

STREETS AND WALKWAYS SUB (PLANNING AND TRANSPORTATION) COMMITTEE

Tuesday, 23 May 2023

Minutes of the meeting of the Streets and Walkways Sub (Planning and Transportation) Committee held at Committee Room 2 - 2nd Floor West Wing, Guildhall on Tuesday, 23 May 2023 at 1.45 pm

Present

Members:

Deputy Graham Packham (Chairman)
John Edwards (Deputy Chairman)
Deputy Randall Anderson
Deputy Marianne Fredericks
Deputy Shravan Joshi
Deputy Edward Lord
Alderman Susan Pearson
Ian Seaton

Officers:

Sam Hutchings	-	Town Clerk's Department
Zoe Lewis	-	Town Clerk's Department
Luke Major	-	Town Clerk's Department
Philip Carroll	-	Environment Department
Maria Herrera	-	Environment Department
Gillian Howard	-	Environment Department
Ian Hughes	-	Environment Department
Daniel Laybourn	-	Environment Department
Bruce McVean	-	Environment Department
Andrea Moravicova	-	Environment Department
Samantha Tharme	-	Environment Department
Kristian Turner	-	Environment Department
George Wright	-	Environment Department

1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Alderman Ian David Luder, Paul Martinelli and Oliver Sells.

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

There were no declarations of interest.

3. **MINUTES**

RESOLVED, That the public minutes of the meeting of 7 March 2023 be approved as an accurate record of the proceedings subject to Ian Seaton being marked as present.

Matters Arising

In response to a Member's questions, an Officer stated that the letter from the Policy Chairman regarding changes to bus routes had been sent to TfL and a response had not yet been received. Also, representations had been made to TfL about the relocation of the bus stop at the end of London Bridge on King William Street.

4. **BANK JUNCTION IMPROVEMENT PROJECT - TRAFFIC AND TIMING REVIEW**

The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director, Environment which updated Members on the progress of the review and set out the findings of the review work to date.

In response to a question from the Chairman, an Officer stated that the findings indicated that there was no clear transport need for a change, over and above the scheme that was currently being constructed. There was, however, a justification to ascertain whether potential relaxations to the allowable traffic mix at the junction would impact positively upon different protected characteristic groups.

The Chairman asked Officers to comment on the three options. An Officer advised that Option B (an experimental traffic order) would present the same challenges as Option A (making a permanent change) as many of the same TfL processes would be required for approval. However, if TfL were content with the evidence provided, Option B would offer the opportunity to observe the option in action and take a decision on whether it worked from a traffic perspective. It would also show how the option worked in relation to other elements of the project objectives e.g., feelings of safety and security and users' experiences of the area. An Officer stated that Option A had the most risk and therefore had the highest risk of not gaining approval from TfL.

Members asked questions about costs, officer time and other resources used to date. An Officer stated that to February 2023, approximately £125,000 had been spent. Since then, there had been further staff time spent on the work. To continue with the work, more data collection would be required than expected. The work was costing more than anticipated when costed in 2021, and the project no longer had sufficient funding.

In response to a Member's questions, an Officer stated that prior to the Court motion, money had been set aside to undertake the review one year after completion of the current changes to the junction. The Court motion has forced an acceleration of the process. It was possible, without the Court motion, that a desktop review could have been undertaken rather than traffic modelling being undertaken upfront. This was taking place to try and shorten the programme.

A Member asked Officers if there was a cost reduction in modelling different vehicle types together rather than individually. An Officer stated that at this stage, desktop surveys were undertaken so the cost difference was not significant. However, at the detailed modelling stage, the costs were higher, although TfL would usually only accept one modelling option due to the time and their resources required to review the proposal.

Members commented that full costings should be provided to the Court of Common Council, as well as detail about the process and constraints, in order for Members to make an informed decision.

The Chairman asked Officers which option they recommended and which option would be their next preferred option. Officers stated that Option C was the preferred option and would give the ability to properly evidence why any potential change was being undertaken. Option B was the next preferred option as it would provide an opportunity to observe the changes in action before implementation. Option B would still require a change to the existing methodology and more work would be required in relation to equalities.

The Chairman asked Officers how a possible scenario, whereby the Sub-Committee supported Option C but the Grand Committee supported Option B, which was endorsed by the Court would be addressed. An Officer stated that more work would then be required to determine the extent of the changes and discussions would need to be undertaken with TfL.

