

**LOCAL PLANS SUB (PLANNING AND TRANSPORTATION) COMMITTEE**  
**Thursday, 27 April 2023**

Minutes of the meeting of the Local Plans Sub (Planning and Transportation)  
Committee held at Committee Room 2 - 2nd Floor West Wing, Guildhall on  
Thursday, 27 April 2023 at 9.00 am

**Present**

**Members:**

Deputy Shravan Joshi (Chairman)  
Deputy Alastair Moss (Deputy Chairman)  
Deputy Randall Anderson  
John Edwards  
Jaspreet Hodgson  
Alderman Ian David Luder  
Deputy Graham Packham  
Elizabeth Anne King (appointed by the Port Health and Environmental Services  
Committee)

**Officers:**

|               |                           |
|---------------|---------------------------|
| Zoe Lewis     | – Town Clerk's Department |
| Rob McNicol   | – Environment Department  |
| Garima Nayyar | – Environment Department  |
| Gwyn Richards | – Environment Department  |

1. **APOLOGIES**

Apologies for absence were received from Deputy Marianne Fredericks, Deputy Christopher Hayward, Deputy Natasha Lloyd-Owen and Alderwoman Susan Pearson.

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

There were no declarations.

3. **MINUTES**

**MATTERS ARISING**

A Member asked if there had been any feedback from developers on the Suicide Prevention Planning Advice Note. An Officer advised that no feedback had been received but the measures were being implemented within schemes. The City had been shortlisted for an award on this piece of work.

A Member asked for an update on stakeholder engagement. An Officer stated that stakeholder engagement events would be held in the next couple of months. This was later than intended due to the process of appointing consultants and mapping out the engagement work. The first series of engagement events would be on the key area of Change and exploring this in

more detail. The feedback would be reported back to the Local Plans Sub-Committee and then the Planning and Transportation Committee when the Plan was submitted to the Committee in October 2023. The Officer confirmed that the delay in the consultation would not delay the progress of the City Plan and it was still on track to be delivered within the scheduled timetable.

In response to a Member's question about the scheduling of meetings, an Officer advised that although the 19 May 2023 meeting had been cancelled, Officers were looking to schedule another meeting for early September 2023. The September meeting would give Members of the Sub-Committee the opportunity to see the whole plan and provide feedback. A Member suggested that this would not leave much time for amendments before the plan was submitted to the Planning and Transportation Committee and that it could be beneficial to hold this in July. An Officer stated that they would look into this.

An Officer advised that the May Sub-Committee meeting would explore issues around residential use and hotel demand, the June meeting would explore issues around office demand and tall buildings and the July meeting would look at the spatial aspects of the City Plan. The Officer advised that several studies were being undertaken to inform the meetings. The Chairman requested that Officers provide a schedule of meeting topics and the evidence work being undertaken to Members of the Sub-Committee and Members of the Planning and Transportation Committee.

**RESOLVED** – That the public minutes of the last meeting held virtually on 21 September 2022 be approved as a correct record.

4. **CITY PLAN 2040 - RETROFIT FIRST POLICY**

The Sub-Committee considered a report of the Planning and Development Director which outlined changes that had been made to the way whole lifecycle carbon (WLC) of a development was measured and assessed through the planning system and the increased importance that had been given to encouraging the retrofit of existing buildings. This report sets out how policies in the City Plan could be updated to reflect these changes.

An Officer stated that the draft City Plan reflected the Corporation's Climate Action Strategy in seeking to secure a net zero carbon square mile by 2040. He advised that since the previous version of the plan was drafted, the London Plan had been adopted and further guidance had been issued advising that reuse and retrofit should be prioritised in the planning system. There had also been increasing awareness in recent years of the need to consider the WLC of the built environment. As an intermediate step towards tackling WLC in the City, a Whole Lifecycle Optioneering Planning Advice Note was developed and this had recently been adopted by the Planning and Transportation Committee. It had been put into practice in the new schemes coming forward allowing the carbon intensity of different design approaches to be considered at an early stage. As the City's plan was taken forward, there would be an opportunity to expand on this approach ensuring the City remained in general conformity with the London Plan and complemented the work on carbon options guidance.

