

PLANNING APPLICATIONS SUB-COMMITTEE

Friday, 31 January 2025

Minutes of the meeting of the Planning Applications Sub-Committee held at Livery Hall - Guildhall on Friday, 31 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
Anthony David Fitzpatrick
Deputy Marianne Fredericks
Jaspreet Hodgson
Amy Horscroft
Deputy Brian Mooney BEM
Deputy Alastair Moss
Deborah Oliver
Judith Pleasance
Deputy Henry Pollard
Hugh Selka
William Upton KC
Jacqui Webster
Deputy Dawn Wright

Officers:

Baljit Bhandal	- Comptroller and City Solicitor's Department
Kerstin Kane	- Environment Department
Rob McNicol	- Environment Department
Gwyn Richards	- Environment Department
Amy Williams	- Environment Department
Polly Dunn	- Town Clerk's Department
Callum Southern	- Town Clerk's Department

1. APOLOGIES

Apologies were received by Deputy John Fletcher, Alderman Robert Hughes-Penney, Alderwoman Elizabeth Anne King BEM JP, Antony Manchester, Eamonn Mullally, Alderman Simon Pryke, Ian Seaton and Tom Sleigh.

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

The Deputy Chairman declared a non-pecuniary interest as a Friend of St. Paul's Cathedral.

3. **MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 6 DECEMBER 2024**

RESOLVED – That, the public minutes of the meeting held on 6 December 2024 be agreed as a correct record.

4. **MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 13 DECEMBER 2024**

A Member raised an issue in relation to the dating of the City of London Corporation's adoption of the international definition of anti-Semitism referred to on Page 52 and sought clarification over whether the date was correct or whether the speaker had misspoken. The Clerk confirmed he would clarify that.

RESOLVED – That, the public minutes of the meeting held on 13 December 2024 be agreed as a correct record, subject to clarification of point raised by Member.

5. **99 BISHOPSGATE**

The Sub-Committee received a report which sought planning permission for the partial demolition of the existing building, retention and partial extension of an existing basement and construction of a ground plus 53-storeys (plus plant) (253.5m AOD) building to provide commercial floorspace (Class E) with market hall space on the ground floor for the following: flexible display of goods or retail/food and beverage (Class E(a)-(b)) and/or drinking establishments (Sui Generis); erection of a multi-purpose ground plus 5- storeys (plus plant) pavilion building (52.5m AOD) for the following: exhibition and/or performance space, learning, community use, creative workspace (Class F1, Sui Generis and Class (E(g)(i)); public cycle hub satellite building (26m AOD) (Sui Generis), public realm improvement works, hard and soft landscaping, provision of basement cycle parking and means of access, highway works and other works associated with the development of the Site.

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

Officers presented the site location plan to the Sub-Committee and noted the site was on the junction of Bishopsgate and Wormwood Street which was an important nodal point at the gateway to the City Cluster from Liverpool Street.

Officers recapped with a presentation of the existing building from an aerial view from the north and stated that the building itself dated from 1976 which had been heavily re-clad following bomb damage in 1993 and was unremarkable in its appearance. Officers also showed an image, for context, of the Eastern Cluster from an aerial view which highlighted the gateway location.

Officers told the Sub-Committee that the site was not a designated heritage asset and did not lie in a Conservation Area, but noted that the St. Helen's

Place Conservation Area was a short distance to the east and did contain the Grade I-listed St. Ethelberga Centre for Reconciliation and Peace. Officers added that the Bishopsgate Conservation Area sat to the north of the site and contained the Grade I-listed St. Botolph Bishopsgate, as well as the closest residential properties to the development on the north side of Wormwood Street and the new Broad Street Conservation Area was to the northwest of the site which contained the Grade I-listed All Hallows on the Wall. Officers further noted that the site was not affected by any protected viewing corridors, but was part of the City Cluster which was visible in a range of LVMF views from river bridges.

The Sub-Committee was presented with an image which Officers stated highlighted the impermeability of the existing sites as the block formed a formidable barrier between surrounding permeable routes and wider connectivity corridors, including new routes to consented schemes as 55 Old Broad Street, and 55 Bishopsgate to the north and south of the site.

Officers presented photographs and a diagram of the existing building and stated it highlighted the non-descript design of the existing 28-storey tower, the lack of active frontage on the ground plane and noted the image to the right showed the structure of the existing building which was dominated by a rough foundation which accounted for 48% of the existing structure by mass.

A rendered view of the proposed scheme in context was presented to Members with an aerial view from the northwest and Officers told the Sub-Committee that the proposals before it would involve the demolition of the existing building, the retention of the raft piles and foundation and the construction of three new buildings on the site. Officers noted, firstly, that the tower would rise to 54-storeys and would deliver over 99,000m² of lettable best-in-class office floor space which would be a significant contribution towards the City's strategic economic objectives. Officers added a standalone pavilion building was also proposed that would rise to 6-storeys, plus plant which would provide 2.400sqm of cultural floor space and a public cycle hub.

Officers presented the ground level public realm plan and stated the proposals would create a new arrival experience for the City Cluster and would massively increase permeability across the site, with the city market at the base of the tower which would provide a unique food and beverage offer for people to arrive in, depart from and move through with ease. Officers added one could also appreciate the new pocket park at the southeast of the site at the junction with 55 Bishopsgate which was created around an existing, and retained, Gingko tree. Officers stated there was a tenfold increase in public space, with the overall space equating to around 80% of the size of Guildhall Yard.

Officers moved on to the layering of the public space across the site and stated that the new public realm and route through the building was created through the pulling back of the building line from the existing to create more generous pavements and significantly improved pedestrian comfort levels.