In response to a question, Officers stated that there had already been discussions with TfL. The first round of mitigations identified would not significantly increase waiting times. The second round of mitigations while reducing impacts on bus journey times would increase waiting times for all other users which was a significant problem. Officers had not yet discussed the finer detail with TfL.

The Chairman asked if modelling had included taxis using all entrances and exits or a sub-set of these. He stated that minimising these would presumably improve safety as it would reduce turns, wait times and delays that drove pedestrians to undertake risky informal junction crossings. An officer responded that a range of scenarios had been modelled at the feasibility stage, including just an east-west route linking Poultry and Cornhill. Officers outlined the difficulty in understanding latent demand, i.e. the potential increase in taxi and motor cycle usage of the junction if restrictions were relaxed, and the impact this would have on wait times.

An Officer responding to a question, commented that if the time pedestrians had to wait at a signal was delayed, they would reach a point where they would give up waiting and cross the road without a signal. A Member said that this raised concerns that this would increase the likelihood of pedestrian/vehicle collisions. He also commented that it was not just those using taxis who might have disabilities as many pedestrians had disabilities too.

Members discussed whether motorcycles should be removed from further consideration as there was no obvious equalities driver for their inclusion as these transport modes were unlikely to be used by people with disabilities. An Officer suggested that motorcycles were not removed at this stage and that that more work on this could be undertaken as part of the work on the option taken forward. The Officer suggested that the motorcycle issue could be resolved at a later date once this work was complete.

A Member stated that a key driver of the original Bank Junction project was to improve safety. She raised concerns that adding more vehicles could increase complexity, increase collisions and suggested that removing traffic from the junction from 7am – 7pm at weekends would encourage visitors to the City and improve pedestrian safety.

A Members raised concern that the review meant other projects were not being advanced. She suggested that Officers request additional resources if the project was continued.

RESOLVED, That the Sub-Committee

1. Note the content of the Officer report including the need for a capital bid to secure funds to proceed (paragraphs 129- 133) and the risks (paragraphs 138- 147);
2. Agree Option C, in line with the Officer's recommendation, to recommend to the Planning & Transportation Committee for their consideration prior to that Committee making a recommendation to the July meeting of the Court of Common Council.

Option C

To pause further work on the traffic modelling exercise. Focus on identifying and evidencing the need for change and how this can be best addressed, and on doing further work to understand the potential latent demand. Subject to the outcome, this would then form the basis of resumed modelling in due course, in advance of public consultation and the taking of a final decision whether to make a permanent or experimental change;

3. Agree that the report to the Court of Common Council should be fully costed and include detail on the process and constraints;
4. Agree that additional funding be sought for further work.

5. TRANSPORT STRATEGY REVIEW

The Sub-Committee received a report of the Executive Director, Environment which updated the Sub-Committee on the engagement carried out to date for the review, along with the suggested amendments to the Transport Strategy proposals.

Members were informed that Officers had identified which proposals required significant change and which ones required minor change. The Officer stated that most of the proposals would remain the same.

A Member asked about the impact on equalities of the granting of pavement licences as this could make moving around the City difficult for some people

with disabilities. An Officer stated that work was taking place with the Licensing team to ensure the environment was more inclusive.

Members raised concerns about the use of the words “wheel” and “wheeling” in the document when referring to mobility aids as this could be misinterpreted and inadvertently encourage skateboarding and e-scooters. An Officer stated that disability groups had undertaken work on inclusive language, and these were preferred terms that were gradually being adopted by industry practitioners.

In response to a Member’s question about the list of modes of transport outlined in the appendix, an Officer stated that those walking, cycling and wheeling were prioritised with motorised vehicles considered after that. Different streets had different priorities depending on needs e.g., some had a greater need for taxis or freight deliveries.

The Chairman queried whether pedal bikes should be grouped together with e-scooters and e-bikes. He stated that pedal bikes were operationally zero carbon and using them was good exercise whereas e-scooters and e-bikes had higher levels of embedded carbon, operational carbon and did not provide the same level of exercise. An Officer stated that whilst pedal cycles were the most sustainable and active method of using wheels, e-bikes and e-scooters were enabling a wider range of people to start cycling. E-bikes and e-scooters were using the same infrastructure space as pedal cycles and were grouped with pedal cycles for the purposes of traffic orders. Therefore, they had been grouped together with pedal cycles in the report.

