

## **PLANNING APPLICATIONS SUB-COMMITTEE**

**Tuesday, 6 May 2025**

Minutes of the meeting of the Planning Applications Sub-Committee held at Old Library - Guildhall on Tuesday, 6 May 2025 at 10.30 am

### **Present**

#### **Members:**

Deputy Tom Sleigh (Chairman)  
Shravan Joshi MBE (Deputy Chairman)  
Matthew Bell  
Deputy John Edwards  
Deputy Marianne Fredericks  
Alderman Alison Gowman CBE  
Josephine Hayes  
Deputy Jaspreet Hodgson  
Philip Kelvin  
Alderwoman Elizabeth Anne King, BEM JP  
Charles Edward Lord, OBE JP  
Antony Manchester  
Timothy James McNally  
Sophia Mooney  
Deborah Oliver  
Deputy Henry Pollard  
Alderman Simon Pryke  
Gaby Robertshaw  
William Upton KC  
Matthew Waters  
Jacqui Webster

#### **Officers:**

Fleur Francis	- Comptroller and City Solicitor's Department
Kieran McCallum	- Environment Department
Rob McNicol	- Environment Department
Tom Nancollas	- Environment Department
Gwyn Richards	- Planning and Development Director, Environment Department
Katie Stewart	- Executive Director, Environment Department
John Cater	- Town Clerk's Department
Ben Dunleavy	- Town Clerk's Department
Polly Dunn	- Assistant Town Clerk and Executive Director of Governance and Member Services

1. **APOLOGIES**

In advance of the meeting, apologies for absence were received from Matthew Bell, Anthony Fitzpatrick, and Naresh Sonpar.

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

Deputy Jaspreet Hodgson declared a non-pecuniary interest in Item 5. Deputy Hodgson is a resident of Speed House on the Barbican Estate.

3. **MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 31 JANUARY 2025**

**RESOLVED** – That, the public minutes of the meeting held on 31 January 2025 be agreed as a correct record.

4. **MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 11 FEBRUARY 2025**

**RESOLVED** – That, the public minutes of the meeting held on 11 February 2025 be agreed as a correct record.

5. **MONTCALM BREWERY**

The Sub-Committee received a Report which sought the approval of planning permission and listed building consent for the partial demolition of an existing building, alteration and extension of the existing Montcalm Brewery hotel, to include additional floorspace through upward extensions; altered and additional entrances; external urban greening; external plant enclosures; facade alterations; internal alterations; and, associated works.

The Chairman invited Officers to make a presentation to the Sub-Committee.

Before introducing the proposal, officers highlighted that, subsequent to the main agenda pack, published on Friday, 25th April, two additional addenda were circulated on Friday, 2nd May, and on the morning of Tuesday, 6th May). Officers began the presentation by providing the Sub-Committee with a historic overview of the site; the complex had been a longstanding operational facility of the Whitebread Brewery, before the company ceased brewing there in the 1970s. The collection of buildings within the site boundaries were mostly Grade II listed and, in the main, dated to the mid-late 19th Century, with the notable exceptions being the Partner's House on Chiswell Street, which dates from the early 18th Century, and the Jugged Hare public house, at the junction of Chiswell Street and Silk Street which dates from the early 20th Century. The site sits within the City of London's Brewery Conservation Area, and neighbours an eclectic locale made up of historic and modern buildings with a wide range of differing heights and uses, including, notably, the northern section of the Barbican Estate. It was also noted that within the immediate vicinity of the site, six other Grade II Listed Buildings form part of the rest of the historic Whitbread Brewery complex which do not form part of the subject site; these elements of the former brewery, situated on the northern side of Chiswell Street, sit within the London Borough of Islington's Chiswell Street Conservation Area.

Officers showed the Sub-Committee a series of photographs of the current site; whilst the proposal included the retention of all historic buildings within the site boundary, it was proposed that an existing, non-original, and "awkward"

modern brick roof extension over the eastern wing of the Hotel would be demolished.

