

of some of the Barbican buildings. However this is only through the 'canyon', which the view is aligned to, and is with the loss of the existing rotunda, highwalks and bridge. Moves across this part of Aldersgate Street, or to the left of the viewing position, would just show the massing of the new buildings. This massing completely blocks in the view west along London Wall from Alban Gate (TVBHIA 20), and that south along Aldersgate Street (TVBHIA 22 & 23), with a detrimental loss of sky. There is the same effect looking north from St Paul's underground station (TVBHIA 38).

The other view which is opened up is that of the front of Ironmongers' Hall from Aldersgate (TVBHIA 23), but again only as an opening between large buildings, which depends on being in the right place.

The impact from Postman's Park is shown in TVBHIA 17 to 19. with the new buildings looming behind the old buildings in Little Britain and St Botolph's Church. In some views (TVBHIA 19) the new Rotunda Building is right behind the tower of the church. This effect is rated (TVBHIA 17) as 'impact : medium, effect ; beneficial', on the ground that (in the view chosen) the two new buildings 'frame' the tower. I would rate this (and many similar impacts in other views) as 'impact : high, effect ; very detrimental', and I think a majority of observers would take the same view. There are multiple other instances of the new buildings filling what are now important gaps of sky between the existing structures.

Impact on the Barbican Estate

The Barbican Estate is Grade II listed. A considerable amount of the attraction of the Estate is in its context of surrounding areas. The original more open aspect around the edges of the Estate has already been eroded, for instance by the new 'Milton Court' building to the north east, and the City Point Tower to the east.

The present proposals would continue and increase that 'enclosure' in relation to the south west aspect. This is well shown in the relevant files in the TVBHIA series. The increased mass of buildings would particularly affect views from Thomas More (TVBHIA 43) and Mountjoy Houses. Some would also affect the view of St Giles Church. There is a general 'blocking in' with loss of gaps of sky to both sides of the church tower, and on some views (eg TVBHIA 57) the proposed Rotunda Building is spoiling the outline of the tower against the sky.

The present Bastion House does appear in some views of the Church, but New Bastion House is wider. Again this is rated 'beneficial', because of the lighter colour of the proposed buildings. I think that the darker colour of the existing Bastion House is better, contrasting rather than merging with the colours of the Church.

Road changes

The proposals would remove the existing roundabout at the junctions of Aldersgate Street with Montague Street and London Wall and replace this with a two-way section using the alignment of the west and south parts of the roundabout. This necessitates new traffic lights at the two junctions, for the right turn from Montague Street into Aldersgate Street southbound, and the right turn to continue south along Aldersgate Street across traffic coming west along London Wall.

Traffic

At present traffic flows well at this roundabout, even at peak times. The proposed changes and traffic lights will increase traffic congestion in this area, with more stationary vehicles, especially at peak times. The Health Impact Assessment (HIA) (6.4 section 3) recognises that there will be an increase in traffic '*almost entirely due to the reconfiguration of the road and subsequent re-direction of traffic*'.

The demolition and new building proposed will cause a large increase in lorry movements in the area during many years of construction. The increase in lorry movements for refurbishment and re-purposing would by contrast be very small.

The proposal is to use the Thomas More House ramp for all construction traffic, and later all operational traffic. How this will operate safely whilst allowing existing traffic to continue on this ramp, which is the access for vehicles to Thomas More, Seddon, and Mountjoy Houses, Lauderdale Tower and Lambert Jones Mews is not explained.

Air pollution and dust

During my career as a specialist in respiratory medicine, I was interested in the effects of dust and air pollution on health. I acted as an expert witness in cases of dust pollution, and gave evidence about air pollution and health to two planning enquiries (none of these in London). I was therefore particularly interested to read the submissions concerning this in the application.

Air pollution in London is too high, which affects respiratory, cardiac, and other types of health. Current levels exceed national and international standards. Much pollution, especially small particles (PM10 and PM2.5) and nitrogen dioxide, comes from road vehicles with internal combustion engines. Air pollution in Central London has improved a little, attributable to the Ultra Low Emission Zone (ULEZ), and lower emission buses and taxis, but is still too high for the health of City of London residents and workers.

The proposal states that the amount of road traffic will be little affected, and is independent of this development. However the additional lorry traffic, particularly with diesel lorries, will add to air pollution. The HIA says only that (6.4 section 2), even using lorries of the highest emission specifications, this will '*help to reduce health impacts from air pollution*'. Mitigation includes a holding area elsewhere, but this only transfers the problem, and increases the total emissions because of greater mileage and manoeuvring. Also more traffic congestion attributable to the road changes and traffic lights will increase air pollution, unless and until there are no internal combustion engines in use.

Dust from construction, and especially from demolition, is also likely to contribute to particulate pollution. Containment measures are never 100% effective.

Pedestrians

The separation of vehicular traffic from pedestrians in the design of the Barbican Estate, using podia and highwalks, was a major step forward in pedestrian comfort and safety. The highwalks were extended east to Moorgate (closed for some years but soon to re-open) and south to London Wall. At London Wall there are a number of bridge crossings to the south side. Two are at the Museum of London building

roundabout, linking to both sides of the southern part of Aldersgate Street, with escalators at one of the exits to street level on the south side, and a lift at the other. A third bridge from Bastion highwalk to the east end of 1 London Wall has a lift on the south side.

The proposals put forward include the demolition of the western part of Bastion highwalk, the rotunda highwalk in the middle of the roundabout, the two bridges from this across Aldersgate Street, and a large part of the John Wesley highwalk. A new highwalk link from the north part of the site will connect to the west part of the Barbican Estate, but most pedestrian circulation will be at ground (road) level. All highwalks and bridges and all pedestrian access through the site will be closed for the duration of demolition and building, including the third bridge which will be reinstated at the end of construction (Construction and Environmental Management Report). Both the neighbouring bus stops will be suspended and relocated for the duration.

Much is made of the present roundabout being unfriendly for pedestrians (the 'tunnel') and dangerous for pedestrians and cyclists. Pedestrians have the highwalks and bridges if they wish. Redesign of the roundabout is needed to improve the cycleways. But do we need to demolish the whole building just to make the cycleways safer?

The HIA (6.5 - part 1 - Easy to cross) states that pedestrian safety will be improved by replacing existing 'zebra' crossings with light controlled crossings. I assume that these will be at the two road junctions, with the necessary pedestrian cycle for the lights increasing traffic congestion. The HIA (6.3 - section 1) states that '*Enhancement of the public realm is planned within the proposed development at street and highwalk level.*'. There is no mention of the loss of the highwalks and bridges.

The HIA also states (section 6.5 - section 1 - Easy to cross) that '*The reconfiguration of the Rotunda roundabout will create a new pedestrianised route to the new plaza in the centre of the Site, and existing footways will be maintained and reconfigured.*'. This is untrue. Or perhaps the highwalks and bridges to be lost are not counted as '*existing footways*'?

I would conclude that this is a major step backwards for pedestrian comfort and safety at this important intersection of London routes, and for the connectivity of the whole Barbican area. In addition pedestrians will be exposed to greater air pollution levels at road level. Even small horizontal and/or vertical separations of pedestrians from road traffic reduces these exposures significantly.

reference 23/01277/LBC - listed building consent - Barbican Estate

I also object to this application. The grounds for the objection are the effects of the removal of the highwalks, and the loss of views and amenity in and around the Barbican Estate. These objections are stated in the relevant sections above concerning 23/1304/FULEIA - planning application for London Wall West.

Yours faithfully,



**(Dr) Martin Farebrother,
MD (Cantab) FRCP (London)**

Comments for Planning Application 23/01304/FULEIA

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/01304/FULEIA

Address: 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

Proposal: 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.

Case Officer: Gemma Delves

Customer Details

Name: Miss Suzanne Hinton

Address: 701 Mountjoy House Barbican London

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Noise
- Other
- Residential Amenity
- Traffic or Highways

Comment: Suzanne Hinton has early onset dementia, she lives at the end of the block right next in 701 Mountjoy House. She has carers living in 24/7.

She lives just 20 metres away will be your proposed building site.

Suzanne sleeps in the day and puts her hands over her ears when normal household noise bothers her.

You are proposing a construction that will easily produce around 80 decibels. It would be like living next to an airport. The aging windows and frames won't keep the noise out, there is no sound insulation.

This would be a living hell for her.

A living hell she won't be able to escape as she is housebound. It will also be hell for her carers, and the good ones won't want to work under those circumstances leading to a decline in the level of care she has currently been receiving.

Are you aware of the mental and physical anguish this will cause? We are talking her having to endure this for hours each day, every week, every month for years.

Imagine if this was our elderly aunt, mum, godparent.

Comments for Planning Application 23/01304/FULEIA

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/01304/FULEIA

Address: 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

Proposal: 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.

Case Officer: Gemma Delves

Customer Details

Name: Mr Brian Johnson

Address: Flat 702 Seddon House Barbican London

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Noise
- Other
- Residential Amenity
- Traffic or Highways

Comment: I wish to object to the proposals that have been made for Bastion House and The Museum of London buildings and the overdevelopment of this site.

I am a resident of Seddon House Barbican .

The Documents, Drawings and Reports, appear to have been made to complicate rather than communicate. Visualisation is limited and optimistic, They avoid and flatter rather than be realistic. This is a development without either a Commercial Developer nor an end user.

Even if granted these will be subject to amendments and 'Value Engineering' and costs and quality will be make the actual far from anything that we are being led to believe will be built.

While I concede that there are some flaws in the existing buildings they could be repurposed and

adapted.

Not only avoiding a the carbon footprint.... which is contrary to both The Corporation of London and National Government guidelines, but also to limit the grief and timescale that the proposal which is suggested will last for ten years.

Aldersgate Street (the Great North Road or the A1, which is the longest road in Britain), is a direct line from The City of London to the the Scottish capital Edinburgh.

The rotunda (or roundabout) of the Museum of London was created in a post war worship for the motorcar.

It seems a same that the new proposal dose not even consider the historic aspect of this important site. There is now idea of creating a 'Gate' just a gate to nothing.

The Mass and density of the new proposal for so much office space runs contra to The Corporations wish to create the west side of the city to be one of cultural and leisure activity.

The proposal for the servicing of both the demolition and the future development puts undue pressure on the ramp to Thomas Moore Carpark, therefore making life for the many residents untenable on health and safety reason, and quiet enjoyment of life, not only for the 10 years duration of the demolistion and build but probably for ever more. The report is risible at the very least,

From:

To:

Subject: LWW planning app 23/01304/FULEIA; 23/01277/LBC; 23/01276/LBC

Date: 29 January 2024 17:16:09

THIS IS AN EXTERNAL EMAIL

I object to the proposals seeking planning permission for the demolition of the former Museum of London and Bastion House and their replacement with commercial premises.

Such permission would allow the future removal of buildings that had predominantly been used for cultural purposes within the bounds of this exceptional residential estate and their replacement with offices. The fact that Bastion House sits atop the former museum seems an architectural and planning anomaly but it does not negate the fact that these buildings were used for cultural not commercial purposes and are interwoven into this residential area. The Museum buildings are as integral to the Barbican as the arts centre and the school.

As a resident in the Barbican for fifty years, I have observed that while the planning authority has over the years permitted office blocks to be built around the Estate of a greater dimension than those present when the Barbican was designed, built and occupied, it has not yet permitted demolition of an important building and its replacement by office blocks to be built essentially within the Estate. If this application is granted, the likely result would be material damage to the cohesion and environment of the Barbican.

There are alternatives that the Corporation should consider for the use of the existing buildings. The City would certainly attract many visitors with its own museum of modern art. Consider the success of the galleries at Tate Modern and indeed the Barbican Arts Centre.

I would ask the planning committee to refuse this application.

Andrew Faiers

183 Lauderdale Tower Barbican London EC2Y 8BY

Comments for Planning Application 23/01304/FULEIA

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/01304/FULEIA

Address: 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

Proposal: 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.

Case Officer: Gemma Delves

Customer Details

Name: Mrs Linda Kiernan

Address: 606 Mountjoy House Barbican London

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of the Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Noise
- Other
- Residential Amenity
- Traffic or Highways

Comment: Obviously things need to change, but this is an over ambitious project incorporating long-term complex building work right next to residential accommodation, which has not been sufficiently thought through in terms of taking account of residents' needs. The planning application also does not take any account of environmental issues, e.g. clean air, pollution and light deprivation.

There has also been a lack of consultation and railroading which has blatantly ignored residents' views & welfare. This project will also impede our car park entry and exit with no thought as to how it will affect residents, thus deliberately obstructing residents' everyday life. I hope some compromise can be reached, particularly in relation to the use of our car park, e.g. using the large area between it and the London Wall entrance instead.

Comments for Planning Application 23/01304/FULEIA

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/01304/FULEIA

Address: 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

Proposal: 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.

Case Officer: Gemma Delves

Customer Details

Name: Mrs Christine Doublet-Stewart

Address: Woodside Old hall Mill Lane Atherton

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Other
- Residential Amenity

Comment: The development will cause substantial harm to the setting of neighbouring listed and unlisted assets - the Barbican, St Giles Cripplegate, Ironmongers' Hall, Postman's Park ...

Comments for Planning Application 23/01304/FULEIA

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/01304/FULEIA

Address: 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

Proposal: 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.

Case Officer: Gemma Delves

Customer Details

Name: Dr Ruth Holt

Address: 96 Thomas More House Barbican

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Noise
- Other
- Residential Amenity
- Traffic or Highways

Comment: I object to this scheme on the basis of it being flawed in a number of respects; it is ecologically damaging, lacks any sense of respect for its context, next to the Barbican estate, unnecessary (adding little or nothing to the City), and is a missed opportunity to design a sympathetic showpiece re-use of the Museum of London.

As a resident in a nearby part of the estate I object to the additional noise, traffic use and general loss of amenity that will result from this greedy and unimaginative development.

Comments for Planning Application 23/01304/FULEIA

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/01304/FULEIA

Address: 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

Proposal: 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.

Case Officer: Gemma Delves

Customer Details

Name: Mr Peter Rimmer

Address: 123 Thomas More House Barbican London

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Noise
- Other
- Residential Amenity
- Traffic or Highways

Comment: The city is already full of empty businesses and shops. We do not need more offices. The demolition of the museum would be disgracefully ungreen, not to mention the impact on the light for residents who live at the Barbican. The noise and disruption would be unbeatable for a prolonged period of time.

Comments for Planning Application 23/01304/FULEIA

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/01304/FULEIA

Address: 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

Proposal: 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.

Case Officer: Gemma Delves

Customer Details

Name: Mrs Joan Farebrother

Address: 117 Defoe House Barbican London

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Other
- Residential Amenity
- Traffic or Highways

Comment: I strongly oppose this application because -

1 The demolition of the buildings is unnecessary. They are safe and can be refurbished and retrofitted.

2 Demolition and reconstruction is incompatible with the declared policy of the City of London, to reduce CO2 emissions, and to this end to favour re-purposing over demolition and reconstruction

3 The proposed development is speculative, and there is no evidence that the increase of office space is needed.

4 The present buildings are good examples of 20th century architecture, and the 20th Century Society has recommended that they should be preserved

5 Bastion House would be replaced with a building with a much larger volume and footprint, there would be another tower (Rotunda Tower), and a new North Building would also be taller than the existing Museum of London building.

6 The increased massing will affect views of the sky, and obstruct views along Aldersgate Street

and along London Wall. The towers will also loom above Postman's Park.

7 The towers will close in around this area, with remaining ground level areas and first floor (present highwalk) areas in canyon like spaces.

8 The towers will further enclose and loom above the Grade II listed Barbican Estate, whose original open environment has already been eroded.

9 The proposed road and traffic management changes will lead to increased congestion and therefore increased traffic pollution

10 The loss of a large part of the existing highwalks in this area will be to the detriment of the public realm, and to the pedestrian experience

Comments for Planning Application 23/01304/FULEIA

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/01304/FULEIA

Address: 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

Proposal: 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.

Case Officer: Gemma Delves

Customer Details

Name: Mr Liam Gillick

Address: 72 Thomas More House Barbican London

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Noise
- Other
- Residential Amenity
- Traffic or Highways

Comment: This proposal is poorly thought out and expressed with misleading renderings and vague plans that avoid showing the impact of the scheme when viewed from the Barbican Estate. The existing highwalks and modernist structures are in keeping with the context of the Estate. The destruction of these access points and the addition of heavy traffic on the ramp towards the Thomas More House carpark will severely impact upon all local residents including the pupils at the City of London School for Girls. The rational objections to this plan are too numerous to mention. Architectural heritage, negative affect upon all neighbors, climate impact, and most importantly misleading "blue sky" renderings that suggest that the architects have spent little or not time in the area. Residents understand that the City of London is in a constant state of renewal and change. Choosing to live in the Barbican suggests we are all interested in the contemporary. This proposal fails to meet the most basic contemporary standards of advanced architecture and social responsibility.

Comments for Planning Application 23/01304/FULEIA

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/01304/FULEIA

Address: 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

Proposal: 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.

Case Officer: Gemma Delves

Customer Details

Name: Mrs Ann Mosseri

Address: 203 Mountjoy House Barbican London

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Noise
- Other
- Residential Amenity
- Traffic or Highways

Comment: Having witnessed firsthand the pollution, mess and noise that the construction of Alban Gate caused which is a few hundred yards away from our home, I know how long and destructive such a development will be.

This one will be even worse as it's closer - just a few metres away - and I'm older now in my '80's and wanting a peaceful life.

Your plans will ruin any chance of peace and rest. It will bring noise, air and noise pollution, loss of accessibility and amenities during the take-down and build which will span years at a time when I and many of my neighbours need rest which is why we chose to live here in the Barbican. Living here will be intolerable.

It's incomprehensible that you think it's possible to bring all the building material through a residential car park that is already known as the most busiest car park in the Barbican Estate as it services Mountjoy, Thomas More, Seddon and Lauderdale. It has just one ramp - this is not sufficient.

I have been diagnosed with breast cancer recently and also suffer from a balance problem. I rely on a walking stick and my husband for support. I would not be able to walk to the street for a taxi but can take the lift to the bottom of our block. I am worried about getting hit by a heavy duty construction vehicle. I fear I will become housebound and whilst being housebound, I will get no rest from the noise and dust.

I'm also asthmatic and worry about the quality of air that will be affected by the take down and building of such a large construction.

This is a densely populated residential area, and there it is not the right place for such a proposed building.

Comments for Planning Application 23/01304/FULEIA

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/01304/FULEIA

Address: 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

Proposal: 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.

Case Officer: Gemma Delves

Customer Details

Name: Mr Roger Cheveley

Address: 203 Mountjoy House Barbican London

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Noise
- Other
- Residential Amenity
- Traffic or Highways

Comment: I look after my wife who is also in her 80's as am I. She has recently been diagnosed with cancer and is receiving treatment. Our flat will be just one flat away from the proposed development.

My wife and I have lived through the Alban Gate development and know how noisy and lengthy these are. This development will be closer and have a very large negative impact to both our lives and my wife's just of recuperating here. I have no words to how worried I have become regarding what you are proposing.

It makes no sense to have such a densely built office building so close to a residential complex of mainly elderly neighbours. It is proposed by a council with no heart.

You will be torturing all those who live here by denying them peace, quiet, light, calmness, and serenity - everything the Barbican is famous for.

You will be bringing dirt, excessive decibels, stress, vibrations, and danger to our car park. It will impact our health negatively.

We are too old to uproot now, so I don't know what we will do if decide to build this despite the obvious negative effect on those who are already here.

Comments for Planning Application 23/01304/FULEIA

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/01304/FULEIA

Address: 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

Proposal: 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.

Case Officer: Gemma Delves

Customer Details

Name: Dr Diana Tyson

Address: 164 Thomas More House Barbican London

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Other

Comment: The latest plans for this development are quite out of sympathy with the architectural context of the location.

