

PLANNING APPLICATIONS SUB-COMMITTEE

Friday, 21 July 2023

Minutes of the meeting of the Planning Applications Sub-Committee held at Livery Hall - Guildhall on Friday, 21 July 2023 at 10.30 am

Present

Members:

Deputy Shravan Joshi (Chairman)
Graham Packham (Deputy Chairman)
Deputy Randall Anderson
Brendan Barns
John Edwards
Anthony David Fitzpatrick
Deputy John Fletcher
Jaspreet Hodgson
Deborah Oliver
Alderwoman Susan Pearson
Judith Pleasance
Ian Seaton
Hugh Selka
Luis Felipe Tilleria
William Upton KC
Alderman Sir David Wootton

Officers:

| | |
|-----------------|---|
| Zoe Lewis | – Town Clerk’s Department |
| Fleur Francis | – Comptroller and City Solicitor’s Department |
| Catherine Evans | – Environment Department |
| David Horkan | – Environment Department |
| Kurt Gagen | – Environment Department |
| Rob McNicol | – Environment Department |
| Gwyn Richards | – Environment Department |
| Bob Roberts | – Environment Department |

-

1. APOLOGIES

Apologies for absence were received from Mary Durcan, Dawn Frampton, Deputy Marian Fredericks, Deputy Brian Mooney, Ian Bishop-Laggett, Deputy Michael Cassidy, Deputy Natasha Lloyd-Owen, Deputy Alastair Moss and Shailendra Umrada.

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

There were no declarations.

3. **MINUTES**

The Sub-Committee considered the public minutes of the last meeting held on 27 June 2023 and approved them as a correct record.

4. **55 BISHOPSGATE**

The Sub-Committee considered a report of the Planning and Development Director concerning demolition of the existing building and the erection of a part-63 storey (284.68 AOD) and part-22 storey (112.30 AOD) building plus basement, including office use (Class E); a publicly accessible multi-purpose space at ground floor level, part Level 02 and part Level 03 for a flexible use including: retail, food and beverage, drinking establishment, learning, community use, exhibition and/or performance space (Sui Generis); a public viewing gallery (Sui Generis), public realm improvements, cycle parking, servicing, vehicle lifts, refuse facilities and other works associated with the development including access and highways works.

The Town Clerk referred to those papers set out within the main agenda pack as well as the Officer presentation slides and an addendum that had been separately circulated and published.

Officers presented the application, highlighting that the application site was located on the west side of Bishopsgate adjacent to Tower 42, within the Eastern Cluster in the current Local Plan and also within the Eastern Cluster in the emerging Local Plan. It was also in the Renewal Opportunity Area.

Members were shown images of the existing cluster showing the nature of tall buildings in the immediate vicinity and the future Eastern Cluster with permitted schemes. Members were informed that 8 Bishopsgate had recently opened and 40 Leadenhall was close to completion. The Officer stated that the site was not in a conservation area but on the opposite side of Bishopsgate was St Helen's Place Conservation area and there were other listed buildings and heritage assets in the immediate vicinity.

Members were informed that the existing building was built in the late 1980s and early 1990s. It was a well-mannered building in this location and was typical of many commercial buildings in the City and across London. There had been some objections relating to the loss of this building, but it was not considered to be a non-designated heritage asset and therefore if it was lost, in townscape terms, it was considered acceptable.

The Officer stated that the proposal sought a 63-storey tower together with a 22-storey satellite tower adjacent to it. The proposal was predominantly for office use with 103,000sqm of space but also included cultural uses at the lower floors and at the top floor.

Members were shown the front elevation from Bishopsgate which showed the green wall stitching the two buildings together and the southern elevation where the green wall extended along the southern façade. Members were also shown an image of the proposed front of the building which showed the ground floor being given over to the public realm with 2,344 sqm of new public realm. Members were also shown the existing ground floor plan which was built to the extent of the site so there was no public realm within the existing building.

The Sub-Committee were shown the proposed ground floor plan with the core in the middle as the main element of the building. The Officer stated that this would deliver a

significant increase in public realm and would also be activated in terms of having pop-up retail situated around the core, a landscaped seating area and it would be a destination for cultural pop-up events.

Members were informed that there would be landscaping water features all around the site. At the front of the site on Bishopsgate, the landscape design was designed as hostile vehicle mitigation so would enhance the overall streetscape without the use of bollards.

The Officer stated that underneath the satellite building, as had been approved in many other City schemes, the delivery and servicing areas would be accessed by two vehicle platform lifts. During the day, when they were not in use, this would create an extended area of public realm and this could be used for pop-up activity.

