

PLANNING APPLICATIONS SUB-COMMITTEE
Friday, 13 December 2024

Minutes of the meeting of the Planning Applications Sub-Committee held at Livery
Hall - Guildhall on Friday, 13 December 2024 at 10.00 am

Present

Members:

Deputy Shравan Joshi MBE (Chairman)
Graham Packham (Deputy Chairman)
Deputy Randall Anderson
Mary Durcan
Deputy John Edwards
Anthony David Fitzpatrick
Deputy John Fletcher
Deputy Marianne Fredericks
Jaspreet Hodgson
Amy Horscroft
Alderman Robert Hughes-Penney
Alderswoman Elizabeth Anne King, BEM JP
Deputy Natasha Maria Cabrera Lloyd-Owen
Antony Manchester
Deputy Brian Mooney BEM
Eamonn Mullally
Alderswoman Jennette Newman
Deborah Oliver
Deputy Henry Pollard
Ian Seaton
Hugh Selka
Tom Sleigh
William Upton KC
Jacqui Webster

Officers:

| | |
|-----------------|---|
| Fleur Francis | - Comptroller and City Solicitor's Department |
| Gemma Delves | - Environment Department |
| Rob McNicol | - Environment Department |
| Gwyn Richards | - Planning and Development Director |
| Tom Nancollas | - Environment Department |
| Katie Stewart | - Executive Director, Environment Department |
| Anna Tastsoglou | - Environment Department |
| Polly Dunn | - Assistant Town Clerk |
| Callum Southern | - Town Clerk's Department |

1. **APOLOGIES**

Apologies were received from Ian Bishop-Laggett, Deputy Edward Lord, Judith Pleasance, Alderman Simon Pryke, Shailendra Umrada and Deputy Dawn Wright.

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

At Deputy Lord's request the following statement was read out by the Town Clerk.

"Having reviewed the papers for this Friday's meeting of PASC and taken independent professional advice, I understand that I continue to have a disclosable pecuniary interest in item 3, 1 Undershaft, due to a potential commercial relationship between the developer and the Leathersellers' Company, of which I am a member.

I will therefore not be present for that item.

As to item 4, Bury House, it is likely due to a duty as Deputy Governor of the Honourable the Irish Society, which is hosting the Freedom of the City for Lady Mary Peters LG DBE OLY, that I would be unable to remain for the full debate.

As a consequence, I must tender my apologies for absence for the whole meeting"

Deputy Lord was therefore not in attendance.

Jacqui Webster had also flagged the following:

"The Leathersellers Company have an interest in Agenda Item 1.

My organisation benefits financially from and has a relationship with the Leathersellers Company.

I sought brief advice for the July meeting.

However, further funding has been granted, and the relationship has deepened and in line with a review with my trustees this morning, the new Charity Governance Code and my organisation's declaration requirements, I am declaring an interest in agenda item 1."

Anthony Fitzpatrick declared that he would not be taking place in the vote on Item 3 – 1 Undershaft as when the plan was originally brought, the Alderman and Common Councillors for the ward of Lime Street had actively engaged in a round table that was hosted at Lloyds of London in February 2024. The Alderman and councillors had relayed the sentiments of businesses and individual votes and had a number of meetings with Eric Parry and the developers at Stanhope and had addresses a meeting of the ward club to present the new proposals. He now considered it inappropriate to take part in the debate and vote on this item and would therefore not do so.

Alistair Moss declared that he had a professional conflict with items 4 and 5 and would leave the room for those items.

Jaspreet Hodgson declared a non-pecuniary interest in Item 3 as it mentioned the Port of London Authority and informed she was a Member of the Ten Trinity Square Private Members' Club.

3. 1 UNDERSHAFT, LONDON, EC3A 8EE

The Sub-Committee received a report which sought Planning Permission for the demolition of existing buildings at 1 Undershaft, the retention and partial expansion of existing basement plus construction of a ground, plus 73 storey building (plus plant) for office use; retail, food and beverage, public amenity space, publicly accessible education space and a viewing gallery at levels 72 and 73, public cycle hub, plus podium garden at level 11, the installation of a digital screen, public realm improvement works ancillary basement cycle parking, servicing, plant, highway works and other works associated with the proposed development.

The Chairman invited Officers to make a presentation to the Sub-Committee.

Officers presented the existing site plan to the Sub-Committee and stated that the application included a 28-storey vacant office tower, an area of space known as St Helen's Square and Undershaft. The development was bounded to the north by St. Helen's Bishopsgate, to the east by St. Mary Axe, to the west by the 'Cheese Grater' and to the south by Leadenhall Street.

Officers highlighted that Members deferred the scheme in July 2024 and had asked the applicant to look at making minor adjustments to the proposal in relation to the ground floor public realm. Officers stated that the applicant had since revised the lower levels of the building and an updated proposal was before the Sub-Committee.

Officers recapped on the details of the existing site and noted there were a number of heritage assets in the vicinity, notably St. Helen's Bishopsgate to the north, St. Andrew Undershaft to the east, the Lloyds Building to the south which were shown in purple on the presentation. Officers stated that a thin sliver of the north of the site was within the St Helen's Place Conservation Area and the site was within the City Cluster. The Officer presented an image of the Eastern / City Cluster policy area in the adopted and emerging Local Plans and explained this was an area of the City that had to work hard to accommodate growth to ensure that economic objectives and competitiveness were maintained. Officers further stated that the area was appropriate for tall buildings and the application site was represented by a red dot on the presentation and was broadly at the heart of the Cluster.

Officers presented an image of the aerial view of the existing site and stated it was a 1960s tower that was remodelled in the 1990s and was now subject to a certificate of immunity from listing. Officers noted the site did have an extant

consent for a new officer tower that was granted in 2019, and the 2019 scheme had recently been technically implemented through some demolition works on the site for context. Officers explained that the consented tower was 73 storeys at a height of 304.94m AOD and the proposed for consideration today was 74 storeys and 309.6m AOD.

Officers presented an image of the existing building from street level with a view of the front of the building and St. Helen's Square.

The Sub-Committee was also shown an image of the existing site from the west side of the building by Officers who described the area as an underutilised space dominated by bollards, railings and a ventilation shaft, as well as the Undershaft carriageway. Officers also presented a view of the existing site looking east along Undershaft toward the Gherkin and another view looking south along St. Mary Axe where Officers noted one could see the Lloyds Building in the background and the application site in the foreground. Officers also presented an image of the existing site looking west along Undershaft where Officers stated one could see the entrance to the servicing ramp for the existing building which was quite unsympathetic to the setting of the church.

Officers presented an aerial view of the proposed scheme and stated that the existing tower would be demolished and replaced with a 73-storey office tower that would deliver 153.602sqm of Grade A office floor space and supported 8,759 jobs. Officers told the Sub-Committee that the proposal was strategically significant to ensure the City maintained its economic competitiveness and would deliver, alongside the office space, complimentary public spaces, including the tallest viewing gallery at level 73, a high-level education space referred to as the classrooms in the sky at level 72, a restaurant at level 2, food and beverage offers at level 11, cultural spaces and a level 11 podium garden.

Officers stated that St. Helen's Square and the surrounding public realm would be transformed and the scheme would optimise the most strategic site in the Cluster.

An overview of how the massing of the building had changed since July 2024 was given by Officers who showed the Sub-Committee an image of the original scheme changes presented in 2024 and the revised building outline to the Sub-Committee. Officers noted that the focus had been on the lower levels of the building only and the upper levels would remain as previously proposed and highlighted that the green line represented the building outline proposed in July and could be seen in relation to the new outline from ground floor to level 3. Officers informed the Sub-Committee that the building would be set back by 10m which allowed more of St. Helen's Square to remain as public realm than previous proposed and there would be a reconfiguration of the building at level 11 which resulted in it coming further south by 7m.

Officers presented an image of the existing basement 3 and the proposed basement 3 and stated the existing basements would be retained, extended and reconfigured. Officers also presented an image of the existing and proposed basement 2 which accommodated policy compliant levels of long-

stay cycle parking and end of trip facilities. An image of the existing and proposed basement 1 was also presented by Officers who stated it would include a publicly accessible short-stay cycle hub that had been proposed in green and, as part of recent revisions to the scheme, a further area of basement would be extended as was shown in the blue outline.

The existing and proposed ground floor plan image was presented to the Sub-Committee by Officers who told the Sub-Committee that the proposed footprint would be bigger than the existing floor plan as it needed to work hard to deliver the necessary facilities to serve a building of the proposed size. Officers presented the original scheme changes from July 2024 and the revised building outline on the ground floor level which Officers stated clearly showed how the footprint of the building had changed with the 10m set back at the southern end and the massing redistributed to the west. Officers also presented an image of the ground floor amendments and stated that the previously proposed triple height lobby that would take people up to the level 11 podium garden was no longer proposed to allow the building line to be pushed back and office space would continue to be on the east side of the building, as was shown in yellow on the image, as well as an office reception, and a Changing Places toilet was proposed, as was shown in blue on the image. Officers stated that parking access would now be on the northwest corner of the building, as was shown on the image in pink, and the building would continue to be serviced from a new entrance at St. Mary Axe. Officers informed that enhancements were proposed to the public realm which surrounded the site. An image of the proposed ground floor entrances was also shown to the Sub-Committee by Officers who stated that it showed how the floor space reconfiguration would change the proposed entrance arrangements, and a single consolidated public entrance point was now proposed on the southwest side of the building. Officers told the Sub-Committee that users would take the lift or stairs to a new public lobby at level 1. From there, they would travel to the public spaces within the building and the revised positioning of the cycle parking entrance meant that cyclists did not have to pass through the public realm with their bikes.

Officers presented an image of the level 1 floor amendments and stated that a new public lobby was proposed that would accommodate space for the necessary lifting and security arrangements to allow people to access the public uses in the building.

An image of the proposed public podium floors at level 2 and level 3 were shown to the Sub-Committee by Officers who explained that, as part of the revision, the cultural and restaurant space had moved to levels 2 and 3 as, in previous proposals, levels 2 and 3 were office space and the culture and restaurant space was located at levels 9 and 10. Officers further stated that the positioning of those uses had been revised in order to better activate the lower levels of the building and make the public uses more visible from the surrounding public realm.

The Sub-Committee was presented with an image of the existing typical office floor plan and the proposed typical office floor plans for Zone 1 (levels 4-9) and Zone 2 (levels 14-29) by Officers who stated that it reflected how the building

form changed as it elevated. Officers also told the Sub-Committee that the office space would be suitable for a range of occupiers and an element of affordable workspace was proposed on the lower levels of the building. Officers further stated that the proposed office space would be befitting for the central cluster location and, in line with market demand and post COVID requirements, the office space would be complemented by generously sized and planted amenity terraces for the office occupiers. Officers presented the Sub-Committee with a CGI image of one of the proposed terraces.

Officers presented an image of the existing and proposed east elevation on to St. Mary Axe to the Sub-Committee and stated that the elevation images would show how the development would optimise the site through uplifting floor space and the increase and in height and massing would result in some daylight and sunlight impacts to nearby sensitive receptors. Officers considered this acceptable given the site context. Officers also presented the existing and proposed south elevation onto Leadenhall Street, the existing and proposed west elevation which faced the cheese grater, and the existing and proposed north elevation which faced onto Undershaft. Officers showed the Sub-Committee an image of the existing and proposed cross-section and stated one could see the public uses woven into the office space.

Officers stated to the Sub-Committee that the building would be contextual and would bring a series of interesting architectural approaches and high-quality design to the cluster which would range from the pale faience elevations which fanned out from the base to the podium garden which was shown to the Sub-Committee. Officers noted it would be suspended 42m above ground level and highlighted the zinc and enamel cladding of the main office tower. Officers further stated that it would be sustainable and would optimise circular economy principles through the reuse of the existing basement, the incorporation of facades optimised for shading, and it would be fully electric.

An image of the proposed crown of the building was presented to the Sub-Committee and Officers stated that the crown of the building would be picked out in subtle colour to reflect the civic functions of the top of the building and would form the apex to the cluster.

A presentation of the Tower of London from the existing and cumulative strategic view of LVMF 10A.1 was shown and Officers stated the development would have a striking and understated presence. Officers also presented a view of the cumulative development from Inner Ward in the Tower of London and told the Sub-Committee the development would be seen as essential to the modern skyline of the cluster and distinct and disassociated from the World Heritage Site.

Images of the existing and cumulative strategic view of Queen's Walk (LVMF 25A.1) were shown to the Sub-Committee. Officers told the Sub-Committee that the building would be the apex of the cluster with other towers descending from it.

Officers presented images of the previously proposed public spaces and cultural offer and the proposed public spaces and cultural offer and noted that more of the public uses would now be located at the lower levels of the building. Officers also presented an image of the public amenity floors and explained that the Museum of London education space would be a classroom in the sky at level 72 and, with the viewing gallery at level 73, both would be accessed from level 1 via the public lobby. Officers also presented images of the spaces in plan form and the classroom in the sky concept. They explained that the space would be curated by the Museum of London and would be a space where children could visit and learn about the City. Officers also stated that the Museum of London activity on the site would be complementary to that of its Smithfield site.

An image of the viewing galley was presented to the Sub-Committee and Officers stated it would offer different views to other viewing platforms in the City.

Officers presented an image and diagram of the level 11 podium garden and told the Sub-Committee it would be a significant architectural achievement and would be a generous, unparalleled public space that offered different views. They also noted it would be generously planted and have good microclimatic conditions. Images of the previously proposed, in July 2024, and proposed level 11 podium garden were shown to the Sub-Committee by Officers who explained that the floor space had been reconfigured while it still provided food and beverages and cultural and public spaces to complement its function. Officers further stated that as the public entrance point at ground level had changed, the arrival point on the podium had also changed, with people arriving on the west side of the terrace instead of the southern end. They also noted it was also proposed that the southern end would be a winter garden, that the public could use, which would increase the year-round appeal of the space.

Another image of the level 11 podium garden was shown to the Sub-Committee and Officers stated a feature of the podium garden would be the oculus, a circular area of walkway on structural glazing which would give views to ground level 42m below.

A diagram of the continuous city public realm was presented to the Sub-Committee by Officers who explained that the public realm would be enhanced and the north-south and east-west walking routes highlighted would be optimised and designs for St. Helen's Square had been revised since July 2024. Officers stated that the revised proposal created Undershaft Square to the west of the building.

Officers also stated that the proposals included an extensive Section 278 agreement for the whole of St. Mary Axe and part of Leadenhall Street to the south which would be transformational and could include the rebuilding of the footway and carriageway to seek to improve the pedestrian environment. Officers also explained it presented an opportunity to remedy some issues on the street through a redesign and the street would be built in the City of London technical pallet of materials which would harmonise with the look of the

adjacent streets and public spaces. An image of St. Mary Axe of the proposed Section 278 works was shown by Officers to the Sub-Committee.

In reference to the ground level experience of the scheme, Officers presented a view of the existing and proposed building from Lime Street looking north and stated that one could see the introduction of a new screen and the podium of the oculus. Officers also showed an image of the existing and proposed building from Lime Street looking north from a closer angle and Officers noted that one could see the proposed base of the building in the proposed version which fanned out with the podium garden above.

Officers also presented images of the existing western public space, the proposed space in July 2024 and the proposed space for December 2024. They stated the area had been worked up in more detail and would become Undershaft Square with further landscaping and greening.