Officers presented an image of the proposed city market which they stated showed the amount of internally accessible public space available amongst the unique food and beverage offer. Officers added that public toilets, changing spaces and a drinking fountain had been provided. Officers also highlighted the lower floors of the pavilion cultural building which they stated showed the vibrancy and activity of the ground plane. Officers also drew attention to the public cycle hub and stated it included a green roof and a generous new public route through which brought the city walkway route down to the ground to be more inclusive. Officers showed an image of the public space overview to the Sub-Committee.

Officers presented CGIs of the 54-storey tower with views from Bishopsgate Junction and Bishopsgate Approach and stated that the proposal was of extraordinarily high architectural quality, with the tower expertly shaped to respond to townscape considerations, London-wide strategic views and microclimatic conditions. Additionally, the new gateway to the cluster would be of the highest aesthetic quality and heavily greened.

The Sub-Committee were presented with the east and west elevations of the tower proposal by Officers who stated that the height of the tower was just over 240m to commensurate with existing and consented neighbouring buildings, including 55 Bishopsgate and the Heron.

An image of the retention of the existing raft foundation was shown to the Sub-Committee and Officers stated that the existing raw foundations and pylons would be retained, and the building had been designed with excellent sustainability credentials around the retained foundation. This also meant that the basement was exceptionally constrained.

Officers presented the structure proposal and stated that the structure had been meticulously crafted to be as lean and efficient as possible, with an innate aesthetic quality where every element had a purpose, and the DNA of the building's architectural design was expertly designed with a seamless integration of structure and aesthetics.

The townscape consideration and the response to the cluster in key views was discussed by Officers who stated that the key influence on the appearance of the tower was the view from Waterloo Bridge and the massing had been sculpted to respond to the highly important view of St. Paul's Cathedral and to create a coherent new piece in the City Cluster.

Officers presented a diagram of the typical office floor from levels 4 to 53 and stated it would provide extensive office floor space designed to be adaptable and flexible to a range of occupied needs and each level had access to amenity. They further noted that it would be served by an offset primary soft core to maximise the floor plates and a secondary soft core containing fire escapes and W/Cs.

The Sub-Committee heard from Officers that the building offered a range of Grade A best-in-class office environments and would be rich in a variety of

office amenity spaces, including internal and external terrace areas and winter gardens that were heavily greened which would create a building that people wanted to work in, with the greening further softening its appearance.

Officers presented images of the external terrace looking north and south which they stated showed the raking back of the profile of the building to respond to long-range views and added that one could appreciate the sheer scale of the terraces.

The Sub-Committee was shown an image of the public realm from the view of Bishopsgate Junction by Officers who stated the scale of the colonnade would open up the pedestrian experience. Officers also presented images of the public realm seen from Wormwood Street and Bishopsgate which they stated showed the generous arcade from Wormwood Street and the new accessible route through the site. Officers presented more images of the public realm and arcade from Wormwood Street and Bishopsgate which showed one of the raised office entrances visible.

The proposed city market entrance from Wormwood Street was shown to the Sub-Committee and Officers stated that the site had a significant level change of 2.5m and, although there were some minimum steps, the design had worked hard to achieve level access through gentle slopes across the site and every part of the development could be inclusively accessed. Officers also presented another image of the city market within the colonnade which showed spill out seating areas. Officers added that the doors to the market would be open for the majority of the time and the gates would be akin to historic city markets and provided visibility across the ground plain.

Officers presented an image of the pocket park view toward St. Ethelburga's and stated it was the southern core of the tower at the junction with 55 Bishopsgate. They noted that the ground floor of the site had been realigned to create a new vista to St. Ethelburga's, the St. Helen's Conservation Area, and to create a new pocket park around the retained Ginkgo tree. Officers added that the opening up of the ground plain would create a new space around the retained tree and provide greater amenity to pedestrians through the pocket park.

Officers informed the Sub-Committee that the scheme had been extensively tested and designed to minimise microclimatic impacts and noted that objections to the proposals had raised concerns with the wind impact to St. Ethelburga's. However, they stated that, in all scenarios, there would be no additional material harmful impact to neighbouring properties and all areas around St. Ethelburga's would be suitable for their intended uses. Officers added that the proposals would have a beneficial impact on wind conditions to Camomile Street. Officers stated that, overall, the proposal would have acceptable impacts for all other microclimatic results, including daylight and sunlight impacts to surrounding properties.

Officers stated that the concept at the heart of the cultural offer was the idea of 'open gate' which drew inspiration from the site's position on the city wall

adjacent to the ancient Bishops Gate and was designed to welcome all into the city.

An image of the pavilion cultural building was presented to the Sub-Committee by Officers who stated that the six-storey building would be for both cultural production, consumption, and would be wrapped in a veil of the map of London. Officers added the pavilion building would bring vibrancy and activity to an important gateway, and the design outwardly denoted its function and would enrich the fringe of the City Cluster.

Officers presented the schematic layout of the glass gallery on the ground floor and first floor of the cultural building and stated there was free public access to exhibitions curated by the Cultural Anchor tenant and the London Museum, with the first-floor mezzanine being a space for smaller recitals and there was a drop-in space for school groups and a lobby for larger events.

CGIs of the glass gallery entrance were shown to the Sub-Committee by Officers who stated they showed high levels of visibility and activity which reinforced that it was a very public use and a location for art and artefacts for display.

Officers stated that the second and third floor levels of the cultural building included a multi-purpose hall, and the cultural audit had highlighted that a hall which could hold 200 people was what was needed in the city, and it was designed to be fully flexible for a range of events which were either free or affordably ticketed to the public. Officers also presented a CGI of the space and added it showed its generous size.

The Sub-Committee were shown images of the fourth and fifth level of the cultural building by Officers who stated it included the creative studios, with one level for the Cultural Anchor and the other as a flexible creative workspace for office or rehearsal space. Officers added the levels would be offered at affordable rates in line with the City's Small and Medium Enterprise (SME) Strategy.