The Sub-Committee was informed that by opening up the frontages, the pedestrian comfort levels and the movement of people in and around the building would be improved, despite the increase in the population within the new development. The Officer stated that Transport for London (TfL) sought C+ as the standard for street pedestrian comfort levels but the City required a higher standard of B+. There would be A's, B+'s and one B- so there would be significant improvement in terms of pedestrian flows. In addition, TfL had advised they would be making permanent their temporary footway widening scheme which was delivered during the Covid period. The footway would be widened immediately adjacent to the site and also along the Bishopsgate corridor so this would result in a further improvement in comfort levels. Officers were satisfied that pedestrian comfort would be enhanced.

Members were shown images of the new pedestrian routes and capillaries being formed within the development site. These would future proof pedestrian flow if schemes came forward on adjoining sites as they would allow connection to these sites and create new routes, improving pedestrian flows in and around the site.

The Officer stated that the cycle parking provision met the London Plan and City standards. There would be short stay cycle parking on the ground floor and additional short term cycle parking at the lower ground floor accessed by the cycle lifts and a ramp stair if necessary. Longer stay cycle parking would be provided at the lower ground floor and basement levels. The short-term cycle parking exceeded the requirements for the London Plan policy with 116 spaces being required and 122 being delivered.

The Officer stated that there would be two vehicle lifts so that the space could be used for public realm during the day with servicing occurring between 10pm and 7am. This would be consolidated and capped at a maximum of 136 vehicles per day during this servicing period. Any deliveries during the day would only be delivered by cargo bikes.

Members were shown the first-floor plan which showed the main office reception accessed by two escalators either side of the core and the lift access. Above this there were the office floors.

The Sub-Committee were shown images of the public realm. The Officer outlined the rich textual timber soffit of the building, the sculpted element of the proposed columns and the bronze finish. He stated the core itself would be brick and porcelain and the area would be welcoming to the public and would not have a corporate feel. Members were shown images of the water feature and how the area could be used for pop-up cultural events. Members were informed that it was intended that there would be a cultural operator that would curate and operate all the cultural elements within the

scheme to include both the ground-floor public realm and also the upper floors and the conservatory on the top floor. The Officer stated that the applicants had been in discussions with New London Architecture about being the operator of this space.

Members were shown images of the auditorium at the lower floors of the satellite building. The Officer stated that the lower level of the auditorium faced outwards towards Bishopsgate. He also stated that Level 3 was the main exhibition area which was a flexible space for learning, the community and a café as well as providing access to the upper level of the auditorium.

Members were shown an image of how the auditorium would look from the street scheme and were advised that it would extend the activation of the ground floor from the public realm to the upper floors.

The Sub-Committee were shown an image of the fourth floor level which was proposed to be a co-working space. The Officer stated that 5% of this space would be affordable workspace which would equate to approximately 50 desks. This would potentially be operated by the cultural operator.

Members were shown a cross-section image showing how the floorspaces fitted together and the circulation around them. They were also shown images of the conservatory which was a unique environment created at the top of the building in the triple height space with capacity for 300 visitors. Members were informed that it would be open from 10am to 7pm or nautical dusk, whichever was later. It would provide learning and educational opportunities which would be curated by the operator of the floor space.

Members were shown images of the viewing platform above the conservatory which would deliver views across London and St Paul's Cathedral. They were also shown images of the landscaping at ground floor, the conservatory at the top and the extensive green wall provided between the two buildings which would be between Level 4 and Level 22. Members were informed that the green wall would provide a striking feature in the street scene and also deliver benefits in terms of biodiversity, urban cooling and benefits to visitors and occupiers of the building.

The Officer stated that the rest of the building would be for office use. Existing and emerging policies sought to deliver a significant increase in Grade A floor space and the cluster was seen as the strategic location to deliver that floor space. This scheme would deliver 103,000sqm of floor space which equated to 14% of the office requirement for the planned period up to 2036. This would be a significant contribution towards this strategic objective.

Members were informed that the proposal was for a tall building within the cluster identified as the place to accommodate tall buildings. The building would be 63 storeys tall and would be 284m in height. Members were shown images of the cluster, including the cumulative image of the cluster where 1 Undershaft and 100 Leadenhall could be seen. Members were shown how the proposal would fit in and consolidate the cluster. It stepped down from 1 Undershaft and 22 Bishopsgate in keeping with the general curve of the cluster form. The elegant, tapered edge provided a well-considered addition to the cluster. The proposed development was considered to be of the highest quality architectural design. Biometric geometry based on the Fibonacci sequence, a geometry found in nature, had been used, creating an elegant design solution and the building had a very efficient structure, which reduced the carbon required for the construction.

The Officer stated that the proposal would enhance the overall longer distance views of the cluster. Members were shown strategic views from Blackheath Point and Parliament Hill. Members were informed that there had been some objections to some of the strategic views, in particular from Historic England and from Westminster City Council.

