PLANNING AND TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE

Friday, 13 March 2026

Minutes of the meeting of the Planning and Transportation Committee held at the Guildhall EC2 at 10.00 am

Present

Members:

Deputy Tom Sleigh (Chair)
Tana Adkin KC
Samapti Bagchi
Deputy John Edwards
Deputy Marianne Fredericks
Alderman Alison Gowman CBE
Deputy Madush Gupta
Deputy Jaspreet Hodgson
Alderwoman Elizabeth Anne King, BEM JP
Charles Edward Lord, OBE JP
Deputy Alastair Moss
Deputy Henry Pollard
Gaby Robertshaw
Hugh Selka
William Upton KC
Jacqui Webster
David Williams

Officers:

Ian Hughes	-	City Operations Director, Environment Department
Rob McNicol	-	Environment Department
Gudren Andrews	-	Environment Department
Ben Bishop	-	Environment Department
Ruth Calderwood	-	Environment Department
James Flynn	-	Environment Department
Ellie Gooch	-	Environment Department
Joanne Hill	-	Environment Department
David Horkan	-	Environment Department
Rachel Pye	-	Environment Department
Gordon Roy	-	Environment Department
Samantha Tharme	-	Environment Department
Tom Nancollas	-	Environment Department
Joe Walsh	-	Environment Department
Matt Baker	-	City Surveyor's Department
Sam Gibson	-	City Surveyor's Department
James Murray	-	City Surveyor's Department
Deborah Cluett	-	Comptroller and City Solicitor's Department
Polly Dunn	-	Assistant Town Clerk and Executive Director of Governance and Member Services
Judith Dignum	-	Town Clerk's Department

1. **APOLOGIES**
Apologies for absence were received from Shravan Joshi (Deputy Chairman), Josephine Hayes, Philip Kelvin, Sophia Mooney, Alderwoman Jennette

Newman, Deputy Deborah Oliver, Alderman Simon Pryke, Naresh Sonpar and Matthew Waters.

Josephine Hayes and Deputy Nighat Qureishi observed the meeting online.

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

Deputy Marianne Fredericks declared an interest in agenda item 6 (Controlled Parking Zones Hours Consultation) in that, as a City resident, she was a regular user of on-street parking areas and the public car parks operated by the City Corporation.

Deputy Henry Pollard declared an interest in Agenda Item 8d (Celebrating Heritage Supplementary Planning Document) in that he is a member of the Skinners' Company.

3. **MINUTES**

Minutes were considered as follows:

a) The public minutes and non-public summary of a previous meeting of the Planning and Transportation Committee held on 8 July 2025 were approved as an accurate record, subject to the inclusion of Deputy Henry Pollard being included in the list of Members present at the meeting.

Matter arising

A Member referred to the minute relating to bus stop safety and the anticipated TfL campaign, noting that no subsequent report to this Committee or the Streets and Walkways Sub-Committee had been received, and sought clarification on when the matter would return.

Officers advised that the TfL campaign related to changes to the Highway introduced in October had been supported by City Corporation communications activity. This Committee had previously considered bus stop safety in relation to the Aldgate to Blackfriars cycle route, which had been paused pending updated Department for Transport guidance on bus stop bypasses. That guidance had since been issued, and the matter would return to a future Streets and Walkways Sub-Committee meeting for further consideration.

b) The public minutes and non-public summary of the previous meeting of the Planning and Transportation Committee held on 19 January 2026 were approved as an accurate record, subject to the inclusion of Deputy Madush Gupta in the list of Members present, Deputy Henry Pollard as observing the meeting online and Lyndsay Jennings, Principal Lawyer, being included in the list of officers present.

4. **RESOLUTION OF THE POLICY AND RESOURCES COMMITTEE: PLANNING PROTOCOL**

The Committee considered a resolution from the Policy and Resources Committee regarding deadlines for objections and letters of support in respect of planning applications, and the production of committee papers.