The two massive towers, as planned, will dwarf all surrounding buildings. If the Corporation of London wishes to attract tourists to the City, as has repeatedly been stated, the development on this site needs to be compatible with the scale of the surrounding buildings on and around London Wall, and also further afield. Iconic sites like St Bartholomew the Great, Clothfair, St Alphage, Smithfield, St Giles Cripplegate need a sympathetic architectural environment. It is the unique historic, even medieval, character of much of the neighbourhood that will bring in tourists.

The size of the planned development also indicates a need for significantly increased policing, cleaning, traffic management, perhaps access roads, general keeping the public space clean and in order. Has this aspect been given due consideration?

There seems to be a lot of new office development in the City. Is there a market for this, or is the

planning based on purely speculative expectation? Is there in fact a client for these two buildings?

Any planned building development needs to be considered as part of a larger whole, and its effect on the character of its surroundings need to be carefully weighed up. No building in the City can function as an individual entity.

I urge the Corporation to reconsider the future of this site.

Comments for Planning Application 23/01304/FULEIA

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/01304/FULEIA

Address: 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

Proposal: 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.

Case Officer: Gemma Delves

Customer Details

Name: Mr Iain Connor

Address: 193 Cromwell Tower Barbican London

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of the Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Other

Comment: Living on a listed estate, such as the Barbican, is a privilege. The CoL seems to regard this a burden rather than something to celebrate which is why at every opportunity it wants to rip out the original architects' plans for a community where offices, houses and the public realm are given equal prominence. The CoL believes it needs to develop the MoL site to balance its cash book due to its commitments to move the historic markets to a new site in Essex and to pay for the MoL to move into the Smithfield Meat Market site. This is not true. The CoL sits on the "City Cash" which at the last audit to the year 31 March 2022 had net assets of 2.8 Billion. Therefore, its mantra that it must maximise revenue from its assets is not borne out by its own accounts and is against the wishes of the vast majority of the City's voters. The development goes against the City's own plan for sustainability by failing to take into account the materials it will take to rebuild the site and the carbon released by the demolition (the environmental study is woeful; written to an agenda which did not adequately assess refitting and repurposing the existing building; in which regard the CoL has also disregarded its own belated request for expressions of interest in repurposing which received rather too many excellent proposals which has allowed the CoL to suggest it has properly considered these options when it has not). The loss of amenity is manifest

in percentage terms by reference to the ratio of the proposed development; in accessibility terms with regard to hours of operation and ability to enjoy in an informal way; and in the catastrophic vandalism of the concept of the Highwalk and the Podium (which the CoL once championed to connect all the buildings in the City). The development will take away right to light and other easements. It is out of character with the Barbican Estate and St Martin's Le Grand. A building which ignores Roman London completely should not be permitted.

Comments for Planning Application 23/01304/FULEIA

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/01304/FULEIA

Address: 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

Proposal: 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.

Case Officer: Gemma Delves

Customer Details

Name: Joe Thomas

Address: 12 Quernmore Road London

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of the Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Other

Comment: I don't think it is outlandish to think of the City of London as a sort of living museum, truly akin to somewhere like Venice. I would implore the Corporation of London to see the City of London in this light, and to see themselves as its custodians, not as its liquidators. This shouldn't be about money. The City of London Corp. has plenty of money. They are not - as they have slightly tried to imply - some cash-strapped "local authority" who needs to sell off whatever they can to survive. There is absolutely no reason to behave in this way. To destroy heritage for money is something you should only do out of desperation, not just because the opportunity happens to come up. Shame on you.

Comments for Planning Application 23/01304/FULEIA

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/01304/FULEIA

Address: 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

Proposal: 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.

Case Officer: Gemma Delves

Customer Details

Name: Ms Helena Twist

Address: 501 Ben Jonson House Barbican London

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of the Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Residential Amenity

Comment: My objections are as follows:

- The proposed development is incompatible with the City's Climate Action Strategy. The existing buildings can and should be repurposed.
- The development fails to take account of the unique character of the Barbican buildings and their environs.
- The proposed scheme is unimaginative and diminishes the overall appearance of the Barbican.
- The City's proposals for two towers of office space is based on outdated concepts of work. There is already sufficient quality office space in the City to meet current and future needs.

Comments for Planning Application 23/01304/FULEIA

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/01304/FULEIA

Address: 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

Proposal: 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.

Case Officer: Gemma Delves

Customer Details

Name: Miss Anne Toovey

Address: Flat 210, Mountjoy House Barbican London

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Noise
- Other
- Residential Amenity
- Traffic or Highways

Comment: I object to the proposals on the following grounds:

(1) They would involve very large CO2 emissions, pollution and dust from the demolition and construction, which is inconsistent with the City's air quality and environmental initiatives. Although the existing buildings can be renovated and repurposed, and developers have expressed an interest in following this path, these options are being ignored by the City of London.

(2) The Thomas More car park would be the new permanent route for ALL traffic entering and exiting LWW. Besides increasing noise and pollution this would severely affect emergency access for residents. It would also severely affect pedestrian access for delivery of parcels and the use of the ramp to Aldersgate Street.

(3) The huge scale of the proposed new buildings would result in loss of light to Barbican flats and to the City of London School for Girls.

Comments for Planning Application 23/01304/FULEIA

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/01304/FULEIA

Address: 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

Proposal: 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.

Case Officer: Gemma Delves

Customer Details

Name: Ms Deborah Lambkin

Address: 130 Thomas More House London

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Noise
- Other
- Residential Amenity
- Traffic or Highways

Comment:As an artist who works from home the planned construction work over several years will impact my business, my health and the environment I live and work in. The scale of the new building is unnecessary and reuse of the existing buildings would be a far more environmentally sustainable way forward.

Comments for Planning Application 23/01304/FULEIA

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/01304/FULEIA

Address: 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

Proposal: 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.

Case Officer: Gemma Delves

Customer Details

Name: Mrs Lesley Connor

Address: 193 Cromwell Tower Barbican London

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of the Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Other

Comment: Buildings such as St Paul's Cathedral and The Barbican, showed ambition to challenge the status quo and bring benefit to both local communities and visitors. The proposed development on LWW is lazy, unambitious and completely inappropriate. It is not best use of the site.

It detracts from its surroundings damaging the listed buildings nearby; is at odds with CoL's own commitment to reuse rather than rebuild (and the interest shown by 3rd parties in doing this).

Information shared to date re CO2 emissions is inaccurate and ignores the short life span of a new build development.

The CoL could fund the Smithfield Museum and Market relocation from other City funds. Short term cash funding needs do not justify permanent damage to the neighbourhood- noise; light pollution, damage to sight lines to St Paul's etc.

The Roman remains found in the City locality would better justify a mixed use cultural or educational centre for the site - the Cultural Mile seems a hollow statement.

Bastion House should be repurposed for housing - this would be more consistent with the residential Barbican area.

Glass towers such as those proposed should be in the existing zone for these near the "Cheese Grater" not create a new zone and by doing so a new precedent.

The City has excess legacy offices that require refurbishment to meet future business needs and CO2 targets. Approving this development would put off any investor from refurbishing existing space as lessees will be attracted by the greenwashing of a new development.

Comments for Planning Application 23/01304/FULEIA

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/01304/FULEIA

Address: 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

Proposal: 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.

Case Officer: Gemma Delves

Customer Details

Name: Mrs Helen Hulson

Address: 523 Ben Jonson House Barbican London

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Other
- Residential Amenity

Comment:

I object to the planned development on the following grounds:

1. The building of the Barbican Estate is a vision of which the City of London can justly be proud. It is widely admired and the original architects carefully considered every aspect of its appearance and function to create an environment where people could enjoy living in the heart of the City. The proposed buildings would destroy the integrity of this listed estate in both scale and style.

2. It is significant that the Museum of London, an educational and cultural facility, was located here, indicating the City's sense of priorities when it was built. It is totally inappropriate for it to be replaced by office buildings. It is questionable whether there is sufficient demand for additional office space, I understand the City does not have an interested tenant.

3. The site is of historic importance. It stands near the beginning of one of the oldest roads in the country, linking London to the North and culminating at St Paul's. What this development would do is effectively present a huge visual block from both North and South, whereas what is needed is a transition with references both to the Barbican Estate and to the heritage of the area.

4. When both National and CoL policies on climate action do not support demolition, but rather retention and reuse of existing buildings, this proposal would result in the release of the unnecessary and irresponsible release of vast amounts of embodied carbon.

65. Both Bastion House and the former Museum of London are buildings of architectural merit which can be retained and adapted creatively so that they function to complement rather than overwhelm their location.

6. The impact of this development on the residential amenities will be to overshadow, diminish light and overlook, to the detriment mainly of the Barbican residential estate. The nearest building will be only 20 metres from Mountjoy House.

Please reject this application.

Comments for Planning Application 23/01304/FULEIA

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/01304/FULEIA

Address: 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

Proposal: 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.

Case Officer: Gemma Delves

Customer Details

Name: Dr Peter Delves

Address: Flat 97 1 Prescott Street London

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of the Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Residential Amenity

Comment: Inappropriately bulky buildings that will overdominate the adjoining Barbican estate and reduce light to resident's apartments.

Comments for Planning Application 23/01304/FULEIA

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/01304/FULEIA

Address: 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

Proposal: 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.

Case Officer: Gemma Delves

Customer Details

Name: Mr Stephen Griffin

Address: 67 Thomas More House Barbican London

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Noise
- Other
- Residential Amenity
- Traffic or Highways

Comment: The proposed redevelopment at London Wall starkly contradicts sustainability goals, with its extensive environmental impact and substantial carbon footprint from demolishing and constructing buildings. I strongly object to this approach and demand a more thorough environmental impact assessment that prioritises sustainable construction and retrofitting to minimise emissions.

The project threatens the area's rich historical heritage, risking irreplaceable architectural and cultural loss. I firmly object to the demolition of historically significant structures, advocating for development strategies that preserve and integrate the city's historical essence.

The plan's focus on increasing office space blatantly ignores the pandemic's insights into the critical need for residential and community spaces, underscoring a misguided disregard for

community vitality and resilience.

Moreover, I object to the inadequate consideration of transportation infrastructure and cyclist safety, particularly around the Thomas More car park. The proposal overlooks the increased risk of congestion, pollution, and danger to cyclists, necessitating a comprehensive transportation impact assessment to ensure the safety and sustainability of all road users.

In summary, the London Wall West development proposal is fundamentally flawed, overlooking crucial environmental, historical, social, and transportation considerations. I strongly object to the current proposal, calling for a reevaluation that ensures a sustainable, heritage-sensitive, and community-focused development, while prioritising safe and sustainable transportation, especially for cyclists near the Thomas More car park.

Comments for Planning Application 23/01304/FULEIA

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/01304/FULEIA

Address: 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

Proposal: 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.

Case Officer: Gemma Delves

Customer Details

Name: Mr Benjamin Auty

Address: 608 Mountjoy House Barbican London

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Noise
- Other
- Residential Amenity
- Traffic or Highways

Comment: I am a long term resident of the Barbican and strongly object to the plans being proposed for the London Wall West Development. My wife and I have chosen to make the Barbican our family home with two young daughters (3 and 7). We live in Mountjoy House and consequently will be heavily affected by the proposed scheme, both in the short term through the huge disruption, noise, dust and pollution generated by the lengthy demolition and construction processes but also in the longer term. Thomas More car park serves as our daily means of access to Adersgate Street. We cycle and use scooters to travel to school, work and around the city and our car is parked in Thomas More car park when we need to travel further afield. The car park is already extremely busy through residents' use (for which it was designed) and daily deliveries/refuse collection etc. The large increase in traffic and complicated traffic light system proposed is going to cause big delays and inconvenience to all existing residents and will unquestionably pose a greater risk to the safety of our children when using the Thomas More

ramp. There is no explanation provided as to why the existing one way system and exit ramp on London Wall will be removed and why these new developments cannot be served by a separate access route in and out.

As residents of Mountjoy House, our external views and the natural light and feeling of openness which is key to the brilliant design of our flats will be directly impacted by the greatly enlarged buildings replacing Bastion House.

Our decision to live in the heart of the City and to raise a family here is in large part due to the cultural amenities on our doorstep. The City's plans for the creation of a Culture Mile were met with great enthusiasm, particularly by resident families. The repurposing of Bastion House and the Museum of London offered a fantastic opportunity to expand that cultural reach and well developed ideas were simply ignored. It is a wasted opportunity.

Comments for Planning Application 23/01304/FULEIA

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/01304/FULEIA

Address: 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

Proposal: 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.

Case Officer: Gemma Delves

Customer Details

Name: Mr Richard Garey

Address: 21 Selwyn House Manor Fields London

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of the Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Other

Comment: I object to the demolition of 140 & 150 London Wall for the construction of new buildings on the grounds of unleashing tens of thousands of tonnes of carbon, even though industry experts have shown that these buildings are suitable for reuse. It is absurd that the government grants VAT exemptions for new builds, but does not extend those exemptions to refurbishments. How does this reflect the City of London's commitment to sustainable development, especially when developers are incentivised to tear down existing structures and rebuild? There seems to be a fundamental disconnect in the government's 'tick-box' culture. Their inability to develop and implement a strategy that meets their sustainability objectives is evident. Who is accountable for this oversight?

Comments for Planning Application 23/01304/FULEIA

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/01304/FULEIA

Address: 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

Proposal: 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.

Case Officer: Gemma Delves

Customer Details

Name: Mr Nicholas STONE

Address: 25 Thomas More House Barbican Estate

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of the Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Noise
- Other

Comment: The proposed massive and unnecessary demolish and redevelopment approach proposed by The City will :

- cause loss of daylight and privacy due to overshadowing and noise: I /we are HORRIFIED to learn for example of the proposed new 160 seat restaurant construction . This simply is not needed, wanted or warranted.
- dominate the surrounding neighbourhood and is contrary to the findings of the City's public consultation recently, which massively favoured refitting and repurposing.
- significantly harm the exiting environs in particular The Barbican itself, the listed building and place like Ironmongers Hall and Postman's Park.
- be contrary to The City's stated and published Environmental Strategy to reduce Co2 emissions and air pollution. This proposal will actually increase Co2 emissions SUBSTANTIALLY. There is undeniable evidence for this, which has already been presented to The City.

Please PLEASE reconsider.

Is this best use of land OR solely and overridingly a scheme to maximise monetary gain to The City? As residents of Thomas More House, our lives will be completely blighted should the demolition and redevelopment proceed. I and my partner LOVE living here, but the bulldozer approach to redevelopment will ruin this sentiment because of the aforementioned. I/we are not against necessary change and redevelopment per se. However, in this case, it must be undertaken mindful of the very many potential negative consequences to local Barbican residents and communities. Re shape London Wall West, yes, but by repurposing and refitting and perhaps some smaller scale demolition. But, the current City proposal as it stands is both flawed and against the majority wishes of The Barbican residents and communities. We feel much aggrieved. The City doesn't appear to be listening to the people and communities it is supposed to strive for and to serve.

Nicholas Stone MA DipCOT MLoD And William Cresswell MA

Comments for Planning Application 23/01304/FULEIA

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/01304/FULEIA

Address: 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

Proposal: 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.

Case Officer: Gemma Delves

Customer Details

Name: Dr Katrina Spensley

Address: 68 Speed House London

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Other
- Residential Amenity
- Traffic or Highways

Comment: I object to the plans for the demolition of 140 and 150 London wall because:

1) It is unnecessary:

There is already a surplus of office space in the city of London, with a large volume of visibly unoccupied offices nearby. Another empty eyesore is not needed as work habits have changed.

2) It is unsustainable:

The unnecessary destruction and redevelopment of the land will release a huge amount of carbon dioxide which undermines the City of London's climate action strategy.

3) It has been misrepresented:

The information provided has attempted to disguise the scale of the development through manipulated and highly selected images.

4) It ignores the surroundings:

The existing buildings have a character and are of a scale which is in keeping with the local area. The new proposal will dominate the area and compromise the local architectural integrity, as well adversely impact the residential amenity and the Girl's School.

5) It will impact safety:

The proposed changes to the traffic flow in the area, particularly with respect to Thomas More carpark will increase the risk to pedestrians and cyclists.

Comments for Planning Application 23/01304/FULEIA

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/01304/FULEIA

Address: 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

Proposal: 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.

Case Officer: Gemma Delves

Customer Details

Name: Mr Nicholas STONE

Address: 25 Thomas More House Barbican Estate

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of the Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Other
- Residential Amenity

Comment: Bastion House is a gem in particular and should be saved and repurposed, NOT demolished and redeveloped!

Comments for Planning Application 23/01304/FULEIA

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/01304/FULEIA

Address: 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

Proposal: 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.

Case Officer: Gemma Delves

Customer Details

Name: Mrs Lorraine Stone

Address: 205 Mountjoy House Syren

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Noise
- Other

Comment: I strongly object to the construction of London Wall West on the grounds that the current plan totally ignores the well-being of the residents of the Barbican living near the project because of the re-routing of traffic through the area causing a large increase in fumes, making it not at all environmentally friendly to us, also the noise levels will be greatly increased throughout the building phase. There will also be massive congestion in our Barbican service yard and access to this area will be very much restricted so deliveries and basic services will be heavily impacted, maybe dustbins also.

In the project details you state that this is a very environmentally friendly project but this is nonsense as it will create a lot of pollution which will be subjected on the residents and school children in the Barbican vicinity.

Please re-think your plan and come back with a proposal which suits everyone.

Comments for Planning Application 23/01304/FULEIA

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/01304/FULEIA

Address: 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

Proposal: 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.

Case Officer: Gemma Delves

Customer Details

Name: Mr Michael Stone

Address: 205 Mountjoy House Barbican London

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Noise
- Other
- Residential Amenity

Comment: The plan submitted regarding LWW appears to have been prepared out without any consideration to the impact it will have on those living in the Barbican and those attending the school.

The service area and approaches to Thomas Moore and Mountjoy Carpark will become heavily congested not only making it dangerous though the increase in traffic but creating noise and pollution. Barbican flats, school tennis courts and sports area are next to this new route plan, how can you say your project attends to our welfare?

The restrictions to Barbican resident's services caused though difficulty in accessing the service area will create stress, be harmful.

Please rethink your ideas and come back with plans which are environmentally and stress free for everybody.

Comments for Planning Application 23/01304/FULEIA

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/01304/FULEIA

Address: 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

Proposal: 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.

Case Officer: Gemma Delves

Customer Details

Name: Dr Sara Tanatova

Address: 373 Lauderdale Tower London

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Residential Amenity
- Traffic or Highways

Comment: The proposed changes would significantly decrease quality of life of residence and especially young children living in the Barbican and area nearby. The fact that such a low number of City residents are not looked after when resources allow to do so, defeats the aim of the proposed changes.

Comments for Planning Application 23/01304/FULEIA

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/01304/FULEIA

Address: 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

Proposal: 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.

Case Officer: Gemma Delves

Customer Details

Name: Miss Gemma Moody

Address: Ealing Cross 85 Uxbridge Road London

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Other

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Other

Comment:Negative effect on residential amenity Privacy/loss of daylight and sunlight/overshadowing/noise. Affects to the Roof Terrace

Adverse effect on highway safety for cyclists and pedestrians/increase in poor air quality with more traffic lights/potential traffic hazard with two way traffic

Comments for Planning Application 23/01304/FULEIA

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/01304/FULEIA

Address: 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

Proposal: 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.

Case Officer: Gemma Delves

Customer Details

Name: Mr Nick Caistor

Address: 910 Frobisher Crescent Barbican LONDON

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Noise
- Other
- Residential Amenity
- Traffic or Highways

Comment: To demolish two eminently servicable buildings in this day and age is short-sighted and irresponsible. They could easily be refashioned and put to good use as they are. Demolition and rebuilding of this site would cause traffic chaos for a number of years, and greatly hinder access to the Barbican facilities. The scheme would also threaten the heritage aspect of the site, including Roman structures and important guild buildings.

