

## **PLANNING APPLICATIONS SUB-COMMITTEE**

**Monday, 20 November 2023**

Minutes of the meeting of the Planning Applications Sub-Committee held at Livery Hall - Guildhall on Monday, 20 November 2023 at 1.00 pm

### **Present**

#### **Members:**

Deputy Shravan Joshi (Chairman)  
Graham Packham (Deputy Chairman)  
Deputy Randall Anderson  
Brendan Barns  
Ian Bishop-Laggett  
Mary Durcan  
John Edwards  
Dawn Frampton  
Deputy Marianne Fredericks  
Deputy Charles Edward Lord  
Antony Manchester  
Deputy Brian Mooney  
Alderwoman Susan Pearson  
Deputy Henry Pollard  
Ian Seaton  
Hugh Selka  
Luis Felipe Tilleria  
William Upton KC

#### **Officers:**

Zoe Lewis	- Town Clerk's Department
Fleur Francis	- Comptroller and City Solicitor's Department
Emma Barral	- Environment Department
David Horkan	- Environment Department
Rob McNicol	- Environment Department
Gwyn Richards	- Environment Department
Robin Whitehouse	- Environment Department
Kerstin Kane	- Environment Department
Katerina Koukouthaki	- Environment Department
Peter Wilson	- Environment Department

### **1. APOLOGIES**

Apologies for absence were received from Deputy Michael Cassidy, Deputy John Fletcher, Anthony Fitzpatrick, Jaspreet Hodgson and Deputy Lloyd Owen.

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

Graham Packham declared a non-pecuniary interest in relation to Agenda Item 4, that he was chairman of the Guildhall School of Music and Drama Board of

Governors. He understood there had been negotiations between the Guildhall School of Music and Drama with the applicant about the potential use of the Victorian Bath House but had not been involved in the detailed discussions.

Deputy Randall Anderson declared the same non-pecuniary interest in relation to Agenda Item 4 as he was Deputy Chairman of the Guildhall School of Music and Drama Board of Governors.

### 3. **MINUTES**

The Sub-Committee considered the public minutes of the last meeting held on 21 July 2023 and approved them as a correct record subject to the following amendments:

- The correction of the spelling of the surname of one of the applicant speakers.
- The addition of the apologies of Deputy Pollard.

### 4. **55 AND 65 OLD BROAD STREET, LONDON, EC2M 1RX**

The Sub-Committee considered a report of the Planning and Development Director concerning the partial demolition of existing buildings and the redevelopment of the site comprising the construction of a new building comprising ground floor plus 23 upper storeys plus 2 existing basement levels (55 Old Broad Street) for the provision of office space (Class E(g)), flexible retail / cafe (Class E(a)(b)), retention of ground floor plus 5 storey building (65 Old Broad Street) for the provision of maker / studio (Class E(g)), flexible retail / cafe / maker / studio (Class E(a)(b)(g)), flexible maker / studio / office (Class E(g)), renovation of Grade II Listed Bath House building for the provision of cultural / event uses (Sui Generis), provision of public house (Sui Generis) and improvements to public realm and routes, ancillary basement cycle parking, servicing and plant, highway improvements and other works associated with the proposed development.

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

Officers presented the application, highlighting that the application was for full planning consent at 55 and 65 Old Broad Street and listed building consent at 7 to 8 Bishopsgate. The Officers stated that the site was located to the south of the Liverpool Street Station and was bound by the Metropolitan Arcade to the north, Dashwood House and the grounds of St Botolph-without-Bishopsgate Church to the east, Wormwood Street to the south and Old Broad Street to the west. The site was not located within a conservation area but was bounded by New Broadgate Conservation Area on its western side and by Bishopsgate Conservation Area to the north and to the east. There were a number of heritage assets in close proximity including the grade two listed Bath House within the application site, the Church of All Hallows-On-The-Wall to the west of the application site and the Church of St Botolph-without-Bishopsgate to the east of the application site.

The Officer outlined the application site and stated it predominantly comprised 55 and 65 Old Broad Street which was a linked L-shaped 1970s building named Broad Street House which turned the corner of Wormwood Street and Old Broad Street. The existing building was 5-11 stories and had two basement levels. The building was of an unexceptional appearance.

Members were shown a visual of the site positioned amongst other tall buildings on the northwestern edge of the City Cluster. The Officer stated that the site was considered to be appropriate for a tall building. Dashwood House was shown immediately adjacent to the existing building with other completed developments to the north including 22 Bishopsgate and 100 Bishopsgate. 55 Bishopsgate, which was considered by the Sub-Committee in July 2023 was not included in this image.

The Officer stated that the proposed development comprised a new mixed-use building at 55 Old Broad Street which would reach a maximum height of 103 metres. Consisting of 23 upper storeys it would sit comfortably adjacent to Dashwood House and other surrounding tall buildings.

Members were shown a series of site photographs immediately in and around the application site, including several views along Wormwood Street, Old Broad Street and within the site in front of the Bath House. The Officer stated that Members who attended the site visit explored all parts of the site.

Members were shown the existing ground floor plans showing a lack of pedestrian links through the site moving south to London Wall towards the cluster area. Members were shown the proposed ground floor plans. The Officer stated that the proposal included 2,000 square metres of accessible and high-quality public realm within the site boundary wrapping around underneath and in between the proposed new building at 55 Old Broad Street, the visitor recycle hub, the retained 65 Old Broad Street and the Bath House. The Officer stated that the proposal would enhance pedestrian routes from Liverpool Street Station to the north. The structure was cantilevered to maximise public realm. Members were shown the two new enhanced pedestrian routes providing links to and from Liverpool Street Tube Station.