The Committee noted that no decision was required at this stage. Members supported further consideration of the matter and raised a number of additional issues for consideration, including submission requirements, the weighting of representations, the consideration of large application materials, the accessibility of committee papers, and the forward timetabling of applications.

In response, it was confirmed that a further report would be brought back to the Committee, taking into account both the Policy and Resources Committee resolution and the additional matters raised by Members during the meeting. It was stressed that any wider review of planning procedures and protocols could constitute a substantial piece of work requiring appropriate scoping and legal consideration.

The Committee agreed that officers should review the issues raised and report back with options and recommendations for consideration.

RESOLVED: That Members: -

- Noted the resolution of the Policy and Resources Committee and agreed that officers undertake a review of the matters set out therein, together with the additional issues raised by Members, and report back to this Committee with options and recommendations for further consideration.

5. **LOCAL IMPLEMENTATION FUNDED PLAN SCHEMES 2026/27**

The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director, Environment, concerning Local Implementation Funded Plan Schemes 2026/27.

A Member referred to the allocation of £146,000 for bridge assessment and strengthening and sought clarification on the types of structures to which the funding would apply and whether it could be used to address specific highway structures of concern. In response, it was clarified that the funding related to highway structures maintainable at public expense and did not extend to City Bridge Foundation assets. It was further clarified that the structure referenced was the responsibility of Transport for London, rather than the City Corporation. The matter had previously been raised with TfL and would continue to be pursued as appropriate.

RESOLVED: That Members: -

1. Approved the allocations up to a maximum of £712,000, for the financial year 2026/27.
2. Agreed to delegate authority to the Executive Director Environment to reallocate the TfL grant between the approved LIP schemes should that be necessary during 2026/27 up to a maximum of £250,000.

3. Agreed to delegate authority to the Executive Director Environment to allocate any additional funds which were made available by TfL in the 2026/27 financial year.

6. **CONTROLLED PARKING ZONES HOURS CONSULTATION**

The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director, Environment, concerning the Controlled Parking Zones (CPZ) Hours Consultation and seeking approval to consult.

Members noted that no immediate changes were being sought, with the proposal being to proceed to public consultation on a range of options. In discussion, Members supported a review of CPZ arrangements after a significant period without change whilst also raising a range of observations, including the potential impact on Destination City objectives, local businesses, residents and faith communities, and accessibility for disabled users. Members also highlighted issues regarding the accuracy and presentation of the report, the practical implications for servicing and day-to-day activity, and the need to ensure that any consultation was balanced, accessible and reflective of real-world usage. Particular concern was expressed regarding the framing of options, with Members requesting inclusion of a “business as usual” comparator, and the need to clearly set out wider contextual factors such as public transport provision and external cost pressures.

In response, it was emphasised that the exercise was at an early stage, allowing for evidence-gathering and consultation intended to test a broad range of options and better understand parking behaviour across different groups and time periods. It was confirmed that engagement would be undertaken with key stakeholders, including residents, businesses, faith groups and disabled users, and that the consultation approach would be refined to ensure clarity and accessibility. It was further confirmed that a “do nothing” option would be included as part of the consultation and that all feedback would be considered before returning to the Committee with revised proposals.

The Committee agreed to proceed to consultation, subject to the issues and amendments raised, including the incorporation of an additional comparator option and a more balanced and comprehensive presentation of the proposals.

RESOLVED: That Members, subject to inclusion of a ‘Business as Usual’ option being included: -

1. Agreed to proceed to consultation on the options for the operational hours of the Controlled Parking Zone (controlled hours) (Paragraph 24)
2. Agreed to proceed to consultation on the options for the charging hours of payment bays (Paragraphs 34 – 35)
3. Agreed to proceed to consultation on the options for the tariff structure for payment bays (Paragraphs 42 – 43)

7. **LOCAL DEVELOPMENT SCHEME AND STATEMENT OF COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT UPDATES**

The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director, Environment, concerning updates to the Local Development Scheme and Statement of Community Involvement.

