

PLANNING AND TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE

Tuesday, 7 March 2023

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

Present

Members:

Deputy Shравan Joshi (Chairman)	Alderman Ian David Luder
Ian Bishop-Laggett	Alderman Bronek Masojada
Deputy Keith Bottomley	Deborah Oliver
Deputy Michael Cassidy	Deputy Graham Packham
Mary Durcan	Ian Seaton
John Edwards	Alderman Sir David Wootton
Deputy Marianne Fredericks	Alderwoman Susan Pearson
Deputy Natasha Maria Cabrera Lloyd-Owen	

Officers:

Tim Fletcher	- Town Clerk's Department
Zoe Lewis	- Town Clerk's Department
Gemma Stokley	- Town Clerk's Department
Fleur Francis	- Comptroller and City Solicitor's Department
Joanne Hill	- Environment Department
Gillian Howard	- Environment Department
Kerstin Kane	- Environment Department
Sam Lee	- Environment Department
Paul Monaghan	- Environment Department
Gwyn Richards	- Environment Department
Rob McNicol	- Environment Department
Gordon Roy	- Environment Department
Ian Hughes	- Environment Department

Prior to the start of the meeting, the Chair set out the procedure for discussion to enable a rounded and representative debate and adequate time to properly consider the items. He reminded Members of the Standing Order around the conduct of debate at Committee and asked that Members confine their speeches to the matter under discussion and avoid being repetitious. The Chairman requested that Members limit their contribution to one comment and if the need arose to raise a new point, they would join the end of the list of remaining speakers. Priority would be given to those who had not yet contributed to the debate. The Chairman reminded Members to have respect for each other when speaking.

1. **APOLOGIES**

Apologies for absence were received from Deputy Alastair Moss (Deputy Chairman), Deputy Randall Anderson, Brendan Barns, Emily Benn, Deputy John Fletcher, Jaspreet Hodgson, Amy Horscroft, Alderman and Sheriff Alastair King, Deputy Edward Lord, Judith Pleasance, Deputy Henry Pollard, Shailendra Umradia and William Upton KC.

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

There were no declarations.

3. **MINUTES**

The Committee considered the public minutes of the meeting held on 10 January 2023 and approved them as a correct record.

Matters Arising

A Member asked for information on the Member Training Programme and was advised this would be considered under Item 13 of the agenda.

4. **BANK JUNCTION IMPROVEMENTS (ALL CHANGE AT BANK): TRAFFIC MIX AND TIMING REVIEW UPDATE**

The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director, Environment which provided an update on the progress of the review of the traffic mix and timing restrictions at Bank Junction.

Members were informed that work was in progress and was scheduled to be completed in Spring 2024. Members were advised that the report set out four traffic mix options that had been investigated using 2022 traffic flows. This indicated that the option to reintroduce all traffic was likely to have significant traffic implications and therefore would not be feasible. However, further investigations should continue for the other three options. The Officer stated that the remaining three options included taxis, powered two wheelers or a combination of both. The Officer stated that these vehicle types were the only types of vehicles with a definition and signage related to them which could be used to restrict usage if the traffic mix was changed.

Officers advised that the next stage of work would involve traffic modelling assessments, equalities assessments, updates on collisions and the general context of the current situation in terms of the post-pandemic recovery of the area. This work would highlight the benefits and likely impacts of each of the options. A further report would be presented to the Committee in May 2023. This report would set out findings and make recommendations on which options could proceed for further design and public consultation.

The Chairman stated that the scenarios for the traffic mix were shown in Paragraph 9 on Page 21 of the Officer's report and reiterated the Officer recommendation that the option of general traffic across Bank Junction should not be put forward for further investigation.

A Member commented that although there was signage for cyclists to dismount, many did not. He asked Officers if there could be two lanes for cyclists going east-west so cyclists had more space. Officers would provide the Member with a written response.

A Member requested that the report back to the Committee in May 2023 include full reasons for the options outlined and if there were any difficulties e.g., with the reintroduction of black taxis, this be fully explained.

The Chairman of the Streets and Walkways Sub-Committee advised that it was important to minimise disruption and publicise the outcome of the works.

