

**PLANNING APPLICATIONS SUB-COMMITTEE**  
**Tuesday, 10 September 2024**

Minutes of the meeting of the Planning Applications Sub-Committee held at Livery Hall - Guildhall on Tuesday, 10 September 2024 at 10.30 am

**Present**

**Members:**

Graham Packham (Deputy Chairman)  
Deputy Randall Anderson  
Ian Bishop-Laggett  
Deputy John Edwards  
Deputy John Fletcher  
Deputy Marianne Fredericks  
Amy Horscroft  
Deputy Charles Edward Lord  
Deputy Brian Mooney BEM  
Eamonn Mullally  
Deborah Oliver  
William Upton KC  
Jacqui Webster

**Officers:**

Zoe Lewis	-	Town Clerk's Department
Polly Dunn	-	Interim Assistant Town Clerk
Fleur Francis	-	Comptroller and City Solicitor's Department
David Horkan	-	Environment Department
Samuel James	-	Environment Department
Kieran McCallum	-	Environment Department
Rob McNicol	-	Environment Department
Tom Nancollas	-	Environment Department
Joanna Parker	-	Environment Department
Gwyn Richards	-	Environment Department
Robin Whitehouse	-	Environment Department
Peter Wilson	-	Environment Department

**1. APOLOGIES**

Apologies for absence were received from Mary Durcan, Anthony Fitzpatrick, Jaspreet Hodgson, Alderman Robert Hughes-Penney, Deputy Shравan Joshi, Alderwoman Elizabeth King, Deputy Natasha Lloyd-Owen, Deputy Alastair Moss, Judith Pleasance, Deputy Henry Pollard, Alderman Simon Pryke, Ian Seaton and Hugh Selka.

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

Deputy Edward Lord stated they were a Governor of the City of London School for Girls and they would therefore not be participating in the consideration of

Agenda Item 5. The Legal Officer stated that the last time the Board of Governors had considered a report relating to this matter was 2021 when they were not a Governor but it was at their discretion whether they wanted to take part. Deputy Edward Lord stated although they were not a Governor at that time they would not participate.

3. **MINUTES**

**RESOLVED** – That the public minutes of the meeting held on 11 July 2024 be agreed as a correct record subject to the following amendment:

That the reference to File Transfer protocol service in Agenda Item 5 be replaced by FTTP Fibre to the Premise Services.

4. **45 BEECH STREET, LONDON, EC2Y 8AD**

The Sub-Committee considered a report of the Planning and Development Director concerning the partial demolition, extension and change of use of existing office building to Class E co-living accommodation in the form of 174 private units with associated internal and external amenity spaces (sui generis) including cycle storage, landscaping, servicing and all other associated works.

The Town Clerk referred to those papers set out within the main agenda pack as well as the Officer presentation slides and two addenda which had been separately circulated and published. Officers presented the application stating that 45 Beech Street was also known as Murray House. It was a corner property that fronted the Beech Street tunnel to the south, beneath the Barbican Podium and residential Bridgewater House on Bridgewater Street to the north and the Barbican Estate which was also residential was to the rear. The three buildings enclosed a courtyard area and ramped access which led from Bridgewater Street into the basement of the site. The site was not a listed building, and was not in a conservation area, however it was immediately adjacent to The Barbican Estate (Grade II\* listed), Barbican Registered Historic Park and Garden (Grade II\* listed), and the Barbican and Golden Lane Conservation Area.

Members were shown the existing views from the Barbican Podium looking west, Beech Street looking west from the junction of Beech Street and Bridgewater Street with the tunnel and supporting structures in front of the building entrance, with the building entrance located in the middle of the southern façade and accessed by a number of steps. Members were informed that step-free access was provided via a ramp and a separate door to the west. They were also informed that neither the southern nor eastern ground floor bays offered active engagement of visual interest with the streets they addressed. In the existing view from the southside of Beech Street looking west, Members were shown the floor condition was currently highly compromised by the construction of the tunnel which had created a poor pedestrian environment. The Officer highlighted images from the existing courtyard with the top of the ramp and access to basement.

The Officer stated that the application property, Briar Court and Bridgewater House enclosed a courtyard area and ramped vehicle access. The building was

currently accessed by pedestrians from Beech Street via two separate entrances, one ramped and one stepped. Internally the building did not currently provide step-free access to the lifts due to internal level changes. There were currently seven existing car parking spaces located along the ramp and in the basement and there was an existing UKPN substation to be retained.

Members were shown the existing first floor and ground floor plans. They were also shown the existing front elevation showing the main entrance below the Barbican Podium and were informed that the existing building had a significant amount of telecommunications equipment cluttering the roofscape. Members were also shown the existing Bridgewater Street elevation with a section of the podium and the west and north elevations within the courtyard.

Members were shown plans of the extent of the demolition. They were informed that the core was to be deconstructed, largely due to the need for an additional stairwell for fire safety needed in residential property as well as to improve access and inclusivity within the building. The columns and floor plates were to be retained.

The demolition east elevation showed the removal of the top two full storeys of the building and the plant areas above which equalled 957 square metres of floor space. The proposal was for the major refurbishment with extensions to upper floors. 90% of the substructure, 66% of the super structure and 0% of the facades would be retained.

The Officer stated that the proposal was for the change of use of the building to provide 174 private co-living units as well as communal space. Co-living, also known as large-scale purpose-built shared living was a form of non-self-contained housing, generally made up of at least 50 private rooms together with communal shared spaces and facilities. This was a type of accommodation seen as providing an alternative to traditional flat shares, and it included additional services and facilities, which could include room cleaning, bed linen services and on-site gym facilities, as well as concierge services. In terms of use class, co-living was not defined as C1 which would be a hotel, C2 residential institutions nor C3 which was self-contained housing. It was distinct from those uses and was sui generis use class.

Members were informed the proposal would result in the loss of 5,284 square metres of office floor space. Officers did not consider this to prejudice the primary business function of the city, nor would it jeopardise future assembly or delivery of large office development sites. It would not introduce uses that adversely affected the existing beneficial mix of commercial uses. The Officer stated that it had been demonstrated through viability testing and marketing that the continued use of the building as an office was not viable in the longer term in this largely residential area and therefore the proposed change of use was acceptable in principle. The Officer added that the loss of office was policy compliant, and the site was considered suitable for the proposed co-living use. The scheme had been through affordable housing viability testing and approximately £8.5 million would be secured towards off-site affordable housing

if permission was granted. This element of the application had been subject to third-party review by a financial viability consultant.

