

LOCAL PLANS SUB (PLANNING AND TRANSPORTATION) COMMITTEE
Wednesday, 18 October 2023

Minutes of the meeting of the Local Plans Sub (Planning and Transportation)
Committee held at Committee Room 3 - 2nd Floor West Wing, Guildhall on
Wednesday, 18 October 2023 at 1.45 pm

Present

Members:

Deputy Shravan Joshi (Chairman)
Graham Packham (Deputy Chairman)
Deputy Randall Anderson
John Edwards
Deputy Alastair Moss
Alderman Susan Pearson
Deputy Elizabeth King (Ex-Officio Member)

Officers:

Zoe Lewis	–	Town Clerk's Department
John Harte	-	Environment Department
Rob McNicol	–	Environment Department
Tom Nancollas	–	Environment Department
Garima Nayyar	–	Environment Department
Gwyn Richards	–	Environment Department
Michelle Rowland	–	Environment Department
Lisa Russell	–	Environment Department

1. **APOLOGIES**

Apologies for absence were received from Deputy Christopher Hayward and Deputy Edward Lord.

2. **MEMBER DECLARATIONS UNDER THE CODE OF CONDUCT**

There were no declarations.

3. **MINUTES**

RESOLVED – That the public minutes of the last meeting held on 20 June 2023 be approved as a correct record.

4. **CITY PLAN 2040**

The Sub-Committee considered a report of the Planning and Development Director, which set out the direction of the City Plan and summarised the main changes to policies to reflect the findings of evidence, to take into account the engagement responses received, and to align the Plan with updated corporate strategies.

An Officer outlined the City Plan timetable stating that following the Sub-Committee's consideration of the text of the Plan, on 21 November, the Planning and Transportation Committee would consider the full plan proposed for submission to the Secretary of State. This would then be submitted to the Policy and Resources Committee followed by the Court of Common Council in January 2024. If approved, there would then be a Regulation 19 Consultation on the City Plan in February and March 2024. The Plan would then be submitted to the Secretary of State along with the consultation responses and other relevant documents in Summer 2024. There was an aim to have public examination hearings towards the end of 2024, an Inspector's report in Spring 2025 and adoption in mid-2025.

Members were informed that Officers had sought to ensure that where contents overlapped, they had been combined, with less repetition. The overall spatial strategy had remained similar to that in the previous plan. The spatial parts of the policies had been separated from the more thematic parts. This work had been informed by the work of the Sub-Committee and extensive engagement carried out over the summer with various stakeholders.

The Officer outlined the substantive changes made to each section as outlined in the Officer report and Members were invited to comment.

The following comments were made in each section:

Health, Inclusion and Safety

Strategic Policy S1 – Healthy and Inclusive City

Policy HL5

In reference to the replacement facilities being equivalent to those being replaced, a Member stated that this should be the minimum requirement.

Policy HL2

A Member raised concern that the policy previously stated that developers would be expected to install non-combustion energy technology but this had been changed and developers were expected to avoid the use of diesel power generators. He stated that this could encourage gasoline power generators. The Officer advised that environmental health colleagues would be consulted on the wording to ensure the wording did not result in negative outcomes.

Policy HL5

A Member commented that there should be an impetus on developments providing public toilets and if provided externally, the developers should be responsible for maintaining them. Concern was raised that toilets were being

provided in developments with viewing galleries but these could only be used by those with tickets. The Officer stated that this policy sought to require the provision of public toilets in major retail, leisure and transport development particularly near visitor attractions, public open space etc. There were also policies around requiring major new developments to be contributing to the life of the City e.g., cultural attractions, roof terraces and viewing galleries. The Officer stated that the provision of public toilets in the right buildings in the right locations could be a valuable addition to these facilities. Officers would consider the wording of the policies to ensure this was appropriately referenced and was being secured through appropriate schemes. The Officer stated that many of the largest developments were focussed in a particular area so appropriate locations should be considered to prevent overprovision in certain areas.

Policy HL2

A Member stated that the policy should seek to drive down local sources of Nitrogen Oxides (NOx) and particulates. A Member also commented that standby generators were required to be tested monthly and each time they entered a start-up phase which resulted in higher particulate emissions. The Chairman stated that there were difficulties setting policy on areas which were difficult to implement without legislation. A Member stated that if a development was connected to two substations it would not need a back-up generator and suggested that this could be mandated. A Member suggested that the particulates of a new development could be evaluated alongside carbon.

