

PLANNING AND TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE

Wednesday, 31 January 2024

Minutes of the meeting of the Planning and Transportation Committee held at the Guildhall EC2 at 9.00 am

Present

Members:

Deputy Shravan Joshi (Chairman)	Alderwoman Jennette Newman
Graham Packham (Deputy Chairman)	Deborah Oliver
Brendan Barns	Alderwoman Susan Pearson
Deputy Simon Duckworth	Judith Pleasance
Mary Durcan	Alderman Simon Pryke
John Edwards	Ian Seaton
Deputy John Fletcher	Hugh Selka
Deputy Marianne Fredericks	William Upton KC
Deputy Charles Edward Lord	Jacqui Webster
Deputy Brian Mooney	

Officers:

Polly Dunn	- Assistant Town Clerk
Zoe Lewis	- Town Clerk's Department
Fleur Francis	- Comptroller and City Solicitor's Department
Gudrun Andrews	- Environment Department
Rob McNicol	- Environment Department
Bruce McVean	- Environment Department
Tom Nancollas	- Environment Department
Garima Nayyar	- Environment Department
Gwyn Richards	- Environment Department
Michelle Ross	- Environment Department
Peter Wilson	- Environment Department
Gwyn Richards	- Environment Department
Dionne Williams-Dodoo	- People and HR
Adeola Lawal	- People and HR

1. APOLOGIES

Apologies for absence were received from Deputy Randall Anderson, Ian Bishop-Laggett, Dawn Frampton, Jaspreet Hodgson, Alderman Robert Hughes-Penney, Deputy Henry Pollard and Shailendra Umradia.

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 12 December 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.

RECEIVED.

5. **CITY PLAN 2040**

The Committee considered a report of the Interim Executive Director Environment concerning the City Plan.

Officers gave a presentation on the City Plan 2040. An Officer stated that the City Plan was the City of London Corporation's vision for how the Square Mile would develop up to 2040, and it set out a suite of policies to guide development in the city, ensuring growth was economically, socially and environmentally sustainable.

The Officer stated that the plan had been in production for a number of years, with initial issues and options explored and consulted on in 2016, a draft plan consulted on in 2018/19, and a proposed submission version of the plan produced and consulted on in 2021. At that point Members had decided to revise the plan and undertake further work and increase the evidence base.

Members were informed that over the last 18 months, new evidence had been produced and further informal engagement had taken place. The City Plan had been amended to reflect the findings, the engagement responses received, and to align the plan with other updated corporate strategies. Work was also informed by the advice of the Local Plans Sub-Committee. The Officer stated that the evidence documents were available on the Corporation's website, and they included extensive work on historic buildings, tall buildings and their impacts on office demand and capacity.

The Officer stated that the consultants from Arup and from Knight Frank were in attendance at the meeting.

An Officer stated that the plan had also been updated in light of changes to the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) in December 2023. Work had been undertaken to ensure alignment both with national policies in the NPPF and regional policies in the London Plan. Changes to the NPPF included how the housing requirement was to be calculated, changes to the transitional arrangements and the timings the City Plan would be examined against.

Officers outlined the outcomes of engagement, the direction of the redrafted plan and they summarised the main changes to policies. They proposed that the latest version of the City Plan be progressed through pre-submission consultation before being submitted to the Secretary of State for public examination.

An Officer stated that the Corporation had its own suite of strategies and policies, many of which were currently being refreshed, and these had been woven into many aspects of the City Plan. There was also a broad suite of planning guidance and supplementary planning documents which had informed the City Plan.

The next steps were outlined to Members. An Officer stated that if the Committee approved the plan, it would be submitted to the Policy and Resources Committee and then to the Court of Common Council in March 2024. Regulation 19 consultation would then be undertaken in which there would be an opportunity for all interested parties to comment on the plan. All of the previous consultation responses had been published as part of the statement of consultation that would be provided to the planning inspector when the City Plan was submitted, and Officers stated that they would strongly recommend that people should make their representations known, as the plan had significantly changed since previous versions.