During discussion, concerns were raised regarding the accuracy and completeness of the organisations listed, including the inclusion of bodies with unclear or inactive status and the omission or misnaming of relevant local groups. It was further queried whether the current arrangements adequately captured individual residents not affiliated with formal associations, and with an assurance sought that consultation processes remained inclusive and reflective of all affected stakeholders.

In response, officers clarified that the list of consultees was intended to be indicative rather than exhaustive, with specific bodies selected as appropriate to each application. It was confirmed that existing consultation mechanisms, including neighbour notifications and planning database consultation, would continue to ensure wider resident engagement. It was further acknowledged that the consultees list required updating, and officers undertook to review and correct inaccuracies.

RESOLVED: That Members: -

- Agreed the Local Development Scheme as at Appendix 1, which set out the updated timetable for the preparation of Supplementary Planning Documents
- Agreed consultation amendments within the Statement of Community Involvement as at Appendix 2

8. DRAFT SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENTS

a. Planning Obligations Supplementary Planning Document (SPD)

The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director, Environment, concerning the draft Planning Obligations Supplementary Planning Document that was being prepared to provide guidance on the likely expected contributions towards infrastructure to be sought through Section 106 processes.

During discussion a concern was raised regarding the potential impact of proposed charges on smaller and heritage-led developments, with costs which may be considered modest in aggregate having the potential of being significant at an individual scheme level. Members queried the underlying viability evidence and whether sufficient engagement had taken place with affected sectors, highlighting the risk that additional financial burdens could discourage refurbishment and adaptive reuse of buildings.

In response, it was confirmed that viability testing had been undertaken across a broad range of development typologies and that, in general terms, the proposals were considered viable. Officers acknowledged, however, that there may be circumstances in which the impact of charges could be disproportionate and indicated that further consideration could be given to potential exemptions or refinements. It was emphasised that the SPD was being issued for consultation, providing an opportunity for stakeholders to inform the final approach before adoption.

RESOLVED: That Members: -

- Approved consultation on the draft Planning Obligations SPD as included at Appendix 1;
- Noted the Equalities Impact Assessment;
- Authorised the Director of Planning and Development to make any formatting or minor corrections to the SPD prior to consultation.

b. Offices Supplementary Planning Document (SPD)

The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director, Environment, concerning the draft Offices Supplementary Planning Document that was being prepared to support the implementation of policies relating to offices within the City.

During consideration of the item, clarity was sought regarding the potential impact of modern office developments on the wider City economy, particularly the extent to which highly self-contained office environments may reduce footfall to surrounding retail and hospitality businesses. Members also highlighted the ongoing loss of retail provision in some areas and the importance of maintaining a strong mixed-use character, noting the need to ensure that office development supports street-level activity and the broader objectives of Destination City. In addition, questions were raised regarding aspects of building design, including the potential impact of vertical circulation arrangements on the user experience and movement within and beyond office buildings.

Officers advised that developments were negotiated to secure active, outward-facing ground floor uses and to deliver improvements to the public realm, with policies in place to encourage and retain retail where appropriate. It was stressed that delivery of retail provision was influenced by market conditions and that a balance must be struck between the quantity and quality of retail offer. It was further clarified that matters such as internal building design, including lift provision and circulation, were typically addressed through detailed design and pre-application processes rather than through planning policy.

RESOLVED: That Members: -

1. Approved consultation on the draft Offices SPD;
2. Noted the Equalities Impact Assessment:
3. Authorised the Director of Planning and Development to make any formatting or minor corrections to the SPD prior to consultation.

c. Draft Air Quality Supplementary Planning Document (SPD)

The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director, Environment, concerning the draft Air Quality Supplementary Planning Document that had been prepared for consultation.

In discussion, concerns were raised regarding the potential implications of the proposed approach for building resilience, particularly in relation to the use of diesel generators for backup power. Members questioned whether the cost mechanisms proposed could discourage the inclusion of essential resilience infrastructure and highlighted the need to ensure that air quality objectives were balanced against the practical requirements of maintaining energy security and operational continuity in major developments.