From:
To:
Subject: Planning. Ref. number 23/01304/FULEIA
Date: 30 January 2024 10:41:22

THIS IS AN EXTERNAL EMAIL

From: Susan Catherine McDonald. 107, Thomas More House, Barbican.
Sent from my iPad. London . EC2Y 8BU

I OBJECT most strongly to the planning application 23/01304/FULEIA.
This plan is short- sighted and places immediate financial gain above CULTURAL,
COMMUNITY and ENVIRONMENTAL considerations, whilst ignoring the effects of
man-made climate change

My objections to this plan are threefold.

1. The DEMOLITION of Bastion House and the Museum of London (two culturally significant buildings, which have been widely praised) runs counter to all enlightened sustainability policies - which the City Corporation proudly claims to support. To approve their destruction would be the height of hypocrisy.

These buildings should be RETAINED and ADAPTED.

2. More TOWER BLOCKS

This plan proposes two new tower blocks, which are quite out of proportion to the surrounding area, in both size and scale (New Bastion House will measure more than two and a half times the volume of the original). Such massive intrusions into this historically important area would have a NEGATIVE IMPACT ON THE SETTING OF LISTED BUILDINGS such as the Barbican Estate and others. There would be a deterioration in the AIR QUALITY, TOWNSCAPE and MENTAL HEALTH of residents and workers. There is a wealth of research concerning the impact of the BUILT ENVIRONMENT upon the mental health of citizens. Is such evidence to be ignored?

3. My third objection, possibly the most important, is both PHILOSOPHICAL and POLITICAL.

This proposed plan applies to part of the City - the historical centre of London, our National Capital. The plan clearly prioritises FINANCIAL GAIN, above all other considerations, be they HERITAGE, ENVIRONMENTAL or PSYCHOLOGICAL. Were this plan to be approved it would provide "CARTE BLANCHE" for other future such plans affecting London, the wider neighbourhood, and indeed the whole country, to adopt a similar scale of VALUES. Such a PRECEDENT would be a national disaster and would augment the increasingly divisive nature of our society.

The majestic dome of St Pauls, towering over blitzed City in the 1940s, inspired the nation, and gave hope for the future. Were the City of London Planners to have long-sighted wisdom , and the courage, to place their priorities in the COMMUNITY, the HERITAGE and the ENVIRONMENT, this would inspire others, and give hope for the future harmonious development of our country and our planet.

THIS PLAN SHOULD BE REJECTED.

Susan C McDonald. MA (Cantab)
30/01/2024

Please acknowledge receipt.

Comments for Planning Application 23/01304/FULEIA

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/01304/FULEIA

Address: 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

Proposal: 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.

Case Officer: Gemma Delves

Customer Details

Name: Mr Robert Elms

Address: 342 Cromwell Tower Barbican London

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of the Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Other

Comment: The waste of an excellent building which should be repurposed for cultural use

Comments for Planning Application 23/01304/FULEIA

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/01304/FULEIA

Address: 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

Proposal: 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.

Case Officer: Gemma Delves

Customer Details

Name: Ms Hilary Belchak

Address: 128 Thomas More House London

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Noise
- Other
- Residential Amenity
- Traffic or Highways

Comment: Further to my previously emailed objections, I wish to add my objection to the way that the proposed new building over the Rotunda will overlook all residential properties especially in Thomas More House. Bearing in mind the recent decision of the Supreme Court finding against the construction by the Tate Modern of a viewing gallery which allowed unobstructed views into adjacent flats, the corporation should not be allowed to build public spaces which would similarly allow visitors in particular to the proposed cafe on the 11th floor, an unobstructed view into residential spaces.

I am also appalled by the clearly unthought out ideas about the alterations to the Thomas More car park space which will be mayhem and hazardous for residents.

Comments for Planning Application 23/01304/FULEIA

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/01304/FULEIA

Address: 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

Proposal: 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.

Case Officer: Gemma Delves

Customer Details

Name: Ariella Yedgar

Address: 81 Shakespeare Tower London

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Noise
- Other

Comment: I have two main objections:

1. Unnecessary negative impact on physical and mental health of neighbours:
 - a. harmful particles realised into air from demolition and construction.
 - b. Noise from demolition and construction.

There is no lack of office space in the city. This is a residential area with many thousands of people affected. The area is already overdeveloped and there is constant harm to residents from building sites all around the Barbican estate and from traffic.

Please stop this harmful and unnecessary development.

Retrofitting is a better option if the City cares about its residents' physical and mental health.

2. Unnecessary harm to the environment: the development will release tens of thousands of tonnes of CO2 during demolition and construction. The refusal to consider retention and retrofitting is incompatible with City's Climate Action Strategy and with national policies.

Negative effect on residential amenity

Privacy/loss of daylight and
sunlight/overshadowing/noise

Comments for Planning Application 23/01276/LBC

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/01276/LBC

Address: Livery Hall Ironmongers' Hall Shaftesbury Place London EC2Y 8AA

Proposal: 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).

Case Officer: Gemma Delves

Customer Details

Name: Ms Hilary Belchak

Address: 128 Thomas More House Lon

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Noise
- Other
- Residential Amenity
- Traffic or Highways

Comment: Further to my previously emailed objections, I wish to add my objection to the way that the proposed new building over the Rotunda will overlook all residential properties especially in Thomas More House. Bearing in mind the recent decision of the Supreme Court finding against the construction by the Tate Modern of a viewing gallery which allowed unobstructed views into adjacent flats, the corporation should not be allowed to build public spaces which would similarly allow visitors in particular to the proposed cafe on the 11th floor, an unobstructed view into residential spaces.

I am also appalled by the clearly unthought out ideas about the alterations to the Thomas More car park space which will be mayhem and hazardous for residents.

Comments for Planning Application 23/01277/LBC

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/01277/LBC

Address: 140 London Wall, 150 London Wall, Shaftsbury Place, And London Wall Car Park, London EC2Y

Proposal: 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, Shaftsbury Place, and London Wall Car Park, London, EC2Y).

Case Officer: Gemma Delves

Customer Details

Name: Ms Hilary Belchak

Address: 128 THOMAS More House London

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Noise
- Other
- Residential Amenity
- Traffic or Highways

Comment: Further to my previously emailed objections, I wish to add my objection to the way that the proposed new building over the Rotunda will overlook all residential properties especially in Thomas More House. Bearing in mind the recent decision of the Supreme Court finding against the construction by the Tate Modern of a viewing gallery which allowed unobstructed views into adjacent flats, the corporation should not be allowed to build public spaces which would similarly allow visitors in particular to the proposed cafe on the 11th floor, an unobstructed view into residential spaces.

I am also appalled by the clearly unthought out ideas about the alterations to the Thomas More car park space which will be mayhem and hazardous for residents.

**74 Thomas More House
Barbican
London
EC2Y 8BT**

30 January 2024

Dear Sir

PLANNING OBJECTION - LONDON WALL WEST – Ref (23/01304/FULEIA)

This is a formal objection to the planning application that has been submitted for the proposed “London Wall West” development involving the demolition of the existing buildings at Bastion House and the former Museum of London site.

Introduction

I am a long-leaseholder of 74 Thomas More House, a flat within the Grade II Barbican Estate, immediately to the north of the proposed development. I object not only because of the considerable loss of amenity that the scheme will cause to my own property, but also because the current proposals are wholly inappropriate, both in the physical form of the planned buildings and the proposed usage of the site. I consider the current proposals to be a wasted opportunity for the use of an importantly located site.

Loss of Residential Amenity

My flat is on the top floor of Thomas More House. The flat’s main aspect faces approximately south over the site of the proposed development. At present the buildings immediately in front of the flat, Ironmongers Hall and the Museum of London, are low-rise. Around them buildings step upwards on two sides - Bastion House and Plaisterer’s Hall / One London Wall to the east and 200 Aldersgate to the west - forming a type of “bowl” or amphitheatre centred on the Museum of London and its rotunda. This means that the area immediately to the south of my property is free from any high-rise development, ensuring that the flat has a wide horizon and receives natural light through its south facing windows throughout the day. It also means that the flat is not overlooked in any way. The proposed development will lead to a considerable loss of amenity to my property.

I am concerned about both the height and the massing of the proposed development. Both of the proposed towers will be significantly taller than Thomas More House. The building on the Bastion House site has a wider footprint than what is currently there; the second tower on the site of the existing rotunda introduces a high-rise element where none is currently present. The combined effect of these two towers (and in particular the new one on the rotunda site which is aligned directly on the north-south axis of Thomas More House) is that they will significantly reduce the open sky / horizon that is visible from within my property and will lead to a loss of light into the property

during the day, particularly during the winter months. The impact of the development will be even greater for my neighbours in flats lower down the block, and for the City of London School for Girls whose games pitch will lose much of the direct southern light that it currently enjoys. The building is likely to also be a source of light pollution at night.

The construction of a new tower block on the rotunda is also likely to create wind a channelling effect between the two blocks which will focus winds (the prevailing winds being from the south west) onto the face of Thomas More House where my property and others currently enjoy a SSW facing balcony. Although there is a Wind Microclimate assessment within the planning application, I note that this assesses effect at 1.5m above ground level in the immediate area of the development, it does not appear to consider the potential impact of the development on Thomas More House (either at ground level or at higher levels).

An additional impact of placing a large tower block where none currently exists is that my property will be overlooked by the many offices in the development including a large number with external balconies directly facing Thomas More House. I am also extremely concerned to note that the plans for the 11th floor of the Rotunda Building appear to include as part of the so-called "Culture Cap", a 160 seat restaurant directly facing towards Thomas More House and my (currently private) living room. I consider that the proposed development will have a significant and adverse impact on my privacy. I would remind the planning committee of the recent decision of the Supreme Court decision relating to the Tate Modern extension (*Fearn v Board of Trustees of Tate Gallery* [2023] UKSC 4). I consider that the construction of a tower block (where none has previously existed) with a high level restaurant and public spaces overlooking a long-established residential building has the ability to amount to a nuisance in law in a similar way. The planning committee should not countenance such an application.

I note that the plans also provide for a public space "the Glade" which is intended to be used for "seasonal events". Whilst the plans include proposed noise restrictions on these events, I recognise that such limits are always open to variation or removal and I am concerned that the creation of a performance arena in the echoing canyon between the two tall blocks will lead to an increase in noise pollution, particularly in summer when flat windows are most likely to be open and will further impact upon the amenity of my property. Similarly, the external balconies on the tower blocks are also likely to be a further source of noise pollution in summer.

Another significant concern relates to the vehicle access proposals for the development. The plans propose that service vehicle access to the new buildings should be via the existing Thomas More House car park ramp and (in the case of the proposed Bastion Yard) through Thomas More House Service Yard. The proposals therefore focus all vehicular movements in connection with the completed development on the side of the development that adjoins Thomas More House and the City of London School for Girls. These proposals will adversely impact upon the amenity of my property in a number of ways.

- (1) The plans will mean a significant increase in traffic using the ramp, turning what is currently primarily access to a residential car park into a two way street regularly used by HGV and other service vehicles. This ramp is used not just

by cars and vans, but is the only cycle access to this side of the Barbican Estate. An increase in the use of this road by HGVs and other service vehicles poses increased dangers for cyclists.

- (2) The increase in traffic means that there will be increased pollution on the side of the development that adjoins (a) a residential estate (b) a school playing field and (c) the car park attendant cabin which is occupied 24/7 by a member of the Barbican Estate staff.
- (3) The additional vehicle use will lead to an increase in noise, especially in the early morning / late at night when deliveries / waste collection takes place. This is unacceptable right next to a large residential complex.
- (4) The existing ramp currently also forms a means of pedestrian access to Thomas More House and Car Park. There is a pedestrian path leading down to the ramp from Ironmongers Hall. This is the most direct means of access to and from Thomas More House for residents and others with Barbican Estate passkeys when approaching from / departing to the south. It is step free and does not require using a public lift. It is therefore used by residents including those with buggies and bicycles etc. Pedestrian use of the ramp is likely to increase under the proposals as the application envisages that the existing highwalk access from 200 Aldersgate and One London Wall to the podium will not be retained, thus leading to more people approaching at pavement level. The increase in traffic (including HGV lorries etc) to and from the service yards of the development will pose a risk to residents using this as a means of access.
- (5) The proposed access road to "Bastion Yard" also passes next to the Thomas More car park attendant cabin. The car park attendant acts as concierge to Thomas More House and Mountjoy House and they receive parcels for all residents. Communal facilities such as access to recycling bags etc are also located here. The area outside the cabin is therefore a busy shared space between pedestrians (some of whom are elderly, some of whom are families with children) and vehicles accessing the car park. The introduction of additional traffic and large vehicles accessing Bastion Yard will therefore pose an increased and unacceptable risk to residents and Barbican Estate staff.
- (6) The proposal to make use of the existing Thomas More Service Yard to access the proposed "Bastion Yard" will not work. This area (which it should be noted is described in Barbican residential leases as being within the Barbican Residential Estate boundary) is already fully utilised by vehicles making deliveries and collections to Thomas More and Mountjoy Houses that would need to be accommodated elsewhere. Moreover, it is the only area of Thomas More car park where vehicle height restrictions do not apply. It is therefore used (by way of example) for parking by removal lorries (which are unable to fit within the underground part of the car park) when residents move into / out of flats. It is unclear where parking for residential removals could take place if this scheme were implemented, as the proposals envisage this area would be taken up by the service road to Bastion Yard.

The above objections relate to the period once the building has been constructed. During the lengthy construction period itself I note that it is proposed that the access ramp and service yard should be restricted to construction traffic, with there being an "assumption" that vehicles entering the Barbican estate will use the low shuttered entrance further north on Aldersgate Street. This is wholly impractical. This alternative entrance does not lead directly to the Thomas More car park, but would involve a

lengthy drive in underground car parks / tunnels under Seddon House and Lauderdale Tower to access the Thomas More Car Park thereby increasing emissions in a residential zone, and increasing traffic in the mews street at the foot of Thomas More House. This plan would also be highly dangerous for cyclists (as the ramp ends at a blind junction). Moreover, it is not possible for delivery, service or removal vehicles to use this entrance as they simply will not fit. No thought appears to have been given as to how waste collection from this part of the Barbican Estate will occur. The proposals make no allowance for the fact that the residents of Thomas More and Mountjoy House have supermarket and Amazon deliveries like everyone else; nor indeed for the fact that they move in and out of their properties.

I note also the further detailed objections on traffic and environmental grounds that have been submitted by Mr Terry Trickett of Mountjoy House. I will not repeat them all here, but would urge the planning committee to take them fully into account.

Impact upon Listed Heritage Assets

The proposal will also cause substantial harm to the amenity and architectural integrity of the listed Barbican Estate and the wider area more generally. The height and bulk of the proposed buildings (and in particular the proposed Rotunda Building) are out of scale to the buildings immediately to their north. The Grade II Barbican Estate is one of the most important examples of Brutalist architecture in the United Kingdom. Its conception and development by the City Corporation was an example of insightful and careful long-term planning. It is extremely disappointing that the current proposals (which I understand to be promoted by the Corporation itself), pay little regard for the heritage or situation of the Barbican Estate and are wholly out of character with it. In recent years a number of high-rise developments have encroached upon the borders of the Grade II listed Barbican Estate to the south and east, blocking views of its buildings and making it much harder to view or understand the architecture of the Estate externally. The south west corner of the Estate is one of the last areas left where the Barbican has not been hemmed in by recent high-rise development and where its own epic scale and the strong horizontal language of its terrace blocks can still be appreciated from a distance. At present, the view northwards up St Martin's Le Grand from near St Paul's Churchyard towards the Museum of London is one of the few places where the Le Corbusier-inspired barrel roofs of the low-rise terrace blocks on the Barbican Estate can be seen and appreciated from a distance. The current proposal, which contains little of any public benefit, will block that view and by overshadowing the south west corner of the Estate will cause substantial harm to a Grade II listed building – one which the City Corporation as freeholder of the Barbican Estate and the relevant planning authority should be seeking to protect and enhance.

Despite being surrounded by historic listed buildings (the Barbican Estate (Grade II), Ironmongers Hall (Grade II), St Botolph, Aldersgate (Grade I), St Giles, Cripplegate (Grade I) Postman's Park (where the Memorial to Heroic Self Sacrifice is Grade II*), and the Scheduled Ancient Monument of the Roman Wall, the development makes no attempt to engage with any of them. It is essentially an identikit office development with no consideration been given as to how it will sit within or relate to the wider built environment. The existing Powell & Moya designed Museum of London building recognises its links to the neighbouring Barbican estate. It adopts a similar architectural language by the use of brutalist concrete columns and the purple engineering brick that surrounds the Museum rotunda. It wraps round, but does not

overpower Ironmonger's Hall. By contrast the proposed development will loom over the Barbican and Ironmongers Hall alike adversely affecting each of them. The proposed new Bastion House, larger than its predecessor, will overshadow the Roman Wall and adjoining gardens and be visible from St Giles' Terrace.

The loss of the existing Bastion House is also extremely regrettable. It too is a Powell & Moya building and is the last surviving example of the buildings erected during the initial post-war redevelopment of London Wall. The loss of two buildings by this respected architectural practice to the proposed development demonstrates the wide-ranging and adverse impact of the current proposals on heritage assets.

Contrary to Local Plan

The proposal is also contrary to the vision set out in the City Corporation's Adopted 2015 Local Plan which states in relation to the "the North of the City" (the area where the London Wall West development is sited) that "[c]areful planning is essential to retain the character and amenity of the individual areas, whilst managing growth". The same document states that the Corporation's vision is for the Barbican area to "continue to develop as a strategic cultural quarter of national and international stature". Core Strategic Policy CS5 in that Plan identifies the following policies:

"Identifying and meeting residents' needs in the north of the City, including protection of residential amenity, community facilities and open space." and

"Promoting the further improvement of the Barbican area as a cultural quarter of London-wide, national and international significance."

Policy CS12 provides:

"Safeguarding the City's listed buildings and their settings, while allowing appropriate adaptation and new uses."

Policy DM12.1 provides:

"Development will be required to respect the significance, character, scale and amenities of surrounding heritage assets and spaces and their settings."

Policy DM 12.5 provides:

"To protect gardens and open spaces which make a positive contribution to the historic character of the City."

The proposed development does nothing to further these aims. The cultural offering contained within the proposals is *de minimis* whilst, as described above, the proposals will cause substantial harm to the Barbican Estate and other listed and heritage buildings and adversely affect residential amenity. It will overwhelm existing buildings and the public space and gardens surrounding the Roman Wall. The replacement of what is primarily at present a low-rise public cultural and educational space (directly situated on the "cultural mile" linking the Barbican Centre to St Paul's, Tate Modern and the South Bank) with a private high-rise office block, seems wholly at odds with the Corporation's own policies. I identify additional breaches of the Local Plan below.

Need

Nor do I consider that the developer has made out a case for the need for further office development in this area. Post-pandemic, with the development of flexible working patterns more companies are moving towards smaller office footprints, and the City of London as a whole is scarcely short of new office developments. If more office space is required then this could be achieved through the retention and retrofit of Bastion House. There is no need to replace the existing low rise Museum of London site which has previously been part of the public realm with yet more private office space.

Misrepresentation of Impact

A particular concern arising from the current proposals is the way that the materials produced by the promoters of this scheme have sought to massage and (quite frankly misrepresent) the impact of this scheme on the surrounding area. The materials produced in support of this scheme have relied upon carefully selected viewpoints and wide-angled views to make spaces look bigger and to minimise the impact of this scheme to the existing built environment, and on wider views of the Barbican and St Paul's.

