

PLANNING AND TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE
Tuesday, 21 January 2025

Minutes of the meeting of the Planning and Transportation Committee held at Livery
Hall - Guildhall on Tuesday, 21 January 2025 at 10.30 am

Present

Members:

Deputy Shravan Joshi MBE (Chairman)
Graham Packham (Deputy Chairman)
Deputy Randall Anderson
Ian Bishop-Laggett
Mary Durcan
Deputy John Edwards
Deputy John Fletcher
Deputy Marianne Fredericks
Jaspreet Hodgson
Amy Horscroft
Alderman Robert Hughes-Penney
Alderwoman Elizabeth Anne King, BEM JP
Charles Edward Lord, OBE JP
Antony Manchester
Eamonn Mullally
Deborah Oliver
Deputy Henry Pollard
Ian Seaton
Hugh Selka
Tom Sleigh
William Upton KC
Jacqui Webster
Deputy Dawn Wright

Officers:

Fleur Francis	- Comptroller and City Solicitor's Department
Simon Owen	- Chamberlain's Department
Gudrun Andrews	- Environment Department
Ben Bishop	- Environment Department
Kerstin Kane	- Environment Department
Rob McNicol	- Environment Department
Bruce McVean	- Environment Department
Gwyn Richards	- Environment Department
Katie Stewart	- Executive Director, Environment Department
Callum Southern	- Town Clerk's Department

1. **APOLOGIES**

Apologies were received by Anthony David Fitzpatrick, Deputy Brian Mooney BEM, Alderwoman Jennette Newman, and Judith Pleasance.

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

Eamonn Mullally declared, in relation to Item 10, that he lived next door to 36 Carter Lane and , therefore, would recuse himself from that item of the meeting.

3. **MINUTES**

RESOLVED – That, Members approved the minutes of the meeting held on 5 November 2024 as an accurate record of proceedings.

4. **ANNUAL REVIEW OF TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR THE PLANNING & TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE**

The Committee received a report which concerned the annual review of the Terms of Reference of the Planning & Transportation Committee, to provide time for consideration and discussion of any changes before they were submitted to the Policy & Resources Committee in time for the annual reappointment of Committees by the Court of Common Council.

RESOLVED – That, Members:

- Approved the Terms of Reference for submission to the Court of Common Council in April 2025.

5. **FIRST CONSIDERATION: ENHANCED BIODIVERSITY DUTIES OF PUBLIC AUTHORITIES**

The Committee received a report which intended to discharge the duty of the City Corporation by setting out what it could do to conserve and enhance biodiversity, and outlined actions and objectives relevant to the authority that are to be considered and taken forward for future implementation and reporting.

A Member queried how the duties would be delivered given the report cited no financial implications. Officers informed the Committee that they had already set up an Officer working group to deal with biodiversity, the duty, and how it was taken account of in existing processes and budgets. They added, in relation to Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG), that the City Corporation had also received funding from the Government to cover it and did not anticipate an additional financial burden.

The Member further enquired at what point it as to be identified where the duties would cause a cost to those who were developing. Officers told the Committee that, as part of the development of the City Plan, a whole plan viability assessment had been done reviewing all the requirements that the

City's policies put onto development industry when they brought schemes forward within the City. They noted that biodiversity was one of the factors taken into account, alongside other sustainability measures within the plan, and the approach to, not just net gain, but biodiversity per hectare had been factored into the whole plan viability and demonstrated as part of that. Officers added it would not have an undue impact on the development of schemes coming forward within the Square Mile.

RESOLVED – That, Members:

- Noted the statutory requirements and provisions placed on Public Authorities in relation to the Biodiversity Duty, as per the 2006 Act as amended by the 2021 Act.
- Noted the reporting requirements of the Biodiversity Duty as set out in paragraphs 11 and 12 of this report.
- Approved the report as a record as part of the City Corporation's statutory First Consideration of the Biodiversity Duty.
- Approved the actions identified in paragraph 19 of the report that are considered appropriate to further the conservation and enhancement of biodiversity.
- Noted the Environment Department's Biodiversity and Nature Recovery officer group as the cross departmental working group supporting the actions and objectives of the Biodiversity Duty.