Members were informed that the proposed basement would contain several amenities for the future residents, including a gym and workout studio, a TV room and a laundry room. It would also contain the cycle parking for the development, including 134 long stay spaces as well as the plant and refuse storage. The laundry room and gym would provide direct level access into the courtyard amenity area. There would be no vehicle access to the basement.

Members were informed that the proposed ground floor would contain the publicly accessible cafe and co-working space either side of the main reception area. There would be a resident only working area and the combined communal kitchen and dining area for residents. There would also be two bookable rooms, one for dining and one which was described as for multi-use, such as meetings. The Officer highlighted the location of the refuse collection area onto Bridgewater Street. Officers had assessed the quality of the proposed communal spaces to be acceptable, and they were in line with the relevant policies and guidance for co-living development. The primary entrance and ground floor plate would be altered to provide step-free access. The existing courtyard would be resurfaced, the top of the ramp closest to the entrance gate would be levelled off and an accessible parking space would be provided here. There would be no vehicle access to the remainder of the ramp beyond the space. The proposed facilities were suitably inclusive and accessible.

The Officer stated that floors 1-9 would house the private co-living units. A number of different private room layouts were proposed, and the floor areas were either 20 or 21 square metres for each of the standard room types. The floor to ceiling heights would be 2.5 metres. This was in line with the guidance set out in the relevant guidance document and this was considered acceptable. 10% of the rooms were proposed as accessible, which equated to 17, and these would be either 28 or 36 square metres in floor area. The proposed accessible units were considered suitably inclusive and acceptable, with regard to their layout and the layout of the wider building. The accessible units would be prioritised for disabled occupants and details of management and allocation of this, as well as the parking space were to be secured in the Section 106 agreement.

There were some identified shortfalls in the provision of daylight and sunlight to the proposed accommodation and communal facilities. Compared to the BRE guidance, however, officers considered the proposed quality of private accommodation and communal co-living facilities to be acceptable overall due to the variety of spaces proposed and the overall floor areas that would be provided. They would provide future residents with sufficient facilities for sleeping, eating, working, relaxing and storage in line with the guidance document and a full assessment of the daylight and sunlight internally could be found in the officer report.

Members were shown the proposed eighth floor plan. There were private balconies on the southern facing units. It was noted that the existing office building had a roof terrace in a similar location to this. The Officer outlined the proposed ninth floor plan, and the location of the proposed communal roof terrace at the end of a communal corridor. The space would incorporate fixed and unfixed furniture to create a flexible space whilst ensuring inclusivity and safety. Planters would run around the edge of the terrace behind the balustrading to create a planted edge and buffer to the terrace. It was noted that objections have been received due to noise and loss of privacy concerns from the terrace and the proposed development generally.

The Officer stated that overall there had been 66 objections to the proposal, which were summarised in the report and appended in full with amenity impacts assessed from paragraph 361. There would be no direct overlooking from the roof terrace due to the oblique angles between this and neighbouring residential windows. Furthermore, the edge planting would ensure any perceived privacy was retained and the detail of this was recommended to be secured by condition. There would be no harmful overlooking resulting from the proposal generally.

In relation to daylight and sunlight impacts, the proposed development had been identified as having some minor and major adverse impacts upon daylight and sunlight to surrounding residential properties. However, the majority of adversely impacted windows were serving bedrooms and had poor existing daylighting factors. The fact this was a tight-knit urban environment also meant that the existing daylight factors were poor. Officers had assessed the impacts to be acceptable and the daylight sunlight assessment submitted by the applicant had been third-party reviewed by the BRE who agreed with the conclusions and the methodology.

The Officer stated that objections relating to noise and disturbance would be addressed through conditions including restricting the hours of the proposed external amenity area, requiring there to be no music to be heard from outside the premises, nor played in the amenity areas as well as with the operational management plan, which was to be secured in the Section 106 agreement.

The proposed roof plan showed an extensive green roof combined with a photovoltaic solar panel system, the details of which would be secured by condition. The areas of plant were set back from the main roof.

Members were shown the proposed front elevation. It was proposed to build four new storeys, which would deliver an increase of approximately 1,700 square metres of floor space, which meant that approximately 7,000 square metres of total co-living floor space would be provided.

Members were shown the proposed east elevation from Bridgewater Street, and the proposed west and north elevations within the courtyard. The greatest alterations to bulk and massing came from the upward extension from Level 6, increasing the height of the building to a maximum height of 51.3 metres AOD, which included the plant and maintenance rail. The Officer stated that the

building would strike a comparative alignment in height with the two Barbican blocks, which flanked it, and Bridgewater House to the north.

The Officer stated the top of the building was expressed by a series of arched roofs, which on the south were set back from the body of the building, creating private terraces. The arches would be clad in zinc with deep reveals, the soffits of which would be decorated with the white metal batons to provide additional visual interest. The variations in the materiality would add texture and complexity to the roofscape, creating a positive sense of differentiation between 45 Beech Street and the surrounding Barbican blocks, which were cast in white painted concrete.

Members were informed the middle of the building was formed from a repeating bay module, framed by textured GRC (Glass Fibre Reinforced Concrete). The window module had been designed to maximise natural light, prevent overheating and provide natural ventilation through the fixed decorative panel. The windows had been set deeply within the facade to create natural solar shading and a more dynamic facade treatment. The entrances and ground floor bays at the base of the building would be given greater visual interest and prominence through the application of vibrant colour, texture and depth within their bays on Beech Street and Bridgewater Street, which would create a more vibrant and dynamic ground floor below the Barbican podium. This included the new entrance gate to the internal courtyard, which would also be painted in a vibrant orange colour and made from a decorative perforated pattern, enabling visibility into the courtyard. The majority of the ground floor bays, including the ground floor cafe, would be clear glazed to ensure views into and out of the ground floors, again adding animation to the surrounding streets.

Members were informed that Officers considered the architectural design of the building would be compatible with the existing context in terms of its scale and massing, and it would be read as a well-layered piece of design which would improve the building's contribution to the local townscape. The proposals would enhance the overall quality and character of the ground floors, which would be transformed to be outward-facing and visually permeable, encouraging a positive interaction with surrounding streets, as well as making the entrances to the buildings much more prominent and inclusive.