The Officer stated that there were a number of places in the draft City Plan where there was the potential to give greater emphasis to a retrofit first approach. Firstly, the overall spatial strategy could be updated to recognise the importance of the WLC of new development and to promote the retrofit and refurbishment of existing buildings. Secondly, the policy on design could be updated, requiring design solutions to take a retrofit first approach by giving greater importance to the reuse and refurbishment of existing building structures and materials and by updating the supporting text as well as setting out the importance of retrofitting existing buildings, retaining embodied carbon and minimising WLC. Thirdly, relevant parts of Policy CE1 could be brought into the design section. This dealt with circular design principles and should be considered as part of the design of new buildings rather than just being viewed primarily as a matter concerning waste management. Fourthly, a policy requirement in the sustainability standards policies could be included to require major development proposals to demonstrate that they had considered multiple options for a site having calculated impacts in line with the carbon options guidance and that they had sought to minimise the WLC impacts of each option. The proposed scheme taken with these would have the effect of promoting retrofit and requiring developers to see it as the first choice. The Officer stated that this would not preclude demolition and redevelopment in all cases and there might be instances where other factors would outweigh the carbon impacts and the use of new materials that came with new development. However, it would act as a tilted balance giving greater weight to retention when development proposals were designed and considered by decision makers as well as ensuring carbon impacts were highlighted and circular economy design principles had been factored into the design of development proposals.

A Member asked how WLC compared between a notional high-rise building and two equivalent smaller buildings that provided the same office capacity. The Officer stated that in relation to existing buildings and the potential to retrofit and reuse materials varied significantly depending on the existing structure. The London Plan set out the overall spatial strategy for the whole of London and this was a densification approach rather than a spreading out approach based on solid long-term planning principles like reusing existing sites, concentrating development in certain places and optimising and making the best use of the public transport facilities. The Corporation had invested £200m to support the Crossrail development, the development had paid a significant sum through the Community Infrastructure Levy and the transport infrastructure meant that promoting the growth of office development within very well-connected places like the City was a sustainable approach as people could get to the City without using cars. It also meant that building was not spreading out into the countryside and using land that could be used in other ways to support climate action, e.g., putting carbon back into the ground as was being considered in Epping Forest and other places across the green belt. The Officer stated the importance of being aware of the special strategy as the Corporation's Local Plan had to be in general conformity with the London Plan and had to comply with the approach taken in the National Planning Policy Framework which reflected that. There was a strong sustainability argument for creating dense development within well-connected places on a building-by-

building basis. The Officer stated that in general the WLC of high-rise buildings was higher than the WLC of equivalent lower-rise buildings. However, it also depended on the design of the buildings. The majority of embodied carbon went into the steel and concrete structures of buildings. Tall buildings had to be heated and cooled differently to smaller buildings and less natural ventilation might be possible. The Officer stated that there were significant constraints in terms of development potential in different parts of the City with a series of conservation areas, over 600 listed buildings and strategic views. An office demand study was being undertaken to give a greater idea of the scale of growth that would be requirement and shape the pattern of development.

The Chairman stated that in terms of longevity, iconic buildings tended to have a much better WLC opportunity than smaller equivalent buildings. Activating ground floor space by including food, beverage and leisure opportunities was important when looking at the carbon footprints of those travelling into offices to work. It would often mean the entire day of an employee could sit on their employer's carbon footprint and these aspects should be considered.

A Member commented on the impact tall buildings had on surrounding buildings e.g., in relation to solar gain as this had an impact on the energy performance of these buildings. The Officer stated that the impacts would be considered. He stated that buildings were being designed to minimise operational carbon demand from heating, cooling and power and also with grid decarbonising the actual power to run the buildings was reducing. The Member stated that it was important the disbenefits did not fall disproportionately on others. The Officer stated that when planning applications were submitted, the impact of the buildings on the wider area were considered. The BRE daylight and sunlight guidance required the impact of a building on solar panels in neighbouring buildings to be considered. Consideration was also given to the impacts on green roofs and other urban greening.

A Member asked if a mechanism could be built into the Local Plan that would mean if a developer demolished a building before a 60-year life, they would start with a carbon debt of whole life carbon that was assumed in the building that had been demolished. He stated that this would give a strong incentive to construct buildings that would be in place for over 60 years because replacing them any earlier would be challenging. A Member asked whether 10 years after construction, a review of the performance of a development relative to projections could be undertaken. The Chairman stated that disincentivising developers to redevelop early should be embedded. Officers would consider the implications of this. An Officer clarified that the embodied carbon was not in the building but was in the construction of the new materials, so the age of a building was less significant than the amount of carbon involved in replacing it. He also stated that if replacing buildings between 5 and 20 years became an increasing trend, the rate of development would become an issue and therefore consideration should be given to slowing down the rate as a whole.