It was highlighted that the operational capacity of the Hotel was becoming increasingly challenging, with the buildings' plant coming to the end of its serviceable life. Separately the site's accessibility and inclusivity were sub-optimal given the prevalence of level changes and several narrow staircases throughout the buildings. In addition, the proposal also provided an opportunity for renewal by the removal of a series of suspended ceilings and other modern interventions which had, over recent decades, resulted in some of the historic features within the buildings being obscured.

Officers confirmed that the proposal included:

- Upward extensions which would provide for additional accommodation at the Hotel.
- New plant enclosures
- Heritage and accessibility improvement works
- New entrances
- External refurbishment works

Officers showed the Sub-Committee photographs of the current elevations, the proposed upward extensions, and some historic images of the original working brewery site. The proposed extensions would revive the dynamic contrast between the "polite" Chiswell Street frontages and the simpler industrial "gritty" style of the former brewery buildings. This contrast had traditionally been a hallmark of the immediate vicinity but had become less visible when brewing ceased in the 1970s. The upward extensions would be comprised of three styles of roof forms, combined to create one overall roof extension which would help to further animate the townscape and reintroduce the lost gritty character of the buildings' industrial legacy. In response to the objections raised previously, principally from the heritage sector, about the extent of the new extensions, it was highlighted that, after significant design development, visually, the proposals submitted today would predominantly impact laterally on the current buildings as opposed to vertically, where, alongside the modest increase in the overall height, the extensions would also be further set back in order to show greater deference to the Grade II listed frontages on Chiswell Street. In order to further soften and subdue the impact on the heritage of the buildings, it was proposed that no extensions would be built above either the Partner's House or the Jugged Hare public house, and that the black cladding proposed previously would be revised to a more softer charcoal character, lightening the impact visually without sacrificing the dynamic contrast in styles.

Separately officers advised the Sub-Committee that the proposal would include both urban greening of the site and a plant enclosure which would provide for the site's energy consumption to move from gas based to entirely electric.

Several additional images and diagrams were displayed including those related to the fourth floor, the third floor, the existing and proposed views from Chiswell Street, the Barbican podium, and Lamb's Passage, with the latter, given it is

situated within the London Borough of Islington, officers confirmed that the Borough had indicated their support for the scheme.

Accompanying several further images, officers confirmed that a number of improvements to the interior of the site were proposed, including works to refurbish and enlighten the ground floor frontages and the existing arched entrance. An additional entrance would provide the public with access from Chiswell Street to the bar and lounges of the Hotel. In addition, sensitive works would be undertaken at the Partner's House to provide it with a more active presence on the street. Further works would include the replacement of the pastiche frontages of the historic shopfronts on Chiswell Street for a more appropriate design, and the exteriors of the site being cleaned up, restored and enhanced.

In summary, Officers highlighted the benefits of the scheme, namely the innovative approach that would revive the industrial heritage that had existed in this area, the internal works which would make the Hotel more inclusive and sustainable, the impact the scheme would have on the City of London Corporation's cultural and economic objectives and the refurbishment works, both internal and external which would celebrate the sites heritage value by revealing and restoring historic features.

For these reasons, Officers recommended the scheme for approval.

The Chair thanked officers for the presentation and asked the objector to deliver their remarks and presentation.

The Objector began his remarks by suggesting that none of the three points he wanted to raise would prevent planning permission being approved, subject to revisions to the roof treatment and associated conditions, with Listed Building Consent following.

Point 1 – Design.

Historic England, the Georgian Group, Historic Buildings and Places, The London and Middlesex Archaeological Society and the City of London Conservation Area Advisory Committee (CAAC) had all objected to the scheme. The City of London's recent dismissal of the objections raised concerning the development of the Grade II listed 1 Golden Lane was a byproduct of the City having ignored the lead of the 32 London Boroughs and the GLA in adopting the Mayor of London's Design Review. The City of London's refusal to have the best architects has resulted in a design that appears to replicate "Hastings-style Fisherman's Huts" which have no place in the City of London's Brewery Conservation Area; despite the revisions resulting in the elevations being further set back, this development would clearly still impinge upon the Grade II listed buildings on Chiswell Street. The Objector saw no reason why the whole set of roof extensions could not be of a uniform design as opposed to the three different designs proposed; that would ensure that instead of being overpowering, the extensions would be subservient to the

historic buildings and the development would be compliant with Point 2 of the City Plan 2040 Strategic Policy, Section 11: Historic Environment.