A Member commented that the modelling was based on 21 bus routes, but the Number 11 would not be coming into the City. An Officer stated that the 21 bus services were bus routes through the modelled area as a whole and not necessarily buses through Bank Junction. The traffic modelling was based on the bus services in operation when the traffic count was undertaken. If bus routes changed, this would be taken into account in future modelling.

A Member asked Officers to clarify whether there were plans for one or more of the bus routes being temporarily diverted down London Wall to be diverted on a permanent basis. The Officer stated that she was not aware of any bus services being permanently diverted but she would check and provide a written response.

A Member suggested that On-Street Parking Reserve (OSPR) funding could be used to provide more resources to deliver the ambitious project more quickly e.g., with more staffing and more out of hours work. The Chairman advised that the Priorities Board would be meeting quarterly to determine budgets for OSPR funds and Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) distribution, and it was anticipated that this would provide a more efficient process for the utilisation of funds.

An Officer stated that this item would be discussed at the Streets and Walkways Sub-Committee later in the day and all Members of the Committee could be provided with an update following the discussion.

An Officer responded to points made by Members. He advised that work was taking place to improve signage and there were engineering challenges on site as there was an extreme lack of depth due to London Underground structures. Hand diggers had to be used and the public had to be allowed to continue to move through the space. In addition, there was a deadline to complete as much as possible before the Lord Mayor's Show.

A Member referred to an original vision to take all traffic out of Bank Junction and suggested taking traffic out of Bank Junction at weekends. The Chairman stated that timings would be part of the review and consultation.

A Member requested that, although not a legal requirement, socio-economic inequality should be added to the equalities impacts of each option. An Officer stated that the incorporation of this would be discussed with the Equalities consultant.

A Member asked the likely cost if the modelling had to be undertaken again. An Officer advised that if the modelling had to be done using the previous methods, including data collection and staffing costs, would cost £400,000 to £500,000. Officers were working with TfL to see if there were other methods that could be used to reduce the costs.

RESOLVED - That the Committee

- 1) Note the contents of the report;
- 2) Approve that no further work on the option of introducing general traffic into Bank at all times be undertaken, based on paragraphs 14-17 of the report;
- 3) Note the complexities of the work moving forward as explained in paragraphs 18 -19 and 22-26 of the report;
- 4) Note the updated indicative programme of work in Appendix 1 of the report.

5. BUILDING CONTROL CHARGES REPORT - 2023/24

The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director, Environment which outlined the findings of the Building Control's review into previous fees and charges increases and the recommendations for revised fees for 2023/24.

An Officer reported that this was the Annual Report to Committee to reset the building control charges taken for applications under building regulations. He informed Members that under CIPFA guidance, charges set should equate to the costs to provide the service. The current charge was £115 per hour and the revised figure was £126. However, as the guidance stated that over a five-year period there should be a zero budget and as the service had run at a deficit of £342,000 since 2018/19, it was proposed to increase the charge by 20% to £152 per hour.

An Officer informed the Committee that many large schemes lasted several years and therefore setting a 20% surcharge now would enable the five-year deadline to be met. As there was an annual report to Committee, if the requirement was being exceeded, and with the Committee's agreement, the surcharge could be dropped at a later date.

A Member asked whether the costs, for schemes that would take a number of years, were set at the start of the scheme or at the time the work was undertaken. An Officer reported that the estimated fees were based at the rate at the time the estimate was given. However as of April 2023, a quarterly review of fees would be introduced for large schemes.

Following a question from a Member, an Officer advised that the fees undertaken through the hub approved by Committee in January 2023 would be at the rate approved by Committee.

A Member asked if the fee had been benchmarked and was advised that all London councils had submitted hourly rate figures to the Building Services Regulator. The City's figures were broadly in the middle of the figures provided.

In response to a Member's question about how fees were estimated, an Officer stated that every project surveyor completed timesheets and records had been kept for several years. When a project of a certain value was submitted, it was possible to use these records to ascertain the number of hours it was expected to take.

In response to a Member's question, an Officer stated that the City of London Corporation had a statutory duty to enforce building regulations and would continue to do this until each job was complete. Public safety was the number one objective.

The Chairman commented on positive feedback from the market about the service provided by the District Surveyors.