6. ENVIRONMENT DEPARTMENT HIGH-LEVEL BUSINESS PLAN 2025-30

The Committee received a report which presented for approval the high-level Business Plan for the Environment Department for 2025-30.

A Member invited Officers to clarify concerns raised at a meeting of the Port Heath & Environment Services Committee (PHES). Officers indicated concerns were raised regarding a lack of reference to residents in the aims in the introduction of the report and reassured Members that services provided to residents were clear in the content of the business plan, but had agreed at PHES that a reference to residents in the aims in the introduction would be added.

The Deputy Chairman suggested a change to the top of Page 55 to read "shaping future environments and nurturing current ones" rather than "shaping future environments and protecting current ones". Officers indicated they were happy to accept the suggested change in wording.

A Committee Member queried whether Officers had additional thoughts, in relation to synergies and combatting silos, on potential structural changes in the future and other techniques that may be used to encourage collaboration across the various departments of the Corporation. Officers informed Members that they were looking at how to build cross-departmental collaboration and building awareness across the Environment Department of the work conducted by other teams. Officers added that the programme for the Senior Leadership Team going forward was to look at how that awareness could be built.

It was acknowledged by a Member that the Committee was not responsible for public toilets but asked whether there was provision for requesting public toilets as part of every planning application. The Member also indicated they hoped something could be included in the business plan to ensure that roads remained operation while tall buildings were being consented. Officers confirmed that the business plan report that went to PHES did include a reference to public toilets but indicated they were happy to include reference in the P&T report. Officers added, in reference to ensuring streets kept moving, that they would take the suggestion away and work on building it into the business plan.

RESOLVED – That, Members:

- i. Noted the factors taken into consideration in compiling the Environment Department’s high-level Business Plan 2025-30; and
- ii. Approved, subject to the incorporation of any changes sought by this Committee, Section A of the Environment Department’s high-level Business Plan 2025-30 (presented at Appendix A), which covered the service areas for which the Planning and Transportation Committee is responsible.

7. CITY PLAN 2040 - EXAMINATION HEARINGS GOVERNANCE AND DELEGATION

The Committee received a report which sought delegated authority from the Planning and Transportation Committee to agree to changes during hearings, subject to later Committee approval. The report noted that once the hearings and consultation on proposed modifications to the plan had been concluded, the City Plan would then be brought to Committee for adoption, which was anticipated around January 2026.

A Member considered whether there was a need for the Chairman and Deputy Chairman of the Planning & Transportation Committee to be involved in the decision about main modifications that would be proposed in public to the inspector. Officers indicated the current recommendation was in response to a procedural issue of timing as the hearings and consultation occurred immediately after the elections, but indicated they would discuss with the Town Clerk’s Department to understand whether there was a mechanism for consulting with the Chairman and Deputy Chairman on the modifications that were proposed.

A clarification was offered by a Member who stated that Chairs and Deputy Chairs, providing they were re-elected to the Court of Common Council, remained in office until their successors were elected, with the only exception being the Chief Commoner who stopped being Chairman of a Committee when they assumed the office of Chief Commoner. The Member added, therefore, it was perfectly possible for the current Chairman and Deputy Chairman to be consulted and indicated they should be. Officers indicated it was eminently

sensible to consult with the Chairman and Deputy Chairman following the explanation they could be consulted.