Following the Regulation 19 consultation, responses would be submitted to the Secretary of State with the plan and he would appoint an independent examiner from the planning inspectorate to undertake a public examination. There would be public hearings and those who had made representations could take part. There would be a report from the inspector that would set out any changes that might be required to the plan. It would then be brought back to the Committee seeking approval to adopt the City Plan in summer 2025.

An Officer stated that the London Plan aimed to create 3.5 million square metres of additional office floorspace within central London over the time period of 2016 to 2041. It expected local authorities to support the unique agglomerations and dynamic clusters of world city businesses within the Central Activities Zone. The City of London Corporation was the key agglomeration area and as such, national and internationally significant office functions should be supported as well as the centres of excellence and specialist clusters that were in the square mile e.g. the legal cluster within the west of the city.

Members were informed that The London Plan also addressed issues of heritage and issues of tall buildings. Boroughs needed to include policies to conserve, promote and actively protect and interpret the outstanding universal value of world heritage sites. The Tower of London was a world heritage site on the City's border. The Mayor for London had also identified three strategically important landmarks and designated views – St. Paul's Cathedral, the Palace of Westminster and the Tower of London that should be reflected in local plans. Development plans also needed to set a definition for tall buildings for particular localities and to determine if there were locations where tall buildings might be an inappropriate form of development. Building heights should be identified on maps in development plans. The London Plan also expected the distinct environment and heritage of the Central Activities Zone to be sustained and enhanced.

An Officer outlined the main areas of the City Plan that had changed and developed. He stated that the City Plan sought to provide an additional 1.2 million square metres of office floor space as a minimum. This figure was based on the extensive study that was conducted by Arup and Knight Frank, which explored three major different scenarios for how office workers might occupy their workspaces in the future. The central projection had been chosen as the one to inform the City Plan although trends over recent months indicated that there could be a need for more floor space, which was why 1.2 million square metres was set as a minimum figure.

An in-house modelling exercise, looking at where the capacity for new office floor space might come forward within the city had been undertaken, and this highlighted the importance of the city cluster and ensuring that there was sufficient capacity for growth in the future. Evidence published on the Corporation's website showed that the city cluster was required to have the potential to provide over 700,000 square metres of additional office floorspace in addition to the approvals that were in the pipeline and this constituted over 50% of the floor space capacity within the City.

As well as a strategic policy on offices set out in the City Plan and policy setting out the types of office development to be encouraged in the square mile, the plan also set out a policy which sought to protect existing floor space. This reflected the findings around Grade B office space, where demand was waning and it introduced a retrofit fast track, allowing a more straightforward route to change use to hotels, cultural and education uses in certain circumstances where existing buildings were being retained.

In relation to sustainable development, there was a need for development to follow a retrofit first approach to their sites with a requirement for a thorough exploration of the potential for retaining and retrofitting existing buildings as a starting point for appraising site options. This would be one of the first local plans to articulate the retrofit first approach. This did not mean retrofit only e.g. there would be sites where there was a potential significant uplift for new development, which could then capitalise on the city's public transport accessibility. Developments were required to establish the most sustainable and suitable approach for the site.

There was a new policy on biodiversity net gain, which included approaches that would support the biodiversity action plan. This included introducing a strategy for green routes connecting up the sites of importance for nature conservation around the City, helping to create green corridors for wildlife. This was complemented by the existing urban greening factor approach in the City Plan, and both would help improve and enhance the biodiversity and greening of the city as development came forward.

The Officer stated that the Destination City vision was woven throughout the plan. It covered a broad range of different policies, from those on open spaces and retail to the approach to the supply of hotels. The plan put greater emphasis on the need to deliver a wide range of inclusive cultural and other public spaces. This work had been informed by the cultural planning

framework, which had been developed in collaboration with Publica, and required the provision of on-site facilities for arts, culture and leisure from the largest developments. Medium sized developments would be required to contribute either on-site or through a financial contribution. This complemented the approach on tall buildings, which required those developments to incorporate publicly accessible open space. Many viewing galleries, roof gardens and public spaces had been delivered in recent months and years.