For example, many of the pictures produced in support of the development have suggested that the building will be softened by long flowing greenery descending from external balconies. This is will not happen. One only has to look at the Barbican itself to see what is (and what is not) possible in this regard. Plants grow primarily on south facing walls and do not thrive above the level of the low rise blocks (7 floors above the podium). The developer's images showing large trailing plants on the north face of the high rise blocks will not materialise (as even if they are planted and watered, the plants will not survive). The reality of the external face of the development (especially on the north side of the Rotunda Building facing Thomas More House) is that it will be an array of concrete and glass with balconies unsoftened by any planting above ground level.

Highway Safety

The current proposals, and in particular the removal of the existing Museum of London roundabout so that its site can be occupied by the Rotunda Building will also have a substantial and adverse affect on highway safety, particularly for vulnerable road users such as cyclists and pedestrians.

- (1) Access to / from Thomas More House. The Delivery and Servicing Plan envisages that the existing arrangements will be retained (that is to say that it will only be possible to access the Thomas More car park ramp when travelling southbound on Aldersgate Street, and that vehicles exiting the ramp will be required to turn left (south)). At present, this is not a problem as cars exiting Thomas More car park that wish to travel north can use the roundabout to make a U turn. In the future this will not be possible. Instead, a driver who wishes to turn north, will need to first turn south, and then make a right turn into the southern portion of Aldersgate Street at its junction with London Wall, and then turn right successively into Little Britain, and King Edward Street before finally joining the northbound carriageway of Aldersgate Street. This will increase journey times, congestion and traffic pollution in this area.
- (2) No regard has been given to the position of cyclists in these proposals. The choice for northbound cyclists seems to be an illegal right turn at the top of the

car park ramp or, (if the Highway Code is to be obeyed) no fewer than three right hand turns at least one of which is across a dual carriageway.

- (3) The desire to utilise the existing rotunda for development will lead to the creation of a “hairpin bend” around the remaining part of the existing roadway. A cyclist using this road who wished to turn right into the southern portion of Aldersgate Street would need to manoeuvre themselves across two or three lanes of traffic while negotiating this curve, whilst a driver approaching from behind would have limited forward visibility (and thus less sight of vulnerable road users such as cyclists) because of the sharp curve.
- (4) The existing roundabout acts as a traffic calming device. It requires all road users to stop or slow as they approach it and this reduced speed provides a degree of safety for cyclists. The removal of the roundabout will increase traffic speed, whilst the removal of the segregated cycle lane that currently exists between Aldersgate Street and London Wall and the introduction of a right hand turn into the southern part of Aldersgate Street with no provision being made for cycle segregation is extremely dangerous and would be a breach of the Mayor of London’s London Cycling Design Standards and of the Core Strategic Policy (CS5) identified in the City’s 2015 Local Plan:

“Requiring improvements to pedestrian and cycle routes to maintain safe, effective and efficient pedestrian and cycle flows, including for disabled people, within and through the north of the City.”

- (5) The position is no better for pedestrians. The proposals envisage that the existing highwalk level access from 200 Aldersgate and One London Wall will not be retained. The Traffic and Movement document (page 21) states:

“Grade separate of pedestrian crossings is generally not seen as ideal route to activation of the street and rarely promotes a safe and inclusive environment for pedestrians”.

This insouciant and generalised statement pays no regard whatsoever to the fact that the entire area around the Barbican Estate and the northern part of London Wall has a dense highwalk network expressly designed to separate pedestrians from traffic. This network has been expanded in recent years with the development that has taken place at London Wall Place where new highwalks and connections have been constructed. The City of London’s 2015 Local Plan identified as part of Core Strategic Policy (CS 5):

“Ensuring the retention and improvement of pedestrian permeability and connectivity, at ground and high walk level through large sites such as Smithfield Market, Barbican, Golden Lane and Broadgate, whilst preserving privacy, security and noise abatement for residents and businesses.”

The failure of the proposals to retain or replace existing links to the highwalk network is a direct breach of this policy.

Environmental Impact

I am also extremely concerned by the environmental impact of the proposals. The development will release tens of thousands of tonnes of CO2 into the atmosphere during the demolition and construction phases. I do not see how permitting development on this scale is compatible with the Corporation's stated aim of achieving Net Zero in its own operations by 2027 or with national policies. The current application should be refused with a view to the promoters identifying a more environmentally responsible proposal; either involving retention and retrofit of the existing buildings or a smaller and less intrusive redevelopment of this site would doubtless have a much smaller carbon footprint. CS5 in the City's 2015 Local Plan identified:

“Requiring developers to make use of innovative design solutions to mitigate and adapt to the impacts of climate change, particularly addressing the challenges posed by heritage assets whilst respecting their architectural and historic significance.

CS15 provides:

“Avoiding demolition through the reuse of existing buildings or their main structures, and minimising the disruption to businesses and residents, using sustainably sourced materials and conserving water resources.”

Again the proposals (promoted by the City itself) appears to be in clear breach of these policies.

Conclusion

I therefore urge the planning committee to reject this ill-considered and harmful application. I would also urge the City Corporation and other promoters of the scheme to think further, harder and more critically about the development of this sensitive site. Despite the Corporation's special status as a public authority, the planning application focusses exclusively on extracting the maximising value from the site and fails to give any (or any adequate) consideration to the site's best use or indeed to its own planning policies.

There has never been any high rise development on the site of the old Museum of London rotunda, and the most careful consideration should be given before the creation of large tower where one has not previously existed is permitted. The existing buildings surrounding the Museum of London create a unique amphitheatre, a punctuation of space which could be the basis for a visionary cultural development. The current proposals would turn what is presently a meaningful public and cultural space into yet another high-rise private office development, and one which would result in substantial harm and a significant loss of amenity, not only to my property, but to the listed Barbican Estate and to the wider area too.

Yours faithfully

David Rees

Comments for Planning Application 23/01304/FULEIA

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/01304/FULEIA

Address: 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

Proposal: 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.

Case Officer: Gemma Delves

Customer Details

Name: Ms Janine Smith

Address: Flat 703, Mountjoy House Barbican London

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of the Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Other

Comment: The access plans for construction traffic pose a serious and life-threatening risk to Barbican residents. As a resident that has required emergency services to attend on several occasions (and I am not alone in this matter), the delays to emergency respondents that will be created by construction traffic along Aldersgate Street and down the car park ramp place me in fear for my life.

The release of thousands of tonnes of embedded carbon and transport emissions also pose serious health concerns in terms of poor air quality, with detrimental effects on residents, local office workers and school children. These plans contravene the Corporation's espoused climate commitments. There is plenty of further scope to explore repurposing of the existing buildings beyond the soft market test already conducted.

The detrimental effects of demolition are in direct contradiction to Corporation plans to improve the City as a cultural destination. Which visitors are attracted to visit a building site and surrounding environment of poor air quality, traffic blight and construction noise?

Although these plans will eventually produce modern high-spec office space, the demolition plans detract from the working environment for all surrounding offices. A continual cycle of demolition undermines the very attractiveness of offices in the City. The only winners are building companies, not office workers and their companies. This is especially true when new office blocks are overly large for their site and block views and light from cultural amenities such as the Barbican Centre.

Comments for Planning Application 23/01304/FULEIA

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/01304/FULEIA

Address: 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

Proposal: 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.

Case Officer: Gemma Delves

Customer Details

Name: Mr Desmond Day

Address: 273 Cromwell Tower Barbican London

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Other
- Residential Amenity

Comment: Extra office space is not required in the City and the proposed replacement buildings have no architectural merit. This is a key hub in the west City and merits a building with at least substantial community use

FAO Gwyn Richards and Gemma Delves
Corporation of London Planning and Environment Director
Corporation of London Planning Department
Email plncomments@cityoflondon.gov.uk

30th January 2024

Dear Sirs

London Wall West 23/01304/FULEIA,23/01277/LBC, 2301276/LBC. **OBJECTION**

My name is Niall Conlon and I am the freehold owner and occupier of 8 Wallside, Barbican EC2Y 8BH which is situated within the terrace of houses that make up Wallside, situated on the North side of Monkwell Square.

Wallside is part of the Grade II listed Barbican Estate and part of the Barbican and Golden Lane Conservation Area. The existing Bastion House and the eastern part of the Museum building lie to the West and Southwest of Wallside and Monkwell Square.

I object to the proposals for the reasons set out below.

(1) Negative effects on amenity for neighbours and community

The planning proposals envisage a period of more than the stated 5 years of disruption beginning in 2027 with utilities diversions followed by the demolition of the Museum Rotunda, the creation of a new road layout (Phase 2 of the St Paul's Gyrotory Transformation Scheme-'Phase 2'), the partial demolition of Bastion House, then a second period of demolition of the rest of Bastion House and the Museum of London and then the construction of new Bastion House and the other new buildings for which this application is made. Construction and fit out is said to be completed by November 2033 but this makes no account of likely if not inevitable delays.

The Construction and Management Logistics Plan along with the Environmental Management Statement (Vol 1) makes it evident that use of the Western end of London Wall will be severely constrained as a result of the proposed demolition and construction with utilities diversions from 2027, the demolition of part of the Rotunda and subsequent construction of the Rotunda building, works in 2028 and 2029 in connection with the codependent Phase 2, the use of pavement and road space on the Western carriageway for construction purposes, the removal of three footbridges and Bastion Highwalk and at some stage the replacement of the latter and of the footbridge to One London Wall.

Upon completion it would appear that access to the east bound carriageway London Wall will be permanently constrained with the consequent loss of amenity arising from the lack of provision to maintain vehicular access to Wood Street North from London Wall West and Montague Street both during and after the construction period. Given that Wood Street North provides the main vehicular access to the Southern and Southeastern side of the Barbican Residential Estate (including Wallside, the Postern, Gilbert House and Andrewes House), Monkwell Square including Barber Surgeons Hall and the residential Monkwell House as well as the residential Roman House such loss of amenity will have a severe and negative impact on all residents of these premises.

(2) Detrimental effect of proposed development on the character of the local area; Over-development or overcrowding of the site

As proposed, this development will have an adverse effect on the character and appearance of the Barbican and Golden Lane Conservation Area and heritage assets within it.

Once complete the new Bastion House will be approximately 2 ½ times the size of the existing Bastion House and the Rotunda building twice the size and as such the proposal as currently presented is on a massively different scale to the existing Bastion House and Museum of London and if completed such over-development and/or overcrowding of the site will have an inevitably negative impact on the character of the local area.

In contrast to the current buildings the proposed new office buildings bear no affinity in their design and scale to the immediately adjoining and iconic Grade II listed Barbican Residential Estate. In particular, the existing local open space including the existing Barber Surgeon's Gardens (which are within the Barbican and Golden Lane Conservation Area), Monkwell Square and parts of the Barbican Gardens (also within the Barbican and Golden Lane Conservation Area) as well as the Grade I listed St Giles Church and Grade II listed Barbican Estate (in particular, but not limited to, those building within the Grade II listed Barbican Estate directly adjacent to the development site, including Thomas Moore House, Mountjoy House and Wallside) which will be overwhelmed and overshadowed by the proposed massive office blocks that will be the new Bastion House and Rotunda building with consequent adverse effect on this Conservation Area as well as the heritage assets within it.

For the reasons stipulated above I object to the proposed development in its current form.

A reasonable and responsible balancing of commercial and financial considerations against consideration of local community and local residents' and/or public amenity and due and proper consideration of the existing character of the local area remains perfectly possible and feasible as evidenced by the successful development of London Wall Place which has enhanced public amenity and had a positive impact on the character of the local area.

As such it is clear that a mutually successful and beneficial balance can be struck with respect to development of this site and I would be prepared to support a more reasonable, responsible and appropriate development proposal that actually enhances local residents' and/or public amenity and will have a positive impact on the character of the local area rather than the current proposal which if approved in its current form will negatively impact both the character and appearance of the Barbican Conservation Area, as well as the Grade I and II listed heritage assets within it, and also negatively impact local residents' and/or public amenity.

Yours faithfully

Niall Conlon

From:
To:
Subject: Planning Objection 23/01304/FULEIA London Wall West Site
Date: 30 January 2024 12:28:34
Attachments: [Outlook-pq13cqsr.png](#)
[Outlook-imzxf1ns.png](#)

THIS IS AN EXTERNAL EMAIL

Dear Sir/Madam,

In view of the fact that your website address <https://www.planning2.cityoflondon.gov.uk/online-applications/applicationDetails.do?activeTab=makeComment&keyVal=S4U0XIFH0UJ00> is non-functioning today, I would like to register my objection to the above referenced planning application.

Before doing so I would like to point out that I spent many hours this morning trying to limit my objection to 2000 characters (as per instructions) which only added to the frustration about the loss of my time which could be better spent dedicated to my business and other projects.

The reasons for my comments fall under:

Noise

Other

Traffic or Highways

I object to a scheme that pays scant attention to the rights of Barbican Estate residents, and fails to enhance the Square Mile.

The City's applications for Planning Permission and Listed Building Consent are very confusing for a non-expert (which, in itself, should be enough for the basis of an objection)! However, I will coalesce my thinking around the following three points:

1. The size and scale of the proposed development is too large for the space and will have a detrimental impact in terms of the general overall cohesion of the City. I wonder at the lack of vision and imagination in the design, and why alternative options have not been adopted and submitted on a scale that would be more harmonious with the surroundings and make use of existing buildings.
2. Traffic access: The submitted delivery and servicing plan has made apparent that access for construction traffic will be a single point of entry via the Aldersgate ramp. What seems to be overlooked (or ignored) is that the noise emitted by traffic travelling to and from Bastion and Rotunda Yards and direct entry to and from Ironmongers Hall will be considerable for the neighbouring properties (expected to peak at approx. 80 to 90 trips per day during the piling and superstructure phases of the work).

The Thomas More Service Yard is already fully used as a space for deliveries to Thomas More House and Mountjoy House and the improvements required to enable the Yard to perform its new role as an entry point for heavy traffic would necessitate significant reconstruction work - not included in City's planning application.

3.Sustainability: The plan is astonishing in its failure to consider the impact of on-going air pollution generated by traffic in the Thomas More Service Yard, a constricted space, the misery of which will continue even after LWW's scheduled completion date.

Please can the City come up with something better, something we can all get behind that best represents our wonderful city?

Thank you for acknowledging receipt of this message.



Helen Barnes
59 Thomas More House London EC2Y 8BT

coach / supervisor / therapist



The information contained in this email is confidential. If the message has been sent to you in error, please notify us at info@missingelephant.com and delete this message from your computer. Any use, copying, dissemination or disclosure of this information is strictly prohibited.

Comments for Planning Application 23/01304/FULEIA

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/01304/FULEIA

Address: 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

Proposal: 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.

Case Officer: Gemma Delves

Customer Details

Name: Mr Guy Atkins

Address: Chalsey Road Brockley London

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of the Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: While the multi-million-pound investment in the new London Museum is admirable, the demolition of the old museum and Bastion House will greatly undermine the green credentials of the New Museum Project, given that thousands of tonnes of carbon will be unnecessarily wasted by the City choosing not to refit the existing buildings.

If the City of London feels it does not have the resources to maintain the buildings itself, has the City considered transferring responsibility for the buildings to a public institution or charity outside of the City?

The buildings would make a fantastic place for new affordable housing, which London so desperately needs. Alternatively, the buildings could be transferred to a university like London Metropolitan University or to a charity like ACME, which operates artist studios for local authorities across London. As the Mayor of London has argued, London needs to find a way to keep artists working in the city. Converting the London Wall buildings into artists' studios or an art school would help do this.

Below is a link explaining more about the Mayor's strategy. Linking up with the Mayor on this might solve the City's problem with regard to the unpopular demolition of the London Wall buildings.

<https://www.theartnewspaper.com/2023/10/11/londons-mayor-sadiq-khan-pledges-to-build-new-artist-studios>

Comments for Planning Application 23/01304/FULEIA

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/01304/FULEIA

Address: 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

Proposal: 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.

Case Officer: Gemma Delves

Customer Details

Name: Mrs Janey King

Address: 162 Shakespeare Tower Barbican London

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Noise
- Other
- Residential Amenity
- Traffic or Highways

Comment: I strongly object.

The proposed development is oversized, ill-judged, unnecessary.

1. There is plenty of office availability in the City, in a time of declining demand.
2. The present buildings are a harmonious and architecturally important part of the peerless Barbican development.
3. Demolition will be a carbon catastrophe.
4. The proposed development will destroy neighbourhood sightlines and built environment proportions.

Instead of this grasping, short-sighted plan the City should consider repurposing the existing buildings for arts/cultural use, social housing, provision for the elderly, both residential and sociable, medical/dental clinic, small-scale retail units, studios, public green space, etc etc. This approach of course would not pour millions into the City's coffers: it would instead be green,

community-centred, longer-term focused and an admirable and valuable example to other developers and councils across the country.

To be human is not all a matter of money, desks, maximisation of returns and ugly glass-clad office blocks.

Please take this opportunity to make a difference.

From:
To:
Subject: Objections to London Wall West.
Date: 30 January 2024 13:12:46

THIS IS AN EXTERNAL EMAIL

Dear Sir/Madam,

Re. 23/01304/FULEIA
23/01277/LBC
23/01276/LBC

I oppose the London Wall West plans. The proposed use of the Thomas More car park ramp by the developers initially, then the service/delivery vehicles for London Wall West afterwards, is simply outrageous. It beggars belief that this one small area is deemed usable by the huge number of trucks (70 plus, apparently) which will be removing rubble, then bringing in building materials. At present the proposed site is serviced by a one way system whereby vehicles enter via London Wall then leave via the Thomas More ramp without actually entering Barbican Estate grounds. Under the proposed plans, however, the Thomas More car park closest to Ironmongers' Hall will be commandeered for use by construction traffic necessitating, so we are told, a 'control system', i.e. alternate one way traffic. This is ludicrous. Residents and their vehicles, their deliveries, trades and emergency vehicles are thus expected to use the low shuttered entrance north in Aldersgate Street thereby creating a choke point. How are refuse vehicles going to manage using this entrance? The disruption to residents from all the construction traffic is going to be immense. And that's before the cursed monstrosities are even built. Thereafter the same traffic problems will remain with deliveries etc to the new office blocks and restaurants/cafes/entertainment venues. Has any thought been given to the health of the pupils attending City of London School for Girls whose pupils have sports areas right next to the proposed building site? And what about the Thomas More car park attendants, whose office is at the foot of the ramp? How is it that the architects even missed the fact that the Thomas More car park is used not just by Thomas More residents but by those in Mountjoy and Seddon Houses too and for deliveries to the school?

Go back to the drawing board.

Tony Lee
301 Seddon House
EC2Y 8BX.

From:
To:
Subject: Objection to LONDON WALL WEST planning application 23/01304/FULEIA
Date: 30 January 2024 13:17:35

THIS IS AN EXTERNAL EMAIL

To the planning officer
From Mrs Averil Baldwin Mrs)
1, Thomas More House
Barbican
London EC2Y8BT

Category - local resident and neighbour

I object to the above planning application on the following grounds

1. Failure to involve the local community in options to develop the site and communicate honestly and transparently

When the City developed its plan for LWW in 2021, there was no involvement with the local community on options - we were simply presented with the proposal for full demolition of the existing buildings and a new build to allow for major office development. We did not have sight of the optioneering exercise, which was subsequently shown to be flawed and were erroneously informed that Bastion House was liable for disproportionate collapse. By the time public consultation started in December 2021 - the fundamental nature of the proposal was determined and despite widespread and expert opposition has never changed.

The size and significance of the site, its cultural history, the proximity to the Barbican and other heritage assets, plus the fact that a world-class cultural asset (the Centre for Music) had previously been proposed all mean that the City should have consulted widely and transparently on the future of the site.

2 Failure to consider sustainable alternatives to demolition and follow national and local planning policies and precedent

The 2021 optioneering exercise (inexplicably/deliberately?) failed to consider retention and major refurbishment as an option. Under pressure, and in order to be seen to be complying with its own sustainability policies, a soft market test was undertaken by the City in 2023. Despite inadequacies with the process, this revealed an appetite among developers for retaining and adapting the existing buildings. The City itself described the exercise as credible and successful. Yet, the City is continuing with proposals for demolition and new build, which would inevitably result in more carbon emissions than other options.

