

Appendix 3 – Expression of interest in the proposals

PC630 Thavies Inn House: Consultation Track						
Objector	Objection? Yes/No	Date Received	Date Response Provided	Objection Withdrawn? Yes, when?	Objection Resolved?	Comments
City Corporation Highways Authority	Yes	12 May 2026	13 May 2026	Yes, 11 June 2026	Withdrawn	1. Opposes the proposed stopping up at St Andrews Street 2 due to concerns that it could leave an unacceptably narrow pedestrian route if the adjacent private space becomes obstructed. 2. Requests clarification on why the stopping up is required, as this is not apparent from the statutory notice. 3. Asks whether there are any approved planning application drawings/plans that demonstrate the need for the stopping up. 4. Notes that although tables and chairs are not currently proposed, a future occupier could seek permission for them.

						5. Seeks reassurance on how pedestrian access would be safeguarded in the future, or whether adoption as public highway would be a better solution. 6. Queries why the strip of highway to the west, which appears to be outside the new building footprint, also needs to be stopped up.
OneSearch	No.	15 May 2026	29 May 2026	N/A	N/A	Request of copy of the draft order and plans.
St Andrew Holborn Church Foundation & Associated Charities <i>St Andrew Holborn Trading Limited</i> (Member of the public)	No.	03 June 2026	05 June 2026	N/A	N/A	Request of information on the proposals.
AtkinsRéalis	No.	25 May 2026	8 June 2026	N/A	N/A	Confirmation email that there is apparatus within the proposed area to stop up.

Openreach	No.	6 June 2026	Not required	N/A	N/A	Confirmation email that there is apparatus within the proposed area to stop up.
-----------	-----	-------------	--------------	-----	-----	---

Appendix 4 – Member of the public Objection

First Correspondence

From: Details Removed

Sent: 22 June 2026 10:04

To: Environment - Transport Planning <Transport.Planning@cityoflondon.gov.uk>

Subject: Re: PC630 THAVIES INN OBJECTION

Importance: High

CAUTION: This email is from outside the Corporation. Do not open attachments, click on links or scan QR codes in this email unless you recognise the sender's e-mail address and know the content is safe.

Sirs

Any update?

Thanks,

Details Removed

From: Details Removed

Sent: Tuesday, June 9, 2026 10:46 PM

To: transport.planning@cityoflondon.gov.uk <transport.planning@cityoflondon.gov.uk>

Subject: PC630

Dear sir/madam

Can you forward the plans relating to the notice advertised on site?

Also register my objection to the proposal.

Thanks,

Details Removed

Second Correspondence

From: Details Removed

Sent: 23 July 2026 21:33

To: Details Removed

Subject: Re: Stopping Up Order - St Andrews St / Thavies Inn - Objection

CAUTION: This email is from outside the Corporation. Do not open attachments, click on links or scan QR codes in this email unless you recognise the sender's e-mail address and know the content is safe.

The plans you sent show different revisions. The notice you sent shows not only the area to be stopped up, but two different revisions of those plans. Which is the correct plan? Are both plans to be included in the draft order? Can the City confirm this and share a copy of the draft order? The notice also says that a new highway area is to be provided; however, I cannot see a plan attached showing that area. Can clarification be provided on this?

There is a large area of 89.9 square meters to be stopped up, in the location where the two TPO-protected London plane trees outside Thavies Inn House appear to have been removed to accommodate the new building. I am surprised to see this order proceeding when the trees do not appear to have been preserved in accordance with the Tree Preservation Order (TPO)! I understood the purpose of the TPO was to protect against exactly this happening. The last time I walked past the site, the trees had been removed, apparently by the developer, from what is a public pavement. I would also like to understand the reasoning behind stopping up existing highway in order to turn it into a permissive path that funnels people through to the pocket park. This is shown in the public records, and it makes little sense: if the open space is intended for public use, the route through it should also be managed and maintained by the City of London as public highway.