Other priorities for the plan were -

- to create a more inclusive, healthier and safer city for everybody;
- to create a square mile that promoted equity, diversity and social inclusion in the design and use of buildings and public spaces; and
- to promote the expansion of the City's sport and recreation offer by encouraging sport and recreation provision as parts of new development and helping to deliver a network of free outdoor sporting facilities in the City.

There were also policies in the plan to support suicide prevention, the creation of quieter areas in the city and the need to incorporate safety and security into the design of buildings from the outset.

In relation to housing and residential areas, the plan set out a requirement of a total of 1,706 dwellings over 15 years from 2025/26. This was informed by the London Plan requirement for 146 dwellings per year up to 2029, and the government's national standard methodology, which gave a figure of 102 units beyond this time frame. Specific site allocations had not been identified, but there were significant amounts of approvals in the pipeline. Over time, historically, the City had delivered an average of 174 units per year, well above the 114 units that would be required on average over the lifetime of this plan. Policies in the plan set out the suitable locations for new housing as well as setting out a clear approach to protecting the amenity of existing residents in the City.

Policies on tall buildings, views and heritage had been informed by updated evidence. In relation to tall buildings, an extensive assessment exercise was undertaken and it was found that most of the City was very sensitive to tall building development. Only two areas were identified as sensitive, meaning that they could in principle accommodate more tall building development. These were the City Cluster and the Holborn and Fleet Valley area to the west of the city.

Heights were modelled using 3D modelling software and over 70 strategic views drawn from the Mayor's London View Management Framework, the UNESCO guidance relating to the Tower of London and other local policy and guidance. This shaped not only the areas which would be, in principle, appropriate for tall building development but also the heights that would be appropriate in principle. There was a complex array of strategic view constraints which were used to produce contour maps for proposed tall building development. Members were shown images of the modelling and constraints.

The Chairman thanked Officers for their work on this substantial piece of work and stated that the City Plan provided a concise and clear a vision for the City and he welcomed sustainability being at the heart of the plan.

The Chairman asked for Members' questions of Officers.

In relation to questions about the Bevis Marks Synagogue, the Officer stated that the City Plan proposed a new immediate setting area for Bevis Marks Synagogue. This was the area around the synagogue judged by Officers to contribute positively to its significance as a listed building. These elements could be protected in future planning decisions. This was a bespoke proposal for the synagogue and was similar to the Monument immediate setting area, which already existed. The proposal for the synagogue was the result of a listening exercise which came from the previous Regulation 19 consultation in 2021, where many representations were made requesting this kind of proposal. Proposals for the immediate setting were shared with the synagogue as they were an important stakeholder as the long-term occupant of the building to which the immediate setting area related. However, it was considered that any amendments proposed by the synagogue should be considered with the full range of stakeholder responses as part of the Regulation 19 consultation so that all views in relation to amending any parts of this immediate setting proposal could be taken into account.

The Officer stated that the immediate setting consisted of those elements of the listed buildings setting which contributed to its significance and the synagogue courtyard. The wider setting was the modern city scene which consisted of tall buildings, and some tall buildings were already visible in relation to the synagogue and from the synagogue courtyard. Officers considered that the wider modern setting did not contribute to the synagogue's significance.

In response to Members' questions about tall buildings, an Officer stated that the London Plan required a positive approach to the siting of tall buildings. The current policy in the adopted plan stated that tall buildings in inappropriate areas would be refused without any form of assessment and the City Plan sought to conform with the London Plan.

A Member commented on the reference to Smithfield Market relocating on page 305 of the agenda pack and asked if the wording "should the market be relocated" could be replaced with "when the market relocates". The Officer stated that the conditional term had been used just in case the market did not relocate, although it was understood that in the Corporation's perspective there was the full intention for the market to relocate. Planning documents had to plan for various different scenarios and therefore the conditional term had been used. It was expected that by the time the plan was adopted in 2025, this could be a modification that would be recommended to the inspector.