National and local planning policies state that demolition should be a last resort. The case of M&S Oxford Street is a case in point. The City presents itself as a pioneer in this field. The decision to proceed with this proposal is contradictory and out of step with the trend of planning policy and case-law.

3 Failure to respect the heritage of the existing buildings and the impact their demolition would have on their surroundings

The former Museum building and Bastion House are important and distinguished post-war buildings, designed by renowned architects, Powell and Moya. They are on the 20Century Society's At Risk register. On those grounds alone they deserve to be retained. However, the impact of their demolition and replacement with the current LWW Scheme would also cause substantial harm to the neighbouring surroundings - the Grade 1 listed St. Giles and St. Botolph's for example and the Barbican Estate itself. The existing two buildings are entirely appropriate in scale and design and complement their surroundings. The mass and scale of what is proposed is over whelming, out- of - proportion and of significant detriment not just to its local surroundings but to outlook coming up from St. Pauls and from local streets.

4 Failure to consider what is an appropriate use for the site

The City has no tenant for this site. Projections of office-demand vary widely . The demolition of the buildings is based on a speculative assessment of demand and driven solely by a desire to secure maximum financial return. Even if demand could be proven there are other locations in the City suitable for major office development away from the few areas where residents live.

Moreover, its history and location suggest the site has strong cultural potential located as it is between Smithfield and the Barbican/ Guildhall and at the gateway of the Culture Mile. If the City is to succeed in its aim of attracting more visitors, it needs to develop a coherent cultural strategy of which the LWW site should be an important part.

5 The severe detrimental impact the plans would have on the local residential amenity .

The local residential amenity will be adversely impacted in a variety of ways, including:

***reduction in daylight and sunlight..** The increase in the height of the office buildings on Aldersgate Street in recent years has already led to a significant reduction in light levels for those living locally. This scheme would add significantly to the cumulative detrimental impact

***viability of the Thomas More House Car Park.** How will the needs of residents be met when the ramp is the only access route to the site? There appear to be major viability and transport issues which have received little to no consideration in terms of safety, air quality, noise and disturbances.

*** the overlooking and disruption caused by the erection of a multi-story welfare block** on a slab above the Thomas More House Car Park. It is estimated that this will be used by hundreds of workers and be in place for at least five years.

*** the overlooking and noise caused by a 160 seater restaurant on the 11th floor** of one of the proposed buildings, directly overlooking Thomas More House.

My conclusion is that the many fundamental objections to the current planning application for LWW mean that **it should be withdrawn and the site put out to developers to bid to retain, adapt and retrofit the current buildings.** There is an appetite for doing so and it is the right thing to do. The City would still secure a decent financial return while salvaging the reputational damage it will inevitably suffer by proceeding with this application..

Averil Baldwin

Comments for Planning Application 23/01304/FULEIA

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/01304/FULEIA

Address: 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

Proposal: 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.

Case Officer: Gemma Delves

Customer Details

Name: Mr Paul Morgan

Address: Flat 321 Lauderdale Tower London

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Noise
- Other
- Residential Amenity
- Traffic or Highways

Comment: My wife and I have lived in the Barbican since 2009 - at our present address in Lauderdale Tower since 2016. We park below Lauderdale Tower. We gain access to the car park along the service road which is alongside the development site.

We are concerned about the needless and avoidable generation of CO2 from the development. We are also concerned by the rather cosy planning process being adopted whereby the City gives itself planning permission for the maximum conceivable development with the greatest adverse impact on adjoining residential properties and then sells the site with this massively favourable permission to a developer.

We have read the well-reasoned note from Terry Trickett RIBA which makes many well considered but disturbing points which persuade us that the proposed development goes well

beyond a development which has considered the position of the adjoining residential properties. Quite simply, this application ought to be rejected by any properly informed planning authority doing its job in a proper way and leaving out of account irrelevant considerations such as desire of the City of maximise its profit from the site.

Sir Paul Morgan and Sheila Harvey

Comments for Planning Application 23/01304/FULEIA

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/01304/FULEIA

Address: 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

Proposal: 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.

Case Officer: Gemma Delves

Customer Details

Name: Miss Jennifer Reeves

Address: 104 Mountjoy Barbican London

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Noise
- Other
- Traffic or Highways

Comment: Objecting for the following reasons:

Climate change is a big issue, and it's important for cities to consider sustainable practices.

Reusing existing buildings instead of demolishing and rebuilding can definitely help reduce carbon emissions. It seems like the current plans might not align with the city's climate action policies, which is a bit contradictory.

The size of the proposed office blocks is another concern. Building much larger structures could disrupt the balance and change the character of the area. It's important to find a balance between development and preserving the heritage and charm of the neighborhood.

Speaking of heritage, preserving the Museum of London and Bastion House would not only protect these important historical assets. It's crucial to consider the impact on the overall local

skyline and the sense of place that these buildings contribute.

Comments for Planning Application 23/01304/FULEIA

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/01304/FULEIA

Address: 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

Proposal: 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.

Case Officer: Gemma Delves

Customer Details

Name: Ms Anett Rideg

Address: Flat 131 Defoe House Barbican London

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Councillor/Ward Member

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Residential Amenity

Comment: I would like to object to the demolishing of Bastion House and the previous Museum of London building. These are not only culturally important heritage assets that could be modernised in line with prevailing trends in the construction industry, but the resulting carbon impact would be contrary to the City's pledge of being a Net Zero champion. As the recent soft market exercise demonstrated, there are credible options for refurbishment, which would retain and enhance the cultural significance of this quarter in line with residents' wishes. The current proposal is environmentally and reputationally damaging and strategically myopic in its insistence of yet more office space.

Comments for Planning Application 23/01304/FULEIA

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/01304/FULEIA

Address: 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

Proposal: 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.

Case Officer: Gemma Delves

Customer Details

Name: Mrs Jenny Smart

Address: FLAT 715 WILLOUGHBY HOUSE BARBICAN LONDON

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Noise
- Other
- Residential Amenity
- Traffic or Highways

Comment: I strongly object to this planning application, which is unnecessary, unsustainable and will have a very negative impact on residents.

It is completely unnecessary as there is no need for extra offices or restaurants. Existing offices are severely under occupied since Covid, whereas there is a great need for affordable housing.

It is unsustainable and goes against the City of London's own Environmental Strategy to reduce CO2 emissions and air pollution.

It will have a very negative affect on residents, both during construction and afterwards. The Barbican's design is notable for it's safety and well-being features of highwalks that separate pedestrians from the danger of cars. However over the last 5-10 years many have been unusable

as building developments have closed highwalk bridges to the east, south east and south. This demolition and re-construction project will further close access to the south west, making the Barbican almost impossible to enter.

I've not had time to study all 454 documents relating to the application, but I have studied the Health Impact Assessment of November 2023 which is a complete fabrication. If this is indicative of the accuracy of the other reports then I fear we are being misled, and that they do not accurately reflect the negative impact of the application. For example in the Health Impact Assessment of November 2023:

6.4 Air quality, noise and neighbourhood amenity

'Does the proposal minimise construction impacts such as dust, noise, vibration and odours?' and 'Does the proposal minimise noise pollution caused by traffic and commercial uses?' evaluates potential health impact for both as 'neutral' when they're clearly both 'negative', as there will be a massive amount of dust, noise, vibration and odours, all of which will be negative to health and there will be an enormous amount of extra traffic both during and after construction.

And further inaccuracies in 6.10 relating to Minimising the use of resources as it's depressing that a perfectly serviceable building is being unnecessarily demolished.

Comments for Planning Application 23/01304/FULEIA

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/01304/FULEIA

Address: 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

Proposal: 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.

Case Officer: Gemma Delves

Customer Details

Name: Miss Aimee Rathle

Address: Otto Building, Downs Road Flat 05.06 London

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of the Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: Please do not demolish such a beautiful piece of London's post-war history! There are plenty enough office space around, find a better way to repurpose or reimagine the current building.

Comments for Planning Application 23/01304/FULEIA

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/01304/FULEIA

Address: 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

Proposal: 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.

Case Officer: Gemma Delves

Customer Details

Name: Mrs Ann George

Address: 173 Lauderdale Tower Barbican London

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Other
- Residential Amenity

Comment: I wish to object in the strongest possible terms to this development. In putting these plans forward the Corporation of London appears to be abandoning its own Climate Action Strategy. Thousands of tons of CO2 will be released into the atmosphere during the demolition and construction of this extremely ugly group of enormous buildings which cannot fail to have an impact on views of St Pauls - a factor which appears to be more or less ignored in the brochure which is pure and simple misrepresentation in its graphics.

One only has to walk around the City or look out of one's window to see that there are already many office blocks in the City which are under-used with many empty desks and rooms. Why do we need more?

The Corporation also seems to be ignoring the historical importance of this site and the fact that Bastion House could easily be refurbished and re-used rather than being knocked down which goes against every principle of good environmental management.

This development is unnecessary, unjustifiable and unsustainable, benefitting only property developers. Not good enough or worthy of forward thinking local government.

Comments for Planning Application 23/01304/FULEIA

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/01304/FULEIA

Address: 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

Proposal: 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.

Case Officer: Gemma Delves

Customer Details

Name: Mr Nicholas Manderson

Address: 76 The Hall Foxes Dale LONDON

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of the Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Other

Comment: The plan would be a terrible loss of midcentury architecture.

Total environmental waste, too. The city doesn't need another bland international-style glass office block with no public domain.

The planned scheme also plans to include car parking - not needed in a central London location where cars should be actively discouraged. Plans should promote walking, public transport and non-motorised wheeled transport.

From: Helen Fentimen
Sent: Tuesday, January 30, 2024 3:37 PM
To: Delves, Gemma ; [Richards, Gwyn](#)
Cc: Fentimen, Helen
Subject: London Wall West Planning Application.

THIS IS AN EXTERNAL EMAIL

Dear Gemma and Gwyn

Please see below my comments in respect of the above planning application. Should you need it my address is 106 Thomas More House, Barbican EC2Y 8BU

23/01304/FULEIA
23/01277/LBC
23/01276/LBC

I write as a resident of Thomas More House and and as a Common Councillor of Aldersgate Ward, **objecting** to the planning application for Bastion House and the Museum of London site known locally as London wall West. I wish my comments below to be read as specific points consideration.

General Comments.

Its is generally accepted that there is to be a development of the LWW site and this principle is not disputed or challenged,. However, it is considered that the development should be within a City strategic context which assists the achievement of City of London ambitions. This can include, as the gateway to the city, an ambitious approach to developing culture, bringing added emphasis and value to the rich historical heritage, adds to successful climate action initiatives and continues to support business in the city in a way which is sustainable and brings added public amenity. Consideration of achieving best value from the site is essential if progress is to be made in delivery of city ambitions.

Local residents throughout the option development phase of this project have had the opportunity to comment on the various options put forward. They have been invited to and have participated in the various consultation events however are left feeling that apart from some changes to mass very few of the detailed comments and expert review reports have been given due consideration. This does not give a “feel” of a positive approach to the residential reset.

The financial requirement to be delivered from this development is also understood as is the need for a best value option to be delivered. It is welcome that the Chair of Policy and Resources confirmed “that all options remain on the table”, as a common councillor I will look for evidence of this in the future assessment of options.

This should not be an issue which impacts on the planning decision making process and it would

be helpful for those assurances to be publicly stated.

Environmental Impact.

The impact of wholesale demolition of the architectural significant buildings on this site will result in substantial negative and Una acceptable level of embodied carbon emissions which will exceed the city's own Climate `Action Strategy nor is it compatible with the City Sustainability plan to be consulted upon imminently.

There are significant concerns about the air quality during both the demolition and construction period which should be mitigated by a refurbishment approach.

Visual and Light Considerations

Many residents are expressing concern on the visual and light impact on their home. A significant number will see reductions in sunlight hours and loss of light more generally, this is of concern where some flats are already below the target. Some residents already argue that the comments in the relevant sections in the application are untrue.

Overdevelopment.

We are led to believe that there is substantial demand for Grade office space, I am not able to argue this point however there is also a need for the city to develop other facilities such as culture space, more green and open space, residential amenity. Equal consideration should be give to these other important strands of the City Strategy not least Destination City.

The "soft market" test, evidenced that there are credible alternatives for this site which can meet the city ambitions. The current proposals do not give consideration to the alternatives which are more sympathetic to exiting listed buildings and those of historical interest.

Construction Process.

It is proposed that the Thomas More Car Park will be used for construction traffic, deliveries and as now residents accessing their car park. There is real concern that this will cause congestion, further negatively impact on air quality for residents, City of London Girls school and Barbican staff.

There is also likely to be an additional impact on Barbican car park attendant staff if they are to include management of traffic flows in this area.

Additionally I have concerns about the noise pollution albeit generally confined to day time working there are a significant number of local residents working form home as well as more elderly residents for whom excessive will be detrimental to health. It is my view that this proposal be rejected and alternatives be explored.

The proposed "Staff Welfare" structure even though temporary will overlook and have huge impact on the flats of both Mountjoy and Thomas More House. The location of this should be reviewed with an alternative sought.

In summary, I urge the committee to give proper consideration to objections raised and reject this application and a more sympathetic development be developed.

Yours Sincerely

Helen Fentimen

Comments for Planning Application 23/01304/FULEIA

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/01304/FULEIA

Address: 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

Proposal: 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.

Case Officer: Gemma Delves

Customer Details

Name: Mrs Jamie Luff

Address: 207 Mountjoy House Barbican London

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Noise
- Other
- Residential Amenity
- Traffic or Highways

Comment: I object to the LWW development for the following reasons:

Environmental: there will be extreme levels of CO₂, pollution and dust created from the demolition and construction, and this is blatantly inconsistent with the City's air quality and environmental initiatives. Many developers are interested in renovating and repurposing the existing buildings. Surely that would be more in line with the City's much-touted eco-goals, and it would be a public relations dream for the City to have such a large-scale, environmentally-friendly renovation project (rather than the PR nightmare that is LWW).

Health of children: the playing fields and netball/tennis courts for City of London School for Girls are literally just a few feet away from this development. Those girls will be inhaling dust and pollution for many, many years. Furthermore, after complete, the traffic into and out of LWW will

go right by these same outdoor spaces. Large delivery vehicles will be idling and polluting the air while the girls are trying to participate in sport. Would this plan be proposed if it were boys' playing fields?

Loss of emergency access/amenities for residents: the Thomas More car park is used by many residents as a pedestrian thoroughfare as well as the emergency services access point for hundreds of residents, many of whom are elderly. Creating a busy road with traffic lights in this area is unsafe and could even lead to tragic outcomes.

The City does not need more office space. It needs to invest in its people, rather than in corporations.

Comments for Planning Application 23/01304/FULEIA

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/01304/FULEIA

Address: 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

Proposal: 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.

Case Officer: Gemma Delves

Customer Details

Name: Mrs Miranda McArthur

Address: 73 Cromwell Tower Barbican London

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of the Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Other
- Residential Amenity

Comment:

The destruction of the Museum of London and its replacement by a giant tower building will damage the integrity of the Barbican architecturally, historically and culturally.

The environmental impact of the demolition will be significant and will further degrade air quality, already a problem in this area.

The proposal may deliver the highest price but not provide the best use of land. The City already has too many office buildings.

Finally, this site links the Cultural Mile with artistic and leisure buildings on the South Bank, something which a high rise replacement will in no way enhance.

This short-sighted proposal should be dismissed and the three other proposal to repurpose and reutilise this important building be seriously considered.

Comments for Planning Application 23/01304/FULEIA

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/01304/FULEIA

Address: 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

Proposal: 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.

Case Officer: Gemma Delves

Customer Details

Name: Mr DANTE VANOLI

Address: FLAT 20 DEFOE HOUSE BARBICAN LONDON

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Other

Comment:OBJECTIONS RELATE TO THE PREDICTABLE ENVIRONMENTAL HARM GENERATED IF THE PROPOSALS ARE IMPLEMENTED.

1.0 IRREVOCABLE HARM AND ERROR OF COMPREHENSIVE DEMOLITION.

1.1 Destruction of the existing Museum of London and Bastion House facilities would eliminate still use able and useful assets that have significant heritage values.

1.2 Their complete demolition is unnecessary and would contravene National and City of London Corporation climate change action policies.

1.3 The Twentieth Century Society have included the Museum of London Bastion House complex as one of the Top Ten Heritage Buildings at Risk from demolition, redevelopment or neglect in 2023. The proposals ignore their importance in post war museum design history. Demolition devalues the international reputation and prestige of original architects, Powell & Moya. Within its archaeologically sensitive environment, they skillfully integrated the diverse functionality of the Museum and Bastion House structures. Surviving together, having been planned in tandem within the original London Wall development, they are rare buildings. C20 has strongly objected to their

loss.

1.4 Adopting the demolition strategy, asserts, conveniently, that the Museum and Bastion House buildings are at the end of their design lives. This is contentious. The potential for their retention and modification in new usage has not been seriously considered. Retaining and creatively adapting an important work by Powell & Moya would be a less carbon intensive alternative to its total demolition and new construction.

2.0 HARMFUL HERITAGE IMPACT

The Barbican Estate and Gardens are listed Grade II and II* respectively and designated Heritage Assets with special significance. Their value will be adversely impacted by the excessive heights of new towers obscuring or depreciating the aesthetic quality of existing views and setting. The overall impact will seriously harm the appreciation of the Barbican's significance value within the City.

From: Fred Rodgers
Sent: Tuesday, January 30, 2024 4:23 pm
To: Richards, Gwyn
Subject: 23/01304/FULEIA, 23/01276/LBC and 23/01277LBC

THIS IS AN EXTERNAL EMAIL

Dear Mr Richards,

The attached image is of a letter dated 5 May 1971 from Powell and Moya. The original of the letter is in planning file 4648 and, as you can see, references Powell and Moya's letter of 26 September 1969.

Unfortunately, the letter of 26 September is not in the file nor is there any contemporary reference to it. However, its importance cannot be under-stressed as, from the face of the letter of 5 May, it calls a lie to Buro Happold's claim in 3.6.3 *Disproportionate Collapse Requirements. Application and Verification* of its submitted Submitted Carbon Optioneering Study:

In response to Ronan Point, changes were made to the Building Regulations from 1972, which required buildings to be designed with specific measures to prevent such a disproportionate collapse. As construction of the Bastion House commenced prior to the introduction of these new requirements, it is unlikely that these measures are incorporated into the building.

Anyone who has followed Powell and Moya's evolving design will have noted significant structural changes between the November 1968 "second scheme" and the final approved drawings of 1971/72. Unfortunately, it doesn't appear that Buro Happold was aware of this.

The missing letter and the sudden appearance of plans prepared by City Corporation's consulting engineers, Charles Weiss and Partners, via MoL, Buro Happold and MOLA, are presumably coincidental. Whilst the source of the Charles Weiss plans appears to be the Museum of London, your Department has responsibility for its own files. Is there any reason why the letter of 26 September isn't where it should be?

Best regards,

Fred Rodgers

100 Breton House
Barbican
London
EC2Y 8PQ
UK



6 Wallside Barbican London EC2Y 8BH O7774864419

FAO Gwyn Richards and Gemma Delves
Corporation of London Planning and Environment Director
Corporation of London Planning Department
Email PLNcomments@cityoflondon.gov.uk
Lpalondonwallwest@cityoflondon.gov.uk

29 January 2024

Dear Sirs

London Wall West 23/01304/FULEIA,23/01277/LBC, 2301276/LBC. OBJECTION

My name is Mary Bonar. I am the owner and occupier of 6 Wallside Barbican EC2Y 8BH which is situated in Monkwell Square. The existing Bastion House and the eastern part of the Museum building lie to the West and South West of Wallside and the Square.