Another Member queried whether reference to minor or major modifications covered every possible type of modification and also asked Officers whether there was an obvious delineation between major and minor modifications. Officers stated that it was a matter of debate in the planning system as to where the line between minor and major modifications sat and, ultimately, it was up to inspectors to consider what they deemed to be a major modification. Officers indicated that minor modifications were defined as not affecting the operation of policies and may be for clarity such as punctuation corrections or help to explain in the supporting text how a policy was meant to operate, whereas main modifications generally had an impact on how a policy would be applied to applications as they were moving forward.

Another Member asked whether the hearing log and briefing from Officers would be made public, and whether the hearings would be livestreamed. Officers confirmed that the hearings would be livestreamed and noted that the hearings log and briefings would be just for Members as Officers wanted to ensure Members were kept in the loop during the course of the examination. Officers added that there would be a programme officer in place who effectively operated the examination on behalf of the inspectors and further noted that there would be a dedicated examination page for all the documents to be published on.

The Member queried whether there was any reason why the briefings could not be made public on the website. Officers indicated they would check whether there was any particular reason for why they could not be made public, but stated they felt it was a reasonable ask.

A Member queried whether the proposal could also be circulated to the Local Plans Sub-Committee Members as they had spent a lot of time on the detail and were better prepared to address it. The Chairman indicated he was reluctant to have Member intervention on minor changes and suggested involvement of the Chairman and Deputy Chairman on any major changes that might be proposed, especially as there was an absence of people around after the election period during Easter.

The Chairman suggested delegating authority to the Director of Planning and Development, in consultation with the Chairman and Deputy Chairman on main modifications, to suggest potential main and minor modifications to the City Plan during the local plan examination hearings.

A Member suggested that a substitution would be required should the Chairman and Deputy Chairman not be re-elected at the Court of Common Council elections and should be based on seniority.

RESOLVED – That, Members:

- Delegated Authority to the Director of Planning, in consultation with the Chairman and Deputy Chairman, or the most senior Member should they not be re-elected in the Court of Common Council elections, on main modifications, to suggest potential main and minor modifications to the City Plan during the local plan examination hearings.
- Agreed that the main and minor modifications be brought back to Planning and Transportation Committee, Policy and Resources Committee and the Court of Common Council for formal approval prior to consultation.

8. **PLANNING FOR SUSTAINABILITY SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENT**

The Committee received a report which presented the Planning for Sustainability Supplementary Planning Document (SPD), the purpose of which was to provide guidance on how applicants should approach environmental sustainability in their developments through the planning application process. It provided detail and guidance on how to fulfil policies of the current Local Plan, as well as emerging policies such as the City Plan 2040.

Officers gave a presentation to the Committee on the Planning for Sustainability Supplementary Planning Document (SPD).

The Deputy Chairman queried whether reference to the superstructure of a building included the foundations and asked, in regard to processing of materials on site for reuse or recycling, whether Officers were confident that the net benefit of energy used when that happened on site was worthwhile in comparison to the process being carried out elsewhere. Officers confirmed that superstructure included all foundations and basement structures and, with regard to energy use on site to reuse materials, told the Committee that it could be a problem in relation to noise for adjacent residents, but assured they would try to solve such problems with developers in pre-application meetings. Officers added it depended on what the works were as crushing materials were very noisy outside and they had included a recommendation to examine that impact in more detail during the application process. Officers further added the industry was reviewing the trade offs of processing reuse of materials on site and had been involved in detail discussions with construction companies who were working hard on making those processes worthwhile.

A Member asked that circular economy principles be included in every planning application, as well as toilet provision, and it be supported on other Committees. Officers noted they could show a circular economy statement with increasing details throughout the planning application process and had asked minor applications, where demolition was proposed, to provide information about whether materials could be reused or retained.

Another Member queried whether a reporting system could be established to ensure developers complied with circular economy principles. Officers confirmed that pre-deconstruction and pre-demolition audits were

commissioned on all major applications. Officers added that pre-redevelopment audits were more a strategic look at how materials could be reused on site which was accompanied by a demolition order which would itemise and quantify each material on site and demonstrate the recycling potential of the materials. Officers further noted they conditioned, at REBA Stage 4 an updated pre-demolition audit, and again at REBA Stage 6 at post-completion where developers would be asked to submit post-completion information and data in the reuse of all the materials on site and was detailed in the SPD. Officers further added that they had powers to enforce conditions specifying requirements around the circular economy.

