



Planning Applications Sub-Committee

SECOND ADDENDUM

Date: WEDNESDAY, 17 APRIL 2024
Time: 9.00 am
Venue: LIVERY HALL - GUILDHALL

AGENDA ITEM 3 - DEMOLITION OF 140 AND 150 LONDON WALL AND AGENDA ITEM 4 - LISTED BUILDING CONSENT REQUESTS

For Decision
(Pages 3 - 24)

Ian Thomas CBE
Town Clerk and Chief Executive

This page is intentionally left blank

Addendum report to Committee Report: Application Nos. 23/01304/FULEIA, 23/01277/LBC and 23/01276/LBC	
Committee	Date
Planning Applications Sub Committee	17 April 2024
<p>Subject: <u>23/01304/FULEIA:</u> London Wall West, 140 London Wall, 150 London Wall, Ironmongers' Hall, Shaftesbury Place, London Wall Car Park, London, EC2Y (including Void, Lifts And Stairs At 200 Aldersgate Street And One London Wall) London EC2Y 5DN</p> <p>Demolition of 140 & 150 London Wall to provide a phased development comprising: the construction of new buildings for a mix of office (Class E(g)), cultural uses (Sui Generis) and food and beverage/cafe (Class E(b)), access, car parking, cycle parking and highway works including reconfiguration of the Rotunda roundabout, part demolition and reconfiguring of the Ironmongers Hall (Sui Generis), creation of a new scheduled monument viewing area, public realm alterations to Plaisterers Highwalk, John Wesley Highwalk, Bastion Highwalk and Mountjoy Close; removal of two highwalks known as Falcon Highwalk and Nettleton Court; alterations to the void, lifts and stairs at 200 Aldersgate Street and One London Wall, introduction of new City Walkway.</p> <p><u>23/01277/LBC:</u> 140 London Wall, 150 London Wall, Shaftesbury Place, And London Wall Car Park, London, EC2Y</p> <p>External alterations to existing highwalks at the Barbican Estate including to the John Wesley Highwalk and Mountjoy Close to allow for the integration of new highwalks, hard and soft landscaping, and works associated with the construction of new buildings with the development proposed at London Wall West (140 London Wall, 150 London Wall, Shaftesbury Place, and London Wall Car Park, London, EC2Y).</p> <p><u>23/01276/LBC:</u> Livery Hall, Ironmongers' Hall, Shaftesbury Place, London, EC2Y 8AA</p> <p>Demolition of Ferroners' House alongside external alterations to the facade and roof level of Ironmongers' Hall, internal reconfiguring to cores and back of house areas and associated works in association with the development proposed at London Wall West (140 London Wall, 150 London Wall, Shaftesbury Place, and London Wall Car Park, London, EC2Y)</p>	Public

23/01304/FULEIA

1. Additional Representations received:

Consultation responses	
Department for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities	<p>Article 31 Holding Direction issued-</p> <p>In exercise of his powers under Article 31 of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015, the Secretary of State hereby directs your Council not to grant permission on this application without specific authorisation. This direction is issued to enable him to consider whether he should direct under Section 77 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 that the application should be referred to him for determination.</p> <p>This direction does not, of course, prevent your Council from considering the application, forming a view as to the merits or, if they are so minded, refusing permission.</p> <p>This letter is for procedural purposes and should not be read as any indication of the Secretary of State's attitude towards the application scheme.</p>
Lead Local Flood Authority	<p>The Lead Local Flood Authority has reviewed the Drainage Strategy for the above application and would recommend the following conditions should the application be approved:</p> <p>Before any construction works hereby permitted are begun the following details shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority in conjunction with the Lead Local Flood Authority and all development pursuant to this permission shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details:</p> <p>(a) Fully detailed design and layout drawings for the proposed SuDS components including but not limited to: attenuation systems, rainwater pipework, flow control devices, design for system exceedance, design for ongoing maintenance; surface water flow rates shall be restricted to no greater than 9.9 l/s from all outfalls, provision should be made for an attenuation volume capacity capable of achieving this, which should be no less than 736 m³ ;</p> <p>(b) Full details of measures to be taken to prevent flooding (of the site or caused by the site) during the course of the construction works.</p> <p>(c) Evidence that Thames Water have been consulted and consider the proposed discharge rate to be satisfactory.</p>