An Officer stated that this policy required developments to be at least air quality neutral and for major developments to maximise credits for BREAM assessments related to on-site NOx emissions. The Officer stated that the largest developments were subject to an environmental impact assessment to adopt an air quality positive approach and this had changed from being 'wherever possible' to being a requirement. There was also London Plan guidance. Members were advised that Officers would look closely at this and understand how it related to aspects such as the heating of buildings and the movement of construction materials. The Officer stated that Construction Logistics Plans were also undertaken to secure improvements. Members were informed that Officers understood Members' concerns and would take these away to ensure that a high bar was being set in relation to the air quality of new developments.

Policies HL7 and HL8

A Member stated that the word 'free' should be included in the reference on page 38 of the report to the network of outdoor sporting facilities. He also stated that there could be a reference to the possibility in some cases of combining HL7 and HL8. He commented that there were successful examples in other boroughs where adult exercise facilities had been combined with children's play

areas so parents and carers could watch their children while exercising and children could learn from seeing their parents and carers from exercising. An Officer stated that some of this would be included in the design of particular sites as schemes came forward. There was also work underway in the City to look at the potential of certain sites and this could be cross referenced in the Plan.

In response to a Member's query about whether events such as Formula 1 would be classified as recreation, an Officer stated that from a strict planning perspective, this would be considered to be a leisure type which would fall within retail and leisure.

Strategic Policy S2 - Safe and Secure City

Policy SA3

A Member stated that in relation to hostile vehicle mitigation (HVM), the words 'designed to minimise the need for HVM on the public highway' should be replaced with significantly stronger wording to strongly discourage HVM on the public highway, except from where this could not be avoided. A Member stated that there was guidance on this that the building line was never at the point where the HVM started and finished but was further forward of that and therefore there could be difficulties in managing this through policy.

The Chairman stated that the Plan was looking forward to 2040 and much could change in this time. An Officer stated that incorporating HVM measures within the design of buildings was generally the preferred approach and that if it was necessary on the public realm, this should be well designed. There were also measures that could be taken to manage the potential for HVM working in partnership outside the red line boundary and with other developers as well and this was encouraged. Officers noted the concerns raised and would look at the wording to check the balance was right.

A Member commented that the amount the developer was required to contribute should be more specific and should be 100% if connected to their building, with a lower contribution if the HVM was towards the wider area. An Officer stated that this policy was working in conjunction with other policies. There was a policy on developer contributions which identified the various aspects of financial contributions that developers would need to be making in relation to a number of policy areas including this one. The language in this policy was deliberately vague because the detail of how the cost was identified was set out in the planning obligations supplementary planning document (SPD). This gave the flexibility to update and amend that when reviewed. Where a development had an impact or could have an impact in the wider public realm, these costs were offset through contributions such as 278 agreements to improve the wider public realm. Officers would ensure that security aspects were included in this.

Housing

Strategic Policy S3 – Housing

A Member raised concern that the City Plan was until 2040 but the Housing Plan was to 2029. An Officer stated that the final year of the housing requirement was 2039-40. Before then changes in the City, might mean there would need to be a review of the City Plan but it set the framework for that time frame, bearing in mind what was known now.

A Member stated that certain buildings should be able to be converted from office to residential more easily than policy would permit. A Member informed the Sub-Committee of two office to residential conversions that had recently been granted planning permission under delegated authority. The Officer stated that Policy OF2 was a lynchpin policy. In relation to residential proposals, this policy took a more flexible approach to residential proposals than the adopted Local Plan. The policy still required proposals that would result in a loss of office and conversion to residential, to undertake a 12-month marketing exercise and for it to not be considered a strategically important office site. However, within and immediately adjacent to residential areas, it did allow the conversion of offices to residential. The Officer advised that over the last 10 years, the City had been relatively successful at supporting residential schemes on particular sites, often in older historic buildings.

A Member suggested that 7.1.6 mentioned the work done outside the City and should be moved to the front of the Housing section to make it more prominent.

The Chairman stated that the Local Plan was to set a generic perspective on the policies rather than look at individual examples. The Committee could then look at individual cases.