There were views where Officers had identified there would be some degree of harm but in all cases it was considered to be at the low level of less than substantial harm. These views were St James's Park looking back to Whitehall Court, the War Office and Horseguards. In this view the proposal was visible behind the island in the park. Guidance stated that it should not protrude above the central part of the island and the proposal was considered offset and its tapering design provided a softer form. It had been designed in keeping with the spires of Whitehall Court so whilst it did appear in this view, it was considered to be a low level of less than substantial harm. Members were shown the cumulative impact with other developments outside of the city e.g. The London Eye which at night dominated the view in terms of its appearance and lighting. The subdued appearance with the tapering form of the proposed building and the lighting strategy would ensure that the upper floors were lit up accordingly so as not to be too prominent.

Members were shown a view from the Golden Jubilee/Hungerford Footbridge and were informed that the proposed building would draw the cluster slightly closer to St Paul's Cathedral but it had been designed with the tapering form arcing away from St Paul's. The height dropping down from 22 Bishopsgate and 1 Undershaft was in keeping with the ethos of the cluster to fall down towards St Paul's to diminish the cluster's appearance. Whilst there was considered to be a low level of less than substantial harm, the building itself had been designed to mediate that harm.

The Sub-Committee were shown images of views from Waterloo Bridge which were kinetic view but had a strategic gap between St Paul's and the cluster. From this view, the design which arced away, mediated the impact on St Paul's.

Members were shown views from further east along the river which showed the scheme fitting within the cluster, and the view from Bankside where the building dropped in height from 22 Bishopsgate. Members were informed that when viewed from London Bridge, the cluster fitted in between Tower 42 and 22 Bishopsgate. Members were shown the view from Queen's Walk at City Hall and were informed that the proposed building did not appear from this view.

The Sub-Committee were shown the views from the north bastion of Tower Bridge and the Tower of London from which the proposed building could be seen embedded within the cluster. Historic Royal Palaces had confirmed that had considered that the proposal did not affect the world heritage site. In the cumulative scenario, the proposal would not appear in the view from the Tower of London. Members were shown the view from the Golden Gallery of St Paul's, which showed the proposal fitting in to the cluster.

Members were shown an image from St Helen's Place, which was within the conservation area. This showed the proposed building appearing in the background behind a listed building. The Officer stated that this was part of the striking juxtaposition of the City and one of the dynamic viewpoints seen all around the cluster with the old and new symbolising the continuous success of the square mile and the evolution of the city. There was no change to the cumulative impact in this view.

Members were shown further townscape views showing how the development would fit in within the overall concept of the cluster, looking east from London Wall and looking from Bank Junction where the cluster fitted in behind Bank Junction. From Bartholomew Lane, the tall buildings of 100 Bishopsgate and Tower 42 could be seen in the background and the elegance of the design, the strong form of the exoskeleton and the way in which the building tapered away, could be seen. This was also a dynamic viewpoint. In an image from Copthall Avenue, the sculptural quality of the building could be seen as well as the green wall.

Members were shown an image from Sun Street Passage southwards, in which the proposal consolidated the form of the cluster. One Undershaft could be seen in the cumulative view.

Members were shown an image from Bishopsgate, looking south, in which the tall buildings could be seen on the eastern side of Bishopsgate with the proposal fitting in in front of 99 Bishopsgate and Tower 42 consolidating the overall cluster.

The Officer stated that the proposal would involve the demolition of the existing building and it was recognised that this created the most embodied carbon but the applicant had been through the whole life cycle carbon optioneering process and this had been independently reviewed in accordance with the Planning Advice Note. In order to deliver the strategic increase in floor space and the significant public realm benefits, the demolition, in this case was considered acceptable. The architects had designed the development to minimise carbon emissions in the construction process. There would be careful deconstruction to maximise the reuse of materials, the sourcing and use of recycled materials would take place where possible, it would be a structurally efficient building to minimise carbon and there would be an effective heating and cooling system to minimise operational carbon. The demolition would meet the GLA benchmark for carbon emissions and the building would meet BREEAM outstanding and Platinum WELL. It would also meet the highest levels of other environmental charters. Overall, the circle economy and sustainability of the schemes was considered acceptable.

The Officer stated that in terms of microclimate, the scheme had been extensively tested and had been designed to mitigate impacts as much as possible. There were two existing breaches on Great St Helens and they would remain as part of the development. There was one additional breach on Great St Helen's but it was only a very marginal breach. The threshold was 15 metres per second squared wind speeds over a period of 1.9 hours for a whole year. This resulted in 15.2 metres per second squared wind speeds in this location for 1.9 hours across the whole year so was considered to be a very marginal exceedance. Great St Helen's was also a pedestrian environment so there was less conflict in terms of vehicles and pedestrians.

