

PLANNING APPLICATIONS SUB-COMMITTEE

Tuesday, 28 October 2025

Minutes of the meeting of the Planning Applications Sub-Committee held at Livery Hall - Guildhall on Tuesday, 28 October 2025 at 10.30 am

Present

Members:

Deputy Tom Sleight (Chairman)
Shravan Joshi MBE (Deputy Chairman)
Samapti Bagchi
Deputy John Edwards
Alderman Alison Gowman CBE
Alderman Prem Goyal CBE
Josephine Hayes
Deputy Jaspreet Hodgson
Philip Kelvin
Alderwoman Elizabeth Anne King, BEM JP
Charles Edward Lord, OBE JP
Antony Manchester
Tim McNally
Sophia Mooney
Deputy Deborah Oliver
Deputy Henry Pollard
Gaby Robertshaw
Hugh Selka
Naresh Hari Sonpar
Jacqui Webster

Officers:

Phillip Carroll	- Environment Department
John Grierson	- Environment Department
David Horkan	- Environment Department
Rob McNicol	- Environment Department
Patricio Taluana	- Environment Department
Gwyn Richards	- Planning and Development Director, Environment Department
Alex Thwaites	- Environment Department
Peter Wilson	- Environment Department
Baljit Bhandal	- Comptroller and City Solicitor's Department
Judith Dignum	- Town Clerk's Department
Callum Southern	- Town Clerk's Department

1. **APOLOGIES**

Apologies for absence were received from Tana Adkin KC, Deputy Marianne Fredericks, Deputy Madush Gupta, Alderman Simon Pryke, Deputy Nighat Qureishi and Matthew Waters. Tana Adkin observed the meeting online.

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

There were no declarations.

3. **MINUTES**

The public minutes of the Planning Applications Sub-Committee on 30 September 2025 were approved as an accurate record, subject to the addition of Deputy Nighat Qureishi as an online observer in the list of attendees.

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

The Sub-Committee considered a report presenting a planning application which sought permission in principle for the erection of a single storey detached dwelling with a single storey detached garage and gardens.

Referring to the 'in principle' nature of the application, which was a relatively unusual one, the Chair stated that an explanation would be given as part of the Officer presentation.

The Chair confirmed that no objectors or supporters had registered to speak at the meeting. The applicant, Mr Meek, had submitted a request to speak but this had unfortunately been received after the deadline. Mr Meek had however provided written submissions which had been circulated to Members the day before the meeting.

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

The officer confirmed that the presentation would cover the permission and in principle application for the erection of a self-built single storey dwelling with detached single storey garage and gardens at Baltic St West. It was noted that seeking permission via in principle consent was an alternative way of obtaining planning permission for housing-led development, separating matters of principle from the technical detail of a proposed development permission. In principle consent had two stages, the first of which established whether a site was suitable for the proposed development in principle. The second stage was concerned with the technical details of the application, when the detailed development proposals was assessed.

The application currently before the Sub-Committee related to the first stage of the permission in principle process, the scope of which was limited to location, land use and amount of development. The application submission consisted solely of the site location plan, which was all that was required to validate a permission in principal application.

The site comprised a triangular strip of land bounded by Baltic St West to the north, Hatfield House and the Golden Lane estate to the south and the City of London Primary Academy, Islington and Golden Lane underground car park access road to the east. Immediately to the north of the site was the boundary with the London Borough of Islington. There were two mature trees on the site, and four Sheffield cycle stands.

The application sought permission in principle for a single Storey detached dwelling garage and gardens on the site. The site had been constructed as part of the Golden Lane Estate and was an area of publicly accessible land owned and maintained by the Corporation. It had been designated as a City of London public footway and a permissive path, and was considered by Officers to be open space, as defined by the 2015 Local Plan.

The proposed change of the land from an area of publicly accessible open space to a private dwelling was considered unacceptable in principle in land use terms.

Members viewed a visual of the site location produced by the City's offices, which showed that the site was immediately adjacent to, but not within, the Barbican and Golden Lane Estate Conservation Area. The Grade 2 listed Hatfield House and the grade two star listed Crescent House were to the west of the site and the Hat and Feathers and Saint Luke's Conservation Areas in Islington were to the north of the site (but not pictured). Members were informed that the Grade 2 listed Golden Lane Estate, Historic Park and Garden occupied the same footprint as the conservation area on the plan.

A full assessment of the impact of the proposed development on the identified heritage assets had been undertaken (as set out in the officer report), and had concluded that it would likely cause a low level of less than substantial harm 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 Estate Conservation Area. This harm had also been considered as part of paragraph 215 NPPF balancing exercise set out in the officer report, which had determined that the only tangible public benefit to the proposal would be the economic benefit arising from the addition of a single self-built dwelling to the city's housing stock. This would not be sufficient to outweigh the heritage harm identified.

The harm caused to the heritage assets would be through the impact on their setting. The site was surrounded by a mixture of four to six storey buildings with well-established clear, geometrically solid building lines on all three sides of the triangle. The provision of a single storey dwelling and garage in this location would likely be visually incongruous, intruding into the geometrically arranged buildings and open space that defined the Golden Lane estate and the setting of Hatfield House. In addition, it would likely appear cramped on its limited plot and would intrude into the sense of space currently present. It was therefore considered that the proposed development would be likely to 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.