Officers informed Members that the applicant, throughout the development of Open Gate, had been working in collaboration with Intermission Youth who were the intended operator and Cultural Anchor tenant of the cultural building. Officers added that Intermission Youth were a charity that was set up to help disadvantaged young people through access to theatre and full details would be worked up through a Section 106 agreement.

Cycle hub diagrams were presented to the Sub-Committee by Officers who explained that it was a three-storey building which would house the free short-stay cycle parking which was accessible to the public, with the possibility of cycle repair facilities and a concierge service.

Officers noted that while the three new buildings proposed would stand above ground, they would be serviced by a site-wide basement of which the proposal

provided 1,600 long-stay cycle parking spaces at basement levels which was heavily constrained by the existing raft.

An image of the existing and proposed basement access location was shown to the Sub-Committee by Officers who stated that the existing ramp to the servicing bay from Old Broad Street was to be re-used and the proposed servicing bay with a disabled parking bay was outlined. Officers added that the consolidation strategy meant that the number of daily servicing trips would be reduced from 219 as existed to 96 trips per day in the proposed scheme which would be undertaken overnight.

A diagram and image of the high-level city walkway that ran through the existing site was shown to Members by Officers who explained that the proposal would bring the route down to ground level which would improve its inclusive access and quality.

Officers presented images of the existing and proposed building from the north at Artillery Lane and stated that the building had a convincing presence in the proposed view which befitted its status as the gateway into the cluster with its height and scale commensurate to the existing and consented tall buildings in the cluster. Officers also presented images of the existing and proposed building from further south along the approach viewed north from Liverpool Street and stated that it showed the striking new gateway at an important junction which would come to ground successfully and increase the public realm in both quality and scale.

Officers showed the Sub-Committee images of the existing and proposed building from Gracechurch Street looking north by Officers who stated that the proposed image showed the principal south core and the way it related back to the cluster, but noted, in the cumulative scenario, that it would be obscured by 55 Bishopsgate. Officers also presented the view of the existing, proposed and cumulative development from St. Helen's Place looking south and noted that the cumulative development from that view would also be obscured by 55 Bishopsgate.

The view of the existing and proposed development from the north end of Waterloo Bridge at LVMF 15B.1 was presented to the Sub-Committee by Officers who noted it was the place from which the proposals impacted on the setting of St. Paul's Cathedral was at its greatest. They added that the proposed view showed how the proposal had been sculpted to be clearly and meaningfully deferential to the Cathedral through the significant raking profile at upper levels and the feathered edge from visible greening which, in turn, allowed it to form an elegant end-piece to the City Cluster when seen from the view presented. Officers further noted, nevertheless, that because of the proposal scale and visual proximity to the Cathedral, that Officers have concurred, with Historic England and St. Paul's Cathedral, that there was a degree of harm arising to the setting of the Cathedral in the view presented. Officers added that the cumulative scenario showed how the proposal would consolidate and tidy up the edge of the Cluster.

Officers presented existing, proposed and cumulative views of the Cluster from the middle of Waterloo Bridge and stated that one could see how the proposals would consolidate the cluster at its northern edge which moved away from the Cathedral as one moved south across Waterloo Bridge.

The view of the existing and proposed development from the south end of Waterloo Bridge at LVMF 15B.2 was shown to the Sub-Committee by Officers who stated that the proposed development would not only have a relatively fleeting impact, limited to a particular area of the bridge, but the proposal was over 1km away from the Cathedral and would be perceived as another layer of the City as part of the existing skyline features of the cluster. Officers also presented the cumulative view from LVMF 15B.2.

Officers presented some existing, proposed and cumulative nighttime views of the development from LVMF 15B.2 on Waterloo Bridge and stated that one could see how the lighting would be of the sensitivity and specification commensurate to others in the cluster which ensured that the Cathedral retained its primacy at nighttime and had all been secured by condition.

Views of the existing, proposed and cumulative daytime view of the development from LVMF 17B.1 on Hungerford Bridge were also shown by Officers who explained to the Sub-Committee that one could see the in foreground that the impacts on the proposal were similar. Views of the existing and proposed view of the development from LVMF 17B.2 further south on Hungerford Bridge were also shown to the Sub-Committee by Officers who added that the proposal was seen at a greater distance from the Cathedral visually and was a considerable physical distance away from it. They also presented the cumulative view to Members.

Officers also presented views of the existing and proposed development from LVMF16B.2 at Gabriel's Wharf and stated that St. Paul's Cathedral had additionally raised concerns about the impact of the scheme from the view. However, Officers stated that they had found no adverse impacts on the view would arise from the proposed development. The cumulative view was also shown to the Sub-Committee.

Officers provided an existing, proposed and cumulative view of the development from LVMF 26A.1 in St. James's Park and stated the proposed view had been the focus of objections from Historic England and had concurred in finding a degree of harm to the view.

An existing and proposed view from the Golden Gallery at St. Paul's Cathedral was also presented to the Sub-Committee by Officers who stated it showed the distance of the proposal from the Cathedral and the way it would form a convincing and dynamic northwestern end piece to the City Cluster.

The Sub-Committee was presented with an existing and proposed view of the development from London Wall by Officers who stated that the proposal would form a striking new piece of modern architecture, seen in conjunction with the

historic financial city and, as part of that, the characteristic contrast between ancient and modern, which was what was so special about the Square Mile.