Members were shown a number of townscape views and were advised that Officers had assessed the impacts of the proposal on surrounding designated and non-designated heritage assets, including the Barbican as a Listed Building Conservation Area and registered Historic Park and Garden and concluded on all accounts the proposal would preserve the setting and significance of all. Furthermore, no objection was raised by Historic England or any other relevant heritage bodies.

In relation to the assessment conclusions, the Officer stated that the loss of office had been demonstrated to be acceptable and the site was considered suitable for a co-living, residential development. The quality of accommodation and communal facilities to be provided was considered acceptable and would contribute to the City's annual housing targets equivalent to 97 conventional

housing units and increased housing choice for City workers and Londoners generally, whilst £8,510,000 would be secured towards offsite affordable housing. The proposal was for the major refurbishment of the existing building, with extensions to upper floors, 90% of the substructure, 66% of the superstructure and 0% of the facades would be retained. Although the proposal would result in the highest life cycle carbon emissions out of the presented options, this option would be able to deliver the holistic sustainability benefits that would complement the redevelopment of the site in its context. Sustainability Officers were satisfied the proposal would deliver a high quality, energy efficient development which was on track to achieve an excellent BREEAM assessment rating. Officers considered the architectural design of the building would be compatible with the existing context in terms of scale and massing, and would be read as a well-laid piece of design, improving the building's contribution to the overall townscape. The proposal would enhance the overall quality and character of the ground floors and the building entrances would become much more prominent and inclusive.

Officers had assessed the impact of the proposal on surrounding heritage assets and the proposal would preserve the setting and significance of these. Officers had also considered the amenity impacts to be acceptable when considered on balance with other merits of the application. Other than the proposed accessible parking space, the development would be car-free. It had been assessed to have less highway activity than the existing use and this was subject to compliance with conditions and planning obligations, which were recommended, including the submission of a demolition and construction logistics plan, delivery and servicing plan and the parking design and management plan. A travel plan was also recommended to be secured by Section 106 agreement and a Section 278 agreement was recommended to secure the cost of public highway and public realm improvements which were required.

The Officer summarised stating the proposal would make the best use of land following a design-led approach which optimised the site's capacity to accommodate co-living housing, which would increase the housing stock and choice for Londoners, and the proposals aligned with the functions of the City to accommodate substantial growth. Officers considered the proposal complied with the development plan when considered as a whole. Officers recommended that planning permission should be granted as set out in the recommendation in the Officer report. Members were shown slides highlighting the CIL and Planning Obligations and Heads of Terms.

The Town Clerk explained that there were three registered objectors to address the meeting and she invited the objectors to speak.

Ms Joanna Boait, stated she was speaking on behalf of the Ben Johnson House Group Committee and the House Group members. She stated that whilst accepting that additional residences were necessary for the City, Ben Johnson House would be significantly adversely affected by the proposals for 45 Beech Street. The proposed added height would impact the daylight and sunlight that reached some of the flats. The Planning Officers had assessed the

impacts to be acceptable but had only assessed ten windows and had suggested that most of the impacted windows were bedrooms. Ms Boait stated that approximately half of the windows impacted a part of the daily living space of these flats, and for most flats the only other window was over 12 metres away on the south side of the building. The 34 additional windows in the upper floors meant that the residents of 45 Beech Street, especially at the north end, abutting Bridgewater House, would be able to see into rooms belonging to Ben Johnson House residents on the northern and western sides. She stated this was a significant invasion of privacy and given the impact on daylight and sunlight, she asked that the roof line be lowered or the upper floor set back.

Ms Boait stated it was understood the operational management plan would be refined and subject to a Section 106 agreement to secure the contents as obligations. She added that there were to be 174 residential rooms and point 116 of the Officer report stated that none of the rooms were considered large enough for occupation by couples. The operational management plan should therefore include the obligation that each room should be lived in by one person. In addition, and in accordance with the London Plan and the Officer response, the operational management plan should include the obligation that tenancies should be for a minimum of three months. The operational management plan would be key to ensuring that the occupants of 45 Beech Street could be welcomed. It would be very helpful if representatives of the residents closest to the development were given the opportunity to be actively involved in the development of the operational management plan.

Ms Boait stated that with 79 rooms with openable windows overlooking Ben Johnson House, the potential for disturbance from music, general noise, smoking and other smells was significant. She requested that the proposed compliance condition requiring the limiting of live and recorded music so that it could not be heard outside the premises, be extended to include all noise, as was the case across the Barbican. She added this should also cover the roof terrace at ninth floor level, which currently referred only to amplified or other music. Ms Boait stated there appeared to be no designated smoking areas and stated that suitable conditions should be included in the operational management plan.

Ms Boait drew Members' attention to the planning conditioning allowing the ninth-floor terrace to be used only between 7:00am and 10:00pm and stated this was both too early and too late for a residential area and the hours should be limited to between 9:00am and 6:00pm. She added that 6:00pm was the planning condition time limit for the roof terraces at 1 Golden Lane. She also stated that a servicing and delivery start time of 7:00am was too early and stated that this should match other sites in this residential area where deliveries, including the shops such as Waitrose, had delivery and servicing times restricted to 8:00am - 9:00pm and there should be no deliveries at weekends. Ms Boait stated that in addition, no delivery, servicing or waste disposal vehicle serving 45 Beech Street should be permitted to reverse in Bridgewater Street. She added that suitable conditions for delivery and servicing should be included in the operational plan. She also raised concern that rubbish would have to be brought up from the basement to the top of the



ramp and then along the pavement. She asked that the waste disposal plan be reconsidered and secured by a planning condition and gave an example of 1 Golden Lane, where waste was taken from inside the building directly to the waiting rubbish vehicle.

Mr Alexander Wilson, Chair of the Shakespeare Tower House Group, stated he was speaking on behalf of Shakespeare Towers. He stated that Shakespeare Towers, whilst further away from the work than Ben Johnson House, was still about 50 metres away from the site at 45 Beech Street. He stated that it would be preferred if the terrace was not included, but if it was to be included, that a 6:00pm restriction be added.

Mr Wilson raised concern about live music events on the ground floor and concern noise would reverberate off all the other buildings and hit Shakespeare Tower. He requested that these events be prevented from taking place or if they were to take place, triple glazing be installed and no windows ever be open during such performances.

