

PLANNING APPLICATIONS SUB-COMMITTEE

Tuesday, 22 November 2022

Minutes of the meeting of the Planning Applications Sub-Committee held at Livery Hall - Guildhall on Tuesday, 22 November 2022 at 10.30 am

Present

Members:

Deputy Shravan Joshi (Chairman)
Deputy Alastair Moss (Deputy Chairman)
Brendan Barns
Ian Bishop-Laggett
Deputy Michael Cassidy
John Edwards
Deputy John Fletcher
Deputy Marianne Fredericks
Jaspreet Hodgson
Alderman Bronek Masojada
Deputy Brian Mooney
Deborah Oliver
Deputy Graham Packham
Ian Seaton
Alethea Silk
William Upton KC

Officers:

Gemma Stokley	- Town Clerk's Department
Tim Fletcher	- Media Officer
Fleur Francis	- Comptroller and City Solicitor's Department
Gemma Delves	- Planning and Development Director
Gwyn Richards	- Director, Environment Department
Juliemma McLoughlin	- Environment Department
David Horkan	- Environment Department
Rob McNicol	- Environment Department
Gwyn Richards	- Environment Department
Tom Nancollas	- Environment Department
Iain Steele	- Environment Department
Robin Whitehouse	- Environment Department

Also In attendance:

Ben Sturdy – West Smithfield resident
Sharon Ament – Director, Museum of London
Paul Williams – Principal Director, Stanton William Architects

1. APOLOGIES

Apologies for absence were received from Deputy Randall Anderson, Emily Benn, Deputy Keith Bottomley, Anthony Fitzpatrick, Martha Grekos, Alderman

and Sheriff King, Deputy Edward Lord, Deputy Natasha Lloyd-Owen, Alderman Ian Luder, Alderwoman Susan Pearson, Judith Pleasance, Deputy Henry Pollard, Shailendra Umrada and Alderman Sir David Wootton.

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

The Town Clerk reported that the vast majority of apologies reported today (for Deputy Randall Anderson, Deputy Keith Bottomley, Martha Grekos, Deputy Edward Lord, Alderman Ian Luder, Judith Pleasance and Alderman Sir David Wootton) had been received in light of the required separation of functions between an authority in its capacity as an applicant for planning permission, and an authority in its capacity as local planning authority. She reported that the City's Capital Buildings Board and the Museum of London Board had responsibility for promoting the proposals that were the subject of the application to be considered today. Therefore, Members of those Boards (as those listed above were) should not, if also on this Sub-Committee, participate in the decision on this matter and had recused themselves for this reason.

3. MINUTES

The Sub-Committee received the public minutes of the Planning and Transportation Committee meeting held on 1 November 2022.

The Chairman highlighted that, as these were minutes of the Grand Committee, they would be officially signed off by the next meeting of that scheduled for 10 January 2023 but were here today for information.

MATTERS ARISING

CRIPPLEGATE HOUSE 1 GOLDEN LANE LONDON EC1Y 0RR (pages 7-29) –

A Member questioned why the comment made as to etiquette and the conduct of debate at the last meeting had not been minuted. The Chairman highlighted that this had also been raised in advance by another Member via email. He highlighted that the purpose of the minutes was to record matters that were pertinent to or impacted upon the decision reached and that they were not designed to be a verbatim record of the meeting. However, he stated that if the Committee were of the strong opinion that this comment ought to also be articulated in the minutes then he was happy to discuss this and the appropriate form of wording for this. The Member commented that she was of the view that, in this instance, the comment ought to feature.

At the invitation of the Chairman, the Town Clerk highlighted that the entirety of the public session of the last meeting had been recorded and was therefore available on the City's webpages.

Some Members made the general point that the minutes of these meetings ought to be reduced as opposed to expanded further given that they were already 35 pages long in this particular instance.

22 Bishopsgate (page 7) – In response to a question regarding the trees at 22 Bishopsgate, the Planning and Development Director reported that he had been made aware that the trees that were part of the approved scheme here had unfortunately and, quite unusually, failed. He added that the original

landscape architects were now undertaking a very detailed assessment as to the reasons for the failure which would precede the replanting of the trees in this location.

RECEIVED.