Members were informed that the proposed scheme responded to existing challenging pedestrian comfort levels and these would be improved from D to B+. In line with the City's aspirations and policy requirements, the Section 278 would secure three crossings and the wider site would consist of yorkstone so the proposed development would seamlessly fit into its surroundings. Servicing would be via the Dashwood House basement access ramp as per the current situation. The proposed scheme would respond to step level changes across

the site and the provision of new trees and landscape features would enhance the pedestrian experience moving through the new routes. The columns that were part of the design of 55 Old Broad Street allowed the public realm areas to be maximised.

Members were also informed that the scheme included dedicated community and cultural spaces within the restored listed Bath House which acted as a centrepiece within the reimagined and transformed public realm. Members were shown an image of the dramatic entrance from the glass house office lobby and the restored Bath House with the new pub, the 55 Old Broad Street cycle pod and enhanced public realm and new pedestrian links.

The Officer stated that Members would be aware of the concerns expressed around the slight overhang of the new building. Members were shown images of the proposal. These showed the overhang and the better revealed Bath House, the prioritisation of pedestrian and cycle accessibility with the prominence of the 360 cycle pod celebrated in the forefront of the site rather than being recessive.

An image was shown of the proposed building in the context of other tall buildings to the east including the Heron Tower, 99 Bishopsgate and other tall buildings to the south. The prominence of the new route and the striking red façade of the public house on Wormwood Street were highlighted. Members were shown an image of the new route from the tube station which would be a critical route towards the City Cluster. The image showed the sensitively restored Bath House and the patterned fretwork details. These would be secured by condition. The image showed the removal of existing level changes within the site and extent of the accessible public realm.

Members were shown images which outlined the different use classes across the application site. The Bath House was proposed to be a dedicated cultural event space available for a range of users. The Bath House was built in 1894 and an image was shown of the existing poor quality backdrop and setting with its inappropriate modern extensions and poor quality brick work. The Bath House was shown surrounded by modern tall buildings including Dashwood House and Broad Street House. Members were shown another image of the Bath House which showed it sat amongst its dense urban context. Historically the Bath House had been located within an exceptionally cramped urban environment tightly enclosed by neighbouring structures. The Bath House formed a ground floor extension projecting outward from the corner of New Broad Street. Another image showed the extent of the west and south elevations added in the 1970s that were constructed of modern and inappropriate materials with inappropriate detailing including engineering brick. The existing inaccessible nature of the Bath House was demonstrated together

with the backdrop of existing tall buildings. Members were shown a south elevation which had been extensively altered. There were various levels changes and utilitarian additions to this elevation.

The Officer stated that Members would be aware that there was a suggestion to retain the white glazed brick wall behind the grill. She stated that Officers were of the view that this truncated wall was of no special interest and its removal was not harmful. This would allow for the provision of a glazed link which would support inclusive access to the basement. Members were shown an image of the challenging level changes around the Bath House which also showed the crude brick work of the 1970s elevation. This image showed tall buildings visible to the north and south of the Bath House and to the east including St Mary Axe.

Members were shown the existing and proposed north elevation of the Bath House and were informed that the original features would be retained and modern inappropriate editions would be replaced with more appropriate materials and more accomplished detailing. In addition, the 1970s brick would be replaced with new tiling to reflect the original tiling in the eastern part of the building. On the west elevation, the 1970s modern engineering brick would be replaced with appropriate tiling and a new doorway would be created which would be in keeping with the character and appearance of the Victorian building. The proposed glazed brick to the south would be located outside the original Victorian footprint. Members were shown an image of the original and proposed east elevation. This would be sensitively repaired. The existing and proposed south elevations were shown to Members and the Officer stated that the crude 1970s brickwork would be removed. Members were informed that the alterations would be in keeping with the character and ornate style of the original part of the Bath House with all external alterations and detailed design of materials for the new elements being secured by condition. The Officer stated that the proposals included a bespoke background screen which separated the Bath House from the glass lobby entrance of the new building at 55 Old Broad Street. The Officer added that there had been various studies exploring an appropriate material treatment and design that would complement the scheme without detracting from the historic building. The conclusion of this study created a calm backdrop to the Bath House with coloured decorative pavement lights to allow light to enter the basement below. The detailed design of the proposed background and lighting would be secured by condition. Internally, the original elaborate tiling and decoration would be retained. The lighting would enhance the flexible cultural and event space below. Officers considered that the listed building consent application set out the proposed alterations that would result in a positive change and would preserve the significance of the building and that the proposed conditions would present appropriate measures to secure the requisite high quality and detailed design.

Members were informed that the large space underneath the Bath House was proposed to be open to the public and a cultural programme would be managed by an operator upon its reopening in 2028 once restoration works had been completed. The Bath House would be available free of charge for qualifying users between 10am and 6pm Monday to Friday and 12pm – 10pm on Saturdays subject to allowances within these hours for private hire of no more than 25% of the space for 18 hours a week as well as an additional 10 full days a year for all of the space and private hire allowed outside of these hours.

The Officer showed Members an image which showed the overhang of the building. The Officer stated that this would not fundamentally undermine the listed building significance or diminish an ability to appreciate the asset. The Officer stated that the slight overhang would measure 9.4m from ground level with the total width of the Bath House 3.5m in width. The slight overhang would project 0.55 metres. The Bath House would act as a focal point within the wider development scheme against a gentle background. The Officer showed an image of 65 Old Broad Street and stated that the development scheme proposed maximum retention and refurbishment of the building. The scheme proposed a range of different but linked uses across four floors providing retail, a café, maker/studio and office floor space. There would also be associated cultural event space at second floor level in the open terrace space. Hive Curates had taken occupation of the space for 18 months from July 2023 as an initial trial period prior to the construction phase of development and this had been well received. The trial period was intended to better understand the space and how this could be managed and utilised in the longer term under the banner of the proposed uses that would be secured by the consent in the Section 106 agreement.

Members were shown visuals of the existing and proposed elevations. The proposed west elevation showed the extent of the retention along with the proposed west elevation facing onto Old Broad Street. The Officer advised that much of the existing glazing would be retained but new frontages would be created.