Images of St. Helen's Churchyard as it existed and as proposed were presented to the Sub-Committee and Officers stated there would be a clear view to the public uses of the lower levels of the building.

An image of the existing and proposed views along St. Mary Axe were shown to the Sub-Committee.

Viewpoints of the existing servicing area view and the proposed view from Undershaft looking west were presented to the Sub-Committee by Officers who highlighted the carriageway moving northwards in the proposed view and the removal of the existing servicing entrance. Officers explained that, as shown in the image, servicing would take place from the corner of Undershaft and St. Mary Axe and deliveries would be consolidated and off-peak with final details being secured by a delivery and servicing management plan.

Officers presented the proposed cycle access and noted the cycle parking entrance would be at the western end of Undershaft.

Existing and proposed views across St. Helen's Square looking toward St. Andrew Undershaft were presented to the Sub-Committee by Officers who stated that the proposals would create a new civic space in the heart of the cluster. The existing steps, level changes, hard edges and planters shown in the existing image were to be removed and Officers further stated that the new space would be simplified completely at grade to make it more accessible and inclusive. Officers noted it would have a grove of trees and new seating.

The existing and proposed ground floor plan which showed the public space around the building was presented to the Sub-Committee by Officers who informed that the footprint of the proposed building would be bigger than as it existed as it worked hard to deliver what was required to make the building of the proposed size function. As a result, there would be some loss of St. Helen's Square. Officers showed diagrams of the existing square per mile area of St. Helen's Square, the proposal of July 2024 and the current proposal to the Sub-Committee and explained that the amount of the square that would be lost

would be smaller than that proposed in July 2024 as the southern edge of the building had been pulled back by 10m. Officers further stated, while they presented a diagram of the square per mile of the public realm at the podium garden, that when both the podium level garden and the ground level space was taken as a whole, the scheme would overall delivered an uplift in the quality and quantity of the public space.

Officers presented an image of the previously proposed scheme in July 2024 and the proposed St. Helen's Square and stated the existing level changes would be removed and more usable space would be created for trees and seating. Officers also told the Sub-Committee that the screen would activate the public realm and could be used to show art displays and sporting events and informed Members that the content of the screen would be controlled through a Section 106 agreement.

An image of the revised proposed new public entrance off St. Helen's Square was shown to the Sub-Committee by Officers who told Members it would be clearly defined with colour to match the way that the colour was used at the top of the building to denote civic use.

A visual of the proposed level 1 lift portal, which would be located off St. Helen's Square, adjacent to the main stairs, was also shown to Members by Officers who stated it was clearly defined in red.

Officers displayed another visual of the proposed St. Helen's Square viewed from Leadenhall Street.

Another visual of the proposed St. Helen's Square was shown by Officers who stated that it was the Undershaft square and would form part of the route between St. Helen's Square and Undershaft and further stated that one could see the relationship between the public uses within the building and the public realms.

Officers summarised that the proposed scheme delivered over 153,000 square metres of flexible, Grade A, best in class office floor space, which accommodated up to circa 8,759 jobs and it would be a significant strategic contribution of office floor of the utmost importance to the City's economic objectives to maintain its international competitiveness, as well as strengthening the economic base of the City Cluster. Officers further noted that it would be a scheme with the highest social and educational values and credentials and would deliver the highest elevated public cultural space and classroom space in Britain. Officers stated that the space would be curated by the London Museum at the apex of the City Cluster of tall buildings and would be free to visit and inclusive. They also stated that the proposals delivered a striking free to visit new public space in the form of a podium garden which was an unparalleled new elevated public space and created an iconic new destination at the heart of the cluster which would support the City's cultural 7 day and evening objectives. Officers further stated the proposal would be the totemic centrepiece and backbone of the cluster and would be an outstanding architectural moment at the heart of the City. Officers told the Sub-Committee

that the scheme would carry exemplary sustainability credentials, targeted a BREEAM 'Outstanding' rating and was designed with circular economy principles to address climate adaptation and mitigation. Officers also stated the scheme would provide significant improvements at ground floor level which included the transformation of Undershaft and St. Mary Axe and noted that there would be a reduction in the extent of the ground floor public realm as a result of necessary facilities needed to service a building of key strategic importance to the City to deliver the office floor space it needed. However, Officers stated that the new reimagined ground floor public realm would provide a significantly more enhanced, inclusive and flexible St. Helen's Square in quality terms and a reimagined public space at the heart of the cluster. Officers told the Sub-Committee that it was the single most strategic site in the cluster and the City and it was vital that optimised floor space capacity was sought on the site to remain internationally competitive in the years ahead. Officers noted the need to balance that with the provision of high-quality public realm and other planning considerations. Officers stated they firmly believed that the scheme achieved the balance and recommended approval of the proposals to the Sub-Committee.

The Chairman informed the Sub-Committee that there were no Objectors to the application and invited the Supporters to address the Sub-Committee.

The Town Clerk explained to speakers that they would have a total of 10 minutes to address the meeting with no one person being able to speak for longer than 5 minutes. The Town Clerk also explained the traffic light system to speakers.

Mr. Paul, from DP9, addressed the Sub-Committee and noted they had been hard at work since the last meeting when the Sub-Committee had asked for the approach to the public realm to be reevaluated and Mr. Paul stated they had done as asked. He noted that the work had taken place in consultation with those who attended the last Sub-Committee meeting on the proposal and a consensus had been reached. Mr. Paul referred to a letter from the Lime Street ward team, along with correspondence from neighbours at 122 Leadenhall Street, that supported the changes and further noted that Lloyds had also withdrawn their objection to the application. Mr. Paul informed the Sub-Committee that the outcome of the review had been a positive one and the overall design had benefitted from the critique. Mr. Paul thanked all those who were involved.

Mr. Hyde addressed the Sub-Committee and stated he was aware there may have been Members present were not present at the Sub-Committee meeting in July 2024 and informed Members he would brief summarise the proposals before he moved on to introduce the amendments that had been made. Mr Hyde also noted that Mr. Lim was in attendance who represented the owners. Mr. Hyde stated the owners had been instrumental in securing the 2019 planning consent and remained fully committed to taking the development forward. Mr. Hyde told the Sub-Committee that at just under 310m tall, the building would be the tallest in the City, London and the UK and it retained its totemic form from 2019. He informed Members that the two uppermost floors

were fully public spaces and was pleased to confirm continued collaboration since 2015 with the London Museum to provide the learning centre. He also told the Sub-Committee that the proposals would provide over 153,000sqm of the best-in-class office space with access to local terraces on the floors, as well as common landlord amenities and outdoor gardens at the main terraces. He explained this alone would represent around 10% of the forecasted occupier requirements in 2040 as was evidenced by the City's own research. Mr. Hyde stated that the office areas were of different sizes and characters and allowed for flexible occupation for the widest cross section of workplace requirements. A lot had been learned from other tall buildings, and the building would not only be lean in embodied carbon but would operate very efficiently. He continued that in addition to the contribution of space for business, the building epitomised the City's desire to be a destination for all and provided over 5000m² internal areas and around 6,500m² of external public spaces at grade and level 11. Mr. Hyde drew attention to the elevated public garden and its own ecosystem of public amenities at level 11, as well as other public areas lower down the building which included a restaurant. He further stated that generous, vibrant, accessible and flexible public realm at grade had been proposed which fully supported the Eastern City BIDs' recently launched public realm strategy and had recently been endorsed by them. He further noted that there were extensive future Section 278 works to improve St. Mary Axe. Mr. Hyde concluded that a number of comments and questions regarding the spaces had been heard in July 2024 and hard work had been done through the summer, in collaboration with local ward Members and other stakeholders. Mr. Hyde indicated that the input had been appreciated and was pleased that they were now supportive of the proposals.

Mr. Parry addressed the Sub-Committee and told Members that it was a generous building and there was an aspiration for it to be a next generation classic of its kind, both for the public and for occupants. He stated that it had been modelled to provide a series of urban horizons at the street level, the elevated public garden amenity floors, the London Museum, classrooms and a viewing gallery at the apex of the building. He also told the Sub-Committee it was a building of character with facades designed for longevity and calibrated for performance and was not another glass tower. He added that the step massing provided a range of floor plates to attract future tenants in the sustainable development. Mr. Parry stated that the redesign of the lower levels had improved both the public realm and the engagement on the three active frontages; to the north, Undershaft with a reposition cycle hub entrance, along St. Mary Axe through improvements under Section 278, and the western pedestrian route which connected St. Helen's with Leadenhall Street. He added that the redesign for St. Helen's Square had been enlarged by setting back the base of the building by 10m, so 80% of the existing public space at ground level had been retained. This would allow more flexible use by the local communities in a fully accessible square with an enlarged grove of trees, more seating, and a new focus with a large public screen curated to support Destination City. Mr. Parry stated, secondly, that Undershaft Square, the current space behind the Leadenhall Building, could, by a relocation of the cycle hub entrance, be reimagined as a quiet space for nature and connected to the public garden above. Thirdly, Mr. Parry stated, in relation to public access, that a single public

entrance, which replaced the previously proposed two entrances, would now be directly off St. Helen's Square with a civic scaled stair and two fully accessible lifts which allowed entry to level 1, while the public lift served levels 2 and 3. He also noted the public garden at level 11, as well as the two lifts that served to top of the building and stated the public spaces had been designed for the flow of visitors and the provision of security screening that would be necessary. Mr. Parry added that by relocating both the restaurant and some cultural uses to lower podium levels, the predominantly glazed base of the building was now more animated and attractive and the elevated public garden would provide a natural respite from the busy city below. He further stated the level would give a unique experience of the notable architecture within the cluster and of St. Paul's and The Shard. Mr. Parry informed the Sub-Committee that the area of accessible public realm had been increased by up to 40% and he stated he was confident that these were all improvements and would further enhance the strong and compelling civic quality that was woven throughout the design which defined and set it apart as the cluster's totemic centrepiece.

Mr. Astrop addressed the Sub-Committee and thanked the policymakers of the City of London for an ambitious commitment to biodiversity. He stated he believed that the project was the beginning of a global paradigm shift and thanked Sub-Committee Members for their feedback. Mr. Astrop stated that the Sub-Committee had previously commented on the number of public benches which had been increased from 268 to 350 where the public could now take lunch breaks. He added that the public could now also take their lunch on the elevated public garden of 2,500sqm with 51 trees and biodiverse planting which was critical in helping to deliver more than 500% biodiversity net gain. Mr. Astrop also told the Sub-Committee that the garden also offered benches inside a free, and enclosed, garden room which ensured it would be pleasant to use all year round. He also noted that the Sub-Committee had commented on the ground floor, which had led to an optimised entrance for bicycles and a place had been designed for a place full of plants that would thrive in those specific conditions. Mr. Astrop also stated that the Sub-Committee had commented on St. Helen's Square which would now have a step-free surface with access for all and a pavement that aligned and merged with adjacent public space. The space would also provide 17 mature native trees instead of 12 and the York stone would remain.

The Chairman invited Members to ask questions of the applicants.

A Member noted they had previously asked a question about the height of balustrades around the public area as they understood they were 2.5m tall and were made of glass, but sought clarity as the report referred to balconies that would incorporate balustrades of 1.5m high. The Member also queried whether a metal balustrade of 1.5m would be included with a 2.5m high glass balustrade. A supporter confirmed that 2.5m was the determined height as proposed and stated it was important there was a rail behind the balustrade to absolutely deter.

The Member also stated she understood that the scheme had come forward as the developer had previously said the trellis scheme floor plates were not

sufficient which was why the redesign had occurred and queried whether it was correct that the developer had now been able to incorporate a design by allowing the garden space with sufficient floor plates and whether it was larger than the previously agreed scheme. A supporter stated that was correct and the previous planning permission had been technically implemented since the last meeting the development was discussed at. The supporter further explained that the planning permission would have lapsed so a commercial decision was made to implement the consent rather than lose it and the CIL payment had been made. The supporter stated that the decision to apply the previously granted planning permission demonstrated a commitment to the site and believed that the application was the future for the site.

Another Member asked a question on who held responsibility for the running costs of the Museum of London classroom and queried how many classrooms in the sky were needed given one had been consented the week before and what analysis had been done on the number of children who needed to use the classrooms. A supporter stated they had been in discussion with the Museum of London for a significant amount of time and the intention was that the spaces would be self-sustaining. The supporter added that the Museum was used to running spaces by allowing private hire to fund the spaces and the landlord would provide and fit out the space, so the operational costs were relatively small, and the same servicing would be used to get into the building. The supporter further added that there would be a mode which would be a blend of the money generated on site, any grants which were available and any contributions from London authorities which is where it was aimed to give every child in London the opportunity to visit it and any sponsorship that could be received. The supporter also stated that the landlord was fully supportive of the Museum to keep in operating. In regard to the question on how many children would use the classrooms, the supporter stated 3 or 4 classrooms had been proposed and that was based on being able to turn through all children at some point in their education, both at the secondary and primary level.

Clarity was sought by a Member on whether the expectation was that all children in London would visit one of the classrooms in the sky at some point. The supporter stated that it was the ambition and every one of London's children should have the opportunity to visit the classrooms. The Member queried whether detailed work had been carried out on the scale of children that would visit the classrooms. The supporter stated that it had been looked and now there was a seven-year journey to work out how it would be implemented. Another supporter stated that the desire to learn about London through the London Museum was compelling for schools and the ambition was to enable every young person in their learning life to pass through the classroom in the sky. The supporter added that the unparalleled quality of experience delivered by the London Museum was hugely valued by schools as it was embedded in the London curriculum and hoped that would give Members assurance that the quality and mechanism to attract young people and schools to the classroom was strong.

A Member asked the developer to recommit that the public spaces would be public spaces once the building had been completed. The supporter stated that

the public ground space had been designed precisely to be publicly accessible and separate from the office space and told the Sub-Committee that if there was an element of potential privatisation in the future, it would have to return to the Sub-Committee for agreement as it had been set out in planning conditions and legal agreements and felt that was highly unlikely.

The Member also sought some clarity on St. Helen's Square being a place for nature as they understood how flora could be introduced through planting, but was unsure how fauna would be introduced. A supporter stated there would be a lot of native species of flora that would adapt to the local climate and attract birds.

The Member also sought to understand whether the height of the building at 310m was necessary as the Shard was 309.6m and felt the description of the building as 'totemic' was disappointing and considered whether it could have been a more modest height. The supporter told the Sub-Committee that it was at the centre of the cluster and felt it was an opportunity to build to the highest height. They added that they felt it was entirely appropriate in order to maximise the site.

A Member sought information on how many classes would go through the classroom in the sky in the course of a day, whether the area was solely for the use of the Museum of London and what would be done with the space at the end of the day when children had gone home. A supporter explained it would be mixed-use like the museum in Smithfield and there would be events for both adults and children and aimed for 300 pupils to come through the classroom every day. The supporter also explained that the amount of time classes could visit was constrained to the middle of the day and adults would visit outside of classroom hours. The supporter added that, to be sustainable, the museum needed to generate income, such as the provision of refreshments and shops, but stated it was absolutely about the public benefit and the museum was committed to that. The supporter told the Sub-Committee they would work through the details with the landlord and felt very assured that a compelling educational offer that benefitted the public would be created.

