

## **PLANNING AND TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE**

**Tuesday, 26 April 2022**

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

### **Present**

#### **Members:**

Shravan Joshi (Chairman)	Deputy Edward Lord
Deputy Alastair Moss (Deputy Chair)	Natasha Maria Cabrera Lloyd-Owen
Deputy Randall Anderson	Alderman Ian Luder
Brendan Barns	Antony Manchester
Alexander Barr	Alderman Bronek Masojada
Emily Benn	Andrew Mayer
Ian Bishop-Laggett	Deborah Oliver
Deputy Keith Bottomley	Deputy Graham Packham
Deputy Michael Cassidy	Deputy Susan Pearson
John Edwards	Deputy Henry Pollard
Anthony David Fitzpatrick	Ian Seaton
Deputy John Fletcher	Luis Felipe Tilleria
Deputy Marianne Fredericks	Shailendra Kumar Kantilal Umradia
Martha Grekos	William Upton QC
Jaspreet Hodgson	
Deputy Shravan Joshi	
Alderman Alastair King DL	

#### **Officers:**

Gwyn Richards	- Chief Planning Officer and Development Director
Elisabeth Hannah	- Environment Department
Gordon Roy	- Environment Department
David Horkan	- Environment Department
Ian Hughes	- Environment Department
Bruce McVean	- Environment Department
Peter Shadbolt	- Environment Department
Simon Glynn	- Environment Department
Gemma Delves	- Environment Department
Deborah Cluett	- Comptroller and City Solicitor's Department
Gemma Stokley	- Town Clerk's Department
Joseph Anstee	- Town Clerk's Department
Shani Annand-Baron	- Town Clerk's Department
Andrew Coke	- City Surveyor's Department

### **1. APOLOGIES**

#### **Introductions**

The Town Clerk opened the meeting by introducing herself.

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. It was confirmed 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.

Apologies for absence were received from Deputy Brian Mooney, Judith Pleasance, Alethea Silk and Alderman Sir David Wootton.

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

Deputy Alastair Moss declared a non-pecuniary interest in agenda Item 8 and indicated that he intended to withdraw from the meeting whilst this matter was debated and voted upon.

3. **ORDER OF THE COURT OF COMMON COUNCIL**

The Committee received the separately circulated Order of the Court of Common Council of 21 April 2021 appointing the Committee and setting out its terms of reference for the ensuing year.

**RECEIVED.**

4. **ELECTION OF CHAIRMAN**

The Committee proceeded to elect a Chairman in accordance with Standing Order No. 29.

A list of Members who had expressed an interest in and were eligible to stand was read by the Town Clerk and Deputy Marianne Fredericks and Deputy Shravan Joshi both expressed a willingness to serve.

A ballot was therefore necessary.

A ballot having been taken, votes were cast as follows:-

Deputy Marianne Fredericks	-	8 votes
Deputy Shravan Joshi	-	18 votes

RESOLVED – That Deputy Shravan Joshi be elected Chairman in accordance with Standing Order 29 for the year ensuing.

On being elected, the Chairman thanked the Committee for its support.

The Chairman went on to pay tribute to those Members who had now left the Committee, beginning with Oliver Sells QC who had served as Deputy Chairman for the past two years and who was thanked for his hard work, leadership and guidance during his term, also Douglas Barrow, Peter Bennett, Deputy Mark Bostock, Thomas Clementi, Deputy Peter Dunphy, Tracey Graham, Graeme Harrower, Deputy Christopher Hayward, Christopher Hill,

Tom Hoffman, Jamie Ingham Clark, Alderwoman Susan Langley, James de Sausmarez and Barbara Newman who had served on this Committee for twenty years and was also a former Chair.

The Chair also welcomed new Members of the Committee – Brendan Barns, Alex Barr, Emily Benn, Ian Bishop-Laggett, Deputy Michael Cassidy, Antony Fitzpatrick, Martha Grekos, Jaspreet Hodgson, Alderman Ian Luder, Anthony Manchester, Deborah Oliver, Alethea Silk, Luis Tilleria, Shailendra Umrada and William Upton who was re-joining the Committee after a short pause in service.