Members were informed that the scheme would deliver improvements in terms of the microclimate conditions on Bishopsgate, Wormwood Street and Chamomile Street. It improved wind conditions so it would be safer for pedestrians and cyclists. The microclimate conditions were considered acceptable in terms of daylight and sunlight. A significant number of properties were assessed in a wide area around the site. One key building was 50 Bishopsgate which was opposite the site and had residential use on the second, third and fourth floors. The existing levels of lights to this building was low so the percentage reduction was disproportionate in terms of impact. Each of the units had two windows serving each room at the front of the building and were dual aspect units and therefore the impact was considered acceptable. The second key building was 33 Great St Helen's which was tucked in behind the existing building. It would not have any direct visibility of the proposed development. The windows that

would be affected were on the back of the building so up against the adjoining commercial development. Three out of the four rooms affected were bedrooms with low existing levels so the percentage reduction was disproportionate. These units, and the living rooms, were dual aspect.

The Officer stated that paragraph 202 of the National Planning Policy Framework required that where there was identified heritage harm, consideration must be given to whether there were any public benefits that outweighed that harm. The economic benefit was the delivery of over 100,000sqm of Grade A office floorspace which was a significant contribution to inward investment in the square mile. Also, the cultural offer would provide a visitor attraction supporting the local economy. There would be significant public realm improvements including improved environments for pedestrians and cyclists and there would be Section 106 contributions of £200,000 to St Paul's lighting scheme and £250,000 for the renovation of the Golden Ball and Cross project which was a joint project with Goldsmiths to include apprenticeships and the renovation of the Golden Ball and Cross project. Where less than substantial harm to St Paul's had been identified, this was a direct contribution to mitigate against this and reinforce the pre-eminence of St Paul's with these works. There would be enhanced public realm for workers, residents and visitors, a significant cultural offer and a visitor attraction together with learning and education opportunities.

The Officer informed Members that some of the key Section 106 Heads of Terms were; an affordable housing contribution of £4.8m; a local training and job brokerage of £2.9m; contribution of security measures for the Eastern Cluster of £976,000; and a TfL cycle hire contribution of £220,000 for a new docking station. In addition to the regular S278 requirements for wider TfL highway improvements to the Bishopsgate corridor, the applicant was also providing £1.5m to TfL for wider improvements and highway improvements along the Bishopsgate corridor.

The Officer stated that in conclusion, the building had been strategically sited within the heart of the City Cluster which had been a plan-led approach to consolidating tall buildings and growth in a manner which would be the least impactful on strategic heritage assets. The development was considered to be an exemplary architectural response to a complicated site that had been designed with sustainability, micro-climate, streets, people and spaces in mind and presented an elegant design solution which made an effective use of limited resources. The development would provide a unique and distinctive addition to the City Cluster and would deliver significant public benefits flowing from the enhanced public realm and the creation of a cultural attraction making a stunning contribution to Destination City. The application was therefore recommended for approval.

The Chairman explained that there were no registered objectors to address the meeting on this occasion and he therefore invited the applicant to speak.

Mr Makoto Fukui, Schrodgers, speaking on behalf of the applicant, 55 Bishopsgate Unit Trust, advised that this was a unique opportunity to deliver on many of the mutual objectives of the City in the wider built environment. The proposal included over 100,000sqm of best-in-class office floorspace for the City which would support approximately 7,500 city-based new jobs. The brief of the project, which was started 5 years ago, was to achieve high quality architecture, exemplary sustainability, performance and positive engagement with the community. Consequently, the scheme proposed a significant increase in activated public realm on the ground floor as well as a unique rooftop experience, both of which would be open to the public. There would be affordable workspace and a dedicated cultural space on the second and third floors. The cultural strategy had been prepared in collaboration with New London Architecture

(NLA) to provide a permanent home for the London Centre. The intention was to commence works in 2024 with the new building targeting completion in 2029. A best-in-class project team led by development manager Stanhope and Architects AFK had been appointed.

Mr Nick McKeough, co-founder and Chief Executive of the NLA, advised that the NLA was the membership organisation for London's built environment community. He stated that there were over 500 member organisations spanning public and private sectors including the GLA, City of London and 29 London boroughs. As well as supporting the development of skills across the professions, the goal was to engage the widest possible audience in the future of London's built environment, from school children to politicians, from community groups to international visitors and investors, through unique London models and public galleries. For the last 15 years, these had been based in two locations but there was an aim to bring them together. In April 2023, the London Centre opened in the Guildhall West Wing. Through a collaboration with Shroders Stanhope and AFK, a purpose-built facility had been designed at 55 Bishopsgate, which would allow for over 500,000 visitors per year. This had been backed up by a financial commitment from Shroders to invest in fitting out the space, providing discounted rent for the first 10 years of occupation and supporting the development of key parts of the programme in advance of opening. This would include committing to invest in content development, schools learning programme and international outreach.