A question was raised by a Member on whether the Museum of London based at the development would recourse to funding from the City of London. The supporter confirmed it would not. The Member further queried whether the museum could be adequately funded through sales and the renting out of the space. The supporter stated that the fitout was supported by the landlord and, in terms of operational costs, the main building would be supported by the landlords which meant the museum would not have those costs. The supporter added that the staffing costs would be borne though the sustainable model developed with the proposed project.

The Chairman opened the floor to questions to the Officers.

The Chairman noted the refreshed National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) issued by central government and asked Officers to clarify what aspects needed to be considered for the application and future applications. Officers

stated an addendum was circulated the day before which set out the changes to the NPPF and how it would impact on schemes before the Sub-Committee. Officers added that the changes did not significantly alter the assessment of the applications against the NPPF or the weight given to it and they did not have significant implications for the issues set out in the main reports for either scheme. Officers highlighted the main changes that had been made; a presumption in favour of sustainable development had been strengthened in some situations where policies were out of date, a new requirement had been added to recognise and address specific locational requirements of different sectors, the introduction of a vision-led approach to sustainable transport, greater emphasis in relation to developing brownfield sites and specific reference to the government's goal of meeting net zero by 2050, and for climate impact, urban heat and island flooding to be taken into account as relevant. Officers added that the addendum did set out where the issues had been covered in the main reports for each application and updated the references to the NPPF. Officers stated that in their view, the City Corporation's policies and practices were already ahead of the curve on those issues and added that Members would be aware that the starting point for determining applications remained the development plan and the NPPF which set out government policy, and was a material consideration to be taken into account alongside other material considerations.

A Member sought clarity on the mention of a Section 278 agreement with regard to the pedestrianisation of St. Mary Axe and a small section of Leadenhall Street. Officers told the Sub-Committee that the Section 278 area would include part of Leadenhall Street and the City Operations team were currently consulting on proposals for pavement widening and public realm improvements along the length of Leadenhall Street. Officers added that the scope for the works under the proposed application would be determined under a Section 278 agreement.

The Member also asked whether there was any opportunity for improvement at ground level at 122 Leadenhall Street. Officers informed the Sub-Committee that there had been scoping of enhancements to the ground floors and ideas were being developed. However, none of those ideas had been shared with Officers to date.

A question was also posed in regard to the corner of Undershaft and St. Mary Axe by the Member as they understood it would be a vehicle access, but there did not seem to be any inclusion of greening on the corner and asked whether there was scope to consider something. Officers stated there were practical constraints, but a valid point had been raised with the greening and they indicated this was something that could be explored through landscaping conditions recommended in the schedule.

A question was raised by a Member in relation to the amount of office space proposed in the development and whether it was the same as proposed in July and the office space had just been moved around. Officers

A Member asked, in relation to the amount of office space proposed in the development, whether it was the same as proposed in July, as objections were related to the effect on neighbouring light and the public realm, and further queried why it was not part of discussion about amendments if office space had just been moved around and not reduced. Officers stated that the changes to the floor space between the July 2024 application and the revised scheme as set out in paragraph 32 of the report did not that there was a small reduction in office space. Officers added it was a reduction from 154,156sqm in the July 2024 application to the application before the Sub-Committee which was 153,602sqm. Officers further stated it was partly due to some of the relocation of the public and amenity spaces which resulted in slight changes to the office across the podium floors, but Officers did not consider that it had significantly reduced it and it was still a significant quantum of office space proposed.

The Member further queried on the massing and whether things had been moved around as there had been mention of increasing the area of St. Helen's Square. The Member also asked whether the space would be added on somewhere else onto the building in terms of massing as it was difficult to follow what had happened in in terms of the lower levels of the building. Officers stated that from ground level to level 3, the building had been pushed back by 10m and some of that massing from the south had been moved around to the west side of the building and all the changes to those floor spaces, the movement of the uses and the implications were set out in the report.

A Member asked, in relation to the unsympathetic servicing ramp that had been mentioned, what Officers could the Sub-Committee was in the previously consented scheme in 2021 compared to the scheme that did not progress in the summer of July 2024. Officers stated it was largely the same as the proposed scheme, the road moved northwards and it would have built over the ramp. Another Officer stated that the previous scheme in 2021 had vehicle lifts on Undershaft as well.

Clarity was sought by a Member who stated that the tables seemed to have the figures for the whole life, carbon options table in metres squared, but not the figures for the total amount and questioned why that had been removed as it was a key figure in terms of the actual carbon impact in terms of the emissions. Officers stated that the table had been extended to show the absolute carbon emissions and the addendum showed that option 4 had a whole life carbon assessment (WCLA) impact of 310,847,000kg of CO₂ compared to option 1, the minor refurbishment option, of 158,094,000kg of CO₂.

The Member asked, if we looked at the major refurbishment against the option proposed, whether there was a differential rate in absolute carbon emissions between the July 2024 application and the proposed application and queried whether the 406,000 tonnes of CO₂ figure had removed the decarbonisation assumptions or whether it assumed the decarbonisation of the grid. Officers stated that the minor refurbishment had half of all the absolute carbon emissions of the new-build scheme, and the lowest carbon option was option 2, the major refurbishment option, that could reduce emissions significantly through the use of heat pumps and would be a quarter of the carbon emissions

of the proposed scheme. Officers added that the whole life cycle of carbon emissions were now calculated to be 390,481 tonnes of CO₂ and that was without decarbonisation as the GLA required. Officers further noted that once the grid decarbonised, it would reduce significantly. Officers added that operational carbon emissions had reduced from 746kg per square metre to 664kg per square metre which was due to the applicant further developing their model of the building from the July 2024 scheme and the total carbon emissions had been reduced from 2,247kg to 2165kg per square metre.

A Member sought assurance over the use of the classroom in the sky and balustrades as to whether they had been clarified in a condition that was watertight as a developer had previously misinterpreted a condition. Officers stated that the classroom in the sky would be secured through an obligation in the Section 106 agreement, not through condition, and they looked to seek agreement of the terms that had been discussed at the meeting through the Section 106 agreement. Officers added, in reference to suicide prevention, that there was a condition on the balustrades and would be condition 55 on approval. Officers further added that they would be drilling into the detail of the Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) and the requirements that were needed. Officers also told the Sub-Committee there was a condition on the balustrade of the doubling-up of requirements to ensure suicide prevention.

The Chairman moved to a debate of the Sub-Committee on the application.

The Chairman thanked the applicant, Officers, neighbours to the scheme, and ward Members and stated that the deferral of the decision in July was not a common action for the Sub-Committee to take. The Chairman added that the Sub-Committee did it on specific grounds around minor alterations to the ground floor and all parties had come together cooperatively in the last few months to deliver what was before the Sub-Committee.

A Member stated they were concerned with the design of the development, and it was an issue the heritage lobby had picked up as well. The Member added they commended the work put in, but felt the building at the lower level had a clear and detrimental effect on the quality of the public spaces around it. The Member further stated there was an increase in carbon footprint compared to what currently existed and there was a direct loss of a large section of the existing space that had a clear sky and no longer would. The Member further added that the heavy dominance of the building at the lower levels and it had a vast oversailing podium. The Member told the Sub-Committee that that it was compromising too and they had expected a reconsideration of not just what happened at a higher level of the building, which had improved, but the ground floor too. The Member added it had compromised the public realm far too much and he stated he could not support a building that was trying to do too much. The Member stated that it was a balance between optimisation and the public realm, and the public realm had to be valued. The Member concluded that the proposal was overselling the garden, and it was the wrong approach and he could not support it.

Another Member stated that not much had changed in terms of the actual figures with regard to the loss of the public realm which was a very rare large space of public realm at the ground level in the City and tiny pocket parks had been put forward as a public benefit. The Member added that the Officers worked incredibly hard to create pocket parks which had some genuine scale and further stated that the reduction in square metres from 4,669 to 3,850sqm was half the size of Manchester Cathedral at 704sqm which was a significant amount of loss. The Member told the Sub-Committee that it was losing when it had very little and endorsed what had been said by the previous Member.

A Member told the Sub-Committee they were not present for the initial consideration of the application but had opportunity to compare the two schemes and felt it was worth reflecting on the changing shape and size of the public realm that had been provided. The Member stated there was a reduction but, compared to the previous scheme, was less so and felt that should be commended as a sign of being listened to. The Member added that it appeared to them that the classrooms in the sky would probably be cross subsidised by the footprint of the larger business model at the Museum of London which sounded entirely feasible and reasonable and it was the kind of thing that should be supported. The Member further stated that while another Member had described the new garden area as bolted on, he felt that it showed a willingness to compromise and adapt which was something he felt the Sub-Committee should encourage. The Member concluded that while there was some harm to the public realm and heritage views, he felt the economic benefit, the benefit from sustainability and the adaptability and compromise that had been made had drawn him to support the application.

It was stated by another Member that it was interesting to hear other Members use the word 'compromise' in regard to St. Helen's Square and added that the point had been well made about the building trying to do too much. The Member commended the developers and designers for their work, but the ambition to achieve the height proposed, and the idea it was of significant strategic value, was nonsense. The Member further stated that the real strategic value was those buildings being close to a public transport hub. The Member added that their real concern was the natural environment, and the reality was there were a lot of failing green spaces around the City due to nature having to do things it could not do and stated that the idea that the space would flourish, be it for flora or fauna, was misleading. The Member concluded that if a public space was being created which was healthy and good for human beings, that needed to be carefully thought about.

Another Member stated they thought it was great that the development would be the tallest building and added it would be a great advert for the City, and to aim for anything less would be disappointing.

A Member stated that moving the space from the shadowed area in the west to the south which was sunnier was smart and a good move. The Member added, in terms of the building itself, it was not boring which was important and having a podium at 42m allowed the public an opportunity to view the iconic buildings around it as the architects had envisaged it. The Member noted that it was a

smart height to look at other buildings at rather than from above and felt the podium would be a great success. The Member concluded that the other advantage was the dedicated lift which meant the public could be at the podium in five minutes, have lunch, and come down again and indicated his strong support for the building.

Another Member told the Sub-Committee they disagreed on the benefit of having the highest public viewing platform, which was situated behind the previous highest viewing platforms. The Member also stated that the degradation of the public realm at street level was very concerning. The Member added that the ground level entrance looked like a cave and stated she did not think that an overshadowed square was going to be an attractive place to sit no matter how many benches were installed in it. The Member concluded that they would not be supporting the application.

A Member stated it was an unusual proposal and indicated she doubted whether or not the application would return to the Sub-Committee in time. The Member told the Sub-Committee she felt that if the applicant had a bit more time, they would have been able to revise and refine it to improve it. The Member added they had concerns about the loss of the ground floor space and whilst one could get a lift up and have lunch quickly, in practical terms it would be impossible as seen with other gardens in the sky where there had been long queues of visitors whilst those who lived or worked in the City would struggle to get up there in their lunchtime. The Member further stated that it was seen during Covid how crucial the open space was for those who had stayed in London and the City, and as people had come out of Covid, they had realised how important the natural environment was. The Member further added it was a shame that something would be lost which could not afford to be lost because the space was not available to be given away. The Member stated she was sure the architect could be creative and keep the open space while designing a building that was viable for the clients and would have preferred the developers to take a little more time rather than rush it through as they thought it could be refined a little bit more.

The Chairman stated the Sub-Committee had looked into the application in depth and acknowledged there were subjective differences of opinion on the architectural merits. The Chairman told the Sub-Committee that it was his feeling that the Sub-Committee should be bold and allow architects to be bold in their vision of what was delivered in the City. The Chairman added that it was important that there were features that were attractive and drew visitors above the ground floor. He stated that the winter garden that had been proposed offered a unique perspective in the heart of the cluster of tall buildings in the Square Mile. In reference to the ground floor, the Chairman added that a lot of work had been done on creating Undershaft Square and it as a vital element of the eastern cluster as there were not that many open spaces and was proud to see another 10m given over to the public realm. He further stated that as one came into the square, their eye was drawn to the London Museum and the public access into the building. The Chairman told the Sub-Committee that Officers had been working hard to ensure the building did feel open and accessible to all and, for those reasons, supported the application.

(5) That your Officers be authorised to provide the information required by regulations 29 of the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017, and to inform the public and the Secretary of State as required by regulation 30 of those regulations.

4. **BURY HOUSE 1 - 4, 31 - 34 BURY STREET, LONDON, EC3A 5AR & 5. HOLLAND HOUSE 1 - 4, 32 BURY STREET, LONDON, EC3A 5AW - LISTED BUILDING CONSENT**

The Chairman stated that Agenda Items 4 and 5 would be taken together.

The Sub-Committee considered a report of the Chief Planning Officer and Development Director regarding Bury House 1 - 4, 31 - 34 Bury Street London EC3A 5AR specifically the demolition of Bury House and erection of a new building comprising of 4 basement levels, ground plus 43 storeys (178.7m AOD); partial demolition of Holland House and Renown House; restoration of existing and erection of four storey extension resulting in ground plus 8 storeys at Holland House (48.05m AOD) and three storey extension resulting in ground plus 5 storeys at Renown House (36.49m AOD); interconnection of the three buildings; use of the buildings for office (Class E(g)), flexible retail/café (Class E(a)/E(b)), and flexible community/education/ cultural/amenity (Class F2(b)/ F1(a)- (e)/ E(f)/ Sui Generis) uses; and provision of a new covered pedestrian route, cycle parking and facilities, landscaping and highway improvements, servicing and plant and all other ancillary and other associated works. The Sub-Committee also considered a report of the Chief Planning Officer and Development Director regarding Holland House, 1 - 4, 32 Bury Street, London, EC3A 5AW, specifically the restoration works to Holland House including removal and reinstatement of external faience together with the removal and replacement of existing concrete beam; partial demolition to facilitate interconnection with the neighbouring proposed new building and the construction of a four storey roof extension resulting in ground plus 8 storeys; together with internal alterations including truncation of the existing lightwell, reconfiguration of partitions, installation of a new staircase, servicing and all other ancillary and associated works.

The Officer stated that the presentation was a brief summary of a more comprehensive presentation which had been published. She added that two addenda had also been published to address additional representations and matters relevant to the new National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

The Officer stated that the application related to a site located to the northeast corner of Bury Street, northwest of Creechurch Lane. It comprised three buildings, namely Holland House, a grade two star listed building, Renown House and Bury House. It was within the recently designated Creechurch Conservation Area. Other designated heritage assets were located near the site, including the Bevis Mark Synagogue, a grade one listed building.

Members were informed that the site was located at the heart of the Eastern Cluster which contained the greatest density of businesses and jobs in the City.

It was also within the city cluster key area of change and the city cluster Tall Buildings Area as identified in the emerging City Plan 2040. In terms of the context of the area the site sat within a number of existing, consented and implemented tall buildings, including the Gherkin, 100 Leadenhall, 1 Undershaft, 24 Bevis Marks and 1 Creechurch.

The Sub-Committee was informed that Bury House was a seven-storey commercial building built in 1967. Members were shown existing floor plans and elevations of the building. Renown House was a five-storey office building, built in 1912. Although not a heritage asset, Renown House was a characterful survival of a small-scale office building. Members were shown the existing floor plans and elevations of the building. The Officer stated that Holland House was a grade two star listed building which was built to designs of Berlage in 1916. It was of expressionist style with vertical architectural form finished in distinctive grey green faience. Members were shown the floor plans and elevations of Holland House.

