

PLANNING APPLICATIONS SUB-COMMITTEE
Tuesday, 30 September 2025

Minutes of the meeting of the Planning Applications Sub-Committee held at Livery
Hall - Guildhall on Tuesday, 30 September 2025 at 10.30 am

Present

Members:

Deputy Tom Sleigh (Chair)
Tana Adkin KC
Samapti Bagchi
Deputy Marianne Fredericks
Alderman Alison Gowman CBE
Deputy Madush Gupta
Josephine Hayes
Deputy Jaspreet Hodgson
Philip Kelvin
Charles Edward Lord, OBE JP
Tim McNally
Sophia Mooney
Deputy Alastair Moss
Deborah Oliver
Deputy Henry Pollard
Alderman Simon Pryke
Gaby Robertshaw
William Upton KC
Jacqui Webster

Members (in attendance but observing online):

Deputy Nighat Qureishi
Matthew Waters

Officers:

Mark Butler	- Environment Department
Fleur Francis	- Comptroller and City Solicitor's Department
David Horkan	- Environment Department
Kerstin Kane	- Environment Department
Rob McNicol	- Environment Department
Tom Nancollas	- Environment Department
Charlotte O'Farrell	- Environment Department
Taluana Patricio	- Environment Department
Jane Powers	- Environment Department
Gwyn Richards	- Planning and Development Director, Environment Department
Morgan Wild	- Environment Department
Peter Wilson	- Environment Department
Judith Dignum	- Town Clerk's Department
Christopher Rumbles	- Town Clerk's Department

1. **APOLOGIES**

Apologies for absence were received from Shravan Joshi (Deputy Chair), Emily Benn, Alderwoman Elizabeth King, Nighat Qureishi and Matthew Waters.

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

There were no declarations.

3. **MINUTES**

- a) The public minutes of the Planning Applications Sub-Committee meeting on 17 June 2025 were approved as an accurate record.
- b) The public minutes of the Planning Applications Sub-Committee meeting on 8 July 2025 were approved as an accurate record, subject to the inclusion of Simon Pryke being recorded as in attendance.
- c) The public minutes of the Planning Applications Sub-Committee on 9 September 2025 considered and approved as an accurate record subject to the following amendments being included: -
 - Marianne Fredericks, Tana Adkin and Jaspreet Hodgson having their vote against Sugar Quay Jetty being recorded.
 - Removing reference to Martha Grekos 'revealing' and replacing it with 'stated' she was speaking.
 - Removal of Deputy Henry Pollard being named
 - Reference to Somerset House being '25 years' and not '20.

A Member raised a concern regarding the late arrival of the minutes and the detailed nature of them, noting that not all Members may have sufficient time to review them thoroughly. The Chair acknowledged the delay, attributing it to a backlog in Town Clerk's Department and giving a commitment to improving the process in future.

The Chair acknowledged and agreed on a need to strive for more timely minutes moving forward, especially when they were lengthy or detailed. The Chair expressed his preference not to defer approving the minutes on this occasion, aiming to keep the business moving forward.

The Chair referred to the last time he was in the Livery Hall being for Deputy Emily Benn's wedding and that he was sure the Committee would want to join him in sending congratulations to her.

4. **130 FENCHURCH STREET, EC3M 5DJ (25/00529/FULEIA)**

The Committee considered a report presenting a planning application for phased development for the demolition of all buildings and structures to existing slab level, erection of a new building comprising 3 basement levels, ground plus 34 storeys (161.46m AOD, 145.86m AGL) to provide a mixed use office (Class E(g)), culture (Class F1/E), public viewing gallery (Sui Generis), flexible retail (Class E(a)-(b)) development with soft and hard landscaping, pedestrian and vehicular access, cycle parking, flexible public realm including programmable space with associated highway works and all other works associated with the development.

The Chair confirmed that no objectors had registered to speak today, although a letter having been received in advance of the meeting today from Mr Fred Rogers registering his objection, which Members have had the chance to review as part of addendum 3 that had been circulated to them.

The Chair invited the officer to make a presentation to the Sub-Committee.