The Member further enquired on whether feedback had been considered when circular economy principles were not being applied the way they were intended and expressed the need for a reporting system similar to that for noise pollution.

The Chairman noted that circular economy principles had been added to the Corporate Plan and circular economy frameworks would be adopted in the next cycle of committees. He added there was a need to learn by trial and error and urged caution on getting to specific on policies related to retrofit schemes. Officers added there was a need to be proportionate in response to non-compliance with circular economy principles. Officers suggested it was an issue beyond planning and there was work to improve the understanding of circular economy principles and how they were operating in the Square Mile.

It was suggested by a Member that the City arborist be consulted, in relation to tree rooting pits, at the beginning of the planning process as part of a binding approach to look at specifying the dimensions of trees pits and the substrates and asked whether such a move had been considered. Officers stated that tree pits, and their design, had been considered through the Core Streets and Greening Programme which had informed the SPD, and it was something that needed to be looked at within highways teams and how it linked into the planning application process and improving the public realm.

A Member queried whether some of the thinking around the SPD would affect retrospective planning applications, particularly on applications where demolition had already been approved. Officers urged caution as the applications had already been approved, conditions had been set on their delivery and on the legal determination of the discharge of conditions, Officers stated they did have to look at the wording of the conditions as drafted and agreed. However, they would seek opportunities to enhance the conditions where possible. Officers added a lot of applicants for major applications did come back with changes to schemes and often related to updated industry methodologies and, therefore, there was a good chance that applications that had been approved could come back with better processes in place to reuse materials.

Another Member asked whether the Worshipful Company of Skinners retrofit development had been helpful in establishing the toolkit for retrofitting historic buildings and whether it would be available to the other over 600 listed buildings in the City. Officers indicated it would be available and noted the

toolkit was warmly received when published. Officers added they had learn a lot from different schemes that had come through the planning system and continued to keep that work under review as part of the Climate Action Strategy.

The Chairman suggested a visit to Skinners' Hall once it had been opened.

A Member indicated that trees were previously seen as a difficult thing to have on streets due to leaf litter and blocked pavements and the City had come a long way with the introduction of pocket parks since then. The Member added there was a need to keep modifying policies when buildings came back to seek planning permission after the consents ran out after three years, and overheating was one of the biggest health issues facing the climate. The Member added that they regular advocated for the installation of water foundations and stated that the heat map included in the reports should be a wake-up call to all who lived and worked in the City. Officers acknowledged that overheating was a serious issue for the City, noted the urban heat island effect was a problem and indicated there were various responses being carried out to address the issue through both planning, as well as the Local Area Energy Plan, where Officers would be looking at existing buildings to see how they heated and cooled themselves. Officers added there were projects like the Cool Streets and Greening scheme where they looked at where to plant trees wherever possible and drew attention to rules around thermal comfort modelling around shadowing and wind modelling that was carried out when schemes came forward in the City. Officers further stated that the shadowing of that wind needed to be carefully balanced, but could have a really positive opportunity to create and diminish the urban heat island effect in specific locations.

A Member stated they were pleased to see backup generators were raised in the paper, but expressed concerns that it said it would discourage their use and encourage the use of alternatives as he hoped that the City would take the opportunity to state they simply would not be permitted once an alternative was approved. The Member suggested that the report ought to have said that once battery backup energy power supplies were approved, developers would need to get rid of diesel generators and noted that hundreds, if not thousands, of generators were tested twice a month in the City which he stated needed to stop. Officers told the Committee that the topic of back up energy supply was a firm point in pre application meetings and there were quite a few developers who now connected to two different substations rather than using diesel generators, and it was important to implement the City's Local Area Energy Plan with heat networks which could provide backup. However, it was not possible in every location in the City.

