



Planning Applications Sub-Committee

Date: TUESDAY, 28 OCTOBER 2025

Time: 10.30 am

Venue: LIVERY HALL - GUILDHALL

Members:

Deputy Tom Sleigh (Chair)	Charles Edward Lord, OBE JP
Shravan Joshi MBE (Deputy Chairman)	Antony Manchester
Tana Adkin KC	Tim McNally
Samapti Bagchi	Sophia Mooney
Deputy Emily Benn	Deputy Alastair Moss
Deputy John Edwards	Aldерwoman Jennette Newman
Deputy Marianne Fredericks	Deborah Oliver
Alderman Alison Gowman CBE	Deputy Henry Pollard
Alderman Prem Goyal CBE	Alderman Simon Pryke
Deputy Madush Gupta	Deputy Nighat Qureishi
Josephine Hayes	Gaby Robertshaw
Deputy Jaspreet Hodgson	Hugh Selka
Amy Horscroft	Naresh Hari Sonpar
Philip Kelvin	William Upton KC
Aldерwoman Elizabeth Anne King, BEM JP	Matthew Waters
	Jacqui Webster

Enquiries: Judith Dignum
judith.dignum@cityoflondon.gov.uk

Accessing the virtual public meeting

Members of the public can observe all virtual public meetings of the City of London Corporation by following the below link:

<https://www.youtube.com/@CityofLondonCorporation/streams>

A recording of the public meeting will be available via the above link following the end of the public meeting for up to one civic year. Please note: Online meeting recordings do not constitute the formal minutes of the meeting; minutes are written and are available on the City of London Corporation's website. Recordings may be edited, at the discretion of the proper officer, to remove any inappropriate material.

Whilst we endeavour to livestream all of our public meetings, this is not always possible due to technical difficulties. In these instances, if possible, a recording will be uploaded following the end of the meeting.

Ian Thomas CBE
Town Clerk and Chief Executive

AGENDA

NB: Certain matters for information have been marked * and will be taken without discussion, unless the Committee Clerk has been informed that a Member has questions or comments prior to the start of the meeting. These information items have been collated in a supplementary document pack and circulated separately.

Part 1 – Public Agenda

1. **APOLOGIES**

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

3. **MINUTES**

To agree the public minutes and summary of the meeting held on 30 September 2025.

For Decision
(Pages 5 - 20)

4. **BALTIC STREET WEST, LONDON, EC1Y 0ST (25/00905/PIP)**

Report of the Chief Planning Officer and Development Director.

For Decision
(Pages 21 - 122)

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

Report of the Chief Planning Officer and Development Director.

For Information

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

Report of the Chief Planning Officer and Development Director.

For Information

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

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

9. **EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC**

MOTION - 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 as follows:-

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

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

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 observing online):

Mathew 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 1900. 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:

- Noted 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 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

Chair

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

This page is intentionally left blank

Committee:	Date:
Planning Application Sub Committee	28 th October 2025
Subject: Baltic Street West, London, EC1Y 0ST Application for Permission in Principle for the erection a self-build single storey dwelling with detached single storey garage and gardens on the existing paved pedestrian open space with 2no mature trees to be retained.	Public
Ward: Cripplegate	For Decision
Registered No: 25/00905/PIP	Registered on: 10 July 2025
Conservation Area: No	Listed Building: No

Summary

- I. The application site comprises a triangular strip of land on the south side of Baltic Street West immediately to the north of Hatfield House which was originally constructed as part of the Golden Lane Estate.
- II. The application seeks permission in principle for the erection of a single storey detached dwelling with a single storey detached garage and gardens.
- III. There are two stages to the permission in principle process. Stage 1 consists of an application for permission in principle, under which only the principle of development can be considered, and, if granted, Stage 2 consists of the technical details consent.
- IV. The relevant matters which pertain to the principle of development (Stage 1) in this instance are the proposed land use, location and the amount of development permitted. No detailed drawings have been provided showing the intended location of the dwelling or the proposed layout and this is not a requirement at this stage of the permission in principle process.
- V. The site comprises an area of publicly accessible land containing two mature trees which the application states would be retained as part of this proposal, although no supporting information as to how this can be achieved has been provided.
- VI. The assessment undertaken in this report concludes that the proposed development is objectionable in principle due to the land use, location and amount of development being unacceptable.

- VII. 14 letters of objection have been received. 1 supporting comment has been registered by the applicant.

Recommendation

- I. That the Planning and Development Director be authorised to issue a decision notice refusing permission in principle for the above proposal, as set out in the schedule in Appendix B of this report, for the following reasons:
1. The proposed land use of the site as a private residential dwelling with a parking garage would be unacceptable in principle as it would result in the loss of public open space and would fail to be car free, contrary to: Policies G4 and T6.1 of The London Plan 2021; Policies CS19, DM16.2 and DM16.5 of the Local Plan 2015; and Policies S14, OS1 and VT3 of the emerging City Plan 2040.
 2. The proposed location and amount of development would be unacceptable in principle as it would likely: have an unacceptable impact on the character and appearance of the area by failing to respect the urban grain, layout, scale and building lines of the existing street scene; cause less than substantial harm to the Grade II Listed Hatfield House and slight levels of harm to the Golden Lane Estate Registered Park and Garden and Barbican and Golden Lane Conservation Area which cannot be outweighed by the public benefits of the proposals; have an unacceptable impact upon the health and longevity of the two mature trees which occupy the site; have a unacceptable impact with regard to road dangers and the pedestrian environment; and result in poor residential amenity to the existing dwellings on the lower floors of Hatfield House and to the proposed dwelling; contrary to: Policies D3, G7 and HC1 of The London Plan 2021; Policies CS10, CS12, CS19, CS21 DM10.1, DM12.1, DM12.5, DM16.1 and DM21.1 of the Local Plan 2015; and emerging City Plan 2040 Policies S3, S8, S9, S10, S11, DE2, DE3, HS1, OS5, and HE1.

Site Location Application Plan



© Crown copyright and database rights 2025 OS 100023243

ADDRESS:

Baltic Street West

CASE No.

25/00905/PIP

-  SITE LOCATION
-  LISTED BUILDING GRADE II
-  LISTED BUILDING GRADE II*
-  CONSERVATION AREA BOUNDARY
-  CITY OF LONDON BOUNDARY



ENVIRONMENT DEPARTMENT

Site Photos



Image 1



Image 2



Image 3



Image 4

Image 1	View east of site and car park access ramp
Image 2	View southeast of site and Hatfield House
Image 3	View west of site and vehicle access barrier to car park ramp
Image 4	View west of vehicle access ramp and cycle stands

Main Report

Site and Surroundings

1. The site comprises a 0.0321-hectare triangular strip of land which is bounded by Baltic Street West to the north, Hatfield House and the Golden Lane Estate to the south, and the City of London Primary Academy Islington (COLPAI) and Golden Lane underground car park access road to the east. Immediately to the north of the site is the boundary with the London Borough of Islington and its two adjacent conservation areas, Hat and Feathers and St Luke's, for both of which the southern boundary lies on Baltic Street West.
2. The land has been undeveloped since its construction as part of the Golden Lane Estate between 1958 and 1962. The site is immediately adjacent to, but not within, the Barbican and Golden Lane Estate Conservation Area, the Grade II Listed Golden Lane Estate Historic Park and Garden, and the Grade II Listed Hatfield House.
3. The site is an area of publicly accessible land owned and maintained by the Corporation which tapers towards the western end of Baltic Street West. The site is designated as a City of London public footway (reference 4971) and permissive path. The site is surrounded by a mixture of 4 to 6 storey buildings with well-established clear geometrically solid building lines on all three sides of the triangle.
4. The site contains two mature trees which are not protected but make a strong contribution to the areas character. There are two other mature trees to the east and west of the site located within the London Borough of Islington.
5. The site also includes four Sheffield cycle stands and serves as the buffer between Baltic Street West and the Golden Lane underground car park access road, which curves around and connects onto Baltic Street West to the immediate east of the application site.

Planning History

6. There is no relevant planning history available at the site.

Proposals

7. The proposal is seeking permission in principle for the erection a self-build single storey dwelling with detached single storey garage and gardens. It has been stated by the applicant that the two mature trees on the site would be retained, although this has not been evidenced as being achievable.
8. As previously stated, there are two stages to the permission in principle process: the application for permission in principle (Stage 1) and, if granted, the technical details consent (Stage 2). No detailed drawings have been provided

showing the intended location of the dwelling or proposed layout, although this is not a requirement at this stage.

Consultations

9. Following receipt of the permission in principle application by the Local Planning Authority in July 2025, it was advertised through a site notice on the 17th July and in the press on the 22nd July. Nearby residential occupiers were also notified directly by letter.
10. Various internal and external consultees provided comments on the application which have been set out in the below table.

Consultee Responses	
<i>External</i>	
Historic England	<p>We object to the permission in principle for the erection of a single storey dwelling with detached single storey garage to land north of Hatfield House and south of Baltic Street West. A proposal of this nature and in this location would cause significant level of harm to Hatfield House and the Golden Lane Estate.</p> <p>Significance</p> <p>Constructed shortly after the Second World War, the Golden Lane Estate was developed in response to the City's steadily declining residential population, a trend that had been ongoing since the early 20th century. Chamberlin, Powell and Bon (CPB) were appointed as architects following a design competition, and construction began in 1952. The estate is defined by a series of rectilinear residential blocks and a central community centre, all set within a carefully conceived hard landscape. The buildings themselves made use of innovative curtain wall construction and introduced pioneering approaches to the design and planning of post-war housing in Britain.</p> <p>Hatfield House (Grade II), sits the north of the Golden Lane Estate, built 1958-61 by Chamberlin, Powell and Bon (CPB). Consists of a block of fourteen flats and 42 maisonettes, with ramp to underground car park beneath and a service road to the shops in Crescent House, and garden walls to south. Hatfield House occupies a particularly important place in the design of the estate, as it forms the northern boundary. It is also significant in being intermediary between the early and later phases of the Estate.</p> <p>To the north of Hatfield House is a modest piece of paved land with two mature trees providing a comfortable degree of separation from the Baltic Street West and the residential</p>

	<p>buildings of the estate. This piece of land is surrounded by bollards and paved in concrete slabs - a consistent materiality found throughout open spaces within the Golden Lane estate.</p> <p>This open space also provides clear visual clues as to the primary purpose of this space as part of the northern entrance to the underground internal roads and car park of the Golden Lane Estate.</p> <p>Chamberlin Powell and Bon shadow diagram illustrates how they planned the layout of the buildings so that undue overshadowing between blocks was avoided - the space to the north of Hatfield House is demonstrated to be largely covered in shadow - and would therefore have been deemed unsuitable for residential building during the design of the estate.</p> <p>Impact</p> <p>The nature of proposals and application brought forwards for a single storey dwelling and garage does not provide enough details to be able to comment in any specific detail. However, two single storey structures in this location would cause less than substantial harm to the Golden Lane Estate and Hatfield House.</p> <p>Hatfield House and Golden Lane Estate</p> <p>These proposals would cause harm to the grade II listed building due to development within its setting. The prominence and massing of the proposal would erode the primacy, as well as the physical and architectural dominance, of the grade II listed building - currently enhanced by the intended open spatial quality afforded by the strip of land between the street and building.</p> <p>Structures in this location would serve to clutter the foreground of Hatfield house and the northern boundary of the Estate - in contrast to the carefully planning of buildings, access and space within the Estate. Furthermore, these structures could create a narrow gulley potentially blocking light into the lower floors of Hatton House and outward views onto the street.</p> <p>The impact of a single storey house and garage in this location would cause less than substantial harm to the significance of the Grade II Hatfield House and Golden Lane Estate.</p>
--	--

	<p>Policy</p> <p>We would draw your attention to Sections 66 and 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, which set out the obligation on local planning authorities to pay special regard to preserving the special interest of listed buildings and their settings, and special attention to preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of conservation areas.</p> <p>The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF, December 2024) provides further guidance on these duties. Paragraph 208 advises authorities to assess the significance of any heritage asset affected by a proposal and to minimise conflict with its conservation. Paragraph 210 stresses the importance of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets and using them in ways consistent with their conservation. Paragraph 215 states: Where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal, including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use.</p> <p>Position</p> <p>Historic England considers these proposals to be harmful to Hatfield House and the Golden Lane Estate and recommends that your authority refuse planning permission.</p> <p>Although further information is required to make a thorough assessment of the impact of proposed buildings - the principle of any substantial structure in this location would cause unnecessary harm to the architectural significance of the Golden Lane Estate and Hatfield House.</p> <p>Recommendation</p> <p>We consider the application should be withdrawn or refused.</p> <p>Officer Response:</p> <p>These matters have been considered in detail in the body of this report.</p>
Islington Council	<p>The application site is located to the south of the London Borough of Islington located directly adjacent to the borough boundary. The proposed new dwellinghouse and detached</p>

	<p>garage would be located in a prominent position on Baltic Street West.</p> <p>The submission claims that the two mature trees would be retained but there is no information on how the development would affect these trees and how these trees would be protected. Furthermore, the site is within the setting of two of Islington's conservation areas: the St Luke's Conservation Area and the Hat & Feathers Conservation Area (both located immediately to the north on the Islington side of Baltic Street).</p> <p>In the absence of details, Islington Council considers that the development would have a negative impact on the experience of the public realm and result in harm to the significance of the setting of these conservation areas. There is also no information on how the development would affect the amenity of neighbours including buildings within Islington.</p> <p>Based on the information as submitted, Islington Council raise concerns to the proposed development.</p> <p>Officer Response:</p> <p>These matters have been considered in detail in the body of this report.</p>
Golden Lane Estate Residents Association	<p>We object to this planning application for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The land on which the house is proposed forms part of the Golden Lane Estate, and is described in the lease plan as a communal garden area. The development would cause a significant loss of residential amenity for residents of the estate but also of residents in other flats on Baltic Street and COLPAI school. • The area on which a house is proposed includes two important mature trees that provide a green canopy with roots that extend under the whole area. There is significant risk of ecological damage. It is not realistically possible to build on the site without disrupting and potentially killing these mature trees which would negatively affect the local wildlife and biodiversity, the green corridor they create, the pollution levels and look and feel of Baltic Street West. • The site is used by the COLPAI school as an assembly point for pupils and staff during fire alarms. It was used

	<p>by rescue services to attend a tragic fire in a Hatfield House flat. A house in this location could affect emergency access to Hatfield House and the school.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed house will impact on Grade II listed Golden Lane Estate. In the words of the City of London's Golden Lane Listed Building Management Guidelines (2013), Hatfield House "occupies a particularly important place in the design of the estate, as it forms the Northern Boundary". It was designed as an open forecourt and communal garden in front of Hatfield House and to change this by building on it would cause significant harm to the visual impact of the estate and fundamentally change the design and aspect of the listed buildings and landscape. • The proposed garage would be against City of London's car-free development policy and would require vehicles reversing onto Baltic Street West which is a busy cul-de-sac, used for servicing the school and Golden Lane estate as well as the businesses on Baltic Street West. • The proposed dwelling would be just 5 metres from the windows of lower ground flats within Hatfield House and cause loss of privacy and daylight for neighbouring flats. It would create a sense of enclosure and block light into these flats, and those on ground level which would negatively affect the wellbeing of residents, which include elderly and vulnerable people. <p>Officer Response:</p> <p>These matters have been considered in detail in the body of this report.</p>
Greater London Archaeology Advisory Service (GLAAS)	<p>I would advise that there are no known significant archaeological issues on the site, but should it come in as a planning application, I'd be likely to recommend an archaeological condition for the site. It's located in an area of known archaeological potential and appears to have undergone little previous development, which increases the potential for archaeological survival.</p> <p>Officer Response:</p> <p>Were the permission in principle to be approved, this would be something that would be considered at the technical details consent stage.</p>

Conservation Area Advisory Committee	<p>The Committee objected strongly to an application on which there were no details, believing that consideration of any such application for development in a Conservation Area would set an unfortunate precedent. The present space was characterised by the trees and adjacent buildings; there was no information on how the proposal would affect these and the Committee believed that any development on it would be likely to have an adverse effect on the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.</p> <p>Officer Response:</p> <p>These matters have been considered in detail in the body of this report. The level of detail provided is sufficient for the validation and assessment of this stage of the permission in principle application process.</p>
<i>Internal</i>	
Tree Officer	<p>No arboricultural information, details for proposed structures or utility connections have been provided. The proposed site is a small area that already contains 2 very large mature London plane trees and development of this type in such close proximity would not be acceptable in arboricultural terms. These trees are very prominent in the street, are of a very high amenity value and meet the criteria under BS5837 for category A trees of high quality.</p> <p>It does not seem possible for any structures to be built on the site without significant encroachment and impacts on the root protection areas (RPAs) of these trees which occupy almost the entirety of the proposed site area. This could lead to the damage or loss of the trees during construction and likely lead to increased pressure post development for pruning to the trees for reasons such as leaf fall and shading.</p> <p>City Gardens cannot support approving the application and have serious concerns about the impacts this would have on the existing plane trees.</p> <p>Officer Response:</p> <p>These matters have been considered in detail in the body of this report.</p>
Cleansing Services	No objections.
Highways and Transport	Baltic Lane West is adopted City of London highway and comprises a single-carriageway cul-de-sac route, with pedestrian and cycle access only through to Baltic Lane

	<p>East. There are two on-street Blue Badge parking bays located on south side of Baltic Street West to the north of the site. The western end of the site abuts the existing ramped access (with barrier gate control) to the Golden Lane Estate underground service road and car park. There is also a pedestrian access route to Hatfield House within the immediate vicinity.</p> <p>There is a general lack of information submitted by the applicant to provide detailed comments, but these following concerns at this stage are noted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The provision of a single storey garage in this location does not comply with the London Plan's car-free policy (T6.1) for residential development in the City. • There is a concern that the proposal could adversely impact on existing access arrangements to Hatfield House, with particular reference to site residents. • There is concern that the proposal could adversely impact on emergency access arrangements in relation to both Hatfield House and the adjacent Primary Academy. Significant pedestrian and cycle movements are expected on Baltic Street West, given this school presence, and this would be a particular concern with regards to construction. • The paved area is public footway (reference 4971) and designated permissive path and forms an established access route for local residents, including in relation to the two existing on-street Blue Badge parking bays. • There is the matter of visibility and sightlines and the proposal would represent a significant change in a tight location where there are differing access requirements. This also comes back to the lack of information in terms of looking at the implications for highway safety given the local residential and school context. <p>Officers Response:</p> <p>These matters have been discussed in the body of this report.</p>
--	--

11. 14 letters of objection were received from residents of the Golden Lane Estate. Copies of all received letters and emails making representations are attached in full and appended to this report.