Officer Presentation

The officer confirmed that the presentation today would be a condensed version of the presentation sent round to Members in the agenda pack with the officer report. A presentation was provided as follows

The application site was located within the city cluster tall building area and was within close proximity to various transport links including Fenchurch Street and Monument Station. The application site itself was located north of Fenchurch Street bound by Cullum Street to the West and Fen Court to the east. The site was within close proximity of various developments, notably 120 Fenchurch Street and 50 Fenchurch Street to the southeast, which was currently under construction.

In terms of heritage assets, the building itself was not listed nor was it a non-designated heritage asset and it was also not within a conservation area. Leadenhall Market Conservation Area lies adjacent to the site as well as the Grade 2 listed Lime St. Estate Buildings and the Grade 2 star listed Leadenhall Market.

The site was occupied almost in its entirety with the 1950s building known as Fountain House. The current property consists of approximately 14,000 square metres of Class C, with the majority of that being previously used as office. Apart from an existing cafe unit, the building was currently vacant and was generally in a decommissioned state. The Sub-Committee were shown views of the existing site from Cullum Street and views of the existing site from Fen Court. Fountain House was very outdated. It has poor office floor space, poor floor to ceiling heights, insufficient energy performance and it was also currently not compliant with fire regulations.

The proposal put forward under this application was for the phased development consisting of the demolition of the existing building and the erection of a new building comprising of three basement levels, ground floor and 34 storeys. This application follows two previous applications on site

approved in 2014 and 2016 for similar proposals, albeit not as tall. The proposal was for an office-led development with additional public communities at ground and elevated levels. In terms of its physical appearance, the application has been designed with the surrounding clusters height in mind, and the evolution of the proposal has led to a unique silhouette. The building would appear as two interconnected tower elements with inset terraces spiralling upwards through the massing.

The appraisals were considered to meet the required standards of architectural design and would fit neatly into the existing and future city cluster. The massing and height were considered to be appropriate within its setting, while also importantly remaining invisible in views from the processional routes and St Paul's Cathedral.

The Sub-Committee were presented with a visual in CGI format from Fenchurch Street showing the proposed glass-led architecture with inset balconies. One of the key themes in the design was the proposed V-shaped columns at ground floor, which was also replicated in the tower's crown design, bringing a symmetry to the architecture. Views from the southwest and a closer look at the crown and terrace details were shown to the Sub-Committee. More likely the proposals would significantly improve the ground floor presence of the application site. The V-shaped columns that essentially hold up the main curved facade would allow for more recessed ground floor and a greater activation.

Moving on to planned format, the new building line would be pulled back from the existing building line, providing an uplift of 316 square metres of public realm. There would be new office access points from Fenchurch St. and Fen Court, as well as a provision of retail units. While there would be a technical loss of retail on the principle shopping centre designation, this would be in line with the previously approved applications on site and this application would go further to provide additional cultural floor space at ground floor, as well as providing a new east to west pedestrian route and safeguarding a north to south route to the Lime Street Estate.

The proposal was therefore considered acceptable in terms of layout and would provide a significant amount of active frontage as well as additional public realm. Moving up the building, the Sub-Committee were presented with a slide showing a typical office floor plate with the core being located centrally. This would provide large adaptable grade A office floor space. The proposal would provide an uplift of circa 43,000 square metres of office floor space, which would provide the equivalent of 3,600 jobs in line with core strategic policies.

Moving to the public amenity provision at upper levels, the Sub-Committee were shown a CGI image showing the concept of the two public areas. The application seeks to provide a cultural space and an elevated public viewing gallery. The concept of the cultural space located on the eastern side of the building has been designed to almost be a continuation of the garden at 120, while the public terrace located on the western side would mitigate the loss of view from 120. Both areas would be accessed from a new culture lobby at the

ground floor and would consist of internal and external spaces. At the highest level, this would provide 644 square metres of internal and 171 square metres of external public viewing gallery. This level also provides space for a link to the cultural use, the details of which would be managed and secured within the appropriate management plans. Similarly at level 17 this would provide 570 square metres of cultural use, again of internal and external, and the details of the culture use would be secured in the management plan.