4. POULTRY MARKET AND GENERAL MARKET AND THE ANNEXE BUILDINGS WEST SMITHFIELD LONDON EC1A 9PS

The Sub-Committee considered a report of the Planning and Development Director regarding the Poultry Market And General Market And The Annexe Buildings West Smithfield London EC1A 9PS, specifically:

General Market

Partial demolition, repair, refurbishment and extension of the existing building known as the General Market at 43 Farringdon Street on the basement, ground, first and roof levels; creation of a new entrance structure on West Poultry Avenue (and associated refurbishment of the existing canopy over West Poultry Avenue) with new facades to West Smithfield and Charterhouse Street; new entrances on the corner of Farringdon Street and Charterhouse Street; Change of use to provide a museum and ancillary uses and areas, together with a flexible retail, restaurant, drinking establishment and leisure (gym) use for the perimeter 'houses'.

Poultry Market

Partial demolition, repair, refurbishment and alteration of the existing building known as the Poultry Market, Charterhouse Street at basement, ground and first levels; change of use to a museum and ancillary uses and areas.

Annexe Site (Red House, Iron Mountain, Fish Market and Engine House)

Partial demolition, refurbishment and extension of the existing buildings known as the Annexe Site at 25 Snow Hill and 29 Smithfield Street at basement, ground, first, second and third levels; creation of a triple height canopy above a public realm space; change of use to a flexible museum, offices, retail, restaurant, drinking establishment, events and functions use. Refurbishment of and minor alterations to the existing building known as the Engine House at West Smithfield at basement and ground levels; Change of use to a flexible retail and museum use. (The proposal would provide 32,864sq.m of Museum floorspace (Class D1), 4,079 sq.m of flexible A1/A2/A3/A4/B1/D1 & D2 floorspace, 2,377sq.m of flexible B1/D1 floorspace, 870sq.m of flexible A3/A4/D1 & D2 floorspace, 18sq.m of flexible A1/D1 floorspace and 82sq.m of flexible A1/A3/A4/D1 floorspace.)

The Town Clerk introduced the item stating that both this and the related Listed Building Consent report at Agenda Item 5 would be considered in tandem. She added that, in addition to the agenda pack, Members would have also received a copy of the Officer presentation slides and an addendum.

Officers presented the application, underlining that it related to the western most buildings of the Smithfield Market complex and that, of note, were the operational East and West markets directly to the east of the site which, as a whole, comprised the General Market, East and West Poultry Avenue, the Poultry Market and the Annexe site. Members were reminded that the site was situated within the Smithfield Conservation Area and that the Poultry Market was in operation in

market use with the General Market and Annexe sites now vacant as had been the case for a number of years.

The Sub-Committee were shown an aerial-view image of the site taken in 2019. It was reported that, at present, the General Market and Annexe site had hoardings and scaffolding around them as repair and restoration works were being undertaken here. As the report indicated, some of the works had planning permission and some were permitted development. An aerial view image of the proposed scheme was shared depicting the conversion of the General Market and Poultry Market to a new site for the Museum of London. It was proposed that the two buildings would be joined by an enclosure along West Poultry Avenue. The Annexe site would be refurbished, repaired and extended and converted to flexible retail, leisure and office uses. Officers commented that many would already be familiar with the site and scheme set out here given that it was considered by the Planning and Transportation Committee in 2020 when Members resolved to grant planning permission and listed building consent. However, due to the delays around obtaining vacant possession of the Poultry Market and issues around the Museum obtaining an interest in the site, the decision was never issued. The scheme was now therefore brought back to Members with the application documentation updated to reflect changes in policy and material considerations since the scheme was last considered – most notably, the adoption of the London Plan. It was reported that the Museum had also taken this time to refine the design of the scheme and some minor design revisions were now proposed. That being said, the scheme still remained fundamentally the same as that considered in 2020.

Officers took the Sub-Committee through an overview of the scheme. Ground floor plans were shown which showed that the new museum had a number of entrances making for a permeable and accessible ground floor plane. The primary entrances would be via the new West Poultry Avenue enclosure, with secondary entrances on Harts Corner, West Smithfield and East Poultry Avenue. The General Market would be serviced via the existing ramp on Snow Hill, with some secondary servicing being undertaken from Charterhouse Street. The Poultry Market would be serviced via the existing loading bay on the north side of the site and the Annexe site would be serviced on-street. A package of 278 works would be needed in conjunction with the scheme to make it acceptable in Highway terms – Officers clarified that this would include works such as footway widening, the provision of coach drop offs and alterations to loading bays. It was reported that the scheme had been designed to function alongside a working market on the basis that the Museum would primarily function during the day, and the market would operate overnight. The loading bays would therefore be available for the market to use overnight. It was reported that the Market Superintendent had reviewed the details and had confirmed that a feasible arrangement was being proposed.