The Sub-Committee viewed an image of the south-east of the site, showing the two mature London plane trees, which the application form stated were to be retained. The applicants had also stated, in their representation made on 3rd August, that the use of screwjack foundations would prevent any harm to the trees. This was not standard construction for a dwelling house. Regardless, officers considered that the construction of a dwelling in this location would have an unacceptable impact upon the health and longevity of the two mature trees which occupy the site.

A view looking west towards the site was shown, with Hatfield House on the left. Although no details of the design were available at this stage of the permission in principle process, it was a matter of fact that the visual intrusion created through the erection of a single storey dwelling and detached garage with garden on the site would be considerably greater than the existing area of open space.

Referencing comments submitted by Historic England, officers highlighted that the original designers of the Golden Lane Estate, Chamberlain, Powell and Bon, had produced a shadow diagram as part of their plan to avoid overshadowing between blocks. This had shown the proposed development site to be largely covered in shadow, which was reflective of the existing situation. It was therefore evident that the site (including trees) would be overlooked by the substantially taller building (Hatfield House). The trees would be overlooked by the immediate proximity of the residential balconies, which would result in poor levels of amenity to the proposed dwelling house on the application site and to the existing dwellings on the lower floors of Hatfield House.

Also visible in the image was the mouth of the access road junction with Baltic St West. The site's location abutting the car park access ramp and junction, made it very likely that the development of a single Storey dwelling garage and gardens on the site would have an unacceptable impact regarding road dangers and the pedestrian environment. This was because the development of this piece of land, currently open space and a designated permissive path and footway, would likely have an adverse impact on sight lines and visibility for vehicles entering the car park access ramp and for pedestrians crossing the vehicle access ramp to access Hatfield House. Furthermore, it was considered that the proposed garage would be contrary to car-free policy.

As mentioned at the beginning of the presentation, this application related to the first stage of the permission in principal process, the scope of which was limited to location, land use, and amount of development. Officers drew attention to the late correspondence from the applicant attached within the addendum pack, advising that in their view, none of the points raised affected the assessment they had undertaken, as detailed in the report.

Finally, the public benefits of the scheme were limited to the economic benefit of the addition of a single, self-built dwelling to the Corporation's housing stock, which was not considered sufficient to outweigh the harm identified.

It was therefore concluded by officers that the proposed development would be unacceptable in principle on the following two grounds:

- Firstly, that the proposed land use of the site is a private residential dwelling with a parking garage would be unacceptable as it would result in the loss of public open space and would fail to be car free. This is contrary to policies G4 and T6.1 of The London Plan 2021, policy CS19, DM 16.2 and 16.5 of the Local Plan 2015 and policies S14 OS1 and VT3 of the emerging City Plan 2040.
- Secondly, that the proposed location and amount of development would be unacceptable 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 2 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 an 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. This was contrary to policies D3, G7 and HG1 of The London Plan 2021, Policies CS 10. CS12, CS19 CS21, DM 10.1, 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.

For these reasons, officers recommended that permission in principle be refused.

The Chair thanked Officers for their presentation. Noting that there were no speakers, he invited Members of the Sub-Committee to ask questions of the officers in attendance.

Referring to a comment within the Applicant's written submission which described the current condition of the proposed development site as 'almost derelict', a member expressed strong disagreement. The land concerned was an open space used by the public, with a path and two beautiful trees, and in their view, it was wrong to consider such spaces as derelict and useless.

No other Members having indicated a wish to speak, the Chair moved to a vote on the officers' recommendation that the Planning and Development Director

be authorised to issue a decision notice refusing permission in principle for the application.

Voting on the recommendation was as follows:

FOR	20
AGAINST	0
ABSTAIN	0

Therefore, the recommendation was carried and permission in principle refused.

Resolved - That Members:

Authorise the Planning and Development Director to issue a decision notice refusing permission in principle for the above proposal, as set out in the schedule in Appendix B of the 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 an unacceptable impact with regard to road dangers and the pedestrian environment; and result in poor residential amenity to the existing dwellings 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.

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 30 September 2025.

RESOLVED - That Members:

- Note the report and its contents.

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

The Sub-Committee received details of development and advertisement applications determined by the Chief Planning Officer and Development Director so authorised under their delegated powers since the report to the last meeting on 30 September 2025.

RESOLVED – That Members:

- Note the report and its contents.

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

Two members raised questions as follows:

Resident Engagement - Information was sought as to whether local residents or House Group representatives, including those from certain blocks located within Aldersgate Ward, were being sufficiently informed and engaged regarding the impact of ongoing building works at the City of London School for Girls.

Clarifying that that the applicant in respect of the works concerned had been the City of London Corporation, Officers advised that the planning permission included a condition requiring the applicant to submit details to mitigate any impact on residential amenity. This had not yet been actioned, a matter raised with environmental health officers prior to the meeting.

Delegated Authority – It was questioned why, given the straightforward nature of the application which the Sub-Committee had just considered, it had been referred to Members rather than being determined by officers under delegated authority.

Officers advised that the application had met the criteria for consideration by Members, as set out in the current Scheme of Delegation agreed by Comon Council. This was firstly, because it was contrary to policy, and secondly, because more than ten objections had been received.

The view was expressed that, although the criteria regarding objections was appropriate in circumstances where officers were recommending the granting of planning permission, it seemed less so where the recommendation was for refusal. Acknowledging this, the Chairman commented that the point should be fed into the ongoing review of the Scheme of Delegation being led by the Town Clerk's Department.

8. **ANY OTHER BUSINESS THAT THE CHAIRMAN CONSIDERS URGENT**
There were no urgent items of business.

The meeting ended at 10.47 am

Chairman

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