The Sub-Committee was advised that planning permission was sought for an office led development involving the demolition of Bury House and erection of a new building comprising four basement levels, ground plus 43-storey restoration works, Holland House and Renown House including extensions, interconnection of the three buildings and construction of a single core within Bury House to serve all three buildings.

The Officer advised that listed building consent was also sought for the external restoration works to Holland House, the partial demolition and construction of the four-storey roof extension, together with the internal alterations including truncation of the existing light well.

Members were informed that the proposed development had been designed to activate the ground floor and optimise inclusive public realm. The Renown House ground floor plate would be lowered to provide step-free access to both Renown House and Holland House. Step-free access would also be provided throughout James Court, Heneage Arcade and Bury Street. Access to the cycle parking would be off Creechurch Lane and Heneage Arcade. There would be one servicing point of Heneage Lane to serve the whole development with consolidated deliveries not exceeding 33 vehicles a day and a blue badge parking bay was also proposed within the designated servicing bay to serve the proposed development. 582 long stay and 85 short stay policy compliant cycle parking spaces were proposed within the lower ground and basement levels along with dedicated cycle repair space supporting the provision of new skills in the area providing training and jobs for young adults. Policy compliant end of trip facilities would be provided at basement level two.

The Officer highlighted the existing and proposed public realm arrangements. Despite the relatively small site footprint, the proposed building would provide over 600 square metres of new external public realm providing over 75% uplift. Members were shown a ground floor axonometric plan showing the ground floor arrangement and its proposed uses. Heneage Arcade would create a new thoroughfare, reintroducing a historic City route with flexible retail cafe uses and

incorporating public art. St James Court would be reimagined, providing a space available to the wider community that was accessible, inclusive and inviting.

Members were shown the proposed lower ground, ground and first floor plans. Alongside the office space, flexible, educational, cultural, community, sports, multi-faith spaces would be introduced which would be combined to create a compelling and inclusive public offer in the heart of the cluster, in line with the Destination City agenda. The proposal would also provide over 1,100 square metres of affordable workspace.

Members were shown the a section of the proposed Heneage Arcade at ground floor and the double-storey flexible auditorium to the upper floors. These multi-functional bookable spaces would attract a wide range of activities, including student visits for learning, educational, creative and skills workshops, rehearsals, performances, conferences, charity events, sports tournaments and faith events. The spaces would be available free of charge for community-based groups, non-profit organisations and schools for over 67 hours each week, along with the artwork proposed to be displayed along Heneage Arcade. The proposal would also involve the creation of an outer climbing wall on the facade of the tower fronting St James Court. This would be open to the public, encouraging health and well-being and supporting the provision of new sports and recreation facilities.

Members were shown the indicative floor plans of the proposed development, showing the variation of the floor plates, the introduction of roof terraces, the recessed extensions to the listed building, the tapering of the upper floors of the tower element, the proposed office floor space floor plates which ranged between 350 square metres and 580 square metres for businesses of 50 to 60 people, supporting smaller start-up businesses providing office tenants with their own private entrance and a gated floor space. An urban farm was proposed at the ninth floor of Holland House to be used as a rooftop classroom, providing a nurturing environment for learners to explore plus urban greening. Office tenants would also benefit from access to terraces which would provide a space of calm and engagement with nature.

The Officer stated that planning permission for the demolition of the building at 31 Bury Street and the construction of a 48-storey tower building was previously refused. The reasons for refusal included the adverse impact the development had on the setting and amenities of the grade one listed Bevis Mark Synagogue by reason of the overbearing and overshadowing impact of the development on the courtyard, and the adverse impact of the development on the Tower of London World Heritage Site by reason of the less than substantial harm caused to the LVMF 10A.1 from the Tower Bridge North Bastion.

Members were informed that the current proposal incorporated three buildings rather than Bury House alone. In terms of the tower element, this had been amended to reduce its height by 19 metres and by setting back the top eight

floors to reduce the massing towards the termination point of the tower.

Members were shown the existing and proposed elevations, showing the development within its context. In the southwest elevation the proposed development would be approximately 16 metres lower than the Gherkin. In the northeast elevation, the development would be approximately 84 metres lower than 100 Leadenhall. Members were also shown the northwest and southeast elevations, a closer view of the proposed development at Renown House and Holland House and the relationship with the proposed tower element. They were also informed by the Officer that the development would involve the demolition of the existing clumsy 1960s, 70s and 80s and 80s extensions and their replacement with three additional floors that were set back from the main facade providing a well-considered designed response. She commented that the overall design of the extensions to Renown House would maintain the existing qualities and its relationship with Holland House executed in a different style to continue to be read as two separate buildings. As could be seen from the historic and proposed illustrative view, the additional storeys would have a very limited visibility in the oblique views.

The Officer stated that the building was designed to have no negative impact on the ability to appreciate the historic facades. The proposed element would be a sophisticated new addition to the city cluster through the use of high-quality faience materials and detailing inspired by the immediate neighbours. The proposed building would be an appropriate and sympathetic neighbour in architectural terms.

Members were shown images of some of the different scenarios that had been tested for environmental impacts, including the baseline scenario, the future baseline and the cumulative including the proposed development. They were also shown a table outlining the daylight and sunlight impacts of the proposed development of the nearby receptors. These impacts had been independently reviewed and were assessed in detail in the report. Moderate daylight impacts on some nearby residential properties have been identified. These were considered acceptable considering the context of the City. Negligible effects have been identified in terms of sunlight.

The Officer showed the view of the proposed development from Bevis Marks Synagogue's courtyard with the reduction in height and massing from the previously refused application. Members were shown an image of the interior of the synagogue towards the Bimah and an image from the gallery. Photographs showed the synagogue had large sized windows to all four elevations. The daylight impacts of the proposed development in the synagogue showed an absolute reduction of 0.4% in the gallery and central room between the cumulative and future baseline scenarios, which was considered a minor adverse impact. Members were shown a slide outlining the sunlight impacts into the synagogue. It was noted that these meet the BRE criteria. Members were also shown a visual of the interior of the synagogue. The exhibition centre could be seen and it was to the south of the synagogue.

The application was supported by a qualitative assessment called a radiance

assessment, which showed the level of daylight in a room. 3D visuals were presented which showed the impact on the level of daylight would be localised and in a limited area in the gallery and it would be minimally noticeable. A comparison of the daylight and sunlight impacts from the previous scheme has been carried out by a third party on behalf of the Corporation. The results show that the daylight effects remained relatively comparable, and the sunlight effects of the proposed scheme represented a small improvement when compared to the refused scheme. Members were reminded that the daylight and sunlight impact into the interior of the synagogue was not a reason for refusal of the previous application.

Members were shown a visual of the layout of the synagogue's courtyard as it was in 1925, with a previous annex and as existing following the recent changes to include an exhibition centre with a new ramp and a permanent security and ticketing booths. In terms of overshadowing, the courtyard of Bevis Marks Synagogue would meet the BRE guidelines. Although not a BRE requirement, when considering the average sunlight availability in the courtyard the changes between the future baseline and cumulative were very limited and equated to a maximum of 19 minutes' reduction of sunlight in June. This reduction was not considered to preclude from continuing to use the space for religious events or in association with the visitor centre.

In terms of wind and thermal comfort, several scenarios had been tested and it had been found there would be no safety exceedances. Members were shown the existing wind condition scenario and were informed that with the proposed development built on site, conditions were suitable for their intended use. Landscaping mitigations were only required at the level seven terrace of the proposed development and with all cumulative schemes included, the wind conditions would still be suitable for their intended use and the conditions in the synagogue courtyard would remain suitable for frequent seating.

Members were informed of the importance of viewing the moon to enable the reciting of the Kiddush Levana prayer and stated this topic was subject to a number of objections. To respond to these objections, the applicant had carried out a study of a full lunar cycle. The assessment was based on the visibility of the moon from two observer points within the courtyard which were outlined. The results of the study were that in the existing conditions the moon was not visible at all for three months in the year and this was reduced by one more month in the future baseline scenario and this was due to the technically implemented 100 Leadenhall building. Although the proposed development would reduce the number of hours that the development would be visible from the observer points, it would not reduce the number of months that the moon would be visible when compared to the future baseline scenario. Members were informed that the City of London Corporation had taken positive steps to advance equality of opportunity by undertaking a detailed assessment of the impacts of the proposal on the use of the synagogue, and it was considered that the impacts of the development would not adversely affect the synagogue as a place of worship in order to warrant a ground for refusal.

Members were shown a number of townscape views. In the existing view from Tower Bridge South, with the proposed development and cumulative schemes, the proposed development would clearly form part of the cluster that was read as a distinctive entity from the World Heritage Site. From 10A.1, less than substantial harm was previously identified to the Tower of London by the previously refused development. As could be seen in the proposed and cumulative views the currently proposed development would appear at the east edge of the cluster, providing an eastern endpiece playing an important role in mediating between the cluster and the lower buildings to the east, particularly when compared to 100 Leadenhall and 1 Undershaft. In the view from Queen's Walk, in the existing, proposed and with cumulative schemes it was considered the observer would continue to recognise and appreciate the World Heritage Site as a strategically important landmark set apart from the City.

Members were shown the existing, proposed and cumulative views from the Tower of London Inner ward and the east of Devereux Tower and the local views from Bury Street. It was considered the proposed extensions to Holland House and Renown House would be architecturally designed to be recessive to the architecture of the Grade II* listed façade.

In the view from Bevis Mark Synagogue with the proposed development and with implemented schemes, the synagogue had commanding presence in the courtyard as the forefront of the view. There were existing tall buildings visible behind the synagogue, including 40 and 100 Leadenhall. It was from the courtyard entrance that they were the most visible. When moving into the courtyard closer to the synagogue, they quickly receded into glimpsed background elements. In the view from Creechurch looking northwest with the proposed development and cumulative schemes, the development could be seen as part of a dynamic, denser urban townscape fundamentally characterised by its proximity to other tall buildings.

Members were informed that Carbon Optioneering had been carried out to establish carbon impacts, opportunities and constraints for the environmental sustainability to inform the development proposals and this was independently reviewed. The energy strategy had been optimised for the site and a BREEAM excellent rating was targeted. Circular economy measures had been incorporated, such as retaining approximately 35% of the existing structures, as well as designing for longevity, adaptability and low maintenance. The development would also achieve a UGF of 0.32 which exceeded the policy requirements.

The Officer stated that when comparing the scheme to that previously refused, it was considered the amendments incorporated to the tower element to reduce its height and massing, would be sufficient to overcome the previous reason for refusal in terms of the impact on to the World Heritage Site.

To conclude, the Officer stated that the proposed development would secure a strategic office-led development within the City cluster that would provide land uses which would support the diversification, vitality and growth of the cluster as a 24/7 world class business destination. The provision of over 34,500 square

metres of Grade A office floor space and over 2,400 jobs would significantly contribute to the City of London's economic base. The provision of over 1,100 of affordable workspace free of charge for charities would provide an inclusive offer and attract small businesses. The flexible retail, educational, cultural community, sports, multi faith spaces would create a compelling and inclusive public offer in the cluster in line with the Destination City agenda. The development would result in a significant aesthetic enhancement to the Creechurch locality, and it would optimise the public realm offer. The proposed faience-clad tower would provide a sophisticated form of architecture and new architectural counterpoint to its glazed predecessors. The environmental impacts of the development had been extensively assessed in detail in the report and were considered acceptable by Officers. Officers recommended approval of the application subject to conditions and subject to the execution of planning obligations as set out in the agenda pack.

At this point, at 12.22pm, the Chairman adjourned the meeting for 15 minutes. The meeting resumed at 12.37pm.

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.

The Chairman then invited the objectors to speak.

Sir Michael Bear requested that as Rachel Blake MP was unable to attend the meeting as she was in Parliament, that Tilla Crowne as trustee be allowed to speak in her stead.

Sir Michael stated that it was unprecedented for a pro-growth, former Lord Mayor of the City of London to address Members as an objector but this particular application left him no choice. He stated that the City of London was an exceptional place from Roman times to mediaeval times to modernity. Interesting and fine buildings had made the city the unique and highly attractive place that it was. These traditions had created the world's leading financial centre. In 1985, rules were changed, allowing much denser and taller buildings, but this had always been counterbalanced by designating conservation areas, and these preserved the best of the past and had produced a vibrant mix of styles. He questioned how 31 Bury Street fitted into the exemplary planning decisions made by Officers and Members in the past, whether it respected the conservation area it was in and was designated less than a year ago and whether it respected listed buildings and views of the two principal heritage assets of St Paul's Cathedral and the Tower of London as well as the Bevis Mark Synagogue grade one listed building and Holland House grade two listed building. He stated that whilst he did not consider that it damaged St Paul's Cathedral, it did damage all of the other three buildings.

Sir Michael stated that Holland House was an exceptional grade two star listed building of the First World War era with a very unusual facade. He stated that the developer planned for extra floors and Historic England had stated they would not grant listed building consent.

Sir Michael stated that Bevis Mark Synagogue had been continuously occupied since its construction in 1701, it was older than St Paul's and built by the same school of constructors as the Wren churches. It was a unique piece of architecture, a living centre of an important minority community and something to be celebrated in the multicultural City. It was the only non-Christian place of worship in the Square Mile. It had religious rules such as not turning on electricity on the Sabbath, requiring views of the moon and having enough natural light to read the books of the law. Some of its traditions were unique in the world. Members were informed the technical issues about 31 Bury Street were clear. Firstly, there was no significant change in the design apart from a small reduction in height so the grounds of refusal of the first application still stood. Secondly, the current application was in direct conflict with the current City Plan where policy CS14 stated that the Corporation would refuse planning permission for tall buildings in conservation areas. He added that the City had rightly been granting consent for new buildings to deal with the demand for new modern space but as a developer, he knew the market very well, and the development world was in turmoil with no finance available for 13 of the 14 consented towers.

Sir Michael expressed concern that it was claimed that the proposals would preserve the setting and significance of the synagogue and that there would be an enhancement to the Creechurch Conservation Area and stated that the benefits were disingenuous. He stated the majority would apply to office buildings anywhere in the City and others were standard requirements. He queried who the community space was intended to serve and whether it would amount to anything with so many recent applications including similar provisions, and with these uses peppered around the City with no apparent demand or location strategy.

Sir Michael added that to degrade one established community space for a new one elsewhere was not reasonable and that the Officer recommendation completely disregarded the City traditions mentioned as well as the importance of multiculturalism and religious tolerance. He further added that he spoke as somebody who cared deeply about the City's heritage and traditions, and he urged Members to refuse this application as they did the previous one.

Ms Henrietta Gordon informed the Sub-Committee that she had worked as a solicitor in the City of London for over 25 years, she was not Jewish and had no links to Bevis Marks, its community or the wider Jewish community. In addition, no one had asked her to object, she had done so because she believed this was not just a planning application but she believed the Jewish people, their faith and their place of worship could continue to be discriminated against and the law could continue to be broken within the City of London. She stated that this was demonstrated by the ways in which St Paul's Cathedral and the Bevis Mark Synagogue were being treated. She commented that St Paul's Cathedral opened in 1710 and was afforded a wealth of legal protection by the City of London Corporation and the Mayor of London. No buildings whether offices or otherwise, encroached upon it. It was justifiably treated with reverence. Bevis Mark Synagogue, by contrast, had little or no

protection and was about to lose its last remaining daylight if this building project went ahead. Ms Gordon stated that the synagogue opened in 1701. It was the oldest synagogue in the UK in continuous use, and it was the only synagogue building in Europe that had held continuous services for more than 320 years. It was the main synagogue built after the readmission of Jews to England by Oliver Cromwell following the expulsion in 1290 and the synagogue continued to be an active place of worship. It was also the only non-Christian place of worship within the City of London.