Another Member indicated there was a solution through the use of hydrogen powered generators, used for major events and concerts, which would take away the pollution aspects and were a much more efficient way of generating energy, and suggested that it should be looked at being pioneered in the City. Officers informed the Committee that hydrogen power had, for now, been

discounted by the Local Area Energy Plan as the technology did not appear to be developed enough to be implemented in the City.

The Deputy Chairman suggested there was a need to be careful about the issue of backup generators as the UK was on the knife edge of major blackouts before Christmas and stated it was becoming increasingly likely the UK would have to rely on Europe to send power across cables which were at risk of being cut by foreign state actors. He added it was unrealistic to expect major developers not to put standby generators in their buildings as they only ran when they were tested and indicated the suggestion to look at alternative fuels for standby generators was attractive as he was wary of relying on battery backup. He added he was not convinced that the power packs could keep a large tower running sustainably for a significant amount of time.

A Member queried why the City could not mandate diesel generators being banned and suggested firmer language needed to be included in new developments. It was suggested by another Member that there was previously an issue raised with regard to the batteries as they would not survive long enough to evacuate a building in the event of a fire. Officers stated, in the absence of a genuinely viable alternative, that there was a need to be careful about knock-on effects and there were cases where sometimes backup generators would be needed and noted the Barbican Arts Centre was powered by a diesel generator a couple of years ago due to the interconnecting power lines breaking down. A Member added there was an issue a year ago where it was insisted there be a diesel generator in the street for months on end and stated that was what needed to stop.

Officers indicated they had worked closely with the air quality team on the backup energy generation hierarchy which discussed hydrogen battery storage and other alternatives and understood that the equality team had updated their Air Quality Strategy which would be discussed later in the meeting. Officers added that an Air Quality SPD could also be found online.

A Member thanked Officers for their work, particularly on pollinators in the document, as they were the key basis of which the plant life and wildlife in the City existed, and added that environments that were good for pollinators were good for humans, both physically and mentally.

The Chairman suggested that sustainability could quite often be seen as a punitive measure from local authorities and there were red lines on what was expected from developers. However, there was a need to look at it another way as there were a lot of existing schemes coming through and attracting the best talent and occupiers to the Square Mile, achieved higher rents and there was a need to balance that equation as the measures being taken did have benefits for all stakeholders concerned in the long-term.

Another Member stated there was a need to be sustainable, especially if the City of London wanted to be known as a powerhouse that moved the country forward, and it was only right for the City to lead by example. The Member urged every developer that had previously been granted a consent, who had

not started construction, to return to discussions with Officers to ensure green corridors were included and that the City remained a powerhouse, but a green powerhouse.

RESOLVED – That, Members:

- Approved the adoption of the Planning for Sustainability SPD attached at Appendix 1 of the report.

9. **REVENUE AND CAPITAL BUDGETS 2025/26**

The Committee received a report which presented, for approval, the revenue and capital budgets for the Planning & Transportation Committee for 2025/26.

A Member raised a question on the forecast uplift as there was only one prior year date and suggested it would be helpful to see more than that. The Member noted that the uplift was about 4% in the net position, and, from this year's reforecast, it was closer to 2% and queried whether the Committee could get by on a smaller increase than expected. Officers responded that estimates were based on best case scenarios of how the Committee was going to perform with both expenditure commitments and income projections and added this year, they were forecasting it would be within budget, as well as next year if the status quo remained. Officers indicated that, currently, they felt the budget would be sufficient and there would be some further adjustments, noting that the pay award was higher than was originally given and there would be an essential adjustment for that. Officers added that, as in previous years, contingencies had been made available in department when energy price increases had exceeded the budget and things did change throughout the year.