Officers told the Sub-Committee that the building had been strategically sited within the heart of the cluster, which followed a plan-led approach to consolidating tall buildings and growth in a manner which would be the least impactful on strategic heritage assets and which was sustainably located. They continued that the proposal would deliver 8.3% of the required office floor space to meet the key strategic objectives of the adopted and emerging Local Plans which had optimised the capacity of the site and would make a significant contribution to maintaining the City's status as the world's leading financial centre. Officers added that the proposal resulted in a 1000% increase in high quality public realm across the site that would transform the permeability of the site at a critical arrival point in the cluster. They told the Sub-Committee that the City market would offer a significant new arrival experience and departure point to appeal to the City's 600,000 daily workers, visitors and residents and a significant new piece of public amenity at an important nodal location. Officers further added that the tower provided a structural quality which would step down from 55 Bishopsgate to provide a distinct and well-conceived addition to the emerging cluster and the proposal added to the existing rich mix of striking juxtapositions which had come to symbolise the continued success and evolution of the City. Officers also stated that the development was considered to be an exemplary architectural response to a complicated site that had been designed with sustainability, microclimate, streets, people, and spaces in mind, and presented an elegant design solution which made effective use of limited resources, as well as being heavily greened. Officers told the Sub-Committee that the pavilion cultural building would deliver a significant new contribution to the strategic cultural aspirations of the Destination City Initiative by providing free-to-enter multi-purpose events, with the venue being an incubator of creativity in a unique new landmark building with an outwardly facing permeable ecosystem. Officers added that the cycle hub contributed to active travel aspirations and, overall, the scheme provided significantly enhanced permeability which fed into wider aspirations for pedestrian movement. They further noted that the development would provide a unique and distinctive addition to the city cluster which would deliver significant public benefits which flowed from an enhanced public realm and the creation of a cultural attraction. Officers stated that, overall, the scheme would be of the highest architectural calibre and have a rare cohesiveness of structural and architectural finesse, and it reconciled structural microclimatic and function requirements in a solution of rare elegance by a world leading architect which would fit neatly into its local and strategic London-wide context. Officers concluded, that, for those reasons, the scheme would strike a compelling planning balance that would easily outweigh the limited and fleeting harmful impacts identified to the Cathedral and represented a major strategic contribution to the City's economic and cultural agenda. They recommended approval of the development as set out in the report.

The Town Clerk explained the procedure for speakers.

The Chairman invited the Supporters to address the Sub-Committee.

Mr. Scanlon of Brookfield Properties UK addressed the Sub-Committee and stated that Brookfield had a proud track record of investment, development and partnerships in the City having delivered over 3,000,000ft² of major office-led schemes in recent years which included developments such as London Wall Place, 100 Bishopsgate and 1 Leadenhall which he stated was not only of the highest architectural quality, but delivered transformational and lasting public benefit for workers, visitors and the City holistically. Mr. Scanlon stated all the schemes had been delivered sensitively and in close collaboration with neighbours protecting and seeking to celebrate the close-knit historic fabric which made the City so special, and included remnants of London Wall, the Grade I-listed St. Ethelburga's, St. Helen's Church, and the Grade II*-listed Leadenhall Market. He added that the office space and amenity delivered had been appealing to occupiers and had supported employment growth within the City and noted that since 2013, Brookfield have secured 2,000,000ft² of pre-lets on their development pipeline and had completed over 5,000,000ft² of leasing transactions. Mr. Scanlon told the Sub-Committee that his firm was acutely aware of what it took to successfully deliver, lease and operate major schemes, and that expertise had shaped proposals for 99 Bishopsgate to ensure that it was deliverable, appealed to the future workforce and would provide transformational and lasting benefit for the wider community. He further stated that alongside 99,000m² of best-in-class essential office space, 99 Bishopsgate would provide vibrant and inclusive public and cultural facilities, including the city market, a new seven-day food and beverage destination and Open Gate, a unique standalone cultural building. Mr. Scanlon also noted that the development would contribute in excess of £40m through CIL and Section 106 obligations and create 7,500 new jobs. He explained to the Sub-Committee that the scheme prioritised sustainability, having retained and reused the existing foundations to reduce embodied carbon and the extent of demolition and vertical gardens an expansive terrace spaces would enhance employee wellbeing, foster biodiversity and provide visual amenity from afar, whilst urban greening initiatives at ground level would further enrich the visitor experience. The tenfold increase in accessible public realm would seamlessly connect with neighbouring consents and create new pedestrian routes which would connect Liverpool Street station to the heart of the cluster which met both the City's and the Eastern City's BID's ambitions. Mr. Scanlon stated that the site was of strategic importance and designated for tall buildings in both the adopted and emerging City policy and the developer's team, led by Graham Stirk of Rochester Carver and Partners, had shown great expertise and creativity, in shaping a scheme which balanced the many constraints and opportunities that the site presented. In collaboration with the City's design and planning Officers, and a wide range of stakeholders over the last three years, the scheme had evolved dramatically to address feedback. Mr. Scanlon informed the Sub-Committee that he was disappointed with St. Ethelburga's objections given the developer's long standing and positive relationship with the organisation and stated he believed that the applicant team had addressed key planning concerns and considered that the pocket park, a new vista of the church created by their proposals, would deliver a lasting benefit. He added that the developer remained in positive dialogue with St. Ethelburga's and was confident of reaching an agreement on neighbourly matters in the months ahead. Mr. Scanlon told the Sub-Committee that there was also disappointment

with the objections from Historic England and St. Paul's Cathedral. He concluded that the proposals for 99 Bishopsgate would be transformational and the wider scheme would change perceptions, attract new audiences and showcase the ambitions of the City's adopted and emerging Local Plan policies.