A Member queried how long the Article 4 direction in relation to housing would be in place. An Officer stated that Article 4 directions were put in place by the City of London Corporation and they lasted until they were withdrawn or potentially amended by the Secretary of State. Although there was no indication

that that would be the case, Members were reminded that the City of London was the only place where an Article 4 direction had been allowed by the Secretary of State to cover the entire area of the local authority. The retrofit fast track approach introduced a policy for routes through different alternative uses, where an office floor space would be proposed to be lost. In all scenarios there would be a requirement for marketing evidence covering a period of no less than 12 months for that office to continue as office uses. There were then a number of approaches. The detail of these approaches was set out in the Officer report and was outlined by Officers.

A Member raised concerns about daylight and sunlight assessments not being cumulative and taking account of previous light loss and asked whether they could take account of previous light loss e.g. over the previous 5 years. An Officer stated that local planning authorities had to adhere to the BRE guidance which did not provide a methodology for assessing cumulative impacts going back over time.

In response to Members' questions about the modelling of office floorspace requirement and how figures compared to other financial centres around the world, an Officer stated that there was 1.47 million additional square metres of floorspace that could come forward. A modelling exercise had been undertaken to look at potential capacity on different sites. Factors including economic growth would have a significant impact on the extent to which new office development came forward in the City and 1.2 million square metres of additional office floorspace was the minimum amount required. The City Cluster played a vital role in meeting demand, and the sites within that area were very tightly constrained.

The Officer stated that sites had to deliver office floor space as well as wider benefits. The City was providing the most significant amount of additional floorspace over the next 15 years compared to other London boroughs. It was difficult to compare figures internationally as the City of London was a small area but vacancy rates were a useful indicator of the current situation. Vacancy rates were around 22% for New York, 11% for Singapore and 14% for Hong Kong. Paris and Tokyo had lower vacancy rates. London's vacancy rate as a whole had decreased since the pandemic to around 7.3%. Within the City, the vacancy rate was approximately 10%. Vacancy rates for best-in-class office space were just under 7%. Vacancy rates for other office stock was increasing to 10% and above. Although vacancy rates depended on economic cycles and many other factors, currently London was performing well but there was a need to provide additional floorspace to retain a low vacancy rate.

In response to a Member's request for more information on the aspects which made the City attractive for offices to be located, the Officer stated that there were unrivalled public transport connections and over 6 million people of working age were within a 45 minute journey of the square mile. 99.6% of the City's offices were within a 5-minute walk of one public transport tube station or mainline railway station and many were within more than a 5-minute walk of more than one station. The time zone London was in was also a benefit. London's cultural offer, including Destination City, was another benefit plus

amenity space was being provided within offices and also in the wider area. Occupiers wanted environmental credentials within their buildings.

In response to a Member's question about the risks of a pepper-potting approach of residential units, the Officer stated that it was important to maintain a separation between allowing office growth and offices to thrive and to reduce impacts of both uses on each other. A Member endorsed this approach and stated that there had been difficulties when residential buildings were within an office area.

A Member commented on how well connected the City was but raised concern about it being one of the oldest parts of the network. She emphasised the need of upgrading to ensure accessibility and raised particular concern about overcrowding at Tower Hill Station. She stated that to encourage more tall buildings, developers would need to fund the upgrading of the tube network and the transport network. She also stated that riverside walkways were congested and this would need to be addressed. An Officer stated that under the planning contributions policy, appropriate contributions were sought from developers. Contributions were required, specifically through the Community infrastructure Levy to assist in the delivery of the infrastructure necessary to support the implementation of the City Plan and the City's Transport Strategy. In addition, the government and TfL were frequently in negotiations about long term funding for TfL, to assist them to upgrade their stations.

A Member raised concerns about noise complaints from Southwark. Officers would discuss noise issues through the duty to cooperate meetings. There was formal process through the duty to cooperate process, so statements of common ground could be agreed. A Member commented that noise issues across the river had been ongoing for many years.