Mr Benjamin O'Connor, Director at NLA stated that NLA had worked closely with the team at AFK and Stanhope and believed that the location, design, content and programme for the London Centre at 55 Bishopsgate would fulfil the vision to create an open, welcoming, egalitarian space for all Londoners to engage in the discussion and debate around the future of their city through exciting, seasonal activation in an aspirational environment. Mr O'Connor stated that ground floor access was unobstructed and would utilise soft, warm, inviting materials with no physical or human barrier to access and there would be a new public amenity in the form of a Place Lab, activated with new public installations, testing out innovative ideas for the public realm e.g. small-scale pavilions and street furniture to kinetic LED paving and smart lighting. The public realm would be flanked by a kiosk-style food and beverage offer with multiple units providing seasonal options for city workers that could be programmed to shift focus on evenings and weekends. The core London Centre offer would include a 20,000 square foot public space with models of the city and a dynamic series of exhibitions with a café and learning offer operating seven days a week alongside the public realm. A double height 250 seat lecture space would be programmed throughout the year, with access to occupiers and city businesses. The space would be flexible with the ability to host large events, dinners and community events. The rooftop experience would combine a garden viewing platform and event space for schools and technology would be used to allow visitors to get a sense of the future in their city.

Mr Earle Arney, AFK stated that it had been an honour to design the extensive cultural floor space and public realm in partnership with the NLA to accommodate the new home of the London Centre. The aspiration was to deliver a world-class building for the city which would be elegant, with sustainability at its heart. This started with an innovative approach to the

structure which mimicked nature and was informed by the fibonacci sequence, the highly efficient organising principle found throughout nature. In doing so, the embodied carbon material needed for construction had been minimised whilst expressing the structure externally and defining the architectural aesthetic. Mr Arney stated that BREAMM Outstanding had been achieved, which was the highest possible rating obtainable. Neighbours 5.5 out of a possible score of 6 had been achieved as had a Platinum rating for the World Building Standard which was the highest available. An Urban Greening Factor of 0.3 had been achieved and there was a target of 850kg of carbon per square metre. Mr Arney informed Members that the Officer report had stated that the proposed scheme achieved outstanding sustainability credentials. This included third party verification. Whole life carbon optioneering had been carried out in accordance with the City's recent carbon options guidance. The architecture, height and form of the proposal had been carried out in accordance with the regard to townscape, views, heritage and the London skyline enriching the composition of the City Cluster as expressed in the elegant, tapered form.

Chris Gascoigne, DP9 Planning Consultants, stated that the site was within the City Cluster which was identified in the adopted and emerging City Plan as being a location with a renewal opportunity area appropriate for tall buildings. He informed Members that the proposals had been designed with careful regard to townscape views and the overall composition of the emerging cluster, with the building tapering down in height from the taller buildings in the cluster – the consented scheme at 1 Undershaft and the completed 22 Bishopsgate. Mr Gascoigne informed Members that the proposals offered a thorough and wide-ranging planning and public benefits package. This included delivering over 100,000 square metres of office floorspace representing 14% of the City's office targets and supporting over 1,200 construction jobs and 7,500 end user jobs. The proposals would result in a combined Section 106 and Community Infrastructure Levy package over £34.5m in addition to the provision of on-site affordable workspace. There would be over 2,300 square metres of increased and activated public realm, improving pedestrian comfort and facilitating new routes. In addition, there would be over 4,300 square metres of dedicated cultural floorspace at Levels 2 and 3 and the unique 360 degree rooftop conservatory experience that would be free to access for the public between 10am and 7pm or nautical dusk. The cultural strategy was underpinned by the partnership with the NLA as the home for the New London Centre. The proposal was based on outstanding sustainability credentials. It was also subject to extensive community engagement in accordance with the City's Statement of Community Involvement Strategy.

Mr Gascoigne stated that there were few public comments and no one registered to speak against the application which was testament to how well the proposals had been received. In conclusion, he stated that the proposals sought to sustainably optimise the potential of the site for office growth, in accordance with the development plan whilst embracing the Destination City objectives.

The Chairman thanked the applicant team for their contributions and invited questions of them from the Sub-Committee.

In response to a question from a Member about the commitment to the partnership between the applicant and the NLA, the applicant stated that there were a number of consequential conditions that had to be met and extensive discussions were taking place with the NLA with terms including financial parameters agreed. Mr Nick McKeough, NLA confirmed that there was a heads of terms agreement in place.

A Member raised concern about the short-stay parking being below ground which would make it more difficult to access. She also raised concern about the difficulty in finding a cycle parking space near the site, and she asked about the size of the lifts. The applicant stated that in terms of short-stay cycle parking, there was a combination of Sheffield stands and provision at lower ground levels which were accessible by the lifts. The parking provision had been split following discussions with Officers to ensure there was extensive public realm. The lifts were 1.8m by 2.5m which exceeded the lift size requirements for the London Cycling Design Standards. They had capacity for at least one accessible cycle per lift or three conventional cycles per lift. The two lifts would operate independently and in terms of peak-hour movement there would be capacity for about 87 accessible cycles per hour or combined capacity for conventional cycles of about 262 cycles per hour. This was sufficient to cater for 100% of the peak-hour cycle demand. The cycle parking within the lower ground floor was fully accessible by the cycle lifts. Splitting the cycle parking obtained a balance both in terms of maximising the public realm within the ground floor but still providing an element of short-stay parking for ad hoc trips to the units within the ground floor as well as other trips within the site. It was also acknowledged that the type of trip to the conservatory, for example, would be of a longer duration. Parking provision at the lower ground floor would ensure that short-stay cycle parking was available at all times. Cycle parking in the area was heavily used and cycle parking within the site would not be on the public realm and would be secure.