Ms Gordon stated that St Paul's Cathedral and Bevis Mark Synagogue were both grade one buildings built within a few years of each other, in the early 18th century with almost identical historic and religious significance and yet Bevis Marks was not being offered the same protection that was given to St Paul's Cathedral. She stated that situation would be significantly aggregated if this application was allowed. She commented that the City of London Corporation was subject to the planning and the public sector equality duty in Section 149 of the Equality Act 2010. The principles in the decision of *Brown v the Secretary of State for Work and Pensions*, had become defining guidelines for the exercise of this duty. The Human Rights Act Articles 9 and 14 also required Christian and Jewish worshippers to be treated in the same way and their places of worship should not, therefore, be treated differently. Furthermore, the Corporation adopted the international definition of antisemitism in full on 5 December 2019. This included antisemitism directed towards Jewish individuals and all their property towards Jewish institutions and religious facilities. Ms Gordon commented that allowing this proposed building to remove the last natural light to Bevis Marks would in her view be a breach of the Corporation's equality duty, a breach of the human rights of the members of the synagogue and an act of discrimination and antisemitism.

Ms Gordon commented that there were approximately 250,000 Jewish people in the UK. They were therefore considered a minority group and, as such, were worthy of protection. She considered that if the application were approved, this would be acting contrary to this. She added that she was objecting because she was concerned at the possible perception of the Jewish faith being treated as worthy of less protection than her own faith and because as a lawyer of over 25 years, she was anxious at the prospect of the law being broken in relation to a Jewish place of worship of equivalent historic and religious significance to a Christian place of worship. Having worked within the City of London for her entire career, she was uncomfortable at the prospect of such discrimination taking place on her doorstep by an establishment that, she strongly felt, should be leading by example. She asked the Sub-Committee to avoid any such discrimination by refusing the planning application and thereby affording Bevis Marks Synagogue the same protection as St Paul's Cathedral.

Adrian Phillips, Director of Historical Palaces, the custodians of the Tower of London World Heritage Site stated they strongly objected to the Bury House application. He stated they firmly believed that the heightened massing of the proposed 43-storey building at the very eastern edge of the cluster would harm the setting of the Tower of London. Mr Phillips commented that it was one of the best examples of castle ever built anywhere in the world. Its landmark siting

and visual dominance on the river edge and the impressive skyline were key to its designation as a World Heritage Site. The setting of such a castle designated to project royal power over its surroundings, was crucial to its significance but the proposed development would fill the clear sky space beside the White Tower when seen from the strategically protected view of Tower Bridge and would erode the setting and value of the World Heritage Site.

The Chairman asked if Members of the Sub-Committee had any questions of the objectors.

A Member asked how the Kiddush Levana prayer was recited when the waxing moon was invisible on a series of cloudy nights and also if following the start of the prayer, it suddenly became cloudy whether the service would be completed. The objector stated that the prayer was said upon seeing the night sky. If that moon was obstructed, then the prayer could not be recited. The reduction in the amount of viewing hours was from 100 to 40 hours and functionally would reduce the number of months that this prayer could be said depending on the year, from four to six months. If someone had been there at the beginning and said the opening of the prayer and then a cloud passed by, they could continue, but this proposal would essentially create a perpetual cloudy sky and would diminish the ability to worship there.

A Member asked Mr Phillips from the Tower of London for more information on his concerns. He stated that whilst the principle of a cluster was supported, it was getting higher and encroaching on the tower. The views of the tower were so sacrosanct to the understanding of its significance and appreciating it as something that reigned over the City for many years. It was a key asset for the City which welcomed over 3 million visitors a year and that really supported the City and the Destination City Programme. The Tower was therefore an important asset that should be embraced and welcomed and it was considered that this development was too close.

A Member queried the UNESCO and ICOMOS concerns on the encroachment to the World Heritage Site and were advised that a state of conservation report had been received by government along with a technical review of Bury Street.

A Member asked a representative of the synagogue why they considered the development to be a major threat to the synagogue e.g. the impact on lighting levels and the ability of the synagogue to function. She also asked if there were any other heritage harm. She added that the scheme had changed since it was previously submitted and asked whether policy changes had impacted either positively or negatively. A representative from the synagogue stated that the functional impact was that the synagogue was a living community. It was probably the only Jewish community in the world today that had maintained continuity back to 1700. This made it a place of profound international and deep significance to the Jewish community and this development would have a meaningful and significant impact on the community's ability to continue to use the space and to worship. The development would create a perpetual cloudy evening, and the internal light levels would ensure a perpetual winter morning. These were real, tangible impacts.

Currently, nearly all the light daylight present, particularly in the ground floor of the synagogue, was a product of light reflected off the surrounding surfaces of the buildings of the courtyard around it. This made this building very unusual as it put it beyond the normal boundaries of the day lighting of buildings. Members were shown an indicative image which showed the creation of a huge degree of shading during parts of the day and it was stated that the report submitted to the Sub-Committee gave an empirical example of this and there was a comparison between the effect of One Creechurch and that of the proposed development. It was suggested that as the current methodology used for understanding the impact of day lighting and its reduction did not take into account the reflective characteristics of the surrounding buildings, as a result, the proposed methodology used was deficient and a significant part of the submission was to try and demonstrate that. As a result, it was considered that the Sub-Committee had not been given the full picture of how much harm was being done to the day lighting of the synagogue. An objector stated this was an exceptional grade one listed building that was essentially like a cathedral building and the courtyard of the building was an extension of the synagogue and was intrinsic to its heritage significance. The synagogue did not have a vestibule but had a courtyard and therefore the building and its courtyard were both of exceptional interest. The prominence of the synagogue was also intrinsic to the significance, and as could be seen in the images shown, this prominence would not be preserved. The light into the synagogue was essential for the synagogue to function as such. If that was somehow prohibited or diminished, then the significance of the synagogue as a working building would be put into question and this would cause a high level of heritage harm together with architectural impacts.

A Member stated that the Officer had stated there would be a minor adverse loss of daylight, that in the gallery, the loss of or the impact on daylight would be minimally noticeable and that there would be no adverse effects that would prevent the synagogue from remaining as a place of worship. The Member asked the objectors reasons for not accepting these statements.

A Member queried an objector's suggestion that Bevis Marks synagogue was comparable to St Paul's which he considered to be a slight distortion of history as Cromwell permitted the synagogue to be built on the basis of it being a discrete private place and it had never been open to the public or visible in the same way as St Paul's so he did not consider it fair to compare the two buildings. He stated they were both important buildings with Bevis Marks possibly more so in some ways as it was the only one in the City whereas St Paul's was one of many churches. The objector stated that St Paul's was so well protected by the City of London, not because it was open to the public, but because it was a place of reverence and a place of historic interest. It was a grade one listed building built at the same time as the synagogue.

A Member queried Ms Gordon statement that the proposal would remove the last natural light from Bevis Marks which was contradicted by Officers. Ms Gordon stated the Officer report confirmed that the light study carried out by the applicant did not take into account reflected light. The objectors had demonstrated with their study that the overwhelming majority of the light in the

synagogue was derived from reflected light. Without a study that took that into account, the loss that would occur could not be measured. The objectors' study had measured the loss that has occurred from One Creechurch, which was the same distance away, where only 20 storeys had caused the light levels to plummet by overshadowing the synagogue. It was stated that it was highly likely that the same plummeting of light levels would occur during the hours of 31 Bury Street obscured the sunlight over the synagogue.

A Member having clarified that Ms Gordon practiced law asked her to confirm that she had stated that if the application was approved, the law would be broken and that the Sub-Committee would be acting contrary to certain people's human rights. She responded by stating that in her understanding the Sub-Committee would be in breach of their duties of Section 149 of the Equality Act 2010, Articles 9 and 10, 9 and 14 of the Human Rights Act and would not be committing to the international definition of antisemitism which the Corporation had subscribed to on 5 December 2009, which meant that the Jewish community, its institutions and religious facilities, were supposed to be protected. By allowing this building to go ahead she considered this would be damaging a Jewish place of worship. The Member then asked Sir Michael Bear who had worked with many of the Members present if he understood how offensive such comments could be to certain people present. Sir Michael Bear stated that people were speaking from the heart and it was worth hearing their comments. He stated he was not there to judge and the campaign embarked upon had been an elegant, sophisticated and respectful one. The Member commented that the City was hosting a Hannukah reception the following week. Sir Michael Bear stated it was ironic this was the festival of light. The Member stated that it been mentioned that the building under consideration was not financed and that this was not a material planning consideration. Sir Michael Bear conceded with the point.

A Member asked given the continuous freedom of worship at Bevis Marks for the last 300 years, what impact this would have on that continued freedom. An objector stated the synagogue was built by Jews who found refuge in this country escaping the Spanish Inquisition. The City of London had protected the community for nearly 400 years and it would be tragic if the planning decision harmed the ability to continue to worship in the place where it was first guaranteed in this country. The development would make it more difficult to read the prayers, if it is more difficult for us to say particular prayers and the synagogue would become simply a heritage asset and would cease to be the longest continuously operating synagogue in the world. This should be a source of pride and be preserved and protected.

A Member asked an objector to clarify the difference between the image of the real world impact and the expected image in relation to One Creechurch. Using the images, the objector outlined the differences with One Creechurch, having a substantial effect on the interior lighting of the of the synagogue. In relation to the Bury Street proposal, there would be a period of time in which the courtyard walls would be similarly shadowed as they were by 1 Creechurch Street so whilst the effect could not yet be given in absolute terms, in indicative empirical

terms there was a similar depreciation of the daylight levels within the synagogue.

The Town Clerk invited the applicants to speak. Alexander Morris stated he was speaking on behalf of the applicant who had been investing in developing in London for over 20 years and was the largest non-listed London Office Fund with real estate in Westminster, the City and Islington. He stated the application provided substantial economic, environmental and social benefits. The economic benefits of the new office space would deliver the strategic objectives of the draft 2040 City Plan. Mr Morris stated the environmental benefits of the scheme were consistent or better than recent applications approved by the Sub-Committee and advised that he was joined by six people to illuminate the substantial social benefits in their own words, representing some of the 250 groups that had been engaged with across education, multi-faith charities, sports and culture.

Mr Alex Feldman, Deputy Headteacher at Dairy Meadow Primary School in Southall stated that this was a state school that served an area of high deprivation in the Borough of Ealing. The majority of the children were first or second generation immigrants from South Asia. They did not have English as a first language and had parents that majorly work in the black or gig economy. He added that his passion as an educator was for children to dream big and realise that their background class, creed, colour or religion should not be barriers to future success. Having Holland House as a tangible resource in the City of London over the last three years had crystallised this, from visiting and seeing the grave of the Roman girl at the entrance travelling through the age of Empire and into a boardroom modelled on the Titanic, Holland House truly made the history curriculum come alive. All of the children at the school knew what CEOs were, but Holland House gave them a chance to sit at the head of the head of a boardroom table. Mr Feldman advised that world of work days had been held, primary school children had met individuals involved who contributed to the construction and the running of Holland House and there had been CV writing workshops and mock interviews. School counsellors had visited to know more about the City of London and could tangibly see now how they could be the next cog in the engine of the mercantile centre of the UK. He added that even by getting on the Elizabeth line to travel up to Holland House, the students got the idea that they could engage with the buildings and could see themselves as future city workers. The hands-on immersive experiences provided the children with real world examples of their learning. There were plans to work with the urban farm to build on ideas of sustainability and teamwork within the STEM sector. This enrichment could never occur within the constraints of the school. Thanks to the visits to Holland House, Mr Feldman had witnessed the children develop their own sense of self identity, learnt from the rich history that surrounded them and the cultural grounding of Holland House. He was confident in saying that the students could now see themselves as decision makers and hopefully future leaders.

Harshita Patel, City resident, parent carer of a teenager with autism and an advocate for families facing special education needs and disabilities (SEND) stated that through her work with the City Parent Carer Forum and the SEN

Board, she had witnessed the unique challenges that families encountered. As an access and inclusion consultant in the public realm, she had collaborated with organisations and this year she had applied for the Barbican Imagine Fund. Together, over 100 individuals had been supported in accessing free creative arts and sports, thereby enhancing their health and well-being in the Square Mile which had limited public spaces and bureaucratic hurdles that often left families isolated. There was a significant lack of safe areas for regular activities and essential facilities. Ms Patel stated there was a need for community centres that were grassroots led, providing structure and fostering a sense of belonging. It was crucial for City planning to consider the needs of families with SEND and other marginalised groups. A great example of inclusive design was Holland House. It prioritised accessibility, featured changing places toilets, sensory areas and spaces tailored for various needs. It created a new standard for accessibility environments, breaking down barriers to participation. Ms Patel added that creating inclusive spaces could profoundly impact the community by promoting dignity and by encouraging involvement, a stronger, more supportive environment could be created for everyone.

Ms Shahida Victor, from Greenhouse Sports charity, stated the charity developed young people through sports and mentoring. She stated that being a Muslim from Fiji, where cultures met, versatile values were united in harmony and she was delighted to learn of Holland House which was a house of hope where different faiths were celebrated. Differences were embraced and welcomed and the space would serve as a platform to unite people in cohesion and build bridges. Ms Victor stated she was speaking as a representative of both community and faith groups, a voice that transcended and united as with up to 150 Muslim men and women joining Friday prayers sessions at Holland House every week. She added that Aslam Baccus, trustee of Halls For Jamar had stated the venue supported multi-faith groups and community based projects in a cultural and professional space supporting diverse initiatives that promoted inclusivity and learning. She further added that this support was shared by Dhara Patel of the City Hindus Network and Param Singh of the City of Sikhs Network who welcomed the proposals, emphasising how activities could be expanded to engage more effectively, sharing their delight at discovering this affordable venue in the City and the opportunities to foster connections and strengthen community ties at Holland House. St Helen's Church in Bishopsgate had welcomed additional space provided at Holland House with Mandarin Christian groups Sunday School, podcast recording sessions and other activities benefiting from its inclusivity and accessibility.

Mr Troy and Ms Kuku Richards, founders of the Museum of Diversity stated they were speaking not just as advocates for this application, but as individuals committed to creating spaces where every voice mattered and every story was celebrated. They asked Members to imagine a young person visiting the City of London for the first time and feeling like an outsider, then stepping into Holland House, a vibrant cultural hub where they saw themselves reflected in the exhibitions, stories and workshops and finding reassurance in a space that whispered 'you belong here'. Slowly their confidence would grow as they began to envision a future where they too could contribute to the City's legacy. Holland House was more than a building. It integrated the Museum of Diversity into the

City of London's fabric, forming a cultural hub that improvised underrepresented narratives and fostered connections. This renovation was vital to transforming the City's identity from a place once defined by its walls to one celebrated for inclusivity and cultural vibrancy.