A Member stated that the context in the history of when Bevis Marks Synagogue and St Paul's Cathedral were built had contributed to their design and size, but they were both living embodiments of their religions and both buildings, irrelevant of size were important heritage buildings. She stated that a development was refused due to the impact on the synagogue and stated the importance of the sky and view around the courtyard of the synagogue as a religious building as well as the importance of light into the synagogue. She stated that the same protection should be given to the heritage skyline. The Member stated that there were concerns about protection being removed under policy 14. She also stated the suggestion put forward by the synagogue to widen the immediate area could help address concerns. She suggested that before going out to consultation, the area could be widened and then if people wanted it reduced, they could respond accordingly.

An Officer stated that the seclusion of the synagogue, reflected its origins and the history of that community at that time. It was in recognition of this that the proposed area had been proposed. The Officer stated that during the Regulation 19 consultation, there would be an opportunity for full consideration by bodies such as Historic England. He added that Officers considered that the

sky setting of the synagogue as compared to the sky setting of the cathedral, was fundamentally different.

The London Plan's proactive approach to the location of tall buildings was being followed and each proposal was taken on its merits. Areas were being outlined where tall buildings would be appropriate in principle, rather than where they would be inappropriate. The Officer stated that a decision in December 2023 designated a conservation area which had a tall building within the designation. He added that the Barbican Conservation Area was a conservation area characterised by tall buildings.

A Member asked how the future requirement of office floorspace was measured. An Officer stated that employment forecasts were the starting point and a pan-London approach was needed. The work of the GLA on employment projections was taken into account.

Matt Dillon, Director and Leader of the City Economics team at Arup, stated that along with Andrew Tyler at Frank Knight, the team had produced the report on office space forecasts. A model for future office needs was based on a number of factors - economic growth projections broken down by subsector and area of London, trends in office attendance, the number of office contracts that lasted for 10 years, the flight to quality and the square feet per employee (which had decreased prior to the pandemic but was now increasing), trends in prices and potential price softening. Three different scenarios were outlined in the report, which produced a spread of between 6 and 20 million square feet needed by 2040 or 2042. The middle scenario was then chosen. He added that it should be noted that the return to the office had been stronger than might have been assumed at the time and whilst economic growth had been weak, London's performance within that looked to be strong.

Andrew Tyler, Frank Knight stated that the government had set out the minimum energy standards for Energy Performance Certificates (EPC's) to ensure that all buildings were rated B by 2030. Across London, 140,000,000 square feet was rated C or below. In the City submarkets, 32 million square feet of offices was rated C or below and 60% was 100,000 square feet or above. He stated that it would be difficult for smaller buildings to achieve the required EPC ratings. The flight to quality from the occupiers also meant Grade B offices no longer had much demand in the City.

In response to a Member's questions, an Officer stated that the immediate setting proposals both of the Monument and the Bevis Marks Synagogue were not designed to curtail the statutory duty to have regard to their settings. The local planning authority did not have the power to change their status and was trying to be more explicit and articulate about the elements of setting in these two very important cases which contributed to significance and which were therefore worth preserving. The silhouettes or the envelopes proposing as part of the tall building strategy were fundamentally shaped by their impacts or the impacts of them on the three strategic landmarks and they satisfied D9A and 9B of London plan policy, which was where tall buildings should be located and

to what heights notionally. This did not remove the need for any qualitative assessment of the individual schemes as they came forward.

A Member asked for clarity on the representation from SAVE Britain's Heritage. An Officer stated that the City Plan was not trying to limit in any way the protection afforded to the synagogue, it was trying to articulate those precise elements of the setting that made a positive contribution to its significance. This did not supersede in any way the standard processes by which proposals and their impact on the building and its setting would be assessed.