Officers went on to refer to a letter of representation received from a local resident which raised concern as to the construction, the impacts of the proposal upon market traffic. It was highlighted that the temporary impacts of construction would be managed through a Construction Logistics Plan and an Environmental Management Plan which would be secured via condition.

The Committee were then told the details in respect of each building. Officers reported that the scheme was based on renewal, restoration and conservation of

as much of the existing fabric of the buildings as possible, although, inevitably, in bringing these buildings into modern use and up to modern standards, the proposals did result in some harm to the Poultry Market as a Grade II listed building and the Smithfield Conservation Area as well as designated heritage assets and also some harm to the significance of the General Market and parts of the Annexe site as non-designated heritage assets. That being said, the Committee papers conclude that the harm to this significance is decisively outweighed by the public benefits of the scheme.

Members were shown existing and proposed visuals of the General Market where floorplans depicted that the form of the buildings would be retained as part of the proposal. The former central market space would be used as gallery space and an engagement area with the 'houses' around the perimeter of the ground floor also retained and retained – some for museum use and some for commercial use as flexible retail, office or leisure uses. At basement level, more permanent gallery space would be provided in addition to some back of house facilities. At roof level, some flat roof areas would be created in order to enable the formation of a green roof to accommodate PV panels and roof plant. Although some greening would be provided on this part of the scheme, as a whole the scheme would not meet the 0.3 Urban Greening Factor requirement, but this was accepted given that the developer was working within the constraints of these historic buildings. Next, the Committee were shown images of the existing and proposed elevations, with Officers reporting that, at present, the site was made up of a relatively eclectic mix of shop fronts. Some shop fronts would be retained as part of the proposals with others replaced with new display windows inserted to showcase some of the Museum's collections. Officers reported that, as part of the 2022 updates to the proposal, some minor revisions had been made to these shopfronts. It was also highlighted that canopies would be added to the shop fronts as a unifying feature. Members were next shown some proposed visuals of the ground floor level where visitors would continue to be able to appreciate the domed roof alongside many of the historic features of the building which were to be retained. Of particular note here would be the reuse of the Lockhart's Cocoa Rooms. At basement level, the vaulted brick arches would be retained to showcase the Museum's collections and, of particular interest here, would be the insertion of a window at basement level so that visitors could view the trains running adjacent to this area.

With regard to the West Poultry Avenue enclosure, Officers reported that, in order to create this, West Poultry Avenue would need to be Stopped Up. Members were shown a proposed visual of the new entrance featuring an LED screen above this. As part of the permission, it would be recommended that an Access Management Plan is secured to secure access through this route even for those not visiting the Museum. The route would also be curated with Museum artefacts embedded within the floor – a unique offer for the City.

With regard to the Poultry Market, Officers acknowledged that the agenda papers set out that the scheme was contrary to Policy CS5 of the Local Plan which sought to support the continued presence of Smithfield Market. It was reported that there were some facilities within the Poultry Market which support the function of the East and West Markets such as waste storage and animal by-product facilities. These would all be relocated to ensure that the East and West Markets could continue to function, and this would be secured via a Grampian condition. A proposed ground floor plan of the Poultry Market showed that the site would be

used to accommodate the Museum's temporary gallery space which would be a very important part of the Museum's offer. On the north side of the site, the existing loading bay would be used for servicing, and, on the south, an education and schools' area would be created to enable the Museum to realise its aspiration of engaging with every school child in London. Long-stay cycle parking would be provided within the Poultry Market for the Poultry Market and General Market, and this would have its own separate entrance off of East Poultry Avenue. The proposed basement plans showed that the area would be used for stores and back of house areas. A new temporary gallery space would be introduced at first floor level with the area around the perimeter of this being used for research and back of house Museum functions. The ground floor of the Poultry Market (which sloped at present) would be removed and replaced by a flat ground floor level allowing for the insertion of the proposed first floor gallery space. The existing and proposed elevations of the building depicted that, overall, there was minimal intervention. The clear story glazing would be replaced in order to enable the building to be naturally ventilated. It would be secured by a condition stipulating that the replacement glazing was as closely matched as possible to the existing offering in terms of appearance. The Committee were informed that, as part of the 2022 design updates, some of the ground floor entrances had been rationalised to enable even more of the fabric of the existing building to be retained. Visuals of the proposal here illustrated how visitors would still get to appreciate the domed roof from the new first floor gallery space with Officers commenting that the domed roof was one of the most significant aspects of the listed building.