RESOLVED – That, Members:

- i. Reviewed and approved the proposed revenue budget for 2025/26 for submission to Finance Committee;
- ii. Reviewed and approved the proposed capital budgets for 2025/26 for submission to Finance Committee;
- iii. Agreed that amendments for 2024/25 and 2025/26 budgets arising from changes to recharges or any further implications arising from subsequently approved savings proposals or changes to the Cyclical Works Programme (CWP) be delegated to the Chamberlain in consultation with the Executive Director Environment.

10. **36 CARTER LANE & 34 - 37 BARTHOLOMEW CLOSE**

Eamonn Mullally left the room for this item.

The Committee received a report that sought determination from the Planning and Transportation Committee that 36 Carter Lane and 34-37 Bartholomew

Close were no longer required to be held for planning purposes and would be appropriated to be held for investment purposes.

A Member expressed concerns about the primary case GP surgery based at Bartholomew Close and considered whether City Surveyors were working to find an alternative site. Officers responded that that the City was the freeholder of 34-37 Bartholomew Close and Heathlink Investments Limited were directly in control of those tenancies, which meant the City could not directly influence the site for the GP surgery. Officers added they were in conversations with Heathlink Investments Limited and were aware of ongoing discussions concerning the renewal of the lease, and there was no intimation of the NHS vacating the property. Officers added that planning permission would be required for change of use and there was a policy in place to protect that use.

RESOLVED – That, Members:

- i. Determined that 36 Carter Lane and 34 - 37 Bartholomew Close are no longer required for the planning purposes for which they were acquired; and
- ii. Recommended to Court of Common Council that 36 Carter Lane and 34 - 37 Bartholomew Close be appropriated for investment purposes.

11. *MODERNISING PLANNING COMMITTEES - GOVERNMENT CONSULTATION

The Committee received a report which proposed that the consultation response reflected the successful operation of the City Corporation's Planning Applications Sub-Committee against the performance criteria set out by the Government, and the unique nature of development in the City. The report also suggested ways in which the reforms could be altered to allow the City Corporation's committee to continue to function effectively.

No questions were received from Members.

RESOLVED – That, Members:

- Noted the report.

12. *NATIONAL PLANNING POLICY FRAMEWORK (NPPF), DECEMBER 2024 UPDATE

The Committee received a report which provided an updated on the government's updated National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) which was effectively immediately for planning decisions, with the implications for plan-making dependent on the stage of development of local plans.

No questions were received from Members.

RESOLVED – That, Members:

- Noted the changes to the National Planning Policy Framework (2024)

13. ***AIR QUALITY STRATEGY 2025 TO 2030**

The Committee received a report which outlined the consultation process that took place from 3rd June to 26th July 2024 on the Air Quality Strategy and detailed responses received and corresponding amendments made to the draft strategy.

A Member drew attention to the Air Pollution Survey which noted that mortality due to air pollution in the City was higher than the London average and suggested reducing mortality was the measurable benefit of having an air quality strategy rather than arbitrary numbers. The Member also queried what specific measures there were to address air pollution on the busiest resident streets. Officers stated there was a statutory requirement to produce an air quality management plan and were working to statutory limits and suggested health benefits would show from working toward the limits.

The Member queried how major roads would be dealt with as part of the strategy. Officers told the Committee they worked closely with the transportation team, TfL and the GLA on the red routes that ran through the City, and had worked as partners on schemes and London-wide initiatives such as ULEZ which had seen an upturn in EURO class vehicles. Officers added they worked with planning officers on new developments to influence the amount of vehicles servicing the buildings and were trying to reduce the number of vehicles on roads within the Square Mile, as well as the technology of those vehicles.

The Member asked if Officers could demonstrate that mortality from air pollution had decreased in the City of London due to measures taken and how it would continue to decrease. Officers indicated they could provide statistics to the Member over a period of time on how concentrations had reduced and how that had affected mortality.

