

## PLANNING AND TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE

Tuesday, 12 December 2023

**Minutes of the meeting of the Planning and Transportation Committee held at the Guildhall EC2 at 10.30 am**

### **Present**

#### **Members:**

Deputy Shравan Joshi (Chairman)	Alderman Robert Hughes-Penney
Graham Packham (Deputy Chairman)	Deborah Oliver
Deputy Randall Anderson	Alderswoman Susan Pearson
Brendan Barns	Deputy Henry Pollard
Ian Bishop-Laggett	Hugh Selka
Mary Durcan	Luis Felipe Tilleria
John Edwards	Shailendra Kumar Kantilal Umradia
Deputy Marianne Fredericks	William Upton KC
Jaspreet Hodgson	Jacqui Webster
Amy Horscroft	

#### **Officers:**

Zoe Lewis	- Town Clerk's Department
Fleur Francis	- Comptroller and City Solicitor's Department
Simon Owen	- Chamberlain's Department
Dipti Patel	- Chamberlain's Department
Andrew Coke	- City Surveyor's Department
Paul Wilkinson	- City Surveyor's Department
Bob Roberts	- Interim Executive Director Environment
Bhakti Depala	- Environment Department
David Horkan	- Environment Department
Rob McNicol	- Environment Department
Bruce McVean	- Environment Department
Tom Nancollas	- Environment Department
Gwyn Richards	- Environment Department
Peter Wilson	- Environment Department
Joanne Hill	- Environment Department
Kerstin Kane	- Environment Department

### **1. APOLOGIES**

Apologies for absence were received From Deputy Michael Cassidy, Anthony Fitzpatrick, Deputy John Fletcher, Dawn Frampton, Antony Manchester, Deputy Brian Mooney, Alderswoman Jennette Newman, Judith Pleasance, Alderman Simon Pryke and Ian Seaton.

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

There were no declarations.

3. **MINUTES**

**RESOLVED** – That the public minutes of the previous meeting held on 21 November 2023, be approved as an accurate record.

4. **OUTSTANDING ACTIONS\***

The Committee received a report of the Town Clerk setting out the list of Outstanding Actions.

In relation to Item 1 – Members' Training, an Officer informed the Committee that training would be arranged in relation to heritage, archaeology and daylight and sunlight as requested by Members in Spring 2024.

An Officer informed the Committee that Item 2 – Sustainability Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) would be considered at this meeting and if approved it would return to the committee following public engagement in early 2024. He also stated that in relation to Item 3 – Whole Life-Cycle Carbon Emission Data Monitoring in Major Planning Applications, the carbon monitoring data had now been published on the Climate Action Strategy Dashboard, and this would be updated regularly. Subject to Committee approval both Items 2 and 3 could be withdrawn from the outstanding actions list.

**RESOLVED** – That Item 2 be withdrawn from the outstanding actions list subject to the Committee approving the Sustainability SPD and that Item 3 be withdrawn from the outstanding actions list.

5. **ANNUAL REVIEW OF TERMS OF REFERENCE**

The Committee considered a report of the Town Clerk setting out the current Terms of Reference for the Planning and Transportation Committee.

A Member commented that the title in (q) required updating.

**RESOLVED** - That the terms of reference of the Committee (as set out at Appendix 1 to the report) be approved for submission to the Court of Common Council in April 2023 subject to the title in (q) being amended to state "Executive Director of Environment".

6. **CREECHURCH CONSERVATION AREA PROPOSAL**

The Committee considered a report of the Interim Executive Director Environment regarding the Creechurch Conservation Area Proposal.

An Officer stated that in July 2023, the Committee had approved a public consultation on the proposals for the Creechurch Conservation Area. This public consultation ran from September to November and involved consultation on three principal options for the conservation area boundary, plus the addition of a fourth option for respondents to suggest their own alternative boundary. Over 900 responses were received. The Officer stated that this was

unprecedented and a very welcome level of engagement. 84.5% of respondents voted for option 3 – the option tabled by Bevis Marks Synagogue.