12. The themes raised within these representations are summarised in the table below, along with the number of representations which reference this theme, and the officer's response.

Letters of Representation		
<i>Principal Themes</i>	<i>No. of Reps.</i>	<i>Officer's Response</i>
Impact on Heritage Assets	11	This has been discussed in detail in the body of this report.
Amenity Impact	10	This has been discussed in detail in the body of this report.
Impact of Garage on Highways	5	This has been discussed in detail in the body of this report.
Lack of Detail	1	This application is for permission in principle only which requires much more limited information than a typical full planning application. Were the application to be accepted in principle, further detail could then be assessed subsequently as part of the technical details consent stage.
Harm to Trees / Biodiversity	10	This has been discussed in detail in the body of this report.
Site Ownership	2	This is not a material planning consideration.
Plot Size and Constraints	3	This has been discussed in detail in the body of this report.
Construction Impact	2	Were the application to be accepted in principle, the further detail regarding the would then be assessed subsequently as part of the technical details consent stage.
Loss of Cycle Stands	2	This has been discussed in detail in the body of this report.
Loss of Open Space	4	This has been discussed in detail in the body of this report.
Leaseholder Rights	1	This is not a material planning consideration.
Proposed Landscape Works to Area	1	There are not currently any plans by the City to make landscaping changes to the site.
Fire Safety	1	The detailed fire safety requirements of the proposal would be considered as part of the subsequent technical details consent stage were the application to be granted permission in principle. Some matters pertaining to fire safety for the existing adjacent uses have been discussed in the body of this report.

Site Should be designated as part of the Conservation Area	1	This is not something which can be considered or actioned as part of this planning application.
Issues with utilities	1	This has been discussed in detail in the body of this report.

13. In addition to these above representations, a public comment was made by the applicant stating the following:

- i. Removing the existing paving will allow rain to feed the trees and reduce storm flow into the sewage system.*
- ii. Screw jack foundations to point load and minimise damage to the existing tree roots, and allow adjustment as the trees flourish under my care, and reduce CO2 production in cement.*
- iii. Timber frame construction to minimise disruption during the build from dust & a long timeline, and trap CO2 in the material.*
- iv. Increase planting on the site as a garden/ orchard.*
- v. Visual intrusion for Hatfield neighbours to be minimised by a single storey building under the tree canopies, so no reduction in daylighting or sunlight for Hatfield residents a swell below the horizon.*
- vi. Amenity buffer to be improve buffering for Hatfield resident's amenity by inserting a building and garden fencing pushing pedestrian gatherings further from and screened from Hatfield House. Currently only 5 metres of open-air separates residents from the open public area, an extension of Highways footways.*
- vii. I hope to include a water feature at the sharp end to replace the long-lost Goswell Road Besley Memorial fountain and to improve residents' amenity.*
- viii. To future-proof my home by including a garage as I approach old age and a disabled driver status, having lost my invalid car garage when the new school was built and struggled with an unlit and insecure basement garage at the far side of GLE almost under the Shakespeare.*
- ix. Overlooking & privacy will be no worse than any of the existing Hatfield gardens or those elsewhere in GLE.*
- x. CityPlan2040 compliance, and specifically Policy HS8 self and custom housebuilding.*
- xi. Maximises housing provision.*
- xii. Inside the Corporation's defined 'residential area'.*
- xiii. Outside the Listed boundary.*

14. The further information provided here has not been presented as part of this permission in principle application, for which the only submitted documents are the application form and site location plan.

15. Nonetheless, officers offer the following response to the points raised here:

- i. This is a claim which has not been evidenced as part of the submission. Furthermore, this is not an application for the removal of the paving but for the erection of a dwelling and detached garage on the site, for which the impact upon the trees and the drainage would be entirely different to that of removing the paving.
- ii. This is a claim which has not been evidenced as part of the submission. This type of foundation design is not standard construction for a single detached dwelling and, without strong arboricultural evidence to support this claim, it is not obvious to officers that this type of design would still not cause harm to the trees on site.
- iii. These are details which would not be considered as part of the permission in principle stage and would instead be considered under the subsequent technical details consent stage.
- iv. These are details which would not be considered as part of the permission in principle stage and would instead be considered under the subsequent technical details consent stage.
- v. The visual intrusion created through the erection of a one storey dwelling and detached garage with garden on the site would be considerably more than the existing situation when there is currently an area of open space.
- vi. On the contrary, the presence of an open area, publicly accessible or otherwise, is a far better amenity buffer than a single storey dwelling house and garage with gardens in this location.
- vii. This is not something which has been applied for under this application and is not included in any of the documentation submitted. It is not possible to attach conditions to a permission in principle application and as such there would be no way of securing this element at this stage.
- viii. The provision of a parking garage is contrary to policy as is discussed in the body of this report.
- ix. On the contrary, the presence of a house in this location would likely result in unacceptable amenity harm and is discussed in the body of this report.
- x. This matter is considered in the body of the report and is not considered to outweigh the levels of harm otherwise identified in the overall planning balance.
- xi. This matter is considered in the body of the report and is not considered to outweigh the levels of harm otherwise identified in the overall planning balance.
- xii. This matter is considered in the body of the report and is not considered to outweigh the levels of harm otherwise identified in the overall planning balance.
- xiii. This matter is considered in the body of the report and is not considered to outweigh the levels of harm otherwise identified in the overall planning balance.

Policy Context

16. The development plan comprises the London Plan (2021) and the City of London Local Plan (2015). The policies of these documents relevant to the consideration of this case are set out in Appendix A of this report.
17. The City of London is preparing a new draft emerging plan, the City Plan 2040, which is currently undergoing examination in public. Emerging policies are considered to be a material consideration with limited weight with an increasing degree of weight as the City Plan 2040 progresses towards adoption, in accordance with paragraph 49 of the NPPF. The emerging City Plan 2040 policies that are most relevant to the consideration of this case are set out in Appendix A to this report.
18. Government Guidance is contained in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) December 2024 and the Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) which is amended from time to time.

The NPPF

19. The NPPF states at paragraph 2 that planning law requires that applications for planning permission must be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.
20. Chapter 2 of the NPPF focuses on achieving sustainable development. Paragraph 8 states that achieving sustainable development has three overarching objectives, being economic, social and environmental. Paragraph 10 of the NPPF states that “at the heart of the Framework is a presumption in favour of sustainable development”. Paragraph 11 sets out this presumption.
21. Chapter 4 of the NPPF focuses upon determining applications. Paragraph 49 states that local planning authorities may give weight to relevant policies in emerging plans according to: a) the stage of preparation of the emerging plan (the more advanced its preparation the greater weight that may be given); b) the extent to which there are unresolved objection to relevant policies (the less significant the unresolved objections, the greater the weight that may be given), and c) the degree of constancy of the relevant policies in the emerging plan to this Framework (the closer the policies in the emerging plan to this policies in this Framework, the greater the weight can be given).
22. Chapter 5 of the NPPF focuses on delivering a sufficient supply of homes. Paragraph 61 states, to support the Government’s objective of significantly boosting the supply of homes, it is important that a sufficient amount and variety of land can come forward where it is needed, that the needs of groups with specific housing requirements are addressed and that land with permission is developed without unnecessary delay. The overall aim should be to meet an

area's identified housing need, including with an appropriate mix of housing types for the local community.

23. Paragraph 63 explains that, within the context of enabling a sufficient supply of homes, planning policies should assess the need, size, type and tenure of housing needed for different groups in the community. These groups should include (but are not limited to) those who require affordable housing; families with children; older people (including those who require retirement housing, housing-with-care and care homes); students; people with disabilities; service families; travellers; people who rent their homes and people wishing to commission or build their own homes. The footnote to this paragraph states that, under section 1 of the Self Build and Custom Housebuilding Act 2015, local authorities are required to keep a register of those seeking to acquire serviced plots in the area for their own self-build and custom house building. They are also subject to duties under sections 2 and 2A of that Act to have regard to this and to give enough suitable development permissions to meet the identified demand. Self and custom-build properties could provide market or affordable housing.
24. Paragraph 65 states that provision of affordable housing should not be sought for residential developments that are not major developments, other than in designated rural areas (where policies may set out a lower threshold of 5 units or fewer). To support the re-use of brownfield land, where vacant buildings are being reused or redeveloped, any affordable housing contribution due should be reduced by a proportionate amount.
25. Paragraph 72 states that strategic policy-making authorities should have a clear understanding of the land available in their area through the preparation of a strategic housing land availability assessment. From this, planning policies should identify a sufficient supply and mix of sites, taking into account their availability, suitability and likely economic viability. Planning policies should identify a supply of: a) specific, deliverable sites for five years following the intended date of adoption; and b) specific, developable sites or broad locations for growth, for the subsequent years 6-10 and, where possible, for years 11-15 of the remaining plan period.
26. Paragraph 73 states that small and medium sized sites can make an important contribution to meeting the housing requirement of an area, are essential for Small and Medium Enterprise housebuilders to deliver new homes, and are often built-out relatively quickly. To promote the development of a good mix of sites local planning authorities should: a) identify, through the development plan and brownfield registers, land to accommodate at least 10% of their housing requirement on sites no larger than one hectare; unless it can be shown, through the preparation of relevant plan policies, that there are strong reasons why this 10% target cannot be achieved; b) seek opportunities, through policies and decisions, to support small sites to come forward for community-led

development for housing and self-build and custom-build housing; c) use tools such as area-wide design assessments, permission in principle and Local Development Orders to help bring small and medium sized sites forward; d) support the development of windfall sites through their policies and decisions – giving great weight to the benefits of using suitable sites within existing settlements for homes; and e) work with developers to encourage the sub-division of large sites where this could help to speed up the delivery of homes.

27. Chapter 6 of the NPPF seeks to build a strong and competitive economy. Paragraph 85 states that decisions should help create the conditions in which businesses can invest, expand and adapt. Significant weight should be placed on the need to support economic growth and productivity, considering both local business needs and wider opportunities for development. The approach taken should allow each area to build on its strengths, counter any weaknesses and address challenges for the future. This is particularly important where Britain can be a global leader in driving innovation, and in areas with high levels of productivity, which should be able to capitalise on their performance potential.
28. Chapter 8 of the NPPF seeks to promote healthy, inclusive and safe places. Paragraph 96 states that planning decisions should aim to achieve healthy, inclusive and safe places which promote social interaction, are safe and accessible and enable and support healthy lifestyles. Paragraph 98 states that planning decisions should provide the social, recreational and cultural facilities and services the community needs.
29. Chapter 9 of the NPPF seeks to promote sustainable transport. Paragraph 110 states that significant development should be focused on locations which are or can be made sustainable, through limiting the need to travel and offering a genuine choice of transport modes. This can help reduce congestion and emissions and improve air quality and public health.
30. Paragraph 117 states that applications for development should give priority first to pedestrian and cycle movements and second to facilitating access to high quality public transport; it should address the needs of the people with disabilities and reduced mobility in relation to all modes of transport; it should create places that are safe, secure, attractive and which minimise the scope for conflicts between pedestrian, cyclists and vehicles; it should allow for the efficient delivery of goods and access by service and emergency vehicles; and be designed to enable charging of plug-in and other ultra-low emission vehicles in safe, accessible and convenient locations.
31. Chapter 11 of the NPPF seeks to make effective use of the land. Paragraph 124 advises that planning policies and decisions should promote an effective use of land in meeting the need for homes and other uses, while safeguarding and improving the environment and ensuring safe and healthy living conditions.

32. Paragraph 125 states that planning policies and decisions should: (a) encourage multiple benefits from both urban and rural land, including through mixed use schemes and taking opportunities to achieve net environmental gains – such as developments that would enable new habitat creation or improve public access to the countryside; (b) recognise that some undeveloped land can perform many functions, such as for wildlife, recreation, flood risk mitigation, cooling/shading, carbon storage or food production; (c) give substantial weight to the value of using suitable brownfield land within settlements for homes and other identified needs, proposals for which should be approved unless substantial harm would be caused, and support appropriate opportunities to remediate despoiled, degraded, derelict, contaminated or unstable land; (d) promote and support the development of under-utilised land and buildings, especially if this would help to meet identified needs for housing where land supply is constrained and available sites could be used more effectively (for example converting space above shops, and building on or above service yards, car parks, lock-ups and railway infrastructure); and (e) support opportunities to use the airspace above existing residential and commercial premises for new homes. In particular, they should allow upward extensions – including mansard roofs – where the development would be consistent with the prevailing form of neighbouring properties and the overall street scene, is well- designed (including complying with any local design policies and standards), and can maintain safe access and egress for occupiers. A condition of simultaneous development should not be imposed on an application for multiple upward extensions unless there is an exceptional justification.
33. Paragraph 126 states that local planning authorities, and other plan-making bodies, should take a proactive role in identifying and helping to bring forward land that may be suitable for meeting development needs, including suitable sites on brownfield registers or held in public ownership, using the full range of powers available to them. This should include identifying opportunities to facilitate land assembly, supported where necessary by compulsory purchase powers, where this can help to bring more land forward for meeting development needs and/or secure better development outcomes.
34. Paragraph 127 states that planning policies and decisions need to reflect changes in the demand for land. They should be informed by regular reviews of both the land allocated for development in plans, and of land availability. Where the local planning authority considers there to be no reasonable prospect of an application coming forward for the use allocated in a plan: (a) it should, as part of plan updates, reallocate the land for a more deliverable use that can help to address identified needs (or, if appropriate, deallocate a site which is undeveloped); and (b) in the interim, prior to updating the plan, applications for alternative uses on the land should be supported, where the proposed use would contribute to meeting an unmet need for development in the area.

35. Paragraph 128 states that Local planning authorities should also take a positive approach to applications for alternative uses of land which is currently developed but not allocated for a specific purpose in plans, where this would help to meet identified development needs. In particular, they should support proposals to: (a) use retail and employment land for homes in areas of high housing demand, provided this would not undermine key economic sectors or sites or the vitality and viability of town centres, and would be compatible with other policies in this Framework; and (b) make more effective use of sites that provide community services such as schools and hospitals, provided this maintains or improves the quality of service provision and access to open space.
36. Paragraph 129 states that planning policies and decisions should support development that makes efficient use of land, taking into account: (a) the identified need for different types of housing and other forms of development, and the availability of land suitable for accommodating it; (b) local market conditions and viability; (c) the availability and capacity of infrastructure and services – both existing and proposed – as well as their potential for further improvement and the scope to promote sustainable travel modes that limit future car use; (d) the desirability of maintaining an area's prevailing character and setting (including residential gardens), or of promoting regeneration and change; and (e) the importance of securing well-designed, attractive and healthy places.
37. Paragraph 130 states Area-based character assessments, design guides and codes and masterplans can be used to help ensure that land is used efficiently while also creating beautiful and sustainable places. Where there is an existing or anticipated shortage of land for meeting identified housing needs, it is especially important that planning policies and decisions avoid homes being built at low densities, and ensure that developments make optimal use of the potential of each site. In these circumstances: (a) plans should contain policies to optimise the use of land in their area and meet as much of the identified need for housing as possible. This will be tested robustly at examination, and should include the use of minimum density standards for city and town centres and other locations that are well served by public transport. These standards should seek a significant uplift in the average density of residential development within these areas, unless it can be shown that there are strong reasons why this would be inappropriate; (b) the use of minimum density standards should also be considered for other parts of the plan area. It may be appropriate to set out a range of densities that reflect the accessibility and potential of different areas, rather than one broad density range; and (c) local planning authorities should refuse applications which they consider fail to make efficient use of land, taking into account the policies in this Framework. In this context, when considering applications for housing, authorities should take a flexible approach in applying policies or guidance relating to daylight and sunlight, where they would

otherwise inhibit making efficient use of a site (as long as the resulting scheme would provide acceptable living standards).

38. Chapter 12 of the NPPF seeks to achieve well designed places. Paragraph 131 advises that the creation of high quality, beautiful and sustainable buildings and places is fundamental to what the planning and development process should achieve. Good design is a key aspect of sustainable development, create better places in which to live and work and helps make development acceptable to communities.
39. Paragraph 135 sets out how good design should be achieved including ensuring developments function well and add to the overall quality of the area, not just for the short term but over the lifetime of the development, are visually attractive as a result of good architecture, layout and appropriate and effective landscaping, are sympathetic to local character and history, including the surrounding built environment and landscape setting, while not preventing or discouraging appropriate innovation or change (such as increased densities), establish or maintain a strong sense of place, using the arrangement of streets, spaces, building types and materials to create attractive, welcoming and distinctive places to live, work and visit; optimise the potential of the site to accommodate and sustain an appropriate amount and mix of development (including green and other public space) and create places that are safe, inclusive and accessible and which promote health and wellbeing and where crime and disorder, and the fear of crime, do not undermine the quality of life or community cohesion and resilience.
40. Paragraph 136 of the NPPF states that trees make an important contribution to the character and quality of urban environments and can also help mitigate and adapt to climate change. Planning policies and decisions should ensure that new streets are tree-lined, that opportunities are taken to incorporate trees elsewhere in developments (such as parks and community orchards), that appropriate measures are in place to secure the long-term maintenance of newly planted trees, and that existing trees are retained wherever possible.
41. Chapter 15 of the NPPF seeks to conserve and enhance the natural environment. Paragraph 187 of the NPPF advises that planning policies and decisions should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by, amongst other things, minimising impacts on and providing net gains for biodiversity, including by establishing coherent ecological networks that are more resilient to current and future pressures. It is also stated that development should, wherever possible, help to improve local environmental conditions such as air and water quality.
42. Chapter 16 of the NPPF relates to conserving and enhancing the historic environment. Paragraph 208 of the NPPF advises that Local Planning Authorities should identify and assess the particular significance of any heritage

asset that may be affected by a proposal (including by development affecting the setting of a heritage asset) taking account of the available evidence and any necessary expertise. They should take this into account when considering the impact of a proposal on a heritage asset, to avoid or minimise any conflict between the heritage asset's conservation and any aspect of the proposal.