With reference to the Annexe site, Officers reported that this was currently made up of Horace Jones' Fish Market, the 1960's Iron Mountain storage facility, the Victorian Red House (a former cold store) and the Engine House. At basement level here, cycle parking would be provided with the Annexe converted for flexible retail, leisure and office uses. At ground floor, of particular note was the proposed removal of the Iron Mountain storage facility which would have a positive impact on the Smithfield Conservation Area given that it was of no architectural or historical importance. This would be replaced by a new, covered, public realm area. A new extension (a contemporary yet subservient addition to the building) was being proposed over the Red House in association with which new external terrace areas would be formed. The extension would be used for flexible office and leisure use. Visuals of the proposed elevation showed that new windows would be inserted into the Red House façade which was considered to cause some harm on the Red House but it would be ensured that the windows and the detailing had the effect of minimising impact. Officers highlighted that, as part of the 2022 design revisions, some changes had been made to the ground floor of the Annexe site, again, in an attempt to try and retain as much of the existing historic fabric as possible. The lift overrun on the Engine House had also been increased in size slightly although it was proposed that this would be largely screened by greening.

With regard to the proposed public realm around the site, Officers reported that consideration had been given to thermal comfort, wind and daylight/sunlight and all of these had been considered acceptable.

To conclude, Officers stated that it was considered that this scheme represented a unique opportunity to regenerate and revitalise these historic buildings that sat within the Culture Mile. The scheme would also deliver a number of economic,

environmental and social benefits and it was recommended that the planning permission and listed building consent were granted.

The Town Clerk welcomed Mr Ben Sturdy, a West Smithfield resident, to the meeting and asked that he now address the Committee having registered a representation in opposition to the scheme.

Mr Sturdy clarified that his representation concerned a traffic management issue. He reported that work at the new Museum site was restricting Market loading bays causing intensive, illegal use of the double yellow lines along 4-8 West Smithfield by Market HGVs. He added that the partial collapse of East Poultry Avenue and pavement layout changes had already restricted Market loading bays. Post lockdown Christmas 2020 traffic management by the Market demonstrated that the double yellow issue was preventable but these enabling resources were only deployed for one month at this time. Mr Sturdy remarked that the Market Superintendent had called West Smithfield and East Poultry Avenue a 'pinch point' and had given him assurances that the double yellow lines would be dealt with by himself and his officers. However, their measures were unfortunately ignored by Market HGV and forklift drivers who had been verbally abusive and even threatened violence when asked not to use the double yellow lines. Mr Sturdy shared photographic images of the issue showing recent examples of sustained parking by market HGVs. Mr Sturdy also referred to a female traffic warden having been shouted at by a market officer and market HGV driver over a legitimate parking enforcement offence. He commented that the Parking Enforcement Office and local parking wardens had reported that they were now ordered by the Highways Department not to issue tickets to Market HGVs parking on these double yellow lines specifically contrary to the Department having written to him to state that parking on them for more than ten minutes was an offence if not unloading and that this should be for no longer than forty minutes at a time. Mr Sturdy reported that, currently, the double yellow lines were used in heavy rotation by Market HGVs to park and then unload with individual HGVs sometimes parking here for up to eight hours. He highlighted that the problem occurred from as early as 2-3pm, continuing until 6am Sunday – Thursday. He went on to state that 2-3 often parked on the lines simultaneously causing a serious pinch point of congestion. Since Market HGVs will also be parked in the legitimate loading bays opposite, manoeuvring was slowed causing further congestion. Mr Sturdy also referred to the fact that the aggregate noise, vibration and pollution from all of this was an extreme nuisance. He mentioned that parked Market HGVs frequently entered 'defrost' mode where the level of noise nuisance was equivalent to an HGV accelerating for a sustained period – something that was audible and frequently interrupted sleep even from his own double-glazed bedroom at the rear of the building. He described the situation as a breach of the Environmental Protection Act 1990. Mr Sturdy attested that, according to an official surveyor for Smithfield Market and an engineer that he had spoken with, the recent part-collapse of East Poultry Avenue tunnel and failure of parts of the glass canopy surrounding the central Market were caused by Market HGV vibrations. He went on to state that he suspected that these had also contributed to the collapse of the concrete ceiling tiles under the pedestrian bridge by Barbican Station. He added that the Victorian buildings alongside the double yellow lines in question were part of the Smithfield Conservation Area and not designed to deal with these stresses and reported that several cracks had begun to show in both the shopfront glass and pavement glass vault lights within his own building in recent years.