In response, clarity was provided that the SPD did not prohibit the use of diesel generators but instead introduced an incentive-based approach to encourage lower-emission solutions and better design choices. Developers would be encouraged to select lower-emission equipment, reduce testing frequency and explore mitigation measures or alternative energy arrangements where feasible. It was further noted that costs would be proportionate to emissions and scale, thereby encouraging more efficient design, and that the approach sought to reduce air quality impacts whilst retaining flexibility.

RESOLVED: That Members: -

1. Approved the draft Air Quality SPD for public consultation.

d. Celebrating Heritage Supplementary Planning Document (SPD)

The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director, Environment, concerning the draft Celebrating Heritage Supplementary Planning Document that was being prepared to provide guidance on the implementation of new policies relating to heritage within the City Plan 2024.

Members expressed strong support for the overarching approach, particularly the emphasis on protecting and enhancing the City's historic environment and promoting the adaptive reuse of heritage assets. Members welcomed the role of the SPD in ensuring that any new development contributes positively to the character and identity of the City, with it being suggested that the strength of policy wording could be enhanced to more clearly reflect the intrinsic value of heritage. A number of Members also proposed the inclusion of further case studies to illustrate best practice and raised concerns regarding the consistency of heritage-led design features within the public realm, including the use of traditional City elements.

Officers welcomed the positive feedback and confirmed that the SPD was intended to provide a clear framework for conserving and celebrating heritage as part of any future developments. The document was being issued for consultation and could be refined further in response to feedback, including strengthening language, improving consistency with other SPDs and incorporating additional case studies where appropriate. It was further clarified that certain design elements were influenced by site-specific considerations, including ownership, planning context and security requirements, with a commitment given to reviewing consistency where possible.

RESOLVED: That Members: -

1. Approved consultation on the draft Celebrating Heritage SPD;
2. Noted the Equalities Impact Assessment;
3. Authorised the Director of Planning and Development to make any formatting or minor corrections to the SPD prior to consultation.

9. **CITY CORPORATION RESPONSE TO THE NATIONAL PLANNING POLICY FRAMEWORK AND THE DESIGN AND PLACEMAKING PLANNING PRACTICE GUIDANCE CONSULTATIONS**

The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director, Environment, concerning the City Corporation response to the National Planning Policy Framework and the Design and Placemaking Planning Practice Guidance consultations.

Members indicated their support for the overall approach, whilst noting the overall strength of the response, particularly in relation to provisions which could potentially undermine the plan-led system and the weight afforded to the Local Plan. A Member queried why certain responses were framed as "partly disagree" rather than "strongly disagree", noting the potential implications for locally derived policies, including those relating to biodiversity net gain and other bespoke City approaches.

In response, it was agreed to amend the draft response to more clearly reflect the level of objection where appropriate. It was noted that similar concerns were being raised more widely across the sector and that the City's submission would form part of a broader set of representations to Government.

RESOLVED: That Members, subject to a strengthening of the response to more clearly reflect the level of objection as appropriate: -

1. Approved the City Corporation's consultation response to the National Planning Policy Framework consultation;
2. Approved the City Corporation's consultation response to the Design and Placemaking Planning Practice Guidance consultation.

10. **BUILDING CONTROL CHARGES REPORT 2025/26**

The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director, Environment, concerning findings of the Building Control's review into their previous fees and charges increases and recommending revised fees for 2026/27.

A Member sought clarification on the application of the Building Safety Regulator surcharge, in particular whether the 20% uplift would apply to works undertaken on behalf of individual residents and leaseholders. It was confirmed that, under the current arrangements, the surcharge would apply to such works.

RESOLVED: That Members: -

- Approved Option 3 and agreed a new "City of London Building Regulations Charges Scheme No 9: 2025".

11. **STATUTORY BIODIVERSITY REPORT**

The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director, Environment, concerning the Statutory Biodiversity Report.