A Member raised concern that if the housing target was not met this could be problematic when the Plan was submitted for inspection. The Officer stated that Officers were confident about the number. It had been developed through looking at both the London Plan requirement which set out the requirement up to 2028-29 and this was 146 dwellings on average per year on average. Beyond this time period, the government's national algorithm was used for calculating housing requirements and the City was in line with this and also the GLA's housing figures which were capacity based. The London Plan stated that the City of London should be promoting office development and seeking substantial additional provision of office development. The Officer stated that if the housing target was revised upwards this could lead to a non-conformity issue with the London Plan by virtue of not providing sufficient sites for office development.

Offices

Strategic Policy 54 – Offices

Policy OF2 – A Member commented that the policy stated that the loss of office floor space would be resisted unless it could be demonstrated that the proposed development would not lead to the loss of office floorspace. He stated that this wording therefore needed amending as any alternate use other than

office would lead to the loss of floor space. An Officer stated that the wording would be considered to ensure it was clear.

Members discussed the importance of not sterilising the land and there being uses which could compromise other uses. The Chairman stated that an ecosystem of cafes, retail and other uses was important to ensure office demand did not drop away. An Officer stated that there were a number of ways that a development could compromise the potential for an office development on a site nearby e.g., there could be issues of light and overshadowing to a residential development sterilising a potentially substantial office development site. The Officer stated that the supporting text could be amended to be clearer about the bar being set and stated that the policy would not encourage the micromanagement of sites. A Member commented that the City had spent a significant sum on Elizabeth Line and the sites around the stations were attractive for Offices. Leveraging those sites for that type of activity was better value than having residential developments there. A Member commented that the policies were about the proper stewardship of space.

In response to a question from a Member about whether there should be an assessment of what a development would provide to the ecosystem of types of development included in the policy, an Officer stated that there were other parts of the plan e.g. design polices which ensured that development was contributing to the life of the city and also the inclusion of active frontages.

A Member queried whether laboratories were classified as offices. An Officer stated that certain laboratory development would be difficult to find appropriate spaces for within the square mile. These tended to be very large, secure facilities with blank frontages. There were other areas around the City that were developing sites. Whilst the City was continuing to support life sciences, there was not a focus on having laboratory developments in the City.

The Chairman stated that the inclusion of laboratory sites, would not be in line with other policies, Destination City and creating an ecosystem feeling. He commented that it was important to remain sector agnostic and although there were a lot of financial and professional services in the City, this was quite a generic area. The Chairman stated that he and the Director of Planning and Development had met with the life science industry about laboratory space. He advised that the City had a large role to play in that sector and financial support was provided out of the square mile. The Chairman also stated that there was a wide spectrum of types of laboratory sites.

Policy OF3

A Member stated the importance of temporary 'meanwhile' uses and having a policy that insisted on these to prevent the sterilisation of a site prior to the development of a site. An Officer stated that the wording of Policy OF3 had been strengthened to now state 'firm encouragement'. In addition, where a major development would affect existing ground floor or podium level active

uses, these units should be kept in active use for as long as possible prior to development taking place and cultural plans should set out how this would be achieved. Officers would push developers on this but also had to be mindful of the legislative framework.

A Member raised concern about the inclusion of cultural plan in the temporary uses without other possible temporary uses being included e.g., temporary market garden or sporting facility. The Officer stated that cultural plans could include a wide range of different uses. The word 'vibrancy' was suggested as improved terminology.

A Member suggested that the business rate change could mean business owners would cover the cost of most of the temporary use. Officers would consult the Chamberlain's Department and if appropriate would reference this as an additional incentive.

Retail

Strategic Policy S5 – Retail and active frontages

The Chairman requested that wording be included about working in partnership with the Business Improvement Districts (BIDs) to gain their perspective.

A Member queried how retail and other relevant uses would be encouraged to open at evenings and weekends particularly in areas around key attractions. The Officer stated that this could not be a requirement so would be through encouragement. He also advised that work could be undertaken with developers on their cultural plans or strategies to consider evening and weekend operation. The Officer stated that work would continue to take place with the BIDS, landowners and other partners to enrich the ground floor economy.

A Member asked whether it would be possible to discourage certain types of retail especially near St Paul's Cathedral. An Officer stated this was difficult and engagement had taken with a borough with similar issues. A range of interventions could be used, working with landowners and businesses and taking enforcement action where necessary. The Officer stated that part of the Plan was to extend the principle shopping centre frontage from Fleet Street up to the front of St Paul's Cathedral. This recognised the value these frontages played in the tourism and visitor economy. It also sent a signal to the retail industry that this was an area considered to be important locally. A Member encouraged work with the BIDs to encourage businesses to curate retail spaces. The Officer stated that any substantial owners of retail space should be thinking of curating spaces to get the right mix of retail.