	<p>Before the shell and core is complete the following details shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority in conjunction with the Lead Local Flood Authority and all development pursuant to this permission shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details:</p> <p>(a) A Lifetime Maintenance Plan for the SuDS system to include: - A full description of how the system would work, it's aims and objectives and the flow control arrangements; Page 2 of 2 - A Maintenance Inspection Checklist/Log; - A Maintenance Schedule of Work itemising the tasks to be undertaken, such as the frequency required and the costs incurred to maintain the system.</p> <p>REASON: To improve sustainability, reduce flood risk and reduce water runoff rates in accordance with the following policy of the Local Plan: DM18.1, DM18.2 and DM18.3.</p> <p><u>Officer response to above comments</u> Addressed by recommended conditions as above.</p>
<p>City of London Access Group (CoLAG) Minutes of Meeting held.</p>	<p>Draft summary of feedback from CoLAG meeting on 23/02/2024 detailing questions and concerns raised, notably with regard to accessible spaces, accessible bays and taxi drop off points, cultural events space, Thomas More car park and service yard, cycle parking, Roman fort exhibition, lifts, construction phase and detailed design.</p> <p><u>Officer response to above comments</u> Addressed in the Accessibility section of the report.</p>
<p>The Ironmongers Company</p>	<p>The Ironmongers Company and the City of London have engaged in discussions for some seven years, and a common interest has emerged due in part to the long term interests of both organizations to foster a continually improving environment in the City that all those in the area can benefit from, whether residents or workers. We have continued our discussions with the City Surveyors on the application scheme over recent weeks, and we are now pleased to confirm we are able to support the scheme and withdraw our earlier objection letter. Discussion on the details of the scheme have been helpful to our understanding of the various aspects of the scheme and alleviated our previous concerns. We consider the scheme will be a welcome addition to this part of the Square Mile and we hope that Members will support the proposals, which will enhance the setting of our building. We have only one remaining area of concern which is the inclusion of the Highwalk that is proposed to run across the frontage of the Hall at high level. That said, we are confident that the positive and constructive discussions we have experienced with the City will continue to yield mutually beneficial</p>

	<p>solutions aesthetically and environmentally. We reiterate our points regarding the need for robust conditions and obligations to control the construction and future operation of the development. The Ironmongers Company looks forward to continued co-operation with the City as this development is built out.</p>
<p>The Worshipful Company of Barbers (legal owner of Barber-Surgeons Hall, Monkwell Square)</p>	<p>States that it is not a letter of objection, but purpose of the letter is to highlight potential impacts of the proposal on the Company and the Hall and to suggest planning conditions and/or obligations that the Company requires to address such impacts. The letter sets out various concerns which are summarised below.</p> <p><u>Background</u> Income is generated from hiring out and utilising the Hall's multifunctional rooms and upper floors leased to firm of architects which account for the majority of the Company's necessary operational income. The Leases if not renewed by the current tenants are due to expire in 3 years' time.</p> <p>Company is particularly concerned about the impact of construction on the Hall's operational uses and the Company's business. Concerns exacerbated by estimated length of the construction period- 6 years.</p> <p><u>Level of detail</u> Lack of detail with application documents and plans. Request draft conditions and section 106 obligations available for review at early stage of drafting.</p> <p><u>Construction impacts</u> Concern regarding disruption during construction, and of particular concern is Site Welfare building detailed in CEMP which is shown to be accessed by elevated walkway. Concern that would dominate the view from rear of the Hall. Request re-site this building and condition that remove when no longer needed.</p> <p><u>Noise</u> CEMP does not explain how the Hall will be protected from noise disturbance and vibrations. Expect control by condition and request that disruptive works (specifically piling works) are restricted to "quiet hours" outside of normal or busy working hours to minimise disruption to the Hall's tenants and income generating uses.</p> <p><u>Public realm</u> Broadly supportive of ambition to deliver high quality urban public realm. Stresses importance of Barber-Surgeons'</p>

Gardens and consultations that have taken place to develop detailed proposals for the gardens. Requests consultation to deliver proposals for gardens as agreed with stakeholders and assurance that gardens not used as site compound and is protected during construction.

Conditions and s106 agreement

Request opportunity to discuss.

Daylight, sunlight and overshadowing

Rights of light is a separate consideration and request payment of professional fees.

Asset protection and neighbourly matters agreement

Request completion of neighbourly matters agreement be pre-commencement obligation in s106.

