

PLANNING AND TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE

Tuesday, 21 October 2025

Minutes of the meeting of the Planning and Transportation Committee held at the Guildhall EC2 at 10.30 am

Present

Members:

Deputy Tom Sleigh (Chair)	Alderwoman Elizabeth Anne King, BEM JP
Shravan Joshi MBE (Deputy Chair)	Charles Edward Lord, OBE JP
Tana Adkin	Tim McNally
Samapti Bagchi	Sophia Mooney
Deputy John Edwards	Deborah Oliver
Deputy Marianne Fredericks	Deputy Henry Pollard
Alderman Alison Gowman CBE	Alderman Simon Pryke
Deputy Madush Gupta	Robertshaw
Josephine Hayes	Matthew Waters
Deputy Jaspreet Hodgson	Jacqui Webster

Officers:

Gudrun Andrews	Environment Department
James Flynn	Environment Department
Ian Hughes	City Operations Director (City Streets and Spaces), Environment Department
Lyndsay Jennings	Environment Department
Rob McNicol	Environment Department
Bruce McVean	Environment Department
Paul Monaghan	Environment Department
Tom Nancollas	Environment Department
Gwyn Richards	Environment Department Planning and Development Director, Environment Department
Lewis Robinson	Environment Department
Katie Stewart	Executive Director, Environment
Judith Dignum	Town Clerk's Department
Gemma Stokley	Town Clerk's Department

Chair's Opening Remarks

In welcoming those present to the meeting, the Chair drew attention to the following issues:

- Matthew Bell and Anthony Fitzpatrick had ceased to be members of the Committee. The Court of Common Council had appointed David Williams in the room of Mr Bell and, regarding Mr Fitzpatrick's Ward of Lime Street, had agreed that it would be twinned with the Ward of Langbourn. The existing representative

for Langbourn, Matthew Waters, would therefore become the new joint representative. The Chair on behalf of Members thanked Mr Fitzpatrick for his work over many years on the Committee.

- The Chair reported that the City Corporation had enjoyed success at the recent Building London Planning Awards 2025, designed to honour excellence in planning and development across both public and private sectors in London. 100 Fetter Lane and The City of London's Sustainability Policy Guidance had been named as winners in the Best New Place to Work and Sustainable Planning Award categories respectively, and Panorama St Paul's (81 Newgate Street) had received a commendation in the Best Retrofit category. The Chair on behalf of the Committee congratulated the officer team and Members expressed their appreciation with a round of applause.

1. **APOLOGIES**

Apologies for Absence were received from Philip Kelvin, Antony Manchester, Alderwoman Jennette Newman, Hugh Selka, Naresh Sonpar and David Williams.

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

Deputy Tom Sleigh (Chair), Gaby Robertshaw and Jacqui Webster each declared an interest in agenda item 7 (Infrastructure Funding Statement – Community infrastructure Levy (CIL) / Section 106).

During consideration of the item, Deputy Sleigh vacated the Chair in favour of the Deputy Chair, Shravan Joshi, and left the Livery Hall. Gaby Robertshaw and Jacqui Webster remained present but took no part in the debate or decision-making on the report.

3. **MINUTES**

- 3a The public minutes of the meeting held on 8 July 2025 were approved as an accurate record.

Clerk's Note: following the meeting, an incorrect version of the minutes document was found to have been included with the agenda. The minutes of the 8 July meeting therefore remain unapproved and will be resubmitted to a future meeting of the Committee.

- 3b The public minutes and non-public summary of the meeting held on 9 September 2025 were approved as an accurate record.

4. **CITY PLAN MAIN AND ADDITIONAL MODIFICATIONS**

The Committee considered a report by the Executive Director Environment seeking approval to conduct a six-week consultation period on the Main and Additional Modifications in the City Plan, the Sustainability Review and the changes to the Policies Map, as set out in Appendices 1-4 of the report. The Committee was also asked to delegate authority to the Director of Planning and

Development, in liaison with the Chair and Deputy Chair of the Committee, to provide a City Corporation response to the consultation responses received.

The report had also been considered by the Local Plans Sub-Committee on 9 October 2025.