In response to a Member's question about Leadenhall Market, the Officer stated that changes had been made to the principle shopping centre aspect that discussed Leadenhall Market, firmly encouraging the transformation into a

destination. Work was taking place with City Surveyors, Destination City colleagues and BIDs.

Culture and Visitors

Strategic Policy S6 – Culture and visitors

A Member stated there should be reference made to how it was expected that the demographics of the visitor mix would change. This would include more families with children. The Officer stated that Destination City colleagues were undertaking an extensive insights programme looking to secure data on who was currently visiting the City, who might visit in the future and how this could be achieved. This would be put into relevant policies at the relevant time but was not available to be put into the Plan at this time. If the work did line up with the Plan, more information could be added. The Officer added that the Plan was clear that there would be an expected increase in the amount of visitors and it was planned that this would include a wide range of people. There were a number of different policy areas, particularly the spatial ones, and a need for additional play space and visitor facilities for families had been recognised. An Officer stated that social and economic inclusivity could be woven into the Plan to reflect the City becoming a more welcoming destination for all communities.

The Chairman stated that the City Property Association (CPA) had launched their visualisation of Destination City so third parties were understanding the policies and would attract different types of people to the City. An Officer stated that the Inclusion Policy was at the front of the Plan. It was recognised that the City needed to become more inclusive. Officers would look into whether shifting demographics should be mentioned.

Infrastructure

Strategic Policy S7 – Infrastructure and Utilities

A Member suggested that new developments should be required to include a piece of tunnel under their developments so that when there were enough sites, they could be connected. An Officer stated the City Operation's Team could be consulted. There would need to be alignment with the Utility Strategy. The Member stated that the costs would be less than putting tunnels under the street.

Strategic Policy S8 – Design

The Chairman stated that many of the points raised were encompassed in this policy.

Policy DE5

A Member commented that viewing galleries were expensive for developers to install and alternative public amenities could be of value. The Officer stated that DE5 Part 3 stated that all tall buildings or major developments were required to provide free to enter publicly accessible elevated spaces which might include roof gardens, or public viewing galleries or other retail or leisure facilities to create attractive destinations for people to enjoy the City's spectacular skyline. This recognised the demand for a range of different experiences. The Officer added that the benefit of tall buildings was an opportunity for experiences at height. It did not necessarily mean the top of the building every time. This tied into the London Plan which had a requirement for viewing galleries to be considered and also the Culture policies for major developments to make a substantial contribution to culture and leisure destinations. Developers were required to look at the cultural planning of offers and look at retail and leisure facilities where appropriate.

An Officer advised that the demand was there for more viewing galleries, however it was important to have a diverse selection of offers. Often when there was a tall building next to a residential building, it was not appropriate to have a viewing gallery. An example of this was at 2-3 Finsbury Avenue had a ground floor triple height community skills training space. The Officer suggested that whilst two viewing galleries had opened in the last few months, there was a whole plethora of different elevated public areas as ground floor public realm could not be provided in the cluster due to the strategic nature of these sites.

A Member questioned whether requiring a ticket meant the viewing galleries were public amenities as they did not replace the public realm that could not be provided at ground floor level. An Officer stated that no visitors without a ticket had been turned away from the viewing galleries since they had opened. It was anticipated that when there were more viewing galleries and supply met demand, visitors to viewing galleries would not need to book.

A Member commented that the aesthetics of buildings was important and expectations should be included in the Plan. An Officer stated that the City sought the highest quality of architecture, the buildings were prominent buildings on the London skyline. Officers would look at the wording to ensure the requirement for exemplary architecture was emphasised.

A Member queried why HVM was included in the section about roof terraces. An Officer stated that HVM was only required where necessary e.g., where there was a public entrance to a roof terrace and this had the potential to turn into a busy place and create a particular vulnerability. Officers liaised with the City of London Police on this.

Policy DE8

A Member advocated the consideration of the cumulative effects of the loss of daylight and sunlight. An Officer stated that a planning advice note was being developed to cover the updated approaches to radiance and ensure that the

latest building research establishment guidance on daylight and sunlight was being reflected. Cumulative issues should be covered in this. The Officer stated that setting arbitrary time limits could result in developments delaying when they were brought forward. A Member raised concern about just having a forward-looking policy. An Officer stated that this would be included in the supplementary planning document which was likely to be presented to the Planning and Transportation Committee by the end of 2023, however work would need to be undertaken in line with BRE guidelines.