The Officer stated that the consultation responses received had been considered by Officers. Responses included new information, including additional detail relating to specific sites within the proposed boundary, within the wider area, and more generally relating to the history of the area and the communities that had settled in the area. Taking this into account, Officers recommended that the Committee designate a proposed conservation area with the boundary set out in Appendix 1 of the Officer report, as this boundary best captured the special architectural and historic interest present in the locality and best discharged the City's statutory duties under policy and legislation in respect of conservation areas.

In response to Members' questions in relation to the timeline for the conservation area being approved by the Court of Common Council and adopted, an Officer stated that subject to the conservation area being approved by Committee, a report would be submitted to the Court of Common Council on 11 January 2024 and if approved, it would take effect immediately. A management plan would then be prepared and subject to the Committee's approval would go out to public consultation in late spring/early summer 2024. The management plan would set out how the conservation area would be managed through the planning process.

In response to a Member's question about how the conservation would fit in with the City Plan, an Officer stated that the conservation area was separate to the City Plan which had its own set of policies. However, a number of designations would be included in the City Plan when submitted to the Committee at the next meeting on 31 January 2024. This would include an Immediate Setting area around Bevis Marks Synagogue, as well as a Tall Buildings area that covered part of this conservation area and would be assessed by virtue of various strategic views and impacts on the wider heritage. Issues relating to this area and to the synagogue would be addressed within the city cluster part of the strategic policy section of the City Plan.

A Member asked Officers to comment on the inclusion of 1 Creechurch Lane. He stated that whilst it was geographically central to the proposed conservation area, in character, it seemed substantially different to the character of the area the conservation area aimed to conserve. An Officer explained that as 1 Creechurch Lane was central to the area, including it enabled a coherent boundary to be drawn. Furthermore, the site of the building was also the site of the Great Synagogue, which was one of the most important sites in respect of the locality. It was considered that following the additional information provided in the consultation relating to the Great Synagogue, its inclusion was important in adequately reflecting the significant Jewish associations the area possessed. Although the building itself did not contribute positively to the proposed conservation area's character and appearance, there was leeway within legislation and policy.

In response to a Member's question request for clarification on the wording of the overarching summary, an Officer stated that this section set out the principal characteristics of character, appearance and significance. The proposed boundary contained buildings ranging from the domestic scale or mercantile scale of the warehouses along Creechurch Lane, through to buildings such as 1 Creechurch Place, Cunard House and others which were of a different scale. The Officer stated that this would be more clearly expressed in the management plan and consultees would be able to express their views on the overarching characteristics of the conservation area.

A Member asked for the rationale for not including the south side of Aldgate High Street with its Victorian buildings and the Metropolitan Aldgate station, as well as the ruins of the priory and the building next to the pump area as the public had asked for these inclusions. An Officer explained that the building mentioned including the ruins, was included within the proposed boundary. The inclusion of the buildings on the south side was considered but the overarching character of the Creechurch locality, which the conservation area sought to protect, was defined principally by ecclesiastical, mercantile, educational and domestic buildings and uses and these were seen to diverge from that character.

The Chairman thanked the synagogue and the rabbi for the for the constructive way they had worked with Officers.

**RESOLVED** – That Members of the Committee, having considered the results of the public consultation, analysis and conclusions, approve the designation of the area identified on the map in Appendix 1 of the officer report, as the Creechurch Conservation Area.

## 7. **PLANNING FOR SUSTAINABILITY SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENT**

The Committee received a report of the Interim Executive Director Environment on the Planning for Sustainability Supplementary Planning Document (SPD), which set out guidance, requirements and processes for the environmental sustainability aspects of proposed development in the square mile.

An Officer stated that the SPD had been informed by internal consultation on five sustainability topics plus stakeholder events for the general public, industry experts and local authorities. The insights gained from three years of detailed negotiations with applicants on sustainability had also been included. The SPD sought to support applicants to achieve best practice outcomes for their site.

The Officer stated that subject to the Committee's approval, consultation events and workshops would take place in spring 2024. Following a review of responses, the SPD would be submitted to the Committee in Autumn 2024.

The Committee noted a presentation from Officers which outlined detail contained within the SPD.

A Member asked how the SPD linked to the City Plan. An Officer stated that the SPD and the City Plan were aligned. The SPD was also aligned with the adopted Local Plan.