Finally, the Chairman read a short statement in response to the Motion that had been passed at last week's Court of Common Council meeting on traffic orders and Bank Junction. He also stated that this statement would be circulated to all Common Councillors at the conclusion of today's meeting.

The Chairman reminded Members that the resolution instructed this Committee to do two reviews. The first is that Officers be tasked with reviewing all traffic orders currently in effect on the City's streets. The second, that the planned review of the traffic mix and timing of restrictions at Bank junction should begin immediately.

The Chairman clarified that both of these reviews should take account of the Transport Strategy, Climate Action Strategy and Corporate Plan. He reported that, for the first task, officers have already begun scoping this exercise and associated surveys and analysis to inform the review. A report setting out the approach would be brought to the next meeting of this Committee in May. The first report of the outcomes of the review is then scheduled to come to this Committee in September 2022.

For the Bank junction review, it was reported that, again officers had begun the process. This review would be overseen by the Streets & Walkways Sub-Committee given its more detailed nature. However, when necessary, reports would also be brought to this Committee, including the final recommendations for decision before being presented to the Court of Common Council.

With the permission of the Chairman, the Chair of the Community and Children's Services Committee spoke from the public gallery to question whether this Committee could give assurances that disability and womens groups would also be consulted as part of this work. The Chairman assured the Member that this would be the case.

## 5. **ELECTION OF DEPUTY CHAIRMAN**

The Committee proceeded to elect a Deputy Chairman in accordance with Standing Order No. 30.

A list of Members who had expressed an interest in and were eligible to stand was read by the Town Clerk and Deputy Alastair Moss, being the only Member expressing a willingness to serve, was therefore duly elected as Deputy Chairman.

## **VOTE OF THANKS**

Proposed by Deputy Henry Pollard;  
Seconded unanimously;

### **RESOLVED UNANIMOUSLY:**

THAT, at the conclusion of his term of office as their Chair, the Members of this Committee wish to extend to

#### **Deputy Alastair Moss**

their sincere thanks and appreciation for the extremely able and competent manner in which he has presided over their deliberations and the detailed interest and commitment he has shown in all aspects of the work of the Planning and Transportation Committee.

ALASTAIR'S Chairmanship has been extraordinary in many ways, not least because of the impact of the pandemic and its consequences upon all aspects of life in the City. Residents, businesses, workers and visitors were all profoundly affected. However, he was keen to ensure that it was business as usual from the onset of the first lockdown, even if that meant informal meetings at the outset and the many technological challenges that this presented. The role of this Committee, under his leadership, has been vital in responding to the crisis and leading the recovery with energy and vision, setting out our route to future prosperity. He has ensured that the challenges faced were met with determination and focus and has been committed to a fair balance between all stakeholders and collaborative decision making.

HIS experience and understanding of planning and transportation matters have been a driving force behind the record number of planning applications which have been considered in the past three years, with many others still in the pipeline. Indeed, a number of additional meetings were called in order to cater for the Committee's very high workload.

UNDER his leadership, the Committee have achieved a great deal, with the active pursuit and implementation of a ground-breaking and radical Transport Strategy – a first for the City, the key role that it has played in the Recovery Task Force, its support for the implementation of the Climate Action Strategy in the built environment and the significant progression of the draft Local Plan, to name but a few.

THE Chair has worked tirelessly to ensure that the City is the place where developers are able to bring forward world class projects that maintain our pre-eminence. He has also given focus to the critical issues affecting our streets and public spaces, seeking always to co-ordinate efforts to further improve the Square Mile over the next 25 years, ensuring that it remains a competitive, safe and attractive place to live, work, learn and visit.

IN taking leave of Alastair as their Chair, Members of this Committee wish to

thank him for his service and excellent leadership in bringing the Committee's demanding agendas to decision. We wish him every possible success in the future.

6. **APPOINTMENT OF SUB-COMMITTEES**

The Committee considered a report of the Town Clerk relative to the appointment of its Sub Committees and Working Party, their constitution and terms of reference.

**Streets and Walkways Sub Committee**

The Town Clerk announced that, with eight Members expressing an interest in standing for the seven available spaces from the Planning and Transportation Committee, a ballot would be required.