Mr Richards stated the impact of the Museum of Diversity being in Holland House had been significant from initiatives such as the virtual reality museum collaborations with local schools and universities, as well as the project for the Commonwealth Secretariat that has reached over 2 million people globally. Events hosted at Holland House included art showcases, music performances and educational forums which engaged the community and deepened impact. Mr Richards added that this renovation would provide the permanent space needed to expand programmes, grow the museum and position London as a global cultural leader. Economically, this project would draw new visitors, boost tourism and support local businesses while redefining public spaces as inclusive and dynamic. This application was not just about renovating the building, it was about investing in London's future by supporting this project to ensure that this historic space became a vibrant cultural hub where diverse voices were celebrated and every individual felt they had a place in the story of the City.

Tessa Sanderson, CBE stated she had competed in six consecutive Olympic Games from 1976 to 1996, winning gold in 1984. She informed Members that forty years ago, she achieved the dream of Olympic gold becoming the first and only British athlete to win gold in a throwing event but she did not do it alone. It was the belief and support of key individuals that made it possible. She was speaking as an ambassador for the Museum of Diversity because hope and an opportunity was given to her and she was committed to sharing stories like hers which inspired, empowered and reflected the resilience and richness of communities.

The Deputy Chairman sought an explanation for how the lunar transit study was carried out, how it was validated and whether it had received a third-party expert review. A supporter stated the study was carried out by Dr. Axel Jacobs who had a PhD in light and lighting and it was reviewed by Dr Ticleanu, the Head of Lighting at the BRE. The supporter added that the information that had been used to undertake the calculations was publicly available and had been entirely peer-reviewed from both a technical side and through the onsite measurements.

The Deputy Chairman cited the support of staff to users in the community space that was frequently mentioned in letters in support of the application and asked, if the scheme was consented, whether the support would be continued and, if so, could details be provided of that. A supporter stated a lot of time had been spent talking to organisations about the requirements and the demand was significant already. He added that the plan was to offer the service, space and opportunities in perpetuity of the life of the asset and there was a number of supporters in attendance that had been heard from. The supporter further stated he would happily talk about some of the others who had used the space and would use the space continuously.

A Member stated the number of voluntary and community-sector organisations that had been engaged was interesting and questioned how many children and families from the Aldgate School had been engaged in the programme. The supporter responded that the Aldgate School had not been engaged and they had not used the space, but they had gone to schools across London rather than just specifically local. The supporter stated they had spoken to Canon Barnett Primary School and they had used the space quite a bit.

The Member also asked whether the St. Botolph's Aldgate Centre had been engaged and St. Joseph's Centre for Dignified Work. The Member added that the new Aldgate Centre was hiring a space at nearly £1,000 a day to keep the lights on. The supporter stated that the documentation clearly described who the developer had been able to consult with and were not sure they had consulted with the two organisations referred to.

A Member asked the applicants to address the issues of reflective light and the assertion made by an objector that the availability of light would plummet. A supporter responded that the studies undertaken had considered reflective light and the point had been made that they may not have considered sunlight reflected light off the back of the Courtyard. The supporter added that the skies in the UK were mostly cloudy, so sunlight proportion was about a third of the day and of that the third, the tower would only block a small portion which had been tested using the BRE methodology. The supporter further stated that the impact was determined to be negligible and the total sum of it meant that there would be an effect, but overall then changes had been considered to be minor.

The Member queried further on the use of the word 'plummet' by an objector. The supporter told Members that there were changes occurring all the time, every day and at different hours depending on things such as external obstructions, the height of the sun in the sky, cloudiness, and haziness. The supporter suggested the word 'plummet' was used to determine what was a temporary effect and the fact that if the tower blocked the passage of the sun, the light could not reflect back into the synagogue and, for a period of time, the light levels would drop. The supporter added that the studies of daylight ran for an entire year and the resulting studies which determined the significance of an effect were judged on balance throughout the whole year and not on a specific instance in a day.

A Member sought an explanation to understand the context of the application, as it was rejected in 2021, and of the developer's relationship with the synagogue as she did not understand how, after all those years, the relationship seemed to be in the same place with the whole Jewish community not in support of the application, especially as the paper said there was an intention to continue engaging with the Bevis Marks Synagogue. A supporter explained that their relationship with the Synagogue started around four and a half years ago in the original application where the very first meeting, in advance of the meeting with City Officers, had been with representatives of the Synagogue. The supporter added that the relationship continued all the way up to the application being submitted, the application going through consultation,

until a month later a number of objections had been received. The supporter stated he felt that it showed during the first application that, even though the application was refused, he continued the dialogue. He further noted that he told the first person he spoke to from the synagogue, who was not part of the current team, that he wanted to create an opportunity where they could work together and there were a number of official and unofficial meetings. The supporter also stated he had met with a number of people in attendance and had got to a point where they tried to reach a neighbourly agreement, as the developer was on one side with the space and the neighbour to the developer past the Valiant House was the Synagogue. The supporter told the Sub-Committee that they had tried to get to a point of agreement between the developer and the Synagogue which he believed was discussed at a trustee meeting and it was not agreed to. He further added that since that point, he had tried to keep the dialogue open and it would be fair to say that he and the Synagogue had not spoken this year other than one meeting on 13 November where he spoke with representatives of the synagogue, with the subject relating to the moon, daylight and sunlight. The applicant told the Sub-Committee that he, without a doubt, had kept a connection with the Synagogue and a lot of their consultants and apologised for having not reached a point of agreement.

The Member also asked if there was anyone on the development team who was an expert, or consultant, who understood the Jewish faith. The supporter stated that they did not have anyone sitting in the team who was an expert of the Jewish faith and felt that all the material provided by Bevis Marks Synagogue and their team, including talks and YouTube videos, had been helpful for the applicant side, as well as Members and Officers, to understand concerns and work out how to apply empirical analysis and methodologies and understand the impact from an empirical and numerical sense. The supporter added it was for Officers and Members to appreciate Bevis Marks Synagogue's concerns and consider whether they were empirical data impacts and what impact it would have on the ability to worship.

The Member also queried a detailed explanation as to what the benefits were, weighted proportionately to the lighting with the Synagogue, as it seemed that some of the benefits could be done without a new development. The Member in response to clarification from supporters on the question stated they were referring to the benefits in relation to the Section 106 funding and within the application as the Sub-Committee had been told they were quite remarkable and, whilst a lot of the things were included were good, they were not necessarily out of the ordinary. The Member added they wanted an explanation as to why they were exceptional benefits.

A supporter explained, in terms of the public benefits package weighed against the heritage harm and overall harms of the scheme, and the uniqueness would be relevant to the weight attributed to the benefit and made reference to a previous application where a classroom in the sky was presented as a 'unique' offer when there were already other classrooms in the sky. The supporter stated, in that sense, that they would not say it was unique, but that there were unique features about the overall package of benefits. The supporter added that one of the unique features was the degree of testing of the public use in

advance which meant that the individual spaces within Holland House and Creechurch Hall that were proposed responded to the engagement that had happened. A supporter indicated that three-on-three basketball, a classroom and an immersive space gallery had fed into the overall broad package of public benefits that would be unique in one sense, but not a single unique benefit.

The Member questioned how long the fabric of the building would last and how long the benefits would be locked in for. The supporter explained that buildings were now designed to a minimum of 60 years and that was linked to the design whole life cycle carbon and the building had been designed to be a loose-fit if it needed to be upgraded. However, the supporter indicated that there was no intention of the building being designed to be demolished, although it had to be as part of due process and expected the building to be there in perpetuity.

A Member stated it was brilliant to hear the space was currently being used by a number of organisations, including the Halls for Jumuah and Museum of Diversity, and sought confirmation that if the application was refused, the organisations would be able to continue using the space. The supporter told the Sub-Committee that in regard to the economics of the building, it was fair to say that there was a point in time where they would have to think of something different if there was a refusal. The supporter added that they had agreed, in the short-term, to three months of use by a number of individuals, whether it was sports or the Museum of Diversity. The applicant stated they needed to manage an economic position and he would have an empty building, which had been kept empty for the case, and he had made that investment and decision to deliver. The supporter further added that what they had been able to do was have a vast list of individuals doing different things within the space, so it was a decision from an economics perspective.

The Member queried why none of the presentation was about the building and whether there was a reason none of the 10 minutes had been used to tackle some of the points made by the Objectors. The supporter explained the reason they only spoke about the social benefits was because he felt the Officer's report had said everything and set out all the key parts of the economic and sustainability aspects. The supporter noted he was quite happy to answer any questions on other parts of the application.

Another Member told the Sub-Committee that everyone had to accept that the community of Bevis Marks believed that the building would severely damage their ability, if not completely stop, to worship in the Synagogue. The Member added that was the Synagogue's view of it and felt everyone needed to accept that. The Member added that it was difficult for them to understand how it could be suggested that the benefits that were applied to other people could, in some way, offset the damage done to another community as it should not be a competition between groups of who gets the benefit. The Member further stated that they found it unseemly that the supporter was trying to use the benefits to justify the damage that the Jewish community believed was going to be done. The supporter stated it was difficult to answer as to whether they accepted the damage that was referred to by an Objector and they had listened to the

Objectors, considered and talked to try to understand. The supporter indicated that they were not religious and could not walk into the Synagogue and respond to what an objector had said, but they could say that they had been through, with their team, a way to find a path of understanding to use empirical and technical information to try to understand what the concern was. The applicant told the Sub-Committee they believed they had done everything they could and had got a point where there was no harm.

The Member questioned why the benefits were predicated on a building whose design would damage the light into the synagogue and why a building could not be designed that did not cause the damage but still contained the benefits. The supporter explained it was related to the economics and partly to do with the opportunity to use Holland House as a community space as there was a certain element of work that needed to be done to connect Holland House, Renown House and Bury House and Bury House was, at present, effectively acting as the host. The supporter added that host provided an upgrade from a DDA and fire perspective, as well as a sustainability answer to the heritage and the tower itself would deliver not only the offices, but was delivering a response to the listed building issue. The supporter told the Sub-Committee that it was necessary to have the two working together and the reason for the height and shape of the building was related to the second reason of the previous application.

A Member noted they were on the Sub-Committee when the developer last brought a scheme for approval and recalled the scheme was refused mainly due to the adverse impact on the Grade One setting of St. Bevis Mark's Synagogue, its overbearing and overshadowing impact of the development on the courtyard of the Synagogue which was contrary to the protection of the setting of listed buildings, and the adverse effect on the setting of the Tower of London world heritage site. The Member stated that they could see the applicant had amended the scheme to try to limit the impact on the World Heritage Site, they struggled to see how the scheme had been amended to overcome the grounds that it was initially refused on in relation to the overbearing and overshadowing impact. The Member added those grounds for refusal were not completely captured in the refusal note and there were other grounds raised such as Holland House as they had raised the impact on the Grade Two-listed Holland House themselves. A supporter confirmed the Member was correct, stated there were a very clear two reasons for refusal and told the Sub-Committee that led to a response to change the massing and tried to reduce harm to both assets in key views and increase the public benefits. Another supporter stated that in relation to the perception of the overbearing impact from the courtyard of the synagogue and the effects of the setting on the Synagogue, the building had been reduced in height quite visibly, with the massing on top also reduced, so when one entered the courtyard, as seen in the presentation, one would see most of the building but as one moved around the courtyard, less of it would be seen. The supporter added that in all cases, the Synagogue would be very close and present in the foreground and, in order to see the building from many spots in the courtyard, one would need to crank their neck, and a video had been provided to prove that. It was further stated by the supporter that tall buildings were already visible, and it was part of the

character of the Synagogue. In relation to the Tower of London, the supporter explained that there was clearly a reduction in height and that the proposal would maintain the gap that already existed in the view from the northern bastion of Tower Bridge between Heron Plaza and the White Tower.

The Member outlined that they realised Holland House needed to have some work done around the façade and queried why that had not been done to protect the historic building as they would have thought it would be one of the developer's priorities to preserve the current historic building of Holland House and ensure it was repaired and safe. A supporter stated they had spent quite a bit of time and money going through the structural elements and the safety of the façade, which continued to be monitored, and had carried out what was required for that particular façade.

The Member also raised the issue of the community space and noted a few months ago that the Sub-Committee granted the whole of Writers House as part of a community space for the Clare House development and there was another development at Bishopsgate near Liverpool Street Station that included two floors of community flexible space. The Member further noted the Sub-Committee had granted a classroom in the sky in the previous application and asked why the developer felt that their community offering was needed in addition to what had already been granted, why it was different and why it was a benefit. The Member stated that there was plenty of space in the City of London for community groups, who were always welcome and, if the development did not go ahead, space could be found for those already using the space. The Member asked the developer to outline the benefits as a lot of these would be encapsulated in any development there that could be designed to not overshadow or overbear on the Grade One-listed St. Bevis Marks Synagogue. A supporter stated that, in terms of benefits, the uniqueness of what they had done was the testing by thousands of users who had used the space and had said that was where the demand was. The supporter added that they understood the point made and that there were already consents for more space, but felt that demand outstripped supply now and would do so in the future. The supporter told the Sub-Committee that another point relating to the overall uniqueness of the scheme was that the offer was in perpetuity as other similar offers were usually aimed at a specific tenant which then fell away and required a new tenant to be found.

The Chairman moved the discussion to Members questions to Officers.

The Chairman sought to clarify some of the emotive points against the factual points and stated a need to get clear bandwidth between the two to ensure decisions were made in line with planning policy.

The Chairman noted there was reference to the fact that Historic England would not grant consent for Holland House off the back of what had been proposed and sought some clarification of the situation from Officers and where the conservation was going as it was a very clear statement they would not grant it. Officers responded that Historic England could not grant Listed Building Consent themselves as they were not a decision-making body. However, as set

out in the report, they did have the power of direction over listed buildings, including the ability to direct refusal of certain building consents, direct the imposition of conditions on consents or allow the Local Authority to determine as it saw fit. Officers added that in this case, they had objected to the scheme and have not issued their direction which, until such a direction had been received, meant that a Listed Building Consent decision could not be issued. Officers confirmed that Historic England were awaiting the Sub-Committee's decision before they decided what to do.

The Chairman also sought an answer on a point made by objectors regarding an assertion of the Sub-Committee being antisemitic, breaching human rights or being discriminatory as they were matters of law and not matters of opinion. He asked Officers for clarification that the Sub-Committee was on solid ground to make its decisions and that the reports that had been provided were not falling into the aforementioned categories. Officers responded that they could give absolute assurance that they were satisfied there had been a thorough assessment on the equality impact of the development and granting permission would not breach the public sector equality duty and the report before the Sub-Committee contained a thorough assessment of the complex equality impact of the application at an unprecedented level and the approach to equality impact was also reviewed by a third party, which was also unique and unprecedented, and was subject to internal and external legal scrutiny. Officers accepted it was a difficult situation for everyone in the room, but the suggestions that the Officers' conclusions were discriminatory or antisemitic were offensive with regard to their integrity. Officers underlined that they operated with professionalism, were objective and acted with integrity and impartiality. He added, above all, they were sensitive and respectful to all communities.