A Member expressed thanks to the Officer Team for an excellent and extremely detailed report and for the additional briefing sessions that had been held. It was hoped that the City Plan would receive final approval approved too many amendments.

Officers responded to Members' questions, covering main points as set out below:

- An explanation was provided as to the varying definitions of infrastructure in Policies IN1 and IN2
- It was noted that external standards quoted in the Plan, such as Wst 05 and BREEAM, were expected to be in place for its entire duration.
- The Inspectors had removed the specific paragraph relating to Bevis Marks Synagogue as in their view this may lead to confusion.
- The expectation would continue that the majority of tall buildings would be located within the three existing clusters.

Members also identified various typographical errors which they undertook to make known to officers.

RESOLVED: That Members -

1. Approve a six-week consultation period on the Main and Additional Modifications to the City Plan, the Sustainability Appraisal Review and the changes to the Policies May as set out I Appendices 1-4 of the report.
2. Delegate authority to the Director of Planning and Development, in liaison with the Chair and Deputy Chair of the Planning and Transportation Committee, to provide a City Corporation response to the consultation responses received.

5. **SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENTS (SPD) UPDATE**

The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director Environment providing an update on ongoing work to produce a series of new and updated Supplementary Planning Documents to support the implementation of the City Plan 2040. The proposed approach to engagement was explained and authorisation sought to:

- seek a Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) Screening view from the Environmental Bodies outlined in the relevant legislation; and
- conduct a 'call for evidence' on the SPDs.

The following responses were provided to Members' comments and questions:

- Officers confirmed that they were liaising with the colleagues working on the Cultural Strategy with a view to understanding the crossover between the SPDs and the wider corporate approach.
- The importance of linking with Ward Councillors and making effective use of their direct contact with constituents was acknowledged.
- A Member asked how developers could be made aware of changes to SPDs which may come into effect during the planning process. Officers explained how the transition would be managed; firstly, by seeking to involve developers, landowners and those promoting sites in the development of the SPDs. Secondly, once the draft documents were in the public domain, Officers would refer to them in their discussions with developers during the planning process, with a view to guiding them to shape their schemes in a way that reflected what the SPDs were aiming to do. This could be shown to have an impact despite the limited weight carried by draft documents.
- Officers agreed to share with Members the full programme of pre-engagement exercises, programmed to begin in November 2025. They also explained the process being used to engage with residents, commenting on how they were keen to expand this further through the development of new approaches to ensure that all groups were reached.

Commenting in her role as Lead Member for Resident Engagement, Jacqui Webster commended officers' commitment to reflecting the core focus of the resident engagement strategy, which was about reaching those who may not usually feel able to contribute. More intensive outreach was essential to ensure that the lived experience of local communities was properly reflected.

RESOLVED: That Members -

1. Note the approach to Supplementary Planning Documents (SPDs) planning and engagement.
2. Approve the request for a Screening opinion on the SPDs with the three Environmental Bodies.
3. Approve a public 'Call for Evidence' on the SPDs.

6. PLANNING ADVICE NOTE - HEAT NETWORK SUPPLY ZONES IN THE THAMES POLICY AREA

The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director Environment which presented a draft Planning Advice Note (PAN) setting out the policy context for developing strategic heat supply in the Thames Policy Area, indicated the potential and preferred options for the mooring of thermal barges in the supply of heat in the short-term and highlighted the recent decision to designate a strategic heat main as a nationally significant infrastructure project.

Members were asked to endorse the draft PAN and approve the undertaking of a consultation thereon.

