Department of the Built Environment
Gemma Delves	- Department of the Built Environment

Kieran Mackay	- Department of the Built Environment
Tom Noble	- Department of the Built Environment
Richard Steele	- Department of the Built Environment
Clarisse Tavin	- Department of the Built Environment
Dom Strickland	- Department of the Built Environment
Lucy Foreman	- Department of the Built Environment
Sonia Williams	- Department of the Built Environment
Rachel Pye	- Markets and Consumer Protection

Also in Attendance:

Ann Holmes – Common Councilman

Ruth Shilston – RWDI – Consulting Engineers and Scientists

Introductions

The Town Clerk opened the meeting by introducing herself 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.

1. APOLOGIES

Apologies for absence were received from Henry Colthurst, Peter Dunphy, Natasha Lloyd – Owen, Oliver Lodge and Sylvia Moys.

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

The Chair – Deputy Alastair Moss - declared a professional conflict of interest in relation to an objection received on agenda Item 4 – 15 Minories, 57-60 & 62 Aldgate High Street and 1 Little Somerset Street, London, EC3 - and advised that, as such, he would withdraw from the meeting for the duration of this item and allow the Deputy Chairman to manage this.

3. MINUTES

The Committee considered the public minutes and summary of the meeting held virtually on 17 November 2017 and approved them as a correct record.

MATTERS ARISING

Anonymisation in Minutes – A Member commented that, whilst he felt that the draft minutes had been well written, they were also bound by the convention that Member contributions were to be anonymised. For the sake of transparency, the Member asked that they be amended so that Members asking questions or making comments were identified by name and that this was now done in the minutes of all future meetings of this Committee. The Member also proposed that the way that individual Members voted at this Committee were recorded within the minutes. He concluded by stating that, whilst he would normally provide the Chair to and Committee Clerk with advanced written warning of any proposed amendments the minutes, he had not done so on this occasion as he felt that there had been recent efforts within the Corporation to limit and control Member participation in meetings and he wanted to protest against this.

The Chair commented that he was not opposed to Members being named within the minutes but asked the Town Clerk to comment on the current convention and the background to this. The Town Clerk reported that, as already stated, it was convention across all Corporation Committees and Sub-Committees that Member contributions and votes were anonymised. If the Committee as a whole were supportive of changing this practice for these meetings this could be considered. The Town Clerk added that, at present, all meetings were broadcast live and were also recorded so that all Member contributions were visible and the way in which individual Members voted was fully transparent.

Another Member spoke to state that, as this Committee had a quasi-judicial role, she also felt that Members should be named in the minutes. She stated that she felt that this would be particularly helpful in terms of planning inquiries that could take place up to 2 years after an application had been considered. The Member went on to suggest that Members had previously been named in Planning and Transportation Committee minutes but that, as elections approached, certain Members had frequently spoken to have their names recorded and the practice had been dropped as a result. The Member concluded that she also intended to propose that contributions in the chat bar were appended to the minutes of all future meetings so that these were automatically visible to the public. The Chair responded by underlining that the chat bar should not be used for debate as this was very hard to monitor during a live meeting. Secondly, the Chair asked the Comptroller and City Solicitor to comment on the quasi-judicial nature or otherwise of this Committee. The Comptroller and City Solicitor explained that there was quite long-standing case law on this, and the conclusion reached was that the role of a Planning Committee was not quasi-judicial.

The Deputy Chairman spoke to state that he did not have a strong view either way on this proposal but underlined that he was strongly opposed to Members not having reasonable notice of suggested changes to minutes such as these and not seemingly being asked to make policy on the hoof.

Another Member spoke to state that he had experience elsewhere where the practice had been to record the names of those who had raised points and that

this had led to grandstanding. As a result, he had advised that the practice should be reversed, and this had led to much smoother meetings. He added that he felt that this practice could become particularly problematic for this Committee as elections approached and given that its meetings were already very lengthy.

The Member had made the proposal spoke again to state that, as meetings were currently recorded for all to go back and review, the argument suggesting that the naming of Members in minutes would lead to grandstanding fell away. The naming of Members in the minutes would take the burden off of people needing to navigate lengthy recordings to try and determine who had said what. Finally, on the statement from the Comptroller and City Solicitor suggesting that the proceedings of this Committee were not quasi-judicial, the Member surmised that this was quoted from the Persimmon case which had been said in the context that Members may have political views however, the judge had also said that the role of Planning Committees was to assess applications impartially and, in that sense, they could be considered quasi-judicial.

Another Member stated that he did not feel strongly either way on this proposal but commented that transparency and openness should be primary in the minds of all in all of their work. However, he noted that any decision on this could have wider ramifications across the Corporation and that Officers should therefore be asked to bring forward a paper on this proposal outlining the arguments for and against this alongside their own suggestions and thoughts.

Another Member commented that, as a point of principal, she had no objection to Members being named within minutes. She went on to comment that not all Members were offered the opportunity to speak at meetings as had been demonstrated at the last meeting of this Committee when a motion was brought to bring debate to a close. In this instance, the Member had taken the opportunity to include her comment within the chat box and she felt that this was appropriate in the circumstances.