Mr Wilson raised concern about noise during construction. He informed Members that noise from 1 Golden Lane had been an issue and Ben Johnson House was in between the two buildings. There would be no building in between this development and Shakespeare House. He requested that the developers acknowledge this and work with the residents to see how the noise could be minimised during the summer when windows were opened.

Mr Fred Rodgers, Barbican resident stated that paragraph 116 of the Officer report referred to only one tenant being regulated under Section 106 and this should be changed to one occupant to ensure that only one person occupied any unit at any time. He raised concern about the additional embodied carbon in the proposed architecture at roof level with the amount not being specified and raised concern that if subjected to a design review panel, the panel would also have had concerns.

The Deputy Chairman, in the Chair, asked if Members of the Sub-Committee had any questions of the objectors. A Member queried if there were noise concerns regarding the terraces on the eighth-floor units as they faced Shakespeare Tower. An objector stated this was the case, although to a lesser extent than the specific noise concerns raised, due to the different demographics of those living in the units. There were family units in Ben Johnson House, but there would not be in the proposal, and the occupants would have a different style of living, with younger residents and more potential noise.

A Member stated that the normal standard for music licences and applications throughout the City was that they should finish around 11:00pm. He asked the objectors why they considered an exception should be made in this case. An objector stated that most people arrived home from work at about 6:00pm and it was reasonable for them to have peace and quiet from that time.

A Member asked for clarification on an objector's concern that the proposal would draw young people. An objector stated that the proposal would add 300 people to a small area that was next to a building with only 400 people. It would add to noise and smells e.g. from smoking and from kitchen extractors. Another objector stated there was no issue with young people or students and many students lived in the Barbican. He added the concern was the destruction of the Barbican being advanced in this scheme and that it was unfortunate that the affordable housing contribution was in cash rather than in flats within the development.

A Member asked objectors to outline the consultation process. An objector stated that some documents had been received through letterboxes and the Barbican Association was consulted but the registered Tenants Associations of the housing blocks were not approached. Residents had had to read notices displayed on site, many of which were put up after the closing date for comments.

A Member asked about the impact the construction of 1 Golden Lane had on the wellbeing of those living nearby. An objector stated complaints had been made. The Deputy Chairman stated that this was not relevant to the application under consideration and that each application should be considered on its own merits. The Member stated that there should be a clear obligation for the developer to take adequate steps to put protection in place and explore minimising noise disruption during the demolition and development e.g. through regular site meetings. The Deputy Chairman stated that Officers could be asked about steps to minimise disruption, later in the meeting.

A Member asked about the significant change in the pattern of deliveries and the impact on local deliveries. An objector stated Viscount Street was currently one-way from the south, Brackley Street had been closed by the construction of 1 Golden Lane and traffic was being diverted the wrong way down a one-way street without marshalling. He added this should be addressed before work started on 45 Beech Street.

The Member also asked about the arches at the top of the building. An objector stated that this could look better if it was coloured orange, but he raised concern about trying to imitate a work by renowned architects for no particular reason and increasing the embodied carbon when a flat roof and wooden structure could be used.

A Member asked about the usage of the podium by the public. He stated that the usage of the podium was one tenth that of most other public realms and yet was the most expensive. Another £17m of on street parking reserves would be spent. The Member asked for clarification on objector concerns about additional public, including the potential residents of this development, using the podium. Ms Boait stated that whilst the podium was a public walkway, it was also the road outside homes. It was proposed to have more seating which would be under residents' windows, and there would be more people in the space near homes. Concern was raised about a potential increase in noise and smoking and there being currently no policing of the area to ensure no anti-social

behaviour was taking place. Ms Boait stated that Ben Johnson House usually had the highest number of anti-social behaviour complaints of the whole estate. Mr Rodgers stated the podium should be used more and disagreed that it should be a private area for Barbican residents.

A Member asked about the consultation process and the delay in the finalised documents being presented. Ms Boait stated that some of the documents were uploaded on 31 August 2024 and there was no index. Mr Rodgers stated the initial consultation was very good. He stated that although listened to, residents did not consider they were heard.

The Deputy Chairman invited the applicant to speak.

Mr Damien Sharkey, Managing Director of Hub stated that Hub along with their partner Bridges Fund Management, were the applicants for 45 Beech Street. Mr Sharkey advised that Hub was one of the UK's leading living developers with over 7,000 homes completed or under development across the UK. At 45 Beech Street, Hub had partnered with Bridges Fund Management, the UK's largest social and environmental impact investor. Hub and Bridges had a 10-year development partnership with all their developments demonstrating positive social environmental impact and leaving a lasting legacy.

The vision for 45 Beech Street included retrofit an existing building and maximising reuse of the existing structure, providing new living accommodation for City workers, producing a high-quality design, providing enhancements to the Beech Street frontage and delivering a car-free development. Members were informed the existing building was no longer fit for purpose as a modern office building and no longer able to compete with other serviced offices providers in the local area, of which there were 29 within 1/2 mile radius. This is because the internal layout was severely compromised. Access around the building did not achieve the inclusivity requirements expected of any modern office building. The office floors had reduced floor to ceiling heights and internal layout was very compromised, not DDA compliant, and did not comply with the latest building regulations. Over the past 12 months, the applicants had engaged in an extensive collaborative design process. They had held a number of consultation sessions with key stakeholders, residents and local resident groups. They had sent out over 2,000 invitations to all households and businesses in the local area and held two public exhibitions on the proposals. These events were attended by 69 people and the applicants had found the feedback extremely helpful, allowing them to consider and incorporate several items into the final proposals. At the consultation events, the applicants had heard the concerns that some local residents had regarding both operational noise from future tenants and also construction noise. Mr Sharkey stated the building would be professionally managed by an on-site team who would be both contactable and present every day. All the external amenity spaces would be closed from 9:00pm until 7:00am and these hours were reduced from those currently set out in the draft conditions. There would be no amplified music in this building at any time. Mr Sharkey stated he understood that construction noise could be frustrating and disturbing and added that given that the majority of the existing structure was being retained, the noise and dusty works were

minimised in comparison to new buildings. However, in order to minimise disruption further the applicants would use one of their trusted contracting partners and hold monthly meetings with all local residents invited to keep them updated and address any concerns.