Conclusion

Letter suggests various solutions and preferred outcomes, summarised as follows-

- The Company to be fully engaged in discussions to agree heads of terms for s106 agreement
- The Company to be provided an opportunity to review and comment on the draft planning conditions at an early stage.
- The Company to be offered opportunity to review and comment on adequacy of provisions which are necessary to protect the Company's interests within the s.106 agreement.
- In particular, the Company to be given full involvement in the framing and finalisation of –
 - a) conditions and s. 106 agreement obligations regarding the public realm's detailed design, implementation and management.
 - b) section 106 agreement requiring the Corporation and the developer to provide and maintain a direct contact for concerns/complaints during demolition and construction.
 - c) conditions and section 106 obligations regarding detailed phasing of the development; and
 - d) section 106 agreement obligation requiring the completion of a neighbourly matters agreement between the Company and the Corporation prior to commencement of development.
- The Company to have input into the development of the site masterplan and any consequential amendments.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Planning condition should be included that requires the public realm areas to be delivered in accordance with outcomes of formal consultations undertaken by CoL Environment Team. • A requirement that the Company must provide their approval on the proposed protection measures to the Hall in place throughout demolition and construction. • Pre-commencement condition that requires submission of plans and approval for alternative location for Site Welfare building. • Planning condition to be included that restricts disruptive works to “quiet hours” outside of normal or busy working hours. • Corporation to consult with the Company prior to approving application for consent under section 61 of the Control of Pollution Act 1974. • Clear and unqualified assurance that Corporation will cover the legal and professional fees of the Company in respect of any neighbourly matters agreement, rights to lights issue or any other agreement or issues. <p>Request kept up to date on how the application progresses.</p> <p><u>Officer response to above comments</u> This is addressed through conditions, notably the submission of the Construction Logistics Plan which would need to reconsider the location of the Site Welfare building. Whilst the applicant is strongly encouraged to discuss the above with this neighbouring owner, largely the purpose of a section 106 agreement is secure contributions towards infrastructure, secure the mitigation necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms and to secure benefits for the public good, rather than to protect individual property rights and some of the above points would need to be covered by a private legal agreement rather than any planning agreement. The proposed heads of terms which officers consider are necessary are set out in the officer report to committee and negotiations on the form of the undertaking will proceed under delegated authority if there is a resolution to grant planning permission. Where officers consider appropriate they can take account of these requests in negotiating the final form of the planning obligations.</p>
City of London Girls School	I am writing on behalf of the City of London School for Girls regarding the proposed London Wall West scheme and current planning application. We have studied the proposals,

	<p>met with the residents’ representatives, and had discussions with the City Surveyor’s team in order to be appraised of the possible impact on the School. We are of course anxious to protect those things important to the success of the School, and to our pupils, parents and staff, whilst not impeding the necessary developments and redevelopments that makes the wider square mile the exciting setting it is for the School. Concerns have centred on possible disruption to the School during construction and impingement on the School’s setting through potential overlooking or overshadowing. We do not believe the noise and construction movements will be significantly worse than those currently accommodated in the wider neighbourhood of the School. We also believe the location of the new buildings and gardens does not provide an unacceptable exposure of the School to being overlooked more than at present. We have however expressed concerns, including to the formal consultation process, about the position of the temporary amenity block which if not designed appropriately would overlook and overshadow the School’s sports pitches to an unacceptable degree. The construction plan only appears to be developed at an outline level where the detail is not clear enough to make a fuller assessment yet. However, in discussions with City Surveyors we are assured that at its simplest, the school-facing side can be installed without windows, but that in any case the discussions that would take place in order to approve a construction plan would explore multiple ways to mitigate this concern including consideration of other possible amenity locations. On balance, the School finds itself taking a neutral outlook on this proposal, given that most of the effects appear indirect and some inevitable disruption is offset by improvements in the public realm and approaches to the School, and that opportunities could present in obtaining some badly needed space in the North Commercial Block or a share of use of some of the cultural facilities. Discussions have led us to believe that our concerns can and will be met if the project proceeds into the later engagement and design processes, where we fully intend to make our case for an optimal an outcome for the School.</p> <p><u>Officer response to above comments</u> The detailed Construction Logistics Plan required by condition would need to address the detailed construction points raised above.</p>
<p>London Borough of Islington letter dated</p>	<p>The London Borough of Islington make the following observations;</p> <p>View 19 - confirmation if “cumulative” massing (rising above the roofline of Finsbury Town Hall (Grade II*)) is the</p>

26 February 2024.

proposed scheme, if so the impact would need to be considered.

View B20 - confirmation of whether or not the orange model visible above the roofline of the listed terrace on 35-45 Skinner Street (Grade II) is the proposal is required, if so the impact would need to be considered.

View B21 - a confirmatory view from Gloucester Way that identifies 27 Myddelton Street would assist the assessment to this Grade II asset and this section of the Conservation Area.

View B22 – important to consider how the materiality changes the scale and setting in this view, particularly in relation to the existing stepped canyon effect. The setting of the Hats and Feathers Conservation Area may be impacted and should be considered. The Zone of Theoretical Visibility (ZTV) picks up some areas where the scheme may be visible but not tested with views. These are as follows;

- Charterhouse Complex and Queen Mary University of London Charterhouse Square Campus
 - Clerkenwell Green Conservation Area and nearby listed building as 201 St. John Street (Grade II).
 - Protected Vista from Alexandra Palace viewing terrace to St. Paul's Cathedral
 - Local View 3 - Angel to St. Paul's Cathedral
 - Local View 4 Archway Road to St. Paul's Cathedral
 - Local View 5 Archway Bridge to St. Paul's Cathedral
 - Local View 7 Dartmouth Park to St. Paul's Cathedral
- The impact on these heritage assets and views should be considered.

Officer response to above comments

The London Borough of Islington has identified the following points for consideration.