The Town Clerk reiterated that the naming of Members in minutes went against the house style that had long since been set down by the Policy and Resources Committee and that, at the very least, any decision here would require a resolution back to this Committee. The Town Clerk added that, whilst it was common for Members to express differences of opinion, this would also go against the ethos of Committee based decision making. At present, if individual Members wished for their objection/an abstention to be recorded by name they were able to do so but it was not suggested that this equate to a 'he said' 'she said', verbatim record of the meeting.

A Member spoke again to suggest that a case should be put to the Policy and Resources Committee to amend the convention for this Committee, particularly around the recording of the way that individual Members voted. The Member stated that she believed that the majority of councils in England did record this information in their minutes. Another Member asked that this fact and the practice elsewhere also be checked to help inform the Committee's decision.

The Chair noted that the Committee made formal resolutions on matters and that, as such, they spoke with one voice. Having said that, he went on to request that Officers bring back a paper on this matter to a future meeting of the Committee so that an informed decision could be made.

150 Aldersgate Street (pages 5-21) – A Member stated that the Chair had already received prior notice of this point in an email issued to him by 8 Members of this Committee on 24 November 2020. He asked the Chair to explain why he had not exercised his discretion under Standing Order No. 37 (3) to disallow the Motion to stop the debate on the application on the grounds that it was premature.

Report of Action Taken (page 26) – The same Member questioned how the proposal that the Chair and Deputy Chairman take more decisions under urgency procedures to help reduce the length of committee meetings would not be an abuse of the procedure that exists to deal with urgent matters that could not await the next scheduled meeting. He also questioned how merely reporting matters decided by the Chair and Deputy Chairman respected the authority delegated to this Committee by the Court to make these decisions.

The Chair undertook to respond to both of these queries in writing in due course.

4. **15 MINORIES, 57-60 & 62 ALDGATE HIGH STREET AND 1 LITTLE SOMERSET STREET LONDON EC3**

The Committee considered a report of the Interim Chief Planning Officer and Development Director regarding 15 Minories, 57-60 & 62 Aldgate High Street and 1 Little Somerset Street, London, EC3, specifically, the demolition of existing structures, and erection of a mixed use office building Class B1(a), including ground floor Class A1, Class A3, and Class A4 uses. (30,901 sq. m. gea.).

The Interim Chief Planning Officer and Development Director presented the application and also drew Members' attention to the fact that an addendum to the report had been circulated and published yesterday afternoon as had some late representations from an objector. Members were informed that the site in question had a very long and convoluted planning history, spanning back more than 15 years. Officers commented that this was probably a reflection of the challenging nature of the site which had a number of subterranean constraints such as tunnels. It was highlighted that this was a key, strategic location for the City, on the eastern gateway to the City, directly opposite Aldgate tube station.

Members were shown images of the existing site which Officers referred to as undistinguished introduction to the City. Officers reported that, in 2014, this Committee had resolved to grant a fairly transformational Master Plan to address this entire site going as far down as to the Guinness Estate at the northern end which involved three separate buildings – one residential block to the south, a hotel scheme in the centre and an office scheme on Aldgate High Street. There was therefore a permission which had been implemented on this site and the southern residential building had been built out to shell and core,

the hotel building was nearing completion and set to open in Spring 2021. This proposal therefore only related to the office component of the scheme which was largely similar to what had already been granted with the only real change being that the footprint of this scheme now extended eastwards to incorporate Rennie House which had now been acquired by the applicant and also the Still and Star public house which was a key part of these proposals.

Members were shown images comparing the existing, consented and newly proposed schemes from Aldgate High Street looking east.

With regard to the Still and Star, Officers reported that this was an early/mid-19th century public house known as a 'slum pub' which had been the subject of quite substantial alterations both internally and externally and was therefore a shadow of its former self. The building was not listed or situated in a Conservation Area however, it did have sufficient charm and significance to be given the title of non-designated heritage asset, but this did not confer additional protection on the building. Officers went on to report that its setting had been greatly changed – it had once sat in an intimate and domestic alleyway but was now surrounded by car-parking space in a rather wind-wept area of paving. Members were shown an aerial view of the site looking north as well as an image of the view of the Still and Star from Little Somerset Street in its current setting.

The Interim Chief Planning Officer and Development Director stated that he wanted to clarify from the outset that the first round of consultation on this scheme had involved the demolition of the Still and Star but did not propose its replacement on the site. This consultation had received approximately 270 objections concerning the loss of the Still and Star. As a result of this and the designation of it as an asset of community value by the City, following a campaign headed by CAMRA (Campaign for Real Ale), the applicant re-designed the scheme to reinstate the Still and Star slightly to the east of where it was currently situated. This was the subject of a further round of consultation where objections to this were still lodged but far fewer than had been the case previously. Perhaps most significantly, the East London and City branch of CAMRA had not objected to the current scheme.