Mr Sharkey spoke about co-living as a use. He stated that 45 Beech Street was located in the middle of the City of London's largest residential neighbourhood. The strategy allowed it to be changed to a residential use which was more in keeping with the surrounding area and community and the City of London. He stated there was a genuine demand for this type of housing. It provides an opportunity for those who worked in the City to live close to where they worked and enjoy all the benefits of the City and in the last 12 months alone, Knight Frank City officers had had over 1,000 inquiries from City businesses. This type of accommodation was more affordable than traditional built to rent or HMO. Co-living rents averaged 7% lower than traditional private rented homes and 14% average discount to multifamily build to rent. Based on recent research from Knight Frank, 72% of co-living residents in the UK were aged between 26 and 40 years old. In terms of building management, the building would be professionally managed by an on-site team. A detailed management plan would be submitted to the City for approval which would cover details of how the building would be managed. Tenants would be required to respect the local community and abide by the rules of their tenancy agreements. The team on-site would ensure that there would be no nuisance to the neighbouring residents and would be contactable at all times to address any concerns or complaints. Mr Sharkey informed Members that there were a large number of benefits to this application. The construction of 174 new homes would contribute to the City housing targets; a fully policy compliant affordable housing contribution of £8.5 million would be made; through the lettings plans, City businesses and organisations would have access to the three month exclusivity sign-up to the co-living homes; the existing building would be given a much needed revival; the public realm would be improved; the ground floor amenity spaces would be open up to the public; and the scheme would provide a sustainable car-free residential development.

A Member asked the applicant if the refuse collection plan would be reconsidered given the objector's concern and if the servicing hours would be reduced. Mr Sharkey stated that the developers wanted to build relationships with nearby residents and were happy to review the detail. He added that the number of trips the scheme would generate was much lower than the existing buildings but the applicants were willing to consider future potential changes.

A Member welcomed the willingness of the applicant to work with residents but stated there were lots of issues around noise and construction and asked for a document to be produced on resident engagement. Mr Sharkey stated that typically, if a scheme had consent granted, the applicant would advance the design alongside one of their preferred contracting partners, who would have experience in this type of construction and would develop a strategy bearing in mind the context they were working within, and this would be presented to all neighbouring groups. Before work started on the site, there would be meetings, and concerns would be addressed. A monthly newsletter was then issued

which covered any work that had taken place in the previous month and a look ahead to the following month. There would also be in-person meetings, with the developers attending. The design would be developed bearing in mind there were elements of prefabrication or off-site construction which would be maximised given the sensitive location.

In terms of the amenities given, a Member asked why when there was the podium and the site was near the Barbican theatres and cinemas, there was a roof terrace proposed and not an extension of the green roof. Mr Sharkey stated the applicants wanted to provide some external amenity. The space had been minimised as much as possible to about one square metre per resident in view of the other amenities in the area.

A Member commented that there had been complaints from current residents in Bridgewater Street about noise from the collection of refuse and she asked if there were quieter systems than the one proposed. Mr Sharkey stated the applicants would review the bin strategy.

The Member welcomed the 17 units for people with disabilities, but was concerned that there was only one proposed parking space for those 17 units. Mr Sharkey stated that the applicants were proud to be delivering 17 fully DDA compliant homes, there was a DDA compliant WC on the ground floor and cycle storage would also be DDA compliant. The applicant typically liked to deliver car-free developments for the social impact benefits and therefore minimised car park spaces and encouraged sustainable means of transport, particularly in a location such as this where public transport was good. However, they fully acknowledged that they did need to provide car parking and so were delivering one space. This would be very carefully managed to make sure that it was provided for the tenants that needed it.

The Member questioned the proposal for building work and HGV access on Saturdays and whether this was reasonable in such a built-up residential area. Mr Sharkey stated the applicant always signed-up to local authority restrictions. It was acknowledged that Saturday was a day that people tended to be in their homes longer so this could be discussed with residents but an element of working on a Saturday was important. Restricting working hours would increase the overall duration of the construction programme. The applicants were willing to work with neighbours to ensure that Saturday disruption was minimised.

A Member suggested that a respite centre be set up for residents to use during noisy working hours. She also queried why there was no affordable housing on site. Mr Sharkey stated that a fully policy compliant affordable housing payment was being made and it was decided at an early stage with Officers that this was the appropriate route forward.

The Member asked how single occupancy would be enforced and whether there should be units couples could rent. The applicant stated that there were single occupancy, tenancy agreements. It was recognised that people would have friends and partners, however all units would have single occupancy tenancy agreements. Where an occupant met a partner and had them stay in

their unit, they would not immediately be asked to end their tenancy but the building would be carefully managed and there would be robust tenancy agreements. Co-living was about providing people with a home and on an all-inclusive basis, giving them flexibility and giving them somewhere close to work to live and was not trying to define how occupants lived their lives.

A Member queried why the applicant had not sacrificed one of the rooms on the podium level and joined up to the podium opposite the T-intersection of the corridors, as this would have given natural light into both of the corridors, which were now entirely artificially lit. This would have also meant there could be fresh air in the corridors, and all the users of the building would have direct access to the podium. The applicant stated that it was not possible to open up the private amenity due to the fire strategy. Also, there were security reasons for the proposed layout. The private amenity space was located where it would minimise the disruption to neighbouring buildings.

A Member asked what discussions would take place with St Bartholemew's Hospital and schools and City of London Police in terms of their needs and how they could be accommodated given the nature of the market rent. The applicant stated that as they moved towards delivery and the occupation phase, they would work to establish local organisation needs and wants. Occupants coming from key worker organisations would be prioritised. A list of those who worked in the City who would be eligible for three-month exclusivity would be proposed to the City for approval. Those parties, businesses and people on this list would also be notified of upcoming vacancies.

The Member asked why an emergency diesel generators was proposed and whether a battery solution could be more sustainable. The applicant stated that current building regulations did not permit electric and battery power generators. It was hoped that by the time the scheme was delivered, the regulations would have changed.

The Member asked whether the applicant would consider installing a Changing Spaces toilet. The applicant stated that the threshold was 100,000 square metres which was significantly larger than the development. However, the applicant was delivering 17 accessible units, the disabled car parking space and an accessible WC on the ground floor.