Following discussion, the Committee were of the view that the membership of the Sub Committee should be expanded to incorporate eight as opposed to seven Members from the Planning and Transportation Committee for the ensuing year only, thereby negating the need for a ballot.

**Local Plans Sub Committee**

The Town Clerk announced that, with ten Members expressing an interest in standing for the five available spaces from the Planning and Transportation Committee, a ballot was required.

Following discussion, the Committee were of the view that the membership of the Sub Committee should be expanded to incorporate ten as opposed to five Members from the Planning and Transportation Committee for the ensuing year only, thereby negating the need for a ballot.

**RESOLVED** - That the appointment, composition and terms of reference of the sub-committees and working parties for the ensuing year are approved as follows:-

a) **Streets and Walkways Sub-Committee**

The Chair and Deputy Chairman of the Grand Committee along with eight other Members (for the ensuing year only) as follows:

- Deputy Randall Anderson
  - John Edwards
  - Deputy Marianne Fredericks
  - Deputy Edward Lord
  - Deputy Graham Packham
  - Deputy Susan Pearson
  - Judith Pleasance
  - Ian Seaton
- 
- Together with four *ex-officio* Members representing the Finance, Police and Open Spaces, City Gardens and West Ham Park and Port Health and Environmental Services Committees.

**Terms of Reference**

The Sub Committee is responsible for:-

- (a) traffic engineering and management, maintenance of the City's streets, and the agreement of schemes affecting the City's Highways and Walkways (such as street scene enhancement, traffic schemes, pedestrian facilities, special events on the public highway and authorising Traffic Orders) in accordance with the policies and strategies of the Grand Committee;
- (b) all general matters relating to road safety;
- (c) the provision, maintenance and repair of bridges, subways and footbridges, other than the five City river bridges;
- (d) public lighting, including street lighting;
- (e) day-to-day administration of the Grand Committee's car parks
- (f) all matters relating to the Riverside Walkway, except for adjacent open spaces; and
- (g) to be responsible for advising the Grand Committee on:-
  - (i) progress in implementing the Grand Committee's plans, policies and strategies relating to the City's Highways and Walkways; and
  - (ii) the design of and strategy for providing signposts in the City
- (h) Those matters of significance will be referred to the Grand Committee to seek concurrence.

b) **Local Plans Sub-Committee**

The Chairman and Deputy Chairman of the Grand Committee along with ten (for the ensuing year only) other Members as follows:

- Deputy Randall Anderson
- John Edwards
- Deputy Marianne Fredericks
- Martha Grekos
- Jaspreet Hodgson
- Natasha Lloyd-Owen
- Alderman Ian Luder
- Deputy Graham Packham
- Deputy Susan Pearson
- William Upton, QC

Together with two *ex-officio* Members representing the Policy and Resources Committee and the Port Health and Environmental Services Committee.

**Terms of Reference**

The Committee first appointed a Sub Committee in October 2004 with the specific task of considering the Local Development Framework (LDF), which replaced the Unitary Development Plan as the spatial planning strategy for the City. It was later agreed that this Sub Committee would also be suitable for considering details of the traffic-related Local

Implementation Plan (LIP) as well. Its Terms of Reference are simply to consider those types of documents in detail and make recommendations to the Grand Committee.

**C) MINUTES**

**RESOLVED** – That the public minutes and non-public summary of the meeting held on 22 February 2022 be agreed as a correct record.

Matters Arising

The Executive Director of Environment advised that further consultation on Beech Street had been deferred until after the 5 May Local Government elections at the request of LB Islington, with whom close co-ordination on the scheme was important. The aim was for this work to be completed by the end of May 2022.

In response to a question from a Member, the Executive Director of Environment advised that the report on whole life carbon referenced in the minutes would be brought to the July or June meetings of the Committee. The Member responded that given the significance of this matter, other matters should be deprioritised in order to complete this work, as it fed into all applications. The Chairman added that Members wanted to put pressure on to further the general agenda on this matter.

In response to a question from a Member regarding the impending application on London Wall West, the Chief Planning Officer advised that officers were working towards bringing the application to Committee in June.