What was of note for this application was that there was a current meanwhile use on site that was essentially testing the cultural ideas in situ, which would be used to inform the final management plan. Both these areas were open to the public level, with both level 20 and level 17 having 2.8-metre-high balustrades within the external areas which have been considered acceptable by the public health officer. Equally for the office amenity areas such as the roof terrace, the balustrades were considered wholly acceptable by the public health officer.

The Sub-Committee were presented with various views: Waterloo Bridge existing versus proposed and consented; London Bridge existing versus proposed and consented; Tower Bridge existing versus proposed and consented; from Inner Wards existing versus proposed and consented; Fen Court existing versus proposed and consented; Leadenhall Market existing versus proposed and consented.

Sustainability-wise, the proposal does include the demolition of the building. The carbon optioneering concluded that the existing pad concrete foundations and the poor-quality office core would mean that the demolition and rebuild would in this case maximise the development capacity while being the most appropriate strategy. In terms of whole life carbon, while the scale of the building would push it above the GLA benchmark, this was mainly due to the requirement for the basement cycle parking and the surrounding site constraints. The applicant has, however, committed to targeting NABERS Five Star and BREEAM Excellent, which has been considered acceptable by officers.

Furthermore, the proposal would be fully compliant in terms of urban greening factor and would represent a significant increase of biodiversity on site. Daylight/sunlight terms: The application has a very limited impact on surrounding properties given the location of the proposal. In the future baseline, the only real impact would be to one window of the Bunch of Grapes pub, which would see a total 1.9% loss of daylight. Similarly, overshadowing was very similar. Not taking into account any other development, the proposal would have an impact on Fen Court in terms of overshadowing. However, officers note that once 50 Fenchurch was built, that development would essentially cause the same level of overshadowing regardless of the proposed development. Similarly, in terms of wind effects, the proposals were compliant with policy and would in fact lead to a betterment of existing conditions.

On transport and highways, the proposal would lead to a significant increase in public realm. While one category C tree was proposed to be removed due to a conflict with fire regulations, this was mitigated against with the proposed

replacement of two new additional semi-mature trees on Fenchurch Street. A further 278 package was also proposed that includes the resurfacing work of Cullum St. to a shared surface. This would be secured within the legal agreement.

Servicing-wise, it was proposed that the application would be serviced by Cullum Street. This would be a continuation of the existing scenario and also similar to that approved under the previous applications.

The proposal was fully compliant in terms of cycle provision, with the development providing 860 spaces at basement level and 72 showers and 860 lockers also at basement level.

To conclude, the proposal would therefore provide a distinct architectural character within the evolving cluster, a significant increase in grade A office floor space, the provision of significant elevated public spaces, a significant increase in public realm, including the provision and safeguarding of pedestrian routes and an overall redevelopment of an underused site. The appraisal was recommended for approval subject to the conditions and heads of terms detailed within the officer report and addendum.

The Chair thanked the officer for his presentation. It was confirmed that the meeting would now move to a presentation from applicants and supporters.

Applicant and Supporters

Ben Littman, Head of Investments Aviva Investors, presented and confirmed that he was joined today by members of the project team who would be available to answer any questions.

Aviva Investors were a major developer and investor in the City of London who were proud of their strong and proven track record of delivering high quality, sustainable developments in the square mile. Their current projects include 101 Moorgate and 1 Liverpool Street, both of which exemplify Aviva's commitment to design excellence, environmental performance and long-term stewardship. This was an approach they remain committed to continuing with 130 Fenchurch St. These three schemes represent over 80,000 square metres of new office space in the City of London, reflecting their commitment to delivering investment and growth in the square mile.

130 Fenchurch Street was a strategically important site located within the designated foothills of the cluster. To maximise the site's potential, they have assembled an experienced professional team led by their development partner CO-RE. The design has been led by architects, Wilkinson Eyre, who were selected as part of a design competition process.

Their assessment of the existing building has demonstrated that it has limited potential to deliver meaningful benefits to the City and its community in its current form. It offers poor quality space that has remained vacant for a number of years and would require major upgrades to meet modern standards, including fire safety, accessibility and environmental performance

improvements. This was not what modern occupiers want, nor what the City needs to remain internationally competitive.