Mr. Sarralde of The Townscape Consultancy addressed the Sub-Committee and noted that since day-one of the design process, a large number of townscape views, including views of St. Paul's Cathedral as seen from Waterloo Bridge, had guided the design response. He stated that St. Paul's Cathedral was seen as a kinetic experience from the bridge, where the gap between the City Cluster and the Cathedral widened as the viewer moved south and added that the whole length of the bridge was important, not just its northern end. Mr. Sarralde informed the Sub-Committee that the proposed scheme sought to create a rationalised context, with massing sloping away from the sky gap at the same height as the top of Cathedral's dome, with a soft edge achieved by stark green terraces and slope glazing to reflect the sky and reduce its visual presence on the skyline. He added that the Greater London Authority (GLA), who were the authors and guardian of the LVMF, had confirmed the following position in the Stage 1 report, namely that the scheme responded appropriately to its position at the northern edge of the Cluster and maintained the clear sky backdrop to St. Paul's Cathedral. It also maintained the visual separation between the Cluster and St. Paul's through its sloping design and it had the benefit of obscuring a more complex group of buildings in the backdrop which provided a cleaner form to the edge of the Cluster that would have a more positive relationship with the Cathedral. Mr. Sarralde stated, therefore, that it was his assessment that the proposals fully complied with the LVMF management guidance for these views and considered that the scheme was of the highest architectural quality which would complete and complement the Cluster without negatively affecting the ability to appreciate St. Paul's Cathedral as an important strategic landmark on the skyline.

Ms. Dobbin of SRD Culture addressed the Sub-Committee and stated SRD Culture had worked with partners in July 2023 to audit the City of London's cultural provision to identify potential opportunities, and had found that there was a need for smaller culture centres where young creators could develop and showcase their work. Following that, SRD Culture, in November 2023, held round tables and co-design workshops with 18- to 25-year-olds and the architects to inform the vision, connect to place identify and provide indicative uses as was seen in the submitted cultural plan. The result of that was a mission to reinstate Bishopsgate as a cultural gateway and fulfilled the Destination City agenda to welcome all. Ms. Dobbin added that the developer team prioritised a new offer to the City, a gateway that invited underrepresented voices to take residence and sought an organisation that already existed but was in need of a home and wanted to grow to operate the six floors of the gallery hall and studios with 90 creative desk spaces and one that would deliver an authentic interest to reach out to the community. She further noted that the developer team was introduced to Intermission Youth and their need for a new home by the Mayor of London's team and their purpose, connection to quality

presentation and a desire to be embedded in a community matched Brookfield Properties' ambition for the cultural building.

Ms. Dobbin read out a speech from Darren Raymond, the Artistic Director of Intermission Youth: Intermission Youth is a registered charity that helps to transform the lives of young Londoners aged 11 to 30 plus through theatre, film, whole person support and community empowerment. Since 2008, we've worked with over 8000 young people to improve their life opportunities. Our productions include, but are not limited to, collaborations with Shakespeare's original language and contemporary and contemporary language that's been devised with the young people to align specific and universal stories of life as Shakespeare's original presence was here in the City, it seems a rightful place for intermission youth, to encourage young people to bring their cultural and contemporary perspectives into conversation with the histories of their city, we developed the name Open Gate in response to the original suggestion of Fourth Gate in the spirit of this mashup. The young people that attend our programmes are highly motivated, passionate and come from across all boroughs of London. We have strong links with national and local arts organisations such as Shakespeare's Globe, Royal Academy of Dramatic Art (RADA), BBC and Guildhall's School of Music and Drama. This can be our permanent home that we share and we reach out and embed in our community. We've been on a 15-month process of collaborative discussions with Brookfield Properties and our trustees about the spaces that it provides. We believe that we can help improve the City of London as dynamic and diverse and bring new opportunity to young people to see the City as relevant and supportive to them. So, we look forward to progressing our discussions with Intermission Youth and bringing forward a cultural implementation plan through the Section 106 to deliver these joint ambitions. Open Gate is an incredible opportunity to gain a unique vibrant cultural hub that provides a home for diverse creatives and draws new audiences to the City of London.

The Chairman moved the meeting to questions to the Supporters.

The Chairman welcomed the pedestrian capillaries that would be created and sought an explanation how cycle flows would operate in practicality for pedestrians who needed to be kept safe. A Supporter stated he expected the vast majority of cyclists would enter the site by the existing vehicular ramp from Old Broad Street and also expected that the travel plan locked into any planning permission would require tenants to encourage their employees to access on bikes via that means of access. He added that those cyclists accessing via Bishopsgate would need to dismount and, therefore, walk with their cycle bikes to the cycle entrance across the footway and noted there was no anticipation of conflict with pedestrians. The Supporter added, as a result, that the developers would work with City and dockless bike operators to ensure appropriate position parking zones were established and maintained to avoid clutter and conflict with pedestrians.

A Member stated that she felt that not showing the cycle parking on visuals could be misleading and expecting cyclists to dismount and wheel their bikes to the cycle hub was unrealistic given the weight of the electric bikes. The

Member also queried the accessibility of the scheme given the inclusion of steps in the visuals leading up to the pedestrian area which did not seem to include any handrails, and was not clear on how pedestrians with limited accessibility would make their way into the market space. The Supporter stated that, even though there was a change in level, it had been designed in close consultation with Andy Sturgeon Landscape Architects to ensure there was no need for a rail or steps, and people were able to freely access the site. The Member responded that for those accessing steps, the inclusion of a handrail was helpful to ensure accessibility had been covered.