I would like this objection formally registered. It appears that the City of London has not given sufficient consideration to the public open space, to the necessity of stopping up such large areas of public pavement, or to whether a proper replacement, including new TPO-protected trees, will actually be provided. This is especially concerning given that the minutes of the Planning and Transportation Committee acknowledge that these two 75-year-old trees "hold a significant role in the townscape form of Holborn Circus," "frame an important view of the Grade I listed Church of St Andrew Holborn," are "in fair to good health with a life expectancy in excess of 40 years," have "high amenity value," and, as mature trees, "play a significant part in climate change resilience." As a result, the report went on to recommend the making of a Tree Preservation Order (TPO) in respect of them.

Appendix 5 – Response

Dear,

I can confirm that your objection has been received and will be taken into account as part of the stopping-up order process in accordance with the relevant statutory procedures. I thought it might be helpful to set out how the issues you have highlighted have been considered by the City Corporation in advance of the publication of the notice.

The stopping-up order relates to the development approved under planning permission 21/00885/FULMAJ (as amended). The notice refers to the plans accompanying the draft order, which identify both the highway proposed to be stopped up and the areas of replacement highway. The draft order and associated plans have been made available for inspection at the Guildhall as part of the statutory consultation process. For ease of reference, I have attached the stopping-up and adoption drawings.

The proposed order does not solely stop up existing highway. It also secures the provision of new highway areas and provides that these areas will be maintainable at public expense by the City of London, as Highway Authority. The purpose of the stopping-up process is to facilitate the implementation of the approved development while ensuring that appropriate replacement highway is provided where necessary.

The matters relating to the removal of the existing trees, the Tree Preservation Order, and the landscaping strategy were considered through the planning application process that resulted in the grant of planning permission by the City of London.

The redevelopment proposals were presented to and approved by the City of London's Planning and Transportation Committee in May 2022 under planning permission reference 21/00885/FULMAJ. In granting permission, the Committee considered the impacts of the development, including those relating to the existing trees (which, as you have noted, were the subject of a Tree Preservation Order), the proposed public realm works, and the wider implications of the scheme.

Where works to trees that are subject to a Tree Preservation Order, including the felling of a tree, are necessary to implement a planning permission that has been granted, those works can proceed and do not constitute a breach of the Town and Country Planning (Tree Preservation) (England) Regulations 2012. The acceptability of the loss of the trees was therefore considered at the planning stage.

Whilst there will naturally be some overlap in considerations, the stopping-up order process is separate from the determination of the planning application. It is not a process for revisiting the planning merits of the approved scheme or reconsidering matters assessed through the planning application process, including the treatment of the existing trees, the landscaping strategy, public realm improvements, and the overall design of the proposal. The proposed stopping-up of highway was itself

considered as part of the planning application and formed part of the development proposals assessed when planning permission was granted.

The proposed stopping-up is necessary to enable the delivery of the consented redevelopment scheme. The planning permission includes the creation of publicly accessible routes and open space, including a pocket park, as part of the wider public realm improvements associated with the development. As noted above, the replacement highway secured through the order will be maintained at public expense by the City of London.

In addition, new areas of greenery, including the planting of new trees (subject to feasibility), are currently being designed by the City of London Corporation's Highways Team as part of the Section 278 works secured through the Section 106 Agreement.

The approved development also includes hard and soft landscaping works, replacement tree planting within the public highway, new pedestrian routes through the site, and the creation of a pocket park within Thavies Inn. These publicly accessible routes were incorporated into the approved scheme to compensate for the loss of existing highway areas affected by the redevelopment and to provide enhanced pedestrian connectivity, permeability, and movement through the site. The permissive routes have been secured through the Section 106 Agreement and must be provided by the owner.

If any of the above information changes your view and you feel that you are now able to withdraw your objection, please let us know. If you maintain your objection, it will be taken into account when deciding the way forward. However, we would be grateful if you could clarify whether you will be personally affected by the proposed stopping-up, taking into account the further information provided above.

If you are able to come back to us by 20 August 2026 so that we can determine the appropriate way forward, that would be very much appreciated.