Members welcomed the report as a comprehensive overview of activity in this area, whilst also raising a number of points for consideration. These included the potential impact of proposed changes to the National Planning Policy Framework on biodiversity net gain, and whether such changes could undermine locally developed policy approaches. Members also sought clarification on references to a potential Smithfield-focused supplementary planning document and suggested that greater emphasis be given to river and foreshore environments, noting their importance as ecological assets within the City. In addition, Members welcomed the City Corporation's approach to partnership working with external organisations to support delivery of environmental objectives.

In response, Members were advised that the outcome of national policy changes remained uncertain and that updates would be provided as further clarity emerged, with similar concerns being raised across the sector. It was confirmed that the Smithfield supplementary planning document remained at an exploratory stage and was not yet a formal proposal. It was also noted that matters relating to river and foreshore habitats were addressed through existing strategies, although the suggestion to strengthen their inclusion would be taken forward for consideration.

RESOLVED: That Members: -

- Approved the Statutory Biodiversity Report (Appendix 1).
- Authorised the Executive Director Environment, in consultation with the Chairman of the Port Health and Environmental Services and Planning and Transportation Committees, to approve any further amendments to the Report as necessary.

12. **APPROPRIATIONS: 150 ALDERSGATE STREET, 1 LONDON WALL PLACE, 2 LONDON WALL PLACE, 11 PILGRIM STREET, 2 SWAN LANE, 55 LUDGATE HILL, 2 ALDERMANBURY SQUARE/55 BASINGHALL STREET**

The Committee considered a report of the City Surveyor concerning the appropriation of land at 150 Aldersgate Street, 1 London Wall Place, 2 London Wall Place, 11 Pilgrim Street, 2 Swan Lane, 55 Ludgate Hill, and 2 Aldermanbury Square/55 Basinghall Street were no longer required to be held for the planning purposes for which they were acquired and may be appropriated to be held for investment purposes.

RESOLVED: That Members: -

(i) Agreed that the properties described in Appendix 1 (the final boundaries of which were to be determined by the Town Clerk) were no longer required for the planning purposes for which they were acquired; and
(ii) Agreed to recommend to Court of Common Council that the properties in Appendix 1 (the final boundaries of which were to be determined by the Town Clerk) be appropriated for investment purposes;

(iii) Noted the appropriation would enable the grant of new long-leasehold interests over the properties.

13. **CITY FUND SURPLUS DECLARATION: THAVIES INN HOUSE, 1-6 HOLBORN CIRCUS**

The Committee considered a report of the City Surveyor concerning the City Fund surplus declaration for Thavies Inn House, 1-6 Holborn Circus, EC1.

RESOLVED: That Members: -

1. Agreed to declare various parcels of City Fund land, hatched and shaded green on plan 2 at Appendix 1, measuring 103.20 sq m (1,111 sq ft) situated at Thavies Inn House, 1-6 Holborn Circus, EC1 surplus to highway requirements to enable its disposal upon terms approved by Policy & Resources Committee and to be further reported to Court of Common Council for approval following your Committee's decision.

2. Agreed to declare the volume of City Fund airspace shaded pink on **plan 4 at Appendix 1,** measuring 135.44 sq m (1,458 sq ft), situated at Thavies Inn House, 1-6 Holborn Circus, EC1 surplus to highway requirements to enable its disposal upon terms approved by Policy and Resources Committee and to be further reported to Court of Common Council for approval following your Committee's decision, SUBJECT TO the City Operations Director (City Street and Spaces) determining the relevant ordnance datum levels to suitably restrict the vertical extent of the leasehold airspace being declared surplus.

14. **CARBON OFFSET INFORMATION REPORT**

The Committee received a report of the Executive Director, Environment, providing a summary of carbon offset information.