RESOLVED - That the Committee approve Option 3 and agree a new "City of London Building Regulations Charges Scheme No 6: 2023", and a "Building Control Miscellaneous Charges No 5: 2023" based on a new rate of £152 per hour.

6. **DRAFT HIGH-LEVEL BUSINESS PLAN 2023/24 - ENVIRONMENT DEPARTMENT**

The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director, Environment which presented the high-level Business Plan for the Environment Department for 2023/24.

An Officer stated that the report set out the key areas of work for 2023/24 and the way in which services would support the Corporate Plan, other key strategies and policies. The Officer advised that more strategies and policies might be introduced during the year and the Business Plan could be amended accordingly.

Members requested that the Sporting Strategy and Small and Medium (SME) Strategy be referenced as forthcoming strategies. An Officer confirmed they would be referenced and the strategies would be incorporated into the Business Plan once approved.

A Member asked about data collection in relation to the Whole Lifecycle Carbon Planning Advice Note (PAN). An Officer stated that monitoring had begun of schemes approved over the last two years. Members were advised that post-completion data was the most relevant data but there was currently no post-completion data as none of the monitored schemes had yet been completed. Officers would provide planning stage data on the schemes approved to date. A

Member commented that going forward there should be more of a focus on performance monitoring of Whole Life Carbon PAN.

In response to a Member's question, an Officer informed the Committee that Local Plans Sub-Committee meetings were being arranged. A Member commented that she hoped there would be continuation in the membership of the Local Plans Sub-Committee. The Chairman advised that whilst the membership of both the Grand Committee and the Local Plans Sub-Committee could change, having oversight of the Local Plans at the Grand Committee would provide continuation of the work of the Local Plans Sub-Committee.

A Member queried whether the Blackfriars Bridge parapet refurbishment and repainting project had received funding from Bridge House Estates. An Officer would look into this and report back to Committee Members.

A Member requested that details on income generation, specific performance targets and baselines be included in the Business Plan. An Officer stated that targets had not been included as the Plan was being prepared in advance. However, once the figures for 2022/23 were available, they could be shown and these would be provided to Committee Members. The Chairman stated that some income streams would require a change in policy so the principles could be included with the details included at a later stage.

A Member requested a report back on consolidation centres. An Officer stated that there was currently just one consolidation centre at 22 Bishopsgate and there would be a report back to the Committee.

In response to a Member's question about whether the strategy of the City or Business Improvement Districts (BIDs) led, the Chairman asked that the reference to aligning BID strategic priorities on page 79 of the Officer's report be nuanced to indicate that the City's strategy led.

RESOLVED - That the Committee:

- 1) Note the factors taken into consideration in compiling the Environment Department Business Plan;
- 2) Approve, subject to the incorporation of changes outlined above, the high-level Business Plan 2023/24 which covers the service areas for which the Planning and Transportation Committee is responsible.

7. **LONDON WALL CAR PARKS JOINTS AND WATERPROOFING**

The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director, Environment which requested reapproval at Gateway 3/4 to carry out essential waterproofing and repair works to the highway structure in order to maintain structural integrity, utility and asset value.

A Member commented that although it was important to review, it should be noted that there were financial implications to the associated slippage. An Officer responded that without the slippage, some of the costs would have been incurred in the current year, whereas they were now fully incurred in the current year. There was a direct cost as a result of the delay. In addition, the delay had

meant the Bank Junction works now had to be completed before the work could commence.

RESOLVED, That the Committee

- 1) Note the total estimated cost of the project at £2,384,000 (excluding risk);
- 2) Grant delegated authority to the Chief Officer to appoint the successful contractor at Gateway 5 and to instruct the Comptroller and City Solicitor to enter into contract, subject to tendered works costs remaining within the £2,200,000 estimate provided by this report (or to instruct under the new highways term contract subject to satisfactory agreement of costs and the same proviso).
- 3) Approve a total Costed Risk Provision of £240,000 for use following Gateway 5, subject to tender costs remaining within budget, for expenditure against identified sums from the project risk registers against specified risks at the construction stage and to be drawn down to the Assistant Director Engineering.

8. TRAFFIC ORDER REVIEW

The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director, Environment which updated the Committee on progress of the review of all traffic orders in the City being undertaken as a result of the motion that was passed at the Court of Common Council meeting in April 2022.