#### Point 2 – Sustainability.

An application consultation was held in a ground floor Chiswell Street facing hotel room, it had single glazing, leading to higher noise levels from passing traffic; the Objector proposed to the architect that a secondary layer of glazing would rectify this issue and additionally, keep the heat in, the architect responded that secondary glazing was not part of the brief. There were real time air monitoring units at the western end of Beech Street, and hourly records of NO2 and PM10 air pollutants from 11pm on 30th April to 10am on 1st May show high levels of these pollutants are massed in the daily average levels. As such, if sustainability means anything in the City of London, it should result in secondary glazing being a condition of approval.

#### Point 3 – Community Benefits

The reputation of the Hotel operators had been “trashed” by uniting the conservation bodies against this proposal, could have some redemption by offering benefits to the local community.

In conclusion, the Objector stressed that if the planning application was approved, the City of London Corporation would, following on from its lack of concern shown for the upkeep of the Barbican estate, have shown no concern for the heritage value of the Brewery Conservation Area; these precedents would likely result in there being no heritage grounds to object to the upcoming redevelopment of the adjoining One Silk Street development – the Objector asked whether this was a position that the Planning Applications Sub-Committee would wish to find itself in.

The Chair thanked the Objector for his presentation and accompanying remarks.

Members did not have questions for the Objector.

The Chair invited the supporters of the application to make their presentation.

The representative of the applicant highlighted the Montcalm’s record as an operator of 18 hotels across central London; they were proud long-time stewards of these sites, having purchased their first hotel in London almost 30 years ago. The Montcalm at the Brewery was their flagship hotel in the City of London and they were proud of their record of ownership over the past decade in welcoming visitors, supporting local businesses, and contributing to the vibrant fabric of the local area. Housed in the storied Whitbread Brewery, the building had been part of the City’s history since the 18th Century. The submission of this application is an effort to ensure it thrives for years to come. At present, the Hotel needs to be upgraded to maintain its position as a 5 star hotel, in an effort to do so, Montcalm has brought together a world class design

team to create a scheme that is more inviting to guests and the wider community as well as being more considered and sustainable in its design.

The proposal is for a sensitive and comprehensive internal refurbishment, including all bedrooms and public areas, alongside a high-quality replacement of its existing extension, the design pays tribute to the industrial heritage and aims to improve both the appearance and accessibility from the street. Importantly, these plans also enhance the Hotel's public facing elements, creating a more open and welcoming space that can be enjoyed by the Hotel's guests and local residents, workers visitors in line with the bold and exciting mandate of the City of London Corporation's Destination City. This is a significant investment in the City, at a time when there is growing demand for high quality accommodation to support the area's cultural offer.

Located just a short walk from the Barbican Centre, one of the City's key cultural landmarks, the Hotel is ideally placed to broaden the City's appeal beyond office hours, it is aimed to continue to contribute to that future by offering a high-quality place to stay and visit in the heart of the City. The Montcalm Collection is known for combining luxury and character with a strong sense of place and they believe this scheme embodies those values. As the operator and long-time steward of this building they were committed to operating and managing this hotel in a way that was sensitive to its surroundings and adds value to the community. They hoped Members would support this application and allow them to take the next important step in the Hotel's journey.