The proposals before the Sub-Committee today would ensure that this site contributes meaningfully towards the demand for new commercial space within the square mile. This would be delivered through a new 34 Storey building which would deliver 57,491 square metres of Grade A office space. With vacancy rates for Grade A space in the city currently sitting at 1.4%, they were confident this building would meet the demand by providing a best-in-class product.

They have incorporated significant greening throughout the building through the creation of public and private terraces. This would create a visual link to other existing and proposed mid height terraces in the immediate area, notably the existing garden at 120 Fenchurch Street and those proposed at 50 Fenchurch Street. A new public viewing gallery on level 20 with a large external terrace to the southwest corner of the site would provide additional public space. The terraces would feature a diverse range of planting species to maximise visual greening along Fenchurch Street.

They would also be creating 600 square metres of new public space at street level and improved pedestrian access by introducing a new route connecting Cullum Street to Fen Court. This would enhance connectivity for office workers and the public, improving access to Fen Court Gardens, the Eastern Cluster and other local landmarks such as Leadenhall Market. The new route would also help ease pedestrian flows for those entering the city from Fenchurch Street Station.

The proposals include a new cultural offer on Level 17 alongside ground floor and food and beverage uses, which would help animate the street and encourage activity beyond traditional office hours. They were particularly proud of the role this development would play in supporting the City of London Corporation's Destination City strategy.

Importantly, they have already begun testing ideas and demand for the future cultural space through Seed 130, a meanwhile use activation programme. Their meanwhile use at Seed 130 has welcomed over 3700 visitors since its opening and has given them valuable insights into how the space can be curated, particularly at weekends when the gallery was at its busiest, to support cultural engagement and community interaction in the City. They were extremely proud that this meanwhile new space has been shortlisted in the Meanwhile Activation category at the NLA Awards.

This was a bold and thoughtful scheme that would bring a long vacant site back into positive use. It reflects the best of what the City can offer, ambition, culture, sustainability and inclusivity, and it was hoped that the Sub-Committee would support the officer's positive recommendation.

Mr. George Kakatos, Director of Culture, Future City, confirmed that he had the pleasure of leading the cultural proposals and strategy for 130 Fenchurch

Street as well as the inception, curation and delivery of Seed 130, the meanwhile activation supporting this application. As a cultural expert with extensive experience in developing and delivering cultural strategies in the City of London responding to Destination City, he can confidently state that proposals for this application were genuinely robust and thoroughly devised.

The vision of the cultural strategy was centred around the gallery at Level 17 and its accompanying cultural spaces, a gallery dedicated to the exploration of environmental sustainability through art and cultural exchange. These proposals were the result of deep research, cultural auditing and policy analysis and have been tested for both the design and operational viability, both internally with the design team and externally with cultural stakeholders and city officers.

Importantly, the response to local need, providing dynamic cultural spaces for the arts, while also addressing themes of sustainability, climate change and greening, all of which were emphasized in local policy.

To test their research in practice, they launched Seed 130, a meanwhile activation programme in the form of a gallery in the existing building at 130 Fenchurch Street. Although driven by the cultural strategy, every effort has been made for Seed 130 to operate as an independent cultural space. Since opening in March 2025, Seed 130 has delivered 4 exhibitions welcoming over 3700 visitors. The gallery has been open three days a week, with Saturday's proving consistently the busiest and the highest single day number of visitors reaching 250.

The free public programme has been carefully curated to test different aspects of the cultural strategy and has included exhibitions from internationally acclaimed artists Matt Collishaw, first year art students from University of the Arts London and artist collective studio Swine and Invisible Dust. Most recently, they partnered with the National Trust and Transport for London to deliver a major photography exhibition and community garden. Alongside the exhibitions, they have hosted free and open to the public workshops, panel discussions and talks with a strong educational focus. They have welcomed young people from across London, including 29 year one students from the local Aldgate school.

Finally, Seed 130 has already received external recognition. It has been shortlisted for two awards, the NLA's Award for Meanwhile Activation and RQ Boost Best Use of AI and Immersive Technologies. Their first exhibition, Move 37 by Matt Colishaw, was named the Guardians Exhibition of the Week in its opening week. The findings from this significant public engagement would directly inform the cultural strategy for 130 Fenchurch Street, its future cultural occupancy, partnerships, curation and design. At the same time, Seed 130 was already generating significant social value, contributing meaningfully to the hybrid local area as well as the square mile destination city by activating the ground floor and repurposing a disused retail unit.