Members welcomed the additional clarity provided in the report. A concern was raised regarding governance and oversight of the Fund, with an observation that its purpose and operation had previously lacked sufficient transparency. Questions were raised as to the appropriateness of certain past allocations, particularly where funding had been directed towards individual sites, and Members emphasised the importance of ensuring that resources were applied to projects delivering broader benefit across the City. Concern was also expressed regarding the scale of funding being generated and the need to ensure that allocations were being made strategically and in accordance with agreed policy objectives.

In response, it was confirmed that a more comprehensive governance framework would be developed, with proposals to be brought forward to the relevant Committees, including Policy and Resources Committee and the Resource Allocation Sub-Committee. Officers advised that Planning and Transportation Committee would have an opportunity to inform the types of schemes considered appropriate, particularly where funding was derived from planning contributions, and that forthcoming work on an Infrastructure Delivery Plan would support a more strategic approach to funding allocation.

RESOLVED: That Members: -

- Received the report and noted its content.

15. **RISK MANAGEMENT UPDATE REPORT**
The Committee received a report of the Executive Director, Environment, concerning a Risk Management Update and providing the Committee with an assurance on the risk management procedures in place within the Environment Department.

RESOLVED: That Members: -

- Received the report and noted the actions being taken by the Environment Department to identify, mitigate and effectively manage risks arising from their operations.

16. **QUESTIONS ON MATTERS RELATING TO THE WORK OF THE COMMITTEE**
The Committee considered a question on matters relating to the work of the Committee as follows.

Definition of 'Minor' amendment
A Member sought clarification on the definition of a minor amendment, the thresholds for referral to Committee, and how cumulative changes to an approved scheme were assessed. In response, officers advised that non-material amendments were considered on a case-by-case basis, while Section 73 applications relating to variations of condition and may be referred to Committee where significant or were subject to objection. Officers added that cumulative impacts were taken into account and that materially altered schemes may require further Committee consideration or a fresh application, with consultation undertaken as appropriate.

17. **FUTURE MEETINGS - MATTERS TO NOTE**
The Committee noted changes to arrangements for future meetings as follows:

1. The meeting of the Committee scheduled for Monday 28 May 2026 had been cancelled – a meeting of the Planning Applications Sub-Committee would now take place in the Livery Hall at the same time and date.

2. The next meeting of the Committee would take place at 1.45pm on Monday 22 June 2026. This was a change from the originally published date of Thursday 18 June.

18. **ANY OTHER BUSINESS THAT THE CHAIRMAN CONSIDERS URGENT**
There was one additional item of business as follows: -

c) Quarterly Public Lift and Escalator Report
The Committee received a report of the City Surveyor outlining the availability and performance of publicly accessible lifts and escalators monitored and

maintained by the City Surveyor, in the report period 1 October 2025 to 28 January 2026.

RECEIVED

19. **EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC**
RESOLVED: That, under Section 100A(4) of the Local Government Act 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.

20. **NON-PUBLIC MINUTES**
Minutes were considered as follows:-

a) The non-public minutes of a previous meeting of the Planning and Transportation Committee held on 8 July 2025 were approved as an accurate record.

b) The non-public minutes of the previous meeting of the Planning and Transportation Committee held on 19 January 2026 were approved as an accurate record.

21. **HEAT NETWORK INVESTMENT OPPORTUNITY**
The Committee received a report of the City Surveyor concerning a Heat Network Investment Opportunity that was to be taken forward through further engagement with key stakeholders to inform an internal Options Review on the investment opportunity and potential role of the City Corporation in supporting local heat network infrastructure and a Strategic Heat Main.

RECEIVED.

22. **NON-PUBLIC QUESTIONS ON MATTERS RELATING TO THE WORK OF THE COMMITTEE**
There were no questions.

23. **ANY OTHER BUSINESS THAT THE CHAIRMAN CONSIDERS URGENT AND WHICH THE COMMITTEE AGREES SHOULD BE CONSIDERED WHILST THE PUBLIC ARE EXCLUDED**
There were no urgent items of non-public business.

The meeting closed at 12.25 pm

Chairman

Contact Officer: Chris Rumbles
christopher.rumbles@cityoflondon.gov.uk