Members were informed that the proposed development at 55 Old Broad Street would deliver an uplift of over 23,000 square metres of Grade A office floor space in the cluster. It would contribute to the achievement of the office floor space target in both the adopted and emerging local plans. It would also deliver 5.7% of the required commercial space to meet projected economic and environmental growth demand. The site would be protected by Hostile Vehicle Mitigation (HVM) bollards located at the building entrances at ground floor level on the west and south facing elevations.

Members were shown the proposed floor plans. The Officer stated that the office use access was from the western side of the new building with lifts to the upper floors. Office uses were proposed on Levels 3-22 with retail spaces located at ground floor. The second-floor floor plan showed the height of the glass house entrance lobby. The Officer stated that a typical office floor plate was around 1,347 square metres and the office spaces were designed to support a range of tenants. At Level 7, there was another typical office floor plan. Members were shown an image of the terraces, balconies and roofs. The Officer stated that each level of office floor space would accommodate external terraces in the southwest corners to create a green ribbon on the front edge of the building. She stated that Level 19 would have a communal planted terrace area and Level 20 would have a tenant terrace area.

Members were shown images of the cycle pod. The Officer stated that cycle spaces would be accessed via dedicated stairs and lifts within the pod building as well as at 65 Old Broad Street. The pod building would be well-located on the corner of the scheme and would be constructed of reused materials from the site. Members were informed that the proposed reprovision of the public house would bookend the eastern part of the site adjacent to one of the new pedestrian links. The proposed façade details had been reimagined reflecting the augmented history of pubs in London. An enhanced detailed design would result in a striking red façade and patterned brickwork with raised signage which was an enhancement on the current provision. Materials would be secured by condition. Members were shown an image of the visibility of the pub façade along Wormwood Street. The Officer stated that the active frontages consisted of new retail provision and would be an improvement when compared to the existing frontages along Old Broad Street and Wormwood Street. These active frontages would increase connectivity through the enhanced public realm between the proposed built form.

Members were shown images of existing and proposed elevations and were informed that the proposed tall building sat comfortably next to the retained parts of 65 Old Broad Street and the Bath House was celebrated as a centrepiece of the proposed scheme.

Members were shown images of the view from Waterloo Bridge with the current situation and the cumulative situation with 55 Bishopsgate included as this had a resolution of consent to be granted. The proposed development was also included. Officers recognised that in this view there was a very slight erosion of sky. The proposed development had been amended by the applicants to minimize this erosion. Officers had concluded that there was a very slight level of harm, however overall it was considered that the proposal would not compete with the prominence of St Paul's Cathedral or hinder views of the strategically important landmark. Instead, 55 Old Broad Street would

seamlessly integrate within the existing development pattern within the City Cluster.

Members were shown the view of the proposed development from London Wall. It was seen at a lower height in front of other tall buildings including 110 Bishopsgate and the green ribbon from the amenity terraces on the southwest corner of the building could be seen. From this view, the building was seen in front of other tall buildings including 110 Bishopsgate and behind All Hallow's Church. The new building would provide a calmer and more consistent background to the church. To the left, 199 Bishopsgate was also visible. Members were shown the cumulative scenario with the building sitting in line with the Heron Tower. Members were also shown a view of the development seen behind St Botolph-without-Bishopsgate Church and next to other tall buildings including 99 Bishopsgate to the left.

In an image from One Bishopsgate Plaza, Dashwood House was seen directly behind the tower of the church and the Cross Point development to the right. From Bishopsgate Churchyard, looking west the development was seen along Alderman's Walk and to the left of Dashwood House. The red tiles of the proposed public house façade and the Bath House appeared behind the trees. The Officer stated that the restored Bath House would be celebrated in this view even in the wintertime.

Members were shown an image looking west from the junction of Wormwood Street in which the vibrancy of the pub facade and the ground floor retail units were visible. The Officer stated that at lower level, the different façade treatments helped to break up the overall scale of the building. To the west of the application site, the proposed development was seen from New Broad Street sitting amongst other tall buildings in the cluster. The removal of part of 65 Old Broad Street allowed new views including enhanced visibility of the Bath House. The Bath House was celebrated in the long vista from the New Broad Street Conservation Area. Moving east along New Broad Street, the new office building could be seen to the right while the refurbished elements of 65 Old Broad Street started to appear to the left and the new view of the Bath House was clearly visible.

Members were shown an image of the cumulative scenario to the western elevation of the Bath House with the Bath House visible where it was not visible before. Members were shown the same view at nighttime. A sensitive lighting scheme was proposed, the details of which would be conditioned. This would allow for sensitive lighting around the listed building. Members were shown an image of the cumulative scenario.

Members were shown the view from Bishopsgate to the northeast of the application site. The Officer stated that the proposed development would appear in the background to the right of the taller Tower 42 and 55 Bishopsgate. From the north of Old Broad Street in front of Hope Square, the proposed building would join the existing group of tall buildings to the southwest and would appear in front of Tower 42 and 22 Bishopsgate and next to Dashwood House. Members were shown the cumulative scenario. Members were shown an image to the northwest along Sun Street Passage where the proposed development would appear in front of Tower 42 at a lower height. Members were also shown the cumulative scenario with 55 Bishopsgate shown. From the south side of Old Broad Street close to Tower 42, the prominence of the cycle pod on the corner could be seen adjacent to the new route through the site moving towards Liverpool Street Station. From Bishopsgate Churchyard facing west into the application site, the removal of part of 65 Old Broad Street allowed the Bath House to be seen as a centrepiece in views from the New Broad Street Conservation Area to the west. This view created alignment when moving from east to west through the application site towards the conservation area boundary. Members were shown a view looking west along Wormwood Street in the southern part of the application site. The Officer stated that the removal of the bridge link was considered to be acceptable in design and heritage terms. Its removal would open up and declutter views along Wormwood Street and the new route adjacent to the vibrant pub façade was seen.