A Member suggested that where buildings were demolished and had a carbon debt of WLC, they could be charged a surcharge on the Community

Infrastructure Levy (CIL) to disincentive demolishing and promote extending and retrofitting.

A Member commented that a building should only be permitted to be demolished if it was deemed acceptable and policies should not look backwards. He stated that most developers were now looking at retrofitting first as a matter of course.

A Member stated that even if a building was 20 years old, it may have been poorly designed, or circumstances may have changed, and it was important to look at each case on its merits. Demolishing and rebuilding could be the most suitable course of action.

A Member stated that the complexity of retrofitting should be included in the documentation e.g. ceiling heights could prevent the installation of a mechanical ventilation system, modern buildings had to be insulated but if there was a solid brick structure, it would not be possible to install external insulation. If the building was in a conservation area, internal insulation would compromise fixings on the walls and could result in moisture and condensation. If there was a late Victorian building with poorly cemented steel, adding insulation could result in corrosion.

An Officer stated that a significance number of planning applications were now for retention and retrofits of buildings up to 40 or 50 years old. The default position was now to retrofit.

Officers stated they were involved in each scheme, exploring in great detail the opportunities for retrofit and the limitations of that, the opportunities for partial retention and for minimising WLC. The Officer stated that the approach set out in the paper acknowledged the complexities but did not set out a threshold for demolition or retrofitting. It deliberately reflected the complexities of the issues by taking a balanced approach. It focused on having tilt in that balance to give additional emphasis to the need to retain existing components, existing buildings, to reuse materials and to develop circular economy. The Officer stated that there could be situations where a retrofit and adding an additional five or six storeys on a building could have a similar carbon impact as demolishing and rebuilding due to the strengthening work that would be required to support the additional floors. There could be other buildings where due to the fabric of the existing building and its foundations, this could be achieved with relatively limited carbon impacts. There were also wider sustainability issues such as providing better mechanical ventilation systems, plant and machinery, solar panels on the roof, green roofs and climate resilience. The wider planning aspects of the opportunities of the scheme could then be considered. This was reflected in the Carbon Options Guidance which was broadly accepted by the development industry as an exemplar process. This was why the balanced view approach had been set out in the plan.

In response to a Member's question, an Officer advised that the terms of a CIL was set by national government. It was set on the uplift of floorspace that a

scheme delivered and therefore the Corporation could only determine the rate at which the CIL was charged.

In response to Members' concerns about buildings being demolished much sooner than the expected 60 years, Members were informed that Officers would explore possible approaches to address this. The Officer stated that the approach outlined in the policy was looking to promote circular economy design principles and building buildings for longevity and adaptability was vital to prevent new applications in 20- or 30-years' time to demolish buildings that were currently being constructed. The Officer advised that many applicants were future-proofing buildings.

A Member commented that having policies in place to make it unviable to be demolishing buildings could address some of the issues raised and having a robust first gate test would achieve this. He stated that there should be the proper utilisation of space as it was irresponsible from an environmental perspective not to properly utilise space. He further stated that it was important that polices were forward looking.

A Member commented that businesses were now considering their carbon footprint and were surveying staff and users about where they travelled from, stayed and how they travelled, to better understand their impact on the environment.

In response to a Member's question, the Chairman stated that although Members were looking at one particular aspect of the City Plan, the retrofit policy, it had to be considered in context with developers, employers and the market also being considered. A Member stated that policies had to balance sustainability and have regard to the market and the Corporation was backed by most of the development industry and was seen as leading the way. The Chairman stated that the Planning Department had been shortlisted for awards on Carbon Optioneering Guidance and various aspects of the approach to sustainability.

A Member asked Officers for more information on Retrofit Fast Track. An Officer started that this would be brought back to the Sub-Committee in June 2023 once evidence on office demand had been received. The Officer stated that where an existing building was retained, there could perhaps be an easier route through the planning system towards changing from office use towards another use that would complement the business City, e.g., education use, research and development, other forms of office space e.g., to support Small and Medium Enterprises (SMEs) and creative industries. Officers would be giving further consideration to this. A Member commented that standards should not be relaxed and WLC assessments should still be undertaken as without these, the reuse of buildings could make them operationally inefficient.