The Chairman asked Officers to inform the Sub-Committee on their confidence, or lack thereof, in the daylight and sunlight reports. Officers explained they had based their assessment on the data that was presented by the applicant which was based on the standards of the industry under BRE guidance, and the assessment had been third party reviewed. Officers told Members that they had considered the previous impact of the previously proposed development in comparison to the current development and that comparison had also been reviewed as well following the submission of the Bevis Marks Synagogue's daylight study which had also been third party reviewed. Officers stated they were confident that the conclusions in the report regarding impact on daylight and sunlight had been robustly assessed.

The Deputy Chairman queried whether the provision of the Hub and the auditorium space with suitable support staff for users would be conditioned and could not be withdrawn if the application was granted and implemented. Officers confirmed there was a condition securing the provision of them and would also secure the provision of them in perpetuity of the development via a Section 106 obligations. Officers added that they had included an implementation strategy for the cultural, education, sports and community spaces via Section 106 obligations, as well as a management plan for those uses to secure Creechurch Hall and Holland House Hub.

The Deputy Chairman also noted that the proposed tower was very close to the Synagogue and asked whether the City had any other consented or implemented towers in the City that were comparably near to sensitive buildings and locations. Officers explained the proposal was in the City Cluster area where ancient and hyper modern office buildings were seen in close juxtaposition such as St. Ethelburga's and 100 Bishopsgate, St. Andrew Undershaft and the Undershaft proposals that were discussed earlier in the meeting, and 22 Bishopsgate and St. Helen' Church. Officers added they were the kind of juxtapositions that most acutely embodied the City's living traditions as a modern financial centre with ancient roots and were part of its DNA. Officers further stated that if one took that as the starting point, then it followed that dynamic change, such as that of the proposal, was not necessarily harmful in principle or against the grain of the place. Officers further noted that they negotiated schemes to achieve respectful and appropriate relationships with heritage assets in the Cluster and the proposals were an example of this in its relationships with the various heritage assets in the locality. Officers maintained that the proposals were entirely in keeping with the character of the Cluster.

The Deputy Chairman also asked Officers to confirm their satisfaction with the lunar study and the BRE validation of it. Officers responded that their assessment had been based on data that was provided by the applicant and, after third party review by BRE, had accepted as stated in the report that there would be a reduction in terms of hours that the moon would be visible. However, as said during the presentation, the number of months that the moon would be visible would not be reduced when compared to the future baseline which reduced the number of months that the moon was visible by one month, but this was due to 100 Leadenhall. Officers directed Members to Page 1005 and stated that was where the tables set out the number of hours, number of days, and number of months that the moon would be visible.

The Deputy Chairman also questioned whether World Heritage was a material consideration that the Sub-Committee needed to consider. Officers confirmed that the World Heritage Site was a material consideration, and the City had a duty to preserve it.

A Member informed the Sub-Committee they too were offended by references to the Equality Act, and particularly antisemitism as, while they were not Jewish, they were a great supporter of Israel. However, this was a planning application, and they stated they were trying to limit their reasoning to planning considerations. The Member asked whether the named Acts were valid reasons to take into account when making the planning decision. Officers indicated they understood the question to be whether the Equalities Act and the Human Rights Act were material considerations in respect of the Sub-Committee's decisions and confirmed that they were. Officers noted that the report set out a thorough assessment of how the public sector equality duty applied and what they believed the impact would be. Officers also added that the report also went through what was considered to be the human rights balance and the implications for that.

The Member also queried if there was provision for public toilets that were accessible and not just those using the building as they had gone through the papers and could not find reference to it. Officers indicated they had considered the provision of changing place facilities and public toilets and confirmed they had imposed Condition 55 on Page 1112 that required the submission of details for a Changing Place, wheelchair accessibility, ambulant accessible toilet, baby changing facilities at the ground floor and associated signs to ensure that people could be directed to those facilities. Officers added they had also secured, through planning obligation, the management of the facilities.

Another Member noted that a year ago, the Sub-Committee voted unanimously to create the Creechurch Conservation Area and questioned why it would be ignored a year later in its first test. Officers explained that it had been fully assessed in the Officer report and summarised from the report that many of the viewing experiences in the Conservation Area did have the towers of the Cluster as its backdrop and, in many of the views, the proposed tall building would be seen above the low-rise Conservation Area buildings as part of the existing high-rise backdrop more associated with the Cluster above than the Creechurch Conservation Area below. Officers added that from the views where the Tower would be seen coming to ground, such as Mitre Street and Creechurch Lane, it would appear as a contrast in scale with the Conservation Area buildings. However, in the Creechurch Conservation Area proposal approved by the Planning and Transportation Committee, one of the identified attributes of the Conservation Area Special Interest was the juxtaposition in scale between buildings. Officers further stated in this sense, the proposal would not be a departure from the qualities identified in the formal designation of the conservation area.

The Member also stated that they understood that the heritage statutory consultees believed that some harm would be caused to the Synagogue and the Tower of London and questioned what the point of the consultation was in the first place if the Sub-Committee was not going to listen to heritage consultees. Officers responded, in relation to a previous point made about the character of the City Cluster, that if one took the established dynamic as the starting point, it followed that the proposal was not necessarily harmful in principle or against the grain of the place and, with that in mind, Officers sometimes arrive at different conclusions to Historic England and other bodies who seemed to begin from a different position. Officers added it was worth noting that there were many instances where Officers accorded with the views of objectors and the planning system allowed for a plurality of approaches.

A Member noted that the report had stated that there would not be any material impact to carry out religious practices, including circumcision, but then on Paragraph 430 went on to state that Officers did not profess expertise in the areas of religious history and practices. The Member stated that the Rabbi and one of the objections had said there would be an impact on circumcision and questioned what experts Officers had consulted with from the Jewish community as there were two different answers being received. The Member also asked for an explanation for the methodology and raised an example that if an organisation had people who were partially blind, would they be taken into

consideration or was it a generic methodology that was applied to the lighting. Officers stated they were not religious experts, but had assessed the daylight levels from the data provided by the applicant, which had also been third party reviewed, and the impacts identified within the interior of the Synagogue were minor adverse and, therefore, were not considered to be significant. Officers, for that reason, still considered that the Synagogue would be able to operate as a place of worship and carry out all religious ceremonies. Officers added, in regard to the daylight assessment, that the industry standards were to submit information around daylight and sunlight guidance based on the BRE guidance and that was what the applicant had submitted. Officers also noted that the applicant had prepared a radiance assessment which showed the light levels within the interior of a room, they were standard practice, accepted by local authorities and that is what Officers had assessed. Officers further stated they had the assessments third-party assessed by BRE and they had accepted and agreed with the impacts identified in those assessments. Officers further added that the impact on the interior, in relation to daylight and sunlight, of the Synagogue was not a reason for refusal last time and the previous refusal was related to the overshadowing and overbearing impact on the courtyard.

Another Member stated equality impact was the focus of what was being looked at and it was a concern that, during the course of the Sub-Committee meeting, it was having to seek to understand whether or not we had to apply the equality impact to the decision-making. The Member told the Sub-Committee the public sector equality duty absolutely had to be considered, and it was in the papers. The Member noted that the papers were the longest and most difficult to follow they had ever experienced and requested a drawing to attention of the key points that Members needed to take into consideration in relation to equality impact. The Member added that they understood it to be that it was not necessarily about having an impact, but the impact being disproportionate and stated the least the Sub-Committee could do was take the application as seriously as it could. The Member drew attention to Page 441 where the public sector equality duty was referenced and felt it would assist the Sub-Committee if that was at the forefront of its mind. Officers stated they would read out Section 149 as there was a danger that if they tried to summarise what had been identified as the main equality impacts, that would leave something out and could bring things into question. Officers added that there was an equalities impact assessment itself and Members were required to take that into account, but a lot of comments had also come through consultation as well and that, and what had been heard at the meeting, all formed part of the equalities information that was in front of Members which they would need to take a view on. Officers read out the following in Section 149 of the Equality Act 2010: the City as a Public Authority must, in the exercise of its function, have due regard to the need to eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other conduct that was prohibited under the Act; advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it; and foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it. Officers read out Section 149.3 of the Equality Act: that having due regard to the need to advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not

share it involves having due regard, in particular, to the need to remove and minimise disadvantages suffered by persons who shared a relevant protected characteristic that are not connected to that characteristic; to take steps to meet the needs of persons who share a relevant protected characteristic that are different from the needs of persons who do not share it; to encourage persons who share a relevant characteristic to participate in public life or in any other activity in which participation by such persons was disproportionately low. Officers added they also set out what the protected characteristics, which were: age, disability, gender, reassignment, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion or beliefs, sex and sexual orientation. Officers further stated that public authorities also needed to have due regard to the need to eliminate unlawful discrimination against someone because of their marriage or civil partnership status. Another Officer added that it did not just stop there as there was a thread throughout the entire report that looked at every single impact through those lenses and would not accept that the report was incoherent or unstructured and felt it was one of the best reports that had ever been drafted by the City.

The Member clarified that they did not mean they were referring to the quality of the report itself, but was referring to the way it had been received and stated they would be very surprised if other Members did not feel that receiving bits and pieces of the report had made it slightly more difficult to read and appreciated that may not have been an issue for Officers but felt it was important for the Sub-Committee to have that drawn to its attention. Officers stated that they read the Member's comments to suggest they had underplayed equalities obligations in the report. The Member confirmed that was not the case and stated there were different views as to where the balance was, but it had been difficult to get everything in one place and to understand everything in a way that would be helpful. The Member suggested it would be helpful to have a SharePoint site where all the papers could be viewed.

The Member sought confirmation that the full redevelopment option, which had been selected, rather than the refurbishment option produced three times the whole life carbon emissions. Officers explained there were four options in the optioneering study and the redevelopment option had 56m tonnes of carbon emissions while the simple refurbishment option was only 15m tonnes, so it was more than three times as much. They added that Options Two and Three, which were also refurbishment with some extensions, were slightly higher in carbon, but were less than the redevelopment option and that was set out in the carbon option table in the report.

The Member asked, in relation to the refused scheme, whether the fact of refusal and the reasons given were a material consideration for the Sub-Committee. Officers confirmed that the reasons for refusal were a material planning consideration.

The Member also queried, in relation to the comparing of the refused scheme and current scheme from the applicant's presentation, that the difference between the two was described as absolutely minimal and were virtually identical in relation to the level of light. Officers clarified that the daylight levels

were relatively comparable and, in relation to sunlight effects, the proposed scheme represented a small improvement in comparison to the refused scheme.

The Chairman moved the meeting to a debate.

A Member indicated they wanted to discuss the balance of public and commercial benefits of the applications by referring to a previous scheme for the Synagogue in 2020. The Member stated that the earlier scheme, which was almost completed, involved demolishing and then rebuilding a single level annex building against the south wall of the Synagogue. The Member added that the project could have been stopped at the demolition stage, which would've added space to the courtyard, and that was how Members saw the site when they visited a few years ago prior to the last application where the old annex had gone and there was a concrete pad in the courtyard. The Member stated further that had the application been stopped at that point, it would have restored the Synagogue to what it was in 1925. However, that was not what happened. The Member told the Sub-Committee that a new annex was built with the same proportions to the previous one with the addition of an access ramp and a ticket office, and it would become a visitor centre with a café, shop, meeting rooms and exhibition spaces. The Member added that the disbenefits of the scheme, which was almost complete, had a reduction of natural light in the Synagogue because the ground floor windows on the south side continued to be internal windows, not external windows as they were in 1925 and there was a loss of a possibility of having a courtyard that was 30% larger. The Member indicated that had that scheme come to the Committee, he would have supported it as they felt the benefits of St. Bevis Mark's having a visitor centre would have outweighed the negatives, but Members did not get an opportunity to consider the application because there were no objections at all and it was decided by Officers under the Scheme of Delegations and he believed the Officers were right that time. The Member concluded that the same reasons for weighing up the loss of light and decrease in size of the courtyard, even though the courtyard was not changing on this occasion, were the same issue on this occasion and expressed his support for the Officers.

Another Member addressed the Sub-Committee and stated the application before it was materially the same as the previous one the Sub-Committee had rejected citing the harm it would cause and, three years later, there was a stronger case to reject the application as the establishment of a Conservation Area, with the policy recommending refusal of tall buildings within inappropriate areas, including Conservation Areas, and if a tall building was to be granted, it should enhance the Conservation Area. The Member added that, as heard from the report, the harm would be caused and not enhance, and the scheme would result in heritage harm to the buildings, as well as to an existing community with deep connections to the location dating back hundreds of years. The Member stated that the benefits from the applications were temporary in comparison and were hardly unique, special or proportionate to justify the harm and it was not necessary to do this to unlock the benefits. The Member further added that the Officer's report acknowledged that they did not have an expertise in the area of religious history and practice, and yet Members were told the

application would not impact on the religious practices when Members were hearing from the Jewish community unequivocally that it would impact their freedom to worship. The Member further stated that it was hardly a development that was promoting inclusivity and accessibility, and indicated she would vote against the application and urged other Members of the Sub-Committee to do so as the application, like the previous scheme, would cause significant harm which could not be outweighed by any benefit of the development as it would cause irreversible damage to religious worship which had taken place on the site for hundreds of years. The Member concluded the application was materially the same as the one previously rejected by the Sub-Committee, particularly in relation to the harm caused, and it was essential that the Sub-Committee remain consistent in its opposition as a result and she would vote against the application.

A Member stated they were in favour of development, were sometimes in favour of taller buildings if they were right and every time the Sub-Committee made a decision of this nature, it was on balance. The Member indicated they would vote against the application as it crossed too much red lines, particularly relating to the Local Plan and heritage considerations.

The Deputy Chairman addressed the Sub-Committee and stated it was a difficult application to decide on as there was clearly harm to the Synagogue which would be caused to the development if consented and it had attracted a large volume of persuasive and passionate objections. He stated that the Synagogue was a wonderful asset in the City and all wanted it to continue to flourish and thrive in the future, but there were a large number of significant benefits that the application, if consented, would bring such as the 34,000sqm of Grade A office space and CIL payments of around £10m, affordable housing contributions and the enhancements to the Grade Two-listed Holland House which the Deputy Chairman indicated were very positive. However, he stated it was the multifunctional auditorium space and the Holland House hub together, which would provide 1,400sqm of free to use space for the majority of the week, which was the unique office offer and the variety of groups that had successfully been using the community space was impressive, including museums, religious groups, art organisations, educational establishments and the London Fire Brigade. The Deputy Chairman further added that the community offering was exceptional and was clearly highly valued by those who had used it and, on balance, believed that the benefits of the application did outweigh the harm. The Deputy Chairman stated he would support the Officer recommendations.