The representative of the scheme's architect followed, who began by stressing his firm's extensive work in the hotel sector in London, particularly with developments transforming sensitive, heritage buildings into vibrant hotels. Some recent examples being Raffles London at the Old War Office in Westminster, the Ritz on Piccadilly, and the Ned in the City. The Montcalm at the Brewery is another of the City's great heritage assets, made up of a series of Grade II listed buildings which originally formed a part of the historic Whitbread Brewery, and more recently operating as the Hotel, after 22 years the Hotel finds itself in need of significant investment to meet the needs of guests and the public today and the needs of the future.

The ground-floor of the hotel needs re-thinking, as, currently, it does not feel inviting or approachable, hampered further by entrances that are unclear and stepped with no proper level access. On the upper-level, the guest rooms need upgrading and mechanical and electrical infrastructure is no longer fit-for-purpose and requires significant investment for a full replacement to bring all of the various systems up to the current all-electric and low carbon standards.

On the top two rooftops levels of the Hotel within the previous extension of the property, new fire and access strategies are needed and the approach to accommodating plant and equipment needs to be rethought, consolidated, and upgraded along with the rest of the mechanical and electrical infrastructure.

The architects have, therefore, been working with the City of London Corporation's Planning and Design officers and the client to make the building more welcoming for guests, the wider public, local residents and businesses with new improved event spaces, restaurants, bar, lounge and guest bedrooms.

To make space on the ground floor for these renewed areas, a number of guest rooms must be provided elsewhere; the rooftop offers the opportunity to do this which, in turn, also allows for to improvement of the existing brick roof extension which is no longer fit-for-purpose as the planning officer's report describes. The extension is of poor quality, visually cluttered, with ad hoc plant, no step free access, and only one means of escape – it falls short of today's standards.

From the beginning the architects have worked with stakeholders on to discuss the new rooftop design and shape the proposal and the evolution of the design reflected those dialogues. What began as a single roof form has been carefully re-worked and shaped through feedback and design with the officers into distinct volumes and geometries. Each one responds and respects the individual rhythms of the buildings beneath it. The different roof forms are purposeful, they take inspiration from the sites varied historical roofscape, triangular, sawtooth and asymmetric shapes that once defined the architecture of the brewery itself. The central gable will mark the former brewery gateway, bringing back the central pitch roof and the importance that it used to hold. The new roof would allow compliant fire escape routes and full step free access across the upper floors. care has been taken to integrate a central plant in a thoughtful and discrete way – it would be screened from all sides and kept to the lowest viable height and would include acoustic treatment and greening that go beyond biodiversity and sound mitigation targets.

The new extension has materials that are contemporary and confident, textured materials that echo the sites original cross hatch iron work and the champagne window frames were suggested by a Barbican Estate resident during a public exhibition, one of the many examples of collaboration that has shaped this design.

Officers now describe this proposal as compelling and sophisticated and say it works harmoniously with the historic buildings from which it grows, that reflects the care, detail and genuine engagement that has gone into every part of this design. This proposal is about securing one of the City's most important historical sites, making sure that it can continue to thrive, contribute and play an active role in the next chapter of the Square Mile. The architect hoped that Members agreed that this proposal was very much in the spirit of Destination City and the Culture Mile, bringing life back to the street, improving accessibility and ensuring that a landmark like this isn't just preserved but is welcoming, open and relevant for generations to come. The architect finished by expressing their belief that this was a thoughtful, balanced, and necessary proposal and hoped that the Sub-Committee would support it.

The Chair thanked the supporters of the proposals for their presentation and accompanying remarks.

The Chair opened up the discussion by asking Members of the Sub-Committee if they had questions to the supporters.

A Member raised two queries, firstly, they asked whether details could be provided about the process of consultation both pre-November 2024 and post-November 2024 (i.e. when the design was amended). Secondly, they asked that the supporters to explain how the design had changed following the consultation.

In response, the planning consultant of the proposal confirmed that consultation had been thorough and had begun at early stage with discussions held, pre-application, with members of the Barbican and Golden Lane Neighbourhood Forum to talk more broadly about the ambitions of the Hotel to improve its offering and sustainability, following this more detailed process of engagement with various stakeholders in the local community as the plans matured, this included well-attended public exhibitions within the Hotel itself (where the suggestion about the champagne window frames was first proposed). The first application was submitted in August 2024, and during the subsequent consultation process, the applicants received the representations that have been referred to, off the back of that, the applicants revisited particularly the extension proposals.