- **Finsbury Town Hall (II*): View B19 in the TBHVIA along Amwell Street. The listed building is experienced obliquely and a sliver of the development would be experienced in the distance rising above background skyline buildings. There would be no backdropping of Finsbury Town Hall; the uppermost storeys would rise slightly above the roofscape of Kingsway College (II) in a neutral manner.**
- **35-45 Skinner Street (Grade II): View B20 the orange model is 55 Bishopsgate within the view and only a glimpse of the development would be visible well to the right of the approved tower and there would be no backdropping of 35-45 Skinner Street (Grade II)**

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 27 Myddelton Street (II) or New River Conservation Area: In View B21 there would be a minor level of visibility of the development which is representative of the visibility from this area reading as a low mid-rise development on the distant skyline, in the context of taller buildings and partially screened by trees. There would be no adverse impact on 27 Myddelton Street (II) or New River Conservation Area. • Hat and Feathers Conservation Area: There would be some minor visibility from the Hat and Feathers Conservation Area indicated in view B22 reading as a low mid-rise development on the distant skyline, in the context of taller buildings. • Charterhouse Complex and Queen Mary University of London Charterhouse Square Campus: View B23 is from Charterhouse Square Conservation Area shows minimal visibility of the top of New Bastion House. There would a sliver of the development would be visible from other locations within the Conservation Area often screened by planting. In cumulative scenarios the development would often be screened by approved development on Long Lane. There would be no adverse impacts in relations to designated heritage assets within this wider sensitive area. • Clerkenwell Green Conservation Area: From Clerkenwell Green Conservation Area and the linear views along St John Street including 201 St John Street the development would be glimpsed low on the skyline horizon in the distance and would be understood in the context of taller buildings. • Protected Vista from Alexandra Palace viewing terrace to St. Paul's Cathedral - addressed in report. • Local View 3 - Angel to St. Paul's Cathedral: the development would not be visible, screened by foreground development • Local View 4 Archway Road to St. Paul's Cathedral: addressed in report. • Local View 5 Archway Bridge to St. Paul's Cathedral : addressed in the report
--	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Local View 7 Dartmouth Park to St. Paul's Cathedral - no visibility: refer View N in Appendix B in TVBHIA. <p>Ultimately, officers consider that the aforementioned views, and settings and contribution to significance of the aforementioned designated heritage assets, would not be affected (and thus preserved) by the proposals due to the relative distance of the proposal and intervening development resulting in little, if any, intervisibility between them.</p>
Southwark Council letter dated 12/04/2024	No comment
The Gardens Trust letter dated 12 th April 2024 (2 nd response)	No additional comments to their letter dated 22 nd December 2024.
Eon Citigen (London) Ltd	<p>Letter of support-</p> <p>Whilst E.ON have a clear vision on how we can expand and decarbonise our Citigen energy network it unfortunately cannot be carried out overnight as it takes time to create the design, obtain the necessary approvals and to then construct the new infrastructure. This is why the Citigen design team have worked to create an innovative heating and cooling solution for the new development at London Wall West that allows the new building to contribute to the decarbonisation of the Citigen energy network. The new energy centre, located at LWW, will provide both heat and cooling for the new development and will also feed into the Citigen energy network supporting the decarbonisation journey of Citigen and therefore helping decarbonise the Square Mile. We see this as a progressive and practical solution that can not only work for LWW but other new developments in the Square Mile where heat networks are not yet in place but where there are plans for one to be built over the next 20 years.</p>

Since midday on 8th April 2024, a further **14** letters of objection have been received against all three applications under consideration. It should also be noted that some contributors have commented more than once. The table below provides a summary of the new points raised within these objections that have not already been covered within the main report and an Officer

response. The letters of objection include a letter received from Unmesh Desai, London Assembly Member for City and East.

Comment	Officer Response
<p>Query regarding what in the HE Local Heritage Listing – Historic England’s Guidance Note 7 supports the City Corporation’s failure to identify the three buildings in LWW as Non Designated Heritage Assets (NDHAs).</p>	<p><i>As HE Advice Note 7 makes clear, identification of non-designated heritage assets (NDHAs) is a matter for local planning authorities and their communities. The criteria set out in Table 1 is a suggested basis for identifying such assets for inclusion on a local list; officers consider these criteria serve equally well as a framework for assessing sites for potential NDHA status as part of planning applications, and have employed the criteria consistently to this end. While officers consider it best practice to adopt Historic England criteria for this, the final assessment of whether a site merits NDHA status is a matter for the local planning authority.</i></p>
<p>The recent release of new and amended planning documents has been timed to coincide with the Easter break. Revisions submitted with no clear explanation of revisions. Chief planning officer publicly stated application before consultation period has ended.</p>	<p>A covering letter was included on the website listing the revisions and full further 21 days of consultation given.</p>

2. Land Use floorspace area table:

Within the application submission and therefore the Officers’ report, the floorspace figures were shown as per the table on page 183 and within the Application Dashboard. These figures included 200 Aldersgate Street stair void and 1 London Wall stair void, as they are access routes to the Museum of London and Bastion House, and were therefore included in the total GIA apportioned areas for the existing and proposed scenarios. The GIA apportioned figures always include all back of house, plant, and circulation areas associated with the buildings.