Members were shown images and provided with an overview of the ground floor plan of the current proposals. These demonstrated that the site was sat largely on top of the District and Circle Line subterranean railway tunnels just under the surface. Members were shown images of the proposed structural grid that would be required to support the building above. Critically, the footprint of the existing Still and Star sat in the area where it was possible to come to ground in terms of foundations. The applicant had investigated the possibility of doing so with the Still and Star in situ, but this was not feasible. The building was therefore set to be reimagined and relocated elsewhere on the site resulting in an additional 90 sq. m. for the building and more than double the active pub frontage with a prominent frontage onto Aldgate High Street. At ground floor, proposals were for an office reception facing out onto Aldgate High Street with a retail element on the north-east corner, which was critical, for Officers, to enliven Aldgate and a new, reimagined Harrow Alley. The southern

side at ground floor level would also be retail throughout and would include an entrance to cycle storage space. The new pedestrian route, both in terms of covered walkways and externally are provided at very generous width which would allow for very good pedestrian comfort levels as well as things such as tables and chairs.

Officers reported that stopping up proposals were around a relatively significant area and that a new dedicated public highway would be provided along the newly reimagined Harrow Alley which was considered acceptable.

At basement level, the subterranean constraints were clear. Officers commented that this was an excellent scheme in terms of cycling provision and that it exceeded both the short-term and the long-stay cycling provision expectations of the London Plan providing 54 short stay spaces at ground floor level and 365 long-stay cycle spaces.

Officers went on to report that the transformational Master Plan for this site granted in 2014, saw the amalgamation of servicing for the residential, hotel and office elements of the scheme at a single point to minimise vehicle intrusion into the public realm. At basement level there was proposed to be an integrated servicing arrangement with the office, hotel and residential building as well as the Still and Star. In addition, this would be consolidated to off-peak deliveries and a Delivery Service Plan would be required as part of the Section 106 agreement. The conditions preventing night-time deliveries would also be carried over due to nearby residential dwellings.

In terms of the office floor plating, the expansion of the footprint to the east provided for a much more successful office floorplate that was capable of being flexibly subdivided by tenants to incorporate things such as co-working spaces. It had been designed with a view to being responsive to the changes in office demands which had been accelerated due to COVID-19. The proposals included an uplift of 10,000 sq. m. in office space over and above the consented scheme which was a very generous contribution to the City Corporation's target on this. Moving up through the building and concentrating on upper level floors, roof terraces were to be provided on a number of levels and Members were informed that there would be an Environmental Health Condition limiting the use of these to avoid disturbances to residents nearby.

The Committee were shown an image of the east west cross section of the scheme depicting the reimagined Still and Star and the very generous 5m high, vaulted, walkways through the building which was highlighted as a very dynamic and striking feature of the design. Members were also shown existing and proposed aerial views of the site, depicting it in its wider context and illustrating that the proposed height of the building was comparable with other buildings in the vicinity. Officers underlined that this was a critical area in terms of the setting of the Tower of London World Heritage Site, in particular from Queen's Walk and that the height of the proposed building had been negotiated to ensure that there was no harm to the view of the White Tower.

Members were informed that the design approach largely mirrored that of the previously consented scheme, involving glazed frontage and curvaceous aluminium fins. Members were shown images of the North, South, East and West elevations of the proposed building.

Members were informed that a new pedestrian crossing would be installed at Aldgate High Street with the approval of TfL. With regards to the view from St Botolph Street looking west, the Committee were informed that there would be a marginal increase in the buildings footprint to the east but not to an extent that it was considered harmful to the setting of the Hoop and Grapes which was a listed building. Other views were shown with Officers highlighting that there would be no significant change between the consented and newly proposed scheme.

Officers went on to focus specifically on the Still and Str – a key element of the scheme. The Committee were shown images of the existing building from Little Somerset Street looking north depicting the red-brick clad elevation which bore little resemblance to its original appearance. Alongside this, Members were shown images of the consented and newly proposed scheme which illustrated that the consented scheme came very close to the Still and Star but that the proposed scheme would move Little Somerset House to the east and rename it 'Harrow Alley' with the Still and Star relocated to the right hand side of this. Members were also shown an image of the reimagined Still and Star from Aldgate High Street and given a rationale behind the reinvention of it as an architectural piece. The elevation on Aldgate High Street would be clearly visible from a wide area which would serve to increase its viability and widen its appeal. The architects had carried out a very thorough assessment of London pubs and had found that there were numerous examples of very successful premises that had the proposed layout of the reimagined Still and Star. Members were also shown comparative images of the existing and proposed setting for the Still and Star which depicted the significant increase in the elevation of the premises and its prominence but also the domestic quality of the architecture. The building would also be reinstated as part of a much more coherent alleyway than existed at present. It was felt that these measures, alongside the much-increased footprint, would increase the Still and Star's contribution to the social life of the City and its viability/popularity. Officers commented that the design approach was particularly creative and innovative with the architect proposing to take 3D scans of the existing facades of the Still and Star and reconfigure these in coloured concrete as a celebration of the existing building which would be displayed on Aldgate High Street. The reimagined Still and Star would include a roof garden including generous planting. Officers went on to comment that the care taken by the architect to assess the essential qualities of both the Still and Star and of a London pub had been particularly impressive and there were also proposals to reinstate a gin distillery here and to have a nursery for botanics for the gin. The interior of the premises would seek to replicate the historic look and feel of a typical London pub. This would be secured through a Section 106 agreement.