43. Paragraph 210 of the NPPF advises, in determining applications, local planning authorities should take account of: a) the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets and putting them to viable uses consistent with their conservation; b) the positive contribution that conservation of heritage assets can make to sustainable communities including their economic vitality; and c) the desirability of new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness.
44. Paragraph 212 of the NPPF advises that, when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation (and the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be). This is irrespective of whether any potential harm amounts to substantial harm, total loss or less than substantial harm to its significance.
45. Paragraph 213 states that any harm to, or loss of, the significance of a designated heritage asset (from its alteration or destruction, or from development within its setting), should require clear and convincing justification. Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional; b) assets of the highest significance, notably scheduled monuments, protected wreck sites, registered battlefields, grade I and II* listed buildings, grade I and II* registered parks and gardens, and World Heritage Sites, should be wholly exceptional.
46. Paragraph 215 of the NPPF states that, where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use.
47. Paragraph 216 of the NPPF states that the effect of an application on the significance of a non-designated heritage asset should be taken into account in determining the application. In weighing applications that directly or indirectly affect non-designated heritage assets, a balanced judgement will be required having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset.

Statutory Duties and Considerations

48. The Corporation, in determining the application has the following main statutory duties to perform:

- To have regard to the provisions of the development plan, so far as material to application(s) and to any other material considerations (Section 70(2) Town and Country Planning Act 1990); and
 - To determine the application in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. (Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004).
49. In considering whether to grant permission in principle for development which affects a listed building or its setting, to have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possessed. (Section 66 (1) Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990).
50. In exercising planning functions with respect to buildings or land in a conservation area, there is a statutory duty to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area. (Section 72(1) Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990).
51. In determining the applications, consideration has to be taken of the documents accompanying the application, the updated information, the consultation responses, the development plan, and other material considerations including SPGs, SPDs and emerging policy.
52. It is necessary to assess all the policies and proposals in the plan and come to a view as to whether in light of the plan as a whole the proposal does or does not accord with it.
53. The principal issues in considering this application are:
- a) The principle of development, the scope of which is location, land use and amount of development; and
 - b) Duties under the Public Sector Duty (section 149 of the Equality Act 2010) and The Human Rights Act 1998.

Principle of Development

54. As per paragraph 001 of the Planning Practice Guidance on permission in principle (Reference ID: 58-001-20180615), the permission in principle consent route is an alternative way of obtaining planning permission for housing-led development which separates the consideration of matters of principle for proposed development from the technical detail of the development. The permission in principle consent route has 2 stages: the first stage (or permission in principle stage) establishes whether a site is suitable in-principle and the second ('technical details consent') stage is when the detailed development proposals are assessed.

55. The relevant matters which pertain to the principle of development (Stage 1) in this instance comprise land use, location and amount of development.

Land Use

Loss of Open Space

56. The Local Plan 2015 defines (glossary) 'Open Space' as:

'Land which is not built on and which has some amenity value or potential for amenity value. Amenity value is derived from the visual, recreational or other enjoyment which the open space can provide, such as historic and cultural interest and value. This includes open spaces in public or private ownership'.

57. While the application site itself is not designated as Statutory Open Space, Officers consider that the combination of significant mature vegetation, historic interest and pedestrian enjoyment provides a level of amenity value that would lend itself to the above definition. The site is also owned by the City and has unrestricted public access. As such, the application site would be considered 'Open Space' as defined by the Local Plan glossary and thus subject to the relevant policies.

58. Policy GG2 of The London Plan 2021 states that, in order to create successful sustainable mixed-use places that make the best use of land, those involved in planning and development must:

A) enable the development of brownfield land, particularly in Opportunity Areas, on surplus public sector land, and sites within and on the edge of town centres, as well as utilising small sites

B) prioritise sites which are well-connected by existing or planned public transport

C) proactively explore the potential to intensify the use of land to support additional homes and workspaces, promoting higher density development, particularly in locations that are well-connected to jobs, services, infrastructure and amenities by public transport, walking and cycling

D) applying a design-led approach to determine the optimum development capacity of sites

E) understand what is valued about existing places and use this as a catalyst for growth, renewal, and place-making, strengthening London's distinct and varied character

F) protect and enhance London's open spaces, including the Green Belt, Metropolitan Open Land, designated nature conservation sites and local spaces, and promote the creation of new green infrastructure and urban greening, including aiming to secure net biodiversity gains where possible

G) plan for good local walking, cycling and public transport connections to support a strategic target of 80 per cent of all journeys using sustainable travel, enabling car-free lifestyles that allow an efficient use of land, as well as using new and enhanced public transport links to unlock growth

H) maximise opportunities to use infrastructure assets for more than one purpose, to make the best use of land and support efficient maintenance

59. With regard to subparagraph A above, the site is in the City's ownership. In June 2025, the Housing Sub-Committee recommended the site should not be declared surplus to housing requirements by the Community and Children's Services Committee. On 17 September, the application went to the to the Community and Children's Services Committee with the recommendation to reject the application to declare this parcel of land surplus for housing purposes, which the committee voted to reject in line with the officer recommendation.
60. Policy G4 of The London Plan states that development proposals should not result in the loss of protected open space and, where possible, create areas of publicly accessible open space, particularly in areas of deficiency.
61. Core Strategic Policy CS19 of the adopted Local Plan 2015 seeks to encourage healthy lifestyles for all the City's communities through improved access to open space and facilities, increasing the amount and quality of open spaces and green infrastructure, while enhancing biodiversity, by seeking to maintain a ratio of at least 0.06 hectares of high quality, publicly accessible open space per 1,000 weekday daytime population protecting existing open space, particularly that of historic interest, or ensuring that it is replaced on redevelopment by space of equal or improved quantity and quality on or near the site.
62. In addition, Strategic Policy S14 of the emerging City Plan states that the City Corporation will work in partnership with developers, landowners, the churches and other agencies to promote a greener City by protecting existing open and green space.
63. Policy DM16.2 of the Local Plan 2015 states the loss of a pedestrian route will normally only be permitted where an alternative public pedestrian route of at least an equivalent standard is provided having regard to the extent to which the route provides for current and all reasonably foreseeable future demands placed upon it, including at peak periods and the shortest practicable routes between relevant points. Routes of historic importance should be safeguarded as part of the City's characteristic pattern of lanes, alleys and courts, including the route's historic alignment and width. The replacement of a route over which pedestrians have rights, with one to which the public have access only with permission will not normally be acceptable.
64. Furthermore, Policy OS1 of the emerging City Plan 2040 states that the quantity, quality and accessibility of public open space will be maintained and improved. Existing open space will be protected and enhanced. Any loss of existing open space should be wholly exceptional, and it must be replaced on

redevelopment by open space of equal or improved quantity and quality on or near the site. The loss of historic open spaces will be resisted.

65. As is noted in the comments from Historic England, the piece of land which comprises the site is surrounded by bollards and paved in concrete slabs, which is a consistent materiality found throughout open spaces within the Golden Lane Estate. It is also noted in these comments that the Chamberlin Powell and Bon shadow diagram illustrates how they planned the layout of the buildings of the Golden Lane Estate so that undue overshadowing between blocks was avoided, with the space to the north of Hatfield House demonstrated to be largely covered in shadow and would therefore have been deemed unsuitable for residential building during the design of the estate.
66. It is therefore evident that the site was constructed as open space as part of the original development of the Golden Lane Estate, and, although not itself part of the Golden Lane Registered Park and Garden designated by Historic England, or the Conservation Area, it possesses a degree of historic interest as it was constructed as part of the listed building and conservation area immediately adjacent.
67. It has been mentioned in several of the representations received that this area of open space is used for school pickups, a fire assembly point, cycle storage, and emergency service access. It is considered that these uses are incidental to the provision of this area of land as publicly accessible open space and serves as evidence as to why the loss of this area of open space would be harmful.
68. The site is a designated footway and permissive path and forms an established access route for local residents, including in relation to the two existing on-street Blue Badge parking bays. The loss of this area of footway and permissive path would require pedestrians to navigate the full perimeter of the site to access the underground car park or lower levels of Hatfield House, which can currently be accessed directly by crossing over the site and down the access road ramp or down the stairs to the southeastern corner of the site.
69. The proposed development seeks to provide residential development on a site that for the above reasons is considered as 'open space'. While the details of the development are not provided (albeit not required) the very provision of a structure(s) in this area would be contrary to the general requirements of policy which seeks to maintain and promote open spaces within the City. Furthermore, the principle of the loss of a public pedestrian route would be contrary to policy as no specific pedestrian route of at least an equivalent standard has been provided.
70. Thus, the proposed development of this open space for the purpose of erecting a private dwelling is contrary to Policy G4 of The London Plan 2021, Policy

CS19 and DM16.2 of the Local Plan 2015, and emerging policies S14 and OS1 of the emerging City Plan 2040.

Parking

71. Policy DM16.5 of the Local Plan 2015 states that developments in the City should be car-free except for designated Blue Badge spaces. Where other car parking is exceptionally provided it must not exceed London Plan's standards. As per London Plan Policy T6.1, the maximum car parking standard for the City of London is for entirely car free development.
72. Policy VT3 of the emerging City Plan 2040 states that development in the City should be car-free except for designated Blue Badge spaces. Where other car parking (including motorcycle parking) is exceptionally provided it must not exceed London Plan standards.
73. The applicant has stated in their description of development that the proposed development would include the provision of a single storey garage. It has been alluded to in the applicant's own representation made on the application that the garage may in future be used as a parking space for a disabled user. However, it has not been clearly stated in the applicant's description of development or otherwise on their application form that the proposed garage would constitute Blue Badge parking.
74. As per paragraph 020 of the Planning Practice Guidance on Permission in Principle (Reference ID: 58-020-20180615), it is not possible for conditions to be attached to a grant of permission in principle and its terms may only include the site location, the type of development and amount of development. This means there would be no means of securing any garage proposed as Blue Badge parking only.
75. Thus, the proposed development does not comply with the London Plan's car-free policy, contrary to Policy T6.1 of The London Plan 2021, Policy DM16.5 of the Local Plan 2015 and Policy VT3 of the emerging City Plan 2040 and is therefore objectionable in principle for these reasons.

Location and Amount of Development

Provision of a Single Storey Dwelling

76. Policy GG4 of The London Plan 2021 states that, in order to create a housing market that works better for all Londoners, those involved in planning and development must:

A) ensure that more homes are delivered

- B) support the delivery of the strategic target of 50 per cent of all new homes being genuinely affordable
- C) create mixed and inclusive communities, with good quality homes that meet high standards of design and provide for identified needs, including for specialist housing
- D) identify and allocate a range of sites to deliver housing locally, supporting skilled precision-manufacturing that can increase the rate of building, and planning for all necessary supporting infrastructure from the outset
- E) establish ambitious and achievable build-out rates at the planning stage, incentivising build-out milestones to help ensure that homes are built quickly and to reduce the likelihood of permissions being sought to sell land on at a higher value.

77. Policy H2 (A) of the London Plan 2021 states that boroughs should pro-actively support well-designed new homes on small sites (below 0.25 hectares in size) through both planning decisions and plan-making in order to:
- 1) significantly increase the contribution of small sites to meeting London's housing needs
 - 2) diversify the sources, locations, type and mix of housing supply
 - 3) support small and medium-sized housebuilders
 - 4) support those wishing to bring forward custom, self-build and community led housing
 - 5) achieve the minimum targets for small sites set out in Table 4.2 as a component of the overall housing targets set out in Table 4.1.
78. In addition, London Plan Policy H2(B) states that Boroughs should:
- 1) recognise in their Development Plans that local character evolves over time and will need to change in appropriate locations to accommodate additional housing on small sites
 - 2) where appropriate, prepare site-specific briefs, masterplans and housing design codes for small sites
 - 3) identify and allocate appropriate small sites for residential development
 - 4) list these small sites on their brownfield registers
 - 5) grant permission in principle on specific sites or prepare local development orders.
79. The application site has an area of 0.0321 hectares and would therefore constitute a small site.
80. Core Strategic Policy CS21 of the Local Plan requires the City to protect existing housing and amenity and provide additional housing in the City, concentrated in or near identified residential areas, to meet the City's needs, securing suitable, accessible and affordable housing and supported housing, by exceeding the London Plan's minimum annual requirement of 110 additional residential units in the City up to 2026:

- i. guiding new housing development to and near identified residential areas;
- ii. protecting existing housing;
- iii. refusing new housing where it would prejudice the primary business function of the City or be contrary to Policy DM 1.1;
- iv. exceptionally, allowing the loss of isolated residential units where there is a poor level of amenity.

81. In addition, Policy S3 of the emerging City Plan 2024 states that the City Corporation will protect existing housing and amenity and encourage additional housing concentrated in or near the identified residential areas to meet the City's needs by making provision for a minimum of 1,706 net additional dwellings between 2025/26 and 2039/40 encouraging new housing development on appropriate sites in or near identified residential areas.
82. As is demonstrated in the City's 'LD28 Housing Delivery and Trajectory Note' from April 2025, the City's delivery, against the London Plan target of 1460 over the ten years from 2019/20 to 2028/29, it is anticipated that completions will provide 2116 new housing units (equivalent, using the GLA ratios for non-self-contained accommodation at paragraph 4.1.9 of the London Plan). Additionally, the City Corporation has already delivered 1056 housing units against the 1460 target. It is anticipated that this ten-year target will be met in 2027/28, one year in advance.
83. The 2023 Housing Delivery Test results showed 206% delivery over the previous three years (2020/1 to 2022/23). Taking the City Corporation's latest data for these years this would rise to 232% (731 units delivered against the requirement of 315) therefore no sanctions are required. In relation to a five-year housing land supply the target would include four years at 146 and one year at 102, totalling 686. Expected completions will deliver 1060 equivalent housing units, therefore no buffers are required. It should be noted that due to the NPPF requirements, no windfall assumption has been added for year 5 however it is anticipated that delivery will come through in year five, including potential capacity from schemes currently at pre-application stage.
84. In addition, the City has demonstrated its ability to meet its target for small sites, as is demonstrated in the London Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment 2017. This shows at 74 per annum, calculates to 740 over a 10-year period from 2019/20 to 2028/29.
85. Policy DM21.1 states that new housing should be located on suitable sites in or near identified residential areas. Within these areas a mix of appropriate residential and commercial uses will be permitted. New housing will only be permitted where development would not:

- prejudice the primary business function of the City;

- be contrary to policy DM 1.1;
- inhibit the development potential or business activity in neighbouring commercial buildings and sites; and
- result in poor residential amenity within existing and proposed development, including excessive noise or disturbance.

86. Policy HS1 of the emerging City Plan 2040 states that new housing will be encouraged on suitable sites in or near identified residential areas. Within these areas a mix of residential, commercial, community, cultural and other uses will be permitted. New housing must not:

- a. Prejudice the primary business function of the City. Where proposed development would result in the loss of office floorspace it must meet the requirements of Policy OF2;
- b. Inhibit the development potential or business activity in neighbouring commercial buildings and sites; or
- c. Result in poor residential amenity within existing and proposed development, including excessive noise or disturbance.

87. The proposed dwelling would be located adjacent to an identified residential area being directly north of the Golden Lane Estate to the south. It is not considered that the proposal would prejudice the primary business function of the city or inhibit the development potential or business activity in neighbouring commercial buildings or sites. However, given the immediate proximity of the site to the residential units in Hatfield House, the proposed development of a single storey dwelling on this site would result in poor residential amenity to these existing dwellings and to the proposed dwelling, as is explained in the following paragraphs.

88. Although there are no details of the design at this stage of the permission in principle process, it is a matter of fact that the visual intrusion created through the erection of a one storey dwelling and detached garage with garden on the site would be considerably more than the existing situation of an area of open space. The presence of an area of open space, publicly accessible or otherwise, is a far better amenity buffer than a single storey dwelling house and garage with gardens in this location. Thus, the proposed development would be inherently harmful to amenity.

89. In addition, as is mentioned in the comments from Historic England, in the Chamberlin Powell and Bon shadow diagram, illustrating how they planned the layout of the buildings so that undue overshadowing between blocks was avoided, the space to the north of Hatfield House is demonstrated to be largely covered in shadow and would therefore have been deemed unsuitable for residential building during the design of the estate. This is reflective of the existing situation, where the site is bordered to the south/southeast by the six

storey Hatfield House and its residential balconies, and is covered by the canopies of the large mature trees.

90. Thus, it is evident that the site would be overshadowed by the substantially taller building and trees, and overlooked by the immediate proximity of the residential balconies, which would result in poor levels of amenity to the proposed dwelling on the application site.
91. It is not evident that these matters could be overcome at the detailed design stage, owing to the location of the site being in such close proximity to the six-storey Hatfield House and its residential balconies to the south/southeast, and the presence of the trees which are to be retained. Whilst it is not uncommon for commercial developments within the city to be located in close proximity to one another, the amenity considerations in these instances are far less pertinent than for that of a residential dwelling.
92. Thus, for these reasons, due to the poor levels of amenity to the proposed site, and the amenity impact on the existing adjacent residential dwellings caused by the erection of a single storey dwelling and garage on the current area of open space, the site is not considered to be a suitable site and therefore fails to meet Policies CS21 and DM21.1 of the Local Plan 2015 and Policies S3 and HS1 of the emerging City Plan 2040.

Design, Heritage and Public Realm

Introduction

93. The land on which the house is proposed forms part of the Golden Lane Estate. The site is bounded by Baltic Street West to the north and by Grade II Listed Hatfield House, a six-storey residential block, to the south. It is a narrow, triangular plot, paved in concrete and enclosed by bollards, with a ramp at the southern end providing access to an underground service road.
94. The site contains two mature London Plane trees, whose expansive canopies provide a green presence and whose root systems extend beneath the entire area. The local character is shaped by 4–6 storey blocks arranged around the triangular layout of Baltic Street West, Hatfield House, and the City of London Primary Academy, with strong geometric building lines, characteristic of the Golden Lane Estate, with the application site at the centre.
95. The Golden Lane Estate was designed as a unified post-war housing scheme, combining buildings, courts, and landscaped spaces into an integrated masterplan. The application site sits at the edge of this composition and was built as part of the development of the Estate, as existing, it contributes to the Estate's characteristic relationship between architecture and communal gardens, as set out in the Conservation Area SPD and the Listed Building Management Guidelines.