Mr Sturdy highlighted that the December 2019 issue of City View magazine described the very serious, newly discovered links between vehicle caused air pollution and health. He reported that the kerb alongside these double yellow lines was marked with yellow chevrons which prohibit unloading at any time. Yet the Highways Department had now informed him that these now faded markings were not in the current traffic plan. Mr Sturdy underlined that he had attempted to identify when and how this decision had been made but was yet to receive a response.

In summary, Mr Sturdy stated that the loss of Market loading bays due to works required for the new Museum of London was causing unsustainable pressure on the double yellow lines by Market HGVs. He added that this representation urged that this material consideration was examined with a traffic management solution added to the planning application.

The Chairman thanked Mr Sturdy for his contributions and invited any questions that the Committee may now have of him. The Chairman began by acknowledging that this was a serious matter and suggested that a meeting be held between Mr Sturdy and officers to discuss this important traffic management piece. Mr Sturdy responded to state that, whilst he would welcome the meeting, he had been given various assurances in the past with no sustained outcome/improvement of any kind.

A Member, also the current Chairman of the Streets and Walkways Sub-Committee, expressed concern at what had been reported here. He suggested that his Sub-Committee therefore be tasked with looking into this matter in greater detail. The Chairman agreed with this approach and asked that a report be brought to a future meeting of the Sub-Committee.

Another Member stated that she would like this matter explored in further detail, particularly around understanding how the City's processes were working in terms of when these matters were reported.

A Member commented that, ultimately, this underlined the importance of moving the Market from the centre of London.

Mr Sturdy stated that this was not solely about noise disturbance but also very much about pollution levels in such close proximity to residential buildings and also about vibrations. He added that he had resided here for over twenty years now and regularly used the market and was not therefore against its operation per se. He also commented that he felt that the proposed scheme was, architecturally, very impressive.

The Town Clerk welcomed those speaking in support of the application – Ms Sharon Ament, Director of the Museum of London and Mr Paul Williams, Principal Director of Stanton William Architects.

Ms Ament began by clarifying that the Museum would be very happy to work with Mr Sturdy to see if they could help ameliorate the situation at all in relation to the site construction. The Committee were informed that there were a number of others present to respond to any questions that they might have on the revised proposals presented today including Alex Shaw, Director of the new

Museum project, Emma Lally from Momentum Transport, Andy Sedgwick from Arup and Jeremy Randall from Gerald Eve. Ms Ament reiterated that this proposal sought approval for minor amendments to the previously agreed planning application. She went on to report that the Museum had now reached many important milestones in relation to this site, not least the stabilisation of the fabric of these historic buildings that had saved the site from disrepair. Ms Ament also took the opportunity to restate the vision for the project and how this related to the City Corporation's own ambitions. She underlined that this was not just about relocation but was a total reimagination of what the Museum could be, making it totally fit for society in a post-COVID world. She underlined that this was the Capital's only Museum properly dedicated to London and that this represented a once in a generation opportunity to create a truly world-class destination that told the story of London – a global, capital City. Whilst the Museum had done everything it could at its current London Wall site since opening its doors in 1976, this project would really set a new benchmark and be a project for all Londoners.