In summary, the Interim Chief Planning Officer and Development Director commented that this was a very strategic scheme where existing permission

had already been granted for the site. These proposals would be the final piece in the regeneration of an underutilised site that was currently somewhat of an eyesore in a key part of the City. Members were reminded that this was an extremely challenging site in engineering terms which these proposals had overcome in a very creative manner and would provide 28,000 sq. m. of high-quality and flexible office floor space which was an additional 10,000 sq. m. over the existing, consented scheme. The proposals would also offer vibrant retail unit and a generous pedestrian route in pedestrianised public realm. It was a model scheme in terms of plans for servicing and cycle space. The Still and Star was, unfortunately, situated in one of the few areas of the site where it was possible to lay foundations and all options of retaining the building that had been considered had not proved to be feasible. Officers commented that, whilst the premises were an undesignated heritage asset it was a shadow of its former self and had been heavily altered. The pub was also an asset of community value due to its contribution to social life in the City and Officers were of the view that this was a very creative scheme in terms of reinventing and reinvigorating the Still and Star as a social and community asset. Officers felt that this was an accomplished, innovative, contemporary imagination celebrating the Still and Star's history and its significance after the very thorough assessment carried out by the applicant and the architect. It was recognised that many of London's most enduring pubs had a long history of rebuilding, remodelling and even relocation meaning that this was not alien or incongruous. The newly proposed Still and Star would be larger than the existing building with a 20% increase in floorspace and double the active frontage of the existing Still and Star which was somewhat lost in its current location. The new premises would have a prominent location on Aldgate High Street, with a long elevation along Harrow Alley and was felt to be a very accomplished and potentially award-winning re-birth of the Still and Star on a challenging site. It was felt that this would strengthen the long-term viability and popularity of the pub which would enhance its contributions serving the wider community.

The Deputy Chairman thanked Officers for their presentation and invited questions of Officers from the Committee.

A Member referred to the late representation received from the adjacent landowner requesting further conditions to ensure that there would be no future issues with their own redevelopment next door to this site. She also asked if there could be conditions to ensure that the Still and Star was not demolished or altered until the 3D castings of the pub had taken place. In terms of the community asset value of the Still and Star, the Member also questioned whether we were fulfilling the listing should the pub be relocated as proposed. Officers stated that they understood that there had been a lot of discussion between the applicant and the neighbouring landowner, commenting that this kind of relationship was quite commonplace in the City as Members would expect. Officers also reported that there was a condition applied that the City would approve details of the flank elevation as there were concerns that this should not be a dominant elevation and that it should be an active and not a dormant elevation. In terms of conditions relating to the proposed 3D castings, it was felt that this would be better captured via a Section 106 agreement which

would be very thorough to ensure that this was delivered in its entirety. With regard to the pub being an asset of community value, it was reported that this was effectively a recognition that the Still and Star contributed to the social, community life of the City and it was felt that these proposals would only serve to strengthen this in terms of increasing its size and presence.

Another Member spoke to question the environmental aspects of the scheme, commenting that she had not found any information in the report about Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS). She had, however, noted a lengthy email from Thames Water and asked Officers if they could provide any further explanation on this. Officers reported that the developer would need to enter into discussions with Thames Water to check that the capacity for drainage is sufficient to accommodate the development. With regards to SuDS, it was noted that the Lead Local Flood Authority had raised no objections to scheme and that there were two conditions requiring further details of the design of the SuDS Strategy which was submitted as part of the application.

Another Member spoke to compliment the comprehensive background information provided on the scheme and questioned the letter received last week from the adjacent landowner and questioned whether it was the case, as stated within the report, that there would be a remaining gap between the sites that could potentially become a wind tunnel. If this were correct, she questioned whether Offices had been able to undertake any work to determine whether or not this would be acceptable in terms of wind standards. Officers responded to state that the reason that the building would be set back was to ensure that development of the adjoining site was not compromised. It was not envisaged that this would lead to any issues such as the creation of a wind tunnel, but this would need to be addressed should a proposal come forward for the adjoining site. If this were the case, it was felt that this could be readily resolved with the use of things such as brise soleils.

A Member questioned the Environmental credentials of the building and noted that the report made reference to the ambition of achieving a BREEAM excellent rating and that this would be conditioned. He sought clarity on the fact that this was both agreed and understood by the developer. On carbon emissions, he also sought to confirm what energy performance certification level the developers were committed to, suggesting that this ought to be as high as possible. Officers reported that the developer was taking a very proactive approach to delivering a much improved BREEAM and carbon emission rating and that both of these points were conditioned to ensure the very highest achievable standards.

Another Member spoke to commend the comprehensive presentation of this project. He went on to question who the freeholder of the site was and whether the City of London had an interest. Officers reported that the applicant was 4C Hotels and confirmed that there was no City interest in the site. It was reported that TfL was the freeholder.

In response to questions, the Deputy Chair reported that there were no objectors or applicants' representatives registered to address the Committee today.