• **15 MINORIES, 57-60 & 62 ALDGATE HIGHSTREET AND 1 LITTLE SOMERSET STREET LONDON EC3**

*At this point, Deputy Alastair Moss (Deputy Chair) withdrew from the meeting.*

The Committee considered a report of the Chief Planning Officer and Development Director regarding 15 Minories, 57-60 & 62 Aldgate High Street And 1 Little Somerset Street London EC3 – specifically, Demolition of existing structures, and erection of a mixed use office building, including ground floor flexible retail/cafe/commercial uses (Class E) and a public house (sui generis) (35,672 sqm GEA).

As a point of order, a Member commented that the application included properties located in the ward of Portsoken. However, the officer's report and online search function listed the application as being located in the ward of Tower only. The Committee noted that this had been corrected in the separately circulated addendum, but that it would not have appeared in an online search for applications in the ward of Portsoken. The Committee was advised that officers were seeking to address this discrepancy.

The Chief Planning Officer and Development Director drew the Committee's attention to the tabled addenda, before the Town Clerk outlined the Committee's usual procedure for the consideration of planning applications.

The Chief Planning Officer and Development Director 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 and outlining the reasons for the officer's recommendation. The officer's recommendation was that the Committee resolve to grant planning permission, in accordance with the details set out in the attached schedule.

In the absence of any registered objectors, Jan Donovan, on behalf of Rolfe Judd Planning, addressed the Committee in support of the recommendations. The Committee was advised that the conditions and obligations recommended by officers were supported by the applicant, and that the owners of 56-58 Aldgate High Street were in discussions with the applicant regarding a suitable deed in respect of land ownerships to ensure that future developments could take place, given the proximity of the east elevation.

Tom Appleton, on behalf of Rocket Properties, then addressed the Committee in support of the application. The Committee noted that the application was an amendment to a previously consented scheme, with the proposed building largely similar to that approved in 2020. However, the scheme would now be net zero-carbon, with other key benefits including the provision of office space, an accessible terrace, increased greening, and more public realm.

Friedrich Ludewig, on behalf of the applicant, then addressed the Committee in support of the application. The application was sympathetic to the historical site, and Planning officers had been clear about their requirements for the site and application. The scheme would provide an improved building and better public space, with interesting infrastructure, closing the urban gap between the City of London and Whitechapel. Since the 2020 consent, the opportunity had been taken to improve the ground floor, and to make the building more sustainable. The scheme would make a positive contribution to the City of London, being of a high standard. The applicant had worked with partners on options for incorporating the Still & Star public house into the new site and was committed to delivering a solution, with the support of CAMRA.

The Chair then invited questions from Members. In response to a point of order raised by a Member, the Town Clerk confirmed that training sessions, in accordance with the Planning Protocol, had been scheduled for Members on the Friday and Monday preceding the meeting, following the appointment of the Committee by the Court of Common Council.

In response to questions from Members, those making representations in support of the application outlined how the revised scheme had achieved net zero carbon, and how this would be evidenced going forward. The Committee was also given further detail on the basement and plans for servicing as part of the scheme, and measures to minimise light pollution as part of the scheme. The Committee was also advised that following consultation, London Underground and TfL had advised that they no longer felt a new entrance to Aldgate Station was required, and therefore this was no longer a part of the overall scheme. In response to a question from a Member, the applicant



advised that the Still & Star public house, whilst part of the heritage of the area, did not retain any original interior features.

The applicant then gave the Committee further detail as to the differences in proportions of carbon emissions and carbon offsetting between the existing consented scheme, and the proposals under consideration, as well as the cost of attaining net zero carbon for the development. In response to a question from a Member, the applicant also explained that the proposals retained the cap on deliveries from the previously consented scheme.

A Member queried whether recommendations d and e, in respect of the implications for planning permission with regards to related schemes, could be amended to make them clearer. Officers responded that these recommendations could be amended, with recommendation d being split into two parts to clarify that they referred to two separate works, and that recommendation e could be amended to confirm the intention to consent to related schemes before the proposals under consideration could begin. The Chair then sought the Committee's approval of these amendments, which was agreed.

In response to a question from Members, the Chief Planning Officer and Development Director confirmed that further efforts to improve carbon emissions and savings would be addressed during the detailed design stage, and advised that it was intended that the wording used in condition 36 relating to lighting strategy would be come standard.