The Member asked about the impact of deliveries to 1 Golden Lane and 45 Beech Street in modelling work. The applicant stated the building was professionally managed with a 24 hour/7day a week concierge, so delivery drivers could give the delivery to the concierge and then leave, rather than wait for the occupier to arrive at the ground floor.

The Member stated that in the London Plan, there was a requirement for space for an armchair and two-person settee in large-scale, purpose-built, shared-living spaces. He asked how this might be accommodated given the size of the rooms. The applicant stated that all their homes were fully compliant with the London Plan and accommodated the furniture that was required. All the homes had been tested by architects to ensure they fully complied.

A Member asked for clarification and reassurance on the fire safety elements of the proposal. Mr Sharkey stated that the core had been reconfigured to put in two staircases and another firefighting lift had been included in compliance with the latest building regulations. This was a gateway project so the scheme had been submitted for Gateway 1. If planning consent was granted, a Gateway 2 application would be submitted to the Health and Safety Executive for approval before any works were started. Prior to occupation, Gateway 3 approval would be obtained. This building had been designed to comply with the latest building regulations and recommendations.

A Member asked for clarification on whether amplified music would be played at events in the communal area. Mr Sharkey stated that amplified music would not be played in the buildings and the ground floor space was a peaceful space for tenants. The only events held there would be resident meetings.

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

He asked Officers to comment on an objector's suggestion that the arches were too large, were a waste of carbon and a flat roof would be better. The Director of Planning & Development stated that Officers considered the design of the arches was contextual in the context of the Barbican, which was a listed building. They were noticeably different and smaller than the Barbican arches so the integrity of the estate and its listed status would not be challenged as a result of them. An Officer stated that the embodied carbon associated with the roof over the building life cycle would amount to approximately 1.5% of the overall embodied carbon associated with the whole development, and Officers were satisfied that that would contribute to the overall sustainability of the scheme. Officers considered this was an important architectural flourish at the top of the building. There were also problems with flat roofs such as pooling of water and leakage. The Director of Planning & Development stated that a building of this nature, given the context, would be expected to have a flourish at the top to give it a visual determination and he considered this an accomplished response to that challenge.

The Deputy Chairman stated the proposed images and plans suggested the telecommunications equipment on the top of the roof would be removed. He asked whether new equipment would be permitted to be installed afterwards. An Officer confirmed that it would be removed and any future proposal for telecommunications equipment would have to go through the normal statutory approval process including consultation and planning.

A Member asked Officers to comment on an objector's point that Officers had found the loss of light to be within acceptable levels, although they considered that Officers had not taken all of the sites and all the rooms into account. An Officer stated the applicant had submitted a daylight and sunlight assessment and the results were fully outlined in the report. He added the assessment had been independently reviewed by the BRE, who had confirmed the

methodologies of the report to be acceptable and in line with the guidance. Overall, Officers considered the loss of light to be acceptable.

A Member asked if the servicing hours could be amended to 8:00am-7:00pm. An Officer stated that the delivery and servicing hours were restricted to avoid peak hours of 7:00am to 10:00am, 12:00pm to 2:00pm and 4:00pm to 7:00pm. The existing building did not have any restrictions, so this would be an improvement. There was a condition attached to the proposal and Officers would receive further details to approve at a later stage. The Member stated that she considered that the servicing hours should be amended to 8:00am-7:00pm.

**MOTION:** A Member proposed that the servicing hours be amended to 8:00am-7:00pm. This was seconded.

Members proceeded to vote on the motion and the motion was carried.

A Member spoke in support of the development and stated architecturally it was an improvement and it was a highly positive scheme which welcomed people including young people. He questioned the different cut off times for terraces on 1 Golden Lane which was an office building and 45 Beech Street which was a residential building. The Officer stated that 6:00pm was the cut off for 1 Golden Lane which was an office building but this would not be reasonable for 45 Beech Street which was residential.

A Member asked Officers to comment on the proposed demolition, work and HGV access on Saturday mornings in a residential area. An Officer stated that Saturday working was permitted under the existing City of London code and a large piece of work was undertaken in 2017/18 looking at what controls the City of London could choose to apply. This led to a later starting time for Saturday works so they were now permitted from 9:00am until 2:00pm rather than the industry standard of 8:00am-1:00pm. Some sites utilised Saturday working and others did not. There was always a balance to strike between the hours of work and how long the job took, cost and minimising disturbance. HGVs could be brought to site earlier than work start times but could not be used before 8:00am on weekdays or before 9:00am on Saturdays.

The Member also asked about whether the Design Out Crime Officer had been consulted. An Officer stated there was no indication in the submission that this was a high-risk use, but the Section 106 would require a management plan to be agreed in consultation with the police. There would also be 24-hour concierge and security access throughout the building.

A Member asked for the Officer view on how this scheme would help meet the needs of key workers. An Officer stated this was a rare type of offer coming before Committee. It was governed by the London Plan which defined co-living. The proposal provided an off-site contribution towards affordable housing of £8.5million. The Officer stated that the bedroom units did not meet the GLA definition of dwellings. They were therefore not flats but bedrooms with shared communal amenities, and that was within the definition of London Plan Policy



H16, and its associated guidance. As such, the GLA were very clear that this product was not suitable for affordable housing or to be considered affordable housing and in lieu payment back into the development at lower rents of a small number of the rooms would not accord with this policy, would not result in affordable housing on the site and as such would not be considered acceptable in planning or housing terms.

The guidance on this product that had been published and adopted was also clear. The provision of below market rental units within the development was not an acceptable alternative to such an off-site financial contribution and the co-living units did not meet the London Plan internal space standards to be considered C3 housing and as such, they were a sui generis product. The London Plan was unequivocal that co-living must provide a cash contribution towards conventional C3 affordable housing, of which the Corporation already had the mechanism to deliver. As it was not housing class C3 it was not an affordable housing solution and was therefore not considered key worker provision. There would be a City worker marketing scheme that would be provided, which Officers would negotiate with the applicant and that might well include St Bartholemew's Hospital.

The policy required that the private units were not to be considered or able to become self-contained homes and should not be able to be converted to such in future, but did provide functional living space. They therefore did not have separate external accesses and they had shared internal areas. The product itself was part of an approach to deliver short term housing solutions as part of the wider housing solution. The intention was that people would take these on relatively short-term agreements and then would move on through the housing market.