Design and Public Realm

96. The scope of the considerations for permission in principle is limited to location, land use and the amount of development permitted. The application does not include details of the intended layout or design of the proposed dwelling and no such details are required with an application for permission in principle, however, reasonable assumptions have been made about a development that is likely to come forward in order to assess the sites appropriateness, particularly in relation to the amount of development:
- The proposal is for a 1 storey residential dwelling, as stated in the description of development, which if designed in accordance with the Technical Housing Standards, a nationally described space standard for residential development, would have to be a minimum of 37sqm (Gross Internal Area) for a 1 bed 1 person dwelling, it would need to be 50sqm if it is a 1 bed 2 person dwelling. It may be larger.
 - A garage would likely be approximately 18sqm and the garden would likely be a minimum of 5sqm.
 - The site is constrained, it is triangular in shape and the existing trees are positioned in the centre of the space, the description of development states the existing trees would be retained. The plot is small, and given its triangular shape placement of the trees, which divide the space into 3, it is difficult to see how the westernmost part of the space could be used for a house, leaving the central space between the trees, or the space to the east of the trees. The amount of space left either side for a residential dwelling, garage and garden is limited, and the proposals would likely take up almost all of the space available.
 - For context, the maximum width of the site is approximately just over 10m.
97. It is likely the dwelling would occupy a substantial portion of the site, disrupting the relationship between the Golden Lane Estate, the existing open space and Baltic Street West, the development could potentially sit just over 5m from the lower ground floor windows of Hatfield House.
98. The site was built as part of the Golden Lane Estate's original masterplan. The Estate's landscape and buildings were conceived as a unified composition, with the buildings arranged in a pattern of hard and rectilinear geometry, with public spaces at the centre of or wrapped around the periphery of each building. The public realm was designed as an open forecourt and communal garden which combined with the basements beneath Hatfield House and residential blocks create an urban landscape of varying levels, contributing to the Estate's distinctive spatial character (Golden Lane Conservation Area SPD).

99. Baltic Street West, around the application site, is characterised by 4-6 storey buildings, including Hatfield House of the Golden Lane Estate and the City of London Primary Academy, the proposal would be 1 storey, positioned closer to Baltic Street West than Hatfield House. It is likely that the proposals would negatively affect the composition of the street scene and would not form a positive relationship to the layout of buildings, building lines or building heights, generally, it is likely that the residential development would not appear contextual in terms of layout, form and scale. It is likely that introducing a single storey dwelling here would appear incongruous with the wider context of the area and impact the setting of the Grade II Listed Hatfield House, this is explained further in subsequent paragraphs. Furthermore, the proposals would lead to a loss of open space and public realm, as outlined in other sections of this report.
100. The site contains two mature London Plane trees, whose canopies and extensive root systems are integral to the local green infrastructure, providing habitat for wildlife, supporting biodiversity, and contributing to air quality and the visual amenity of Baltic Street West. It is unclear how the development would be set around these trees and avoid damage to them and safeguard their root systems, although given the likely footprint of a 1 storey dwelling and spatial constraints of the site, it is likely that the dwelling would encroach on the permeable area around the tree roots.
101. In addition, it would likely appear cramped on its limited plot and would intrude into the sense of space currently present.

Design and Public Realm Conclusion

102. The proposed dwelling would likely be visually incongruous with its surroundings, intruding into the geometrically arranged buildings and open space that defines the Golden Lane Estate and the setting of Hatfield House, its design and materials are unclear at this stage, however, assessment of the detailed design would take place at the subsequent technical stage if this application was approved, and is not therefore assessed here.
103. It is also likely that the proposals would also remove a significant proportion of the existing public realm and open space. It is likely there would be risk of damage to mature trees which provide environmental and visual amenity benefits.
104. The proposal would conflict with multiple planning policies. City of London Local Plan 2015 Policy DM10.1 requires development to respond to local context in terms of scale, form, materials, and building lines, ensuring it contributes positively to the character of the area. It is likely the proposal would not appropriately respond to local context; it would likely disrupt building lines and not be coherent with the urban grain.

105. The proposals would also conflict with Local Plan 2015 Policy DM10.4 – Environmental Enhancement - which encourages high-quality public realm improvements that enhance the character, appearance, and functionality of the City's streets and spaces. It is likely the proposals would represent the loss of public realm, specifically a space that forms a relationship with the Golden Lane Estate and it is likely it would harm the existing trees.
106. The proposals would conflict with emerging City Plan 2040 Policy S8 that prioritise buildings and spaces which have an appropriate scale, massing and built form for their Character Areas and optimises pedestrian movement and safe, attractive and permeable public spaces. It would also conflict with emerging City Plan 2040 Policies DE2 and DE3, which collectively focus on ensuring design quality and creating an exemplar, inclusive and accessible public realm, for the reasons set out above.
107. The proposals would also conflict with London Plan 2021 Policies D3 and D8. Policy D3 encourages delivering buildings and spaces that positively respond to local distinctiveness through their orientation, scale and layout, with due regard to existing and emerging street hierarchy, building types, forms and proportions, the proposals would not satisfy the 'form and layout' and the 'quality and character' subsections of the policy.

Heritage

Introduction

108. The site is in close proximity to Hatfield House which is a Grade II listed building, the Golden Lane Estate Registered Park and Gardens (Grade II), and the Barbican and Golden Lane Conservation Area. The application site is not listed, not within the Registered Park and Garden or within the Conservation Area, but it forms part of the northern periphery and setting of these assets. This small open space was built as part of the Golden Lane Estate, but the extent of these designations only runs up to the site boundary to the south. Nearby the application site to the southwest is Crescent House which also forms part of the Golden Lane Estate, Crescent House is individually listed at Grade II*.
109. The estate was built in phases between 1953 and 1962, with the first residents moving in during 1957. The public spaces including the landscaped courtyards, play areas were integral parts of the original masterplan and were constructed alongside the housing blocks during that period (1950s–early 1960s). The spaces were delivered using a consistent palette of materials and a unified design language including bollards, concrete paving, exposed aggregate finishes, brick edging, and brushed stainless-steel details that echoed the prevailing modernist aesthetic and robust materiality of the Golden Lane Estate as a whole. The existing site follows this aesthetic.

110. It is reasonable to conclude most of the plot would be occupied by the 1 storey dwelling, garage and gardens, and the development would significantly alter most of the existing open space, representing a change the composition of the of the street scene and urban grain as well as having an impact on the setting of the designated heritage assets listed above, more detail on this consideration has been outlined in the architecture and urban design section above.
111. No supporting information to assess and evaluate the significance of heritage assets and the degree of impact caused by the development has been submitted, nor is it required to be as part of the validation requirements for the permission in principle process at this stage. However, objections have been received from residents, Historic England and Islington Council, objecting to the proposals on design and heritage grounds.
112. It is necessary to assess the scheme based upon what is known about the proposals from the description of development. Given the information provided, the assessment below will be proportional and relevant to what is to be assessed at this stage. If this permission is approved, there would need to be subsequent applications where further assessment of the developments impact on designated heritage assets would take place.

Impact on Significance and Setting of Listed Buildings

Hatfield House, Golden Lane Estate (Grade II)

113. Hatfield House is a six-storey maisonette block, built in (1958 – 1961), designed by Chamberlain, Powell and Bon. It forms the northern boundary of the Golden Lane Estate. The block plays an important role in acting as intermediary between the earlier and later phases of the Estate. Hatfield House reflects the design ideals of Le Corbusier and more widely the Golden Lane Estate lays the foundation for many of the architectural concepts present in post-war housing. This expresses itself on a macro-level through the meticulously planned townscape and generous open landscape, the layout of the estate and the urban design principles it follows, and on a micro-level through the architectural design, detailing and layout of both the apartment blocks and the flats within them. More widely, the estate is an ensemble: a piece of architecture, urban design and townscape. The qualities of light, space, transparency, function and communality run through the architecture, design and heritage significance of the estate. Its significance is derived from architectural interest, historic interest and survival.
114. Hatfield House is noted for its pink brick crosswall construction with pink mortar, reinforced concrete floors and roof slabs, and concrete balconies. Hatfield House is clad with blue panels, some of opaque glass, that brings coherence and continuity with the architectural language of the rest of the Estate despite the diversity of buildings.

115. The basement flats are noted for having their own gardens, with the garden walls of pink brick continuing the lines of the main block. To the north of the block, a brick and concrete ramp serve the underground car park and Crescent House shops service road.

Setting

116. There are several aspects of setting relevant to this application that contribute to the significance of Hatfield House. This includes the observer's ability to appreciate:
- The 'masterplanned' orthogonal layout of the Golden Lane Estate and its positioning and layout both within the Golden Lane Estate and the wider urban grain and street pattern;
 - The buildings arrangement and relationship to the communal public spaces within and around the estate; and
 - The architectural design of each block and the apartments within them.
117. From the application site, to the north of Hatfield House, the Estate is experienced in conjunction with the existing public space. The relationship of the application site and Hatfield House is clearly intentional and reflects the wider grain of Chamberlain Powell and Bon's masterplan, particularly its orthogonal arrangement and the spaces which are created around the periphery. The application site frames Hatfield House with trees and openness.
118. The application site contains concrete pavers, bollards and ramps, which, while inherently unremarkable and functional, are visually coherent with the rest of the Golden Lane Estate, the space was built at a similar time to Hatfield House and it reads as an extension of the Golden Lane Estate.

Impact

119. It is likely that the development would result in most of the open space being occupied by the 1 storey dwelling, garage, and gardens, and this would likely erode the ability to appreciate Hatfield House's original placement within the Golden Lane masterplan when viewed from the north.
120. It is likely that in constructing this dwelling here, the landscape materials and features which are in tune with the Golden Lane Estate aesthetic would be lost, namely the concrete pavers and bollards, whilst not listed, they are characteristic of the wider aesthetic of the estate.
121. It is also likely that the proposal would also partially block views of the lower facades of Hatfield House and reduce the viewers ability to appreciate its architectural design.

122. Historic England have objected to the proposals and have recommended that they are refused or withdrawn, their objection regards the erosion of the physical architectural dominance of Hatfield House and the Golden Lane Estate, stating that the structure would clutter the foreground of Hatfield House, causing less than substantial harm. Similarly, officers consider that less than substantial harm to the significance of Hatfield House would likely be caused by the proposals.
123. Collectively, it is likely these impacts on setting and therefore significance of Hatfield House would result in a low level of less than substantial harm, drawing conflict with City of London Local Plan 2015 Policies CS12 and DM12.1, emerging City Plan 2040 Policies S11 and HE1, and London Plan 2021 Policy HC1.

Golden Lane Estate Registered Park and Garden (Grade II)

124. The intensely urban landscape at Golden Lane Estate by Chamberlin, Powell and Bon was designed and constructed between 1952 and 1962. Its significance is derived from design interest, historic interest and survival. At Golden Lane Estate, the spaces and the relationship between the blocks were designed as strong simple forms which were central to the overall layout and pattern of the Estate.
125. The external landscape was carefully designed by the architects around a series of courts, each with its own distinctive character. Some are more formally set out within defined boundaries of the residential blocks, using landscape elements such as planting, hard surfacing and water to create amenity spaces. In all the spaces, there is a coherence and reference to the limited palette of materials and colours, monumental spaces contrasted with smaller human scale elements and graphic aesthetic of the building elevations.
126. The design of the landscape at the Estate makes clever use of complex levels previously on the site, to create a series of intimate courtyards linked by pedestrian thoroughfares and features including pools, rotundas and roof gardens. The design of the landscape was deliberately formal and the layout of the blocks in the estate shapes the viewer's experience of a sequence of views which narrow and widen as they move through the series of courts. The landscape is set atop a podium, with steps, ramps and access to basement car parks highlight this design, the podium landscape is partly built above a underground car parks, this 3D arrangement of space represent the urban planning and architectural ideas of the time, which sought to make urban living attractive by providing high quality amenity space for residents, at a time when cities were grappling with the proliferation of the car.

Setting

127. From the application site, both the buildings and landscape of the estate are experienced in conjunction with the existing public space, although it is not part of the Registered Park and Gardens designation, the space reads as a continuation of the Golden Lane masterplan. The application site contains concrete pavers, bollards and ramps, which are visually coherent with the rest of the Golden Lane Estate and the Registered Park and Gardens.
128. The existing car park ramp, which sits to the rear of the space outside the site boundary, but within the Registered Park and Garden, is visible, although it is unclear that the space was deliberately designed to be flat and open up views of the ramp.

Impact

129. It is important to note that the application site was not included in the Registered Park and Garden at the time of designation, and the strong implication of this omission is that the application site was not at that time regarded as being an essential component of the GLE designed landscape. However, as set out in the section on Hatfield House, above, it clearly forms part of the original northern periphery of the GLE, characteristics of which it reflects.
130. It is likely that the development proposal would result in most of the open space being occupied by the 1 storey dwelling, garage, and garden. Because this would likely blur the original design intent for and relationship between Hatfield House and the application site, it would cause a slight erosion of the northern periphery of the masterplan as a whole. The likely effect of this would be a slight level of less than substantial harm to the significance, via setting, of the Registered Park and Garden.
131. In this way, the proposal would cause conflict with City of London Local Plan 2015 Policies CS12 (4), DM12.1 and DM12.5, emerging City Plan 2040 Policies S11 and HE1, and London Plan 2021 Policy HC1.

Barbican and Golden Lane Conservation Area

132. The significance of the Conservation Area is set out in the Barbican and Golden Lane Estates Conservation Area Appraisal 2022. The area is characterised by two distinct developments: Golden Lane Estate to the north and Barbican Estate to the south. The characteristics which contribute to the Character and Appearance of the Conservation Area are:
- Two estates which, together, provide a unique insight in the creative processes of a seminal English architectural practice, Chamberlin, Powell & Bon.

- In scope and extent, the estates are important visual evidence of the scale of devastation wrought by the WW2 'Blitz' bombing campaign of 1940-41.
- Seminal examples of ambitious post-war housing schemes incorporating radical, modern ideas of architecture and spatial planning reflecting the development of both Modernism and Brutalism
- Unprecedented and ingenious provision of open space and gardens within central London within a masterplanned residential development

Impact

133. The proposals are located outside of the Conservation Area, and therefore the impact assessment below relates to how the proposals would alter the setting of the Conservation Area. The City of London Conservation Area Advisory Committee (CAAC), have objected to the proposals, for the reason of the proposals impact to the relationship between the existing buildings and the existing the space itself. For the reasons given above in respect of Hatfield House and the Registered Park and Garden, the proposals would likely cause a slight level of harm to the significance, via setting, of the conservation area.
134. In this way, the proposal would likely cause conflict with City of London Local Plan 2015 Policies CS12 and DM12.1, emerging City Plan 2040 Policies S11 and HE1, and London Plan 2021 Policy HC1.

Heritage Assets in other boroughs

135. Islington Council have objected to the scheme based on the impact to the setting of the Hat and Feathers Conservation Area and to St Luke's Conservation Area. Islington have said this impact would be harmful, a view that CoL officers disagree with for the reasons set out below.

St Luke's Conservation Area (Islington)

136. The western extents of St Luke's Conservation Area stretches across the north of the site boundary and ends just to the west of the site. The buildings in the Conservation Area across the street are 5 Sycamore Street, a recently refurbished office building and 24-26 Baltic Street, both are fairly typical late 20th century office buildings. Neither are mentioned in Islington's St Luke's Conservation Area SPD as making a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the conservation area.

Character and appearance

137. The St Luke's Conservation Area Design Guide (2004), describes the character of the conservation area as a mix of residential, commercial, institutional and

residential uses. It is quite a broad designation, and includes a variety of historic buildings, a variety both in age and original use.

138. To the north of the site, beyond the two modern buildings adjacent to the site boundary, (5 Sycamore St and 24-26 Baltic Street that do not make a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the conservation area) is a collection of former industrial warehouses arranged in tight knit streets with a fine urban grain.

Impact

139. It is likely the impact to the conservation area would be experienced when looking away from it or along its southern boundary, past, or next to, two fairly non-descript commercial office buildings which do not positively contribute to its character and appearance.
140. Despite the Golden Lane Estate being located on the other side of Baltic Street to St Luke's, there is little relationship between the two conservation areas, despite both being historic.
141. It is likely the proposal for a 1 storey dwelling would not harm the setting of the conservation area, it is likely it would reduce the street width, but it is likely this would not be to an extent that would be harmful to the conservation area's setting.
142. The conservation area SPD mentions the use of appropriate materials, which is a level of detail that would be required at a subsequent stage from permission in principle, which may be harmful, but would be assessed in future if this permission in principle were approved and further details submitted.

Hat and Feathers Conservation Area (Islington)

143. The southernmost extents of the Hat and Feathers Conservation Area is to the west of the site.

Character and appearance

144. The Hat and Feathers Conservation Area Design Guide (2002), describes the character of the conservation area as a mix of residential, commercial, institutional and residential uses. Similar to St Luke's, it is quite a broad designation, and includes a variety of historic buildings, a variety both in age and original use.
145. The buildings in the Conservation Area to the west of the site are a c.1950s office building and a collection of commercial and formerly industrial buildings arranged in a tight urban block, where they face the application site, they are arranged around a small public space. Several buildings within the wider 'block'

are mentioned in the Hat and Feathers Conservation Area SPD as buildings that should be retained, they are historic and contribute to the character and appearance of the conservation area. They are set in a tight knit streets with a fine urban grain.

Impact

146. Again, a 1 storey residential building would be experienced when looking away from the conservation area along its southern boundary, given the siting and geometry of the conservation boundary. It is likely the dwelling would be in a position that would appear visually detached from the conservation area, with modern buildings positioned in between which would provide separation.
147. There is little historic relationship between the two conservation areas, their character and appearance are not directly linked.
148. It is likely the proposals would not harm the setting of the conservation area, its character, appearance and setting would be preserved by the proposals. The conservation area SPD mentions the use of appropriate materials, which is a level of detail that would be required at a subsequent stage from permission in principle.