A Member questioned whether the issue around rights of light to the adjoining site was a relevant planning consideration. Officers stated that this was a planning issue/material consideration in so far as the adjoining landowner had objected on the grounds of overlooking which was not felt to be a sustainable planning ground. However, it was noted that there was also a party wall issue to be resolved which was a civil matter.

A Member spoke again on the fact that the Still and Star was an asset of community value and, as such, was an important building which showed the social history of this part of the City. She noted that, in the addendum sent to Members yesterday, 4C Hotels would ensure that the name Still and Star would be retained but questioned whether the City Corporation ought to suggest a covenant to ensure that the reimagined Still and Star would remain in perpetuity on this site for as long as the building did given that they had recognised its historical importance. She questioned whether it was possible to condition this. The Interim Chief Planning Officer and Development Director reported that, should the applicant wish to change the use of the Still and Star, they would require planning permission from the City Corporation. In addition, the Section 106 agreement would ensure the delivery of this, its continuation and the appropriate look and feel of the building, ensuring that this was not diluted in the future.

Another Member also spoke on the rights of light issue and asked whether Officers could provide further information on this and explain the matter in the context of this application. The Interim Chief Planning Officer and Development Director clarified that rights of light were not a planning matter but a civil matter between adjoining landowners and that this should not therefore be taken into consideration by the Committee when deciding upon this application. The impact of a development on an amenity such as overlooking and daylight/sunlight was, however, a material consideration and it was clarified that Officers did not consider that this proposal caused harm in these respects.

Members proceeded to debate the application.

A Member highlighted that Officers had stated in their presentation that CAMRA had objected to the original proposal which had involved the demolition of the Still and Star but had then supported the revised proposal which involved a replacement. What had not been mentioned, was that the Victorian Society had objected to both proposals. The Member suggested that the views of the Victorian Society should be given greater weight when the preservation of heritage was concerned. Secondly, the Member went on to question the precise application of the relevant planning policy. He highlighted that this proposal entailed the demolition of a 200 year old public house of a rare historical type which had recently been listed as an asset of community value in order to make way for the substantial expansion of an already substantial proposed office development. The Member commented that, on the face of it,

this breached policy CV1 of the emerging City Plan 2036 which states that “special consideration should be given to the protection of cultural facilities that are unique to the City and maintain an historic or cultural association with the Square Mile, including public houses which have community value”. The Member commented that this pub fell squarely within this description. He reported that the policy continued by stating that “the City Corporation will resist the loss of existing visitor, arts, heritage and cultural facilities unless replacement facilities of at least equivalent quality are provided on site or within the vicinity which meets the needs of the City’s communities”. The recommendation to this Committee was that it did not resist the loss of this existing heritage facility in spite of its rarity and community value. This was justified within the report by saying that replacement facilities of at least equivalent quality are provided in the form of a “reimagined”, new pub with the same name in a location that is more convenient for the developer. The Member commented that a new building in a contemporary style was not a replacement of a 200-year-old building. He concluded by stating that this original pub was a small and rare piece of the City’s history which should not be sacrificed for an office development and yet more office space. When the application was assessed against the City’s relevant planning policy it should fail.

Another Member spoke to recognise that the Still and Star was an important part of this project but was by no means its only part. He added that the pub actually closed in October 2017 because it was unable to continue as a going concern. The objections received would indicate that the heritage site was more important than the pub as a business. The Member stated that he felt that the opportunity offered by the developer to give the pub more prominence on the high street and to make it an integral part of the new development would keep its heritage more alive than a disused, closed building in an undistinguished location. The Member also mentioned that the eastern City Business Improvement District strategy in place was also of relevance to this application and it should be borne in mind that there was a drive to see this part of the City improved with better facilities and he felt that this building would complement this approach.

A Member spoke in support of the application noting that he had also been involved in the 2007 and 2014 previously consented applications for this site. He described the proposals as a brilliant feat of engineering in an important location. He felt that the reimagining of the Still and Star in a more prominent location should be supported and he congratulated the architects for its inclusion in the scheme. He added that his only concern was that discussions had not yet taken place with Thames Water in terms of resource for the site.

Another Member spoke on the proposed preservation of the Still and Star which was, at present, a rather run-down building in a restricted access area. He was supportive of the reimagining of the pub which would be in a better location and larger than the existing premises, making it more commercially viable and therefore a real asset to the surrounding area and local community. He added that he felt that this application was the final piece in the jigsaw for this scheme and the redevelopment of this area which he intended to support.

Another Member spoke to report that the Still and Star was once an incredibly popular pub until local businesses had left the area. She went on to state that the pub was an important part of the City's community history and that the fact that the building may be unattractive on the outside did not devalue it in terms of historical interest. She expressed her disappointment that the building was not able to remain in situ. With regard to Harrow Alley, she commented that the City had taken an entirely different view with regard to Vine Street where they had asked that this be reinstated with the new walkway built from here to Tower Hill. She added that alleyways and passageways defined the City of London. Finally, she requested further information from Officers on the wind effect that this building would have on Aldgate High Street and Aldgate Square which was described as 'sitting wind'. The Interim Chief Planning Officer and Development Director assured the Committee that the wind effects had been modelled intensely and confirmed that the proposals were in compliance with the wind guidelines. It was felt that the wind conditions here would be conducive for people to sit and dwell here outside of the public house.