Members were informed that the scheme would deliver a number of key benefits including a strategic contribution of office floor space in the City with an uplift of over 23,000 square metres. This would be best-in-class Grade A flexible office floor space designed to meet the needs of future occupiers. The proposed scheme would be energy efficient and would aspire to BRE AAM outstanding. The scheme would also deliver two pedestrian links, cultural and events floor space, affordable office space, vibrant and active retail frontages, dedicated cycle parking, public house provision and improved public realm. It would also deliver a dedicated community and cultural space within the sensitively refurbished Bath House, supporting community and cultural needs. The Officer stated that Officers acknowledged the number of objections received relating to the Bath House and its setting. These had been carefully considered, however, Officers did not concur with the objections relating to harm to this heritage asset and considered that the wider scheme would be a positive change and would preserve the significance of the listed Bath House.

The Officer stated that the proposed development scheme would optimise the use of land to deliver a transformative and new mixed-use seven-day destination for the Liverpool Street area. The scheme would sit comfortably within the cluster, would activate and animate new public spaces transforming

an under-utilised site with little active ground floor uses and an underwhelming public realm to a new commercial and cultural hub for the City and London, with the Bath House as the centrepiece of the scheme. The Officers stated that for these reasons and the reasons set out in the report, the scheme was recommended for approval.

A Member asked for clarification on the recommendations as the addendum included a different resolution to the agenda and it had been suggested that the Committee might have to take account of the consultation period that had not finished and a draft City Plan which could be changed. The Officer clarified that the recommendations were as specified in the second addendum. The Legal Officer stated that the recommendations were broad enough to take account and allow for the issue set out in the addendum. She further stated that there was a need to take account of any material considerations that changed up until the point that permission was granted and not just until the day of the Sub-Committee meeting. Often there could be a six-month gap between the Sub-Committee meeting and the actual notice being issued and any changes in this time had to be considered. The Legal Officer stated that she understood that the consultation period had closed, and the date published on the website was a typographical error. Hundreds of consultation responses had been received and the error had been rectified about a week before the Sub-Committee meeting. Therefore, it was considered that the meeting could proceed but the director should be delegated the authority to consider any consultation responses that might come in after the date of the meeting and taken account of those before deciding whether to grant permission. If any issues arose which had not already been considered by the Sub-Committee Members, a decision could be made to bring the matter back to the Sub-Committee, but it was considered that this would be unlikely given the number of consultation responses already considered and the detailed officer report. Members were informed that the weight given to the Local Plan would change as moved through the process towards approval. The Legal Officer stated that her view was that the application could be determined at this meeting.

The Chairman explained that there was one registered objector to address the meeting. He therefore invited the objector to speak.

Mr Guy Newton from the Victorian Society advised that the Victorian Society had a formal role in the planning system by virtue of the Secretary of State arrangements for handling heritage applications Direction 2015. He stated that when determining applications, local authorities must take the response from the Victorian Society into account. Mr Newton stated that the former Turkish Bath House on which the proposed development would partially sit, was a Grade 2 listed Islamic style building modelled on the Church of the Holy Sepulchre in Jerusalem. It was designed by Harold Elphick and built between

1894 and 1895. It was notable for its unusual Islamic style tiles and onion-shaped dome and crescent-shaped minaret. The building had a good amount of space around it and so the remarkable architectural quality could be appreciated. It was also a well-known landmark within the City.

Mr Newton stated that the proposed 23 storey building showed a lack of deference to a Grade 2 listed building overshadowing and dwarfing this heritage asset, diminishing its architectural significance, and essentially engulfing the building in an artificially lit cavernous space. He raised concern that the Bath House would not be a celebrated centrepiece. Mr Newton stated that the partial cantilevering reduced the appreciation of crucial architectural features. He also commented that the crescent-shaped minaret was meant to be seen against the sky.

Mr Newton stated that the proposal would cause harm at the high end of less than substantial harm to the setting of the Grade 2 listed building. He further stated that policy guidance including the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) emphasised giving great weight to the conservation of a heritage asset including its settings. The proposal would materially detract from the asset of significance but also might damage its economic viability in the future thereby threatening its ongoing conservation.

Mr Newton raised concerns the massing and proposal of the building would affect the views in and out of New Broad Street and Bishopsgate Conservation Area and would compete with the outline of the Grade 2 \* listed former Great Eastern Railway at Liverpool Street Station. He added that views along New Broad Street would be hemmed in, eroding the street's broad and open character.

Mr Newton commented that the building would sit outside the City Cluster in an area not designated for tall buildings and this was a policy violation. He added that the building would largely sit within the Bank character area which was an area not designed for tall buildings. Mr Newton referred to Policy 7.7 of the London Plan and stated that the impact of tall buildings proposed in a sensitive location should be given particular considerations such as conservation areas, listed buildings and their settings. He added that Paragraph 199 of the NPPF stated that great weight should be given to the conservation of assets including setting and heritage assets. Mr Newton stated that there had been over 360 objections and the Sub-Committee should take into consideration the substantial harm to the Grade 2 listed building.

Mr Newton raised concerns about cantilevering over listed buildings and a precedent being set. He stated that the building should be pushed back with the

cantilevering elements removed and suggested that the commercial space lost here could be made up elsewhere on the development.

The Chairman thanked the objector for his contribution and invited questions of him from the Sub-Committee.

A Member asked the objector if he could see any merits in the preservation and restoration work that was proposed to be undertaken on the existing Bath House. Mr Newton stated that the Bath House was not in a terrible state and the future of the building did not depend on this development. He acknowledged that there were some merits to the restoration, but he did not consider that they went far enough to restore the building. He stated that there would be some loss to the curtilage.