Liam Lawson Jones from DP9 confirmed they were available to take any questions and were also joined by members of the project team.

The Chairman invited Members to ask questions of the applicant team. The following questions were raised: -

A Member referred to information in the officer's report about the occupier comfort regarding sunlight on the windows being brief. The Member referred to a report from Arup they had been given sight of. It was understood that there would be double glazing with Venetian blinds that automatically lower and raise through an automated process and that the objective was to maximise the natural light while minimising the heat in the summer and in the wintertime maximising the heat?

Dominic Bettison from Wilkinson Eyre responded confirming the planning application seeks permission for a fully glazed facade system. Within that analysis they have explored whether or not they can use two different types of facade systems. Hopefully all being well today, they would be getting ready to carry out detailed design work that would go through all of those options. It was believed that the system the Member was referring to followed the Members' briefing talks about a closed cavity framework system, which has the blinds that were within it. These were automatic and were based on solar, solar gain and glare which prioritise natural light, but they were to manage internal heating demands so that they were minimising the need for air conditioning etcetera. There were conditions proposed in the draft decision notice that would control that. Once they have carried out their detailed design work and made a final facade selection that would all be something that was for officers' further consideration.

A Member raised a question regarding water resources. The aim was to achieve BREEAM excellent, which should include water efficiency. It was asked if an explanation could be given regarding e.g, cleaning the windows, also use of water resources and grey water and the impact that this would have on the surrounding area.

In response, it was confirmed that in terms of the water retention of water that lands on the building, there was a proposed blue roof to attenuate the water and small attenuation tanks in the basement. The facilities within the building would utilise grey water recycling as part of the proposal and this was outlined in the design. This would all be part of the design that would continue to be developed through to tender and construction.

A Member sought clarify regarding cleaning the outside of the building and how this would happen.

It was clarified that in addition to the BREEAM condition there was another range of conditions relating to suds and water use. It was confirmed that cleaning the outside of the building was a detail which was to follow at a later design stage, but with it having been shown within all of their 3D modelling the locations of the building maintenance units, which were cranes which extend to enable cleaning of the facade and that was outlined within the submission in the design and access statement.

A Member confirmed that she had three questions, which would be put together. Wi-Fi connectivity and tall buildings blocking out connectivity for people locally and indeed people on the ground. Has that been mitigated or provision made in relation to Wi-Fi? Second, was the gallery going to remain? It has previously been heard how well it was done. The drawings suggest that it was going to be a coffee shop or something else rather than a gallery. Thirdly, should permission be granted, how long would it take for demolition and construction?

The applicant responded confirming that Wi-Fi and 5G were included in the heads of terms within the planning obligations section of the report. They had to commission a television interference survey which also deals with the telecommunications networks, with this also dealing with issues such as Wi-Fi and telephone operators. There was also utility connections to the development which would require those details. Regarding the gallery, it has not been designed in detail, so the details which were secured by the cultural management plan, which was in the same paragraph on planning obligations as amended by the addendum. They were looking forward to securing all of those details through the Section 106 so that they can show how much of it was to have an ancillary food and beverage function, but it was very much envisaged as something for people to grab a coffee while they were visiting, rather than it being an entire space which was taken over by food and beverage. It was envisaged that the programme would take between five and six years from start.

A Member asked the applicant if they could elaborate on what they were going to do with excavation and the archaeological finds and how they were going to retain and protect what they do find.

The applicant responded confirming that they have had the opportunity with the building being in its current state to do perhaps more archaeological evaluation at this stage than they would have had if the building had people in situ. The report deals with the engagement that has been carried out and they have discovered that there was quite low potential for surviving archaeology beneath this, but the conditions which were proposed would allow them to capture any of those findings and deal with that in a positive, proactive way with officers under the excavation period.

The Chair invited Members of the Sub-Committee to ask questions of officers in attendance.