A Member commented on the slow, steady pace of vehicles on some roads in the City and asked whether this message was being reinforced to keep the pace down across the City. An Officer stated that work was being undertaken under the Pedestrian Priority Programme to encourage calmer cycling and this would apply to users of cycles, e-bikes and e-scooters.

A Member raised concern about commercial Apps to assist the public in reporting issues e.g., footpath raises, having become obsolete. An Officer advised that issues could be reported through the Corporation’s website.

A Member raised concern that the lifts at Bank Station were closed at weekends which meant some people were unable to use the station. She stated the importance of accessibility.

RESOLVED – That the Sub Committee:

1. Note the proposed approach to managing traffic movement and access as set out in Appendix 1;
2. Note the proposed changes for Transport Strategy proposals that had been identified as requiring significant change – see paragraphs 22-63 and Appendix 2 of the report;
3. Note progress with the delivery of the engagement activity, outlined in the report and in Appendix 4 of the report.

6. **PEDESTRIAN PRIORITY STREETS PROGRAMME - PHASE 1**

The Sub Committee considered a Gateway 5 report of the Executive Director, Environment which sought authority to permanently implement the traffic measures at Cheapside and Old Broad Street/Threadneedle Street.

An Officer stated that the report set out the results of the experimental traffic orders, the traffic data collision data and the result of the public consultation. Members were informed that the experimental traffic orders expired in July 2023 and therefore a decision was required on whether to make the traffic orders permanent. There was also a recommendation to undertake further analysis of taxi movements and an assessment of the Cheapside restriction and a potential experimental traffic order at that location following the assessment. Members were informed that the report set out the funding strategy for the various options.

In response to the Chairman's questions about introducing taxis on Cheapside, an Officer stated that when comparing 2019 data and late 2022 data, traffic numbers had declined by approximately 25% across the City. Along the section of Cheapside between Queen Street, King Street and Bread Street, traffic volumes were almost nil. The traffic in the next closest set of streets – King Street, Queen Street and Poultry, had declined by 60%. Feedback from the consultation, from Members and from the Business Alliance was that taxis were now less available along Cheapside, and this was supported by data. The Officer advised that relaxing the current restriction only permitting buses and cycles through, to add taxis, would need to forecast taxi volumes that would use the route if permitted. Currently delivery vehicles made a three-point turn to the east of the restriction. There had not been any collisions reported since the restriction was introduced as the sight lines were good. However, if traffic volumes increased, this might not remain the case and therefore assessment was required.

In response to a Member's question, the Officer stated that the way the highway was currently built out on both sides would remain the case if Option 2 was progressed, with planting and seating on both sides. Option 2 was more expensive than Option 1 due to the challenges presented by the underground utilities. Option 1 was less expensive as it floated and sat around the utilities.

A Member commented that any work should be undertaken to the usual standards and landscaping and seating so that it was built to last. She stated that would improve rents in the area and encourage people to utilise the space.

A Member asked if Cheapside could still be used for sports events and an Officer stated that there would be a 5 metre carriage way which would mean events could still be held.

In response to a Member's question about the funding strategy, an Officer stated that the schemes would be funded by OSPR and also Climate Change Action Strategy funding. A Member commented on the importance of having a separate maintenance fund.

A Member suggested that the Cheapside Business Improvement District (BID) had funding to activate space and could be asked to contribute. Members were informed that Officers had met with the BID's steering group and presented options and Option 2 was the preferred option.

A Member raised concern that the options were being presented before funding had been obtained and asked what would happen to the King William Street work if the work did not take place. The Officer stated that if this happened, Option 1 and 2 would have to be scaled back. The project management system would be used to manage the programmes and more work would be undertaken to better understand the costs and mitigate these where necessary.

A Member suggested that any approval should be in principle, subject to the funding being approved. An Officer stated that the experimental traffic orders would expire in July 2023 and if not approved, there would be no traffic order in place after this time.