The Committee then proceeded to debate the application. The Chair, opening the debate, advised that he supported the application, adding that he felt officers had done a thorough job, and that the scheme represented progress in the area, which would benefit from the improvement and revitalisation.

A Member commented that the developer had displayed a good attitude towards local residents, holding monthly meetings about the site and providing newsletters. The applicant had made efforts to take residents with them and it was hoped this would continue. The Member added that he had not experienced significant objections or interest in the scheme from local residents, having sought comments. The Member added that he had not experienced issues with the servicing bay for the site, having lived nearby.

A Member commented that the scheme was complicated, and requested that officers make every effort to use plain language throughout application reports, and also to make more explicit the differences between the proposals under consideration and previously consented schemes for applications of this nature. The Member added that whilst there were benefits to the scheme, the uplift in office space could use more justification.

Another Member commented that it was useful to hear local views during the consideration of the application, adding that they supported the scheme, there being demand for office space and the proposals providing flexible and multi-

use spaces. The Member added that the energy strategy for the scheme was a significant positive.

A Member voiced their concerns about the scheme, commenting that the proposals represented scope creep, being an uplift in size on an already sizeable scheme, adding that the proposals ought to be considered as a new application. The Member confirmed that they did not support the recommendation, there being no justification for the increased height and lack of extra public realm, most of which would be taken up by bike parking.

A Member noted the increase in size on the previously consented scheme, but commented that there was a degree of constraint resulting from the previous approvals. The Member added that there was a reduction in parking provision for blue badge holders, and that they felt the Committee should insist on the requisite amount of provision, given the importance of accessibility. Following confirmation that this provision within the proposals under consideration was acceptable, the Member asked that officers provide further information for Members on the requirements for different types of accommodation, such as offices, hotels and residences.

A Member commented that they remembered the Committee's consideration of the previously consented scheme, and that there had been constant scope creep on the site since the opening of the hotel. The Member added that the Still & Star public house used to thrive, and had previously been designated as an Asset of Community Value, and that original material would not be used for its rebuild. The Member commented that they did not like the design of the building, which was out of keeping with its surroundings, and that they were not minded to support the recommendations, on the basis that the scheme represented overdevelopment.

The Chair then thanked Members for their contributions to the debate, before drawing Members' attention to the recommendations. The Town Clerk advised that the recommendations should be considered as amended at (d) and (e), with the wording to be amended by officers in consultation with the Chair and Deputy Chair.

The Committee then proceeded to vote on the recommendations as amended, with 18 Members voting for the amended recommendation, and 5 Members voting against the amended recommendation, with no abstentions.

**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 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 authority be delegated 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 this report;
- (d) (i) That Officers be delegated to negotiate and execute obligations in connection with Application ref: 16/00406/FULMAJ in respect of those matters set out in "Planning Obligations" under Section 106 and any necessary agreements under Section 278 of the Highway Act 1980 prior to the grant of planning permission pursuant to Application ref: 16/00406/FULMAJ.
- (ii) That Officers be delegated to negotiate and execute obligations in connection with Applications ref: 13/01055/FULMAJ and/or 15/01067/FULL and/or 21/00271/FULMAJ (or any subsequent amendments thereto) in respect of those matters set out in "Planning Obligations" (at paragraphs 390 and 391 of the Officer's Report) under Section 106 and any necessary agreements under Section 278 of the Highway Act 1980 prior to the grant of planning permission pursuant to Application ref: 16/00406/FULMAJ; and
- (e) An application to vary planning conditions attached to consent reference 15/01067/FULL being first submitted and approved prior to the grant of planning permission pursuant to Application ref: 16/00406/FULMAJ.

*\*In accordance with Standing Order No. 38, Marianne Fredericks and Susan Pearson, having voted against the recommendation, asked that this be recorded in the minutes.*

*At this point, Deputy Alastair Moss (Deputy Chair) returned to the meeting.*

- **PLANNING ADVICE NOTE: PREVENTING SUICIDES IN HIGH RISE BUILDINGS AND STRUCTURES**

The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director of Environment presenting a guidance note advising developers how to minimise the risk of suicide attempts in their proposed high-rise buildings and structures. The Executive Director of Environment introduced the report and drew Members' attention to the key points. The Chairman thanked officers for this critical work and sought the Committee's approval.