The Chair referred to a previous point on telecoms and Wi-Fi interference. It was known that City Plan policy encourages developers to put in additional micro cells for 5G in the buildings where needed. If the interference survey comes back and says there was an impact on the building, would the City Corporation be mandating that through condition? How does that process work?

In response it was confirmed that this was something that they could search through in the survey. With telecoms, they see surveys on a yearly basis through companies submitting applications for telecoms all over the city. It was something that they were keeping up with as well. It would be dealt with through the survey.

A Member followed up regarding communications and Wi-Fi, highlighting their particular concern being the low-level small businesses who need it to survive e.g., coffee shops and paper shops. When attempting to make an electronic payment and it does not work, and you have to go outside. Would it be possible to look at low-level mobile Wi-Fi and 5G connectivity when looking at conditioning further tall buildings?

In response, it was clarified that the survey was for all neighbours, it was not specifically for people up high or down low and was for everyone surrounding the site.

A Member asked how easy it was going to be for the public to access the public areas. Next door at 120 the terrace was so popular, the queue snakes all the way around the buildings and the Member wanted to understand how easy it was going to be for someone to go in their lunchtime to be able to enjoy the area.

In response, it was confirmed that this would be something that would be dealt with within the cultural management plan, and it would certainly take this into account. One thing that has been ensured during the process of the planning was that the ground floor plan includes a specific cultural area, which would essentially act as an area for people to come into the building and wait. It would not exactly be queuing out onto the streets or anything along those lines. Essentially, when it comes to the cultural plan and ensuring that there was enough space for that, it would all be detailed within the clauses of the S106.

The Member sought clarity on why this had not been designed in and put in front of Members today so that they were fully aware of how people were entering the building e.g. security as they normally do with these large schemes? Members normally see the queuing area, air stuff, security and everything. The Member was curious to understand why Members were not taking that decision, why it was being left to be reviewed by officers and negotiated.

In response, it was confirmed that at this current time it was something of an evolving beast. The galleries would be open between 10:00 and 19:00. The basics of both the culture uses was more down to the detail and perhaps that could have been flushed out. The one thing that they did want to make sure was that the ground floor at least had enough space for those items to be controlled. It was now acknowledged that at 120 Fenchurch St, because it was one of the first of a generation, they should have negotiated room within the building to queue, so they had to use a retail unit. There was sufficient room within the ground floor plane of this building to accommodate queuing to avoid a repeat of Fen Court.

The Chair responded confirming that it may be a matter of emphasis, but that it would be helpful to make sure that those matters were covered ideally in the pack by the time they come to this committee. In the future it would be hoped to have heads of terms around the Section 106 agreement so that Members have the fullest possible picture for their decisions. The Chair thanked the Member for making the point.

A Member referred to pictures within the pack, certainly black and white pictures. Whenever they have a skyline, it was very difficult to see the line around it. It was obviously meant to be showing proposed and consented to show the skyline. Could they actually have a CGI imposed skyline so Members can actually see what was proposed rather than just a line round it?

In response it was confirmed that imagery had been included that shows the outlines of consented schemes. These were quite subtle, and you do need to zoom in typically to see them. This was a standard methodology used in all planning applications. For printing, it doesn't quite work, and it was suggested working with the Town Clerk looking to rectify that in the future.

The Member responded confirming the very faint line does not show what it purports to show and so it makes it very difficult. If that could be amended it would be really helpful given it was something Members were looking at.

A Member referred to their previous point relating to the blinds, during which she was referring to heat conservation and management effects, but can it be confirmed that enabling those inside the building to have the maximum ability to look at the wonderful views of London was one of the reasons why Venetian blinds were proposed?

It was confirmed that, as the applicant had alluded to earlier, the final details of those elevations were secured by conditions. It was definitely something that the officer would look for in the condition and from an officer point of view that was exactly what they would be looking for.

A member referred to pedestrian comfort on Fenchurch Street. There was always a significant impact on the area when the wind starts to get up. Was that going to improve or was it going to get worse?

It was confirmed that it was going to improve quite significantly. Footway was going to increase, through 316 square metres of new public realm to be provided and with this giving a lot more comfort. In terms of wind, it was a betterment that they were seeing as part of the cluster as it was evolving.