Members were informed that Stage 1 of the review was to compile a list of all permanent and experimental traffic orders. This was completed in September 2022 and comprised over 1,500 measures introduced by a traffic order. Stage 2 of the review was to assess the orders against the outputs from the data collected and assessed against relevant City of London Corporation policies such as the Transport Strategy. The methodology in relation to Stage 2 was agreed by the Planning and Transportation Committee and Court of Common Council in September and October 2022. Stage 3 would look to implement any modifications that were identified. The Streets and Walkways Sub-Committee was tasked with scrutinising the detail and they agreed the scoring and ranking system as well as to expand Stage 2 to include a) a desktop study which scored and ranked the 1,299 traffic orders in scope and b) a more detailed site assessment as well as further work on 78 of the poorest scoring/performing orders. Following the site visits recommendations had been made to amend or consider amending 36 orders. Officers also identified an additional 32 orders which could benefit from being amended.

An Officer informed Members that if the Planning and Transportation Committee and Court of Common Council agreed, a new programme would be established to assess the merits of these of the recommendations and where appropriate changes could be delivered as part of existing or planned projects or by using underspend from the review. If additional funding was required, this would follow the usual bidding process.

The Chairman commented on the extensive volume of work involved in this review. He stated that it was testament to the Streets and Walkways

Department that out of 1,200 orders reviewed by the external consultant, only 32 were identified as orders that would benefit from alteration. The Chairman stated that this showed the thorough work of Officers.

A Member commented that this was a high-quality report and that the programme should be considered for nomination for an award once implemented. He suggested using funding reserves to achieve early results in a cost-effective way.

A Member congratulated Officers on the comprehensive piece of work. He commented that although he would like the work on Fleet Street to happen soon, it could not take place while the works currently being undertaken on Fleet Street were taking place as it would increase disruption. He suggested that the proposal to introduce a no right turn at the junction of Fleet Street and Whitefriars Street should be frozen until after the building works so that it could be considered in detail in light of the road layout and usage that would arise after the major developments had been completed. He raised concern that introducing it now would cause short term closures.

An Officer informed the Committee that the way in which traffic would move around the Salisbury Square development would be part of a holistic review so if it was agreed as part of this review to introduce a no right turn at the junction of Fleet Street and Whitefriars Street, it would not be implemented until the development was completed.

A Member requested that Ward Members be involved in the consultation before any proposals were implemented. An Officer advised that the recommendations in the report were recommendations for further consideration and were not necessarily the recommendations that would be implemented. He confirmed that Ward Members would be consulted and the traffic order changes would require a formal statutory consultation process.

A Member stated that a meeting had taken place between the clerk of a concerned livery company and Officers and he thanked Officers for attending. An Officer confirmed that contact with the livery company had been maintained.

A Member congratulated those involved in the work. She stated that the motion was passed by the Court of Common Council as a result of concern about how the streets in the City were working. This review proved the streets were working well and Officers were correctly applying Traffic Management Orders. She informed the Committee that some of the servicing and off-street delivery areas identified as successes were in The Minories and Aldgate High Street. There was an extended pavement for use when busy but also provision for off-street unloading and unloading during peak times.

A Member raised concern that in Mincing Lane and the surrounding streets, the safety of cyclists was not being reviewed. An Officer stated that the contraflow was implemented some time ago as a result of cyclists using the streets in this way. The contraflow helped facilitate them and improve safety. Data had suggested it had made an improvement and there was not a set of accident

issues related to contraflow cycling. However, Officers would address concerns raised and would carry out engagement if Members or the general public requested further discussion about how the contraflow cycling operated and any improvements that could be made. Officers stated that they would consider Mincing Lane in more detail.

A Member raised concerns about signage and suggested that Member input could be useful. An Officer stated that Officers could look into specific examples. He further stated that some signage was governed by statute and there were sensitivities around the positioning of signage as there had to be a balance between the signage required for traffic and space for pedestrians moving around footways.