The Member stated she applauded the choice of Intermission Youth as a partner for the cultural space and sought information on what guidance had been received by the developer from Officers on the choice of cultural amenity as she was not aware of the cultural strategy being worked on in the City. A Supporter explained to the Sub-Committee that they were encouraged to seize the opportunity to create a unique offer in that particular part of the City and knew there were a lot of higher-level public viewing galleries. As the location of the site, and its relationship with Liverpool Street and the significant number of pedestrians that would be moving around Old Broad Street, it was felt it would be fantastic to create a building in its own right that could offer different things to different groups within the wider community. Another Supporter confirmed there was a thorough audit of what cultural offers existed in the City, and what schemes had been consented to take a look at the balance of cultural offers there were, and a gap had been identified. The Supporter added that, following the audit, the development team felt the best thing to do was reach out to artists through workshops with 18- to 25-year-olds, and realised from the exercise that they did not stick to one art form. Therefore, that was why the proposed building offered a gallery and a hall that was flexible, and studios, which could accommodate the fact that the artists did not stick to one art form and a space where digital work could be carried out. The Supporter further added that the artists wanted a space where they could present and exhibit, so the development team worked on developing the cultural framework, as well as with the proposed City Plan, to ensure the proposal stayed current with adjustments that were coming up and complemented other offers in the area.

The Member followed-up on the question as to whether the developers had received guidance from Officers on cultural amenities. The Supporter responded that they did receive guidance in regard to the collaborative planning meetings and, through those sessions, put forward concepts and received feedback from them, carried out the workshops with potential users for more specificity and brought that feedback to Officers who were worked with to refine those suggestions.

The Member questioned how cultural offerings were selected and whether developers were assisted by being presented with a framework from Officers, and suggested the audit carried out by the development team on cultural offerings could be used to inform work being done at the Corporation.

A question was posed by a Member on what further design measures could be employed to reduce and mitigate further the impacts on heritage assets and St.

Paul's Cathedral in particular given the developer had the benefits of a study setting collated by St. Paul's Chapter. The Supporter stated that St. Paul's Cathedral had been consulted through the application process and noted their letter had praised the quality of the engagement, the material presented and the positive collaboration. He added that, as part of the consultation process with St. Paul's and Historic England, the development team embedded mitigation measures in the design which included the sloping of the building to reflect the sky in a different way to the body of the upright elements of the facades which meant that, at certain times of the day and with certain light conditions from testing done with CGIs, a much more lightweight presence and appearance would be presented compared to the body of the building which meant that there was a mitigation through the design of the development that would reduce its impact. He further noted St. Paul's focused a lot on the view from the northern end of Waterloo Bridge which was the narrowest possible gap between the cluster and the cathedral, but most people experienced that relationship in a kinetic way and one could see from the images it was the worst case scenario. He added that, from that view, the effect would not be perceived as such.

The Chairman opened questions to the Officers.

The Chairman queried whether there was any point at which, on the views from Waterloo Bridge, the proposed development was in the backdrop of St. Paul's and whether it was out of sync with current Local Plan policies as he did not understand the strength of the language in the objection with regard to that issue. Officers stated it related to LVMF 15B.1 at the northern end of the Waterloo Bridge which was where the acutest impact could be found on the Cathedral which was momentary. They added it was a visual impact rather than physical and the Cathedral and the development site were situated about 1km apart. Officers also stated that they had found a slight degree of harm from that view, and even less so, but again slightly, with the view from Hungerford Bridge too in relation to the reduction in sky space which formed some of the setting of the Cathedral so that it was very slightly narrowed. However, there was still a large amount of sky scape that was preserved, albeit with a slight reduction. Officers added that in none of the views, there would be no backdropping or direct encroachment on the silhouette and, in all the views, the Cathedral remained recognisable, commanding and clearly distinct from the City Cluster.

The Chairman requested, in relation to the traffic management plan for the scheme, that it was ensured there was clear signage on cycle dismounting and where trail lines were supposed to be located for cyclists to get to the cycle hub in the conditions. Officers confirmed that would be done.

A Member queried whether the setting corridors were available that went across St. Paul's Cathedral to see how it impacted upon the site. Officers stated that the setting corridors were only related to the panoramic views that were available from Primrose Hill, Alexandra Palace and Greenwich Park. They added, in relation to the river bridge views, that they were a kinetic experience as one moved between LVMF 15B.1 and further along the bridge, so there was no viewing corridor that one could see for the panoramic views.

Another Member drew attention to the emerging development Local Plan and asked when a level of harm was identified by Officers, and agree upon, whether any building within the City Cluster 'jelly mould' would be described in such a manner and then other policies would be applied, or was there specifically something about the proposed scheme to indicate they had gone beyond what was anticipated so there was a level of harm beyond what was assessed. Officers explained that the City Cluster contour lines were shaped to minimise the possibility of harm occurring to the three strategic landmarks: St. Paul's Cathedral, the Tower of London, and the Monument, so it did not expressly state that no harm would be caused as, in a place as complex and significant as the City, that was an unachievable goal at the macro-strategic planning policy level. Officers added that the contour lines were shaped in response to these views and minimised, in the Officer view, the possibility of harm being caused and the scheme fit entirely within those contour lines. Officers noted they considered that the scheme minimised the harm to a very acceptable level, and it was a fleeting moment of impact. While there was a degree of harm, it was entirely within the spirit of the contour lines in the City Plan.

The Deputy Chairman, in reference to LVMF 15B.1 view from Waterloo Bridge, suggested that the trees in the image diminished the prominence of the dome more than the buildings and queried whether trees would be cut if they continued to grow. Officers confirmed that the trees were pollarded.

A Member sought clarity around accessibility for pedestrians in relation to the scheme. Officers stated Condition 76 was included in the scheme, in relation to inclusion and accessibility, and Part F included an element with regard to public realm that would raise aspects such as handrails that were needed for steps. They added there was also an access management plan under Condition 77 and, in addition, there would be a public realm management plan within the Section 106 agreement that would ensure that the Mayor's Public Charter would be picked up in relation to inclusion and access. Officers further added that access Officers had reviewed the scheme and indicated they were happy with it.