A Member added how they welcomed the Chair's earlier comment that S106 would come forward more defined and detailed in future so that Members would be aware of what they were actually agreeing. The Member added that, should there be any change to the cultural offering, that it comes back to the Sub-Committee for consideration, not wanting another issue similar to HSBC where public realm was lost and it was not brought back. The Member sought

an assurance on this development and also on any other development that does not come forward detailed and defined.

The Chair added his agreement to the Member's point, which he considered a very important point, and which he noted officers were in agreement with.

A Member referred to the cultural offer and commended what the meanwhile gallery was doing. It was questioned why this was not shown on Destination London and their date line? The Member asked if developers could be made known that there was this facility where areas were being tested out so that even more visitors can go and visit in the meanwhile time. The Chair confirmed this point was for noting and that he was sure action would be taken, thanking the Member for raising the point.

A Member remarked that he was sure all Members were impressed by the considerable work that has gone into this, that he particularly wanted to note the really welcome addition on the public realm. It was always an issue in the past that you increase the intensification of a building, but you do not increase the space around it. The Member was pleased that this had picked up a theme that he was sure officers have been pushing. It makes a huge difference, and he really welcomed that. The Member added that he wanted it noted as it was suspected that the lack of contentious debate was a tribute to the amount of work that has gone into the application. The Chair thanked the Member for his comment, which he was sure had been noted.

The Chair thanked Members for their contributions and confirmed that he would move to a vote and take all recommendations together.

FOR – 19

AGAINST – 0

ABSTENTION – 0

Therefore, the recommendation was carried and planning permission granted.

RESOLVED: That Members:

- (1) Agreed that subject to the execution of an agreement to secure planning obligation(s) and other covenants under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and s278 of the Highways Act 1980 in respect of the matters set out under the heading 'Planning Obligations', and recommended conditions of development, 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 Appendix C, the decision notice not to be issued until the agreement has been executed.
- (2) Agreed that 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 Section 278 of the Highways Act 1980.
- (3) Noted that land affected by the building which was currently public highway and land over which the public have right of access may need to be stopped up to enable the development to proceed and, upon receipt of the formal application, officers may proceed with arrangements for advertising and (subject to consideration of consultation responses) making of a Stopping-up Order for the area shown marked on the Stopping-up plan included within this report under the delegated arrangements approved by the Court of Common Council.
- (4) Agreed that Officers be authorised to provide the information required by regulations 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.

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

The Sub-Committee received details of development applications received by the Department of the Built Environment since the report to the previous meeting on 9 September 2025.

RESOLVED – That Members:

- Note the report and its contents.

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

The Sub-Committee received details of development and advertisement applications determined by the Chief Planning Officer and Development Director or so authorised under their delegated powers since the report to the last meeting on 9 September 2025.

RESOLVED – That Members:

- Note the report and its contents.

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

A Member raised three questions as follows:

Timing of Minutes Circulation – Reference was made to minutes from the last meeting that were quite detailed having only been circulated the afternoon before the meeting, leaving insufficient time for Members to review them. The Member asked that in future detailed minutes be held over to the next meeting if they were not circulated in good time.

Planning Portal Upload Times – It was questioned how long it typically takes for representations to be uploaded to the planning portal, noting that some members of the public had submitted comments, but these could not be seen online.

Judicial Review – London Wall West – An update was requested on the judicial review proceedings relating to London Wall West and how this might affect the planning process.

The Chair responded to the points raised, agreeing on a need for more time to review detailed minutes in future. Regarding planning portal upload times, it can vary depending on volume and a commitment was given to providing a more definitive response via email.

Regarding the judicial review, it was confirmed that a hearing has been allowed, and it was not expected to take place until December at the earliest.

City Plan 2025 – An update was requested on the City Plan. It was confirmed that the City Plan and modifications to it would be coming to Planning Applications Sub-Committee on the 21st October and prior to this it would be going to Local Plan Sub-Committee on 9th October

8. **ANY OTHER BUSINESS THAT THE CHAIRMAN CONSIDERS URGENT**

There were no urgent items of business.

The meeting ended at 11.17 am

Chairman

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