Following discussion with the applicant, an additional floorspace area table has been produced to separate out the areas apportioned to 200 Aldersgate Street and One London Wall, and is to be inserted into the report after the table on page 183, as follows:

Land Use	Existing GIA (sqm)	Proposed GIA (sqm)	Net change GIA (sqm)
Office (Class E(g)(i))	16,887.0	55,980.8 (88sq.m could be apportioned to Class E(f) for Hatching Dragons)	39,093.8
Retail / Restaurant (Class E(b))	0	1,107.9	1,107.9
Cultural (Sui Generis) [Total]	-	8,151.2	8,151.2
Livery Hall (Sui Generis)	439.0 (88sq.m of this belongs to Hatching Dragons Nursery within Ferroners' House)	480.0	41.0
Museum (Class F1(c))	15,188.0	0	-15,188.0
Bar (Sui Generis)	287.0	0	-287.0
Public Car Park (Sui Generis)	1,458.0	594.2	-863.8
Cycle Hub (Sui Generis)	0	703.0	703.0
Circulation Only (Use Class E – ancillary to office)	-	266.4	266.4
TOTAL	34,259.0	67,283.5	33,024.5

The areas marked 'Circulation Only' form part of ancillary accommodation to the offices (Use Class E) at 200 Aldersgate Street and 1 London Wall.

This table is to provide further details in respect of the floorspace figures and its inclusion does not mean that the original floorspace table was incorrect, and does not materially alter any conclusions made within the report.

The condition relating to floorspace (condition 5) has been updated in line with the figures shown in the new table, and two new conditions are recommended

(nos. 111 and 112) in relation to the Nursery floorspace and that at 200 Aldersgate Street and 1 London Wall.

3. Report amendments:

- On page 15, row 13, add 'Application scheme' in the first line of the right-hand side column.
- On page 15, row 14, add 'Application scheme' in the first line over the graph in the right-hand side column.
- On page 16, row 15, add 'Application scheme' in the first line of the right-hand side column.
- On page 16, row 15, add a footnote under the table: 'None of the options/scenarios shown in this table reflect the detailed calculations of the application scheme and therefore the carbon emission results in this table are different to those stated in rows 13-15.'
- On page 24, replace 'Aldgate: west pavement looking south' with 'Aldersgate: west pavement looking south'
- At end of Para 146 (p.184-185), insert 'the applicant has committed to provide 300sq.m of affordable workspace'.
- "Page 214, paragraph 283, states "There is 9,080sqm of existing public realm on site, including both hard and soft landscaping, which would be improved. The proposals would deliver in total 13,032 sqm, a significant uplift of 3,952sqm (43.5% by area) of new public space". Delete this sentence and replace it with "There is 8,431sqm of existing public realm on site, including both hard and soft landscaping, which would be improved. The proposals would deliver in total 13,031sqm of public space, a significant uplift of 4,539sqm (49.9% by area) of new public space."
- On page 217, paragraph 289 refers to the Rotunda Garden, highlighting "[the Rotunda Garden] is tucked away and its location is not particularly obvious to visitors, it is an underutilised space". After this sentence add "The Rotunda garden is a private space and it is not accessible to the public."
- On page 219, paragraph 294 states "Additional access would be provided by opening the gates from Monkwell Square", this sentence should be deleted and replaced with "A new path would be provided through Barber Surgeon's Gardens to improve connectivity with Monkwell Square"
- On page 429, para 1226, replace '...meeting Local Plan ambitions for further office floorspace within the City Cluster area and contributing to the City's primary business and professional services function...' with '...meeting Local Plan ambitions for further office floorspace and contributing to the City's primary business and professional services function...'
- Page 410, para 1157, after "...the results show that the embodied carbon emissions can be reduced beyond the GLA's Aspirational Benchmark when..." add "the ambitious measures set out below are applied."
- Page 411, para 1160, table with detailed whole life-cycle carbon emissions per square meter: Relating to life-cycle modules B6-B7, the site wide operational carbon emissions differ from the operational carbon emissions of the

individual proposed buildings because, for the latter, industry benchmark data have been used instead of modelled data. This should be corrected for all individual proposed buildings to align with the site wide B6-B7 value of 671 kgCO2/m2.

The amended table should read as follows (changes highlighted in yellow):

Scope	Proposed Redevelopment					Benchmark	GLA Benchmark
RICS components	kgCO2/m2					kgCO2/m2	
	Site	Bastion House	Rotunda Building	North Building	Auxiliary Spaces		
A1-A5	560	460	645	713	625	< 950	GLA Standard
						< 600	GLA Aspirational
A-C (excluding B6-B7)	795	708	890	1,068	905	< 1400	GLA Standard
						< 970	GLA Aspirational
B6-B7	671	671	671	671	671		
A-C (including B6-B7)	1,466	1,375	1,503	1,710	1,547		

- On page 434 para 1240 final sentence the Twentieth Century Society objection, delete "less than substantial harm" and replace with "substantial harm".