Heritage Conclusion

149. The proposals would likely cause a low level of less than substantial harm, via setting, to the significance of Hatfield House, and slight levels of less than substantial harm to the Golden Lane Estate Registered Park and Garden and the Barbican and Golden Lane Conservation Area. The benefits and harms will be considered as part of the paragraph 215 NPPF balancing exercise, and in the final planning balance at the end of this report. Overall, in view of the heritage harm identified the proposal would draw conflict with Local Plan 2015 Policies CS12, DM12.1 and DM12.5, draft City Plan 2040 policies S11 and HE1, and London Plan HC1.
150. Special regard has been given to the desirability of preserving listed buildings, their setting and any features of special architectural or historic interest which they possess, under s.66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, as amended. Considerable importance and weight has been attached to and special attention has been paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of Barbican and Golden Lane Conservation Area under s.72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, as amended.

Impact on Trees

151. Policy G7 of the London Plan states that development proposals should ensure that, wherever possible, existing trees of value are retained. In addition, Local

Plan Policy CS19 states that, to encourage healthy lifestyles for all the City's communities through improved access to open space and facilities, increasing the amount and quality of open spaces and green infrastructure, while enhancing biodiversity, by protecting the amenity value of trees and retaining and planting more trees wherever practicable.

152. Policy OS5 of the emerging City Plan 2040 states that the City Corporation will seek to increase the number of trees and their overall canopy cover by:

1. Requiring the retention of existing mature and semi-mature trees and encouraging additional tree planting to be integrated into the design and layout of developments and public realm improvements where appropriate;
2. Protecting trees which are subject to Tree Preservation Orders (TPO) and designating new TPOs where necessary to protect trees of high amenity value;
3. Other than in exceptional circumstances, only permitting the removal of existing trees which are dead, dying or dangerous. Where trees are removed, requiring their replacement with trees that can attain an equivalent value;
4. Ensuring that existing trees located on or adjacent to development sites are considered during the planning process and are protected from damage during construction works;
5. Promoting tree planting to provide a diverse range of tree species, including large-canopy trees wherever practicable, especially in places that would contribute to the green routes set out in Figure 18; and
6. Ensuring tree species are consistent with the Climate Action Strategy and Biodiversity Action Plan (BAP), and promote habitats and forage for target species, especially pollinators.

153. The site is a small area that already contains two very large mature London plane trees and development of this type in such close proximity would not be acceptable in arboricultural terms. These trees are very prominent in the street, are of a very high amenity value and meet the criteria under BS5837 for category A trees of high quality. These are defined by BS 5837:2012 as category A, B and lesser category trees where these are considered by the local planning authority to be of importance to amenity and biodiversity.

154. The applicant has stated that the trees will be retained. However, no evidence or supporting arboricultural information has been provided to substantiate this claim. The City's Tree Officer has reviewed the application and does not consider it possible for any structures to be built on the site without significant encroachment and impacts on the root protection areas (RPAs) of these trees which occupy almost the entirety of the proposed site area. This could lead to

the damage or loss of the trees during construction, installation of utilities, and likely lead to increased pressure post development for pruning to the trees for reasons such as leaf fall and shading.

155. These two trees are of very high amenity value and the loss of, or damage to, the trees would have an unacceptable impact on the setting of the Grade II Listed Hatfield House, the Barbican and Golden Lane Estate Conservation Area and the wider street scene, including the London Borough of Islington and its designated heritage assets to the north.
156. Thus, without evidence to the contrary, the proposed development would have an unacceptable impact upon these two trees, contrary to Policy G7 of the London Plan 2021, Policy CS19 of the Local Plan 2015, and Policy OS5 of the emerging City Plan 2040, and is therefore unacceptable in principle.

Highways Impact

157. Policy DM16.1 of the Local Plan 2015 states that development proposals that are likely to have effects on transport must be accompanied by an assessment of the transport implications during both construction and operation, in particular addressing impacts on: road dangers; pedestrian environment and movement; cycling infrastructure provision; public transport; and the street network.
158. Strategic Policy S9 of the emerging City Plan 2040 states that the City's transport infrastructure will be maintained and improved by minimising road danger and congestion, and reducing vehicle emissions by:
- a. Not providing any additional on-street car and motorcycle parking;
 - b. Identifying opportunities to use on-street parking reductions and restrictions to discourage private vehicle use;
 - c. Designing and managing streets in accordance with the City of London street hierarchy;
 - d. Minimising the impact of freight and servicing trips through such measures as the provision of on-site servicing facilities, the timing of deliveries outside peak hours, the adoption of area-wide solutions, freight consolidation and promoting deliveries by foot or bicycle;
 - e. Facilitating essential traffic, including emergency service vehicles, buses, freight and private transport for people with particular access needs, whilst minimising the environmental impact of these modes;
 - f. Requiring the provision of infrastructure for alternative-fuel vehicles and zero emissions vehicles, such as off-street vehicle charging points;
 - g. Using traffic management measures and street works permits to improve journey time reliability on the City's roads; and
 - h. Requiring developers to demonstrate, through Transport Assessments, Construction Logistics Plans, Travel Plans, Cycling Promotion Plans and Delivery and Servicing Plans, how the environmental impacts and road danger

of travel and servicing will be minimised as a result of their development, promoting best practice such as direct vision standards, and zero vision policies to minimise danger of travel and servicing, including through the use of river transport.

159. In addition, Strategic Policy S10 of the emerging City Plan 2040 states that the City Corporation will work with partners to improve the quality and permeability of the City's streets and spaces in ways that enhance inclusion and accessibility, put the needs of people walking and wheeling first when designing and managing our streets, and enable more people to choose to cycle in the City by improving conditions for safe, convenient, comfortable, inclusive and accessible walking, wheeling and cycling, incorporating climate change adaptation.
160. Baltic Lane West is adopted City of London highway and comprises a single-carriageway cul-de-sac route, with pedestrian and cycle access only through to Baltic Lane East. There are two on-street Blue Badge parking bays located on south side of Baltic Street West to the north of the site. The western end of the site abuts the existing ramped access (with barrier gate control) to the Golden Lane Estate underground service road and car park. The site is also a designated pedestrian footway and forms part of the pedestrian access route to Hatfield House from Baltic Street West.
161. The City's Transport Officers have raised concerns that the development could have an adverse impact on existing access arrangements to Hatfield House. They also raised concern that the proposal could adversely impact on emergency access arrangements in relation to both Hatfield House and the adjacent Primary Academy.
162. The City's Transport Officers also raised concerns regarding the significant pedestrian and cycle movements expected on Baltic Street West, given this school presence and the impact of construction. However, construction logistics is not a matter which constitutes the principle of development and would need to be considered at the subsequent technical details stage were the application to be granted approval.
163. In addition, there are a row of Sheffield Cycle Stands which are located on the site. However, the replacement of these could be secured as part of the technical details stage were the application to be granted approval.
164. By reason of the site's location abutting the car park vehicular access ramp, and junction between this ramp and Baltic Street West in immediate proximity, its designation as footway, it is considered very likely that the development of this site for the purposes of a single storey dwelling, garage and gardens would have an unacceptable impact with regard to road dangers, and the pedestrian environment. This is because the development of this piece of land, which is

currently open space, would likely have adverse impact upon sightlines and visibility for vehicles entering the car park access ramp and for pedestrians crossing the vehicle access ramp to access Hatfield House. The proposal would represent a significant change in a tight location due to differing access requirements given the residential and school context.

165. Thus, the proposed development would be contrary to Policy DM16.1 of the Local Plan 2015 and emerging Policies S9 and S10 of the City Plan 2040.

Other Matters

Provision of Self-Build Housing

166. Policy H2 (A) of the London Plan 2021 states that boroughs should pro-actively support well-designed new homes on small sites (below 0.25 hectares in size) through both planning decisions and plan-making in order to support those wishing to bring forward custom, self-build and community led housing. In addition, Policy HS8 of the Emerging City Plan states that the City Corporation will encourage the provision of self and custom build units within large residential schemes.
167. Given that this is an application for self-build, regard has been given to the register and 'duty to grant permission' as set out in the Custom and Self Build Act 2015. The City is required to maintain a self-build and custom housebuilding register under Section 1 of this Act and it must have regard to such register (Section 2). Section 2A states that relevant authorities must give suitable development permission to enough suitable serviced plots of land to meet the demand for self-build and custom housebuilding in their area. Demand is assessed with reference to the number of entries and those added on the register during each base period (year starting 31 October).
168. The City have three years to permission 'plots' from the year in which any individual has formally registered. This means that the demand identified by the first entrants in 2016 should have been provided for by 30 October 2019. Having reviewed all residential permissions over this period, there are none which can be considered as new self-build on a plot, and therefore, as of 30 October 2019 the City had a backlog of 6, rising to a backlog of 16 (or 12 depending on the methodology used) as at 30 October 2024.
169. Although the demand for self-build housing has not been met within the City, the application site is not considered to be a "suitable serviced plot" for this purpose. This is for the reasons stated in this report including the loss of open space, impact on urban grain and heritage, and highways impact. This is reflective of the wider situation within the City of London, in which there are a very limited number of vacant plots or undeveloped land, and the fact that the primary function of this City is for business purposes.

170. As is stated in the supporting text for emerging Policy HS8, there are no large areas of unused land in the City of London that would provide an opportunity to create serviced building plots. Furthermore, self-build and custom-build are likely to involve lower density development, which would conflict with policies in the Plan which seek to maximise housing supply. Given these constraints, the City Corporation considers that the best prospect for bringing forward suitable land will be in conjunction with large housing developments.
171. Nonetheless, it is considered that the proposed new dwelling would fail to meet the requirements of Local Plan Policies CS21 and DM21.1. Furthermore, the City has demonstrated its ability exceed its housing supply and small sites target. Although the demand for self-build housing has not been met within the City, the application site is not considered to be suitable for this purpose, and furthermore, the benefit of the provision of one single self-build dwelling would not outweigh the harm as otherwise identified in this report.

Assessment of Public Benefits and Paragraph 215 NPPF balancing exercise

172. Under sections 66 and 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, in considering whether to grant planning permission for, development which affects a listed building or its setting, the City Corporation shall have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building/s or its/their settings or any features of special architectural or historic interest which they possess, or, for development which affects a conservation area, special attention should be paid by the City Corporation to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character and appearance of that area.
173. When considering the impact of a proposal on the significance of designated heritage assets, decision makers are required to give great weight to their conservation (and the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be), and to be satisfied any harm is clearly and convincingly justified (NPPF paragraphs 212 and 213).
174. The proposal would likely result in less than substantial harm to the significance of Hatfield House and slight levels of harm to the Golden Lane Estate Registered Park and Garden and Barbican and Golden Lane Conservation Area.
175. Given that the proposal would likely result in less than substantial harm there is a strong presumption against the grant of planning permission. Notwithstanding, that presumption is capable of being rebutted via wider public benefits. Paragraph 215 of the NPPF, which states *'where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed*

against the public benefits of the proposal, including where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use’.

176. Within the statutory process and under NPPF policy the decision-maker must adopt a sensible approach to assessing likely harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset and weighing that harm against the benefits. The decision maker does not have to go about balancing harm against benefits in a particular way.
177. The National Planning Practice Guidance states that “*public benefits...could be anything that delivers economic, social or environmental objectives as described in the National Planning Policy Framework. Public benefits should flow from the proposed development. They should be of a nature or scale to be of benefit to the public at large and should not just be a private benefit. However, benefits do not always have to be visible or accessible to the public in order to be genuine public benefits*”.
178. The provision of a single dwelling with garage and gardens would provide an additional unit to the City’s housing stock and would also provide a plot for self-build housing within the City. Given the fact this is only one single dwelling, this would be an economic benefit of low weighting. However, it is considered that the loss of public open space to facilitate the provision of a single dwelling would negate any social benefit provided by said dwellinghouse. Furthermore, the proposed loss of open space and potential harm to the mature trees for the purposes of providing a single dwelling is not considered to be of any measurable environmental benefit.
179. Thus, the only tangible public benefit of the proposal is considered to be the economic benefit of the provision of a single dwelling to the City’s housing stock and provision of a self-build housing unit.
180. In carrying out the paragraph 215 NPPF balancing exercise, considerable importance must be given to the desirability of preserving listed buildings and their settings, great weight is attached to the significance of these assets of national importance. The proposals would likely result in a low level of less than substantial harm to the significance of Hatfield House and slight levels of harm to the Golden Lane Estate Registered Park and Garden and Barbican and Golden Lane Conservation Area.
181. Officers consider that the small public benefit of a single self-build dwelling house being provided, giving great weight to the likely heritage harm, would fail to outweigh the heritage harm identified. On the basis there is no clear and convincing justification for the harm identified, the presumption against granting planning permission is applied and the outcome of the paragraph 215 NPPF heritage balance falls against the proposed development.

Public Sector Equalities Duty

182. When considering proposed development, the Public Sector Equality Duty requires the City of London Corporation to consider how the determination of the application will affect people who are protected under the Equality Act 2010, including having due regard to the effects of the proposed development and any potential disadvantages suffered by people because of their protected characteristics.
183. Under the Act, a public authority must, in the exercise of its functions, have due regard to the need to:
- Eliminate discrimination, harassment and victimisation and any other conduct that is prohibited by or under this Act.
 - Advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it.
 - Foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it.
184. The relevant protected characteristics are age, disability, gender reassignment, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion or belief, sex and sexual orientation.
185. Public authorities also need to have due regard to the need to eliminate unlawful discrimination against someone because of their marriage or civil partnership status.
186. It is the view of officers that a decision to refuse permission would not disadvantage those who are protected under the Equality Act 2010. On the contrary, it is considered that the loss of open space would reduce the amount of open space in the vicinity for use by the general public, which includes people of protected characteristics, especially children (age) given the sites close proximity to the City of London Primary Academy and its use as an egress space and waiting area for school pick-ups.

Human Rights Act 1998

187. It is unlawful for the City, as a public authority, to act in a way which is incompatible with a Convention Right (being rights set out in the European Convention on Human Rights ("ECHR")).
188. It is the view of officers that there would be no infringement of the ECHR as a result of this recommendation.

Conclusion

189. The proposal has been assessed in accordance with the relevant statutory duties and having regard to the Development Plan and other relevant policies and guidance, SPDs and SPGs and relevant advice including the NPPF, the London Plan, the emerging City Plan 2040 and considering all other material considerations.
190. When taking the development plan as a whole, the proposal is considered to be contrary to the provisions of the Development Plan. As Local Planning Authority the application must be determined in accordance with the Development Plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. Officers do not consider that there are material considerations which would indicate that the application should be determined other than in accordance with the Development Plan. It is also considered that the small public benefit of an additional dwelling for the City's housing stock and a self-build housing plot does not outweigh the harm as outlined in the body of this report.
191. As such, the proposal is recommended to be refused for the reasons as follows:
1. The proposed land use of the site as a private residential dwelling with a parking garage would be unacceptable in principle as it would result in the loss of public open space and would fail to be car free contrary to: Policies G4 and T6.1 of The London Plan 2021; Policies CS19, DM16.2 and DM16.5 of the Local Plan 2015; and Policies S14, OS1 and VT3 of the emerging City Plan 2040.
 2. The proposed location and amount of development would be unacceptable in principle as it would likely: have an unacceptable impact on the character and appearance of the area by failing to respect the urban grain, layout, scale and building lines of the existing street scene; cause less than substantial harm to the Grade II Listed Hatfield House and slight levels of harm to the Golden Lane Estate Registered Park and Garden and Barbican and Golden Lane Conservation Area which is not outweighed by the public benefits of the proposals; have an unacceptable impact upon the health and longevity of the two mature trees which occupy the site; have a unacceptable impact with regard to road dangers and the pedestrian environment; and result in poor residential amenity to the existing dwellings on the lower floors of Hatfield House and to the proposed dwelling; contrary to: Policies D3, G7 and HC1 of The London Plan 2021; Policies CS10, CS12, CS19, CS21 DM10.1, DM12.1, DM12.5, DM16.1 and DM21.1 of the Local Plan 2015; and Policies S3, S8, S9, S10, S11, DE2, DE3, HS1, OS5, and HE1 of the emerging City Plan 2040.