A Member sought clarification on the biodiversity requirements. An Officer stated that a key piece of evidence had been published setting out the background and the evidence for the requirement for three biodiversity units per hectare and this was also set out in the City Plan. Officers would ensure that the SPD cross referenced these specific pieces of evidence and policy where they were not already referenced.

A Member welcomed the high standards being set for sustainability across the City. He asked how these would be balanced against ensuring the City remained economically competitive and a welcoming place to invest. The Officer stated that this was considered in the development of this guidance, and that developers and occupiers were keen to pursue high environmental sustainability standards within their own schemes. A clear message had been set through the Climate Action Strategy that the City was becoming a more sustainable place. The SPD had been developed taking into account the views of consultants and experts in the field, as well as the Sustainability team who worked closely with developers and applicants on enhancing sustainability of their schemes. A Whole Plan Viability Study was recently undertaken supporting the City Plan, which incorporated several assessments of the viability implications for high sustainability standards within schemes. This would be published online and would be submitted to the Committee in January 2024. It showed that the high sustainability standards as proposed in the SPD would not render schemes in the City unviable. Officers would continue to work in a positive and collaborative way with developers to set high standards, and having clear guidance on the standards would be a key driver for ensuring that developers were confident about the requirements when bringing forward schemes.

A Member asked if a route map could be produced to assist applicants proposing smaller developments to understand the requirements relevant to them. The Officer explained that chapter eight had been designed for this purpose and outlined the difference between major and minor developments. The Officer stated that a pre-application meeting was recommended to developers during which Officers could outline the sustainability opportunities for even small schemes.

A Member asked about the financial implications arising from the implementation of the report and the aspirational plans. The Officer stated that the adopted local plan had high ambitions in terms of sustainability and the SPD built on that and the emerging City Plan. It provided further detail and explanation of the expectations of developers rather than setting requirements that had extensive additional costs, as this helped shape and scope these schemes within those overarching parameters and provided more clarity. The Whole Plan Viability Study would be presented to the Committee in early 2024. This covered the environmental costs within the emerging City Plan which were

reflected in this SPD as well as the other costs to developers when bringing forward schemes.

A Member stated that approximately one quarter of the energy used in the City was for lights. He stated that once a building was completed, there was a fit out typically undertaken to the requirements of tenants. Rather than having the one lighting system, different lighting systems could be used in different areas and motion-activated lights could be used. He stated that the Lighting Strategy considered the development but not the fit out. He asked if this had been addressed in this SPD. An Officer stated that matters relating to the fit out were incorporated into each chapter. Energy efficiency measures were recommended and these included lighting measures. There were also conditions on new developments which required efficient lighting. In relation to the fit outs, tenancy agreements and green leases were recommended and it was requested that these be submitted as part of the circular economy or whole lifecycle of carbon assessments.

A Member queried whether sewage effluence was included in the report. An Officer stated that she would review the wording and ensure this was included.

A Member asked how the SPD would support innovation and implementation of technology to ensure that the built environment remained competitive. The Officer stated that the pre-application meetings with developers included discussions on identifying opportunities for the reuse of materials and using recycled materials. This required applicants to produce material audits and upcycle strategies to facilitate zero waste. Details of reuse were required at the Royal Institute of British Architects (RIBA) Stage 4 after permission was granted which meant collaboration would continue with developers on this matter. Applicants were encouraged to look at deconstruction rather than demolition ensuring material could be salvaged wherever possible. Coordination opportunities were encouraged with nearby developments e.g., relating to material exchanges, storing and processing materials.

A Member asked if in relation to greenhouse gas emissions and energy use, Officers had an active role in encouraging developers to work together and look at shared facilities and linking into utilities. An Officer stated that this was taking place and outlined a number of examples across the City. The Member also commented that in relation to the urban greening factor, most planting and biodiversity was on rooftops and on walls and asked if creative ways could be used to encourage more planting and biodiversity at street level. An Officer stated that in pre-application discussions, developers were encouraged to include environmental benefits such as linking into biodiversity corridors, cool routes and climate resilience infrastructure. Examples of greening in the public realm were contained within the climate resilience chapter of the SPD. Encouraging biodiversity was included within the Biodiversity Action Plan.