The Deputy Chairman indicated it was striking what proportion of PM2.5 originated outside the Square Mile, particularly as 96% and 90% of PM2.5 and PM10 originated outside the Square Mile and stated it was a pan-London issue and a limitation in what the City could accomplish.

A Member encouraged more deliveries via cargo bikes and queried what was being done to encourage that. Officers stated that the Transport Strategy had an overall aim to reduce the total number of vehicles in the City, to reduce the number of motorised freight vehicles, and for the vehicles which remained to be cleaner and quieter. Officers added there were a range of measures around cargo bikes that included the Zero Emissions Network with neighbouring boroughs, which would include bringing in some for-hire cargo bike schemes as well and were looking to support wider efforts across Central London to find spaces so that there were hubs for people to use cargo bikes.

A Member suggested it would be helpful to see a comparison on how other London boroughs were performing on air pollution compared to the City.

RESOLVED – That, Members:

- Noted the contents of the report and its appendices.

14. ***ENVIRONMENT DEPARTMENT HIGH-LEVEL BUSINESS PLAN 2024/25 – PROGRESS REPORT (MID-YEAR: 1 APRIL – 30 SEPTEMBER 2024)**

The Committee received a report which provided a mid-year update on the progress made against the high level Business Plan 2024/25 by the service areas of the Environment Department which fell within the remit of the Committee.

RESOLVED – That, Members:

- Noted the content of the report and its appendices.

15. ***MONTHLY PUBLIC LIFT & ESCALATOR REPORT - OCTOBER 2024**

The Committee received a report which outlined the availability and performance of publicly accessible lifts and escalators monitored and maintained by City Surveyor's, in the reporting period 1 October 2024 to 31 December 2024.

A Member raised concerns about the escalators at Auburn Gate as they were still not working and had not been working for three years as it was difficult for those with accessibility needs and queried what could be done as the access from Alban Gate, at the high-level walk toward Sebastian House in the old Museum of London building was not being blocked off. The Member also asked Officers to confirm when the high-walk level would be restored. Officers noted there was a condition to ensure continuous access at Auburn Gate development and noted there would be disruption, but patterns of movement would be retained through that. Officers stated they would share that information with the Member. Officers also added they understood that the developer was awaiting the recommendations of their escalator consultant.

Another Member appreciated there was alternative access, but stated it was not alternative access for those with accessibility problems as one had to go down quite a few steps to the road and get back up and, when the lifts were working, it was not an issue and the lifts at London Wall west were blocked off. The Member added that the sooner access could be restored, the better and there was no signage at all. Officers confirmed they would discuss the issue with the developers.

A Member indicated they had received a lot of complaints about Bastion Highwalk being closed off due to a redevelopment and sought clarity over whether the West Pavilion lift and escalators were located at 1 London Wall. Officers stated that was correct. The Member stated that no one used them as

there were down for a significant period and indicated they would inform people they were now operating again.

It was suggested by a Member whether it would be possible, in regard to the Wood Street public lift, to guide people to an alternative with signage as the lift was often used outside of hours for the Barbican. Officers indicated that could be done.

Another Member asked whether there was an accessibility map available which highlighted the lifts operating and those not operating and indicated that signage was an issue around Blackfriars as it was dark at night. The Member also suggested there was an issue around signage at Tower Bridge where it was required as the Member stated they often saw people dragging pushchairs upstairs when there was a lift under the bridge. It was suggested that Officers needed to speak to Southwark Council.

The Member also highlighted that a lift at 70 Mark Lane, which was provided as part of planning consent, was not working and required someone in the building to be contacted in order to be let into the lift.

The Chairman requested a report on accessibility and wayfinding to go to the Streets and Walkways Sub-Committee. Officers agreed to that and noted they were currently undergoing a review of Legible London. Officers added that TfL had also introduced a method of signposting around banks, accessible entrances and suggested it would be good to look at that model and replicate it.