A question has been raised about and as to whether an alternative scheme or alternative schemes to develop the application site, or part of it, is/are material considerations to be taken into account when determining this application. In this case there is no known alternative scheme. There have been some suggestions made in respect of other options for the site objectors would prefer and reference made to a marketing exercise carried out by the City Corporation as landowner prior to the submission of the planning application. In the view of officers any such suggestions falls into the category of a vague or inchoate scheme/s. Further there is no evidence that such a scheme/s could be delivered. In these circumstances any alternative scheme(s) should be given little or no weight. It is the view of officers that the suggestion that there may be an alternative scheme or options is a material consideration of such little weight that that it makes no material difference to the planning balance and analysis set out in the report, and does not alter the recommendation made by officers.

4. Additional and Updated conditions:

Additional conditions:

Add condition 110-

In this condition “*Unilateral Undertaking*” means the undertaking of even date with this Planning Permission given by the City Corporation as landowner pursuant to Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 in relation to the development site and this Planning Permission, including any modifications from time to time to such Unilateral Undertaking.

110. Section 106

No development shall take place unless and until all parties with a legal interest in the development site as the Local Planning Authority consider necessary, have entered into a Section 106 agreement directly with the City Corporation giving planning obligations on like terms to those contained in the Unilateral Undertaking.

REASON: To ensure that any future landowners are bound by the terms of the planning obligations which mitigate the impacts of the development and that the public benefits are secured before any development pursuant to the planning permission commences.

111. Nursery Floorspace

Prior to completion of the development, details of the reprovision of nursery (Use Class E(f)) floorspace shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority including location within the development and layout, with a minimum of 88sq.m (GIA) of floorspace to be provided. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

REASON: To ensure the reprovision of the existing social and community facility in line with the following policy of the Local Plan: DM22.1.

112. Circulation Floorspace

Prior to completion of the development, details of the layout of the ancillary Class E floorspace within 200 Aldersgate Street and 1 London Wall shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

REASON: To ensure that the Local Planning Authority may be satisfied with the detail of the proposed development.

113. Drinking Water Fountains

A strategy for the provision of free, publicly accessible drinking water fountains shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority before any landscaping works are commenced. The drinking water fountain strategy should include the detailed design, location and maintenance of drinking water fountains. The drinking water fountains as approved shall be in place before occupation and the operation of the drinking water fountains must be provided for the lifetime of the development, alterations may be agreed in writing by the local planning authority.

REASON: To provide publicly accessible free drinking water in accordance with London Plan Policy D8 part O.

Reword the following conditions with amended wording (in bold):

1. Time limit

The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of **five** years from the date of this permission.

REASON: To ensure compliance with the terms of Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

2. Approved drawings

Amend -

Site plans:

6594-DSRSR-ZZ-ZZ-DR-A-001000 **rev P02** Site Location Plan;

6594-DSRSR-ZZ-ZZ-DR-A-001001 **rev P02** Proposed Site Location Plan;

Change title Demolition plans to Demolitions **drawings**

Change title Landscape plans to Landscape **drawings**

Omit the following-

Site plans

6594-DSRSR-ZZ-ZZ-DR-A-001002 Existing site plan

6594-DSRSR-ZZ-ZZ-DR-A-001004 Enabling Phasing Plan- Ground level

3. Use Classes

Add (Class E(g)(i)) to read “The areas shown on the approved drawings as Offices **(Class E(g)(i))**, and as set out in Condition 5 of this decision notice shall be used for those purposes only...”

4. Retail use

Add (Class E(a)) to read “The areas shown on the approved drawings as Retail **(Class E(a))** , and as set out in Condition 5 of this decision notice shall be used for those purposes only...”

5. Floor Areas (C)

The development shall provide (all figures GIA, including back of house and plant):

- 55,980.8 sq.m Office Use (Class E(g)(i));

- 1107.9 sq.m Retail/Restaurant Use (Class E(a/b));

- 8151.2 sq.m Cultural Use (Sui Generis);
- 480 sq.m Livery Hall Use (Sui Generis);
- 594.2 sq.m Public Car Park (Sui Generis);
- 703 sq.m Cycle Hub (Sui Generis);
- 266.4 sq.m Class E use in relation to 200 Aldersgate Street and 1 London Wall.

20. Preliminary Roost Assessment (PRA)

Replace “prior to commencement of development” with “**prior to demolition**”.