A Member commented that almost all the churches and monuments in the city were to some extent hemmed in and crowded as that was the nature of the City. He asked if this could not be considered to be a fair compromise. Mr Newton stated that most churches did not have buildings cantilevered over them. Mr Newton stated that the cantilevering element should be removed and the building set back by double the size of the Bath House.

In response to a Member's question, Mr Newton confirmed that he did not consider that the proposal would enhance the heritage asset. He stated that this would be against policy.

Seeing no further questions, the Chairman invited the applicant team to speak.

Mr Ross Sayers, Head of Development Management at Landsec, stated that Landsec believed in the long-term sustainability of cities as places to live, work and play, in creating world class sustainable buildings blended with exciting and varied public realm, retail, food, leisure and community spaces. New Street Square and One New Change were examples of other Landsec schemes which contributed to the shaping successful cities for the future. At One New Change best-in-class office space had been supplemented with flexible office business Myo responding to occupiers growing demand for flexibility and increased amenity. Also at One New Change, the introduction of restaurants and leisure concepts such as the new F1 Arcade were drawing visitors into the City outside of standard working hours. Members were informed that the need to learn and to adapt had never been more critical. The rise of hybrid working meant the best talent had to be drawn in and the City had to be more than just a place of work, it needed to inspire and excite in order to draw people in and a data-led strategy was required to respond to the climate emergency.

Mr Sayers stated that the vision for 55 Old Broad Street answered these challenges. He explained that the office space at 55 Old Broad Street was flexible, sustainable, provided access to outdoor space through terraces on each floor and also provided shared amenity space for customers to enjoy. It provided affordable workspace designed for fast growing SMEs within the square mile. The ground floor experience with new connectivity, more choice

and better public spaces would earn the commute of the best talent. The scheme provided two compelling reasons for both workers and visitors to come, be inspired and stay longer. The first one was 65 Old Broad Street Studios. Building on the City's heritage of craft and enterprise, the studios would provide a new creative hub in the heart of the City with space for artists and makers, workshops and exhibitions available to the public. Hive Curates were currently trialling this space under the name Broad Works which acted as a benchmark for meanwhile use in the City. Mr Sayers informed Members that the second venue would be created by the sensitive restoration and refurbishment of the Grade 2 listed Victorian Bath House currently used for private events. This would be turned into a community and cultural event space in partnership with the Guildhall School of Music and Drama. It would be a place which would celebrate innovation and would support London's emerging performers, musicians and theatre makers within a sensitively restored asset. Historic elements which had been damaged over time would be sensitively restored and the building would be set within attractive new public realm. The proposals would allow more local people, workers, shoppers and passers-by to see and enjoy the historic building for the first time.

Mr Sayers stated that as the first real estate property to set science-based targets for carbon reduction and having delivered the UK's first net zero carbon office space earlier this year, creating a sustainable place had been in the heart of Landsec's design process. He stated that with the extensive carbon optioneering work undertaken, the plans supported the City of London's Climate Action Plan. Designed to last for over a 100 years, the net zero, all electric building would set a benchmark for deconstruction and material reuse rather than demolition. Members were informed that the investment provided a vote of confidence in the City of London Corporation's vision to boost the square mile's position as a world leading destination for visitors and talent.

Mr Mark Beattie of Hive Curates stated that he was an artist and co-founder of Hive Curates. He advised that Hive Curates was a collective of artists, curators and cultural programmers who specialised in arts and place-making. Hive Curates opened its first studio space in 2019 in Enfield. It had a strong, friendly, creative community of diverse artists and quickly started to take its work beyond the studio. Over the last four years, placemaking projects, cultural programmes and light festivals had been undertaken. Clients included the Greater London Authority (GLA), Enfield and Camden Councils, the Peabody and Creative Land Trust. Hive Curates had been partnering with Landsec since September rebranding the site using the name Broad Works. There were 10 creative studios which were being offered at genuinely affordable rates set by the GLA. There was 100% occupancy with a growing waiting list of artists. Alongside the studios, there was a gallery for exhibitions and a retail space where artists were given the opportunity to sell their crafts and run workshops for the community, both helping them build a sustainable income. Some of the workshops already held included tapestry weaving and screen printing. The latest event held was in celebration of Black History Month and had over 180 attendees. Members were informed that in the first two months there had been an overwhelming response to the achievements so far, and Hive Curates was excited to grow and evolve the model over the next 12 months, listening to what the community wanted and finding new ways to activate the site. The findings

from Landsec's local engagement were that 72% of people said that creative activities would make them more likely to attend the office more frequently. Activities were being held which would drive employees into the office and visitors to the area, thereby supporting the City's Destination City ambition. Mr Beattie stated that Hive Curates also understood that these projects often had a limited life space which made them hard to build a stable creative community. He added that Landsec's plans represented an opportunity to make this permanent, building on the area's heritage of craft and enterprise and this would create a new dynamic cultural hub in the City of London.

Mr Sean Gregory, Vice-Principal and Director of Innovation and Engagement at the Guildhall School of Music and Drama stated that the school was a vibrant international community of musicians, actors and production artists in the heart of the City of London. He stated that the school's 2023-2030 strategic plan and vision advocated for the continuing importance of the performing arts in a context where equity and sustainability mattered. He added that the school had a long history of training in socially engaged work and championing community partnerships. Mr Gregory stated that the Bath House was a hidden gem and was a stunning venue dating back to 1895 with baths present on this site since 1817. Through the partnership with Landsec, the school intended to open this building for use by communities, artists and the public. A flexible cultural and community venue would be created providing community groups, city workers, charities and cultural organisations with access to free space, events and activities which celebrated the City's heritage. Alongside this, performing artists would be offered free workshops, rehearsal and R&D facilities creating a new performing arts venue to showcase London's best emerging talent. It was envisaged that there would be a community programme designed around three main themes. The first would be community makers focusing on skills development with creative workshops and co-creative theatre and music projects. The second would be around health directed towards community wellbeing which might include music and art therapies, movement workshops and mentoring. The third area of focus would be on community connections providing a free accessible and welcoming space for community groups and charities from the City and surrounding boroughs.

