

Member Engagement: Planning (Lisvane Review)

From: Hayward CC, Christopher (Sheriff)
Sent: 29 January 2021 17:01
To: Chair of the Barbican Association
Subject: RE: Lisvane on Planning Barbican Association's view

Dear Adam

I am hugely grateful to you and your Association for your email and for expressing with clarity your views and concerns regarding our Planning activity in the City. As Chairman of the Lisvane Consultation process I will most definitely ensure that the views that you express are taken forward and drawn to the attention of the members of those Committees who are making the ultimate formal recommendations to the Court of Common Council. I have no doubt that your elected members will also ensure your message is heard too.

I said as recently as the last Planning Committee meeting that in my view residents are important stakeholders in the City and I accept that some of our past actions may not have necessarily given that impression. Even when we disagree, which inevitably we will do from time to time, we must be respectful of resident's views and I personally am keen to try and start a new chapter in rebuilding the relationship between us. It is in that spirit that I have offered to meet with you quarterly to better understand resident's concerns and I know that the Policy Chair is meeting with you likewise today. That offer should in no way be seen as seeking to undermine your relationship with your excellent team of elected Ward members who should always be your first point of contact.

Best wishes
Chris

Christopher M Hayward CC
Sheriff of the City of London
Deputy Chairman of the Policy & Resources Committee

From: Chair of the Barbican Association
Sent: 29 January 2021 10:16
To: Hayward CC, Christopher (Sheriff)
Subject: Lisvane on Planning Barbican Association's view

Dear Chris

When we last talked, you mentioned that you thought that relations between the City and its residents were not as good as they had been in the past. We endorsed that view.

You also updated us on how the City was responding to the Lisvane Governance report. Planning was next on the Agenda.

We definitely support Lisvane's proposals that the Planning Committee should follow best practice in reducing conflicts of interest and the perception of them, and we accept that there are statutory limits on how much ward councillors can do on the committee to represent the interests of their constituents. However, we do think that residents come off particularly badly from the current planning regime.

Recent planning decisions, the most recent being 150 Aldersgate, (other examples are presented as an appendix below), where sufficient attention to residents' views, Conservation Area rules and the Local Plan did not appear to have been paid, have not helped City resident relations. Indeed, there appears to be a culture that pays virtually no attention to residents and renders the planning policies that protect residential amenity, listed buildings and Conservation Areas meaningless because they are always trumped by other policies.

In the BA's response to Lisvane, we said "Residents should have a stronger voice than currently and stronger than that of workers or visitors because we are more heavily invested in the City and what the City does affects our lives more." The BA represents about half of all the residents in the City and planning decisions impact on us 24 hours a day and for many years.

We hope that in your deliberations you will take full account of residential needs. We will be seeking further protection in the Local Plan during the next round of consultation in view of the City's unique structural imbalance against residential interests.

Adam Hogg Chairman Barbican Association
Jane Smith Chairman PA Planning Group

Appendix

Further examples of planning committee decisions that simply ignore residents' concerns or their rights to some amenity. These range

From the small scale – e.g., the decision to grant 21 Moorfields' request to vary their originally consented scheme to move their delivery bay from Fore Street Avenue to Moor Lane. The City's own traffic engineers had approved a delivery bay on Fore Street Avenue, certifying that it could cope with the traffic flows. The City approved its movement to Moor Lane, which is overlooked by all the flats in Willoughby House and is itself designated as a quiet cycleway with a City plan for greening and public realm enhancements.

To the medium scale: an unwillingness to do anything about building managers' delight in 24 hour a day lit-up building, leading to light pollution for residential neighbours (and incidentally wasting energy).

To the large scale: multiple approvals for buildings surrounding the Barbican estate that are more massive and much higher than the buildings they replace, leading to cumulative losses of daylight and sunlight, and a persistent refusal to recognise that even though the loss might be less than the BREAM limit of 20% that is still a loss and it is compounded by successively higher buildings- Tenter House, 21 Moorfields, London Wall Place Nos 1 and 2, No 1 London Wall; 140, 150, 160 Aldersgate Street; the Denizen.