The proposals would offer visitors a better sense of arrival and large-scale exhibitions in collaboration with other international museums. They would also feed the urge of those living, working and visiting the capital to learn more about the City. In this vein, the Museum would embody the City Corporation's Culture Mile and Destination City aspirations, seeking to enhance the Square Mile's leisure offer to ensure that the City of London remains a hugely attractive place to invest, work, live, learn and visit long into the future. Culturally, the Museum aspired to become one of London's top ten visitor destinations and to support the growth of curators, artists and small businesses. Economically, the Museum Masterplan was forecast to generate £755 million in gross added value during the first ten years of operation, bringing two million visitors to the City which would be key to the economic growth of the local area. In terms of learning, the ambition was for the Museum to reach every London school child thus contributing to social mobility. In heritage terms, these beautiful buildings would be saved, creating a remarkable new offer. Environmentally, the Museum was also extremely proud of the story it could tell here. The proposals here would be a landmark in terms of sustainability which would see over 70% of the existing fabric preserved and would reduce operational carbon through connecting to Citigen and smart technologies. Ms Ament commented that the Museum were keen to lead the way in helping reach the City's Net Zero target and Climate Action Strategy.

Mr Williams opened by stating that this application was the product of seven years of detailed work. This ambitious, remarkable project would redefine what it means to be a 21st Century Museum whilst simultaneously securing the sustainable future of the three Market buildings in Smithfield. He reported that the Victorian General Market and Fish Market buildings as well as the 1960s Poultry Market had unfortunately fallen into significant disrepair. Under these plans, the General and Poultry Markets would provide the Museum with wonderfully dramatic, contrasting spaces both above and below ground and spaces capable of hosting an extensive range of displays, exhibitions, learning activities and events to trigger the imagination of both young and old. The ambition here was for a world-class venue with no parallels. Proposals for the

Fish Market and Annexe site as a whole were a fundamental and exciting component of the submission and would be developed separately.

Mr Williams went on to report that the brief on this had remained constant throughout – to preserve and celebrate the historic fabric of these buildings and to deliver a truly world-class destination that can effectively tell the story of London and Londoners. The aim was also to create the most sustainable set of buildings possible. It was highlighted that the Team's design approach adhered to the principle of the circular economy, looking to reuse, repair and recycle materials where possible to reduce the embodied carbon footprint and targeting 95% diversion of waste from landfill. The buildings would connect to the local Citigen facility across Charterhouse adjacent to the buildings for the supply of low carbon heating and cooling produced as a by-product or electricity generation. The proposals were targeting a rating of BREEAM excellent and, by preserving up to 70% of the site's fabric, the proposals would ensure that the history and character of this part of the City would remain, be celebrated and become an integral part of the Museum's storytelling.

The Committee were informed that early work repairing, stabilising and cleaning the site had begun but no construction work had yet commenced. The project aimed for practical completion of the General Market and West Poultry Avenue by 2025 with a public opening in 2026. Work on the Poultry Market should be completed later in 2027 and opening shortly thereafter. Whilst Mr Williams acknowledged that several changes had been made to the 2019 application, these were largely in response to updated planning and environmental policies and were therefore minimal. Some of these changes were also as a result of site discoveries impacting upon internal layouts. Mr Williams concluded by encouraging the Committee to approve this application which was clearly a once in a lifetime project.

The Chairman thanked both for their contributions and invited any questions that Members might now have of the applicant team.

A Member underlined that the preservation of these historic buildings was a major benefit of this application however Harts Corner and the Turret were not to be reinstated. He asked Mr Williams why this was the case. Mr Williams recognised that Harts Corner was part of the history of the building that had been bombed during the Second World War. The team had therefore had discussions around its preservation. He reported that the intention here was to tell the story of the building.

With no further questions of the speakers, the Chairman invited any questions of Officers.

A Member commented that the Committee had previously expressed concerns as to how the project would work alongside the existing market. He therefore sought an update from Officers on this point. He went on to refer to the holding objection received from the Smithfield Market Tenants' Association and questioned whether there was any further update on this. Officers responded to state that the holding objection still stood and was addressed in detail within the Committee papers. Officers also acknowledged that the existing market which was to be retained and the Museum both had relatively intense uses of the public highway but were also,

in many ways, complimentary in that the Museum would see peak activity over lunchtime periods with high levels of pedestrian activity with the Market seeing more intensive use during the evening and overnight periods. It was reported that Officers had worked closely with the applicant and the Market Superintendent to examine how the two uses could be facilitated to successfully coexist. Members were informed that the public realm would be subject to Section 278 works which would include areas of significant footway widening, particularly in the area adjacent to the Poultry Market where the removal of some market bays was also proposed. The market bays adjacent to the General Market would also be re-timed and integrated into a wider public realm strategy such that during the day they could function and create generous footways yet also accommodate loading activities associated with the General Market during the evening period. Members were therefore informed that a lot of conversation and negotiation had gone into the ways in which both uses could be accommodated. The proposed coach drop off area on East Poultry Avenue would also function as a dual use and accommodate Market activity at appropriate times. All of the Section 278 works would also be subject to further consideration and detailed design.