Mr Gregory stated that the Guildhall School of Music and Drama was excited about the range of opportunities this project presented. It wanted the Bath House to become a new home for the community and emerging talent in the centre of London, celebrating innovation and creative risk-taking.

The Chair thanked the applicant team for their contributions and invited any questions that the Sub-Committee might now have of them.

A Member asked for more information on the plans for the operation of the Bath House and public access and consultation with the Victorian Society. The applicant team stated that the Bath House would be accessible to members of the public and advised that a new lift was being put in to make the basement space accessible. The priority would be for the public to have as much access as possible to the building and feel a sense of belonging. Workshops and other activities would be run and would be organised in advance and publicised. There was a long history of building relationships with surrounding boroughs

and local communities and organisations so the applicant team was geared to co-imagining and co-creating projects and activities that would work within the spaces and work for the people who wanted to attend. Members were informed that Landsec would welcome conversations with the Victorian Society and would ensure the building worked in line with proposals whilst meeting concerns currently being expressed, through the activities being proposed.

A Member asked if someone passing by could visit without booking to attend a workshop and was advised that how the venue would work was part of the consultation process but the idea was there would be times when people could visit. These were likely to be at fixed times during the week, for a number of reasons such as the nature of an activity taking place and safeguarding.

A Member asked about the type of events proposed and raised concern about the size of the basement space in the Bath House and whether production costs would be covered. The applicant team advised that the activities run would be shared, participatory activities bringing people together rather than having a focus on performance and productions. Careful thought would be given to the nature of the activities that were considered in terms of the creative partnership working and socially engaged work. In advance of the Bath House opening, work would take place to ensure the space was usable and fit for purpose for the planned activities, giving thought to practicalities of the size of the space. Consideration would be given to having flexible partitions to divide the space or have it as one larger space. Jo Chard from the Guildhall School of Music and Drama stated that this was an exciting opportunity for the school, and it provided an opportunity for innovation, experimentation and the development of partnerships and activities. The school was keen to be involved as part of its civic purpose as an institution and a university and would provide much needed space to artists and communities in the City.

A Member commented on there being a condition on the playing of live music that could be heard outside the Bath House between 8pm and 8am and asked if there would be sound insulation or if 8pm was sufficient. The applicant team stated that the space would be designed for the Guildhall School of Music and Drama and so sound insulation would be provided as required.

In response to a Member's question about fire escapes, the applicant team stated that there would be two escape routes from the Bath House. One escape route would be at ground level and the other would be from the basement, through the larger 55 Old Broad Street basement.

A Member raised concern about the oversailing and asked how many additional square metres of office space were gained by extending out of the boundary and over the pavement. The applicant team stated that the proposal oversailed Wormwood Street which was owned by the City but not Old Broad Street as this was land owned by the developer who also owned Dashwood House to the north of the site. There was an element of office space created by the oversail and there would be a commercial discussion if planning permission was approved.

A Member raised concerns about the loss of retail and vital space at ground floor for the office entrance and bike store and asked where the applicant saw

the enlivenment that was proposed. The applicant team stated that processes had been run to find the right occupiers and partners to deliver on their aspirations and the City's aspirations to bring people into the City and encourage them to stay. Through these processes the Guildhall School of Music and Hive Curates were selected as they put forward publicly accessible space bringing craft back into the City, bringing music and rehearsal space into the City, outside an Elizabeth Line station with significant numbers of people walking past. The applicant stated this was a compelling offer.

The Chairman commented that while there was a loss of retail, there was an increase in the affordable office space and the cultural offering and shops coming into the entire complex. He asked how the affordable workspace would work alongside those who would pay full rate for flexible workspace and whether there would be equity of amenities. The applicant team advised that the affordable workspace would be linked to the existing building at 65 Old Broad Street studios with the two floors under the terrace space being the maker space/ studios and a shop for artists to sell their work and a gallery for them to showcase it. There would also be an accessible terrace above and the affordable workspace and affordable maker space would be in the two stories above so would all be accessible and in one part of the building. Currently there was an obligation for at least 25 affordable desks at a discounted market rent but the exact definition would be defined through the Section 106 agreement process setting out whether this would be affordable desks or affordable artist studios.

A Member asked if, on the two levels where artists worked, there could be an area for the public to observe the artists working and see products being made that they could buy in the retail shop. Mr Beattie stated that Hive studios were designed with transparent windows and had communal areas for artists to work in. Each month at Broad Works, open studio sessions were held that were free and open to the public. All artists were encouraged to open their studios to show the process involved in their work. This also encouraged members of the public to take part in workshops. Members of the public who had requested to be shown around, had been.

In response to a Member's question about the consolidation figures, the applicant team stated that the proposal was to work towards a 50% reduction, in line with the figure used for other City developments.

A Member asked how the fabric of the Bath House would be protected from the proposed green roof. The applicant team stated that there was a heritage strategy which would include further investigation and work to understand all future interventions and alterations and ensure that historic fabric was preserved. It was proposed that the green roof would sit independently on top of the structure so there was no risk of roots damaging the Bath House structure. There would be a structural survey undertaken beforehand. Following further investigative work, a detailed conservation management plan would be drawn up to ensure the ongoing preservation of the building.

A Member asked whether this scheme which would deliver benefits but would also overhang the Bath House, was the only way to deliver the benefits or if it was about maximising what was included on the site. The applicant team stated that this investment was a package and was balanced. It was considered that a small oversail of Wormwood Street would create additional floor space that the City needed in an area that could take the additional floorspace and height. The applicant considered this to be the right balance alongside the public benefits that would be part of the scheme. The applicant stated that the overhang over the Bath House would be at 9m high. Slightly more space would be created above which would allow more public realm to be created below and the scheme allowed the creation of 65 Old Broad Street Studios and to spend significant sums on the Victorian Bath House and provide a rent free new music and cultural venue.