RESOLVED – That the Sub-Committee

1. Approve the progression of Option 1 to make the experimental traffic measures permanent on: a) Cheapside (point restriction except for buses and cycles + priority give-way arrangement); b) Initiate a further traffic experiment at the same location on Cheapside to assess the impacts of taxis being exempted from the restriction; c) Old Broad Street (one-way northbound with contra-flow cycle lane) and Threadneedle Street (one way westbound with contra-flow cycle lane), subject to the two schemes, Cheapside and Old Broad Street/Threadneedle Street receiving approval from TfL and noting the objections to the statutory consultation;
2. Approve the initiation of an experimental traffic order at the Cheapside location, following a safety assessment, exempting taxis from the point restriction, and delegate authority to the Executive Director Environment to make any necessary traffic orders;
3. Note that a funding strategy was being prepared to deliver the appropriate scheme outcomes for the best value;
4. Note that a capital bid of £2m was to be prepared to fund the maintenance elements of the King William Street corridor scheme;
5. Delegate authority to the Executive Director Environment, in consultation with the Chamberlain, to make any further adjustments (above existing authority within the project procedures) between elements of the budget.

7. ST PAUL'S GYRATORY PROJECT - PHASE 1

An Officer advised the Sub-Committee that Members had approved a Gateway 3 report in September 2022 which approved the taking forward of three highway layout options for further testing and assessment. He stated that since then, extensive traffic modelling had been undertaken with TfL on the three options; an engagement exercise had been undertaken with over 2,500 responses received, including key stakeholders in the project area such as St Bartholomew's Hospital and 81 Newgate Street; cost estimation had taken place and internal funding had been secured for the project.

The Chairman advised Members that there was a non-public appendix to the report. The Chairman also stated that the conceptual proposals for the new public space at the southern end of King Edward Street would be subject to further scrutiny and there was scope for the design to change following this scrutiny.

In response to a Member's question, an Officer advised that decision points were being accelerated where possible, with the report being considered at the June Court of Common Council rather than the July meeting as previously scheduled.

In response to a Member's comment that TfL support would be required and a question about whether discussions had taken place with TfL, the Officer advised that discussions had taken place with both TfL Buses, and TfL's Network Performance Team who were overseeing the traffic modelling. The preliminary modelling results were positive. Out of the three options, Option 1 performed the best as it removed the signalised junction at the southern end of the King Edward Street and the junction of Newgate Street. The Officer advised that overall Option 1 performed well in terms of bus journey times at this stage of its development for such a large-scale change. The Officer stated that TfL could see the gains for cyclists, pedestrians and public space.

RESOLVED - That the Sub-Committee

1. Approve the progression of Option 1 that introduces: two-way working on Newgate Street and St Martin Le Grand to its junction with Angel Street; and closes the southern section of King Edward Street and the Newgate Street slip road to all vehicles to enable the creation of a new public space;
2. Approve the progression of Option 1A that is the same as Option 1 except for the introduction of two way working on part of Montague Street;
3. Approve Option 1/1A to continue to be developed and progressed to public consultation;
4. Approve the concept design proposal for the new public space to be developed and progressed to public consultation;
5. Approve re-naming the project "St. Paul's Gyratory Transformation";
6. Delegate authority to the Executive Director Environment, in consultation with the Chairman and Deputy Chairman, to approve the (non-statutory) public consultation content and then proceed with the public consultation, to include seeking the public's views on the four proposed names for the new public space on King Edward Street;
7. Note the approved financial bid for the project of up to £13,915,175 from OSPR and CIL contributions;
8. Approve an additional budget of £1,712,050 from the OSPR to reach Gateway 5;
9. Note the revised total project budget of £2,947,992 (excluding risk) to reach Gateway 5;
10. Note the total estimated cost range of the project at £ £15-17 million;

11. Approve the costed risk register of £280,000 in Appendix 3 and delegate authority to the Executive Director Environment to draw down funds from this;
12. Delegate authority to the Executive Director Environment, in consultation with the Chamberlain, to make any further adjustments (above existing authority within the project procedures) between elements of the budget.

8. **MOOR LANE ENVIRONMENTAL ENHANCEMENTS**

The Sub-Committee considered a report of the Executive Director, Environment which provided an update on the design of Area B and sought approval to implement the scheme following the approval of the Gateway 4c-5 report for Area A approved in July 2022.