The following information was provided in response to Members' comments and questions:

- It was noted that the consultation process would follow the usual timescales for planning guidance and advice notes, with a duration of six weeks, including workshops and face-to-face discussions.
- Specific details on the design of individual sites would be available later in the process. The purpose of the PAN was to ensure that developers along the riverfront was aware of the aim to deliver heat capacity to the City via various means in future and was including the information in discussions with relevant stakeholders.
- Officers explained the reasons why, following a technical assessment Swan Lane Pier had been selected as a preferred site. These included the potential to host a heat store on that part of the Riverside, proximity to Walbrook Whard (a potential future energy centre for storing and discharging heat) and the need to avoid any potential conflict with the existing Walbrook Wharf operation and other river-based operations and operators. This information would be placed in the public domain for the consultation, and respondents' views were keenly sought.
- Officers undertook to amend some minor amendments of detail concerning discrepancies in the number of sites referred to in various locations within the PAN.
- Members emphasised the need to provide as much information as possible about issues such as the design of the barges, in order to address any apprehension that may exist regarding the proposals.
- Officers undertook to investigate the rejection by a neighbouring council of a planning application which included the installation of thermal barges, to ascertain whether lessons could be learned for future applications. They also agreed to ascertain whether there were examples of the use of thermal barges in other cities in order to draw on their experience.

RESOLVED: That Members -

1. Endorse the draft Planning Advice Note on Heat Network Supply Zones in the Thames Policy Area.
2. Approve the undertaking of a consultation on the Planning Advice Note.

Deputy Shravan Joshi (Deputy Chair of the Committee) in the Chair

7. INFRASTRUCTURE FUNDING STATEMENT - COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE LEVY (CIL) / SECTION 106 (2024-25)

Deputy Tom Sleigh (Chair), Gaby Robertshaw and Jacqui Webster declared an interest in this item – minute 2 above refers.

During consideration of the item, Deputy Sleigh vacated the Chair in favour of the Deputy Chair (Deputy Shravan Joshi) and left the meeting. Gaby Robertshaw and Jacqui Webster remained present but took no part in the debate or decision-making on the report.

The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director Environment which presented the City's Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) and Section 106 (S106) planning obligations infrastructure funding statement at the end of the financial year 2024/25. The report summarised the City's CIL and S106 balances, allocation and spend at the end of the financial year and updated the list of infrastructure projects or types of infrastructure the City would be wholly or partly funding by CIL.

In presenting the report, Officers highlighted the significant amount of CIL generated by development in the City, and the substantial contribution towards essential infrastructure which this represented.

In response to a Member's question, Officers undertook to work with colleagues across the Corporation to produce additional information showing a breakdown of funding over the longer term and how it had been used.

Commenting that the report demonstrated the critical nature of CIL funding for the type of projects and schemes supported, a Member emphasised the need to defend against requests for it to be used to support other of the Corporation's budget needs.

A Member expressed the view that greater transparency in explaining the uses of CIL monies, including providing greater detail on the organisations receiving funding, would be helpful, in a similar manner to presentation of a charity's annual report. It was noted that this information was already provided to the main decision-making body, the Resources Allocation Sub-Committee, as well as on the Corporation's website (with real-time data updates) and duplication to this Sub-Committee would therefore be unhelpful.

Acknowledging this, the Member proposed the creation of a more comprehensive report, with information about the decision-making process, a link to the webpage and maybe some examples of the neighbourhoods which had received funding. The view was expressed that the existence and use of these funds was positive news that should be celebrated.

Regarding decision-making on the allocation of CIL monies, Officers advised that, in addition to the allocations agreed by the Resource Allocation Sub-

Committee, there was also an officer panel which considered grants below the value of £100,000 and made recommendations on grants above that amount.

In response to a Member's question as to whether Wards in which residents had experienced the greatest inconvenience from a development or series of developments were prioritised for the allocation of CIL funds, it was noted that the City had adopted a needs-based approach, rather than hypothecate to the specific wards in which developments had taken place.

RESOLVED: That Members -

1. Note the content of the report and Infrastructure Funding Statement (found in Appendix 1 to the report).
2. Approve the infrastructure list at paragraph 20 of the report, repeated at section 4 of the Infrastructure Funding Statement, for publication on the City 's website.

Deputy Tom Sleight (Chair of the Committee) in the Chair

8. ALDGATE TO BLACKFRIARS CYCLEWAY

The Committee received a report of the Executive Director Environment on progress regarding the Aldgate to Blackfriars Cycleway, part of the network of core cycling routes in the City identified in the Transport Strategy.