A Member stated that the City and Hackney Public Health and Protection Team were working on their climate resilient strategy. She raised concerns about the hidden costs in terms of public health with the climate changing and also raised

concerns about water management. She stressed the importance of building these measures into schemes and ensuring they were fully implemented.

Several Members congratulated officers on their work on this document.

The Chairman stated that in relation to the issue of economic pressure on developers and investors, many tenants were pushing for sustainable buildings that embodied their corporate values around sustainability and net zero. Therefore, developers were bringing forward suitable schemes. There was large demand for this space and peak rents were being achieved in those buildings that had achieved net zero and had high sustainability standards. The Chairman added that whilst the costs of the building and implementation of these schemes were higher, the profitability results could be higher too. In addition, having pre-application discussions about the expectations on developers in relation to carbon options guidance helped to relieve some of the risk elements. He stated that the SPD was setting clarity and transparency around sustainability expectations and provided a balance between encouraging economic growth and also a responsible sustainable future for the square mile.

The Chairman stated there was a lack of skilled resource in the market to do some of this work and that increased the costs of the available resource. However, the City's Skills for a Sustainable Skyline programme was resulting in success, driving in education and resources to the market.

**RESOLVED** – That Members of the Committee approve the draft Planning for Sustainability SPD for public consultation.

**8. SALISBURY SQUARE DEVELOPMENT - APPROPRIATION FOR PLANNING PURPOSES**

The Committee received a report of the City Surveyor regarding the Salisbury Square Development for the Appropriation for Planning Purposes. The City Surveyor stated that this item had been withdrawn from the agenda to enable a procedural error to be addressed. He informed Members that the report would be brought back to the Committee in early 2024.

**9. REVENUE AND CAPITAL BUDGETS 2024/25**

The Committee received a report of The Chamberlain and the Interim Executive Director Environment regarding the revenue and capital budgets for the Planning & Transportation Committee for 2024/25.

A Member requested clarification on the unallocated savings. An Officer stated that the unidentified savings were a result of previous savings exercises held corporately for fundamental review and as part of the Target Operating Model savings of 12%. In Appendix three, there was a category entitled "savings to be applied". Originally there was a target of £1,728,000. This was mainly identified with generating additional income which was identified in the report and some various expenditure efficiencies. This was now £110,000 and the Interim Executive Director had further plans to reduce this to a balanced budget throughout 2024/2025. The Member also enquired about the proposed staffing

numbers particularly the highways and structural inspections number of staff, which was decreasing. The Officer stated that the numbers were derived from discussions with the service directors. It was considered that the required service could be delivered with the proposed staffing numbers.

A Member asked whether income could be raised from the dockless bike schemes. An Officer stated that income from the e-scooter trial was included. This was a regular payment. There would be income from the dockless operators contributing to new bays and research and this would be included once received.

**RESOLVED** - That Members of the Committee

1. review and approve the proposed revenue budget for 2024/25 for submission to the Finance Committee;
2. review and approve the proposed capital budgets for 2024/25 for submission to the Finance Committee;
3. agree that amendments for 2023/24 and 2024/25 budgets arising from Changes to recharges or any further implications arising from subsequently approved savings proposals, changes to the Cyclical Works Programme, or changes to the resource envelope be delegated to the Chamberlain in consultation with the Interim Executive Director Environment.

**10. INFORMATION REQUIREMENTS FOR THE VALIDATION OF PLANNING APPLICATIONS**

The Committee received a report of the Director of Planning & Development on the review of the local list of information required with planning applications.

An Officer informed the Committee that an addendum report had also been published and circulated.

A Member sought clarification on the health impacts assessment, particularly regarding suicide prevention measures. She also stated that reports should detail information on health impacts. An Officer stated that in terms of security and safety from terraces, there was a separate entry for that under risk assessments for external terraces. This captured the latest advice note on suicide prevention measures on these terraces. The City had produced its own guidance on health impact assessments and the detailed guidance would be followed for any applications that came forward.