A Member raised concern about in one of the examples used by the applicant, there were many empty units. The applicant stated that although this was correct and there were empty units in One New Change, the new F1 Arcade was almost fully booked for the next two months both during the day and in the evening and this was the same for the restaurant, The Ivy, Asia. The applicant acknowledged the lower ground floor of One New Change was not currently working but stated they had plans and were talking to Officers about how they could move away from retail to provide a leisure offer.

The Chairman suggested that the Sub-Committee now move to any questions that they might have of Officers at this stage.

A Member commented that the objector from the Victorian Society had claimed the proposed location of the tall building was a policy violation and asked Officers to clarify this. An Officer stated that this was not a policy violation and the cluster policy area was a generic term for an area in which it was envisaged that there would be a cluster of tall buildings. The proposed location was not in an area considered inappropriate for tall buildings and was not in a conservation area. The thorough visual assessments undertaken suggested this was an appropriate site for a tall building.

A Member commented that the overhang on Wormwood Street would provide shelter from the rain or sun and therefore might be of benefit to pedestrians. He asked if there was a plan to widen the footway. The Officer stated that Section 278 was secured through the Section 106 legal agreement and set out in the heads of terms. This contained detail that would be secured as a minimum through the Section 278 agreement and would be subject to various profiling and modelling required by the transport team. The Officer stated there was not a plan set out for the widening of this specific footway, however there was a plan moving forward that could be presented to committee in the near future for

the general east west corridor works to Wormwood Street, London Wall and other streets which might encapsulate various footpath improvements and highway considerations.

A Member asked for clarification on the locations of HVM bollards and whether planters could be used instead of bollards, where appropriate. An Officer stated that HVM measures were subject to landscaping details and the precise detail, design and location would be finalised in conjunction with the City of London Police and be included in the condition submission.

A Member raised concern about the limited information about the impact on the public spaces of the building in relation to the daylight and sunlight (in terms of diagrams), wind and pedestrian comfort. The Officer noted the comment about the lack of diagrams in relation to daylight and sunlight and stated that there were predominantly negligible or moderate impacts to certain rooms including the churches. The Officer stated that overall the conclusion was that the overall results in an urban area and for non-residential properties such as churches were acceptable. The microclimate findings showed a negligible benefit. Further mitigation measures would be secured by condition.

A Member asked if there could be a condition to ensure the public had access to the building without having to attend an event. An Officer stated that the heads of terms secured a cultural strategy and this provision would be incorporated. The cultural strategy would set out the precise nature of the cultural space. The addendum clarified the hours of operation and stated the access would be for qualified users. A draft cultural strategy had been submitted. The applicant would be required to satisfy the criteria of being a qualified user and which community uses were under consideration.

A Member asked for more information on pedestrian comfort levels. An Officer stated that if no footway improvements were made, the pedestrian comfort on Old Broad Street would be D on Old Broad Street and B+ on Wormwood Street following occupation of the development. He informed Members that pedestrian comfort levels were cumulative so an increase in occupation of the site would inevitably lead to more people and therefore a decrease in pedestrian comfort levels. However the Section 278 agreement would take an appraisal on various pedestrian comfort levels, healthy streets and modelling exercises as to the precise nature and design of footpaths around the site. The funded works set out in the report included the reconstruction of footways fronting the application site and the possible widening of the Old Broad Street eastern footway in yorkstone paving. There would be further investigation as to what was required to achieve a higher possible level of pedestrian comfort level. A Member raised concern that waiting until the Section 278 to resolve the pedestrian comfort level issues meant there would be limited options such as widening the road

which would create issues with traffic flow. An Officer stated that there would be two new generously wide public routes through the site which did not currently exist. These were intended and negotiated to frontload the issues in advance. These would take the pressure off Old Broad Street. Pedestrian comfort levels on Old Broad Street would then increase to B+.

A Member asked for more information on servicing. An Officer stated that there would be 65 trips a day in a worst-case unconsolidated scenario. Consolidation would reduce this by 25% but that was subject to the submission of a servicing and delivery plan. It was expected that the number of trips would reduce further once the detail had been submitted and considered.

A Member referred to the Officer report which stated the exceptional benefit of office space contribution, and asked why the provision of office space, when there were many applications coming forward, was seen as an exceptional benefit. An Officer stated that it was a significant economic benefit because it meant employment, growth and as an economic catalyst to the resurgence of the City and also in terms of its position as an international business centre. He added that the provision of best-in-class Grade A office space when there was an undersupply, was a very significant public benefit.

The Member also queried how the Local Plan fitted in with the figures in relation to the supply of office floorspace. The Officer stated that by 31 March 2022, a 1.2 million square metre net increase had either been delivered or was under construction or was permitted in the City, against the targets set out previously. There was a further requirement to meet the draft City Plan 2036 target of approximately 2 million square metres. The new draft City Plan had a target of 1.2 million square metres so the amount of floorspace required by the new draft City Plan because of what had already been delivered to date, was broadly commensurate with what was required in the draft City Plan. Therefore, even though the total number was very different from the current City Plan, the current City Plan had an earlier start date and a substantial amount of floorspace had been delivered, hence the lower figure of 1.2million.

A Member stated that with limited fire escapes in the Bath House, any increase in capacity would require more fire escapes to be added.

The Chairman asked Officers to provide more information on the carbon optioneering undertaken. An Officer stated that a number of options had been considered. One option was a light touch refurbishment option with a small extension of three storeys. This option would not provide the high-quality office floorspace discussed and would not deliver the public benefits, climate resilience or amenity. Another option had a considerable uplift. The application scheme had the option that had the lowest embodied and operational carbon

emissions. It also had a sizeable retention percentage. It was therefore considered to be the best, sustainable and balanced approach for the application site.