A Member noted the use of both four storeys and ten metres as a measurement of height and suggested that their usage should be made consistent throughout the guidance note if buildings of four storeys or more were always at least ten metres in height.

A Member added that the use of this guidance as a standard planning note would be an important aspect going forward. Another Member suggested that links to relevant organisations from whom developers could seek advice on suicide be added to the guidance note, and that further consideration could be given to the use of balustrades.

**RESOLVED** – That the Planning & Transportation Committee approve the Preventing Suicides in High Rise Buildings and Structures Planning Advice Note attached at Appendix 1 as a material planning consideration.

10. **BUILDING CONTROL CHARGES REPORT 2022/23**

The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director of Environment advising the Committee of the findings of the Building Control's review into their previous fees and charges increases and to recommend revised fees for 2022/23. The Executive Director of Environment introduced the report and outlined the key points for Members. The Chairman commented that he felt general feedback was that the service was good and represented value for money, adding that the service was also in the process of digitising, which he hoped would be joined-up.

In response to a question from Member, the Executive Director of Environment advised that whilst the increase in charges was below inflation, it would be sufficient, and that the fees were correct.

**RESOLVED** – That the Planning & Transportation Committee approve the new "City of London Building Regulations Charges Scheme No 5: 2022", the "Building Control Miscellaneous Charges No 4: 2022" and amend the charge relating to the Hourly rate from £112 to £115 per hour.

11. **\*PUBLIC MINUTES OF THE LOCAL PLAN SUB-COMMITTEE**

**RESOLVED** – That the public minutes and non-public summary of the meeting of the Local Plans Sub Committee held on 31 January 2022 be noted.

12. **\*PUBLIC MINUTES OF THE STREETS & WALKWAYS SUB-COMMITTEE**

**RESOLVED** – That the public minutes and non-public summary of the meeting of the Streets & Walkways Sub Committee meeting held on 15 February 2022 be noted.

13. **\*OUTSTANDING ITEMS**

The Committee received a report of the Town Clerk setting out its list of Outstanding Actions.

**RESOLVED** – That the list of outstanding actions be noted.

14. **\*PUBLIC LIFT REPORT**

The Committee received a public lift report of the City Surveyor for the period 08/02/2022 – 10/04/2022.

A Member commented that a number of public lifts were at the end of closed walkways, and that notices should be put up well in advance of the lift in order to notify and divert intended users at an earlier stage, as this would be beneficial for users with limited mobility. The Member added that given the frequency with which some lifts and escalators were out of order, officers should consider reaching out to partner organisations that operated similar numbers of lifts and escalators to discuss availability and maintenance, and if performance was better elsewhere, to discuss what lessons could be learnt. Another Member added that the Committee had previously discussed the online reporting of availability.

The City Surveyor apologised for any individual difficulties caused by unavailability, and advised that reporting was currently possible via text and email, and maps showing the nearest available alternative were included with notices attached to lifts and escalators that were not available. The City Surveyor then acknowledged Members' frustrations over the recent poor performance of the London Wall West escalators.

The Chairman asked that additional information on the provision of an online portal for reporting closures be provided with the next public lift report to Committee.

**RESOLVED** – That the report be noted.

15. **\*DELEGATED DECISIONS OF THE CHIEF PLANNING OFFICER AND DEVELOPMENT DIRECTOR**

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

**RESOLVED** – That the report be noted.

16. **\*VALID PLANNING APPLICATIONS RECEIVED BY DEPARTMENT OF THE BUILT ENVIRONMENT**

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

**RESOLVED** – That the report be noted.

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

Ludgate Square Construction

A Member asked whether businesses were given prior notice of street closures and relevant advice, particularly where the street closure would not necessitate

the closure of those businesses, so that they could advise their clientele of the restrictions on access to them.

The Executive Director of Environment advised that in this case, businesses had been consulted one week prior to the start of construction, but accepted the view that this could have been done earlier. However, appropriate signage was installed quickly following notice of the issues for businesses after the closure, and the works would soon be complete.