21. Updated Biodiversity Net Gain score (PCED)

Replace “Prior to the commencement of development excluding demolition with
“**Further to the approval of landscaping and urban greening details as set out in Conditions 76 and 77**”

22. Ecological Management Plan (PCED)

Replace “Prior to the commencement of the development, excluding demolition, with
“**Further to the approval of landscaping and urban greening details as set out in Conditions 76 & 77.**”

29. SUDs

Replace “surface water flow rates shall be restricted to no greater than 1.94 l/s from all outfalls, provision should be made for an attenuation volume capacity capable of achieving this, which should be no less than 240m³” with “surface water flow rates shall be restricted to no greater than **9.9l/s** from all outfalls, provision should be made for an attenuation volume capacity capable of achieving this, which should be no less than **736m³**”

40. Additional doors add “noise management scheme”

Reword to “Prior to occupation, a noise management scheme shall be submitted and approved by the Local Planning Authority (to include details of further sets of doors as deemed necessary to rooms used for entertainment purposes and with doors opening out to external areas). The measures set out in the scheme must be implemented and retained for the life of the premises. Any additional doors must not be left open except in an emergency or for maintenance purposes.

REASON: To safeguard the amenity of the adjoining premises and the area generally in accordance with the following policies of the Local Plan: DM15.7, DM21.3.”

61. Landscape tree barriers (PC)

Reword to state “Prior to the occupation of the first building, details of the landscape buffer including species and height of tree planting to demonstrate how this will minimise pollutant exposure as set out in paragraph 8.6.6 of the ES Air Quality.

62. Demolition and Construction Logistics Plan (PC)

Replace “Deconstruction” with “**Demolition**” and replace Mayor of London's Construction Logistics Plan Guidance July 2017 with dated “**April 2021**”. Add “**and shown within detailed traffic management drawings**” after Details will be required to describe how pedestrian and cyclist safety will be maintained, including any proposed alternative routes (if necessary), any Banksman arrangements and shown within detailed traffic management drawings.

70. Blue Badge Car Parking Spaces

Add “A minimum of three **additional (five in total)** blue badge off-street parking

72. Car Management Plan (PCRW) in condition insert “**Park**” after car to read Car Park Management Plan. Insert “**for London Wall car park**” after A Car Park Management Plan

75. Design detail (PCRW)

e. Ironmongers Hall

f. delete “including sample panel of brickwork”

76. Landscaping (PCRW)

Insert at beginning of second paragraph “**All works located within the vicinity of scheduled monuments and in relation to the Barbican Estate**”

Insert in first sentence of second paragraph “**...[in consultation with] City Gardens**”

77. Urban Greening

Delete: “Before any works hereby affected are begun, details of a holistic urban greening strategy, **including hard landscaping,**”

Delete : “ **and c. the landscaping including samples of the public realm**”

78. Wayfinding

Insert in the first sentence "...demolition, a **bespoke, site specific**, signage and wayfinding..."

79. Public Realm details

- a. part vi. delete whole part relating to drinking water fountain and replace with standalone condition
- d. part vi, after "girls school", insert, "**to maintain privacy**"
- d. part vi, after "Barbican Estate", add, ", and **Monkwell Square**"
- d. part vii. After 'car park area below' **add** 'to include details of sound insulation to be incorporated into the design of the deck'

Reason: **add** in policy DM15.7 and DM21.3.

82. Sculptures, Markers and Plaques (PC)

Insert : "All sculpture, parish markers, commemorative plaques on the existing buildings and in the existing public spaces shall be carefully removed prior to demolition commencing stored for the duration of building works, repaired, reinstated in agreed locations and retained for the life of the building or **off site locations to be agreed...**"

Delete repeated "**Bull and Mouth Sculpture**" insert "**Horse with Two Discs**"

87. Archaeology and Fieldwork (PC)

Insert the following: "No demolition or development shall take place until a stage 1 written scheme of investigation (WSI) has been submitted to and approved by the local planning 533 authority in writing. For land that is included within the WSI, no demolition or development **other than demolition to basement slab**, shall take place other than in accordance with the agreed WSI, and the programme and methodology of site evaluation and the nomination of a competent person(s) or organisation to undertake the agreed works....."

Delete the following section **B. Where appropriate, details of a programme for delivering related positive public benefits.**

88. Preservation and Protection (PC)

Insert the following: "No development **or site investigation or site preparation** shall commence until details of fencing, signage and other control measures to protect the part of the Jewish Cemetery that may extend onto the site have been submitted and approved in writing by the local planning authority...."

89. Jewish Cemetery Condition (PC)

Insert the following "Notwithstanding Condition 2 (approved drawings), **no development or site investigation or site preparation** shall take place until detailed drawings of a revised design of the northern part of New Bastion House and highwalk"

90. Foundation design

Insert:” No development shall take place **other than demolition to basement slab**, until details of the foundation design and construction method to protect archaeological remains have been submitted and approved in writing by the local planning authority..... “

91. Public Engagement (add “archaeology”)

Insert “**relating to the findings of archaeology**” after public engagement.

95. Add “and Sanitary Facilities” after Changing Places.

Change trigger from “Before the shell and core of the first building are complete to **“Prior to occupation of any part of the development”**”

108. Affordable Workspace

Amend parts J-R to read A-I.

After (A) “the size, location and fit out of the Affordable Workspace” insert **(minimum of 300 sq.m (GIA) to be provided)**.