The architect explained that the design proposal evolved after the first submission. The City of London's Design officers were engaged with during a number of successful design workshops and the roof form itself changed into the geometry that was presented at today's meeting, this was more of a singular expression and the team also investigate ways in which the silhouettes of the former Brewery's industrial rooflines could be re-established. In response to the concerns raised by the Heritage bodies, an effort was made to purposefully reduce the visible massing of the building (as shown in the officers presentation earlier), notably by ensuring that the roof extensions became more recessive than the earlier proposal and to, more broadly, shape the building to ensure that the new massing was as respectful as it could be to the existing buildings. This illustrated a very collaborate effort where the design evolved through those consultation processes.

A Member noted that the colour for the roofing had been amended from black to charcoal – and asked whether the applicants had further considered a colour which more closely resembled the brickwork on the streetside elevations, if so, would they be more open to again amending it to something lighter and a more “compatible” colour than charcoal.

The architect responded that the chosen colour, namely, charcoal, aligned with the goal of trying to achieve a contrast in materiality between the metal based industrial aesthetic of the former working brewery and the softer brickwork of the heritage buildings facing onto the street. It was added that black was the traditional colour of the working brewery but, due to the concerns raised by the heritage bodies last year, the colour was amended to charcoal as this considered lighter and more contemporary.



A Member queried why the applicants had chosen not to take the opportunity to connect the development to the Citigen plant which was located close to the site.

The applicants responded that, whilst engagement with Citigen had taken place, it was determined that due to the planned replacement of the gas boilers and the overall scheme's objective of being fossil fuel free, connecting with the Citigen supply was not the right course of action.

Reflecting on the concerns raised by the heritage bodies last year concerning the nighttime views of the scheme, A Member asked what the applicants had amended in the plans to try to mitigate these concerns.

The architect responded that in revising the plan, the team had looked into the shaping and location of the windows which would mitigate the levels of light at nighttime, notably the previous scheme had featured a large strip of window and this had been replaced by individual windows which were more isolated, this would have the affect of diminishing the level of light the site emitted at nighttime.

A Member queried how much of the demolition and other works could take place from within the courtyard as opposed to the street, which already had limited space for pedestrians to navigate.

The applicants noted that the Hotel would remain operational throughout the works which would take place in phases thereby limiting the overall impact of disruption. It was confirmed that the demolition works and fit out would, where possible, take place within the footprint of the site; contractors with experience of working within these types of constraints would be engaged, in addition, the applicants were looking at whether scaffold fans could, for the most part, be put in place as opposed to scaffolding on the exterior of the building throughout the works, the exceptions being, where works were required to restore the historical fabric facing the street. Fundamentally, throughout the works, they would endeavour to minimise disruption to the general footfall on the neighbouring streets and general surroundings.

The Chair asked Members of the Sub-Committee if they had questions for officers.

A Member asked how, from a strategic perspective, the Corporation was managing the local area around this development. Given the likely application that would be shortly considered for the commercial developments at Silk Street and 45 Beech Steet, as well as the works at the Barbican podium, and the upcoming major redevelopment of the Barbican Arts Centre, the immediate area was facing significant development over the coming years.

The Chair pointed out that whilst this particular point was not directly material to the merits of the planning application before Members at the meeting, it was nevertheless an important matter to highlight and suggested that a further

discussion should take place outside of the Sub-Committee in the appropriate forum.

Another Member added that it was vital that a careful approach to things like freight times was taken, given the narrow walkways, the proximity of the local school, and the general heavy footfall in the immediate area. A Member highlighted that, having spoken to some of the construction worker on other projects in the vicinity it was apparent that whilst they operated with varied “active building hours” accumulatively, these could, given the volume of developments, result in entire days of disruption.

