

Addendum	
Committee:	Date:
Planning Applications Sub-Committee	28 October 2025
Subject:	Public
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.	
Ward: Cripplegate	For Decision
Registered No: 25/00905/PIP	Registered on: 10 July 2025
Conservation Area: No	Listed Building: No

1. Amendments

- 1.1. Please note the following modification to the wording of the Recommendation Refusal Reason 2:

*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 **less than substantial** 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.*

2. Additional Consultation Responses

- 2.1. Comments received from the applicant on 23rd, 25th and 27th October 2025 (attached in full to Addendum). These have been addressed in the Officer report as is explained in further detail in the body of this Addendum report.

- 2.2. Comments received from the City's Environmental Health Officers requested a Scheme of Protective Works Condition should the application be considered for approval. As is stated in Para 74 it is not possible for conditions to be attached to a grant of permission in principle and this would instead be something which is attached at the subsequent technical detail consent stage.

3. Response to Applicants Comments

- 3.1. Officers consider that the points raised in the applicants' comments have already been suitably addressed in the Officers report, as is explained below.
- 3.2. A full assessment on the loss of open space is considered within the Officer report in Paras 56 – 70. Para 57 explains clearly why the site is considered 'Open Space' as defined by the Local Plan glossary.
- 3.3. A full assessment of the proposed car parking is considered in the Officer report Paras 71 – 75. Para 74 explains how it is not possible for conditions to be attached to a grant of permission in principle and so there would be no means of securing any garage proposed as Blue Badge parking only.
- 3.4. The scope of the second reason for refusal has been informed by the UK Government's Planning Practice Guidance and appeal decisions and has also been subject to legal review by the City's legal team. A full breakdown of the various components of this refusal reason has been provided in Paras 76 – 165 of the Officer report.
- 3.5. A full assessment of the provision of housing has been considered in Paras 76 – 92 and the provision of self-build housing has been discussed in Paras 166 – 171.
- 3.6. A full assessment of the design impact has been discussed in Paras 93 – 107 and of the heritage impact in Paras 108 – 150. The NPPF Para 215 balancing exercise is also undertaken in Paras 172 -181. Historic England objected to the application.
- 3.7. A full assessment of the highways impact has been discussed in Paras 157 – 165. There is no evidence that building a dwelling in this location would improve the pedestrian and highway safety over the existing situation within the vicinity of the site.
- 3.8. The status of the emerging local plan is discussed in Para 17 of the report. Neither of the refusal reasons rely solely upon emerging policy. They include policies from both the currently adopted London Plan and Local Plan. The adopted and emerging policies broadly align, and the acceptability of the

scheme does not alter depending on which policies are applied meaning the outcome of the recommendation is the same for both the adopted and emerging local plan policies. It is also considered necessary to do so given an appeal could follow the refusal of permission and the appeal decision may be made after the emerging plan is formally adopted.

- 3.9. The applicant references two emails from City officers in 2017 referring to the costs of landscaping and the granting of 'a sufficient number of permissions'. The context of these comments is unknown. Nonetheless, these emails do not form part of the applicant's submission and thus do not form part of the assessment of this application.