RESOLVED, That the Committee

- 1) Note the outcome of the review, including the recommendations for the 78 traffic orders and measures that were the subject of Stage 2b detailed investigations (Appendix 1).
- 2) Note that officers have identified an additional 32 traffic orders and measures that could benefit from amendments to improve the way they support delivery of Transport Strategy outcomes (Appendix 5).
- 3) Note that implementation of any modifications identified (Stage 3) will be taken forward through a new programme or within existing and planned projects, subject to funding and approvals.
- 4) Agree to allocate the remaining unspent amount of £300,000 towards the delivery of changes to the traffic orders identified in Stage 3 of the review that are not being progressed as part of existing or planned projects. Where additional funding beyond this allocation is required, it will be subject to the usual process.
- 5) Agree not to proceed any further with the review of TfL's traffic orders and measures on the Transport for London Road Network.

9. **WHOLE LIFECYCLE OPTIONEERING PAN***

This item was withdrawn from the agenda and replaced with an item for decision to be considered under Agenda Item 19.

10. **PUBLIC LIFT AND ESCALATOR MONTHLY REPORT***

The Committee considered a report of the City Surveyor which outlined the availability and performance of publicly accessible lifts and escalators monitored and maintained by City Surveyors.

RESOLVED - That Members note the report.

11. **RISK MANAGEMENT UPDATE REPORT***

The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director, Environment providing them with assurance that risk management procedures in place within the Environment Department were satisfactory and that they met the requirements of the corporate Risk Management Framework.

The Committee considered the key risks managed by the service areas of the Environment Department which fell within their remit.

RESOLVED - That Members note the report and the actions being taken by the Environment Department to monitor, mitigate and effectively manage risks arising from their operations.

12. **PARKING METER SURPLUS REPORT***

The Committee received a report of the Chamberlain which informed Members of action taken in respect of any deficit or surplus in its On-Street Parking Account for the year 2021/22 before submission to the Mayor for London.

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

13. **PLANNING AND TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE MEMBER TRAINING PROGRAMME***

Members considered a report of the Executive Director, Environment which set out a series of training opportunities for Members of the Planning and Transportation Committee to ensure members had access to the most up to date information on key aspects of the planning system and transportation issues.

RESOLVED – That Members note the report.

14. **OUTSTANDING ACTIONS***

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

A Member requested that in future agendas, that the Outstanding Actions be moved to the main agenda pack after the minutes and that the document be kept updated. The Member asked for an update on the Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD). An Officer advised that this was taking longer to update than expected due to the complexity of issues being explored with the consultant. It was intended to submit a report to the July 2023 Committee. The Chairman requested that this report include details of the reasons the consultants had been unable to keep to the timeframes.

RECEIVED.

15. **MINUTES OF THE STREETS AND WALKWAYS SUB-COMMITTEE***

The Committee received the draft public minutes and non-public summary of the Streets & Walkways Sub Committee meetings on 17 January 2023 and 14 February 2023.

RECEIVED.

16. **MINUTES OF THE PLANNING APPLICATIONS SUB-COMMITTEE***

The Committee received the draft public minutes and public summary of the Planning Applications Sub-Committee meetings on 22 November 2022, 13 December 2022 and 31 January 2023.

RECEIVED.

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

Dockless Cycles

A Member requested an update on the issues relating to dockless cycles. An Officer informed the Committee that this was an item on the Streets and Walkways Sub-Committee agenda later in the day and an Officer would be attending that meeting for the discussion. He stated that Members could be provided with an update following the Streets and Walkways Sub-Committee meeting.

Monitoring Climate Change in Planning Applications

A Member referenced a 2019 Committee report on the monitoring of buildings once completed e.g., in relation to BREAMM and requested an update report. An Officer confirmed that the 2019 report was a monitoring report on climate change in planning applications. Members could be provided with an update on how BREEAM requirements were being met and there could be a wider discussion on how applications were meeting climate aspirations. This could be discussed at the Local Plan Sub-Committee and then be reported to the Grand Committee in July 2023.

18. ANY OTHER BUSINESS THAT THE CHAIRMAN CONSIDERS URGENT

National Planning Policy Framework

An Officer informed the meeting that the Government had recently consulted on changes to the National Planning Policy Framework as part of the wider planning reforms. A response on this had been submitted under delegated powers before the deadline of 2 March 2023. A draft response had been circulated to all Members of the Committee.