Another Member spoke on the proposed stopping up of West Poultry Avenue stating that the condition imposed upon the Museum would be around maintaining a thoroughfare through here. He commented that this seemed to be unnecessary given that there were plenty of walkways around the perimeter of the site and that this would reduce their flexibility in terms of this being a curated space. Officers stated that the part of the proposals that would form the main entry point and access to the Museum was intended to form an orientation point and for this to be a curated space. It was therefore considered necessary for this area to be stopped up but, at the same time, Officers were keen to maintain as much permeability as possible through the site for those not visiting the Museum. Officers went on to refer to policies within the Local Plan which sought to enhance permeability around the City and stated that the Museum had indicated that they could potentially open the route from 7am to midnight as a through route for people. That being said, it was acknowledged within the papers that at times there might be higher security here depending on what exhibitions were showing and that they may also wish to use this space for events. All of this would be factored into the Access Management Plan.

The Chairman then invited members of the Committee to debate the application.

A Member stated that she was delighted to see this scheme coming to fruition and that this would be a public building with public use, opening up the City's heritage to all and telling the story and history of London and its people.

Another Member commented that he was fully supportive of the application however he referred once more to the traffic management issues which he was keen to see taken very seriously and have the Streets and Walkways Sub-Committee scrutinise in further detail to achieve a satisfactory outcome as opposed to just leaving this to Officers to resolve.

Another Member questioned whether anything needed to be put forward to strengthen this point around Member oversight of the issue. The Chairman stated that he felt that it was sufficient to instruct Officers to bring the matter back to the

Streets and Walkways Sub-Committee at this juncture. Officers undertook to action this.

A Member stated that he was very pleased to learn that so much thought had been given to how the Museum site would work alongside the existing market and how the transition would be managed. As a result, he now felt able to support this extraordinary project.

The Chairman summed up by underlining that this was not an isolated project, and that the Museum's move played a much bigger, critical role in what the City would look like over the coming decades making it a genuine global destination. He also commended the way in which the project was being designed sympathetically to maintain the fabric of these buildings and tell their stories as active workplaces. He encouraged the Committee to vote in favour of these proposals.

Having fully debated the application, the Committee proceeded to vote on the recommendations before them.

Votes were cast as follows: IN FAVOUR – 16 Votes
OPPOSED – None
There were no abstentions.

The recommendations were therefore carried unanimously.

RESOLVED –

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

- (a) the Mayor of London being given 14 days to decide whether to allow the Corporation to grant planning permission as recommended, or to direct refusal, or to determine the application himself (Article 5(1)(a) of the Town & Country Planning (Mayor of London) Order 2008);
- (b) planning obligations and other agreements being entered into (or given unilaterally by the City Corporation as landowner) under Section 106 of the Town & Country Planning Act 1990 (and ancillary powers) 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 and a commitment has been given by the City Corporation as landowner that it will comply with the obligations in connection with the development and that it will ensure that the obligations are binding on any future purchaser or development partner;

(2) That your officers be instructed to negotiate and secure the planning obligations through an agreement or unilateral undertaking as detailed in this report;

(3) That it is noted in principle that land affected by the building which is currently public highway and highway over which the public have a right of access, including West Poultry Avenue may be stopped up to enable the development to proceed and, upon receipt of the formal application, officers may proceed under delegated authority with arrangements for advertising and

making of a stopping-up order for the various areas, to the extent that such stopping-up order is unopposed . If there were to be any unresolved objections to the stopping-up order, a report would be taken to the Planning and Transportation Committee for decision;

(4) That your Officers be authorised to provide the information required by regulation 29 of the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017 (information to be provided to the developer post determination of the application), and to inform the public and the Secretary of State as required by regulation 30 of those regulations.