The Chairman outlined points made by a Member who had sent apologies. She stated that she considered that the policy should be expanded to embed a retrofit first approach and provide a retrofit fast track to incentivise this. She considered that the plan's spatial strategy could be amended to specifically

recognise the importance of the WLC of new development and the need to promote the retrofit and refurbishment of existing buildings. She stated that this approach would reflect the aims of the Corporation in promoting sustainable development in line with the Climate Action Strategy and would allow for greater weight to be applied to the retention of existing buildings and structures in decision making.

In response to points raised by the Member in relation to the definition of Tall Buildings, the Chairman stated that there were statutory definitions of spaces.

In response to Members' questions, the Officer stated that in general, the development industry was in support of retrofitting. Office uptake of redeveloped spaces had been increasing in the past 5-10 years. The City Property Association (CPA) had published their own 'Retrofit First, Not Retrofit Only' study which looked at different case studies. The Officer stated that some developers and landowners were already making firm commitments to taking science-based targets in across their portfolios of development and looking at specific targets for the WLC of their new developments as well. The level of support to the planning advice note was evidence that there was industry-wide and stakeholder-wide support.

A Member stated the importance of preserving office space in the City and not approving sub-standard residential accommodation and stated this should be reflected in the policy. An Officer stated that the City was exempt from the permitted development rights to convert offices to residential use. This had been secured through the Article 4 Direction which was endorsed and supported by the government at a time when they were looking to restrict the ability of local authorities to bring in Article 4 Directions. This was a clear national steer to maintain the City's functions. In addition, the London Plan set out clear policies that required the City to prioritise and promote office development above residential development within the square mile. The Officer stated that he would advise against any approach which sought to make change of use to residential a more straightforward process than was already in the draft City Plan.

**RESOLVED** - That Officers continue to progress work on the City Plan based on Members' views on the proposed policy direction in relation to the 'retrofit first' policy approach and draft amendments to the spatial strategy for the draft City Plan.

5. **CITY PLAN 2040 - CULTURE, PUBLIC USES AND PUBLIC SPACES**

The Sub-Committee considered a report of the Planning and Development Director which set out the potential ways that policies in the City Plan could be amended to reflect responses received in relation to culture, public uses and public spaces during the previous Local Plan consultation and the City Corporation's Destination City objectives.

The City's destination vision sought to renew the square mile making the city a leading destination for visitors and workers, increasing footfalls seven days per week and creating places in the City that would draw in cultural attractions,

events and unique experiences. Developments were already required in the draft City Plan to provide cultural plans setting out how they would contribute to enriching the City's cultural offer. Policy S12 required development to provide open spaces at street level and incorporate areas of publicly accessible open space or other facilities at upper levels. These spaces were being developed and the Roof Garden at 120 Fenchurch Street had been approved, as had the Migration Museum. In addition, the archaeological display at Vine Street had recently been opened. A cultural planning framework was being developed in conjunction with consultants Publica and colleagues in the Destination City team were helping to provide the strategic framework for understanding the cultural make-up of the City and how this could inform new development in different parts of the square mile.

The Officer stated that in the City Plan, there were some key policy shifts that could help to reinforce the delivery of cultural and other public spaces, and this was in response to consultation responses received in previous rounds of engagement. There was a need to ensure that the spaces created were inclusive and accessible and were celebrating the rich heritage of the City as the key reason people wanted to visit.

An Officer stated that a refreshed Policy S6, underpinned by the overarching Destination City theme was proposed in the City Plan. This would give the potential to provide a wider set of public uses and public spaces within the City as well as making the scale and provision more consistent. The Officer stated that the recommended three overarching priorities for the new culture policy included delivering a range of new public uses and spaces through new development, placing heritage at the heart of place shaping and ensuring new public spaces and uses were more accessible and inclusive to all. The Officer stated that there were two ways this could be approached. The first approach could be to set out different kinds of uses and spaces that could be delivered through new development. These uses could include museums, art galleries, visitor centres and exhibition spaces. Where there were public spaces e.g., roof gardens and public squares, this policy would also set out specific area requirements which would be expected from the proposed development. The amount of this contribution would depend on the quantity of floorspace and that would be proportionate to the uplift quantity. A benchmarking exercise of the Culture Plan submitted along with planning applications was carried out. This benchmarking data was used to identify threshold values above which developments would be required to deliver new public spaces and uses. The Officer stated that large-scale developments over 10,000 square metres met substantial contributions whereas for smaller developments the contributions were inconsistent. The proposed policy approach would require developments over 1,000 square metres to deliver specific amounts of floorspace of new public uses and spaces. The policy would give priority to on-site provision and make this a requirement for large-scale developments over 10,000 square metres. On site provision could be set out as a preference for developments of 1,000-10,000 square metres with off-site provision deemed acceptable where there was an identified public space or public use project within the vicinity which would lead to better outcomes. If it could be clearly demonstrated that on-site and off or off-site contributions could not easily be made and were not