A Member raised concern that fewer trees were now proposed than previously. Although it was understood that this was due to services underground preventing trees from being planted, there had been a lack of expectation management which meant residents had been disappointed. The Member also stated there were ongoing concerns about the Clean Air Garden and stated the importance of the planning application being agreed with residents. She stated that investigation into the location of trees should have been undertaken earlier in the project with expectations managed from the outset. An Officer stated that the original scheme had been through the approvals process in 2011 before changes in project management were introduced. Groundwork surveys were now undertaken before any proposals were mapped out with ground radar surveys undertaken or trial holes dug, where appropriate. An Officer stated that there was now a more joined up approach with three departments having been brought together as one division. As much greening as possible was being undertaken with planters and other forms of greening.

A Member commented on it being difficult to put trees in the City of London with the rail network underneath and suggested that vertical greening could be used. The Chairman advised that this was a Planning matter.

In response to a Member's question about the 2011 proposal including stakes in the ground with a framework on which plants could climb, an Officer stated that they would look into this.

RESOLVED - That Members of the Streets and Walkways Sub Committee:

1. Approve in principle the design as described in Section 4 and shown in Appendix 5 of the report;
2. Agree to delegate approval of the final elements of the design related to greening to the Director City Operations in consultation with the Chairman and Deputy Chairman of Streets and Walkways Sub-Committee once discussions with local residents had been concluded;
3. Authorise the transfer of any design & evaluation underspend for Moor Lane Section 106 budget from the previous gateway to the Area B (Section 106) implementation budget;

4. Approve a budget increase of £110,000 funded from the Climate Action Strategy Cool Streets programme. Allocation proposal was granted by Streets and Walkways Sub-committee on 15 February 2023 to support design and installation of climate resilience measures on Moor Lane;

5. Note the undertaking of a statutory consultation regarding the removal of the motorcycle bay in Moor Lane. The consideration of consultation responses, the decision as to whether to remove the motorcycle bay and the making of any resulting traffic order, was to be undertaken under the Executive Director's delegated authority in respect of traffic order making processes (unless there are unresolved objection to any such order, in which case it would be brought back to the Sub-committee to decide whether or not to proceed with the order);

6. Note the investigation of loading restrictions along the west kerb on Moor Lane. The undertaking of any statutory consultation, the consideration of consultation responses, the decision as to whether to introduce loading restrictions and the making of any resulting traffic order, was to be undertaken under the Executive Director's delegated authority in respect of traffic order making processes (unless there are unresolved objection to any such order, in which case it would be brought back to the Subcommittee to decide whether or not to proceed with the order);

7. Note the total budget for Area B to be £1,560,000 and approve allocation of the available funds as shown in the section 3 of the report and Table 2 in Appendix 3 of the report;

8. Approve the Risk Register in Appendix 2 of the report and approve the costed risk provision of £100,000; and delegate the drawdown of funds from the risk register to the Executive Director Environment;

9. Delegate to the Executive Director Environment authority to approve budget adjustments, above the existing authority within the project procedures and in consultation with Chamberlains between budget lines if this was within the approved total project budget amount and within intended scope.

9. **LIVERPOOL STREET AREA HEALTHY STREETS PLAN - DRAFT FOR CONSULTATION**

The Sub-Committee considered a report of the Executive Director, Environment which set out a proposal to consult on a Healthy Streets Plan (HSP) for the Liverpool Street area.

RESOLVED - That the Sub-Committee

1. Approve the draft Healthy Streets Plan for public consultation.
2. Approve an allocation of £15,000 for fees to undertake the public consultation exercise, as described in the Issues Report - Crossrail Liverpool Street Urban Integration (Phase 2) also part of this Committee's agenda.
3. Delegate authority to the Director of City Operations, in consultation with the Chairman of the Streets and Walkways Sub-Committee, to approve

the (non-statutory) public consultation content and then proceed with the consultation.

10. **CROSSRAIL LIVERPOOL STREET URBAN INTEGRATION (PHASE 2)**

The Sub-Committee considered a report of the Executive Director, Environment which sought approval for a change in scope for this project to fund and undertake a public consultation exercise for the Liverpool Street area Healthy Streets Plan.

RESOLVED – That the Sub-Committee

1. Note and approve the contents of the report;
2. Approve a change in scope for this project to fund and undertake a public consultation exercise for the Liverpool Street area Healthy Streets Plan.

11. **BANK STATION UPGRADE - CANNON STREET ENTRANCE S278**

The Sub-Committee considered a Gateway 6 Outcome report which updated Members on the project.