The report had been considered by the Streets and Walkways Sub-Committee on 16 September, when Members had expressed concern at the safety of the bus stop bypasses incorporated into the project design. The Sub-Committee had agreed to pause the project pending the issue of new national guidance on bus stop bypasses, expected early in 2026. In the light of this decision, officers would submit a further report to the Sub-Committee seeking Members' view as to how to proceed.

Responses were provided to Members' comments and questions as set out below:

- Officers undertook to investigate the reasons for the delay in opening the Bazalgette Embankment, confirming that there was no link with the decision to pause the Cycleway project.
- It was noted that the Accessibility Review for the cycleway project had been conducted on behalf of the Corporation by consultants whose processes were informed by engagement with vulnerable groups.
- The Committee noted the expression of a personal view regarding the potential for all pedestrians, with or without a specific vulnerability, to be at risk from bus stop bypasses. The impact of poor cycling behaviour was also highlighted.

The report was **noted**.

9. **NAMING OF NEW HIGHWAY MAINTAINABLE AT PUBLIC EXPENSE: GREYFRIARS SQUARE**

The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director Environment seeking approval to name as 'Greyfriars Square' the publicly accessible square to the west of 81 Newgate Street.

RESOLVED:

That the name for the publicly accessible square to the west of 81 Newgate Street be approved as 'Greyfriars Square' and a statutory notice issued.

10. **ADVERTISING BOARD UPDATE**

The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director Environment which set out the current policy on Advertising Boards (A-Boards), agreed in 2020. The report had been considered on 16 September by the Streets and Walkways Sub-Committee, which had been asked to review options regarding future policy in the area and to make recommendations to this Committee.

The Committee was asked to consider the comments and recommendation of the Sub-Committee (set out in the minutes of the meeting included as item 14 on the agenda for this meeting) and agree to proceed with one of the following options.

Option 1: Continue with the current policy and begin engagement prior to enforcement. (Recommended option.)

(Approval of this option would have the effect of confirming the City-wide ban on A-Boards agreed by the Committee in 2020, of which implementation had been deferred during the COVID 19 Pandemic.)

Option 2: Amend the A-Board policy to allow A-Boards for wayfinding purposes by exception (via a Way-board licence or other licencing criteria) and proceed to public consultation.

Views were expressed in favour of both options, with all speakers acknowledging that the most important factor in the decision was the impact on people in terms of accessibility and being able to move around the City comfortably.

Those not in favour of an A-Board ban referred to the following factors:

- Concerns at the impact of a ban on visitors, businesses and other organisations such as churches. The current difficult trading conditions facing small businesses were highlighted, as were the effectiveness of A-Boards as a traditional form of advertising.
- The potential disconnect between a proposed ban, commitments to small businesses included within the SME strategy and outcomes sought as part of the Destination City programme.

- The brutal effect of an outright ban compared with the more flexible approach of Option 2, and the risk of attracting a backlash from businesses and organisations affected. Approval of Option 2 would demonstrate the Corporation's appreciation for small businesses and their contribution to the life and culture of the City.

Regarding this latter, it was noted that members of the Streets and Walkways Sub-Committee had indicated some support for a revised version of Option 1, which would have allowed an exception to the ban for pedestrianised and timed closure streets. However, a proposed amendment to this effect had not received the support of the meeting.

- The potential impact which an inflexible policy could have on the vibrancy in the City which was a legacy of the opening up of outdoor spaces and restaurant seating areas during COVID.

Issues mentioned by those expressing support for the proposed A-Board ban included the following:

- The ease of a simple, consistent policy applicable to all, with a gentle approach to enforcement of the ban and the provision of assistance to businesses regarding alternative means of advertising. Examples of good practice in this respect were present in neighbouring authorities.
- The importance of giving pavements back to people. Evidence showed that the City's streets were now as busy as they had been before the Pandemic and issues of pedestrian access and inclusion needed to be the main priority in determining the way forward.
- The increased work and likely challenges for Officers of identifying locations which were suitable or not for A-Boards.
- The importance of trusting that the Streets and Walkways Sub-Committee had been thorough in their debate and assessment of the most appropriate option.