Background Papers

Application Documents

Received 10th July 2025

- Completed Application Form, prepared by Mr Iain Meek
- DWG 100B Rev B 22.12.2015

Internal Consultations

- Memo, City Gardens, 18 July 2025
- Email, Cleansing, 20 July 2025
- Email, Highways, 04 September 2025
- Email, Highways, 29 September 2025

External Consultations

- Email, Historic England – GLAAS, 24 July 2025
- Letter, Historic England, 01 August 2025
- Letter, CAAC, 04 August 2025
- Email, Golden Lane Residents Association, 11 August 2025
- Letter, Islington Borough Council, 19 August 2025

Representations

- Objection, David Butcher, 23 July 2025
- Objection, Roland Jeffrey, 28 July 2025
- Objection, Noreen Kay, 29 July 2025
- Objection, El Perry, 30 July 2025
- Objection, Alex Mosey, 31 July 2025
- Support, Iain Meek, 03 August 2025
- Objection, NAME REDACTED, 04 August 2025
- Objection, Paul Drinkwater, 04 August 2025
- Objection, Sarah Batty-Smith, 04 August 2025
- Objection, Raymond Hamilton, 04 August 2025
- Objection, Pablo Abellan, 05 August 2025
- Objection, Andrew Gault, 11 August 2025
- Objection, N Deakin, 13 August 2025

Other

- Clerkenwell Green (CA01), Charterhouse Square (CA09), Hat and Feathers (CA26) Conservation Area Design Guidelines January 2002.
- St Luke's (CA16) Conservation Area Design Guidelines February 2004
- London Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment 2017
- City of London LD28 Housing Delivery and Trajectory Note

Appendix A

London Plan Policies:

- GG2 Making the best use of land
- GG4 Delivering the homes Londoners need
- Policy SD5 Offices, other strategic functions and residential development in the CAZ

- Policy D1 London's form, character and capacity for growth
- Policy D3 Optimising site capacity through the design-led approach
- Policy D8 Public realm
- Policy D12 Fire safety
- Policy H1 Increasing housing supply
- Policy H2 Small sites
- Policy HC1 Heritage conservation and growth
- Policy G4 Open space
- Policy G6 Biodiversity and access to nature
- Policy G7 Trees and woodlands
- Policy T1 Strategic approach to transport
- Policy T5 Cycling
- Policy T6 Car parking
- Policy T6.1 Residential parking

Emerging City Plan 2040 Policies:

- Strategic Policy S3: Housing
- Policy HS1: Location of New Housing
- Policy HS8: Self and custom housebuilding
- Policy IN1: Infrastructure provision and connection
- Strategic Policy S8: Design
- Policy DE2: Design Quality
- Policy DE3: Public Realm
- Policy VT3: Vehicle Parking
- Strategic Policy S9: Transport and Servicing
- Strategic Policy S10: Active Travel and Healthy Streets
- Policy AT1: Pedestrian Movement, Permeability and Wayfinding
- Strategic Policy S11: Historic Environment
- Policy HE1: Managing Change to the Historic Environment
- Strategic Policy S14: Open Spaces and Green Infrastructure
- Policy OS1: Protection and provision of open spaces
- Policy OS3: Biodiversity
- Policy OS5: Trees
- Strategic Policy S23: Smithfield and Barbican

Relevant City Corporation Guidance and Supplementary Planning Documents (SPDs):

- Barbican and Golden Lane Conservation Area Supplementary Planning Document 1 February 2022
- The City of London Open Space Strategy Supplementary Planning Document 2015
- Golden Lane Listed Building Management Guidelines Updated Edition 2013 September 2013

Relevant Local Plan 2015 Policies:

Core Strategic Policy CS5: The North of the City

To ensure that the City benefits from the substantial public transport improvements planned in the north of the City, realising the potential for rejuvenation and “eco design” to complement the sustainable transport infrastructure, by:

1. Ensuring that disruption to the City is minimised during construction of Crossrail and requiring the restoration of worksites to deliver enhancement of biodiversity, heritage assets and the public realm, open space provision and integration with other transport modes.
2. Implementing proposals for the rejuvenation of Farringdon, Moorgate and Holborn jointly with neighbouring boroughs in the Farringdon / Smithfield Area for Intensification, taking account of urban design studies, conservation area management strategies and area enhancement strategies.
3. Requiring improvements to pedestrian and cycle routes to maintain safe, effective and efficient pedestrian and cycle flows, including for disabled people, within and through the north of the City.
4. Ensuring the retention and improvement of pedestrian permeability and connectivity, at ground and high walk level through large sites such as Smithfield Market, Barbican, Golden Lane and Broadgate, whilst preserving privacy, security and noise abatement for residents and businesses.
5. Identifying and meeting residents’ needs in the north of the City, including protection of residential amenity, community facilities and open space.
6. Safeguarding the Citigen combined cooling heating and power (CCHP) network and ensuring that, where feasible, all new development is designed to enable connection to the CCHP network.
7. Requiring the incorporation of sustainable drainage solutions (SuDS), such as green roofs, into development.
8. Requiring developers to make use of innovative design solutions to mitigate and adapt to the impacts of climate change, particularly addressing the challenges posed by heritage assets whilst respecting their architectural and historic significance.
9. Further enhancing the distinctive character of the Smithfield area by retaining a range of buildings suitable for accommodating a mix of uses, whilst recognising the particular challenges arising from the 24 hour character of the area.
10. Recognising and supporting the continued presence of both Smithfield Market and St Bartholomew’s Hospital.
11. Promoting the further improvement of the Barbican area as a cultural quarter of London-wide, national and international significance.

Core Strategic Policy CS10: Design

To promote a high standard of design and sustainable buildings, streets and spaces, having regard to their surroundings and the historic and local character of the City and creating an inclusive and attractive environment, by:

1. Ensuring that the bulk, height, scale, massing, quality of materials and detailed design of buildings are appropriate to the character of the City and the setting and amenities of surrounding buildings and spaces.
2. Encouraging design solutions that make effective use of limited land resources.
3. Ensuring that development has an appropriate street level presence and roofscape and a positive relationship to neighbouring buildings and spaces.
4. Requiring the design and management of buildings, streets and spaces to provide for the access needs of all the City's communities, including the particular needs of disabled people.
5. Ensuring that new development respects and maintains the City's characteristic network of streets and alleyways.
6. Delivering improvement in the environment, amenities and enjoyment of open spaces, play areas, streets, lanes and alleys through schemes in accordance with public realm enhancement strategies.
7. Ensuring that signs and advertisements respect the restrained character of the City.

Policy DM10.1 New development

To require all developments, including alterations and extensions to existing buildings, to be of a high standard of design and to avoid harm to the townscape and public realm, by ensuring that:

- the bulk and massing of schemes are appropriate in relation to their surroundings and have due regard to the general scale, height, building lines, character, historic interest and significance, urban grain and materials of the locality and relate well to the character of streets, squares, lanes, alleys and passageways;
- all development is of a high standard of design and architectural detail with elevations that have an appropriate depth and quality of modelling;
- appropriate, high quality and durable materials are used;
- the design and materials avoid unacceptable wind impacts at street level or intrusive solar glare impacts on the surrounding townscape and public realm;
- development has attractive and visually interesting street level elevations, providing active frontages wherever possible to maintain or enhance the vitality of the City's streets;
- the design of the roof is visually integrated into the overall design of the building when seen from both street level views and higher level viewpoints;

- plant and building services equipment are fully screened from view and integrated in to the design of the building. Installations that would adversely affect the character, appearance or amenities of the buildings or area will be resisted;
- servicing entrances are designed to minimise their effects on the appearance of the building and street scene and are fully integrated into the building's design; · there is provision of appropriate hard and soft landscaping, including appropriate boundary treatments;
- the external illumination of buildings is carefully designed to ensure visual sensitivity, minimal energy use and light pollution, and the discreet integration of light fittings into the building design;
- there is provision of amenity space, where appropriate;
- there is the highest standard of accessible and inclusive design.

Policy DM 10.4 Environmental enhancement

The City Corporation will work in partnership with developers, Transport for London and other organisations to design and implement schemes for the enhancement of highways, the public realm and other spaces. Enhancement schemes should be of a high standard of design, sustainability, surface treatment and landscaping, having regard to:

- the predominant use of the space, surrounding buildings and adjacent spaces;
- connections between spaces and the provision of pleasant walking routes;
- the use of natural materials, avoiding an excessive range and harmonising with the surroundings of the scheme and materials used throughout the City;
- the inclusion of trees and soft landscaping and the promotion of biodiversity, where feasible linking up existing green spaces and routes to provide green corridors;
- the City's heritage, retaining and identifying features that contribute positively to the character and appearance of the City;
- sustainable drainage, where feasible, co-ordinating the design with adjacent buildings in order to implement rainwater recycling;
- the need to provide accessible and inclusive design, ensuring that streets and walkways remain uncluttered;
- the need for pedestrian priority and enhanced permeability, minimising the conflict between pedestrians and cyclists;
- the need to resist the loss of routes and spaces that enhance the City's function, character and historic interest;
- the use of high quality street furniture to enhance and delineate the public realm;
- lighting which should be sensitively co-ordinated with the design of the scheme.

Core Strategic Policy CS12: Historic Environment

To conserve or enhance the significance of the City's heritage assets and their settings, and provide an attractive environment for the City's communities and visitors, by:

1. Safeguarding the City's listed buildings and their settings, while allowing appropriate adaptation and new uses.
2. Preserving and enhancing the distinctive character and appearance of the City's conservation areas, while allowing sympathetic development within them.
3. Protecting and promoting the evaluation and assessment of the City's ancient monuments and archaeological remains and their settings, including the interpretation and publication of results of archaeological investigations.
4. Safeguarding the character and setting of the City's gardens of special historic interest.
5. Preserving and, where appropriate, seeking to enhance the Outstanding Universal Value, architectural and historic significance, authenticity and integrity of the Tower of London World Heritage Site and its local setting.

Policy DM12.1 Managing change affecting all heritage assets and spaces

1. To sustain and enhance heritage assets, their settings and significance.
2. Development proposals, including proposals for telecommunications infrastructure, that have an effect upon heritage assets, including their settings, should be accompanied by supporting information to assess and evaluate the significance of heritage assets and the degree of impact caused by the development.
3. The loss of routes and spaces that contribute to the character and historic interest of the City will be resisted.
4. Development will be required to respect the significance, character, scale and amenities of surrounding heritage assets and spaces and their settings.
5. Proposals for sustainable development, including the incorporation of climate change adaptation measures, must be sensitive to heritage assets.

Policy DM12.5 Historic parks and gardens

1. To resist development which would adversely affect gardens of special historic interest included on the Historic England register.
2. To protect gardens and open spaces which make a positive contribution to the historic character of the City.

Policy DM16.1 Transport impacts of development

1. Development proposals that are likely to have effects on transport must be accompanied by an assessment of the transport implications during both construction and operation, in particular addressing impacts on:
 - road dangers;

- pedestrian environment and movement;
- cycling infrastructure provision;
- public transport;
- the street network.

2. Transport Assessments and Travel Plans should be used to demonstrate adherence to the City Corporation's transportation standards.

Policy DM16.2 Pedestrian movement

1. Pedestrian movement must be facilitated by provision of suitable pedestrian routes through and around new developments, by maintaining pedestrian routes at ground level, and the upper level walkway network around the Barbican and London Wall.

2. The loss of a pedestrian route will normally only be permitted where an alternative public pedestrian route of at least an equivalent standard is provided having regard to:

- the extent to which the route provides for current and all reasonably foreseeable future demands placed upon it, including at peak periods;
- the shortest practicable routes between relevant points.

3. Routes of historic importance should be safeguarded as part of the City's characteristic pattern of lanes, alleys and courts, including the route's historic alignment and width.

4. The replacement of a route over which pedestrians have rights, with one to which the public have access only with permission will not normally be acceptable.

5. Public access across private land will be encouraged where it enhances the connectivity, legibility and capacity of the City's street network. Spaces should be designed so that signage is not necessary and it is clear to the public that access is allowed.

6. The creation of new pedestrian rights of way will be encouraged where this would improve movement and contribute to the character of an area, taking into consideration pedestrian routes and movement in neighbouring areas and boroughs, where relevant.

Policy DM16.5 Parking and servicing standards

1. Developments in the City should be car-free except for designated Blue Badge spaces. Where other car parking is exceptionally provided it must not exceed London Plan's standards.

2. Designated parking must be provided for Blue Badge holders within developments in conformity with London Plan requirements and must be marked out and reserved at all times for their use. Disabled parking spaces must be at least 2.4m wide and at

least 4.8m long and with reserved areas at least 1.2m wide, marked out between the parking spaces and at the rear of the parking spaces.

3. Except for dwelling houses (use class C3), whenever any car parking spaces (other than designated Blue Badge parking) are provided, motor cycle parking must be provided at a ratio of 10 motor cycle parking spaces per 1 car parking space. At least 50% of motor cycle parking spaces must be at least 2.3m long and at least 0.9m wide and all motor cycle parking spaces must be at least 2.0m long and at least 0.8m wide.

4. On site servicing areas should be provided to allow all goods and refuse collection vehicles likely to service the development at the same time to be conveniently loaded and unloaded. Such servicing areas should provide sufficient space or facilities for all vehicles to enter and exit the site in a forward gear. Headroom of at least 5m where skips are to be lifted and 4.75m for all other vehicle circulation areas should be provided.

5. Coach parking facilities for hotels (use class C1) will not be permitted.

6. All off-street car parking spaces and servicing areas must be equipped with the facility to conveniently recharge electric vehicles.

7. Taxi ranks are encouraged at key locations, such as stations, hotels and shopping centres. The provision of taxi ranks should be designed to occupy the minimum practicable space, using a combined entry and exit point to avoid obstruction to other transport modes.

Core Strategic Policy CS19: Open Spaces and Recreation

To encourage healthy lifestyles for all the City's communities through improved access to open space and facilities, increasing the amount and quality of open spaces and green infrastructure, while enhancing biodiversity, by:

1. Seeking to maintain a ratio of at least 0.06 hectares of high quality, publicly accessible open space per 1,000 weekday daytime population:

(i) protecting existing open space, particularly that of historic interest, or ensuring that it is replaced on redevelopment by space of equal or improved quantity and quality on or near the site;

(ii) securing public access, where possible, to existing private spaces;

(iii) securing additional publicly accessible open space and pedestrian routes, where practical, particularly in the eastern part of the City;

(iv) creating additional civic spaces from underused highways and other land where this would not conflict with other strategic objectives;

v) encouraging high quality green roofs, roof gardens and terraces, particularly those which are publicly accessible, subject to the impact on the amenity of adjacent occupiers.

2. Improving access to new and existing open spaces, including those in neighbouring boroughs, promoting public transport access to nearby open space outside the City and ensuring that open spaces meet the needs of all of the City's communities.
3. Increasing the biodiversity value of open spaces, paying particular attention to sites of importance for nature conservation such as the River Thames. Protecting the amenity value of trees and retaining and planting more trees wherever practicable.
4. Improving inclusion and access to affordable sport, play and recreation, protecting and enhancing existing facilities and encouraging the provision of further facilities within major developments.

Core Strategic Policy CS21: Housing

To protect existing housing and amenity and provide additional housing in the City, concentrated in or near identified residential areas, as shown in Figure X, to meet the City's needs, securing suitable, accessible and affordable housing and supported housing, by:

1. Exceeding the London Plan's minimum annual requirement of 110 additional residential units in the City up to 2026:
 - (i) guiding new housing development to and near identified residential areas;
 - (ii) protecting existing housing;
 - (iii) refusing new housing where it would prejudice the primary business function of the City or be contrary to Policy DM 1.1;
 - (iv) exceptionally, allowing the loss of isolated residential units where there is a poor level of amenity.
2. Ensuring sufficient affordable housing is provided to meet the City's housing need and contributing to London's wider housing needs by requiring residential developments with the potential for 10 or more units to:
 - (i) provide 30% affordable housing on-site;
 - (ii) exceptionally, provide 60% of affordable housing off-site, or equivalent cash-in-lieu, if a viability study demonstrates to the City Corporation's satisfaction that on-site provision is not viable. These targets should be applied flexibly, taking account of individual site and scheme viability;
 - (iii) provide 60% of affordable units as social/affordable rented housing and 40% as intermediate housing, including key worker housing.
3. Providing affordable housing off-site, including the purchase of existing residential properties on the open market to meet identified housing needs, such as large units for families.

4. Requiring all new and, where possible, converted residential units to meet Lifetime Homes standards and 10% of all new units to meet Wheelchair Housing Standards (or be easily adaptable to meet these standards).

Policy DM21.1 Location of new housing

1. New housing should be located on suitable sites in or near identified residential areas. Within these areas a mix of appropriate residential and commercial uses will be permitted.

2. New housing will only be permitted where development would not:

- prejudice the primary business function of the City;
- be contrary to policy DM 1.1;
- inhibit the development potential or business activity in neighbouring commercial buildings and sites; and
- result in poor residential amenity within existing and proposed development, including excessive noise or disturbance.

Appendix B

Schedule

Application: 25/00905/PIP

Site Address: Baltic Street West, London, EC1Y 0ST

Description of Development: Application for Permission in Principle for the erection a self-build single storey dwelling with detached single storey garage and gardens on the existing paved pedestrian open space with 2no mature trees to be retained.

Refusal Reason(s)

1	Land Use The proposed land use of the site as a private residential dwelling with a parking garage and garden would be unacceptable in principle as it would result in the loss of public open space and would fail to be car free contrary to: Policies G4 and T6.1 of The London Plan 2021; Policies CS19, DM16.2 and DM16.5 of the Local Plan 2015; and Policies S14, OS1 and VT3 of the emerging City Plan 2040.
2	Location and Amount of Development The proposed location and amount of development would be unacceptable in principle as it would likely: have an unacceptable impact on the character


	<p>and appearance of the area by failing to respect the urban grain, layout, scale and building lines of the existing street scene; cause less than substantial harm to the Grade II Listed Hatfield House and slight levels of harm to the Golden Lane Estate Registered Park and Garden and Barbican and Golden Lane Conservation Area which cannot be outweighed by the public benefits of the proposals; have an unacceptable impact upon the health and longevity of the two mature trees which occupy the site; have a unacceptable impact with regard to road dangers and the pedestrian environment; and result in poor residential amenity to the existing dwellings on the lower floors of Hatfield House and to the proposed dwelling; contrary to: Policies D3, G7 and HC1 of The London Plan 2021; and Policies CS10, CS12, CS19, CS21, DM10.1, DM12.1, DM12.5, DM16.1 and DM21.1 of the Local Plan 2015; and Policies S3, S8, S9, S10, S11, DE2, DE3, HS1, OS5, and HE1 of the emerging City Plan 2040.</p>
--	---

Informatives

1	<p>NPPF</p> <p>In dealing with this application the City has implemented the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework to work with the applicant in a positive and proactive manner based on seeking solutions to problems arising in dealing with planning applications in the following ways:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - detailed advice in the form of statutory policies in the Local Plan, Supplementary Planning documents, and other written guidance has been made available; - a full pre application advice service has been offered; and - where appropriate the City has been available to provide guidance on how outstanding planning concerns may be addressed. <p>However, notwithstanding the above, it has not been possible to achieve solutions to the problems as the proposals are contrary to planning policies, do not demonstrate other over-riding material considerations, and negotiations could not overcome the problems.</p>
----------	---

Appendix C

Submitted Site Plan



MEEK ASSOCIATES
architect.designers.illustrator
www.meek.demon.co.uk
50 Hatfield House
London EC1Y 0ST
07960 173 903

Baltic Street West House
London EC1Y 0ST
date 09.07.2015
scale 1:500
site plan

dwg 100B

revA 22.12.2015 corrected to
match OS map
revB 22.12.2015 corrected to match
site survey

Comments for Planning Application 25/00905/PIP

Application Summary

Application Number: 25/00905/PIP

Address: Baltic Street West London EC1Y 0ST

Proposal: Application for Permission in Principle for the erection a self-build single storey dwelling with detached single storey garage and gardens on the existing paved pedestrian open space with 2no mature trees to be retained.

Case Officer: John Grierson

Customer Details

Name: Mr David Butcher

Address: Flat 61 Hatfield house Golden Lane Estate London

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Other

Comment:

The site is part of the listed Golden Lane Estate. A building on this site would not be in keeping with GLE.

The property would be a few yards from Hatfield house and would possibly impact the amount of light that an already north facing building gets

There is already significant traffic on the street servicing the school and GLE therefore a n additional garage would add to congestion.