The Committee then proceeded to vote on the recommendations before them within the report. The vote was conducted by rollcall 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 – 24 Votes

OPPOSED – 1 Vote

There were 2 abstentions.

One Member present was unable to vote due to technical issues which had led to her missing part of the debate.

The application was therefore approved.

RESOLVED – That planning permission be granted for the above proposal in accordance with the details set out in the attached schedule subject to:

- (a) Planning obligations and other agreements being entered into under Section 106 of the Town & Country Planning Act 1990 and Section 278 of the Highway 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;
- (b) That Members agree in principle that the land affected by the proposal which is currently public highway and land over which the public have right of access (between Aldgate and Little Somerset Street that would be built upon if the development was implemented) may be stopped up to enable the development to proceed and, upon receipt of the formal application, officers be instructed to proceed with arrangements for advertising and making of a Stopping-up Order for the various areas under the delegation arrangements approved by the Court of Common Council.
- (c) That Members agree to delegate authority to officers and the Comptroller and City Solicitor to declare new highway or city walkway

through the development in accordance with the principal reservations, limitations and conditions set out in the report.

- (d) That Officers be delegated authority 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 Highway Act 1960.

5. **BRIDGE HOUSE ESTATES, COLECHURCH HOUSE, SE1 - PROPOSED REMOVAL OF THE ELEVATED FOOTWAY**

The Committee considered a report of the City Surveyor regarding the proposed removal of the elevated footway at Colechurch House, SE1.

RESOLVED – That, acting collectively for the City as trustee of Bridge House Estates, and considering it to be in the best interests of the charity, the Committee:

- i) Delegate authority to the City Surveyor to carry out the statutory consultation in accordance with section 32(3) of the City of London (Various Powers) Act 1963 (as amended) with Network Rail, Transport for London and the London Borough of Southwark with regards to the proposed demolition of the elevated footway at Colechurch House;
- ii) Delegate authority to the City Surveyor in consultation with the Chairs of the Planning and Transportation Committee and Property Investment Board to review the responses to the consultation subject to reporting back to Committee in the event of any unresolved objections or issues; and
- iii) Subject to there being (i) no unresolved objections or issues in response to the statutory consultation (ii) planning permission being granted for the redevelopment of Colechurch House and removal of the elevated footway and (iii) the developer obtaining all consents necessary for the demolition of the elevated footway, to delegate authority to the City Surveyor to take all necessary steps (including the entering into of any necessary agreements) to enable the stopping up and demolition of the elevated footway to be carried out.

6. **LONDON WALL CAR PARK - PARTIAL REPURPOSING FOR LAST MILE LOGISTICS HUB**

The Committee considered a report of the Director of the Built Environment recommending the repurposing of 39 spaces in London Wall Car Park for their use as a last mile logistics hub to be operated by Amazon Logistics.

A Member commented that she was aware that some residents used this Car Park and questioned whether this would still be possible should these proposals be approved. Officers assured the Member that this would still be possible as this arrangement would essentially use surplus capacity in the car park as there was no consistent, wider demand for these spaces at present.

RESOLVED – That Members agree to:

- The repurposing of 39 spaces in London Wall Car Park for use as a last mile logistics hub, with the responsibility for the facility remaining with the Department of the Built Environment.
- Lease the hub to Amazon Logistics subject to final agreement of the terms set out in the non-public appendix 1, with such terms to be agreed under delegated authority by the City Surveyor.
- Approve the necessary enabling works subject to planning approvals, the cost of which would be covered by the operator.

7. **LOCAL DEVELOPMENT SCHEME 2020**

The Committee considered a report of the Director of the Built Environment regarding the Local Development Scheme (LDS).

RESOLVED – That Members:

- Approve the updated Local Development Scheme for publication; and
- Resolve that the updated Local Development Scheme is to have effect from 15 December 2020.

8. **THERMAL COMFORT GUIDELINES**

The Committee considered a report of the Interim Chief Planning Officer and Development Director regarding Thermal Comfort Guidelines.

The Chair commended this work. The Interim Chief Planning Officer and Development Director reported that this work merged together sunlight, wind, heat and humidity through the seasons to really understand how locations felt for those using that space, quantifying this and assessing applications in terms of their impact on users. Members were informed that this work was quite revolutionary globally and that Officers hoped to be able to further refine it in due course as more lessons were learned. It was not felt that this would be onerous on developers or applicants as it built upon the Microclimatic work that they were already required to do. Members were informed that representatives from RWDI were also present to respond to any questions.

A Member questioned whether the guidelines would have any legal standing or were simply advisory. Officers reported that the guidelines would be a planning advice note and not supplementary planning guidance. The Chair added that where he and the Deputy Chair were meeting applicants, they were emphasising the importance of these guidelines.

RESOLVED – That Members adopt the Guidelines as a Planning Advice Note.