In the light of the support expressed by some Members for a more flexible approach to A-Boards rather than a complete ban, a Member proposed that the Committee consider an amended version of Option 1, as put to the Streets and Walkways Sub-Committee at its September meeting.

The unamended Motion would read:

"That Members:

1. Note the comments of the Streets and Walkways Sub-Committee and its recommended support for Option 1.
2. Agree to proceed with one of the following:

Option 1: Continue with the current policy and begin engagement prior to enforcement.

Option 2: Amend the A-board policy to allow A-boards for wayfinding purposes be exception (via a Way-board licence or other licencing criteria)."

It was moved by Charles Edward Lord, seconded by John Edwards, that the text of Option 1 be amended to read as follows:

'To continue with the current policy, **save for pedestrianised and timed-closure streets**, and begin engagement prior to enforcement.'

The amendment was put to the meeting, with votes cast as follows:

In favour: 4

Against: 10

There were no abstentions.

The amendment was declared to be **LOST**.

The Chair invited Members to vote on the original Motion as set out below:

"That Members-

1. Note the comments of the Streets and Walkways Sub-Committee and its recommended support for Option 1.
2. Agree to proceed with one of the following:

Option 1: Continue with the current policy and begin engagement prior to enforcement.

Option 2: Amend the A-board policy to allow A-boards for wayfinding purposes be exception (via a Way-board licence or other licencing criteria)."

The Motion was put to the meeting, with votes cast as follows:

Option 1: 5

Option 2: 11

There were no abstentions.

The Motion was therefore **CARRIED** with support for Option 2, and it was

RESOLVED: That Members-

1. Note the comments of the Streets and Walkways Sub-Committee and its recommended support for Option 1.
2. Support Option 2 as the future policy approach to A-Boards, as set out below:

'Amend the A-Board policy to allow A-Boards for wayfinding purposes by exception (via a Way-board licence or other licencing criteria) and proceed to public consultation.

11. PIPE SUBWAYS OF HOLBORN VIADUCT AND SNOW HILL OVER THAMESLINK

The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director Environment which provided an update on the project to carry out works on existing pipe subway structures of Holborn Viaduct and Snow Hill over Holborn Viaduct. Approval was sought to progress according to the recommended option set out in paragraph 5.2 of the report.

RESOLVED: That-

1. An additional budget of £196,000 be approved for Gateway 4 to allow for analytical work to be carried out.
2. The total estimated cost of the project of £2,862,000 (excluding risk), up from £2,666,000 reported in September 2019, be noted
3. A Costed Risk Provision (CRP) of £135,000 be approved (to be drawn down via delegation to Paul Monaghan, Assistant Director Engineering).
4. The recommended option set out in paragraph 5.2 of the report be agreed.

12. LEGIBLE LONDON SECTION 106 FUNDS

The Committee received a report of the Executive Director, Environment regarding the ongoing project to update the City of London's existing Legible London wayfinding signage. Approval was sought to allocate the ring-fenced S106 funds secured for this purpose to make these updates, which would include the installation of step-free diversion signage at City-managed public lifts.

RESOLVED: That Members-

1. Approve the allocation of £245,000 in S106 Legible London deposits to a project to update the City Corporation's Legible London signage.
2. Note that the City Corporation will be entering into a contract with Trueform, the supplier of Legible London signage, via a call-off process under the Transport for London framework agreement.

13. QUARTERLY PUBLIC LIFT AND ESCALATOR REPORT - 1 JULY TO 30 SEPTEMBER 2025

The Committee received a report of the City Surveyor outlining the availability and performance of publicly accessible lifts and escalators monitored and maintained by City Surveyor's in the reporting period 1 July to 30 September 2025.

The Committee noted that, during the reporting period, publicly accessible lifts and escalators had been available for 86% of the time.

The report was **noted**.

14. **STREETS AND WALKWAYS SUB-COMMITTEE DRAFT MINUTES**

The minutes of the Streets and Walkways Sub-Committee meeting held on 16 September 2025 were presented for information.