A Member asked about servicing and blue badge parking. The applicant stated that access would be via the lifts. It would be pre-booked and there would be a banks person to escort the driver through to one of the lifts. It would be a managed process from kerbside down to the basement and up again. There would also be a barrier providing protection to public realm users as the lift descended from, and ascended to, the public realm. The vehicle mitigation bollards by the dropped kerbs would recess into the ground to enable access to blue badge holders.

In response to a Member's comment that the City was trying to enhance activities through Destination City, and that more creative activity would be welcomed, the applicant stated that the space would be programmed by the applicant but there would also be partnerships with the City, with the Destination City campaign, and with other cultural organisations. The public space at ground floor level would be activated through competitions processes, changing on a quarterly basis, with active events and installations and testing out new public realm ideas. The second and third floor spaces would provide options to collaborate on events and activities including learning workshops.

A Member asked whether the architectural design team would be involved from start to finish as suggested in the London Plan. The applicant stated they had been working with AFK Architects, a best-in-class design team, since 2018. They had led the design process throughout and would be delivering an exceptional architectural building.

A Member asked about emergency back-up powering. The applicant stated that as with a number of the larger buildings in the City, they were connected to a newer part of the UK Power Network. The building would have two power suppliers in line with some of the more newer buildings in the City. Discussions were taking place with the fire brigade about the provision of back-up power for life safety. Currently the plan was to use generators to provide that. However, technologies were changing and the situation would be monitored. It was possible that as the scheme was developed, the two power supplies could be relied on without the use of generators.

A Member asked how temperature would be controlled given the large amount of glass in the conservatory. The applicant stated that it was not a close controlled environment and it would react to the external environment. It would be double glazed so there would be no condensation. The temperatures would flow and behave in a similar manner to the external environment. In winter, solar energy would allow the space to be warmed up. In the summer, a series of automated vents would be opened to let the warm air out preventing an overheating effect. There would be a large movement of air as the vents were opened and the space cooled through the stack effect.

A Member asked about the benefits of the innovative exoskeleton approach. The applicant stated that the approach was to broaden and make a more economical vertical cantilever by putting the structure on the outside of the building rather than relying solely on the concrete core. The building was a slender building in terms of height to width ratio at about seven times multiplier. Buildings of this ratio and above that were only stabilised by a concrete core had a high density of concrete. This proposal would use a combined exoskeleton and concrete core. The main benefit of the exoskeleton was that the core did not need to do so much work and less concrete was required in the core and the concrete strength requirement could also be reduced. This would mean there were substantial embodied carbon advantages with the embodied carbon reduced by approximately 10%. Extensive optimisation studies using the most contemporary methods and computer technology meant there were more efficient relationships of geometry than the conventional x-frame shape exoskeletons and these could yield further savings of about 7% steel. There were also advancements in the embodied carbon in steel with the steel sector working to decarbonise the supply chain. Work had taken place with the design team to look at ways reused scrap steel could be used as the primary steel for the exoskeleton and to look at steel created with renewable energy sources. The low embodied carbon exoskeleton had been further optimised by approximately 40% in terms of the steel embodied carbon through the optimisation process.

A Member asked for clarification on how the vents and the mechanical ventilation heat recovery systems would coexist. The applicant stated that the

two elements were part of the same system. On each floor there was a ventilation slot that ran around the building and that would be used for taking air in and exhausting air out from the office floors. There would be enough movement of external air past the building to allow this to work correctly. In traditional buildings, there were large central air systems that used large shafts and large handling units to deliver large volumes of air and these used a significant amount of energy. Having a floor-by-floor approach meant the systems could be designed to be specific for the use on each floor. There would be a series of heat recovery units around the floor which would be connected to the façade. When air was brought in, it would be used on the floor and when rejected, any heat would be retained from that and would be transferred back into the supply airflow. The applicant confirmed that the vents could not be opened by individuals using the space, however there was a strategy to look at free cooling where the external conditions were acceptable so that fan energy could be minimised.

In response to a Member's question about deliveries and the modelling for expected deliveries during the night period, the applicant stated that there would be four loading bays within the service yard and extensive calculations had been undertaken in relation to the average duration of stay in these bays. The constraints of the site were such that the size of the vehicles would be restricted to 8 metres. Smaller vehicles would deliver fewer goods and therefore the duration of stay would be shorter. The capacity of the service yard would be about 15-17 vehicles per hour. The maximum number of vehicles which could be accommodated from 10pm to 7am was 136 vehicles. This was the shortest delivery period that the development could accommodate. The movement of vehicles would be heavily managed and all vehicles would be required to have a pre-booked slot. The lifts had been set back to ensure vehicles could enter the site without having to wait on the footway. A stage one safety audit did not raise any concerns with regards to movements across the footway.