A Member welcomed the opening of the new entrance but asked for reassurance from TfL that the entrance would remain open and funded for long term access. Concern was raised that the Walbrook Entrance was often only partly opened. An Officer confirmed that this would be discussed with TfL as would the concerns a Member had raised about lifts not being in operation at weekends. A Member stated that there should be accessibility to lifts and entrances at weekends especially when events were being held. She suggested that a timetable of events be shared to improve connectivity with TfL and the Mayor of London around large events in the City.

RESOLVED – That the Sub-Committee

1. Approve the content of this outcome report;
2. Approve that the final account be undertaken;
3. Authorise the Chamberlain's department to return unspent funds to Transport for London (the Developer) as set out in the respective legal agreement (subject to the verification of the final account) including any further subsequent refunds returned to the City by third parties; and
4. Agree to close the project.

12. **GLOBAL CITY OF SPORT - A NEW SPORT STRATEGY FOR THE SQUARE MILE (2023-2030)**

The Sub-Committee considered a report of the Interim Director of Communications and External Affairs which set out the work that had taken place to respond to Member requests to prioritise sport engagement and develop a strategy to guide this work over the medium term.

In response to Members' questions, an Officer advised that high quality, well-organised, high-profile events were being sought. These might increase the total number of events but not in a substantial way. It was important not to have events on consecutive weekends in the same areas and to support events which would bring in crowds, help promote the City and use landmark spaces in the City. These events would be subject to the approval processes.

A Member stated that the Sports Strategy could encourage major sporting events. It could also encourage residents, workers and visitors to use the City for physical recreation.

A Member stated the importance of not landscaping all streets in order to keep some multi-functional space which could be used for sports courts and pop-up sporting events. She stated that events should take place over the weekends as well as during the week as many residents would be working during the week and could only participate at weekends.

RESOLVED – That the Sub-Committee note the report.

13. **OUTSTANDING REFERENCES**

Dockless Vehicles

An Officer stated that there would be an update report to the July Sub-Committee. He also stated that he and the Chairman would be meeting with Lime, one of the operators. Members had individually been invited by Lime to meet with them and a Member requested that Officers arrange a hybrid meeting for all Members.

Beech Street

An Officer stated that a report would be submitted to the July Sub-Committee meeting. In response to the Chairman's question about the suggestion of the designation of Golden Lane as a School Street, an Officer stated that discussions with Islington Council were ongoing in relation to the area-wide approach and Golden Lane was part of this. The Officer considered it to be unlikely that Golden Lane would be designated as a School Street. However, discussions on this would continue.

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

A Member stated that Fann Street had been resurfaced with stone and tree pit surrounds which had been viewed as trip hazards and had therefore been increased in size. However, this had the unintended result of being used by skateboarders. She stated the importance of speaking to local residents about their views about what would and would not work at the start of a project in a residential area rather than assuming what would work. An Officer confirmed that this would be reported to the relevant team. He also stated that the reason consultation and engagement was undertaken, was schemes were better when they were informed by people who used the streets and understood the area.

A Member commented that Aldgate Square required maintenance. An Officer stated that he would raise this with City Gardens.

A Member stated the importance of consulting the right people before going to third party architects to design a scheme.

In response to questions about trees, an Officer stated that 40-50 trees were being planted across the City.

Members agreed to extend the meeting in line with Standing Order 40.

A Member raised concern about graffiti on the pavilion at Aldgate and also across the City. An Officer advised that it was the responsibility of the building owner and the Corporation would only remove graffiti at the request of a building owner. The pavilion was owned by the City Surveyors Department and he would report the matter to them. The Officer also stated that graffiti was a matter for Port Health and Environmental Services.

15. **ANY OTHER BUSINESS THAT THE CHAIRMAN CONSIDERS URGENT**
There were no urgent items.
16. **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.
17. **ST PAUL'S GYRATORY PROJECT - PHASE 1 - NON-PUBLIC APPENDIX**
RESOLVED – That the non-public appendix be noted.
18. **NON-PUBLIC QUESTIONS ON MATTERS RELATING TO THE WORK OF THE SUB COMMITTEE**
There were no non-public questions.
19. **ANY OTHER BUSINESS THAT THE CHAIRMAN CONSIDERS URGENT AND WHICH THE SUB COMMITTEE AGREES SHOULD BE CONSIDERED WHILST THE PUBLIC ARE EXCLUDED**
There was no urgent business to be considered in the non-public session.

The meeting ended at 3.50 pm

Chairman

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