A Member raised an issue that there was no signage to indicate the existence of a large ramp at Aldersgate Street up to the podium and signage needed to be improved overall on a number of things.

RESOLVED – That, Members:

- Noted the report.

16. ***OUTSTANDING ACTIONS**

The Committee received a report on outstanding actions to be completed by Officers.

The Chairman suggested removing the action relating to Member training as he had confidence that Officers were producing Member training on a regular basis and asked if the Committee agreed. A Member suggested that was fine, provided a list of training session was mapped out for Officers for the first planning meeting of the civic year. Officers agreed to the request and suggested topics such as biodiversity and sustainability were of interest to the Committee which should be arranged.

The Deputy Chairman requested a comprehensive training programme be in place for new members to planning after the elections. Officers confirmed it

would be arranged and it was mandatory. The Chairman suggested new members should be briefed on the new Local Plan.

17. QUESTIONS ON MATTERS RELATING TO THE WORK OF THE COMMITTEE

A Member queried whether the City was going to follow in the footsteps of TfL who had indicated they were going to take a more aggressive stance toward inappropriate parking of e-bikes on their property. The Deputy Chairman asked Officers to provide a brief update on the meeting with Lime. Officers noted Lime were looking at a range of measures which included increase staffing, increased use of technology to improve parking compliance, and, as they had done already, continuing to help fund increased parking spaces as well. Officers suggested good progress was being made and noted there was likely to be legislation around the issue soon given the reference to dockless bikes and micro-mobility in the local government devolution white paper.

A Member stated that noise pollution from 1 Golden Lane had been unbearable for months and suggested it would have been shut down if there were office workers in the area. The Member indicated there was a need to review construction and deconstruction policies to ensure reuse occurred without destroying the peace of people nearby for months at a time, especially as noise pollution Officers had been called out and had not been able to get control of the issue. Officers responded that the issues at 1 Golden Lane were acknowledged and they had worked hard with local Members and residents to try to find solutions or mitigations and the developer had come across a lot of unforeseen works which had delayed the programme and caused additional issues. Officers added the developer had put in place quite a lot of mitigations, including a WeWork site for local residents which was much appreciated and used by local residents. Officers told the Committee that they were currently working on a new code of practice and were speaking to the industry about how retrofit schemes could be delivered without the issues caused at 1 Golden Lane and they added that the policy in the code would come back to the Committee for consultation, before going out to residents and stakeholders for consultation. The Chairman requested a report on the outcomes of meetings between Officers and developers from 1 Golden Lane.

A Member raised the issue of construction noise as it was an issue residents had long complained about and suggested the City needed to be more proactive and ensure developers were consulting with residents. The Chairman suggested Officers coordinate with the resident-lead Ward Member to ensure there was progress as it needed to be ensured that the residents were living comfortable lives. Officers confirmed they were happy to coordinate as suggested.

Another Member stated it was an issue being taken seriously and there were bi-weekly resident meetings directly with the contractor and City of London staff and urged colleagues to attend those meetings.

The issue was raised by another Member who stated similar concerns were being flagged with the 45 Fleet Street retrofit and suggested communications around that development needed to be issued soon to provide reassurance to residents and offer much-needed respite. Officers stated they had reached out to the developer to request a consultation as early as possible, firstly with Officers and then with residents as soon as possible.

A Member suggested, when looking forward to future planning applications, that the Committee should consider giving two days of respite from development works, and also suggested the issue could be reviewed with consideration given on a case-by-case basis where it was required.

18. ANY OTHER BUSINESS THAT THE CHAIRMAN CONSIDERS URGENT

There was no other business that the Chairman considered urgent.

19. EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC

The Committee did not resolve to move to non-public session.

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

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

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

There was no other business that the Chairman considered urgent which the Committee agreed should be considered whilst the public were excluded.

The meeting ended at 12.26 pm

Chairman

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