feasible and there were no identified projects within that area, financial contributions could be sought as part of a Section 106 agreement to deliver another new public space somewhere else in the city or make improvements to the existing public realm in the City. The benefits of this approach were that it would ensure effective delivery of public uses and spaces by setting out a clear matrix of floorspace requirements. This option would also give priority to on-site provision and at the same time ensure off-site or pooled contributions were secured where appropriate. The Officer stated that this approach was transformational in line with the Destination City objectives.

The Officer stated that the second approach was to adopt a bespoke approach for different types and scales of development. In this case, the type and amount of contribution would be determined on a case-by-case basis and there was an opportunity to explore multiple options. However, within this approach, requirements for the type and amount of contribution expected would not be set. The major drawback of this approach was that the policy could not be applied in a consistent manner and there could be situations where meaningful contributions could not be secured. The two other key priorities of the Culture Policy included inclusions and accessibility and celebrating the City's heritage. In relation to inclusion and accessibility, the draft City Plan already set out a number of policies which sought publicly accessible spaces with new developments. To add weight to this policy requirement, the new policy would strengthen the requirement for the management of public spaces, particularly privately owned public spaces. The policy would outline how public spaces could be used and managed by setting out specific levels of public access requirements for different types of public spaces. The Officer stated that the next key priority was how to embed heritage within the cultural offer and celebrate the City's heritage. Through the refreshed Culture Policy, developments would be expected to adopt a place-based approach to celebrating heritage, embed heritage in the culture offer, provide access to heritage assets, incorporate heritage into new developments, recognise and reflect the site area's history in the design proposal and provide access to archaeological features wherever possible.

A Member asked if there was data to show how well terraces and viewing galleries were used. An Officer stated that since the Sky Garden opened, there had been 10 million visitors. Evidence showed there was significant interest in visiting viewing galleries. They were also appealing to a wider demographic than previously with teenagers and young people posting photos on social media. Each viewing gallery was unique in view and experience offered. They also created energy at ground floor level. The Member raised a concern that buildings at the lower end of the scale were not overburdened.

In response to concern from a Member, an Officer stated that work was taking place with the operator of the public space around the Cheese Grater building looking at possibilities for enlivening it. Lessons had been learnt and were being applied to other schemes. The Business Improvement District had also been working to try and use the space and enliven the area.

A Member raised concern about the queues for viewing galleries and security measures not being inclusive and welcoming. An Officer stated that security was required, however, there was a need to try and make it as inclusive and seamless as possible and that was a key part of negotiations.

A Member stated this policy would work well on large buildings but on smaller developments, requiring retrofits and extensions to have on-site provision could make them unviable. He suggested that where a development was 10,000 square metres or less, a monetary contribution could be a better option to avoid discouraging retrofit through this policy. The Member stated that there were merits in both approaches using a combination of the two policies outlined.

An Officer stated that anonymised data from a monthly report could be shared.

A Member asked if a specific fund could be set up within S106 to enable cultural use. An Officer stated that cultural spaces on smaller schemes was a challenge. In negotiating schemes, scoping was taking place of people who could be culturally curating these spaces. Officers were being proactive in understanding the types of operators and type of offers that could fit into these spaces.

An Officer stated that the proposed policy was for medium-scale developments. Although it would be unlikely that there would be a retrofit that would over 10,000sqm, modelling would be done in these circumstances. He stated that it was suggested that on-site provision be considered first but that off-site provision could be looked at, particularly where there was an off-site scheme that the provision could go to with developers working together to look at what they could provide in the area within the framework. The Officer stated that if off-site provision was considered first, on-site provision would not take place.