Referring to minute 7 (Pedestrian Priority Streets Programme – Old Jewry), a Member commented on the debate which had taken place at the Sub-Committee, particularly around the involvement of relevant Ward Members in the consultation on the proposal, and advice provided by Officers regarding the response to the consultation of the Mercers Company, a major landowner in the area, which did not appear to be straightforward. Since the meeting, it had become clear that the Company had grave concerns about the closure of Old Jewry. In the light of these two issues, the Member requested that the matter be referred back to the Sub-Committee for reconsideration once further consultation had been undertaken specifically with relevant Ward Members and major property owners and occupiers in Old Jewry.

Members expressed views both in support of and against the proposed referral back to the Sub-Committee. The Chair commented that in general he was reluctant for such action to be taken. However, on this occasion, given that some questions had come to light late in the process, he would request the Chair of the Sub-Committee to review the issue at the next meeting once further consultation had occurred, noting the potential for the original decision to remain unchanged.

The Chair of the Sub-Committee accepted the suggestion, proposing also that, prior to the December meeting, he and the Deputy Chairman meet with representatives of the Mercers Company to discuss this issue and another which the Company had raised. This was agreed with the proviso that the meeting include officer representation in order to assure the continued delivery of an officer-led consultation process incorporating fair and equitable treatment for all stakeholders.

Officers commented on the situation that had arisen, stating that, although the consultation process had been wide-ranging and lengthy, the receipt of additional responses at a late stage meant that a further review was sensible. An undertaking was given to review the consultation process to ensure it was sufficiently thorough.

Responding to a Members' challenge, the Member who had raised the original concern about the consultation process placed on record that, in suggesting that Officers' response to the Streets and Walkways Sub-Committee concerning the Mercers' Company's view of the proposed scheme had not been straightforward, he had not in any way meant to imply any disrespect or that this had been intentional.

RESOLVED: - That

1. The minutes of the Streets and Walkways Sub-Committee held on 16 September 2025 be noted.
2. That the proposals and decision set out in Minute 7 (Pedestrian Priority Streets Programme – Old Jewry) be referred back to the Sub-Committee for review once further consultation had been undertaken specifically with relevant Ward Members and the major property owners and occupiers in Old Jewry.

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

Two questions were asked, and responses given, as set out below:

Obstruction caused by Dockless Bikes – Referring to the Committee's earlier discussion on pavement obstruction caused by A-Boards, a Member highlighted more serious obstruction issues linked to the careless parking of dockless bikes and asked what further action could be taken.

Officers clarified the Corporation's policy on dockless bikes, which was that they should be left only in designated parking bays in order to avoid causing an obstruction. Where this did not occur, users were issued a warning or a fine by the operator as a means of encouraging appropriate parking behaviour. When spotted by Corporation staff, incorrectly parked bikes were reported directly to the operators for removal. Further information concerning dockless bikes could be found within reports to the Streets and Walkways Sub-Committee as the issue fell within its terms of reference.

Date of Next Planning Applications Sub-Committee – Concern was expressed that the next meeting of the Planning Applications Sub-Committee on the morning of 11 November would clash with Members' commitments to observe Remembrance Day in their Wards. Following consideration of various means of resolution, it was agreed that the meeting should proceed with an earlier start time of 9.30 and adjourn shortly before 11am if necessary.

Secretary's Note – the meeting was subsequently cancelled due to a lack of business.

16. ANY OTHER BUSINESS THAT THE CHAIRMAN CONSIDERS URGENT

There was no urgent business.

17. EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC

RESOLVED - that under Section 100(A) of the Local Government 1972, the public be excluded from the meeting for the following items of business on the grounds that they involve the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act

18. **NON-PUBLIC MINUTES**

The non-public minutes of the meeting held on 9 September 2025 were approved.

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

There were no questions.

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

The Chair, supported by the Committee, agreed to consideration of the following item of urgent, non-public business due to a need to update Members on a developing situation.

Bury House 1 - 4, 31 - 34 Bury Street London EC3A 5AR

The Committee noted a report of the Executive Director Environment.

The meeting closed at 12.30 pm

Chairman

Contact Officer: Judith Dignum
judith.dignum@cityoflondon.gov.uk