Another Member queried whether there was any guidance on cultural offerings as they sought assurance there was an overall approach and noted it was an issue that the Culture, Heritage and Libraries Committee had discussed. The Chairman suggested the issue raised was better suited to be considered at the grand committee and stated that the Local Plan for 2040 had a chapter dedicated to culture in it. The Member agreed it should be considered at grand committee.

The Deputy Chairman expressed concerns about the proposal to mix cyclists and pedestrians as he had found it did not work due to a minority of irresponsible cyclists. He recognised that the scheme proposed a ramp entrance for cyclists to get access to the cycle hub and queried whether, if it did not operate well, whether it would be possible to mandate that cycles must go in via the cycle hub. Officers responded that the short-stay cycle hub would be impossible to access through the delivery bay service entrance. However, something could be secured via the travel plan which was secured by condition.

A Member also expressed concern in relation to the mixing of cyclists and pedestrians due to current issues with work on Leadenhall Street as some cyclists had been riding onto the pavement with disregard for pedestrians and was particularly concerned about those with mobility issues. The Member also stated there seemed to be no image from the northern end of Waterloo Bridge at night as it would be helpful to see. Officers told the Sub-Committee that the only nighttime image from Waterloo Bridge of St. Paul's Cathedral was the view from the south in the presentation and added that lighting conditions were included at the end of the pack which would ensure that the lighting was focused, and any public lighting was at the ground floor and needed to meet the City of London lighting strategy. The Member expressed disappointment that the image was not included in the presentation pack given daytime photographs had been included as it was an area of concern. The Chairman stated the need to ensure that conditions on the night light impact were properly conditioned through the lighting strategies that had been approved by the grand committee.

The Chairman sought assurances on cyclist behaviour. Officers confirmed that the report, on paragraph 909, stated that appropriate signage would be provided for the cycle hub for the benefit of office workers, visitors and members of the public, and stated, as an assurance, that there would be signs to encourage cyclists to dismount. Officers added that the public realm was technically private land for the developer and could enforce against cyclists if they wished, but further stated they would recommend that on-site facilities management and security staff ask those who do cycle to dismount to ensure the safety of pedestrians and other use of the area.

A Member stated that the images did not show dockless e-bikes which she suggested would be an impediment to pedestrian access given there had been issues on Wormwood Street with rows of dockless e-bikes and asked Officers if there were plans for people who dumped their dockless e-bike. Officers responded that the TfL bikes would have to be removed as part of the construction process and may, or may not, return to the same place. However, there were wider aspirations for the area as part of the London Wall Corridor study which meant the new location for TfL bikes would have to be agreed with TfL at a later stage in conjunction with the wider project. Officers added that the issue of the dockless e-bikes was one that was being addressed.

Another Member stated the pedestrian comfort around the site was important and was not clear if the pavements would be widened but added that pedestrian comfort was reduced when advertising boards and dumped bikes were an issue. The Member further added that the area was a very busy corner and whatever was implemented had to include a clear thoroughfare all the way around the development with obstructions removed quickly. The Member highlighted that the setting of St. Paul's Cathedral and its contribution to heritage significant was included in Historic England's objection and queried whether a briefing session could be organised on heritage as it would help inform the Sub-Committee on perceived concerns. The Member also questioned, having noted the number of conditions, what tweaks they would ask the applicant to undertaken to reduce the harm to the heritage asset as

much as possible, especially given that 122 Leadenhall Street (The Cheese Grater) was designed specifically to ensure there was no impact on the viewing corridor. Officers stated there was a significant raking profile of the tower was shaped directly in response to the Waterloo Bridge views and was a significant chunk of the scheme which stretched for 16-storeys from the position where it raked to the top and the position where it started to rake was set below the Cathedral's ball and cross to below the overall height of it. Officers noted they considered it was clearly deferential to the Cathedral. Officers further added that the raking of the building conceded Grade A office floor space that was needed, from around 100,000m² to the 99,000² that was proposed and noted there was a balancing act between growth and heritage.

The Chairman agreed it would be useful to have a Member briefing session on heritage so it was clear what was considered policy and the strains with the heritage lobby could be identified and addressed.

The Deputy Chairman suggested that the only way to reduce the harm would be to reduce the massing of the building and queried whether that would have wider implications, especially in relation to the offer of the cultural building as it would no longer be viable or affordable. Officers stated while they did not want to comment on a hypothetical scenario, it would have resulted in a very different scheme to the one before the Sub-Committee.

The Chairman moved the meeting to a debate.

A Member drew attention to an email that was received the night before from a representative of the Chapter of St. Paul's Cathedral in regard to their desire to speak at the Sub-Committee, but could not as they had missed the deadline for speaking outlined in the Planning Protocol and suggested more flexibility was needed around speaking as she did not believe it would have had a major impact had the representative been able to speak and it would have improved the transparency around the meeting. The Member also noted that the Town Clerk's Department received reports two clear weeks before a Committee meeting as per corporate policy and Members received the reports five working days before the meeting. The Member queried whether the reports could be made available earlier so reports could be digested as it would be a great help to the Sub-Committee.

The Member told the Sub-Committee she believed it was a great scheme in regard to the cultural offering, but agreed with a previous comment that the City needed to have a formed view of what offerings it already had, what it needed and what was lacking. She added that some developers, if they could not include viewing platforms, were moving to include cultural offerings, which could be next to a cultural offering that already existed and cautioned against having too many cultural offerings as the City had lost retail units and there was a need for a framework that provided a dynamic mix of users.

The Member expressed concerns that were highlighted by the heritage lobby and stated had the Sub-Committee seen the framework that informed the thinking around heritage assets, it would have helped to understand the lobby's

concerns and hoped, before it was constructed, that any impact could be reduced as much as possible.

The Chairman stated that matters of the Planning Protocol were not for the Sub-Committee to decide on and suggested the matter be taken away for discussion.