Wallside is part of the Grade 2 listed Barbican Estate and within the Barbican and Golden Lane Conservation Area..It is a particularly peaceful location overlooking to the south Monkwell Square Gardens, sheltered from traffic by the buildings on the south side of the Square and to the north overlooks the Wallside listed gardens, part of the Barbican Lake and St Giles's Church.It also benefits from the public Barber Surgeons' Gardens immediately to the West.

I have taken part in the various consultations carried out by the Applicant over including visiting the exhibition of the model and reviewing a number of the planning documents.

I object to the proposals for the reasons set out below.

Interference with Residential Amenity over a prolonged period

The planning proposals envisage a period of more than the stated 5 years of disruption beginning in 2027 with utilities diversions followed by the demolition of the Museum Rotunda ,the creation of a new road layout (Phase 2 of the St Paul's Gyrotory Transformation Scheme-'Phase 2'),the partial demolition of Bastion House, then a second period of demolition of the rest of Bastion House and the Museum of London and then the construction of new Bastion House and the other new buildings for which this application is made. Construction and fit out is said to be completed by November 2033 but this leaves out of account the time for the recommended archaeological survey and dealing with archeological finds and any other delays. Throughout this lengthy period public access to the Barber Surgeons Gardens will be restricted if not completely curtailed and enjoyment of open spaces including in my case my roof terraces and balcony and the Barbican Gardens will be affected by noise and dust and other pollution from the proposed works including Phase 2.

Can the archaeological survey be accelerated?

Can the Barber Surgeon's Gardens be restored to normal access and use as soon as the construction of new Bastion House has been completed (and before the fit out) in order to reduce the impact on the public gardens?

Residents exposed to consequences of demolition twice

The phasing of the demolition and construction is also unfortunate for people living and working to the East and South of the proposed works. Bastion House is to be demolished first but not completely. The floor above the Museum will be retained to provide protection for the Museum

building until it has been vacated and a second phase of demolition will happen. This means exposure to two periods of demolition with the associated noise and dust with an intervening period looking at a partly demolished building.

Can the two stage demolition be reassessed in order to cause less disruption?

Design involves out of scale size and massing. Lack of recognition of historic associations of site and location

At the end of the lengthy construction period I amongst the many residents in the biggest residential part of the City I would be living next to two ultra modern and massive glass office buildings; new Bastion House is 2 ½ times the size of the existing Bastion House and the Rotunda building twice the size and of a completely different scale to the existing Bastion House and Museum of London.

In contrast to the current buildings the proposed new office buildings bear no affinity in their design and scale to the immediately adjoining and iconic Barbican Residential Estate. Nor do the proposed new buildings and the plazas in any way reflect the historical significance of this site including its interesting history as an area outside the old City walls significant for its provision for non-conformists and the Jewish Community and standing at the beginning of the Great North Road. The new buildings will obscure the views of the Barbican including its three Towers from the South by interposing more glass offices thus changing the impression of the City as a place where people both work and live. The proposed development contrasts with the sensitive approach taken to the development of London Wall Place which has enhanced heritage assets and public amenity.

Can the overwhelming scale and the design of the proposed new buildings be re-examined to make them compatible with the adjoining Conservation Area and the other Conservation Areas in the vicinity as well as the adjoining listed estate and gardens?

Permanent loss of quiet public space and diminution of culture

In the course of these works the quiet rotunda gardens and Engineers Gardens (the public garden near Ironmonger's Hall) and many trees will disappear not to be replaced until the end of the works by new planting and plazas. In no way will the cultural offering of the Museum or the Centre for Music (which was due to replace the Museum) and the loss of the visual connection to St Paul's Cathedral be compensated for by an outdoor public performance space and landscaped gardens although I do acknowledge the proposal to improve the accessibility and visibility of the remains of the City Walls within and outside the London Wall Car Park. Not only is the proposal entirely different in the type of cultural offering but the open space including the existing Barber Surgeon's Gardens, Monkwell Square and parts of the Barbican Gardens will be overwhelmed and overshadowed by massive office blocks.

Negative effects of demolition and construction on carbon and pollution emissions

It is now increasingly understood and indeed promoted by the Applicant that demolition and new build can contribute substantially to climate change by releasing embodied carbon into the atmosphere. In addition, harmful pollutants are released as a result of demolition and construction activities. Table 8.17 in the Environmental Management Statement Vol 1 fails to include the residential properties in Monkwell Square (Monkwell House and Wallside), Mountjoy House, the Postern and Roman House when looking at loss of amenity due to dust and impacts of PM on human health during demolition and construction.

How far can this assessment be relied on? Can it be corrected and the resulting implications taken into account?

What steps will be taken to improve the design so that construction, fit out and operational servicing vehicles will not interfere with residential and school amenity with noise and harmful emissions. The proposal for all 4 buildings to be accessed via the Thomas More ramp and car park is sub-optimal and creates inherent safety risks.

The Applicant has conducted soft market testing which indicated commercial appetite for refurbishing and repurposing the existing buildings but in spite of that the Applicant is pursuing demolition and reconstruction which is interdependent on a new road scheme right next to this peaceful residential area.

Loss of amenity due to the closures of all or part of London Wall during construction

The Construction and Management Logistics Plan along with the Environmental Management Statement (Vol1) makes it evident that use of the Western end of London Wall will be severely constrained as a result of the proposed demolition and construction with utilities diversions from 2027, the demolition of part of the Rotunda and subsequent construction of the Rotunda building, works in 2028 and 2029 in connection with the codependent Phase 2, the use of pavement and road space on the Western carriageway for construction purposes, the removal of three footbridges and Bastion Highwalk and at some stage the replacement of the latter and of the footbridge to One London Wall.

As a result the London Wall bus stops will be relocated with consequent loss of amenity, in the absence of the foot bridges a temporary crossing will be installed and the Santander cycle hub will be moved. London Wall is likely to be closed to two directional traffic. Individually these matters would cause disruption, associated noise and inconvenience but these disruptive activities are indicated to last for over 5 years. After that access to the east bound carriageway London Wall will be permanently constrained.

What steps can be taken to minimise the effect on residents of road closures during construction and to make other routes available for traffic using this busy East-West route

Loss of access to Wood Street North during and after construction

Having examined the planning documents referred to it appears that little consideration has been given to the question of how vehicular access is to be maintained to Wood Street North both during and after the construction period. This is not an insignificant matter given that Wood Street North provides the main vehicular access to the Southern and Southeastern side of the Barbican Residential Estate (including Wallside, the Postern, Gilbert House and Andrewes House). It also provides access to 125 London Wall loading bay and the and the two London Wall Place loading bays, Monkwell Square including Barber Surgeons Hall and the residential Monkwell House, Roman House (also residential), St Giles's Church, the CLSG at ground level, and Salters Hall. Wood Street South is and will be even more difficult to access, relatively narrow and contains an important cycle route. During the construction period the proposed works to Wood Street Police Station are due to take place. An increase in HGVs and other vehicles using Moor Lane (when the barrier is open) would further reduce residential amenity. It cannot be right that the combination of demolition and construction including Phase 2 would cause such significant loss of access from London Wall and the situation continues after the construction phase because there is no provision for traffic which is currently needs to use the roundabout to access the east-bound carriageway of London Wall to continue to do so.

I have raised this matter separately with the planning officers and am awaiting a reply and a solution.

Yours faithfully

Mary Bonar

Comments for Planning Application 23/01304/FULEIA

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/01304/FULEIA

Address: 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

Proposal: 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.

Case Officer: Gemma Delves

Customer Details

Name: Ms Lucy Sisman

Address: 293 Cromwell Tower Barbican London

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Noise
- Other
- Residential Amenity
- Traffic or Highways

Comment: I'd like to object to this plan for a number of reasons:

1. From a heritage point of view, these existing buildings are important.
2. Substantial daylight will be reduced for residents of the Barbican.
3. I believe that the city has no tenant for this site - surely this plan is entirely speculative.
4. The mass and scale of these buildings seem completely out of proportion with the surroundings.
5. I'm concerned about the amount of traffic these proposed buildings will generate during their build.
5. How can it be a sustainable option to demolish these two buildings?

Comments for Planning Application 23/01304/FULEIA

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/01304/FULEIA

Address: 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

Proposal: 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.

Case Officer: Gemma Delves

Customer Details

Name: Mr George Theodosiou

Address: 162 Shakespeare Tower, Barbican, London EC2Y 8DR

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Noise
- Other
- Residential Amenity
- Traffic or Highways

Comment: I wish to register an objection to this proposed development as now a local resident who has followed the history of the Barbican since I played on the bombed site as a boy. I have examined the new proposals in detail and it is clear that the sole merit in them is to make money. The new proposal is a cheap easy-build device to maximise the footprint and profit and minimise all other considerations. It clearly goes against all the Corporation of London's own sustainability and ethical considerations, clearly demonstrated by the Corporation's ignoring all local, national, architectural, environmental and social considerations. It is also clear that the Corporation would love to get rid of the Barbican entirely, now in its 59th year, with the attendant upkeep and responsibilities this entails. Residents constantly battle the Corporation, which seems now dedicated to benefit those at its centre rather than the people and businesses of London. Many schemes have been put forward to repurpose Bastion House and the Museum of London site, but they do not return as much money as the new proposal to the Corporation's bank account. This

proposal is driven by greed and speed. ("Let's get this knocked down before the objections become too noisy" seems the credo) Bastion House is an integral part of the Barbican complex and deserves to remain to be re-used instead of destroyed for short-term profit. The new proposal is totally out of character and looks like a cheap fairground attraction. Plus the new proposal designs and drawings take a simplistically glamorous and favourable view of what, in a few years' time, will erode to a dirty, dated wasteland. Bastion House, at 47 years, still looks as fresh and powerful as it did when it was built. It clearly has another 47 years and more ahead of it. The new proposal buildings are designed, ask any architect and builder, for a maximum lifetime of 25 years. This is not a sensible proposal, it's a quick-make-money-and-get-out exercise.

Comments for Planning Application 23/01304/FULEIA

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/01304/FULEIA

Address: 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

Proposal: 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.

Case Officer: Gemma Delves

Customer Details

Name: Jennifer White

Address: Flat 3A London Wharf Wharf Place London

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of the Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Other

Comment: The destruction of the Museum of London and its replacement by a giant tower building will damage the integrity of the Barbican architecturally, historically and culturally.

The environmental impact of the demolition will be significant and will further degrade air quality, already a problem in this area.

The proposal may deliver the highest price but not provide the best use of land. The City already has too many office buildings.

Finally, this site links the Cultural Mile with artistic and leisure buildings on the South Bank, something which a high rise replacement will in no way enhance.

This short-sighted proposal should be dismissed and the three other proposal to repurpose and reutilise this important building be seriously considered.

Comments for Planning Application 23/01304/FULEIA

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/01304/FULEIA

Address: 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

Proposal: 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.

Case Officer: Gemma Delves

Customer Details

Name: Andre Sirangelo

Address: 304 Seddon House Barbican London

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Other

Comment:As a neighbour, I object to the planning application submitted by the City of London for the demolition and subsequent development at 140 & 150 London Wall. My concerns are rooted in the potential harm this development could inflict on both the immediate and broader surrounding environment.

The proposed development poses a significant threat to the setting of neighbouring listed and unlisted assets, including the Barbican, St Giles Cripplegate, Ironmongers' Hall, and others. This raises serious concerns about the preservation of our cultural and architectural heritage.

Furthermore, the anticipated release of tens of thousands of tonnes of CO2 during demolition and construction is alarming. This contradicts the principles outlined in the City's Climate Action Strategy and national policies. The refusal to consider retention and retrofitting further exacerbates these environmental concerns.

The scale of the proposed development appears to be excessive and out of proportion with the

surrounding neighbourhood. This is particularly concerning given its proximity to the Grade II listed Barbican Estate and the Conservation Area.

With vacant office and retail/food spaces existing in the City of London, it is pertinent to question the necessity for additional office blocks. Not to mention that large-scale developments can sometimes inadvertently invite corruption and greenwashing practices. I implore the City of London to maintain vigilant oversight to ensure that the proposed development aligns genuinely with sustainable and ethical practices.

In conclusion, I request that the planning authority reevaluates the proposed development, considering its broader impact on the environment, cultural heritage, and the best use of available land.

Comments for Planning Application 23/01276/LBC

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/01276/LBC

Address: Livery Hall Ironmongers' Hall Shaftesbury Place London EC2Y 8AA

Proposal: 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).

Case Officer: Gemma Delves

Customer Details

Name: Sarah Mann

Address: 9 Defoe House Barbican London

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Other

Comment: I object to the plans on the grounds of the sheer height and bulk of the proposed buildings.

The impact of tall, bulky buildings is to cast shadow; to reduce sunlight and warmth across a wide area; and to create strong winds at street level which circulate dust and dirt. They reduce the quality of life of everyone working, living and trading in their shadow. They make the City a less attractive place to live and work.

The case for creating massive buildings seems desperately weak given post-pandemic working patterns and the very visible glut of office and retail space in and adjacent to the City. There are significant environmental costs arising from this project which should not be incurred without much stronger justification.

Smaller buildings which allowed sunlight and green space around them would help to create a more beautiful and attractive City.

Comments for Planning Application 23/01304/FULEIA

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/01304/FULEIA

Address: 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

Proposal: 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.

Case Officer: Gemma Delves

Customer Details

Name: Miss Frances Northall

Address: 702 Bryer Court London

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Noise
- Other
- Residential Amenity
- Traffic or Highways

Comment: The old Museum of London buildings are unique and form a cohesive whole with the Barbican Estate, surely they should be Grade II* listed?! Such a valuable

Comments for Planning Application 23/01304/FULEIA

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/01304/FULEIA

Address: 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

Proposal: 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.

Case Officer: Gemma Delves

Customer Details

Name: Dr Jane Bickerton

Address: 207 Ben Jonson House Barbican London

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment:

The plan for this development is to demolish and rebuild going against the Cities net zero carbon targets. The effects will be unnecessarily damaging to our climate and the pollution caused will be damaging to our general health.

The standing buildings are part of the City of London's cultural heritage and are included in the City's newly formed Cultural Mile.

The former Museum of London and Bastion House could be retrofitted. They are internationally recognised examples of post-war civic design. The Twentieth Century Society has named in the top ten most at risk buildings.

The site overlooks St Paul's and at the moment is marked by a peaceful rotunda. The site is significant because marks an ancient gateway to the City and now also acts as a Gateway to the Barbican. These buildings are integral and form part of a thoroughfare used since before the Romans.

The planned buildings are enormous and not human in scale. The plans are a design for international business rather than to enhance cultural connections. These enormous buildings will be of a scale comparable with St Paul's and do not appear to help spark the cultural imagination in the newly named Cultural Mile area. And apparently it isn't sufficient to point out the glut of office space in the City.

Additionally, the new plans cover up the present rotunda which echos the ancient walls of the City of London. The plans will destroy the concept of the Barbican as a whole, cutting off and breaking up the outer defence walls, the podium walkway, and destroying the double tower above the drawbridge which articulates the gateway to the 'Barbican'. Gog and Magog must surely have something to say about this.

For me, and most importantly there is a lack of consideration for our democracy and the human connection. The development illustrates the City of London as the 'Ivory tower' and how they connect to the 'hoi polloi'.

Comments for Planning Application 23/01304/FULEIA

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/01304/FULEIA

Address: 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

Proposal: 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.

Case Officer: Gemma Delves

Customer Details

Name: Ms Liz Hasell

Address: 203 Cromwell Tower Barbican London

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Other
- Residential Amenity

Comment:As a Barbican resident I object to the proposed scheme for the following reasons below:-

The sheer bulk and mass of this scheme bears no relationship to the original plan and has no relationship to the surrounding area. It's too big and too bulky and lacks any design sensitivity or concern for city workers or local residents.

The destruction of these buildings runs counter to both local and national climate action policies - with a large amount of demolition taking place in the City with much more planned, can this be explained?

Currently there are no tenants for this scheme whilst many office blocks remain unoccupied - this continues to be a baffling situation.

On an aesthetic level, more bland glass towers aren't going to win any prizes for visionary, innovative, climate aware, people-friendly urban development. As a good example, please see the No 1 London Wall the scheme by Make architects which uses stone and corten steel with a variety of design and consideration for the historic sensitivity of the area - and has created a pleasing location for residents, workers and visitors to the city - and is a complex that has been much praised.

Comments for Planning Application 23/01304/FULEIA

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/01304/FULEIA

Address: 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

Proposal: 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.

Case Officer: Gemma Delves

Customer Details

Name: Miss Charlotte Day

Address: Flat 17 Thomas More House Barbican London

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Other

Comment: The buildings are safe and do not need to be demolished to make way for more office blocks. It will be harmful to the environment and can be refurbished and retrofitted instead. The new buildings are not necessary or desired in the community.

Comments for Planning Application 23/01304/FULEIA

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/01304/FULEIA

Address: 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

Proposal: 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.

Case Officer: Gemma Delves

Customer Details

Name: Miss Frances Northall

Address: 702 Bryer Court London

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Noise
- Other
- Residential Amenity
- Traffic or Highways

Comment: The Old Museum of London buildings are unique, blending seamlessly with the grade (2) listed Barbican estate; these buildings are more than worthy of grade 2 listing, if not grade 2 star and I would have thought the City of London would value them rather than wanting to sell & demolish!

The demolition of the current buildings will surely release massive amounts of carbon, whereas repurposing would have far less impact.

The presence of massive new Office blocks can only detract not only from the Barbican Estate but from other local wonderful buildings and facilities, such as Ironmongers Hall and Postmans Park both of which would be totally dwarfed and devalued as would the remains of London Wall and views of St Paul's Cathedral would also be impacted.

As a resident of the City of London I express my extreme disappointment with the current plans and object most strongly.

Please reconsider & repurpose, do not demolish.

From:
To:
Subject: Representations about 23/01304/FULEIA and 23/01277/LBC London Wall West
Date: 30 January 2024 17:44:10

THIS IS AN EXTERNAL EMAIL

Representations about 23/01304/FULEIA and 23/01277/LBC London Wall West
From John Taysum, Flat 701 Bryer Court, Barbican, London EC2Y 8DE
OBJECT

I object to these applications for planning permission and listed building consent for development of the London Wall West site. My comments about the proposed developments are:

Principally, they do not give due regard to this site being the setting for the listed heritage assets which comprise the Barbican Estate. The proposed buildings for the site will obscure the public's reading and enjoyment of the listed heritage assets. In contrast, the existing buildings skilfully merge them with the office block concept of London Wall. Bastion House is a distinguished Miesian reminder of that era and the other office blocks that aligned along London Wall originally.

The proposals disregard the importance of the existing Rotunda level as node connection for the Highwalk network embodied in the Barbican Estate and its context; particularly as this is the gateway approach from the south. A high level building on the Rotunda site would block the sense of elevation and opening up to the Barbican vista beyond and its edifying pedestrian experience. The existing MoL buildings, especially the sunken garden in the core of the roundabout, maintain this human scale and even Bastion House appears to step aside for this openness.

The height and volume of the proposed buildings are overbearing for this context. The peninsular building over the existing Rotunda roundabout is particularly out of line. There are already, interesting, high quality office buildings all around the site competing for status and attention. Why add to this? The existing Powell & Moya buildings have an understated civic quality and openness, which is becoming more precious than anything around it could be. Furthermore the embodied carbon in these existing structures should stay where it is; there is a compelling environmental case for reuse, which is being ignored.

The impact of demolition and new building has not been realistically considered for the Barbican Estate residents, CoL Girls School and other neighbours. The proposal for mixed together traffic management shows how closely the Barbican Estate and this site are meshed together. The existing buildings should be reused, not demolished.

From:
To:
Cc:
Subject: LWW objections
Date: 30 January 2024 17:44:53

THIS IS AN EXTERNAL EMAIL

To the LWW design team

As a Barbican resident, I've submitted objections to the proposed LWW scheme and here I'm summarising the reasons why.