A Member asked what steps were being taken to ensure that the residents all around Barbican continued to be able to enjoy the present level of utility once the telecommunications equipment was removed. An Officer stated that this would normally be considered to be a market-led solution and through the demolition of the products in the existing building, the developer would need to engage with the equipment operator and the mast companies, and would come to planning for suitable relocations of that. A Member suggested that discussions should be proactively undertaken with the telecommunications providers before masts were removed. Officers stated they would work with the developer on this.

A Member asked how long occupiers would be expected to live in the units. An Officer stated there were a number of these co-living developments around the country and within London. The minimum tenancy was three months to prevent a constant turnover. There was no maximum prescription for occupation although most people tended to stay for a year or two. The housing approach was similar to a multiple occupancy home but with greater provision for communal facilities e.g. gym and retail which were prescribed within the guidance as being encouraged and the amenity space was a requirement also. The applicant had delivered on these aspirations.

The Member asked that the Officer who specialised in suicide prevention be consulted on the design of the roof terrace. The Officer stated there was a condition in relation to suicide prevention but the wording of this would be made more explicit.

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

The Deputy Chairman stated that he considered that the proposal provided much needed high-quality private rented co-living accommodation. There was an acute shortage in London, exacerbated by private landlords leaving the sector. The proposed development had a high degree of material reuse and low operational energy use through the extensive use of modern technology and solar panels.

It would be connected to the district heating network and the building's energy performance would be further enhanced when the district heating network was further decarbonised. There was a significant £8.5 million contribution to affordable housing. The development would put a stranded asset on a valuable but difficult site back into productive use. The Deputy Chairman considered that the modified building's appearance was aesthetically superior to the existing building and the design sensitively acknowledged the Barbican Estate while maintaining a clear differentiation with the surrounding Barbican blocks.

A Member spoke in support of the scheme and highlighted the difficulties in undertaking an office to residential conversion. He stated this was a successful example and he congratulated the architect on making the scheme work.

A Member raised concern about construction noise, traffic, and the impact on people's mental health. She stated the developer should be required to work with residents and ward councillors.

A Member asked Officers how the developer working with residents, could be embedded in terms of managing the construction phase and having a respite area. An Officer stated the code was detailed in terms of expectations of developers and contractors and liaison with residents. Officers were acutely aware of the sensitivity of the site due to the significant number of residents that would be impacted by the works and Officers would be encouraging developers to start discussions. The Member stated she would encourage the use of non-percussive piling to deconstruct the concrete and requested that sound and vibration monitors be used.

A Member raised concerns about noise from 1 Golden Lane and acoustic shielding there not having been delivered. He stated developers should be held to account ensure points raised by residents were taken into account e.g. in relation to noise and delivery management. He added the impact of this development would significantly affect the lives of the residents over the next 18 months to two years and work should take place with them to ensure it was minimised.

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

A Member stated that no plan would ever be perfect and when a building was being repurposed, compromises would have to be made. He considered the compromises made were fair and generally speaking the scheme met objectives. He understood the construction concerns and stated that in his ward, close work had taken place with developers to minimise disruption and he anticipated this would happen with this application as there had been commitment from all parties to make this happen. He could not see a regulatory reason to reject the application.

Seeing no further questions the Deputy Chairman moved to the vote.

The Sub-Committee proceeded to vote on the recommendations before them.

Votes were cast as follows: IN FAVOUR – 11 votes  
OPPOSED – 0 votes  
There were 2 abstentions.

The recommendations were therefore carried.

#### **RESOLVED -**

(1) That subject to the execution of the planning obligations in respect of the matters set out under the heading 'Planning Obligations', and the recommended conditions of development, the Planning and Development Director be authorised to issue a decision notice granting planning permission for the above proposal in accordance with the details set out in the attached schedule with any relevant amendments set out in the addenda and the motion outlined above; and:

(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.

5. **CITY OF LONDON SCHOOL FOR GIRLS, ST GILES' TERRACE, BARBICAN, LONDON, EC2Y 8BB**

The Sub-Committee considered a report of the Planning and Development Director concerning the retrospective application for removal of three fume cupboard discharge flues and installation of three new extract flues to existing roof plant enclosure.

The Deputy Chairman, in the Chair, reminded Members that the fact that this was a retrospective application should not be part of the considerations and that the application should be taken on its own merits.

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

Officers presented the application highlighting the site in context with the listed Barbican Estate, which was Grade 2 listed, and the site within the Barbican Estate and Golden Lane Conservation Area. Members were also shown the site in the context of where the school sat within the estate and also its proximity to Saint Giles Cripplegate Church, which was a Grade 1 listed building.

Members were shown the site plan for the school and were informed that the proposal lay on the elevation of a plant enclosure on the western side of the main school building. They were shown images of the rooftop plant enclosure on the western side of the main school building, with the images being taken prior to the works which were then carried out to install flues. Members were shown images of the flues, comprising one horizontal flue and two vertical flues.

The Officer showed an image of the plant room prior to the amended flue installation which demonstrated the constrained and unsafe ladder access which was heavily compromised by the position of flues. Members were informed that the extract flue relocation was to accommodate a safe ladder access and they were shown images of the relocated flues and the new, safer compliant ladder access in the plant room. Members were also shown images of the flues prior to the amendment how they would appear afterwards.

Members were shown a view of the flues from Defoe House where they sat minimally as three grey marks, a view from Seddon House where they were minimally visible but partially obscured by trees and a view from Thomas More House demonstrating the flues were not visible from this location. Members were also shown a view from the Barbican Arts Centre, which was likely to be one of the views where the flues were the most visible, a view from the adjacent highwalk where they were minimally visible and two views from Wallside where they were not visible.

The Officer stated that the flues themselves were not the subject of a planning application when they were installed, and that was why they were being dealt with as a retrospective application. During the course of the application, Officers treated them as they would any other application and they explored the constraints and the design requirements for the flues to arrive at a solution which would alleviate objectors' concerns. A meeting was also held with two objecting residents and the Barbican Association early on in this process. To see the concerns objectors had with this installation, Members were shown an image of the solution that was found, which was a reduction of the flues from their originally installed height of 1.3 metres down to 700 millimetres, a reduction of 600 millimetres in total. This brought them below the roof slope and significantly reduced their visibility and made them appear as a more natural and normal form of utilitarian roof servicing.