Officers responded that construction and logistics were looked at very carefully in a integrated approach to minimise disruption, these management plans were coordinated with the City Corporation’s Environmental Health officers and the Transport team. Whilst it was, on occasion, challenging when several developments were running concurrently, officers always endeavoured to ensure that disruption was minimised.

A Member asked whether the high standard of design, as outlined in the conditions for the development, should apply to the whole of the development, not just the listed section of the buildings.

Furthermore, they asked whether, given the serious objection raised by the heritage bodies, there remained scope to change the roof material.

In addition, they asked for further detail about the nighttime affect, given that the visual materials in the pack did not include relevant images.

Officers highlighted that it was important to emphasise that, whilst their concerns were expressed, Heritage England had not formally objected to the proposal, and had stated that if, the application were to be approved, particular care and attention should be paid to the detail of design development of the proposals.

Officers added that a change of colour in the roof materials could, in theory, be accommodated, however, it was reiterated that the overarching objective of the design was to evoke the industrial heritage of the site and to provide a contrast between this legacy and the softer brickwork of the heritage buildings of the lower levels facing onto the street.

Separately, officers pointed out that, per the revised proposals, the nighttime impact had not received detailed scrutiny because of the proposed limited number and recessive positioning of the windows in the scheme, which had resulted in an anticipated small-scale spillage of light pollution at nighttime. A condition had been included in the application concerning lighting and appropriate controls would be in place to mitigate concerns.

In response to an officer reiterating that conditions would be assessed against all relevant policies as required by the City Plan, a Member emphasised that the reason for the inclusion of a condition needed to be comprehensive, with

the need to identify the policy on which officers were relying; officers would take that point away and ensure it is included.

Whilst acknowledging the proposed contrast in aesthetics, A Member was of the view that the roof extension was “bulky and fussy” which detracted from the brick heritage frontages and asked whether a more “harmonious and sympathetic” approach could instead be taken, which would “de-clutter” the front view.

Separately, the Member asked whether further consultations with the Sub-Committee could be arranged in which Members would be able examine the materials being used in the development and whether Historic England could also have an opportunity to input into this area.

Officers responded that the scheme in planning terms was a not a major development, which proposed only a modest uplift. All comments from Members at today’s meeting would be included in the formal minutes and would be carefully considered as planning for the scheme progressed further.

Officers highlighted that in the pre-application stage, the proposal had included a “bulky” mansard roof extension which sat very uneasily over the listed buildings to the point where it was almost detracting from their qualities. The key to unlocking the problem of increasing the number of and accessibility to guest rooms was to look again at the roof extension and the opportunity to revive the industrial heritage of the site that had been lost over recent decades. By taking a more cellular, tapering, nuanced approach to the massing of the roof alongside the industrial aesthetic the uplift has been able to be delivered in a way that has more authenticity which believes in itself more than the previous timid mansard approach. In addition, the townscape is already very eclectic, and these rooflines would contribute to that eclecticism. Having these industrial forms arising from behind the frontages, it was considered that this revived the spirit of the historic legacy of the site which had been lost to view. In short, the proposal has the right conceptual routes and adheres to the City’s heritage objectives, it is contextual to the local area, albeit it provides for a new visual enjoyment.

The Chair added that he hoped and trusted that officers would take the very strong steer from Members today regarding ensuring the quality of materials. Officers responded that whilst inserting a formal condition around materials would be unhelpful given the already high number of conditions involved in this scheme, they would work with the applicants to ensure that the view on this matter from the Sub-Committee was fully taken on board and would also ensure that, in the interests of transparency, all matters pertaining to the scheme’s development would be uploaded onto the City Corporation’s planning portal in a timely fashion.

The Chair thanked officers and opened the item to debate and comments from Members.

A Member congratulated the architect for the proposal and for making the effort to propose such interesting extension, which was in keeping with the local area. They noted that it was telling at the the neighbouring London Borough of Islington had not objected to the scheme.