In response to a question from a Member about the approach to sustainability, an Officer stated that sustainability was covered in the local plan and the city policies, and items were largely itemised individually throughout the document. There were separate ones on biodiversity, circular economy, whole life cycle and carbon. These elements had their own requirements to the specific documents that were required for particular categories of applications. Generally, they were very specific in terms of all the documents that would be required for the majority of applications, including major applications, but sustainability was also a consideration for any schemes that came forward.



A Member enquired further on the issue of health impact assessments to include the provision of health services. She stated that if schemes were increasing the number of people in an area, this would impact on general practices and dental services which were already under stress. Therefore, the provision of health services should be considered. The Officer stated that this would be covered in the City Plan which had a policy that required any scheme that had an impact on the need for health services or for other social infrastructure to make appropriate contributions or provide those services as part of the scheme.

In response to a Member's point that service consolidation should be included, an Officer stated that this should be included and the wording of the document would be amended to include this.

**RESOLVED** – That Members agree to consultation with the local community, including applicants and agents, on the local list of information required with planning and other applications as set out in Annexe A of this report with the wording amended to include service consolidation and that if no significant comments were received the Planning & Development Director be authorised to adopt the list.

**11. PUBLIC LIFT & ESCALATOR REPORT\***

The Committee received a report of the City Surveyor on the availability and performance of publicly accessible lifts and escalators monitored and maintained by City Surveyor's, in the reporting period 3 November 2023 to 24 November 2023.

**RESOLVED** – To note the report.

**12. RISK MANAGEMENT UPDATE REPORT\***

The Committee received a report of the Interim Executive Director Environment regarding the risk management update which provided the Planning and Transportation Committee with assurance that risk management procedures in place within the Environment Department were satisfactory and that they met the requirements of the Corporate Risk Management Framework.

**RESOLVED** – To note the report.

**13. TO NOTE THE DRAFT MINUTES OF THE STREETS AND WALKWAYS SUB-COMMITTEE - 7 NOVEMBER 2023\***

The Committee received the draft public minutes of the meeting held on 7 November 2023.

**RECEIVED.**

**14. TO NOTE THE MINUTES OF THE PLANNING APPLICATIONS SUB-COMMITTEE - 20 NOVEMBER 2023\***

The Committee received the public minutes of the meeting held on 20 November 2023.

**RECEIVED.**

**15. QUESTIONS ON MATTERS RELATING TO THE WORK OF THE COMMITTEE**

A Member requested that a resolution from the Cripplegate by-election be discussed as the Court of Wardmote only sat once a year. She stated that the resolution related to the Barbican and Golden Lane Neighbourhood Forum. The Member asked to present this for discussion. She read the wording of the resolution as follows:

“This Wardmote respectfully requests that the Corporation of London acknowledges the important role of the Barbican & Golden Lane Neighbourhood Forum in local plan-making and policy development by:

- a) Reflecting that role within the Corporation's ‘Statement of Community Involvement’.
- b) Reflecting that role within the text of the City Plan 2040, placing the Forum on a par with the non-statutory Business Improvement Districts in the City.

The Barbican & Golden Lane Neighbourhood Forum, under the Localism Act 2011, has statutory standing as a consultee in City planning policy and development control from the date of designation by the City, and not from the date of the Neighbourhood Plan. The City owes the Forum a statutory duty of cooperation from that same date.”

An Officer stated that the Barbican and Golden Lane Neighbourhood Forum was set up following this Committee's agreement of the statement of Community involvement in May 2023. The Statement of Community Involvement (SCI) mentioned neighbourhood forums and how to engage with them through the planning process. Officers stated they would update Appendix A of the SCI, which set out the specific groups that they would engage with to ensure the Neighbourhood Forum were mentioned specifically by name. The City Plan 2040 would be submitted to the Committee in January 2024 and it identified the Neighbourhood Forum within the relevant policy that related to the Smithfield and Barbican area. Furthermore, Officers within the Corporation worked closely with the neighbourhood forum in the development of their neighbourhood plan, in line with statutory duties. The Forum had been set up a consultee within the planning system for planning applications within their area. The Chairman thanked the Member for the question and asked Officers to ensure this was submitted to the Wardmote in writing for their next meeting.