19. CONSULTATION RESPONSES AND FINALISATION OF THE PLANNING ADVICE NOTE: WHOLE LIFE-CYCLE CARBON OPTIONEERING

The Committee considered a late, separately circulated, report of the Executive Director, Environment, which provided information on the consultation responses received for the Whole Life-Cycle Carbon Optioneering Planning Advice Note. It set out the consultation engagement undertaken, the type of responses received and the subsequent changes that were made to the Planning Advice Note in response to the received comments and feedback.

An Officer stated that a threshold had been introduced for the optioneering requirement for all major applications and for other applications that were proposing to demolish more than 50% of the existing building. Applicants would be asked to use the optioneering exercise to demonstrate how the scheme evolved to become the planning application scheme. Applicants would not be challenged on the optioneering calculations when assessing the planning application scheme as the calculations were only used to compare the options

with each other. The optioneering results were based on less detail than the planning application scheme so it would not necessarily be possible to compare the optioneering results with the planning application scheme. Third party verification had been introduced with optioneering results required to be independently assessed to ensure high quality and robust schemes developed.

An Officer stated that work had taken place on the Planning Advice Note following consultation and changes had been made to the structure and layout. Officers had worked to improve the flow and navigation of the Planning Advice Note and align it more with the design of other City of London policy documents recently published. An Officer stated that the planning advice note was based on the GLA Guidance but was at a less detailed level, consistent with the conception stage of the exercise which took place at the pre-application stage.

An Officer stated that the options chosen depended on the opportunities and constraints of the site. She stated that the baseline option had been amended to 'minor refurbishment' rather than the 'do nothing option' because it was important, as a minimum, to extend a building's lifetime.

An Officer stated that collecting data would have limited purpose beyond comparing the results of the options with each other. Post completion data would be important in comparing schemes and creating standards in the long term. Carbon reduction opportunities were being considered in relation to every scheme.

A number of Members stated that they were impressed with the quality of the documents and the responses to questions.

In response to a Member's question about the average lifecycle of a building in the City, an Officer stated that this was not monitored.

A Member asked if the options would contain sufficient information for Members to compare them at Committee meetings. An Officer stated that two dashboards had been developed. One of the dashboards was about the planning application scheme and the other was about options. Both dashboards would form part of the Committee reports members would receive. The information would also include assumptions made with the options and evaluation of each option against different environmental issues and the wider planning balance of the scheme. An Officer stated that as the optioneering took place at the pre-application stage there would be little detail e.g., in relation to materials, as these decisions were taken relatively late in the process. The information in the optioneering was based on nominal figures and all the information was the same across all the options.

In response to a Member's question about third party verification, an Officer stated that the Whole Lifecycle Carbon Guidance required third party verification.

In response to a Member's question, an Officer stated that the change of use between different schemes could not be introduced through the Planning

Advice Note as the Local Plan, Adopted Local Plan and the forthcoming City Plan would take precedence. It could be considered as part of the retrofit first approach being explored through the Local Plan Sub-Committee.

The Chairman stated that this substantial piece of work took sustainability aims and ambitions and put them at the heart of the built environment policy. This work would put the City of London Corporation in a leading position in setting the bar for sustainability criteria. The Chairman requested that the name of the document be simplified.

RESOLVED, That the Committee agree the adoption of the Whole Life-Cycle Carbon Optioneering Planning Advice Note (Appendix 2 – WLC PAN Pre-Design Version).

20. **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.

Item Nos	Paragraph No(s)
23	3
24	3
25	3
26	3
27-28	3

21. **NON-PUBLIC MINUTES**

The Committee considered the public minutes of the meeting held on 10 January 2023 and approved them as a correct record.

22. **DOMINANT HOUSE FOOTBRIDGE FUTURE OPTIONS**

The Committee considered and approved a non-public Gateway 5 report of the Director of the Built Environment.

23. **NON-PUBLIC MINUTES OF THE STREETS AND WALKWAYS SUB-COMMITTEE MEETING ON 17 JANUARY 2023***

The Committee received the draft non-public minutes of the Streets & Walkways Sub Committee meeting on 17 January 2023.

24. **PARKING METER SURPLUS REPORT - NON-PUBLIC APPENDIX***

The Committee considered a non-public appendix to the public report.

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

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

26. **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 12.25 pm

Chairman

Contact Officer: Zoe Lewis
zoe.lewis@cityoflondon.gov.uk