5. **POULTRY MARKET CHARTERHOUSE STREET LONDON EC1A 9LH - LISTED BUILDING CONSENT**

The Sub-Committee considered a report of the Planning and Development Director regarding the Poultry Market Charterhouse Street London EC1A 9LH – specifically,

the part demolition, repair, and refurbishment of the building known at the Poultry Market, Charterhouse Street at ground, first and basement levels, associated with a change of use of the building to provide a museum and ancillary uses and areas; including: works associated with an entrance structure on West Poultry Avenue; internal alterations including creation of a part new first floor; fabric removal and refurbishment on all floors; replacement glazing; facade cleaning and other facade repair; levelling of ground floor; works of repair to the roof; installation of new heating and cooling equipment; new M&E services; repurposing of the south service bay and associated infill structure; remodelling of the north service bay; internal decoration; replacement balustrade; and other associated works as shown on the submitted plans and drawings.

The Committee voted on these recommendations alongside those set out under Agenda Item 4.

Having fully debated the application, the Committee proceeded to vote on the recommendations before them.

Votes were cast as follows: IN FAVOUR – 16 Votes
OPPOSED – None
There were no abstentions.

The recommendations were therefore carried unanimously.

RESOLVED - That listed building consent be granted for the above proposal in accordance with the details set out in the attached schedule.

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

The Sub-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.

7. 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 applications received by the Department of the Built Environment since the report to the last meeting.

RESOLVED – That the report be noted.

8. QUESTIONS ON MATTERS RELATING TO THE WORK OF THE SUB-COMMITTEE

Local Plans Sub-Committee

A Member recognised that this came under the work of the Grand Committee but noted that they were not now scheduled to meet until January 2023. The Member referred to the recent cancellation of Local Plans Sub-Committee meetings for the remainder of 2022 in order to enable Officers to work up the engagement strategy around this. However, there were now some concerns as to the time delay and Members being able to see and comment upon this Strategy ahead of it being finalised and in between meetings.

Aa a more general point, the Member questioned whether matters relating to the work of the grand Committee could also be raised at this Sub-Committee given that it was now set to meet much more frequently. The Deputy Chairman stated that he would also appreciate some clarity on this point. The Comptroller and City Solicitor stated that questions here should really be related to the work of this Sub-Committee as stipulated on the agenda. It could, however, be at the Chair's discretion to alter this for time critical matters although it was suggested that these could equally be dealt with in writing or via email in between scheduled Grand Committee meetings.

With regard to a further comment as to the frequency of meetings now proposed for the Grand Committee, the Town Clerk reported that this matter was entirely within the hands of the Committee and the Chairman and that if they were of view, in due course, that quarterly meetings were not sufficient, this could be added to or revisited as necessary.

Reporting on Discharged Conditions

The Chairman highlighted that this matter had been raised with him on a few occasions by another Committee member who had questioned how these matters were reported on once they had been discharged. He stated that he felt that it would be helpful for Officers to include this information within the weekly summary distributed to the full Court. Officers stated that they would be happy to action this and would also continue to include within the agenda papers for Planning and Transportation Committee meetings.

A Member questioned whether the website featured a list of conditions attached to individual planning applications alongside information as to when these were discharged for the public to consult. The Planning and Development Director

reported that whenever a condition was discharged this was made clear on the website however, he recognised that this might require the public to plough through the paperwork in relation to a given application as, at present, a summary sheet detailing this did not exist. The Member commented that this did exist for other Local Authorities and questioned whether a suitable solution could be found here. Officers added that when planning history was searched for on the website the planning permission featured alongside a list of conditions that had been discharged on that same page, but it was accepted that this could possibly be more helpfully summarised going forward.

9. **ANY OTHER BUSINESS THAT THE CHAIRMAN CONSIDERS URGENT**
Forthcoming Committee Visits

The Chairman reported that the Committee had the opportunity to undertake two visits in the coming weeks. Firstly, a visit to the public terraces at 22 Bishopsgate was scheduled for Monday, 18 November at 10.30am for which he encouraged Members to RSVP as soon as possible. Secondly, a tour of the Lloyds Building was also being proposed for Friday, 2 December at 2pm and further details on this would be communicated to all in the coming days.

Consolidation

A Member noted that at the last meeting, there had been some discussion around bringing back a future report on the success (or otherwise) of consolidated services and how these were working in practice for applicants. She suggested that it might be helpful to invite them to address a future meeting of the Committee on this. The Planning and Development Director reiterated that 22 Bishopsgate was probably the best, current, working example of this and he suggested that this might also helpfully be weaved into next week's visit to the site.

The meeting ended at 11.43 am

Chairman

Contact Officer: Gemma Stokley
gemma.stokley@cityoflondon.gov.uk