### 21 Moorfields

A Member advised that it was clear that there had been a serious breach of the conditions applied to 21 Moorfields that affect Moor Lane, with Condition 17 in respect of protection from attacks using road vehicles before the start of construction and no application for the amendment of this Condition. As the breach had not been reported to Committee, the Member asked that officers investigated and reported back on how this had been allowed to happen, and what processes were in place to stop this from happening again.

The Chairman advised that in order for officers to provide as full a response as possible, the response would be deferred until the non-public section of the meeting.

### Reporting

A Member reiterated a point raised by another Member during the consideration of the application in respect of 15 Minories, and asked that a table highlighting expected ratios of provision against the various characteristics of an application be provided for all future major developments. The Member added that a similar point had been raised previously in respect of off-site parking provision, and asked that a draft pro forma be put to the Committee for review. The Chairman added that there had been discussions on providing more tabular and graphic information for Members.

The Chief Planning Officer and Development Director responded that a draft pro forma for review could be brought to the Committee within the next two meetings. A Member added that there had previous been requests for data relating to carbon emissions to be presented in this way, and that this was still outstanding.

### Sustainability Supplementary Document (SPD)

A Member noted that the timeline for this had been moved, but commented that no target date for completion of this item was provided with the list of Outstanding Actions, and asked that officers provide a date for completion or an explanation as to why this could not be provided.

### City of London Access Group

A Member asked that officers provide a report briefing on the City of London Access Group (CoLAG) as it was felt that Members were not clear on their role or the extent of their involvement in relevant matters. The Chief Planning and Development Director responded that CoLAG was an active group and that information on the group would be provided to the next meeting.

### Community and Children's Services Committee

A Member queried whether it would be possible to consult the Community & Children's Services Committee on elements of the Local Plan relevant to them. The Chairman responded that he felt this would be appropriate.

### Bury House

A Member asked for an update on the Bury House application refused by the Committee, as they understood that a notice of refusal had not yet been sent out. The Chief Planning Officer and Development Director advised that officers were awaiting Stage 2 consideration from the GLA and would follow up on this.

### GoPuff Licensing Application

A Member noted that there was a pending licensing application for the establishment of a delivery hub business on Aldersgate Street, and asked, given the current premises, whether this necessitated a change of use application. The Chief Planning Officer and Development Director confirmed that this was the case, and that officers had liaised with relevant colleagues to advise them of this.

### Pedestrian Priority Programme

A Member asked for further analysis to be provided on the impact of the Pedestrian Priority Programme in light of the figures previously circulated to Members, and with the knowledge of the impact of other factors such as COVID-19. The Executive Director of Environment clarified that the figures provided were counts from a specific month, and that a further update would be provided in June 2022.

## 18. **ANY OTHER BUSINESS THAT THE CHAIRMAN CONSIDERS URGENT**

A Member advised that they had constituents that were seeking to meet with him about Planning, particularly an application that had been considered prior to his election as a Member, and asked whether officers were able to support Members in these matters. The Chief Planning Officer and Development Director advised that officers should be present at meetings between Members and potential applicants, and that an officer could be made available to accompany the Member. Furthermore, officers would be happy to consult with the Member beforehand in order to ensure they were adequately prepared. The Chairman added that the Planning Protocol specified that officers should be present at meetings between Members and developers or other stakeholders, and asked that this be noted.

## 19. **EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC**

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

<b>Item</b>	<b>Paragraph</b>
20	3
21-22	-

20. **\*NON-PUBLIC MINUTES OF THE STREETS & WALKWAYS SUB-COMMITTEE**  
**RESOLVED** – That the non-public minutes of the Streets & Walkways Sub Committee meeting held on 15 February 2022 be noted.
21. **NON-PUBLIC QUESTIONS ON MATTERS RELATING TO THE WORK OF THE COMMITTEE**  
There was one question.
22. **ANY OTHER BUSINESS THAT THE CHAIRMAN CONSIDERS URGENT AND WHICH THE COMMITTEE AGREES SHOULD BE CONSIDERED WHILST THE PUBLIC ARE EXCLUDED**  
There was no other business.

**The meeting closed at 1.21 pm**

-----  
Chairman

**Contact Officer: Gemma Stokley**  
**[gemma.stokley@cityoflondon.gov.uk](mailto:gemma.stokley@cityoflondon.gov.uk)**