Seeing no further questions of Officers, the Chairman asked that Members now move to debate the application.

A Member commented that the Bath House was a hidden gem and this scheme would open it up, celebrate and enhance it. He also stated the building was unobtrusive to look at, would open up two new pedestrian accesses in an area with restricted pedestrian access and as part of the scheme the unsightly pedestrian bridge would be removed.

A Member stated that the Bath House originally was not a standalone building. It was attached to North Broad Street House. The south side and the rear were only exposed when that building was demolished. The Member commented that the site visit had shown the Bath House was dilapidated and the scheme would carefully restore the Victorian exterior and would remove the inappropriate modern fabric on the south side and rear and sensitively replace it. He stated that the basement was currently not accessible and inside there were multiple levels that would be replaced by a single level. The Member commented that the cultural use would include skills development and he understood there would be no charge for people to attend the cultural events. He considered that the proposal would significantly improve the Bath House and safeguard it as an important part of the City's heritage.

A Member stated that many of the objections assumed that the Bath House would be demolished and replaced by a large block and that was not the case. The future of the Bath House was being considered in a sympathetic way, like the City had done with the Temple of Mithras, Walbrook which had been resurrected to a site which could be visited and also with the Amphitheatre below Guildhall. This proposal would enhance the heritage building. There was an economic benefit to the scheme, and better open space for people to enjoy, particular to and from Liverpool Street Station.

A Member commented that the new pedestrian routes and permeability of the site would be a significant improvement and would help more people discover the architectural gem of the Victorian Bath House. He stated he had slight concerns about whether the space would be as accessible as he would like it to be and encouraged the Guildhall School of Music and Drama to consider having open days when any member of the public could access the Bath House. He stated that originally the building was more hemmed in than it would be with the proposed scheme. The Member congratulated the applicant on the Broad Work site which Members had visited on the site visit.

A Member commented that a lot of thought had gone into the application and there was a package of beneficial measures including the restoration of the Bath House and modern officers. However, he considered that the scheme was trying to achieve too much. He stated that several advisory bodies stated there

was a balance to be struck which did not go as far as this proposal. He stated the building could be set back and the level of office space could be reduced whilst still providing the benefits. He also stated that this scheme caused harm and its package of benefits though interesting and welcome, was not sufficient to outweigh the harm, if heritage was valued.

A Member commented that the Officer report stated the proposal was finely balanced. The Member stated that she considered that balance had been overstepped with the building proposed on site being built to the maximum size to maximise the office space. There would be a refurbished Bath House and creative spaces. The Member applauded the developer for retaining the existing building but this did not justify the overbuilding of this proposal.

A Member stated that an overhang of 55cm over 9m was insignificant. He stated that the overhang on Wormwood Street was significant but was not necessarily a problem as pedestrians could benefit from a rain and sun shelter. It was high enough that it would not cause a problem. The Member commented on the benefits of the creative workspace including bringing makers back into the city and stated that this provided a reason for workers to attend their office as they could attend classes after work. It would create a destination. He commented that he would like feedback from the developer over the coming years on how well this worked as there were other sites in the City where artisans could work.

A Member commented that she supported the refurbishment of the Bath House but consideration had not been given to the wide range of heritage assets this scheme would impact upon due to its height and bulk and the wider historical impact. The Member stated that culture and heritage should be protected and she was concerned about how this application would encroach on the view of St Paul's Cathedral. She stated that the developer had maximised their assets to the detriment of a much wider range of grade listed buildings in the area and the views.

A Member commented that the primary public benefit being provided was more office floorspace when significant amounts of new office floorspace was required in the City and it was right that the use of space be maximised.

The Chairman summed up the points made and stated that the applicant had taken an experimental step in the City with the Hive Curates concept over the last few months. Members had visited the site and had seen that having a live facility in place showed what could be done in one of the busiest most congested parts of the square mile. It was bringing in new diversities of sectors and younger people who would not necessarily think about working in the square mile. This tied in with the ambitions of the City. The Chairman commented that using the Bath House for arts would be a very good use of the space. He also commented that providing affordable office space and bringing in people who were starting up businesses and innovators from different sectors which were not traditional to the City was vital for the future of the City. The provision of affordable workspace was working effectively in other buildings

and was welcomed as part of the package of benefits with this scheme. The provision of Grade A office floorspace was also a central part of the provision.

Having fully debated the application, the Chairman asked the Town Clerk to read out the recommendations on pages 3 and 4 of the second addendum. Following this, the Committee proceeded to vote on the recommendations before them.

Votes were cast as follows: IN FAVOUR – 13 Votes  
OPPOSED – 4 Votes  
There were no abstentions.

Luis Tilleria did not vote as he was not present for the whole agenda item.

The recommendations were therefore carried.

#### **RESOLVED –**

1. That, subject to the execution of a planning obligation or obligations in respect of the matters set out under the heading 'Planning Obligations' the Planning and Development Director be authorised to issue a decision notice granting planning permission and listed building consent for the above proposal in accordance with the details set out in the attached schedules;
  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;
  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; and
  4. That it be agreed in principle that the land affected by the building which is currently public highway and land over which the public have right of access may be stopped up to enable the development to proceed and, upon receipt of the formal application, officers be instructed to proceed with arrangements for advertising and (subject to consideration of consultation responses) making of a Stopping-up Order for the area shown marked on the Stopping-up Plan annexed to the Officer report under the delegation arrangements approved by the Court of Common Council.
5. **\* 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.

6. **\* 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.

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

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

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

There were no questions.

**The meeting ended at 3.00 pm**

-----  
Chairman

**Contact Officer: Zoe Lewis**  
**[zoe.lewis@cityoflondon.gov.uk](mailto:zoe.lewis@cityoflondon.gov.uk)**