9. **REVIEW OF PILOT AND FUTURE BRIDGE HOUSE ESTATES FUNDING FOR ENFORCEMENT ACTIVITY AGAINST ILLEGAL STREET TRADING ON AND BY THE BRIDGES**

The Committee considered a report of the Director of Markets and Consumer Protection providing details of the review of the 2 year pilot of a new approach to enforcement against illegal street traders by the City Corporation as local authority on the five Thames bridges owned by Bridge House Estates (BHE).

A Member stated that he strongly supported this and made the point that the involvement of the City of London Police had made a huge difference to the success of this work and that it was therefore very important for this to continue.

RESOLVED – That, Members of the Planning and Transportation Committee: -

- Note the review of the effectiveness and outcomes of the two-year trial period of increased enforcement activity against illegal street trading on and around the five bridges owned, supported and maintained by Bridge House Estates.
- Agree to support enhanced local authority street trading enforcement capability on and around the bridges for a further two year period (subject to annual review) with a view to supporting, safeguarding and preserving the bridges and to the protection of the general public who use the bridges,

10. **GATEWAY 6 - OUTCOME REPORT - LONDON BRIDGE WATERPROOFING AND BEARINGS REPLACEMENT**

The Committee considered a Gateway 6 – Outcome Report of the Director of the Built Environment regarding the London Bridge Waterproofing and Bearings Replacement work.

The Committee were informed that the Director of the Built Environment was immensely proud of the team involved in this work for completing the project early by immediately responding to the first national lockdown in March 2020 to find safe ways of working and keep the project running.

The Chair added the Committee's thanks to Officers for completing this high-profile work successfully.

RESOLVED – That the Committee:

- Approve the closure of the project, providing the final account is agreed within £2,626,000
- Delegate authority to the Chief Officer to agree a settlement of disputed items, if this becomes necessary,
- Delegate authority to the Chief Officer to use released but unspent CRP allocation (up to £61,000) to settle, if this becomes necessary.

11. **TRANSPORT STRATEGY UPDATE: QUARTER 2 2020/21**

The Committee received a report of the Director of the Built Environment updating Members on progress with delivering the City of London Transport Strategy for Quarter 2 of 2020/21 (July-September 2020).

RESOLVED – That Members note the report.

12. **2020/21 BUSINESS PLAN UPDATE Q2**

The Committee received a report of the Director of the Built Environment setting out progress made during Q2 of the 2020/21 Departmental Business Plan.

RESOLVED – That Members note the report and appendices.

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

The Committee received a report of the Director of the Built Environment providing Members with assurance that risk management procedures in place within the Department of the Built Environment are satisfactory and that they meet the requirements of the corporate Risk Management Framework.

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

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

The Committee received the public minutes of the Streets and Walkways Sub-Committee held virtually on 15 October 2020.

RECEIVED.

15. **OUTSTANDING ACTIONS**

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

RECEIVED.

16. **PUBLIC LIFT REPORT**

The Committee received a public lift report of the City Surveyor for the period 29/10/2020 – 25/11/2020.

Officers reported that Blackfriars lift was nearing repair after having overcome some issues with the doors. However, there were now issues with the lift controller with Officers waiting on lead times now for its replacement. A Member expressed concern at the fact that this was a relatively new lift yet seemed to be particularly problematic and questioned the reasons behind this. Officers reported that a previous lift failure had resulted in the fire service attending and forcing the doors to free someone trapped inside and further safety measures to prevent the need to force the doors open in the event of future entrapments were now being looked at with new doors to be fitted in due course.

Members were informed that there were some issues with vandalism to the Inclinator with the doors being forced. Officers had discussed the matter with the lift contractor who would now be attending every morning and evening to ensure that the Inclinator was back in service. Further measures such as the installation of CCTV were also now under consideration.

A Member commented that a new lift had been installed in London Street as part of the 17 Mount Lane planning application. She questioned whether this was anything to do with the City Corporation and reported that she had recently

had to help free someone trapped inside. She reported that there had been issues with the door mechanism and asked that this be fed back to the building owner. Officers undertook to make further enquiries on this.

RESOLVED – That Members note the report.

17. **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.

18. **VALID PLANNING APPLICATIONS RECEIVED BY 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.

The Interim Chief Planning Officer and Development Director highlighted that the Department was currently busier than ever with November 2020 statistics depicting that applications were higher now than pre-lockdown in March 2020. He therefore forewarned Members that a number of major, ambitious schemes would be put to the Committee in the next six months and reported that the department had been resourced to be able to withstand this amount of work and move things forward as quickly as possible.

A Member requested that, where there were major applications to be considered, these were considered at separate, dedicated meetings so that they were able to be adequately deliberated.

The Town Clerk reported that additional meeting dates were currently being identified for the first quarter of 2021 for this purpose.

Another Member spoke to suggest that no more than one substantial planning application should be put on an agenda for each meeting. The Chair agreed with this point.

Another Member suggested that fortnightly meeting dates, set in advance, could also be helpful. The Chair highlighted that similar comments were now being received from all parties and that he and the Deputy Chair were assuming that Members would be amenable to this. He commented that agenda plans were being drawn up on the assumption that just one application per meeting would be considered and that, as such, it was clear that additional meetings would be required in 2021 which Members would be notified of as soon as possible.