An Officer reiterated that the Sub-Committee considered flexibility to be important and Officers would work to find the right balance on this. He stated that security was a priority and Officers were proposing in the policy that the places should be advertised as inclusive and publicised to those in the vicinity. Developers could also be doing more to advertise spaces. There were two elevated viewing galleries opening in Summer 2023 at 8 Bishopsgate and 22 Bishopsgate and Officers would work with the Destination City team on publicity. Creative ways the Corporation could publicise these as destinations included having an App to alert people walking past that there was a viewing gallery nearby.

An Officer stated that lessons had been learnt from the popular Sky Garden which was the first pioneering scheme. When viewing galleries were now proposed, space was incorporated within the buildings for queuing so that queuing did not take place on the public realm.

The Chairman stated the importance of starting work on wayfinding as this would help with understanding and provide an evidence base for points being included in the Local Plan.

A Member raised concern about the cost of Beech Street Gardens when the Local Plan showed that footfall in these gardens had been the lowest of any of the City's open spaces.

A Member welcomed the inclusion of public uses in public spaces including indoor sports facilities and outdoor sports and play facilities.

A Member stated that he considered that most occupiers would want to be associated with uses such as roof terraces and that in a few years' time work would be taking place to marshal where they should be places rather than just encouraging developers to include them in their developments.

An Officer stated that there was a current planning application for The Podium being negotiated with Officers to ensure it was fully integrated into the public realm. It would include play equipment, exercise equipment and greening to make it a place and a destination in its own right. There would be a commitment to wayfinding and there was a need to take a consistent approach across all of the stakeholders and this work was currently taking place. This application would be presented to the Planning Applications Sub-Committee in the near future.

A Member raised concern about how strategies fitted together and stated that as the City was going to lock into a fairly long-term plan, there was a need to ensure it fitted with other strategies.

A Member raised concern that there was a Cultural Policy rather than a Cultural Strategy. An Officer stated that the work being undertaken with Publica was to develop a cultural planning framework. It was looking spatially at the City as a whole, the cultural assets within the City, the character of different areas of the City and how new development could contribute to this in a meaningful way. The policy had been designed to be relatively flexible. It would set out a policy requirement for developers to make a meaningful contribution with the Cultural Planning Framework helping to inform these types of spaces and how they would operate. Work was also taking place to speak to cultural occupiers about the work they were doing. An Officer stated that a significant part of the policy shift was the Celebrate Heritage approach. This was applied to 85 Gracechurch Street where a deep dive was undertaken into the scheme. There was a creative process to understand collating archaeological remains in a dedicated site. Each site had its own challenges and opportunities and a bespoke approach had to be applied to each site.

A Member commented that it was relatively straightforward to change use within Class E. An Officer confirmed this was the case and also stated that within the draft City Plan, Policy HL5 covered the need for the provision of community facilities if there was a requirement for them.

The Chairman stated that hotel room demand was increasing year on year. Some of this was overspill from the West End but much of it was leisure users coming to explore the City and wider London area, particularly at weekends. He stated that it was important, when developing a cultural plan and sites of

attraction, to also build in supply chain and logistical elements e.g., with TfL and other transport providers, hotels, food and beverage outlets so that the City could meet the increase in demand. The Chairman stated this should be included in the Local Plan to ensure there was a holistic approach.

Members commented that the provision of public toilets was also an important consideration and raised concern about the current provision. An Officer advised that there was a specific policy on public toilets included in the draft Local Plan to make toilets available for the public. An Officer advised that there were currently four major schemes where discussions were taking place about the potential to incorporate toilets for public use.

A Member commented that in relation to the provision of open spaces, quality was important as well as quantity. An Officer advised that the thermal comfort work that had been done was key to understanding the look and feel in open spaces e.g., how comfortable people were there through the seasons.

The Chair stated that the discussion had been useful and provided feedback for Officers to work on.

**RESOLVED** – That Officers continue to progress work on the City Plan based on Members' views on the proposed policy direction for City Plan policy that sought to secure cultural and other public uses and spaces in new developments.

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

There were no questions.

**7. ANY OTHER BUSINESS THAT THE CHAIRMAN CONSIDERS URGENT**

The Chairman stated that this was the last meeting of the civic year. He thanked Members and Officers for their work.

**The meeting ended at 10.38 am**

-----  
Chairman

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