Comments for Planning Application 25/00905/PIP

Application Summary

Application Number: 25/00905/PIP

Address: Baltic Street West London EC1Y 0ST

Proposal: Application for Permission in Principle for the erection a self-build single storey dwelling with detached single storey garage and gardens on the existing paved pedestrian open space with 2no mature trees to be retained.

Case Officer: John Grierson

Customer Details

Name: Mr Roland Jeffery

Address: 209 Crescent House Golden Lane Estate London

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Other
- Residential Amenity

Comment:I am surprised this application has been registered as it appears to lack all the necessary detail for it to be properly considered and determined. I would oppose any development on this site as doing severe harm to the setting Grade II and Grade II* listed buildings immediately adjacent to the application site; and on the basis of likely damage, both during constuction and afterwards, to the two mature plane trees on the site. I am not aware that the applicant owns this site or is likely to be able to acquire it, so there is negligable likelihood of a scheme here being realised.

Comments for Planning Application 25/00905/PIP

Application Summary

Application Number: 25/00905/PIP

Address: Baltic Street West London EC1Y 0ST

Proposal: Application for Permission in Principle for the erection a self-build single storey dwelling with detached single storey garage and gardens on the existing paved pedestrian open space with 2no mature trees to be retained.

Case Officer: John Grierson

Customer Details

Name: Mrs Noreen Kay

Address: 11 Hatfield House Golden Lane Estate London

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Noise
- Other
- Residential Amenity

Comment: Due to the location of this self build dwelling, there are several reasons why this should be opposed. The character of the building will have a visual impact on the Grade 2 listed Golden Lane estate, namely Hatfield House, looking from Baltic Street. Besides noise, privacy and looking at preserving the two mature trees, the area is extremely constricted for a dwelling purpose and separate garage. If the trees were to be felled or damaged(it's not clear in the proposal) this would have an impact on any wildlife in the area. The trees are vital for shade and help in keeping temperatures lower in the area. Privacy for this dwelling will be non existent, due to being overlooked by Hatfield House.

Comments for Planning Application 25/00905/PIP

Application Summary

Application Number: 25/00905/PIP

Address: Baltic Street West London EC1Y 0ST

Proposal: Application for Permission in Principle for the erection a self-build single storey dwelling with detached single storey garage and gardens on the existing paved pedestrian open space with 2no mature trees to be retained.

Case Officer: John Grierson

Customer Details

Name: Mrs Noreen Kay

Address: 1 Hatfield House, Golden Lane Estate, London EC1Y 0ST

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Noise
- Other
- Residential Amenity

Comment: Due to the location of this self build dwelling, there are several reasons why this should be opposed. The character of the building will have a visual impact on the Grade 2 listed Golden Lane estate, namely Hatfield House, looking from Baltic Street. Besides noise, privacy and looking at preserving the two mature trees, the area is extremely constricted for a dwelling purpose and separate garage. If the trees were to be felled or damaged(it's not clear in the proposal) this would have an impact on any wildlife in the area. The trees are vital for shade and help in keeping temperatures lower in the area. Privacy for this dwelling will be non existent, due to being overlooked by Hatfield House.

From: [REDACTED]
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: Objection to application 25/00905/PIP
Date: 30 July 2025 13:35:06

You don't often get email from [REDACTED]

THIS IS AN EXTERNAL EMAIL

Hello,

I tried a week or so ago to submit an abjection to application ref 25/00905/PIP. The comment didn't seem to submit and I have just tried again but thought I would email too.

I live next to the proposed site and strongly object to the application. Already there is a huge amount of noise disturbance due to the City & Islington Primary Academy just next door, reversing bin trucks at all hours and people gathering in the street from clubs nearby. In addition to the planned building work in the leisure centre, this would cause lots of extra noise disturbance to everyone living here. Baltic Street West is already busy and the building work would add traffic and block the road. There are two Disabled parking bays which we use often and need continued access to. The building would block light from the ground floor and first floor flats and would be very close to the kitchen windows of Hatfield House. It would make the existing flats feel enclosed and the new building would have no privacy at all. I can't see how the trees on the site would be undamaged by the building work, as the roots will extend underneath the whole site. The trees provide vital shade, especially with rising temperatures, and are important for wildlife and pollution. The proposed garage is against car-free development policy.

Thank you,
El Perry
24 Hatfield House
Golden Lane Estate
EC1Y 0ST

[REDACTED]

Comments for Planning Application 25/00905/PIP

Application Summary

Application Number: 25/00905/PIP

Address: Baltic Street West London EC1Y 0ST

Proposal: Application for Permission in Principle for the erection a self-build single storey dwelling with detached single storey garage and gardens on the existing paved pedestrian open space with 2no mature trees to be retained.

Case Officer: John Grierson

Customer Details

Name: Mr Alex Mosey

Address: 62 Hatfield House Golden Lane Estate London

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Noise
- Residential Amenity

Comment: My objection to this proposal is based on the following key concerns:

1. Impact on Heritage and Character

The development site sits within the curtilage of the Golden Lane Grade II listed estate. The proposal appears incongruent with the architectural and spatial character of the estate and risks undermining the historic value of the setting. I urge the planning team to consider the potential long-term impact on the estate's integrity and the estate's amenities this would replace (cycle stands only just installed, greenery).

2. Loss of Daylight and Privacy

The proposed building would severely impact natural light to the lower ground, ground, and first floor flats of our building as it would be within 5 meters. These units are already partially shaded due to the estate's configuration, and the additional obstruction would result in a material reduction of daylight and sunlight, contrary to established BRE guidance as I understand it. Furthermore, the proposed structure would compromise the privacy of these homes, as it introduces new, close-proximity sightlines into previously shielded living spaces.

3. Ecological Disruption

The construction would require the removal of two large, mature plane trees that are vital not only to the estate's visual amenity but also to its ecology. The loss of these trees would be detrimental to local biodiversity and green infrastructure.

4. Construction Impact

The scale and location of the proposed works present concerns around disruption for existing residents and the neighbouring primary school. This includes potential noise, dust, and access issues, particularly during term time.

In light of the above concerns, I respectfully request that the application be reconsidered or rejected in its current form. I would be grateful to be kept informed of any updates or revisions to the proposal. Thanks.

Comments for Planning Application 25/00905/PIP

Application Summary

Application Number: 25/00905/PIP

Address: Baltic Street West London EC1Y 0ST

Proposal: Application for Permission in Principle for the erection a self-build single storey dwelling with detached single storey garage and gardens on the existing paved pedestrian open space with 2no mature trees to be retained.

Case Officer: John Grierson

Customer Details

Name: Mr Iain Meek

Address: 10 Tudor Rose Court Fann Street City of London

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Other

Stance: Customer made comments in support of the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Other

Comment:1 Remove the existing paving to allow rain to feed the trees and reduce storm flow into the sewage system.

2 Screw jack foundations to point load and minimise damage to the existing tree roots, and allow adjustment as the trees flourish under my care, and reduce CO2 production in cement.

3 Timber frame construction to minimise disruption during the build from dust & a long timeline, and trap CO2 in the material.

4 Increase planting on the site as a garden/ orchard - ref my earlier proposal of 11/10/2021 to Sue as CC or Aldersman.

5 Visual intrusiuon for Hatfield neighbours to be minimised by a single storey building under the tree canopies, so no reduction in daylighting or sunlight for Hatfield residents a swell below the horizon.

6 Amenity buffer to be improve buffering for Hatfield residents amenity by inserting a building and garden fencing pushing pedestrian gatherings further from and screened from Hatfield House- currently only 5metres of open air separates residents from the open public area, an extension of Highways footways.

7 I hope to include a water feature at the sharp end to replace the long-lost Goswell Road Besley Memorial fountain and to improve residents' amenity in future hot Summers. ref my earlier proposal for a Great Fire 1940 Memorial, sent to you on 15/04/2025.

8 To future-proof my home by including a garage as I approach old age and a disabled driver status, having lost my invalid car garage when the new school was built and struggled with an unlit and insecure basement garage at the far side of GLE almost under the Shakespeare.

9 Overlooking & privacy- no worse than any of the existing Hatfield gardens or those elsewhere in

GLE.

10 CityPlan2040 compliance, and specifically Policy HS8 self and custom housebuilding

11 Maximises housing provision.

12 Inside the Corporation's defined 'residential area'.

13 Outside the Listed boundary.

I fully intend to retain the 2 mature trees NOT as Officers' MONDAY, 30 JUNE 2025 report!!!!

Comments for Planning Application 25/00905/PIP

Application Summary

Application Number: 25/00905/PIP

Address: Baltic Street West London EC1Y 0ST

Proposal: Application for Permission in Principle for the erection a self-build single storey dwelling with detached single storey garage and gardens on the existing paved pedestrian open space with 2no mature trees to be retained.

Case Officer: John Grierson

Customer Details

Name: [REDACTED]

Address: [REDACTED]

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Other
- Residential Amenity
- Traffic or Highways

Comment: I wish to OBJECT to this application.

I live at in Hatfield House and my kitchen and bedroom look out over the proposed site. My objections are:

1. The site of the proposed house is included on the lease of my flat as a communal area. The site cannot be developed without changing my lease and, I assume, those of the other leaseholders as well.
2. The proposed house would be only about 4 metres from my windows creating a sense of enclosure and possibly impacting light.
3. The site is part of the listed Golden Lane Estate and a building on this site would detract from the listed buildings. It was designed as an open forecourt in front of Hatfield House and to change this by building on it would fundamentally change the design and aspect of the listed buildings and landscape.
4. The proposed house, even if it is one storey, would have an impact on the over shadowing and and sense of enclosure on flats in Hatfield House especially the lower ground floor flats.
5. Discussions are underway with the Corporation to landscape this area.
6. The site is open amenity space and has just had cycle stands installed.
7. There are two mature plane trees on the site whose roots will be under the whole of the area. It will not be possible to build on the site without disrupting the root systems and possibly killing

them.

8. The proposed garage will have to be accessed from Baltic Street West which is already overloaded with access to the Golden Lane Estate service road and service traffic to COLPAI.
9. The proposed garage would be against car-free policy.

I would ask that this application is rejected.

i would also ask that my name and personal details be redacted.

Comments for Planning Application 25/00905/PIP

Application Summary

Application Number: 25/00905/PIP

Address: Baltic Street West London EC1Y 0ST

Proposal: Application for Permission in Principle for the erection a self-build single storey dwelling with detached single storey garage and gardens on the existing paved pedestrian open space with 2no mature trees to be retained.

Case Officer: John Grierson

Customer Details

Name: Mr Paul Drinkwater

Address: 41 Hatfield House Golden Lane Estate London

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Other

Comment: I would like to object to this application, and question its seriousness given the lack of detail contained within the application.

I believe this objection should be rejected for the following reasons:

1) Fire safety risk. A residential building is proposed on a site used by the COLPAI school as an assembly point for pupils and staff during fire alarms. It was used by rescue services to attend a tragic fire in a Hatfield House basement flat in 2023. A house in this spot could affect emergency access to Hatfield House and the School.

2) Loss of privacy and daylight for neighbouring flats. The proposed dwelling would be just 5 metres from the windows of basement flats within Hatfield House. It would create a sense of enclosure and block light into these flats, which would negatively affect the wellbeing of residents, which include elderly and vulnerable people.

3) Significant risk of ecological damage. The area on which a house is proposed includes two important mature trees that provide a green canopy with roots that extend under the whole area. It is not realistically possible to build on the site without disrupting and potentially killing the trees which would negatively affect the local wildlife, pollution levels and look and feel of Baltic Street West.

4) Impact on Grade II listed Golden Lane Estate. In the words of the City of London's Golden Lane

Listed Building Management Guidelines (2013), Hatfield House "occupies a particularly important place in the design of the estate, as it forms the Northern Boundary". The proposed dwelling would cause significant harm to the visual impact of the estate as viewed from Baltic Street West.

5) Increased traffic. The proposed garage is against the City's car-free development policy. It would need to be accessed from Baltic St West which is already overloaded from traffic serving Golden Lane Estate, local shops and offices, and COLPAI and acts as a 'rat run' for motorcycles and mopeds.

Comments for Planning Application 25/00905/PIP

Application Summary

Application Number: 25/00905/PIP

Address: Baltic Street West London EC1Y 0ST

Proposal: Application for Permission in Principle for the erection a self-build single storey dwelling with detached single storey garage and gardens on the existing paved pedestrian open space with 2no mature trees to be retained.

Case Officer: John Grierson

Customer Details

Name: Miss Sarah Batty-Smith

Address: 130 Crescent House Golden Lane Estate London

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Other
- Residential Amenity

Comment:I object to this proposal as the area is part of a Grade II listed estate and not available to be built on. The land is not for sale. I am not sure why it's even being considered.

Additionally, not every spare bit of space needs to have a building on it. And apparently there would be no detriment to the trees in this area, however I doubt this very much, they would undoubtedly be damaged by the building work.

From: [REDACTED]
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: Baltic Street West, London EC1Y 0ST- 25/00905/PIP
Date: 04 August 2025 16:52:52

You don't often get email from [REDACTED]

THIS IS AN EXTERNAL EMAIL

As a resident of Hatfield House on the Golden Lane Estate I wish to object to this application. This is completely unacceptable and should be rejected by the planning department.

There are no merits to this application that can be discerned. The provision of electrical/gas and sewerage services might be problematical. This would be an incongruous eyesore without any architectural merit.

It is also difficult to see how the provision of a garage could be fitted in the space available. This could also cause traffic and parking problems, as well as being a danger to pedestrians and cyclists in Baltic Street West.

Yours sincerely,

Raymond Hamilton
27 Hatfield House.

Comments for Planning Application 25/00905/PIP

Application Summary

Application Number: 25/00905/PIP

Address: Baltic Street West London EC1Y 0ST

Proposal: Application for Permission in Principle for the erection a self-build single storey dwelling with detached single storey garage and gardens on the existing paved pedestrian open space with 2no mature trees to be retained.

Case Officer: John Grierson

Customer Details

Name: Pablo Abellan

Address: 307 Crescent house Golden Lane Estate London

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Other

Comment:I object to this application in principle.

Baltic street west is already saturated with noise pollution from the car park entrance and school entrance and any additional residential amenity would be detrimental to this environment.

The site should remain a green space and the two plain trees protected including their roots.

Any structure built on this plot would also block light to properties at ground and lower ground levels of Hatfield house, a listed grade 2 estate and part of the Barbican conservation area.

For these reasons this application should be denied.

Regards

Pablo Abellan

Comments for Planning Application 25/00905/PIP

Application Summary

Application Number: 25/00905/PIP

Address: Baltic Street West London EC1Y 0ST

Proposal: Application for Permission in Principle for the erection a self-build single storey dwelling with detached single storey garage and gardens on the existing paved pedestrian open space with 2no mature trees to be retained.

Case Officer: John Grierson

Customer Details

Name: Mr Andrew Gault

Address: Golden Lane Est, Baltic St West Golden Lane Estate Not recorded

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Other
- Residential Amenity

Comment:I'd like to object to this planning application. The area in application is a useful tree-lined pedestrian area to separate the street and Hatfield House on GLE. The area is used by parent's and families waiting for kids to arrive a the primary school and by residents and the general public.

I believe the loss of daylight to the lower ground floor and ground floor flats would be significant especially in the darker winter months. There are two wonderful trees which provide a wonderful aspect from kitchen and bedroom windows in Hatfield House.

I also think the area is already highly built-up and open public spaces are needed on a busy residential and office building space.

Comments for Planning Application 25/00905/PIP

Application Summary

Application Number: 25/00905/PIP

Address: Baltic Street West London EC1Y 0ST

Proposal: Application for Permission in Principle for the erection a self-build single storey dwelling with detached single storey garage and gardens on the existing paved pedestrian open space with 2no mature trees to be retained.

Case Officer: John Grierson

Customer Details

Name: Dr N Deakin

Address: 372 Lauderdale Tower Barbican, London

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of the Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Other
- Residential Amenity

Comment:I wanted to register my objections to this proposal.

It will significantly detriment the Listed Golden Lane Estate, and in particular the setting for Hatfield House and the northern entrance to Crescent House.

It takes away a small pocket of green space to the north of the Estate on the fringe of the City. This will have detrimental environmental impact despite the mitigating actions outlined in the 'supportive' comment here from someone I can only suppose has made the application for themself.

There is no need to develop every pocket of space. I don't think I need say more. This application shouldn't even have progressed to this stage and the site should be designated part of the conservation area and Listed park and garden in my view.



From: Varma, Vimal <[REDACTED]>
Sent: 20 July 2025 00:19
To: Grierson, John <[REDACTED]>
Cc: Turner, Lee <[REDACTED]>
Subject: 25/00905/PIP -Baltic Street West

Hi John,

We would not object to this proposal.

Thanks

Vimal

-----Original Message-----

From: PLNComments@cityoflondon.gov.uk <PLNComments@cityoflondon.gov.uk>

Sent: 15 July 2025 16:21

To: Varma, Vimal <[REDACTED]>; Turner, Lee

<[REDACTED]>

Subject: Planning Application Consultation: 25/00905/PIP

Dear Sir/Madam

Please see attached consultation for Baltic Street West London EC1Y 0ST .

Reply with your comments to HYPERLINK "<mailto:PLNComments@cityoflondon.gov.uk>"
PLNComments@cityoflondon.gov.uk

Kind Regards

Planning Administration

On behalf of

John Grierson
Environment Department
City of London

Planning case officer

John Grierson

From	City Gardens
My reference	
Your reference	25/00905/PIP
Being dealt with by	Alex Roebuck
Telephone	[REDACTED]
Date	18 July 2025

Baltic Street West London EC1Y 0ST

Application for Permission in Principle for the erection a self-build single storey dwelling with detached single storey garage and gardens on the existing paved pedestrian open space with 2no mature trees to be retained.

No arboricultural information, details for proposed structures or utility connections have been provided. The proposed site is a small area that already contains 2 very large mature London plane trees and development of this type in such close proximity would not be acceptable in arboricultural terms. These trees are very prominent in the street, are of a very high amenity value and meet the criteria under BS5837 for category A trees of high quality.

It does not seem possible for any structures to be built on the site without significant encroachment and impacts on the root protection areas (RPAs) of these trees which occupy almost the entirety of the proposed site area. This could lead to the damage or loss of the trees during construction and likely lead to increased pressure post development for pruning to the trees for reasons such as leaf fall and shading.