A Member commented that if public realm was lost to bollards at pavement level required for roof gardens, this was net loss to most people who moved around the area. An Officer stated that having large ground floor entrances queuing did not take place on the public highway.

Transport

Strategic Policy S9: Transport

A Member asked how the City ensured that lifts provided as part of an application were maintained and kept in use for the public to use. An Officer stated that where lifts were required as part of a planning application, they would be secured through the S106. If it was subsequently found that the lifts were not being run in accordance with this, work would be undertaken with the developer to ensure this was rectified.

In response to a Member's question about the prohibition of on-street shredding, an Officer stated that this just applied to new developments as it was not possible, within the planning system to require existing buildings to do this. In response to the Chairman's suggestion that a voluntary charter could be introduced, an Officer stated that he would raise this with transport strategy colleagues.

A Member asked about wayfinding and suggested that as most people used Smartphones rather than signage to navigate around the City, engaging with providers to ensure their apps located interesting destinations in the City should be explored. An Officer stated that discussions were taking place between transport strategy colleagues and the Destination City team and providers. Offers could look at policy to see if developers could be encouraged to engage with the providers of various different apps. A Member stated that three-dimensional signage was required for multi-dimensional public spaces. An Officer stated that this was included in Strategic Policy S10: Active travel and healthy streets. The Officer stated that wayfinding measures could include design consideration of how to reveal spaces and lighting could be used.

In response to a Member's concern about anecdotal evidence that there could be safety issues around the changing on e-scooters, an Officer stated that this level of detail would not be in the City Plan but it could be raised with transport strategy colleagues to ensure any guidance issued was clear about maintaining fire safety when e-scooters were charging.

At this point, the Chairman sought approval from the Committee to continue the meeting beyond two hours from the appointed time for the start of the meeting, in accordance with Standing Order 40, and this was agreed.

Active Travel and Healthy Streets

Strategic Policy S10: Active Travel and Healthy Streets

Policy AT3

In response to a Member's concerns about discarded hire bikes, an Officer stated this could not be tackled through the City Plan as it was not a planning matter.

Heritage and Tall Buildings

Strategic Policy S11: Historic Environment

The Chairman stated that it was important not to suggest that it was right to fill the tall tower cluster area of Fleet Valley area with developments and also not to suggest that developments could not take place in an area that was outside of these areas. An Officer stated that the wording would be considered to ensure it was clear. He also stated that Officers had worked to ensure a context led approach was being taken towards development. Within the key areas of change policies, more detail had been provided about how different parts of the City might reflect their heritage and the potential of the area.

Tall Buildings

Strategic Policy S12 – Tall Buildings

There were no comments on this section.

Protected Views

Strategic Policy S13 – Protected views

There were no comments on this section.

Open Spaces and Green Infrastructure

Strategic Policy S14 – Open Spaces and Green Infrastructure

Policy OS3

The Chairman stated that the provision of new honey bees, particularly where not well managed, could have an impact on biodiversity. The Officer stated that the wording should be amended to make it clear that insect hotels for solitary bees were supported.

Climate Resilience

Strategic Policy S15 – Climate resilience and flood risk

Policy CR1

In response to a Member asking for clarification on the policy, an Officer stated that where new buildings were being developed, the impact on the inside of the building and the impact on the wider world were considered. The Officer stated that urban greening could improve the cooling within the immediate vicinity, passive ventilation had an impact on the building itself and the thermal mass of buildings could help to modify some of the fluctuations in temperature. The Officer added that this would be covered in more depth within the Sustainability SPD which also covered approaches such as communal heating, joining up to wider heat networks or sharing heat.

In response to a Member's query about asking developers to ensure they had the potential to connect to heat networks in the future, an Officer stated that extensive work had been undertaken through the Local Area Energy Plan which sat outside the planning system. This set out how energy requirements would be addressed and how these would be sustainable over the longer term. The government was also introducing a requirement for heat zoning and strongly supported heat networks as a key mechanism for delivering decarbonisation nationally.

Policy CR3

A Member commented that using semi-permeable or permeable materials rather than granite sets would absorb more water into the ground. An Officer stated that the wording could be considered to ensure the policy did not preclude the most up-to-date thinking in relation to sustainable drainage. He also stated that there was guidance around the type of materials that should be used and work could take place with transport strategy colleagues and the public realm team to ensure that these were aligned in terms of sustainable drainage.