A Member suggested that the new lighting system that was to be used to light up St. Paul's Cathedral at night would significantly change its image in the images shown and transform the look of the dome to look more vivid and, further indicated, that it would provide the Sub-Committee with a much more comfortable feeling about the night view from Waterloo Bridge.

It was stated, by a Member, that she welcomed the confirmation of the anchor tenant Intermission Youth and was heartened to read how the relationship had developed with the developer directly as it was fairly unique in her experience and added she was keen to see how the relationship would develop further, including, potentially, with support with a home fit-out with running costs outside of whether the application was granted or not as it felt like meaningful social value. The Member also highlighted research undertaken by the YMCA that there had been a 73% cut in youth services since 2010.

The Chairman stated that the building itself was offering 99,000²ft of prime office space which was desperately needed in the City and, on that basis, the desire to have such a building was really vital for economic growth in the Square Mile. He added that the ground floor plain tenfold increase in public realm, with the cultural offering next door, could not be realised without the office building in place. He also drew attention to the issue of embodied carbon as a lot of work had been carried out to retain as much as possible. The Chairman indicated he was happy to support the application on that basis.

The Chairman moved the meeting to a vote on the application.

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

Votes were cast as follows: IN FAVOUR – 17

OPPOSED – 0

There were two abstentions.

The recommendations were therefore carried.

RESOLVED – That, Members approved the following recommendations:

- 1) That the Planning and Development Director be authorised to issue a decision notice granting planning permission for the above proposal in accordance with the details set out in the attached schedule subject to:
 - a. The application be referred to the Mayor of London to decide whether to allow the Corporation to grant planning permission as recommended, or to direct refusal, or to determine the application

himself (Article 5(1)(a) of the Town and Country Planning (Mayor of London) Order 2008);

- 2) That your Officers be instructed to negotiate and execute obligations in respect of those matters set out in “Planning Obligations” under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and any necessary agreement under Section 278 of the Highway Act 1980 in respect of those matters set out in the report, the decision notice not to be issued until the Section 106 obligations have been executed;
- 3) That Members note that the proposal will require the rescission of the City Walkway through the Site and that should the development proceed, a report will be taken to the Planning and Transportation Committee seeking authority to rescind the necessary parts of the City Walkway; and
- 4) That your Officers be authorised to provide the information required by regulation 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.

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

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

RESOLVED – That, Members:

- Noted the report and its contents.

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

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

RESOLVED – That, Members:

- Noted the report and its contents.

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

A Member sought assurance that all of those present for the vote on the Bury Street item that went to the 13 December 2024 meeting of the Planning Applications Sub-Committee would get an opportunity to participate in a discussion and determination of the reasons as to why the Bury Street application was refused. The Chairman indicated it was important for the minutes of that meeting to be approved and stated it would have been unfair to

call on Members to immediately vote on the reasons for refusal following immediately after that. Therefore, it was decided to move the Reasons for Refusal item to the next meeting of the Sub-Committee so Members had a chance to ensure the minutes were digested before a decision was made.

The Member sought clarification that Members would be allowed their own input into the reasons for refusal of the Bury Street application and opportunity to question whether they were satisfied with those reasons as the Member felt the refusal was not done solely on planning considerations. The Chairman responded that the Sub-Committee had tasked Officers at the end of the 13 December 2024 meeting to formulate reasons for refusal on planning grounds based on the discussion in the meeting and the report that would come to the 11 February 2025 meeting of the Sub-Committee would be the planning grounds for refusal. Officers confirmed that the report would be published in the next few days and stated they had reflected on the level of consensus on certain grounds in the report recommendations.

The Member queried whether Members would have an opportunity to amend the reasons for refusal report at the 11 February 2025 meeting. Officers confirmed they would.

The Town Clerk confirmed that the reasons for refusal report, along with the papers for the next Sub-Committee meeting, would be published on 03 February 2025.

A Member sought confirmation that only those Members who were present at the 13 December 2024 meeting for the Bury Street item could vote on the reasons for refusal. The Chairman confirmed that only those Members who were present at the determination of the Bury Street item could participate in the discussion and vote on the reasons for refusal.

The Member also sought confirmation that the grand committee would get the opportunity to receive a briefing in relation to the St. Paul's Cathedral setting and whether the prospect of getting papers to Members earlier than the five working days deadline would be reviewed. The Member also suggested a draft timetable would be useful for when applications were due to come before the Sub-Committee as it allowed Members and other stakeholders to be aware when reports would be published and what deadlines were associated with the meeting such as deadlines to speak. The Member also drew attention to a meeting on 28th May 2025 which fell during the School Holidays as there was concern that people could be away for the Bank Holiday as well. Officers responded that the letters that set out the timescale in which people were required to notify the planning department of the intention to speak was explicit, but indicated they would look at the letter to see if it could be made more obvious. Officers added, in relation to trying to give certainty as to when schemes would come forward, they would be keen to provide that as planning was volatile and big applications were particularly complex. They added that it could be a double-sided sword as people could be notified something was due to appear at Sub-Committee only for a deferment to occur which made it counterproductive. Officers further noted that when they were in a position

where they were as certain as they could be, they would highlight dates as they agreed it was important that people got as much notice in advance as possible.

The Member suggested a speaking protocol or guide would be helpful for those who registered to speak at Sub-Committee. Officers indicated the letters sent out did explain the speaking protocol.

The Chairman stated that the current timeframe for registering to speak was set so that if one speaker, either an objector or an applicant, they had time to coordinate the time amongst them as that was an important factor in determinations.

9. ANY OTHER BUSINESS THAT THE CHAIRMAN CONSIDERS URGENT

There was no other business that the Chairman considered urgent.

The meeting ended at 11.46 am

Chairman

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