

Town Planning & Development • Property Strategy • Master Planning & Urban Design • Consultation :

## Note Of Meeting With City Corporation

Thursday 19<sup>th</sup> July 2007, 3.00 pm In Respect of

The Tower at St Mary Somerset 211 Upper Thames Street London EC4

In Attendance:

Breda Daly - Area Team Leader (Planning)

Claire Brady - Planning Officer

Kate Renwick - Client

Mike Richardson - WSP Architects

Richard Greenwood – WGDP Alexander Trevor – WGDP

Action

- Introduction: RG described the contents of Bibles I and II
  and discussed the submission of specific details to discharge
  Conditions a) through to h) and also in respect of
  archaeological conditions 9 and 10.
- 2. General Strategy Point: CB/BD both noted that all the conditions 2a to 2h are governed by the words "before new works thereby affected" and noted that these conditions could be discharged once construction has started on site.
- 3. It was suggested that BD write to the City solicitor and surveyor (Avtar) to explain that the scheme could now be implemented and that these Conditions can be discharged in due course, as the applicants had shown best endeavours to overcome these conditions and that agreement appeared likely.
- 4. Archaeological Conditions 9 and 10: BD and CB both acknowledged that the watching brief statement by MOLAS had been submitted and that this was satisfactory subject to further comment by the City Archaeologist (Kathryn Stubbs).
- 5. **Condition 2a):** RG submitted a sample of oak (stone sample to follow).
- 6. **Condition 2b):** RG referred to the submission of details in respect of the cleaning and repair methodology; and,
- 7. Condition 2b): External lighting: CB expressed the opinion that she did not like the use of spotlights and thought that they would be difficult to maintain; too visible and she would prefer a washing over of light similar to Unilever House.

**PLN** 2 6 JUL 2007

- 8. With respect to the proposed lighting around the four doors (light L15) CB thought that this was satisfactory but an excessive number ie, the light should only be either side of the main entrance door to avoid confusion.
- 9. CB/BD both confirmed that in their experience of other projects it had been possible to install new windows etc as part of the process of repair (rather than replacement). This introduces a critical amount of flexibility to allow developments to proceed onto site and for key decisions to be made without the need to resubmit for planning permission and listed building consent.
- 10. **Roof Plant:** further details are required by CB to ensure that the plant is concealed behind the parapet.
- 11. Graffiti: CB particularly noted the evidence of graffiti at first/second floor(?) she thought that these details should be recorded and retained in the scheme if at all possible.
- 12. **Conclusion and strategy:** RG discussed with BD at the end of the meeting the process of implementing the planning and listed building consents. BD agreed with RG that if we submitted a draft development programme to indicate what works were intended to take place in the earliest phases that she would be able to write to me to confirm that such works would "implement" the scheme.

Richard Greenwood 23.07.2007