The Officer stated that the materials of the flues were subject to condition. They would be submitted to Officers for review to make sure that they were visually congruent with the roof enclosure behind them. Members were informed that the reduction in height would not lead to any reduction in air quality or any reduction in the dispersal qualities of the original flues. The intake behind this installation would be infilled so that there was no spilling back into the plant enclosure and given that the flues served an internal science cupboard, they were not the same as flues which might serve plant machinery that ran all day. They ran when necessary to extract a fume cupboard from a science classroom.

Members were shown a comparison image which showed the flues now and how they would appear in the future. It was considered that they, as amended, would have a neutral impact on the heritage assets outlined and that they would have an acceptable impact on residential amenity. As such, Officers recommended this for approval.

There were no objectors registered to speak. The Deputy Chairman invited the applicant to speak.

Mr John Hall stated he was Chief Operating Officer at the City Schools, covering the Junior School, Girls' School and Boys' School who were not the building owners. They were the occupiers and such projects were run for them by City Surveyors. They were however, the project funder. It was the parents' fees that were invested in the 20-year programme of renewal and there was a commitment to the upkeep of the Barbican estate, extending the lifespan of the school building there and the associated infrastructure as well. Mr Hall stated he was unable to comment in a technical capacity, but he understood during the course of the project that these were essential alterations in order to be compliant so that the school could have new fuel cabinets, to update the science teaching facilities. They learned about this late in the process and regretted that this ended up being a retrospective application.

A Member asked for reassurance from the school that there would be a more strategic engagement plan with local residents going forward. Mr Hall assured the Member that this would be the case and stated he met with the chairs of the residents' committees regularly every term and they talked in broad terms about the schools plans e.g. the science refurbishment. He stated there had been a gap in terms of this design detail which the school did not have sight of at the time. They had discussed with City Surveyors that in terms of the detailed engagement the school needed more information and there needed to be more proactive engagement with residents. Mr Hall stated he was meeting with the Planning Department to agree a regular forum through which issues could be raised as sometimes the works at the school were fragmented between different parties, and different parts of City Surveyors. Mr Hall stated he had also met with the chair of the resident association's planning committee to discuss improvements going forward.

Seeing no further questions the Deputy Chairman moved to the vote.

The Sub-Committee proceeded to vote on the recommendations before them.

Votes were cast as follows: IN FAVOUR – 10 votes  
OPPOSED – 0 votes  
There were 0 abstentions.

The recommendations were therefore carried unanimously.

[Deputy John Fletcher, Deputy Edward Lord and Amy Horscroft were not in attendance for this item and therefore did not vote.]

**RESOLVED -**

That planning permission be granted for the above proposal in accordance with the details set out in the attached schedule with any relevant amendments in the addendum.

**6. \* VALID PLANNING APPLICATIONS RECEIVED BY THE ENVIRONMENT DEPARTMENT**

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

**RESOLVED** – That the report be noted.

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

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.

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

A Member raised concern about the number of retrospective applications from the City of London School for Girls and stated they had recently installed CCTV, a camera keypad and cabling plus a permanent shelter for security guards. She asked if it was acceptable for this amount of work to be undertaken without planning permission, in particular when it impacted on the listed status of the Barbican Estate. She also raised concern that there seemed to be a lack of active involvement with residents.

An Officer stated that a retrospective planning application was not the preferred approach. To try and prevent it from happening again, there was an agreement in principle for there to be a quarterly meeting with Planning Officers, City Surveyors and the City of London Girls School to discuss the programme of works being undertaken. In relation to the other works outlined, Officers would be visiting the site in the immediate future. The Director of Planning and

Development stated he would raise the matter with the City Surveyor after the meeting. The Deputy Chairman stated the situation was unacceptable and there needed to be clarity on where the responsibility lay, to ensure it did not happen again. He added that whilst a solution had been found, it had caused unnecessary expense, delay and work.

A Member stated that this was a constant source of frustration with people undertaking work on the estate without regard for the list of building guidelines for the Barbican Estate. He stated the need for those working on the estate to be made aware of these guidelines. The Director of Planning and Development stated he would outline the points raised by Members, and provide a link to the debate, to the City Surveyor and state the need for discipline and proper procedure to be followed.

The Director added that instances of unauthorised works within the Barbican Estate were not particularly widespread but Officers would keep monitoring this to ensure there was not any slippage.

A Member asked for clarification on the process of reconsulting when there were amendments. The Director of Planning and Development stated in terms of amendments to applications, it depended on the nature of the amendments. If they were very insignificant there would not be a whole new round of consultation. The onus was on both parties and the developer was expected to engage with the community as set out in the advice. If amendments were significant, there would be another statutory consultation period which could be up to 30 days and again the onus was on both parties.

A Member stated it would be helpful to know which applications were likely to be considered at each meeting to help inform the public so those with an interest had plenty of notice and could schedule in time to attend the relevant meeting. Members could also start work and look at documents online.

The Member raised concern about the meeting scheduled for 17 December being the only committee meeting scheduled in that week. She stated diaries would be busy with Christmas events and some people could be away. She suggested that the meeting be moved to earlier in December or early January. The Director of Planning and Development stated that there was a vigorous pipeline of schemes with several towers coming up and therefore 17 December meeting was likely to be required. As a matter of good practice, Planning Applications Sub-Committee meetings were not held straight after the Christmas break as notification letters were sent out prior to the meetings. During the Christmas period, people were less likely to be home to get forewarning that an application was going to the Sub-Committee and this could lead to criticism. The Deputy Chairman stated there would also be a gap in meetings over the election period in the Spring 2025 which meant there was pressure to get applications considered before then. A Member stated that he considered before Christmas as preferable to just after the Christmas break as Members would be able to read all the material before rather than during the break.

A Member raised concern about the reputational risk of holding meetings in holiday times. He stated the 8 October meeting had been rescheduled to 29 October as the Chairman and Deputy Chairman were unavailable. He stated that as 29 October meeting was in half term there would be similar issues with people being unavailable to attend. He suggested that this date be reconsidered and that Committee members be given the reason when meetings were being rescheduled.

The Deputy Chairman stated he would inform the Chairman of the points made by Members in relation to the meeting dates.

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

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

**The meeting ended at 1.00 pm**

-----  
Chairman

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