5. Additional background papers:

Statutory and Internal Consultees omitted from original report pack:

13/12/2023 - 16:29	Active Travel England
19/12/2023 - 12:27	Environment Agency
19/12/2023 - 15:49	Thames Water
20/12/2023 - 16:55	London Underground/DLR IP
22/12/2023 - 10:39	The Gardens Trust
05/01/2024 - 15:15	Historic England
08/01/2024 - 11:37	Southwark Council
09/01/2024 - 10:34	Natural England
21/01/2024 - 22:43	CFTPO Jewish Cemeteries in Europe
22/01/2023 - 16:13	Historic England
25/01/2024 - 18:07	Historic England
30/01/2024 - 20:25	Barbican and Golden Lane Forum
31/01/2024 - 10:14	Twentieth Century Society
31/01/2024 - 13:45	Willoughby House Group
31/01/2024 - 17:22	Ben Jonson House Group
31/01/2024 - 17:26	Barbican Association
01/02/2024 - 00:57	The Ironmongers’ Company
01/02/2024 - 13:02	Historic England
01/02/2024 - 13:02	Historic England
01/02/2024 - 16:24	Historic England

05/02/2024 - 16:08	Greater London Authority
08/02/2024 - 17:55	Historic England
11/02/2024 - 16:41	Barbican Association
22/02/2024 - 19:21	Westminster City Council
29/02/2024 - 15:19	Active Travel England
01/03/2024 - 13:52	Thames Water
05/03/2024 - 13:02	Historic England
05/03/2024 - 13:02	Historic England
06/03/2024 - 16:50	London Underground/DLR IP
15/03/2024 - 16:03	Thames Water
18/03/2024 - 10:22	Environment Agency
19/03/2024 - 08:40	Active Travel England
20/03/2024 - 00:50	CFTPO Jewish Cemeteries in Europe
20/03/2024 - 12:16	Historic England
20/03/2024 - 12:16	Historic England
22/03/2024 - 18:53	Barbican Quarter Action
25/03/2024 - 16:18	Surveyor to the Fabric of St Paul's
26/03/2024 - 11:01	Westminster City Council
26/03/2024 - 15:39	Conservation Area Advisory Committee
02/04/2024 - 11:11	Historic England
02/04/2024 - 11:15	Historic England
03/04/2024 - 09:11	London Underground/DLR IP
03/04/2024 - 13:58	Westminster City Council
05/04/2024 - 13:45	The Gardens Trust
05/04/2024 - 20:49	Barbican Quarter Action
06/04/2024 - 21:38	Barbican Association
09/04/2024 - 16:45	The Worshipful Company of Barbers
12/04/2024 - 08:25	Southwark Council
12/04/2024 - 11:55	The Gardens Trust
15/04/2024 - 09:40	Islington Council
15/04/2024 - 11:18	The Ironmongers' Company
15/04/2024 - 14:58	City of London School for Girls
16/04/2024 - 12:37	EON
23/01/2024	Environmental Resilience Officer
05.02.2024	Environmental Health
09.02.2024	Local Lead Flood Authority
27.02.2024	Access Advisor
04.03.2024	Planning Obligations
05.03.2024	District Surveyors Office (fire)
06.03.2024	Air Quality Advisor
08.03.2024	Planning Obligations

Additional representations received following publication of the original report pack:

08/02/24 - 08:20	Fred Rodgers	Objection	All three
08/04/24 - 13:50	Mr Unmesh Desai	Objection	23/01304/FULEIA
08/04/24 - 15:39	Mrs Mina Lad	Objection	23/01304/FULEIA
08/04/24 - 10:03	Dr Nicholas Bacon	Objection	23/01304/FULEIA
09/04/24 - 15:56	Martin Kinsey	Objection	23/01304/FULEIA
09/04/24 - 17:52	Mr Alan Petty	Objection	23/01304/FULEIA
09/04/24 - 22:32	Dr Sam Christie	Objection	23/01304/FULEIA
09/04/24 - 22:56	Miss c gough	Objection	23/01304/FULEIA
09/04/24 - 22:58	Fred Rodgers	Objection	All three
10/04/24 - 23:45	Miss Fern Abbott	Objection	23/01304/FULEIA
12/04/24 - 21:57	Mrs Sandra Fryer	Objection	23/01304/FULEIA
14/04/24 - 16:47	Mr Thomas Ingram	Objection	23/01304/FULEIA
15/04/24 - 20:02	Mr Michael Keen	Objection	23/01304/FULEIA
16/04/24 - 11:17	Terry Trickett	Objection	All three

23/01276/LBC

Condition 4 f. delete **“including sample panel of brickwork”**

23/01277/LBC

Condition 4a. Amend: details of the interface junction including soffit, balustrade, expansion joint and materials and surrounding structure to extend Mountjoy Close Highwalk and ~~Hohn~~ **John** Wesley Highwalk.