A Member stated that she was a member of the London Cycling Campaign, and in their magazine they had mapped the most dangerous junctions in London between 2018 and 2022 for cyclists and pedestrians. She stated that as far as cyclists were concerned there were only two junctions, one at New Bridge Street at number 55 and 67 in the top 100. For pedestrians there was only one junction, but it was the fourth most dangerous with one fatality, four serious injuries and seven slight injuries to pedestrians. The junction was

between Cannon Street, King William Street, Eastcheap, and Gracechurch Street. The Member asked whether Officers could advise if they were aware of these statistics and if steps were being taken to improve this. An Officer explained that they were aware of those statistics and of the London Cycling campaign specifically the New City London Cycling Campaign Group. They had shared the statistics directly with the Environment Department. Officers were using this and cross referencing it against their own plans set out in both the Vision Zero plan and the Healthy Streets minor schemes programme. Regarding the junction which was the fourth most dangerous for people walking and wheeling, often referred to as the monument junction, this was part of the Transport for London's street networks. TfL were developing proposals for that junction and Officers had been working with TfL to improve this and to make it safer for people walking, wheeling and cycling and to travel through it. They were expecting to consult on the draft design of this project after the Mayoral elections in May 2024. There would be a briefing for local Members and stakeholders in advance. Finally, this was also on the agenda for the upcoming meeting with the TfL Commissioner which the Chairman of this Committee and the Chairman of Policy and Resources Committee would be attending.

A Member raised concern about Conway storage containers in her ward, including a number of Conway shipping containers which had been on Vine Street for many years. The Member stated that a large part of the pavement had been taken over with signs and bollards and asked when these would be moved. The Officer explained that they would consult colleagues and provide the Member with a written response.

A Member stated that one of the suggestions from a briefing that has taken place with a dockless cycle operator, was whether there was a way to get feedback from building tenants on the usage of their cycle bays, whether they were all being used and whether a frequency analysis report could be brought back to the Committee. It was possible that there was less usage of these bays than expected, if more people were hiring cycles instead. The Chairman asked Officers to provide the Member with a written response. He added that a report detailing the relationship with dockless operators would be submitted to the Streets and Walkways Sub-Committee, including the measures available, whether the regulatory frameworks meant conditions could be imposed, the way they operated and what good behaviour should entail. This could lead to a possible voluntary charter in the lack of any legislative legislation from central government. The Chairman asked that this report be submitted to the Streets and Walkways Sub-Committee and then to the Planning and Transportation Committee. A Member asked that this report include the background history including information on the memorandum of understanding with the previous dockless bike operators and she stated that they operated without the current negative impacts.

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

The Chairman informed the Committee that the City's Planning Department City's Planning Division had won the Royal Town Planning Institute's national award in November as the UK's Best Planning Authority. This followed on from winning the London's Best Planning Authority award in summer. The judges

said that the City of London was “setting an example for cities across the world to follow” and were particularly impressed with the innovative microclimatic modelling work and the manner in which the division managed stakeholder relationships.

**17. EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC**

**RESOLVED** – That under Section 100(A) of the Local Government Act 1972, the public be excluded from the meeting for the following items on the grounds that they involve the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in Part I of the Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act.

**18. NON-PUBLIC MINUTES**

**RESOLVED** – That the non-public minutes of the meeting held on 21 November 2023 be approved as an accurate record.

**19. DEBT ARREARS - ENVIRONMENT DEPARTMENT (P&T COMMITTEE) FOR THE PERIOD ENDING - 30TH SEPTEMBER 2023\***

The Committee received a report of the Interim Executive Director Environment regarding the debt arrears of the Environment Department (P&T Committee) for the period ending on 30th September 2023.

**RESOLVED** – To note the report.

**20. NON-PUBLIC QUESTIONS ON MATTERS RELATING TO THE WORK OF THE COMMITTEE**

There were no non-public questions.

**21. ANY OTHER BUSINESS THAT THE CHAIRMAN CONSIDERS URGENT AND WHICH THE COMMITTEE AGREES SHOULD BE CONSIDERED WHILST THE PUBLIC ARE EXCLUDED**

There were no additional urgent items of business for consideration in the non-public session.

**The meeting closed at 12.10 pm**

-----  
Chairman

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