They also added that it was dangerous for Members to become involved in detailed design matters such as the colour of the material on the roof extensions and that these should be left to the architects to determine.

A Member welcomed the proposal as a valuable addition to Destination City, which would help to balance out the other end of Culture Mile, namely Asif Khan's new London Museum at Smithfield; they commended the proposal and hoped that the other projects in the local area could be strategically brought together.

A Member welcomed the proposal, citing the City Plan's recommendation for the City to expand from its current 7,500 hotel rooms to approx. 9,000 by 2040. They noted the that only a slight increase in hotel rooms was proposed which displayed sympathy to the local environment and was to be commended, in addition they effusive about the inclusivity benefits of the proposal for 15% of the rooms to be fully accessible.

Separately, given the challenges for the hotel sector in this area, the Member praised the scheme's target for 70% carbon footprint reduction.

The Member who raised the earlier concern about the proposed charcoal colour of the roof extension stated that her concerns were assuaged by the explanation of the officers during the meeting and agreed that this fitted into the conceptual routes of the historic site. They supported the points made about accessibility for those with disabilities. They also supported the proposed use of air sourced heat pumps which were much more preferable than linking to a fossil fuel-based supply.

Whilst stating their support for the scheme, a Member highlighted the impact it and other developments in the immediate vicinity would have on the local walkways and subsequent risks to the safety of pedestrians, whilst this point fell outside of the matter at hand today, it was important that this was considered holistically in the appropriate forum.

In addition, the Member welcomed the confirmation that no extensions would be built above the Partner's House.

Another Member considered that on balance, whilst the proposal did create some harm, the benefits of the scheme, as a whole, should be welcomed and supported and the redesign had been very helpful in this regard.

Finally, a Member asked whether a condition could be included which specified the exclusion of honeybee hives, as lots of evidence had emerged recently that these were detrimental. Officers responded that they could informally signal this to the applicants, and it would be weaved into the next phase of discussions.

The Chair moved the meeting to a vote on the application.

The Sub-Committee proceeded to vote on the recommendations before them.

For the planning application, votes were cast as follows:

IN FAVOUR – 17

OPPOSED – 0

There were zero abstentions.

For the listed building consent, votes were cast as follows:

IN FAVOUR – 16

OPPOSED – 1

There were zero abstentions.

The recommendations were therefore carried.

**RESOLVED** – That, Members approved the following recommendations:

(1) That, subject to the execution of a planning obligation or obligations in respect of the matters set out under the heading 'Planning Obligations' the Planning and Development Director be authorised to issue a decision notice granting planning permission and listed building consent for the above proposal in accordance with the details set out in the attached schedule

(2) That your Officers be instructed to negotiate and execute obligations in respect of those matters set out under the heading 'Planning Obligations' under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

6. **\*VALID PLANNING APPLICATIONS RECEIVED BY ENVIRONMENT DEPARTMENT**

The Sub-Committee received a report which detailed development applications received by the Department of the Built Environment since the report to the last meeting.

**RESOLVED** – That, Members:

- Noted the report and its contents.

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

The Sub-Committee received a report which detailed development and advertisement applications determined by the Chief Planning Officer and Development Director or those so authorised under their delegated powers since the report to the last meeting.

**RESOLVED** – That, Members:

- Noted the report and its contents.

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

Noting the high volume of supplementary documentation circulated in advance of the Planning and Transportation Committee and the Planning Applications Sub-Committee meetings, a Member asked the Chair to work with officers to reduce the amount of paperwork going forward.

The Chair agreed that the circulation of multiple supplementary documents was sub-optimal and would ask officers to review the way of working for both the Grand Committee and the Sub-Committee to ensure that additional communications and documentation was kept to a minimum.

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

The Chair noted the earlier discussion about multiple schemes taking place in the same local areas in the City and proposed that informal briefings for P&T Members should take place on this subject.

**The meeting ended at 12.10 pm**

-----  
Chairman

**Contact Officer: John Cater**  
**John.Cater@cityoflondon.gov.uk**