City Gardens cannot support approving the application and have serious concerns about the impacts this would have on the existing plane trees.

Regards,

Alex Roebuck
Arboricultural Projects Officer



From: Powers, Jane <[REDACTED]>
Sent: 04 September 2025 10:01
To: Grierson, John <[REDACTED]>
Subject: 25/00905/PIP Baltic Street West - Transport Planning Initial Observations

Dear John,

I have reviewed the information provided on the planning portal with respect to the above Permission in Principle (PIP) and have the following comments set out below. Given the lack of information, they are top-level for now, but do let me know if you need further details.

The application relates to a PIP for the erection of a self-build single storey dwelling with detached single storey garage and gardens on the existing paved pedestrian open space.

The site is formed by a triangular paved area of land that is designated permissive path, which is surrounded by bollards. It is bordered by Baltic Street West to the north and Hatfield House to the south, located within the Golden Lane Estate. It is situated at the northern tip of the City of London, with the boundary line running east / west on Baltic Street West itself. The City of London and Islington Primary Academy is located to the east of the site.

Baltic Lane West is adopted City of London highway and comprises a single-carriageway cul-de-sac route, with pedestrian and cycle access only through to Baltic Lane East. There are two on-street Blue Badge parking bays located on south side of Baltic Street West to the north of the site. The western end of the site abuts the existing ramped access (with barrier gate control) to the Golden Lane East underground service road and car park. There is also a pedestrian access route to Hatfield House within the immediate vicinity.

There is a general lack of information submitted by the applicant to provide detailed comments, but these following concerns at this stage are noted:

- The provision of a single storey garage in this location does not comply with the London Plan's car-free policy (T6.1) for residential development in the City.
- There is a concern that the proposal could adversely impact on existing access arrangements to Hatfield House, with particular reference to site residents.
- There is concern that the proposal could adversely impact on emergency access arrangements in relation to both Hatfield House and the adjacent Primary Academy. Significant pedestrian and cycle movements are expected on Baltic Street West, given this school presence, and this would be a particular concern with regards to construction.
- The paved area is designated permissive path and forms an established access route for local residents, including in relation to the two existing on-street Blue Badge parking bays.

Kind regards,

Jane


Jane Powers MRTPI | Transport Planning and Development Officer (Development Management)

Environment Department | City of London | Guildhall | London EC2V 7HH

Mob: [REDACTED]


[REDACTED] | www.cityoflondon.gov.uk


Katie Stewart –Executive Director Environment



From: Grierson, John <[REDACTED]>
Sent: 29 September 2025 10:58
To: Grierson, John <[REDACTED]>
Subject: Chat conversation with Powers, Jane from Microsoft Teams


Microsoft Teams





Powers, Jane 4 minutes ago

Hi John - I did thanks and hope you did too! I am happy with the paragraph and agree (from my transport planning perspective) it's principally a matter of visibility and sightlines and the proposal would represent a significant change in a tight location where there differing access requirements. This also comes back to the lack on information in terms of looking at the implications for highway safety (given the local residential and school context) in sufficient detail. I hope that helps. Just shout if you need anything further. Jane



From: Hawkins, Helen <[REDACTED]>
Sent: 24 July 2025 14:27
To: Grierson, John <[REDACTED]>
Cc: PLN - Comments <[REDACTED]>
Subject: FW: Planning Application Consultation: 25/00905/PIP

THIS IS AN EXTERNAL EMAIL

Hi John

One of my colleagues sent this through to me. I would advise that there are no known significant archaeological issues on the site, but should it come in as a planning application, I'd be likely to recommend an archaeological condition for the site. It's located in an area of known archaeological potential and appears to have undergone little previous development, which increases the potential for archaeological survival.

Let me know if you need anything further

Regards

Helen

Helen Hawkins BA MA MCIFA

Archaeology Adviser, City of London
Greater London Archaeology Advisory Service (GLAAS)
Phone: [REDACTED] Mobile: [REDACTED]

Historic England, 4th Floor, Cannon Bridge House, 25 Dowgate Hill. London EC4R 2YA

www.historicengland.org.uk

Please send all your planning and pre-planning archaeology consultations to:
e-glaas@historicengland.org.uk

We will always store your personal details securely. We collect data that you provide to us and only ever collect the information we need in order to carry out our statutory purposes and that helps us to deliver and improve our services. We will only share personal data when we are required to by law or with carefully selected partners who work for us. If you would like to know more or understand your data protection rights, please take a look at our Privacy and Cookies Policy

Dear Sir/Madam

Please see attached consultation for Baltic Street West London EC1Y 0ST .

Consultation is for proposed works involving a material change to a building which is listed grade .

The application and associated documents are available for viewing at <http://www.planning2.cityoflondon.gov.uk/online-applications/applicationDetails.do?activeTab=summary&keyVal=SZ8B9ZFH0QH00>

Reply with your comments to PLNComments@cityoflondon.gov.uk.

Kind Regards

Planning Administration

On behalf of

John Grierson
Environment Department
City of London

Details

OUR REF: 25/00905/PIP

ADDRESS: Baltic Street West London EC1Y 0ST (Grid Reference: 532100, 182180)

PROPOSAL: Application for Permission in Principle for the erection a self-build single storey dwelling with detached single storey garage and gardens on the existing paved

pedestrian open space with 2no mature trees to be retained.

THIS E-MAIL AND ANY ATTACHED FILES ARE CONFIDENTIAL AND MAY BE LEGALLY PRIVILEGED. If you are not the addressee, any disclosure, reproduction, copying, distribution or other dissemination or use of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you have received this transmission in error please notify the sender immediately and then delete this e-mail. Opinions, advice or facts included in this message are given without any warranties or intention to enter into a contractual relationship with the City of London unless specifically indicated otherwise by agreement, letter or facsimile signed by a City of London authorised signatory. Any part of this e-mail which is purely personal in nature is not authorised by the City of London. All e-mail through the City of London's gateway is potentially the subject of monitoring. All liability for errors and viruses is excluded. Please note that in so far as the City of London falls within the scope of the Freedom of Information Act 2000 or the Environmental Information Regulations 2004, it may need to disclose this e-mail. Website: <http://www.cityoflondon.gov.uk>



Ensuring our heritage lives on and is loved for longer.

historicengland.org.uk

This e-mail (and any attachments) is confidential and may contain personal views which are not the views of Historic England unless specifically stated. If you have received it in error, please delete it from your system and notify the sender immediately. Do not use, copy or disclose the information in any way nor act in reliance on it. Any information sent to Historic England may become publicly available. For information about our use of your personal data please visit: historicengland.org.uk/terms/privacy



Mr John Grierson

Direct Dial [REDACTED]

City of London Corporation

Planning Administration

Our ref: P01595378

Environment Department

1 August 2025

Dear Mr Grierson

**T&CP (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015
& Planning (Listed Buildings & Conservation Areas) Regulations 1990**

**BALTIC STREET WEST LONDON EC1Y 0ST
Application No. 25/00905/PIP**

Thank you for your letter of 15 July 2025 regarding the above application for planning permission. On the basis of the information available to date, we offer the following advice to assist your authority in determining the application.

Summary

We object to the Permission in Principle for the erection of a single storey dwelling with detached single storey garage to land north of Hatfield house and south of Baltic Street West. A proposal of this nature and in this location would cause significant level of harm to Hatfield House and the Golden Lane Estate.

Historic England Advice

Significance

Constructed shortly after the Second World War, the Golden Lane Estate was developed in response to the City's steadily declining residential population, a trend that had been ongoing since the early 20th century. Chamberlin, Powell and Bon (CPB) were appointed as architects following a design competition, and construction



4TH FLOOR, CANNON BRIDGE HOUSE, 25 DOWGATE HILL, LONDON EC4R 2YA

Telephone 020 7973 3700
HistoricEngland.org.uk

Historic England is subject to both the Freedom of Information Act (2000) and Environmental Information Regulations (2004). Any Information held by the organisation can be requested for release under this legislation.



began in 1952. The estate is defined by a series of rectilinear residential blocks and a central community centre, all set within a carefully conceived hard landscape. The buildings themselves made use of innovative curtain wall construction and introduced pioneering approaches to the design and planning of post-war housing in Britain.

Hatfield House (Grade II), sits the north of the Golden Lane Estate, built 1958-61 by Chamberlin, Powell and Bon (CPB). Consists of a block of fourteen flats and 42 maisonettes, with ramp to underground car park beneath and a service road to the shops in Crescent House, and garden walls to south. Hatfield House occupies a particularly important place in the design of the estate, as it forms the northern boundary. It is also significant in being intermediary between the early and later phases of the Estate.

To the north of Hatfield House is a modest piece of paved land with two mature trees providing a comfortable degree of separation from the Baltic Street West and the residential buildings of the estate. This piece of land is surrounded by bollards and paved in concrete slabs- a consistent materiality found throughout open spaces within the Golden Lane estate.

This open space also provides clear visual clues as to the primary purpose of this space as part of the northern entrance to the underground internal roads and car park of the Golden Lane Estate.

Chamberlin Powell and Bon shadow diagram, illustrate how they planned the layout of the buildings so that undue overshadowing between blocks was avoided- the space to the north of Hatfield House is demonstrated to be largely covered in shadow- and would therefore have been deemed unsuitable for residential building during the design of the estate.

Impact

The nature of proposals and application brought forwards for a single storey dwelling and garage does not provide enough details to be able to comment in any specific detail. However, two single storey structures in this location would cause less than substantial harm to the Golden Lane Estate and Hatfield House.

Hatfield House and Golden Lane Estate

These proposals would cause harm to the grade II listed building due to development



4TH FLOOR, CANNON BRIDGE HOUSE, 25 DOWGATE HILL, LONDON EC4R 2YA

Telephone 020 7973 3700
HistoricEngland.org.uk

Historic England is subject to both the Freedom of Information Act (2000) and Environmental Information Regulations (2004). Any Information held by the organisation can be requested for release under this legislation.



within its setting. The prominence and massing of the proposal would erode the primacy, as well as the physical and architectural dominance, of the grade II listed building- currently enhanced by the intended open spatial quality afforded by the strip of land between the street and building.

Structures in this location would serve to clutter the foreground of Hatfield house and the northern boundary of the Estate- in contrast to the carefully planning of buildings, access and space within the Estate. Furthermore, these structures could create a narrow gulley potentially blocking light into the lower floors of Hatton House and outward views onto the street.

The impact of a single storey house and garage in this location would cause less than substantial harm to the significance of the Grade II Hatfield House and Golden Lane Estate.

Policy

We would draw your attention to Sections 66 and 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, which set out the obligation on local planning authorities to pay special regard to preserving the special interest of listed buildings and their settings, and special attention to preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of conservation areas.

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF, December 2024) provides further guidance on these duties. Paragraph 208 advises authorities to assess the significance of any heritage asset affected by a proposal and to minimise conflict with its conservation. Paragraph 210 stresses the importance of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets and using them in ways consistent with their conservation. Paragraph 215 states: Where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal, including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use.

Position

Historic England considers these proposals to be harmful to Hatfield House and the Golden Lane Estate and recommends that your authority refuse planning permission.

Although further information is required to make a thorough assessment of the impact



4TH FLOOR, CANNON BRIDGE HOUSE, 25 DOWGATE HILL, LONDON EC4R 2YA

Telephone 020 7973 3700
HistoricEngland.org.uk

Historic England is subject to both the Freedom of Information Act (2000) and Environmental Information Regulations (2004). Any Information held by the organisation can be requested for release under this legislation.



of proposed buildings- the principle of any substantial structure in this location would cause unnecessary harm to the architectural significance of the Golden lane Estate and Hatfield House.

Recommendation

We consider the application should be withdrawn or refused.

Your authority should take these representations into account and seek amendments, safeguards or further information as set out in our advice. If there are any material changes to the proposals, or you would like further advice, please contact us.

This response relates to designated heritage assets only. If the proposals meet the Greater London Archaeological Advisory Service's published consultation criteria we recommend that you seek their view as specialist archaeological adviser to the local planning authority.

The full GLAAS consultation criteria are on our webpage at the following link:

<https://www.historicengland.org.uk/services-skills/our-planning-services/greater-london-archaeology-advisory-service/our-advice/>

Yours sincerely

Guy Newton

Inspector of Historic Buildings and Areas

E-mail: [REDACTED]

cc



4TH FLOOR, CANNON BRIDGE HOUSE, 25 DOWGATE HILL, LONDON EC4R 2YA

Telephone 020 7973 3700
HistoricEngland.org.uk

Historic England is subject to both the Freedom of Information Act (2000) and Environmental Information Regulations (2004). Any Information held by the organisation can be requested for release under this legislation.

City of London Conservation Area Advisory Committee

Department of the Built Environment,
Corporation of London,
P.O. Box 270,
Guildhall,
London EC2P 2EJ

4th August 2025

Dear Sir/Madam,

At its meeting on 24th July 2025 the City of London Conservation Area Advisory Committee considered the following planning application and reached the decision given below:

C.108 25/00905/PIP- Baltic Street West, London EC1Y 0ST

Barbican And Golden Lane Conservation Area/Cripplegate Ward. Ward Club rep. David Ayres.

Proposal – Application for Permission in Principle for the erection a self-build single storey dwelling with detached single storey garage and gardens on the existing paved pedestrian open space with 2no mature trees to be retained.

The Committee objected strongly to an application on which there were no details, believing that consideration of any such application for development in a Conservation Area would set an unfortunate precedent. The present space was characterised by the trees and adjacent buildings; there was no information on how the proposal would affect these and the Committee believed that any development on it would be likely to have an adverse effect on the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.

I should be glad if you would bring the views of the Committee to the attention of the Planning and Transportation Committee.

Yours faithfully,



Mrs. Julie Fox
Secretary

PLANNING DECISION NOTICE

John Grierson

Development Management Service
Planning and Development
Islington Town Hall
London, N1 2UD
Planning@islington.gov.uk
W www.islington.gov.uk

Case Officer: Marc Davis
E: planning@islington.gov.uk

Issue Date: 19-Aug-2025
Application No: P2025/2160/OBS

(Please quote in all correspondence)

TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACTS

BOROUGH COUNCIL'S DECISION: Adjoining Borough Observations – Make Comments

Notice is hereby given, in respect to the request for observation(s), of the above stated response of Islington Borough Council, the Local Planning Authority, in pursuance of its powers under the above mentioned Acts and Rules, Orders and Regulations made thereunder. The response relates to the application / development referred to below, at the location indicated.

The observations (if any) of the Borough Council are noted below.

Location:	Baltic Street West, London, EC1Y 0ST
------------------	--------------------------------------

Application Type:	Observations to Adjoining Borough	Application Received	15-Jul-2025
Application Valid:	15-Jul-2025	Application Target	14-Aug-2025

DEVELOPMENT:

Application for Permission in Principle for the erection a self-build single storey dwelling with detached single storey garage and gardens on the existing paved pedestrian open space with 2 no. mature trees to be retained.

OBSERVATIONS:

The application site is located to the south of the London Borough of Islington located directly adjacent to the borough boundary. The proposed new dwellinghouse and detached garage would be located in a prominent position on Baltic Street West.

The submission claims that the two mature trees would be retained but there is no information on how the development would affect these trees and how these trees would be protected. Furthermore, the site is within the setting of two of Islington's conservation areas: the St Luke's Conservation Area and the Hat & Feathers Conservation Area (both located immediately to the north on the Islington side of Baltic Street). In the absence of details, Islington Council considers that the development would have a negative impact on the experience of the public realm and result in harm to the significance of the setting of these conservation areas. There is also no information on how the development would affect the amenity of neighbours including buildings within Islington.


Based on the information as submitted, Islington Council raise concerns to the proposed development.

Certified that this document contains a true record of a decision of the Council

Yours faithfully




**KAREN SULLIVAN
SERVICE DIRECTOR - PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT
AND PROPER OFFICER**



From: Chair GLERA <[REDACTED]>
Sent: 11 August 2025 08:58
To: Grierson, John <[REDACTED]>
Cc: Richards, Gwyn <[REDACTED]>
Subject: 25/00905/PIP - BALTIC STREET WEST

You don't often get email from [REDACTED]

THIS IS AN EXTERNAL EMAIL



25/00905/PIP | Application for Permission in Principle for the erection of a self-build single storey dwelling with detached single storey garage and gardens on the existing

paved pedestrian open space with 2no mature trees to be retained. | Baltic Street West
London EC1Y 0ST

We object to this planning application for the following reasons:

- The land on which the house is proposed forms part of the Golden Lane Estate, and is described in the lease plan as a communal garden area. The development would cause a significant loss of residential amenity for residents of the estate but also of residents in other flats on Baltic Street and COLPAI school.
- The area on which a house is proposed includes two important mature trees that provide a green canopy with roots that extend under the whole area. There is significant risk of ecological damage. It is not realistically possible to build on the site without disrupting and potentially killing these mature trees which would negatively affect the local wildlife and biodiversity, the green corridor they create, the pollution levels and look and feel of Baltic Street West.
- The site is used by the COLPAI school as an assembly point for pupils and staff during fire alarms. It was used by rescue services to attend a tragic fire in a Hatfield House flat. A house in this location could affect emergency access to Hatfield House and the school.
- The proposed house will impact on Grade II listed Golden Lane Estate. In the words of the City of London's Golden Lane Listed Building Management Guidelines (2013), Hatfield House "occupies a particularly important place in the design of the estate, as it forms the Northern Boundary". It was designed as an open forecourt and communal garden in front of Hatfield House and to change this by building on it would cause significant harm to the visual impact of the estate and fundamentally change the design and aspect of the listed buildings and landscape.
- The proposed garage would be against City of London's car-free development policy and would require vehicles reversing onto Baltic Street West which is a busy cul-de-sac, used for servicing the school and Golden Lane estate as well as the businesses on Baltic Street West.
- The proposed dwelling would be just 5 metres from the windows of lower ground flats within Hatfield House and cause loss of privacy and daylight for neighbouring flats. It would create a sense of enclosure and block light into these flats, and those on ground level which would negatively affect the wellbeing of residents, which include elderly and vulnerable people.

--

Chair 2025 /26

On behalf of Golden Lane Estate Residents' Association