The City's scheme submitted for planning permission and listed building consent reveals plans for access and egress of traffic to and from the LWW site which, in terms of noise and air pollution, can be expected to have a severely detrimental effect on the lives of residents in Mountjoy House and Thomas More House and, not least, on girls using the playing field on top of Thomas More Car Park. This impact will occur not only during the period of construction (2027 to 2033) but, also, forever after.

Barbican Estate residents have begun to realise the extent of harm that will be caused to their lives if the proposed LWW scheme goes ahead. I'm referring, in particular, to the noise and air pollution of heavy traffic moving through the Thomas Moore Service Yard during construction and, thereafter, all service vehicles entering and exiting the new LWW development. The new Bastion and Rotunda Yards and Ironmongers Hall are all to be entered and exited via the existing Thomas More Service Area, which acts as a marshalling point. Entry from the street will be via the existing Aldersgate ramp which, with some difficulty, will continue also to act as a main means of access/egress to and from the Barbican Estate. The resulting extent of traffic will be considerable and continuous.

The *coup de grâce* is delivered by Multiplex Construction Europe Limited with its assumption that the Thomas More Service Yard, accessed via the Aldersgate St. ramp, will be restricted to construction traffic only, from the commencement of main demolition work and will remain restricted until the project's completion. What are car owning residents from Thomas Moore and Mountjoy and other Barbican locations meant to do? Multiplex sees no difficulty for residents in cars, and service vehicles, gaining alternative access to the car park by using the back exit/entrance located 90 metres further north along Aldersgate St. Indeed, there is such a ramp which leads to a low roller-shuttered opening, too low for most service vehicles. Once past the shuttered opening, drivers encounter a hairpin bend, too tight for most cars to negotiate, which means a long detour round Seddon Car Park before exiting via a one-way tunnel, the only throughway from one car park area to another. No one from Multiplex can ever have examined the consequences of residents' taking its proposed alternative route. The suggestion beggars belief.

If there is any logic to the proposed LWW scheme, it appears to be a determination, on the

part of the LWW design team to render the development 'car free' – achieved at the expense of hiving-off all LWW traffic into the neighbouring Grade II Listed Barbican Estate, where it doesn't belong. This is back-to-front thinking at its worst; the design team's failure to prioritise vehicle circulation at the outset has led to the adoption of a piecemeal and mostly unworkable *ad hoc* access/egress system, which will inflict maximum and permanent damage on Barbican Estate residents.

My own first sight of the proposed access/egress proposals, as detailed in DELIVERY AND SERVICING PLAN Part1-1476384 prepared by Buro Happold, was at the public exhibition of the LWW project, held at the London Centre, 11 January 2024. I was shocked by what I found there. Now, after studying the LWW design team's access/egress proposals in some detail, I find myself in strong opposition to a scheme that is revealed as paying little attention to the inalienable rights of Barbican Estate residents. The reasons for my objections are detailed in '[A Barbican resident's response to a deeply flawed proposal for London Wall West](#)'. I'll leave you to study these comments, which have been distributed throughout the Barbican Estate. By all means come back to me if you think any of my comments are unjustified or, in any way, they give a false interpretation of what is on offer.

The reconstruction and making good that would be required to enable the Thomas More Service Yard to perform its extended role is not included in the City's applications, whereas other much less significant work to highwalks and hard and soft landscaping etc. is itemised. The words 'associated and ancillary work' are not sufficient to cover for the inevitable changes that would have to be made to the Thomas More Service Yard, if it were to become the biggest of LWW's intrusions into a Grade II Listed property.

As a final comment, I should add that, in my opinion, the City's applications for Planning Permission and Listed Building Consent are muddled and overridden with a plethora of documentation, which is uncoordinated and ambiguous. There's much unnecessary duplication, which serves only to confuse rather than to explain. Searching for the truth of what is on offer requires the recipient to make sense of documents sometimes starting in mid-sentence, often with arbitrary page numbers (eg. commencing with page 19), and often without titles stating their purpose. The documents submitted are a true reflection of a muddled scheme for a site that deserves something much better.

Regards

Terry Trickett RIBA

605 Mountjoy House, Barbican, London EC2Y 8BP

Comments for Planning Application 23/01304/FULEIA

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/01304/FULEIA

Address: 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

Proposal: 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.

Case Officer: Gemma Delves

Customer Details

Name: Mr Richard Barrett

Address: 293 Cromwell Tower London

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Noise
- Residential Amenity

Comment: I object to this application as it will create a considerable loss of amenity to the area with little countervailing benefit. There will be considerable negative impact on air quality and the environment during destruction and construction. Although the developers claim that a considerable amount of material will be available for use elsewhere, this will depend on its being moved to a so far unidentified site that requires these pre-used materials and in reality almost all will be scrapped. The de/construction period will last several years, causing dust, noise and other nuisance. There is no identified end user for the new build and given the vacancy rates in the area, it is unlikely that the demand for Class Eg and Eb use will lead to occupation in the foreseeable future, especially given the amount of construction already in hand and for which planning permission has been granted. The proposed buildings are out of scale with the Grade II listed Barbican estate and are also close enough to impact one of the iconic and best known buildings in the country: St Paul's. The planned construction will therefore fail to contribute to the Corporation's mid to long term plan to promote cultural and economic vitality. In fact, the large buildings and their lack of usage will have the opposite effect. While the existing buildings on this

site are not of especial merit, the proposed replacements offer no obvious improvement, either visually or in function.

Comments for Planning Application 23/01304/FULEIA

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/01304/FULEIA

Address: 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

Proposal: 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.

Case Officer: Gemma Delves

Customer Details

Name: Mr Daniel Gerring

Address: 5 Lambert Jones Mews Barbican London

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Noise
- Other
- Residential Amenity
- Traffic or Highways

Comment: I have lived in the Barbican for many years. I own 5 Lambert Jones Mews, where I live with my family, including my 18 month old son. I am a partner in a City firm and attend St Giles Cripplegate.

I object to the proposed development on a number of bases:

1. Inevitable adverse effect on highway safety, in particular routes for residents' and other's vehicles to access and move around the Barbican, with associated impact on pedestrians and cyclists.
2. Associated air and noise pollution, in particular arising from the proposed sole use of the vehicular access ramp nearest to Lauderdale Tower during development. The children's play area

and my home and the Mews outside would be badly affected, which concerns me greatly - especially for the health of my son.

3. Material harm to the setting of neighbouring listed buildings and landscape - in particular the Barbican itself and St Giles Church.

4. Incompatibility with the City's own Climate Action Strategy by entirely demolishing and reconstructing (so releasing significant quantities of CO₂), instead of repurposing.

5. Manifestly inadequate consideration of the wider cultural and historic significance of the site and the City's heritage. If demolition and rebuilding really is necessary (which is not accepted), the plans could and should give greater weight to these points: the development could seek to showcase the City's rich heritage. This could include the Jewish history of this area, the links with Shakespeare and the Roman Wall, as well as a much better gateway to St Paul's and Tate Modern and connections through to the Barbican Centre/Culture Mile.

In summary, I am concerned that the current proposal is likely negatively to affect the health and well-being of my small child, cause unacceptable highway issues and harm the setting of important cultural landmarks. As a long-term City resident and business owner, I believe that the City Corporation has a duty to find a better use for this public asset.

**74 Thomas More House
Barbican
London
EC2Y 8BT**

30 January 2024

Dear Sir

PLANNING OBJECTION - LONDON WALL WEST – Ref (23/01304/FULEIA)

This is a formal objection to the planning application that has been submitted for the proposed “London Wall West” development involving the demolition of the existing buildings at Bastion House and the former Museum of London site.

Introduction

I am a long-leaseholder of 74 Thomas More House, a flat within the Grade II Barbican Estate, immediately to the north of the proposed development. I object not only because of the considerable loss of amenity that the scheme will cause to my own property, but also because the current proposals are wholly inappropriate, both in the physical form of the planned buildings and the proposed usage of the site. I consider the current proposals to be a wasted opportunity for the use of an importantly located site.

Loss of Residential Amenity

My flat is on the top floor of Thomas More House. The flat’s main aspect faces approximately south over the site of the proposed development. At present the buildings immediately in front of the flat, Ironmongers Hall and the Museum of London, are low-rise. Around them buildings step upwards on two sides - Bastion House and Plaisterer’s Hall / One London Wall to the east and 200 Aldersgate to the west - forming a type of “bowl” or amphitheatre centred on the Museum of London and its rotunda. This means that the area immediately to the south of my property is free from any high-rise development, ensuring that the flat has a wide horizon and receives natural light through its south facing windows throughout the day. It also means that the flat is not overlooked in any way. The proposed development will lead to a considerable loss of amenity to my property.

I am concerned about both the height and the massing of the proposed development. Both of the proposed towers will be significantly taller than Thomas More House. The building on the Bastion House site has a wider footprint than what is currently there; the second tower on the site of the existing rotunda introduces a high-rise element where none is currently present. The combined effect of these two towers (and in particular the new one on the rotunda site which is aligned directly on the north-south axis of Thomas More House) is that they will significantly reduce the open sky / horizon that is visible from within my property and will lead to a loss of light into the property

during the day, particularly during the winter months. The impact of the development will be even greater for my neighbours in flats lower down the block, and for the City of London School for Girls whose games pitch will lose much of the direct southern light that it currently enjoys. The building is likely to also be a source of light pollution at night.

The construction of a new tower block on the rotunda is also likely to create wind a channelling effect between the two blocks which will focus winds (the prevailing winds being from the south west) onto the face of Thomas More House where my property and others currently enjoy a SSW facing balcony. Although there is a Wind Microclimate assessment within the planning application, I note that this assesses effect at 1.5m above ground level in the immediate area of the development, it does not appear to consider the potential impact of the development on Thomas More House (either at ground level or at higher levels).

An additional impact of placing a large tower block where none currently exists is that my property will be overlooked by the many offices in the development including a large number with external balconies directly facing Thomas More House. I am also extremely concerned to note that the plans for the 11th floor of the Rotunda Building appear to include as part of the so-called "Culture Cap", a 160 seat restaurant directly facing towards Thomas More House and my (currently private) living room. I consider that the proposed development will have a significant and adverse impact on my privacy. I would remind the planning committee of the recent decision of the Supreme Court decision relating to the Tate Modern extension (*Fearn v Board of Trustees of Tate Gallery* [2023] UKSC 4). I consider that the construction of a tower block (where none has previously existed) with a high level restaurant and public spaces overlooking a long-established residential building has the ability to amount to a nuisance in law in a similar way. The planning committee should not countenance such an application.

I note that the plans also provide for a public space "the Glade" which is intended to be used for "seasonal events". Whilst the plans include proposed noise restrictions on these events, I recognise that such limits are always open to variation or removal and I am concerned that the creation of a performance arena in the echoing canyon between the two tall blocks will lead to an increase in noise pollution, particularly in summer when flat windows are most likely to be open and will further impact upon the amenity of my property. Similarly, the external balconies on the tower blocks are also likely to be a further source of noise pollution in summer.

Another significant concern relates to the vehicle access proposals for the development. The plans propose that service vehicle access to the new buildings should be via the existing Thomas More House car park ramp and (in the case of the proposed Bastion Yard) through Thomas More House Service Yard. The proposals therefore focus all vehicular movements in connection with the completed development on the side of the development that adjoins Thomas More House and the City of London School for Girls. These proposals will adversely impact upon the amenity of my property in a number of ways.

- (1) The plans will mean a significant increase in traffic using the ramp, turning what is currently primarily access to a residential car park into a two way street regularly used by HGV and other service vehicles. This ramp is used not just

by cars and vans, but is the only cycle access to this side of the Barbican Estate. An increase in the use of this road by HGVs and other service vehicles poses increased dangers for cyclists.

- (2) The increase in traffic means that there will be increased pollution on the side of the development that adjoins (a) a residential estate (b) a school playing field and (c) the car park attendant cabin which is occupied 24/7 by a member of the Barbican Estate staff.
- (3) The additional vehicle use will lead to an increase in noise, especially in the early morning / late at night when deliveries / waste collection takes place. This is unacceptable right next to a large residential complex.
- (4) The existing ramp currently also forms a means of pedestrian access to Thomas More House and Car Park. There is a pedestrian path leading down to the ramp from Ironmongers Hall. This is the most direct means of access to and from Thomas More House for residents and others with Barbican Estate passkeys when approaching from / departing to the south. It is step free and does not require using a public lift. It is therefore used by residents including those with buggies and bicycles etc. Pedestrian use of the ramp is likely to increase under the proposals as the application envisages that the existing highwalk access from 200 Aldersgate and One London Wall to the podium will not be retained, thus leading to more people approaching at pavement level. The increase in traffic (including HGV lorries etc) to and from the service yards of the development will pose a risk to residents using this as a means of access.
- (5) The proposed access road to "Bastion Yard" also passes next to the Thomas More car park attendant cabin. The car park attendant acts as concierge to Thomas More House and Mountjoy House and they receive parcels for all residents. Communal facilities such as access to recycling bags etc are also located here. The area outside the cabin is therefore a busy shared space between pedestrians (some of whom are elderly, some of whom are families with children) and vehicles accessing the car park. The introduction of additional traffic and large vehicles accessing Bastion Yard will therefore pose an increased and unacceptable risk to residents and Barbican Estate staff.
- (6) The proposal to make use of the existing Thomas More Service Yard to access the proposed "Bastion Yard" will not work. This area (which it should be noted is described in Barbican residential leases as being within the Barbican Residential Estate boundary) is already fully utilised by vehicles making deliveries and collections to Thomas More and Mountjoy Houses that would need to be accommodated elsewhere. Moreover, it is the only area of Thomas More car park where vehicle height restrictions do not apply. It is therefore used (by way of example) for parking by removal lorries (which are unable to fit within the underground part of the car park) when residents move into / out of flats. It is unclear where parking for residential removals could take place if this scheme were implemented, as the proposals envisage this area would be taken up by the service road to Bastion Yard.

The above objections relate to the period once the building has been constructed. During the lengthy construction period itself I note that it is proposed that the access ramp and service yard should be restricted to construction traffic, with there being an "assumption" that vehicles entering the Barbican estate will use the low shuttered entrance further north on Aldersgate Street. This is wholly impractical. This alternative entrance does not lead directly to the Thomas More car park, but would involve a

lengthy drive in underground car parks / tunnels under Seddon House and Lauderdale Tower to access the Thomas More Car Park thereby increasing emissions in a residential zone, and increasing traffic in the mews street at the foot of Thomas More House. This plan would also be highly dangerous for cyclists (as the ramp ends at a blind junction). Moreover, it is not possible for delivery, service or removal vehicles to use this entrance as they simply will not fit. No thought appears to have been given as to how waste collection from this part of the Barbican Estate will occur. The proposals make no allowance for the fact that the residents of Thomas More and Mountjoy House have supermarket and Amazon deliveries like everyone else; nor indeed for the fact that they move in and out of their properties.

I note also the further detailed objections on traffic and environmental grounds that have been submitted by Mr Terry Trickett of Mountjoy House. I will not repeat them all here, but would urge the planning committee to take them fully into account.

Impact upon Listed Heritage Assets

The proposal will also cause substantial harm to the amenity and architectural integrity of the listed Barbican Estate and the wider area more generally. The height and bulk of the proposed buildings (and in particular the proposed Rotunda Building) are out of scale to the buildings immediately to their north. The Grade II Barbican Estate is one of the most important examples of Brutalist architecture in the United Kingdom. Its conception and development by the City Corporation was an example of insightful and careful long-term planning. It is extremely disappointing that the current proposals (which I understand to be promoted by the Corporation itself), pay little regard for the heritage or situation of the Barbican Estate and are wholly out of character with it. In recent years a number of high-rise developments have encroached upon the borders of the Grade II listed Barbican Estate to the south and east, blocking views of its buildings and making it much harder to view or understand the architecture of the Estate externally. The south west corner of the Estate is one of the last areas left where the Barbican has not been hemmed in by recent high-rise development and where its own epic scale and the strong horizontal language of its terrace blocks can still be appreciated from a distance. At present, the view northwards up St Martin's Le Grand from near St Paul's Churchyard towards the Museum of London is one of the few places where the Le Corbusier-inspired barrel roofs of the low-rise terrace blocks on the Barbican Estate can be seen and appreciated from a distance. The current proposal, which contains little of any public benefit, will block that view and by overshadowing the south west corner of the Estate will cause substantial harm to a Grade II listed building – one which the City Corporation as freeholder of the Barbican Estate and the relevant planning authority should be seeking to protect and enhance.

Despite being surrounded by historic listed buildings (the Barbican Estate (Grade II), Ironmongers Hall (Grade II), St Botolph, Aldersgate (Grade I), St Giles, Cripplegate (Grade I) Postman's Park (where the Memorial to Heroic Self Sacrifice is Grade II*), and the Scheduled Ancient Monument of the Roman Wall, the development makes no attempt to engage with any of them. It is essentially an identikit office development with no consideration been given as to how it will sit within or relate to the wider built environment. The existing Powell & Moya designed Museum of London building recognises its links to the neighbouring Barbican estate. It adopts a similar architectural language by the use of brutalist concrete columns and the purple engineering brick that surrounds the Museum rotunda. It wraps round, but does not

overpower Ironmonger's Hall. By contrast the proposed development will loom over the Barbican and Ironmongers Hall alike adversely affecting each of them. The proposed new Bastion House, larger than its predecessor, will overshadow the Roman Wall and adjoining gardens and be visible from St Giles' Terrace.

The loss of the existing Bastion House is also extremely regrettable. It too is a Powell & Moya building and is the last surviving example of the buildings erected during the initial post-war redevelopment of London Wall. The loss of two buildings by this respected architectural practice to the proposed development demonstrates the wide-ranging and adverse impact of the current proposals on heritage assets.

Contrary to Local Plan

The proposal is also contrary to the vision set out in the City Corporation's Adopted 2015 Local Plan which states in relation to the "the North of the City" (the area where the London Wall West development is sited) that "[c]areful planning is essential to retain the character and amenity of the individual areas, whilst managing growth". The same document states that the Corporation's vision is for the Barbican area to "continue to develop as a strategic cultural quarter of national and international stature". Core Strategic Policy CS5 in that Plan identifies the following policies:

"Identifying and meeting residents' needs in the north of the City, including protection of residential amenity, community facilities and open space." and

"Promoting the further improvement of the Barbican area as a cultural quarter of London-wide, national and international significance."

Policy CS12 provides:

"Safeguarding the City's listed buildings and their settings, while allowing appropriate adaptation and new uses."

Policy DM12.1 provides:

"Development will be required to respect the significance, character, scale and amenities of surrounding heritage assets and spaces and their settings."

Policy DM 12.5 provides:

"To protect gardens and open spaces which make a positive contribution to the historic character of the City."

The proposed development does nothing to further these aims. The cultural offering contained within the proposals is *de minimis* whilst, as described above, the proposals will cause substantial harm to the Barbican Estate and other listed and heritage buildings and adversely affect residential amenity. It will overwhelm existing buildings and the public space and gardens surrounding the Roman Wall. The replacement of what is primarily at present a low-rise public cultural and educational space (directly situated on the "cultural mile" linking the Barbican Centre to St Paul's, Tate Modern and the South Bank) with a private high-rise office block, seems wholly at odds with the Corporation's own policies. I identify additional breaches of the Local Plan below.

Need

Nor do I consider that the developer has made out a case for the need for further office development in this area. Post-pandemic, with the development of flexible working patterns more companies are moving towards smaller office footprints, and the City of London as a whole is scarcely short of new office developments. If more office space is required then this could be achieved through the retention and retrofit of Bastion House. There is no need to replace the existing low rise Museum of London site which has previously been part of the public realm with yet more private office space.