Seeing no further questions of the applicant, the Chair sought out any remaining questions of Officers.

A Member asked about the microclimate and the wind changes at street level, especially at Camomile Street. An Officer stated that the microclimate assessments had demonstrated that there would be improvements in the wind conditions along Bishopsgate, Wormwood Street and Camomile Street. Currently winds wrapped around 100 Bishopsgate and these created a crosswind which affected cyclists. The proposal would create a more linear nature of the wind direction making it safer for cyclists and would reduce the extent of the wind improving the overall microclimate for pedestrians and cyclists.

A Member asked Officers for clarification on the local training and job brokerage of £2.9m, how this would be monitored and the effectiveness measured. An Officer stated that the £2.9m was part of the local training and job brokerage package secured through the Section 106. As was the case with many other schemes, the expenditure of money was delivered by the skills team in innovation and growth and specific projects were considered and steered by the Policy and Resources Committee. In previous years, this had helped to fund projects such as the Socioeconomic Diversity Taskforce and the Financial Services Skills Commission as well as jobs on City

construction sites and local apprenticeships, as well as the Skills for a Sustainable Skyline Taskforce. A report would be submitted to the Policy and Resources Committee to secure funding from Section 106 for specific projects over the coming years.

A Member asked if the proposal fitted in with the Local Plan in terms of tall buildings and the skyline. An Officer stated that in terms of the 3D modelling and capacities massing studies carried out as part of the Local Plan review, the proposal fitted comfortably within the modelled envelope.

A Member asked whether modelling of pedestrian movement had taken place. An Officer stated that the application was accompanied by a transport assessment and Space Syntax had also produced a pedestrian flow analysis and the immediate site and its surroundings had been considered. Opening up the public realm would increase the size of the footways immediately around the building. The growth in the number of people visiting the site and moving along Bishopsgate and through various routes had been taken into account. Therefore, with the increase in occupancy of the building and with the increased pedestrian flows, the widening of the footways was enhanced and would make the conditions more comfortable than currently. TfL's proposals to widen the footway even further than modelled would result in further improvements in terms of pedestrian flows in the wider area.

A Member asked how Thames Water concerns that there was not enough water for a building of the proposed size, would impact the development. An Officer stated that one of the conditions attached to the proposal was requested by Thames Water and was that the applicant must undertake capacity modelling and submit this to demonstrate that there was a sufficient water supply.

In response to a Member's question about having an architectural retention condition, an Officer stated that this condition was added where it was considered necessary to monitor the design quality.

A Member asked for clarification on the office floor space and the evidence base given the figures were from 2017, prior to the pandemic and changes in working patterns. An Officer stated that the most up to date assessment of additional capacity set a requirement for about 2 million square metres between 2016 and 2036. This was based on GLA employment projections that were published in 2017. These had been superseded by more recent GLA employment projections. The City had recently commissioned Arup and Knight Frank to undertake an evidence piece looking at future demand for office requirements in the square mile. They had provided a report setting out three scenarios for office capacity based on office attendance and a number of other factors. The upper range scenario set out demand for an additional 1.9 million square metres, the mid-range demand was just over 1 million square metres and the lower range was approximately 570,000 square metres of additional floorspace. The study had not yet been formally incorporated into the City Plan that would be considered by the Planning and Transportation Committee in Autumn 2023. However, it was a robust and up-to-date piece of evidence work that was based on the latest GLA employment projections and modelled a number of different scenarios. The Officer stated that the 2 million square metre projection was from 2016 and therefore much of this capacity had already been delivered through planning decisions. The mid-range scenario was considered to be the one that most closely currently matched the trends of midweek attendance and the rate of office attendance. The most recent evidence corroborated broadly the previous evidence that informed the 2 million square metre requirement that was set out in the City Plan.

A Member referred to the recent appeal decision in relation to Marks and Spencer, Oxford Street, Westminster and asked if this decision changed how City Officers would advise Members in relation to embodied carbon and retaining buildings. An Officer stated that each case had to be understood on its merits and the appeal decision should not be applied directly to other schemes. The Officer also stated that there could be a legal challenge to the appeal decision. He further stated that the Secretary of State's decision concluded that that particular development did not accord with the development plan as a whole and he gave consideration to the balance of material considerations. Carbon was one of these material considerations and that specifically was informed by a lack of robust consideration of different options. Consideration was given to the balance of heritage harm and weight was given to some aspects of the heritage implications.