A Member indicated they wanted to come back on some points made by a Member earlier in the debate in regard to the visitor centre next to the Synagogue and noted when they visited the Synagogue, they could clearly see that the visitor centre was a single level building with a glass roof, so the light was getting into the visitor centre and was not obscuring the windows at all. The Member told the Sub-Committee she could see that the developer had tried to improve the public benefit as the public benefit did not outweigh the detrimental harm done to the Synagogue and the World Heritage Site last time. The Member added that, whilst she believed the applicant had done their best,

they believed the harm may have been impounded by the proposal to increase the floors on Holland House which was a Grade II-listed unique building and the only building to have been constructed during the First World War which for her was another negative impact on a listed building. The Member further stated that the Tower of London as a World Heritage Site really was unique and was why it had that status, so while the height might have dropped down slightly, it was still very clear in those visuals of the impact toward White Tower and deflected from the site of White Tower across towards the Cluster and felt that was a very negative impact on the World Heritage Site. The Member, in reference to the Bevis Marks Synagogue, told the Sub-Committee that they had asked to see the light slide of the previous scheme that had been refused versus the proposed scheme and noted that Officers had confirmed in the meeting that there was no difference in the lighting between the refused scheme and the proposed scheme. The Member added that, having visited the Synagogue again, it was a very unique location, and it would be really overshadowed and impacted in her view. The Member further stated that the Synagogue was unique to the City of London and the country and believed that it deserved protection, as the City's policies stated, and felt that she would approve a scheme that was designed to minimise the impacts on the Synagogue and the World Heritage Site. The Member added that there were other spaces in the City of London which were granted a number of community spaces and the City was not lacking in those, and not to the point where the Sub-Committee would agree a scheme that would irreversibly damage the Synagogue and the World Heritage Site. The Member concluded that she would not approve the scheme.

Another Member addressed the Sub-Committee and stated their first point was in relation to the impact that Historic England had highlighted and noted they had previously supported applications that filled in the Cluster, including the application that had come before the Sub-Committee earlier in the meeting. The Member stated, however, that if one looked at View 23, one could see that the development popped up, not as a shoulder of the Cluster, but as if another Cluster was being started and was a very substantial addition and did not read as part of the existing Cluster. The Member added, secondly, that when one turned to View 45a, and referred to a comment made earlier in reference to need to crack your neck to view the building, that was not the case, it could be seen as soon as one walked into the courtyard and the dominant thing in that courtyard would be the building. The Member told the Sub-Committee he could not see how it possibly protected or enhanced the Conservation Area and did not see how it possibly helped the setting of a Grade I-listed building. The Member, referring to the new NPPF framework, highlighted paragraph 212 that stated: when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation and the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be. This is irrespective of whether any potential harm amounts to substantial harm, total loss or less than substantial harm to its significance. The Member stated that was the new instruction and did not see how the Sub-Committee could possibly approve the application with that instruction. The Member also raised the issue of sunlight and overshadowing, which referred to Page 203 of the presentation pack which had the indoor daylight luminance

study shown, and indicated he could not figure out which of the numbers were supposed to be used as it seemed to be two numbers for the balcony, but whichever numbers were used, there was a 30% reduction in an already lower level and, in particular, the balcony was where women worshipped and would have a particular impact on them. The Member concluded, with reference to the lunar studies, that they did not understand the concept of counting the months and the fact was that people had to go out and worship on a monthly basis if they could, and to tell them they had a 15-minute window to possibly do it on a particular day was not telling them that they could do it. The Member suggested it was trying to explain Judaism to Jewish people which did not strike him as a helpful thing for anyone to be trying to do. The Member concluded that, for the aforementioned reasons, they would reject the application.

A Member addressed the Sub-Committee and stated he had been present for the original rejection and remained fairly convinced by the Officers, and had been reassured by them, that the development would not adversely affect the Synagogue as a place of worship. The Member added that they had been reassured by the Officers that it did meet the primary requirements for daylight and not adversely affecting daylight, and the applicants had made significant changes to the tower, specifically the shape and scale of it, in such a way that met the objections from both the Tower of London and from inside the Synagogue. The Member noted on the other hand that the Rabbi and the Jewish community were all saying it would adversely affect, or to some extent, render worship unworkable in the Synagogue and reduce it to being no more than a tourist attraction. The Member further added that there were two very strong arguments on both sides and could see it was going to be very challenging for the Sub-Committee to reach a fair and equitable decision. The Member concluded that it would have to be voted on and he intended to vote in favour of the application.

Another Member addressed the Sub-Committee and referred to a previous point made by a Member that the Officers said it would not affect worship in the Synagogue. The Member stated that Officers had confirmed, in response to another question, that they were no experts and the congregation obviously disagreed with that assessment. The Member added that if the Sub-Committee valued The Hub which seemed to be doing lovely work, there was no reason why it could not look for it in any other development and the Sub-Committee could demand it of the developer if they came back to Sub-Committee on a different site. The Member told the Sub-Committee that, as a previous Member had stated, all the heritage groups were against the proposal and the previous, and current, Members of Parliament was against the proposal. The Member further added that the proximity, the overshadowing and the overbearing nature of the development did affect the setting of the Synagogue which was important to the congregation. The Member further stated they did not believe that was acceptable and concluded they could not support the application.

A Member stated that they felt all of the Members felt that it was a difficult position for the Sub-Committee to be in and no one liked to have to make such decisions, but Members were elected to do so and it was interesting that planning applications came down to the passage of the sun and, indeed, in this

case the passage of the moon. The Member added that there was the added complexity of a heritage asset near the site, as well as the complexity of religion in the mix too and, to a certain extent, Officers had been put in an extremely invidious position of having to somehow make tangible the intangible which was at the heart of the challenge that Members had. The Member told the Sub-Committee that there was a developer who wanted to build a large building and had brought the scale of that back from a rejected application and the Sub-Committee were being told that the economics of that were required in order to continue what appeared to be a really worthwhile and valuable community space. The Member further added, as an aside, that they felt slightly uncomfortable at feeling like the Sub-Committee was being pitted between two different sets of communities within the City during the early presentations, but that was to be put to one side. The Member stated that on one hand were friends in the Jewish community whose voices the Sub-Committee was listening to who had heard what had been said, and echoed another Member's comments that it was unfortunate that the timing of the meeting was today on Shabbat. The Member further added that, having read through the pack and listened to the comments, they wanted to address a previous point by another Member as, when Members said the Officers had to be an expert in absolutely everything, including religion, he did not believe that was necessarily true and felt what was important was that Officers used the metrics and benchmarks that were available to them. The Member told the Sub-Committee that they had heard, with regard to the lunar transit, that Officers had done that and they could not be asked to be experts on the divine and did not think that would be reasonable as it was a part of town that needed a revamp and where development was needed and the economic benefit did need to be yielded that the site would bring. The Member concluded that, in recognition of the public benefit and trading that off against what they thought was indeed concern from a very valuable minority community here in the City who it desperately wanted to protect and look after, in their view they would support the application as he felt that the Officers had made a very difficult, but correct decision.

Another Member stated they believed that the Sub-Committee was working on the basis that it was an application being treated on its merits and not as a show of loyalty to anyone in particular. The Member added that the use of benchmarks was important, and it was important to say where the limit of those benchmarks was and they felt the Sub-Committee was in unique territory with the application. The Member stated it was right to say that last time, planning Officers had recommended and the Sub-Committee refused the application and did so on grounds that had not changed in substance. The Member noted that the reason she had asked about the material planning consideration of the previous refusal was to ensure that everyone could understand there was a consistency in approach of the Sub-Committee and that certainty was important, whether one was more pro-growth than their approaches to the expansion of office space or not, for everyone. The Member added she was asking the question about the point of whether it had fundamentally changed in terms of light or harm to the Tower of London World Heritage Site, and, in her view, there was unjustified harm to the Tower of London World Heritage Site at a very sensitive time which was entirely in keeping with what had been said before. The Member further stated that if one looked at images 23 and 45a, it

was really instructive and showed one that it was highly visible and did draw the eye, and it was important to acknowledge that there was a real harm to the Synagogue which everyone agreed there would at least be some adverse effect to the Synagogue's light impact, particularly in the ladies gallery and in the courtyard. The Member further added that it diminished the quality of the space and the chipping away at the access to light and sunlight for the important and valuable Grade I-listed building did not justify the continue chipping away and was an example of why the stringent St. Paul's requirements on sightlines, that sometimes felt heavy-handed, were the only way to prevent it from taking place. The Member told the Sub-Committee that, on balance, there had not been a significant change in those aspects and hoped a broader conversation could be had with Officers about how the City used really valuable opportunities, in relation to meanwhile space, to infill them into spaces that have been used as a public benefit on a number of other applications as if those spaces were not suitable for some groups, then the City would have a broader issue. The Member confirmed they would not approve the application and would be refusing.

The Chairman indicated the Sub-Committee need to give credence to the fact that it had a responsibility to vote without fear or favour as had been pointed out at the last meeting and stated it was not to give any favouritism to any party to an application as the Sub-Committee had to make sure it was making decisions as independent Members. He told the Sub-Committee that an application had been looked at in the morning where an applicant had listened to their neighbours and come back with an improved scheme and he looked at the proposed scheme with the reduced massing, the reduced height and felt the applicant had listened, listened to their neighbours, engaged with the groups involved in the scheme and had come back with quite a different scheme. He stated there were some comparators around the tower, but when one considered the impact on Holland House and Renown House, it was a very different bulk altogether that had come forward for consideration. The Chairman added that the Sub-Committee had to remember that it may have subjective views on the impacts on the World Heritage Site, the heights and impacts on daylight and sunlight, but the scheme did fit within the Eastern Cluster and the tall buildings area that had been designated by Members, had been approved by the Planning and Transportation Committee and the Court of Common Council, and was now with the Planning Inspectorate. The Chairman further stated that the tall building fit within the tall building cluster and, objectively, fit within City policies which the Sub-Committee should bear in mind when it looked at the impact on the World Heritage Site. He further added, in relation to the community offering, that was interesting that competition was spoken about in reference to the Synagogue and the communities that had been heard from and felt there was not a competition and there was nothing stopping the Synagogue from carrying out its religious activities. The Chairman told the Sub-Committee that if he felt there was a real impact on the Synagogue being able to continue services, he would not be supporting the application, but he saw the other community groups coming in as a compliment to the area, not a competition, and that diversity of offering should be embraced. He added that there had been discussion about other community offerings in the Square Mile and knew for a fact there were hundred of museums and community groups

looking for a home, and it was not a nil-sum game. He stated that there were people requesting a cultural activation or a community offering in the new schemes coming up and there was certainly no shortage of community groups, but there was a shortage of space to accommodate them. The Chairman confirmed he would support the scheme and would do so on a balanced perspective that had taken into account all of the argument heard on both sides.

The Chairman moved the meeting to the vote.

The Town Clerk stated that Members were voting on Items 4 and 5 and the recommendations on Pages 565 to 566, and Page 1127 of the main agenda pack with any relevant amendments set out in the addendum packs. Members confirmed they were happy to proceed to the vote on that basis.

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

Votes were cast as follows: IN FAVOUR – 8
OPPOSED – 14
There were no abstentions.

The recommendations were therefore not carried.

RESOLVED – That, planning permission not be granted for the above proposal.

The Chairman asked the Town Clerk to run through the process outlining reasons for refusal.

The Town Clerk stated the following: In line with the Planning Protocol, specifically Appendix A, subsection 2a, the Committee should indicate reasons for refusal with sufficient clarity to enable clear and precise reasons (with reference to relevant policies) to be provided in the Decision Notice. The Protocol provides for instances such as this where, although committee has indicated clear reasons, the precise wording (including relevant policies) cannot appropriately be framed in the forum of the committee meeting. In these cases, the drafting of precise reasons may be delegated to the Town Clerk (after consultation with the Chief Planning Officer and Development Director and the Chairman and Deputy Chairman).

The Chairman moved a Motion.

MOTION: Delegated Authority be granted to the Town Clerk, in consultation with the relevant Officers, the Chairman and the Deputy Chairman, to finalise the precise wording of the minutes and Decision Notice, to be drafted in line with these reasons for refusal.

The Deputy Chairman seconded the Motion.

The Chairman moved the meeting to a debate on the Motion.

A Member addressed the Sub-Committee and stated the importance of the reasons for refusal and the reliance upon them as a material consideration and expressed concern that they would only be viewed by those who recommended supporting the application. The Member stated that the reasons, from the last refusal, were related to the bulk and massing of the proposal regarding the effect on the setting and amenities of the Synagogue, the daylight and sunlight effect, and Historic England's concerns about the views of the Tower of London. The Member added that she believed the reasons for refusal should come back to the Sub-Committee due to the significance and it being a material consideration. The Chairman expressed concern about bringing it back to the Sub-Committee and wanted to get the reasons for refusal actioned as the Officers had listened.

Another Member addressed the Sub-Committee and stated that Officers would usually work up grounds for refusal which would come back to Sub-Committee as had been done last time the application had been discussed and then it was agreed. The Member stated this happened at every other Local Authority and it was not delegated to the Chairman and Deputy Chairman, who had voted for the application, to agree the grounds for refusal. The Member added there was another reason for refusal related to the negative impacts on the Grade II-listed Holland House and suggested it had to come back to Sub-Committee to be agreed. The Chairman responded that the reasons for refusal were issued by the Town Clerk, in consultation with the Director of Planning, the Chairman and the Deputy Chairman, and stated there was an Officer oversight.

A Member proposed an amendment to the Motion. that the reasons for refusal come back to the Sub-Committee for consideration after it had been drafted by Officers.

MOTION: That the reasons for refusal come back to the Sub-Committee for consideration and approval following drafting by Officers.

The Town Clerk stated, for the avoidance of doubt, that Members had before them a Motion put forward by the Chairman and seconded by the Deputy Chairman for the final terms of refusal to be delegated to the Town Clerk in consultation with the aforementioned Officers and the Chairman and Deputy Chairman. The Town Clerk understood that a Member had moved an amendment, that had been seconded, which would amend the Motion in such a way that it would require it to come back to the Sub-Committee. The Town Clerk added, in terms of procedure, that Members could either move the amendment and then vote on it or vote down the original Motion proposed by the Chairman.

The Chairman moved to a vote on the amendment to the Motion.

The Town Clerk confirmed that Members were being asked to vote on an amendment which require the precise terms of the refusal to come back to the Sub-Committee for approval rather than for a Delegated Authority.

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

Votes were cast as follows: IN FAVOUR – 13

OPPOSED – 7

There were no abstentions.

The Motion detailing the amendment to the prior Motion was therefore carried.

RESOLVED – That, the Motion was amended to read: The reasons for refusal were to return to the Sub-Committee for consideration and approval following drafting by Officers.

The Chairman moved to the vote on the amended Motion.

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

The Motion was carried.

RESOLVED – That, the reasons for refusal were to return to the Sub-Committee for consideration and approval following drafting by Officers.

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

The Committee received a report which detailed development applications received by the Department of the Built Environment since the last meeting.

RESOLVED – That, Members noted the report.

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

The Committee received a report which detailed development and advertisement applications determined by the Chief Planning Officer and the Development Director or those authorised under delegated powers since the last report to the meeting.

RESOLVED – That, Members noted the report.

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

There were no questions on matters relating to the work of the Sub-Committee.

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

The Chairman asked Officers to advise the Sub-Committee on the report on the new NPPF which would outline the changes and implications which was being prepared for Planning and Transportation Committee. Officers informed the Sub-Committee that a report would be going to Planning and Transportation

Committee setting out in detail the changes to the NPPF and how it impacted upon the work of the Committee.

The Chairman noted there had been a recent Government consultation document on planning committees and their structure and asked Officers to advise how the response would be drafted, and how the Committee would be involved. Officers stated that the report would be going to the Planning and Transportation Committee in January before it went to Policy & Resources Committee, and it would contain a draft response to the consultation about the workings of planning committees nationally.

The meeting ended at 2.33 pm

Chairman

**Contact Officer: Callum Southern
Callum.Southern@cityoflondon.gov.uk**