The legal adviser addressed the statutory requirements as they were overarching and applied separately to the development plan and there were strong duties. She stated that statute protected all listed buildings. The legal adviser stated that statute protected all listed buildings (Section 66 of the Listed Building and Conservation Areas Act) and that setting had a very wide definition in the national policy framework. The development plan could not reduce the statutory protection, so the setting of the Bevis Marks Synagogue remained protected by statute. The legal adviser stated that harm to the significance of the asset as a result of impact on any part of the setting must by law be given considerable importance and weight, so the identification of an immediate setting could not leave the balance of the setting unprotected. The aim of identifying the immediate setting was initial planning judgment for the purpose of the plan and as to that part of the setting on which the building most relied for its significance. The impact of a building anywhere within its setting would need to be judged on a case-by-case basis as applications were received and this would include any impacts on the existing sky gaps if they formed part of the setting. In relation to questions about whether it should be extended to include the whole block, Officers considered that choosing a whole city block as an immediate setting when significant parts of it might be outside the setting would present difficulties, would be difficult to defend and have a sound argument at public examination.

Seeing no further questions, the Chairman moved to the debate on the item. He stated that following this scrutiny by the Planning and Transportation Committee, there would then be scrutiny by the Policy and Resources Committee and then scrutiny at the Court of Common Council. After this, the influence Members would have would end and it would become a technical document to go towards public consultation. All stakeholders would be able to express their views during the formal, statutory consultation. The City Plan would then be submitted to the Secretary of State with all the representations made under the Regulation 19 consultation for the Secretary of State to decide if any amendments were required. The Chairman stated that this plan was started in 2016 and it was going through a thorough process. He added that it was imperative to continue with the process to get to the end stage.

A Member asked for clarification on the process after the Regulation 19 consultation. The Chairman clarified that it was intended that after the Regulation 19 consultation and any corrections being made, the Plan would be submitted as a whole and he stated that there was substantial evidence that underpinned it. He stated that the Planning and Transportation Committee,

Policy and Resources Committee and the Court of Common Council were being asked to approve the plan as a whole., to allow it to go through to the next stage of public consultation and any modifications proposed, if there were any, would go to the Secretary of State and then public examination.

A Member asked for clarification on the process to be followed if modifications were required. An Officer stated that, subject to approval, a list of further changes to the City Plan in response to public representations would be compiled by the Planning and Development Director in liaison with the Chairman and Deputy Chairman of the Planning and Transportation Committee. This was the standard approach that was taken by many local authorities and it would enable the plan to be progressed quickly to the Secretary of State, and then to a planning inspector to allow them to consider all the issues. The planning inspector would put together those modifications that they considered necessary to make the plan sound. Any modifications put by the planning inspector would be subject to further consultation following the examination in public. The Officer recommendations included authorisation to the Planning and Development Director, in consultation with the Chairman and Deputy Chairman to make non-material amendments and editorial changes in the lead up to the public consultation.

A Member raised concern that the process outlined could mean the plan submitted to the Secretary of State was different to that approved. She suggested there should be a special meeting of the Planning and Transportation Committee if modifications were required. The Chairman stated that there had been a number of Member briefings, Members had had sight of the City Plan and the Local Plans Sub-Committee had scrutinised the plan so there had been many opportunities for comments. The Secretary of State would be given details of the process and changes that had taken place as part of the transparent process. It was important that the inspector and the Secretary of State scrutinised the Corporation's processes.

A Member suggested that the policies, documents and maps could be made more user-friendly and that processes should be fair and transparent to encourage people to engage.

A Member suggested that any changes agreed by the Director of Planning and Development, the Chairman and Deputy Chairman could be shared with the Committee Members.

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

Votes were cast as follows: IN FAVOUR – 18 votes
OPPOSED – None
There was 1 abstention.

The recommendations were therefore carried.

RESOLVED – That Members of The Committee

1. Agree the proposed changes to the City Plan set out in Appendix 2 of the Officer report and that the City Plan 2040 (Appendix 3 of the Officer report) be published for pre-submission consultation, subject to the approval of the Policy and Resources Committee and Court of Common Council;
2. Agree that, following consultation, the City Plan, the public representations and other supporting documentation be submitted to the Secretary of State, for examination;
3. Authorise the Planning and Development Director, in liaison with the Chair and Deputy Chair of the Planning & Transportation Committee, to compile a list of further changes to the City Plan in response to public representations and submit this to the Secretary of State; and
4. Authorise the Planning and Development Director to make further non-material amendments and editorial changes prior to public consultation and submission to the Secretary of State.