In response to a Member's question about the impact of the development on St Paul's Cathedral, an Officer stated that the application went through a significant pre-application process and the application had been amended. The original scheme was higher than that currently proposed and the reduction in height had a material impact in terms of the impact on St Paul's and also the impact in the wider context. The current scheme lessened the substantial harm to the significance of St Paul's. As required by the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) all the public benefits arising from the proposed scheme had to be considered and it had to be established whether these outweighed that particular harm. In this case, the benefits and the harm were set out in the report. Officers had concluded that the harm was outweighed by the significant public benefits. A number of conditions and Section 106 obligations required the Cultural Plan to be delivered, there to be a cultural operator and the public realm, ground floor auditorium and exhibition space would all be for flexible use and that the conservatory would be delivered.

A Member asked for confirmation that the public benefits would be provided for the life of the building. An Officer stated that any change would require a deed of variation to the Section 106 or a new planning permission for a change of use.

The Sub-Committee then moved to debate the application.

A Member commented that the striking, elegant design, public realm proposals and substantial pedestrian permeability improvements were welcome additions to the City.

A Member welcomed the permeability at ground floor level and cultural offering and stated that this would be a new iconic landmark in the City.

A Member commented that this was a good scheme, with a good design, cultural offering and it fitted in with the cluster.

A Member commented that whilst she could see the benefits of the proposal, she had concerns about whole life carbon and the demolition of a 40-year-old building which could be refurbished.

A Member stated he also had concerns about the building being demolished but considering the building being demolished was small in comparison with the size of the proposal, he considered this to be acceptable. He also welcomed the building style.

A Member welcomed the creative design of the building that reduced embodied carbon and thanked Officers for their detailed presentation.

A Member welcomed the cultural elements of the scheme and the design of the building.

The Chairman summed up the points made and stated that this site was the right home for the NLA. He had seen firsthand the work done at the London Centre with school children, exciting them about the built environment and architecture and the careers available to them. Moving to this building would further inspire them. The NLA had also done work on social mobility. Adding inclusivity to the building would enhance that offer further. The building would sit at the heart of the Eastern Cluster, in the middle of the area defined as suitable for tall buildings. In terms of the future requirements for square footage, this building would be an important part of the ecosystem of towers in the City and essential for the growth of the square mile.

A Member who had asked for either an architectural retention condition, or for this to be included as part of the legal agreement, stated that he was content for Officers to decide which way to progress this. Officers confirmed this would be added to either the conditions or legal agreement.

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

Votes were cast as follows: IN FAVOUR – 14 votes
OPPOSED – 1 vote
There were no abstentions.

The recommendations were therefore carried.

Mr Hugh Selka, who had not been present for the whole agenda item, did not vote.

RESOLVED -

1. That planning permission be granted for the above proposal in accordance with the details set out in the attached schedule subject to:
 - (a) The application be referred to the Mayor of London to decide whether to allow the Corporation to grant planning permission as recommended, or to direct refusal, or to determine the application himself (Article 5(1)(a) of the Town & Country Planning (Mayor of London) Order 2008);
 - (b) The application being referred to the Secretary of State pursuant to the Town and Country Planning (Consultation) Direction 2021 and the application not being called in under section 77 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990;
2. That Officers be instructed to negotiate and execute obligations in respect of those matters set out in "Planning Obligations" under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and any necessary

agreement under Section 278 of the Highway Act 1980 in respect of those matters set out in the report, the decision notice not to be issued until the Section 106 obligations have been executed; and;

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

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

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

RESOLVED – That the report be noted.

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

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

RESOLVED – That the report be noted.

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

A Member stated that on the planning portal, the application noted in the current list for Cripplegate for “repairs and minor alterations to the existing windows and window framing of Crescent House, including stripping, repairing and redecorating existing window frames; replacement of existing single glazing with vacuum glazing panels and associated works” had a number of objections.

The Member stated that a year ago, the Committee had approved a pilot project to test three options for the window and facade refurbishment of the Grade II* listed Crescent House. She stated that the project was yet to deliver any results and the heritage glass had yet to arrive on site to enable the first part of the pilot to be completed and tested. The Member stated that residents felt they had waited for the pilot project proposed by the applicant and it was premature for an application to be submitted and considered before the results were known and Historic England, The Twentieth Century Society and residents have seen the results.

The Member asked Officers to advise on the position of the pilot project, the requirement for it to be completed and the timeline for the new application, including whether it was likely to come to Committee before phase one of the pilot was completed and tested.

An Officer stated that the pilot project was being considered and worked through in tandem with the current application and was focussing on the vacuum glazing. Samples would be delivered on site later in the summer and there would be an opportunity at that time, for Officers, the Twentieth Century Society, Historic England and residents to view these samples in situ. Depending on the outcomes of the testing and the aesthetics of the proposal, the current application which had been submitted would be submitted to Committee after the assessment.

8. **ANY OTHER BUSINESS THAT THE CHAIRMAN CONSIDERS URGENT**
There were no additional urgent items of business for consideration.

The meeting ended at 12.15 pm

Chairman

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

This page is intentionally left blank