The Deputy Chair added that reports on applications and Officer presentations should always be as thorough as possible with papers circulated to all in advance. He added that fortnightly meetings could prove difficult for working Members.

Another Member added that site visits or virtual site visits should also always be provided wherever possible. The Chair stated that he had never refused the request from any party for a site visit and agreed that these were helpful, particularly if they could be delivered virtual in the current circumstances. He added that briefings were also sometimes organised by the applicant as per the Planning Protocol.

A Member picked up on the Interim Chief Planning Officer and Development Director's comment about his team being properly resourced to deal with forthcoming applications and questioned whether, given the ongoing effects of COVID-19, there had been any notable time delays or 'congestion' in terms of the processing of development applications. The Interim Chief Planning Officer and Development Director reported that the Department had recently lost a number of experienced Planning Officers. He confirmed that a period of successful recruitment had followed this and that he was of the view that the Department were now in a strong position resources wise. He did not, therefore, believe that any schemes had been compromised in terms of timescales but undertook to keep this matter under review.

RESOLVED – That Members note the report.

19. **PUBLIC 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).

RESOLVED – That Members note the report.

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

Staffing – Transport Officers

A Member noted that a number of Transport Planning Officers had left the organisation recently and sought some assurance that the Department were still adequately resourced from this perspective. The Member added that she wanted to record her thanks to those who had left for all of their hard work. The Interim Chief Planning Officer and Development Director reported that the Department were devising a new way of working where work was now increasingly carried out across teams as opposed to in siloes and stated that he was confident that the resources were in place to cover this work. The Committee were informed that some members of the Strategic Transportation Team were also soon set to depart and that resources would be managed across the section to cover these roles given that there was an organisation-

wide recruitment freeze in force at present. It was therefore not envisaged that there would be any significant impact on resources.

Virtual Reality (VR) Square Mile

A Member reported that he had attended a very interesting webinar on this subject in recent months which had also been attended by the Interim Chief Planning Officer and Development Director and had featured 'the most advanced, fully interactive, virtual reality model ever created of a major City', sponsored by the City of London. He therefore questioned whether any of this technology which had been developed so successfully could be used to help the Committee understand the context of some of the forthcoming applications. The Interim Chief Planning Officer and Development Director stated that he would be happy to present the technology to the Committee at a future training session. He added that VR technology required the use of a headset but that the aim was for this to become an established tool, not just for Members but also for the general public to better understand the impact of a proposal. Further work was also being undertaken to allow people to better understand and visualise the pedestrian flows and thermal comfort/wind impacts of developments.

Museum of London Progress

A Member questioned the progress made on the permission granted by this Committee in Summer 2020 noting that no decision notice had yet been issued. The Interim Chief Planning Officer and Development Director reported that his had not been issued as the Section 106 agreement had not yet been entered into as the Museum of London were yet to take an interest in the site which would then enable them to enter into the planning obligation and to the agreement. Negotiations on the lease to the Museum were continuing.

Governance Review pertaining to the Planning and Transportation Committee

A Member reported that recent discussions on the Planning Protocol at the Policy and Resources Committee had led to the Chair and Deputy Chair of the Policy and Resources Committee undertaking to consider the Lord Lisvane recommendations pertaining to the Planning and Transportation Committee in early 2021 with any changes being put in place for the new civic year in April 2021.

A Member, also Deputy Chair of the Policy and Resources Committee, confirmed that this was the case and that he would be bringing forward the consideration of the Lord Lisvane recommendations around this Committee. He added that consultation dates for January 2021 had now been agreed and that Members would be notified of these later this week. Any recommendations arising from these sessions would be taken to the Resource Allocation Sub Committee, the Planning and Transportation Committee and, ultimately, the Court of Common Council to a timescale that envisaged the Corporation being able to implement any changes agreed by the beginning of the new municipal year.

The Chair added that he and the Deputy Chairman were very keen to see this work undertaken. He added, however, that this was not about a review of the Planning Protocol but a review of the Lisvane recommendations and stated that the Protocol had already been reviewed by this Committee and the Policy and Resources Committee. He noted that there may, however, be an overlap of issues in terms of the governance of this Committee.

21. ANY OTHER BUSINESS THAT THE CHAIRMAN CONSIDERS URGENT

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

22. 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>
23	3, 5 & 7
24-25	3
26-27	-

23. DEBT ARREARS - BUILT ENVIRONMENT (P&T COMMITTEE) PERIOD ENDING 30TH SEPTEMBER 2020

The Committee received a report of the Director of the Built Environment informing Members of arrears of invoiced income as at 30th September 2020.

24. NON-PUBLIC APPENDIX 1 TO AGENDA ITEM 6 - LONDON WALL CAR PARK - PARTIAL REPURPOSING FOR LAST MILE LOGISTICS HUB

The Committee received a non-public appendix which was considered in conjunction with Item 6.

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

The Committee received the non-public minutes of the Streets and Walkways Sub-Committee meeting held virtually on 15 October 2020.

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

A Member raised a question regarding the Beech Street Judgement.

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

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

The meeting closed at 12.30pm

Chairman

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