6. *** ANNUAL ON-STREET PARKING ACCOUNTS 2022/23 AND RELATED FUNDING OF HIGHWAY IMPROVEMENTS AND SCHEMES**

The Committee received a report of the Chamberlain concerning the Annual On-Street Parking Accounts and Related Funding of Highways Improvements and Schemes before submission to the Mayor for London.

RESOLVED - That Members of the Committee note the contents of the report before submission to the Mayor for London.

7. *** TO NOTE THE MINUTES OF THE PLANNING APPLICATIONS SUB-COMMITTEE - 8 DECEMBER 2023**

The Committee received the public minutes of the meeting held on 8 December 2023.

RECEIVED.

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

A Member stated that he had been liaising with Officers on whether a register existed of conditioned community, cultural and heritage space and also start-up space and space for social enterprises and charity use. He had been advised that there was not a register but a draft was in process.

The Member asked how these were recorded so that they could be promoted to interested parties and how the spaces were monitored post development to ensure they were being used for the correct purpose or whether they were used at all.

An Officer stated that there were some community spaces in operation and there were more currently under construction. Officers would consider which team corporately should keep records and Members would be kept updated. The Officer thanked the Member for raising this and stated that a register would be maintained and publicised externally.

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

Member-Led Recruitment

The Committee considered a report of the Chief People Officer and Executive Director of Human Resources which outlined the proposed process for the recruitment to the Executive Director of Environment post. This report had been circulated as a late report.

An Officer stated that it was intended to have recruited to this post by mid-April 2024. The candidate's start date would be dependent on their availability. The Officer stated that the report would also be submitted to the Corporate Services Committee, Port Health and Environmental Services Committee, the Natural Environment Board and also the Licensing Committee under urgency in order to progress with the recruitment as soon as possible. The Officer highlighted the elements of the recruitment process which were set out in the Officer report.

A Member stated the importance of seeking applicants widely from different backgrounds and requested that this take place.

RESOLVED – That Members of the Committee

1. Agree the proposed recruitment timetable (including assessment centre) as outlined in the Officer report;
2. Agree the proposed Interview panel as outlined in this report;
3. Agree the proposed selection of search and select agencies (headhunters) for this appointment; and
4. Agree that decisions on alternative panel representation from the committee, e.g. in the event of an absence or availability of a Member is delegated to the Town Clerk and Chief Executive. This is to allow the recruitment to continue without delay.

Alan Benson

The Chairman stated that it was with great sadness that the news of Alan Benson's death last month was received. He stated that Alan was a passionate and tireless campaigner for disabled people's right to travel freely and confidently. His work included co-chairing Transport for All, the disabled-led group that worked to break down barriers to create an accessible transport system and the City of London Corporation had been working with the group for a number of years.

The Chairman added that as a member of the Transport Strategy Board, Alan had a significant influence on the City's efforts to make its streets accessible and inclusive. He stated that Alan would be sorely missed and he would like to take this opportunity for the Committee to record his considerable contribution to improving travel for disabled people and to offer sincere condolences to Alan's wife, his family and his colleagues.

10. **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 involved the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in Part I of the Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act.

11. **NON-PUBLIC MINUTES**

RESOLVED – That the non-public minutes of the meeting held on 12 December 2023 be approved as an accurate record.

12. * **ANNUAL ON-STREET PARKING ACCOUNTS 2022/23 AND RELATED FUNDING OF HIGHWAY IMPROVEMENTS AND SCHEMES - NON-PUBLIC APPENDIX**

RESOLVED - That the non-public appendix be noted.

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

There were no non-public questions.

14. **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 11.00 am

Chairman

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