Circular Economy and Waste

Strategic Policy S16 – Circular Economy and Waste

No comments were made on this section.

The Temples and The Thames Policy Area

Policy TP1

No comments were made on this section.

Strategic Policy S17 – The Thames Policy Area

No comments were made on this section.

Strategic Policy S18 – Blackfriars and Strategic Policy S19 – Pool of London

The Chairman stated that the two ends of the river within the City were neglected and there were no BIDS which included these areas. He stated that this could be an area for future development. A Member stated that there not being any major businesses with substantial footprint was a consequence of the area being neglected and therefore it would be difficult to establish a meaningful BID but that a BID could be transformative.

In response to a request from a Member, an Officer confirmed that the wording could be amended to include 'refurbishment' first and 'redevelopment' second.

Strategic Policy S20 – Aldgate, Tower and Portsoken and Strategic Policy S21 – City Cluster

No comments were made on this section.

Strategic Policy S22 – Fleet Street and Ludgate, Strategic Policy S23 – Smithfield and Barbican and Strategic Policy S24 – Smithfield

The Chairman stated that the neighbourhood forum had been included in the Plan.

A Member queried the reference to the culture mile and an Officer stated that this should refer to the Culture Mile BID. Officers would amend the wording accordingly.

A Member stated, that in relation to ensuring retention and improvement of pedestrian permeability, this could be difficult on Golden Lane estate as it was a private estate and so costs would be added to service charges. Officers would look at the wording in relation to this.

A Member referred to 17.8.9 – The cultural offer on Fleet Street and commented that this should state a ‘potentially’ strong cultural offer. An Officer stated the wording could be updated and that the policy recognised the heritage aspects in terms of the churches and the history of printing.

A Member queried the strength of the wording in relation to the resistance of residential development. An Officer clarified that this was to be narrowly applied to the area adjacent to the current market site or the future Museum of London so that a new residential development was not proposed immediately opposite the entrance to the new Museum of London. Officers would look at the wording to ensure it was clear. Members supported the restriction on residential development on this site as it could inhibit uses for the future Museum of London site which would be part of Destination City.

An Officer stated that it was acknowledged that there were residents already living in the area and that was part of the character of the area but this policy would avoid major additions of residential development adjacent to the Museum of London site.

In response to a Member’s comments that existing residents were used to noise from the market, a Member stated that the market did not trade on a Sunday so the area was quiet but in the future, there was a cultural opportunity and as part of Destination City, the area could become much busier at weekends.

Strategic Policy S26 – Liverpool Street

No comments were made on this section.

Economic Objective, Social Objective and Environmental Objective

The Officer outlined changes made to the first three chapters of the City Plan, Economic objective, Social objective and Environmental objective.

A Member asked that ‘sport’ be added into the objective – ‘creating new and enhanced culture, leisure and visitor attractions’. An Officer stated this could be considered.

The Chairman thanked Officers for their work in producing the City Plan. He also stated that the City Plan was at the heart of policymaking for the built environment. It also fitted into the Corporate Plan and the London Plan

In response to a Member’s question about the process going forward, an Officer stated that the City Plan would be amended following the discussion at this Local Plans Sub-Committee meeting and a full version of the City Plan would be submitted to the Planning and Transportation Committee on 21 November 2023. There could also be amendments made to technical aspects

of the plan through internal consultation and Members would be provided with a track change version so the changes could be easily seen.

The Chairman requested that to try and avoid repetition in the discussion at the Planning and Transportation Committee, the draft minutes of this Local Plans Sub-Committee should be circulated to Members of the Planning and Transportation Committee, in advance of that meeting.

A Member referred to the cross-cutting nature of the City Plan and the overlap with other policies. He stated that the work in the City Plan was a major part of Destination City. An Officer stated that these cross-cutting approaches would be highlighted at the Planning and Transportation Committee meeting. Following a request, the Officer stated that page numbers would also be referenced in the presentation at that Committee meeting.

RESOLVED: - That Officers continue to progress work on the City Plan based on Members' views.

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

There were no questions.

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

There were no additional, urgent items of business for consideration.

7. **NON-PUBLIC MINUTES**

The Committee considered the non-public minutes of the Local Plans Sub-Committee meeting held on 20 June 2023 and approved them as a correct record.

The meeting ended at 4.25 pm

Chairman

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

This page is intentionally left blank