Misrepresentation of Impact

A particular concern arising from the current proposals is the way that the materials produced by the promoters of this scheme have sought to massage and (quite frankly misrepresent) the impact of this scheme on the surrounding area. The materials produced in support of this scheme have relied upon carefully selected viewpoints and wide-angled views to make spaces look bigger and to minimise the impact of this scheme to the existing built environment, and on wider views of the Barbican and St Paul's.

For example, many of the pictures produced in support of the development have suggested that the building will be softened by long flowing greenery descending from external balconies. This is will not happen. One only has to look at the Barbican itself to see what is (and what is not) possible in this regard. Plants grow primarily on south facing walls and do not thrive above the level of the low rise blocks (7 floors above the podium). The developer's images showing large trailing plants on the north face of the high rise blocks will not materialise (as even if they are planted and watered, the plants will not survive). The reality of the external face of the development (especially on the north side of the Rotunda Building facing Thomas More House) is that it will be an array of concrete and glass with balconies unsoftened by any planting above ground level.

Highway Safety

The current proposals, and in particular the removal of the existing Museum of London roundabout so that its site can be occupied by the Rotunda Building will also have a substantial and adverse affect on highway safety, particularly for vulnerable road users such as cyclists and pedestrians.

- (1) Access to / from Thomas More House. The Delivery and Servicing Plan envisages that the existing arrangements will be retained (that is to say that it will only be possible to access the Thomas More car park ramp when travelling southbound on Aldersgate Street, and that vehicles exiting the ramp will be required to turn left (south)). At present, this is not a problem as cars exiting Thomas More car park that wish to travel north can use the roundabout to make a U turn. In the future this will not be possible. Instead, a driver who wishes to turn north, will need to first turn south, and then make a right turn into the southern portion of Aldersgate Street at its junction with London Wall, and then turn right successively into Little Britain, and King Edward Street before finally joining the northbound carriageway of Aldersgate Street. This will increase journey times, congestion and traffic pollution in this area.
- (2) No regard has been given to the position of cyclists in these proposals. The choice for northbound cyclists seems to be an illegal right turn at the top of the

car park ramp or, (if the Highway Code is to be obeyed) no fewer than three right hand turns at least one of which is across a dual carriageway.

- (3) The desire to utilise the existing rotunda for development will lead to the creation of a “hairpin bend” around the remaining part of the existing roadway. A cyclist using this road who wished to turn right into the southern portion of Aldersgate Street would need to manoeuvre themselves across two or three lanes of traffic while negotiating this curve, whilst a driver approaching from behind would have limited forward visibility (and thus less sight of vulnerable road users such as cyclists) because of the sharp curve.
- (4) The existing roundabout acts as a traffic calming device. It requires all road users to stop or slow as they approach it and this reduced speed provides a degree of safety for cyclists. The removal of the roundabout will increase traffic speed, whilst the removal of the segregated cycle lane that currently exists between Aldersgate Street and London Wall and the introduction of a right hand turn into the southern part of Aldersgate Street with no provision being made for cycle segregation is extremely dangerous and would be a breach of the Mayor of London’s London Cycling Design Standards and of the Core Strategic Policy (CS5) identified in the City’s 2015 Local Plan:

“Requiring improvements to pedestrian and cycle routes to maintain safe, effective and efficient pedestrian and cycle flows, including for disabled people, within and through the north of the City.”

- (5) The position is no better for pedestrians. The proposals envisage that the existing highwalk level access from 200 Aldersgate and One London Wall will not be retained. The Traffic and Movement document (page 21) states:

“Grade separate of pedestrian crossings is generally not seen as ideal route to activation of the street and rarely promotes a safe and inclusive environment for pedestrians”.

This insouciant and generalised statement pays no regard whatsoever to the fact that the entire area around the Barbican Estate and the northern part of London Wall has a dense highwalk network expressly designed to separate pedestrians from traffic. This network has been expanded in recent years with the development that has taken place at London Wall Place where new highwalks and connections have been constructed. The City of London’s 2015 Local Plan identified as part of Core Strategic Policy (CS 5):

“Ensuring the retention and improvement of pedestrian permeability and connectivity, at ground and high walk level through large sites such as Smithfield Market, Barbican, Golden Lane and Broadgate, whilst preserving privacy, security and noise abatement for residents and businesses.”

The failure of the proposals to retain or replace existing links to the highwalk network is a direct breach of this policy.

Environmental Impact

I am also extremely concerned by the environmental impact of the proposals. The development will release tens of thousands of tonnes of CO2 into the atmosphere during the demolition and construction phases. I do not see how permitting development on this scale is compatible with the Corporation's stated aim of achieving Net Zero in its own operations by 2027 or with national policies. The current application should be refused with a view to the promoters identifying a more environmentally responsible proposal; either involving retention and retrofit of the existing buildings or a smaller and less intrusive redevelopment of this site would doubtless have a much smaller carbon footprint. CS5 in the City's 2015 Local Plan identified:

“Requiring developers to make use of innovative design solutions to mitigate and adapt to the impacts of climate change, particularly addressing the challenges posed by heritage assets whilst respecting their architectural and historic significance.

CS15 provides:

“Avoiding demolition through the reuse of existing buildings or their main structures, and minimising the disruption to businesses and residents, using sustainably sourced materials and conserving water resources.”

Again the proposals (promoted by the City itself) appears to be in clear breach of these policies.

Conclusion

I therefore urge the planning committee to reject this ill-considered and harmful application. I would also urge the City Corporation and other promoters of the scheme to think further, harder and more critically about the development of this sensitive site. Despite the Corporation's special status as a public authority, the planning application focusses exclusively on extracting the maximising value from the site and fails to give any (or any adequate) consideration to the site's best use or indeed to its own planning policies.

There has never been any high rise development on the site of the old Museum of London rotunda, and the most careful consideration should be given before the creation of large tower where one has not previously existed is permitted. The existing buildings surrounding the Museum of London create a unique amphitheatre, a punctuation of space which could be the basis for a visionary cultural development. The current proposals would turn what is presently a meaningful public and cultural space into yet another high-rise private office development, and one which would result in substantial harm and a significant loss of amenity, not only to my property, but to the listed Barbican Estate and to the wider area too.

Yours faithfully

David Rees

Comments for Planning Application 23/01277/LBC

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/01277/LBC

Address: 140 London Wall, 150 London Wall, Shaftsbury Place, And London Wall Car Park, London EC2Y

Proposal: 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, Shaftsbury Place, and London Wall Car Park, London, EC2Y).

Case Officer: Gemma Delves

Customer Details

Name: Mr Christopher Makin

Address: 21 Speed House Barbican London

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Alderman

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Other
- Residential Amenity

Comment: I OBJECT on the basis of:

The Planet - demolishing these buildings will release thousands of tonnes of embodied carbon - which is in stark contrast to City of London policies.

The Proportions - our predecessors commissioned the existing buildings and the Barbican Estate to 'talk' to each other. The proposed bulk is out of scale and has no regard for its neighbours.

The Past - the Twentieth Century Society has the existing buildings on its at risk list. The proposed buildings will harm neighbouring heritage assets such as the local churches, parks and gardens, in addition to the Barbican Estate.

The Population - the negative impact on daylight for residents and the way they and the Girls' School (playground in particular) will be overlooked cannot be overestimated.

The Practicalities - this scheme intends that the small ramp which is adequate for its current purpose will be the sole access for the proposed developments in addition to five residential buildings. The road safety risks here are huge - let alone the impact on air quality and noise.

From:
To:
Subject: Objection to planning application reference: 23/01304/FULEIA
Date: 30 January 2024 18:25:32

THIS IS AN EXTERNAL EMAIL

As a long standing resident of the Barbican Estate I WISH TO OBJECT to the planning reference quoted above (23/01304/FULEIA) on the following grounds:

Inadequate Consideration of Alternative Options: The proposal seems to lack a thorough exploration of alternatives that could preserve the existing structures. Adaptive reuse could be a more sustainable and culturally respectful approach.

Impact on Local Wildlife and Green Spaces: The demolition and construction activities threaten the local wildlife habitats and the limited green spaces in our urban environment, which are crucial for biodiversity and resident well-being.

Yours sincerely

Philip Crawford
73 Lauderdale Tower
Barbican
EC2Y 8BY



Comments for Planning Application 23/01304/FULEIA

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/01304/FULEIA

Address: 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

Proposal: 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.

Case Officer: Gemma Delves

Customer Details

Name: Ms Christina Wilson

Address: 342 Cromwell Tower London

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of the Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Residential Amenity

Comment: I think that this building has some historical significance- especially the roundabout garden. I would like to see the building re purposed. Seems a shame to erect yet another glass office block.

Comments for Planning Application 23/01304/FULEIA

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/01304/FULEIA

Address: 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

Proposal: 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.

Case Officer: Gemma Delves

Customer Details

Name: Miss Dom Flewitt

Address: 509 Mountjoy House Barbican City of London

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Noise
- Other
- Residential Amenity
- Traffic or Highways

Comment: I'm deeply concerned about the proposed demolition and redevelopment plans for the Museum of London and Bastion House sites in the Barbican area.

My objections raise several valid points, reflecting the sentiments of many other residents and stakeholders in the community.

Environmental Impact: The demolition and reconstruction of these buildings would indeed contribute to carbon emissions and run contrary to climate action goals. Reusing existing structures could mitigate this impact and align better with sustainability objectives.

Scale and Disruption: The proposed size of the new buildings appears disproportionate to the existing urban landscape and may disrupt the character of the Barbican Estate. Preserving open

spaces and respecting the architectural integrity of the area should be paramount in any development plans.

Heritage Preservation: The historical and architectural significance of both buildings should be acknowledged and preserved. Demolition would not only erase important heritage assets but also potentially affect neighboring landmarks and green spaces.

Office Demand and Urban Planning: The necessity and rationale behind constructing more office spaces in an already saturated area, especially without confirmed tenants, raise questions about urban planning priorities. Exploring alternatives such as affordable housing or cultural venues could better serve the community's needs and aspirations.

Cultural and Community Values: Repurposing the Museum of London site for cultural and public use could enrich the community and enhance the area's cultural vibrancy. Investing in spaces that foster creativity, entertainment, and community engagement aligns with the spirit of the Barbican's cultural heritage.

From:
To:
Subject: Objection to London Wall West Planning Application 23/01304/FULEIA
Date: 30 January 2024 18:55:42

THIS IS AN EXTERNAL EMAIL

Professor Richard Lynch
114 Thomas More House, Barbican,
London EC2Y 8BU.

30th January 2024

Planning Officer, City of London Planning Department,
Guildhall, London EC2P 2EJ

Dear Planning Officer,

Objection to the proposed planning application 23/01304/FULEIA

I am writing to object to the above planning application under the collective title of *London Wall West*. I have no doubt that you will have received other numerous and detailed objections to the proposal. I will therefore summarise my objections to the proposed planning application here:

1. *The design of the planned vehicle and service access to the three proposed buildings.* Existing users of the Thomas More House Car Park ramp will be severely troubled by this proposal because there is a strong likelihood of chaos and congestion at busy times of day. It will impact particularly on the old and incapacitated. This objection alone has the potential to form the basis of a legal challenge by Barbican Estate leaseholders with regard to their contractual right to full and unfettered vehicle access to their relevant car parks.
2. *Heritage removal of the former Museum of London building and Bastion House:* the national government guidelines state - *Guide for the Disposal of Surplus Land 2017, Appendix 2, Section A2,2 page 38* – “The disposal of heritage assets should be handled carefully to comply with Government policies regarding their protection and conservation.” This application fails to follow this ‘protection and conservation’ guidance.
3. *Size and scale of the proposed buildings:* Both main buildings will be over

twice as large as the current buildings. This is not consistent with the *Local Plan* for this part of the City of London which assumes open spaces to the south of the estate. Moreover, it has the potential to disrupt the views of St Pauls Cathedral which are protected by the *London Building Acts of 1888 and 1894*.

4. *Sustainability policies of the City of London and the Greater London Authority*: the destruction of the existing buildings will release thousands of tonnes of carbon into the atmosphere. This is not only against good, current practice but the planning application is likely to be rejected at regional and government level – see, for example, the UK Government Minister’s rejection of plans to demolish the Oxford Street Marks and Spencer store August 2023. Reference: APP/X5990/V/3301508

5. *Demand for Office Space in the City*: the planning application is justified by several market studies by London Estate Agents who have vested interests in ensuring that this application is successful. There has been no independent verification of such estimates. The current, existing high level of office building in the City plus the increasing desire to ‘Work from Home ‘ suggests that such optimistic estimates are deeply flawed.

6. *Alternative business use of the site*: for example, a hotel using Bastion House and an attractive and viable visitor facility at the Museum – remains largely unexplored. The City now has significant numbers of empty shops – One New Change on Cheapside for example - and low foot traffic outside the St Pauls Churchyard area, especially at weekends. The proposed offices are not consistent with the City’s new visitor strategy - epitomised by the September 2023 Bartholomew Fare. Planners at the City of London are therefore making a major strategic mistake.

For the above reasons, I strongly object to this planning application.

Yours sincerely,

Professor Richard Lynch

Comments for Planning Application 23/01304/FULEIA

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/01304/FULEIA

Address: 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

Proposal: 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.

Case Officer: Gemma Delves

Customer Details

Name: Mr Richard Lynch

Address: 114 Thomas More House London

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of the Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Other
- Residential Amenity
- Traffic or Highways

Comment: I am writing to object to the above planning application under the collective title of London Wall West. I have no doubt that you will have received other numerous and detailed objections to the proposal. I will therefore summarise my objections to the proposed planning application here:

1. The design of the planned vehicle and service access to the three proposed buildings. Existing users of the Thomas More House Car Park ramp will be severely troubled by this proposal because there is a strong likelihood of chaos and congestion at busy times of day. It will impact particularly on the old and incapacitated. This objection alone has the potential to form the basis of a legal challenge by Barbican Estate leaseholders with regard to their contractual right to full and unfettered vehicle access to their relevant car parks.
2. Heritage removal of the former Museum of London building and Bastion House: the national government guidelines state - Guide for the Disposal of Surplus Land 2017, Appendix 2, Section

A2,2 page 38 - "The disposal of heritage assets should be handled carefully to comply with Government policies regarding their protection and conservation." This application fails to follow this 'protection and conservation' guidance.

3. Size and scale of the proposed buildings: Both main buildings will be over twice as large as the current buildings. This is not consistent with the Local Plan for this part of the City of London which assumes open spaces to the south of the estate. Moreover, it has the potential to disrupt the views of St Pauls Cathedral which are protected by the London Building Acts of 1888 and 1894.

4. Sustainability policies of the City of London and the Greater London Authority: the destruction of the existing buildings will release thousands of tonnes of carbon into the atmosphere. This is not only against good, current practice but the planning application is likely to be rejected at regional and government level - see, for example, the UK Government Minister's rejection of plans to demolish the Oxford Street Marks and Spencer store August 2023. Reference: APP/X5990/V/3301508

5. Demand for Office Space in the City: the planning application is justified by several market studies by London Estate Agents who have vested interests in ensuring that this application is successful. There has been no independent verification of such estimates. The current, existing high level of office building in the City plus the increasing desire to 'Work from Home ' suggests that such optimistic estimates are deeply flawed.

6. Alternative business use of the site: for example, a hotel using Bastion House and an attractive and viable visitor facility at the Museum - remains largely unexplored. The City now has significant numbers of empty shops - One New Change on Cheapside for example - and low foot traffic outside the St Pauls Churchyard area, especially at weekends. The proposed offices are not consistent with the City's new visitor strategy - epitomised by the September 2023 Bartholomew Fare. Planners at the City of London are therefore making a major strategic mistake.

For the above reasons, I strongly object to this planning application.

Yours sincerely,

Professor Richard Lynch

Comments for Planning Application 23/01304/FULEIA

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/01304/FULEIA

Address: 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

Proposal: 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.

Case Officer: Gemma Delves

Customer Details

Name: Mr Daniel James

Address: Flat 56, London House 172, Aldersgate Street London

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Other
- Residential Amenity
- Traffic or Highways

Comment: I object to the proposed development on the following grounds:

1. There is no clear requirement

The City have drawn up designs that would provide a number of new buildings for which there is no proven demand. Until occupants for these buildings can be identified nobody can know whether the proposal would meet their needs.

The proposal provides for mainly office accommodation and, despite the fact that the Barbican is a primarily residential area, no increase in residential accommodation. This at a time when "Working from Home" is on the increase and office buildings are being converted to flats all over the country.

The plan seems to be short-sighted and foolhardy.

2. Sustainability

The proposals are for all-new buildings. A number of existing buildings that are in no way unsound would be demolished. This is not sustainable, and is contrary to the City's own stated planning goals. Some of the buildings that would be demolished are architecturally significant and should be preserved.

3. Scale

The proposed structures are excessive in size. They would damage the environment by blocking light paths and redirecting wind flows. The existing Barbican towers minimize this by being tall and narrow whereas the new buildings in this proposal would be tall and broad.

4. Amenity

The Barbican system of highwalks separates public spaces from roads. Pedestrian spaces are kept free from traffic, noise, and pollution. Roads are kept free for vehicles.

The new proposal lacks this separation of spaces. Pedestrian and vehicle routes compete for available space, leading to poor access for both. The need to provide pedestrian space at street level leads to restrictions in vehicular access that could be avoided.

Access points to the highwalk provide safe pedestrian traversal of roadways as well as access to the highwalk system. Their removal would result in a serious loss of amenity.

Comments for Planning Application 23/01304/FULEIA

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/01304/FULEIA

Address: 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

Proposal: 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.

Case Officer: Gemma Delves

Customer Details

Name: Mr Graham Bulpitt

Address: Flat 10 Thomas More House, Barbican London

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Other

Comment: I am writing to express my concerns about the proposed development of London Wall West. There are three points that I wish to cover: conflict with the City's Climate Action Policy; the size and mass of the proposed buildings; and the impact of other aspects of the scheme, particularly the public spaces and traffic management.

The Corporation's Climate Action Policy proposes that the carbon footprint of buildings should be measured by taking a lifecycle approach. The current proposals to demolish existing buildings and construct new blocks would release tens of thousands of tons of carbon dioxide yet alternative viable proposals for refurbishment seem to have been rejected without explanation.

The most critical concern is the scale and mass of the proposed buildings which will dominate this part of the Barbican Estate and do not respect its culture and heritage. The size of the proposed blocks is out of scale with the surrounding landscape and ignore the original plans drawn up for the Barbican and the wider area.

The proposals for the public areas and traffic management as currently envisaged could prove highly disruptive. Public social space needs to be designed so that it avoids disturbance to nearby residents: this will require it to be actively managed. The proposals for traffic flows do not reflect an understanding of the Barbican Estate system and seem to displace many problems from London Wall West to the Barbican Estate.

It should be noted that a major disappointment for residents has been the failure of City officials to heed, and respond to, their concerns. It is difficult to find evidence of changes to the scheme which reflect the many issues raised by residents.

From:
To:
Subject: Objection to London Wall West planning application (Ref 23/01304/FULEIA) and to the associated applications 23/01276/LBC and 23/01277/LBC
Date: 30 January 2024 19:38:43
Attachments: [London Wall West - Planning Objection from David Rees.pdf](#)

THIS IS AN EXTERNAL EMAIL

Dear City Planning Team,

I am a leaseholder of 74 Thomas More House, Barbican, London EC2Y 8BT and I am writing to object to the London Wall West planning application (Ref 23/01304/FULEIA) and to the associated applications 23/01276/LBC and 23/01277/LBC.

I wish to adopt the objections set out in the attached letter as my own and ask you to take them into account in your consideration of this application. There is a further matter that I would like the Planning Committee to consider. On the 'fly-through' video of the proposed development, the ground level paths and associated spaces concern me as a female walking home at night. The existing (current) walkways are open and direct in their transit. The 'leisure' spaces – winding paths, lots of foliage, areas for people to congregate – which replace those walkways do not assist safe access for residents to the Barbican Estate, especially after dark.

I am also concerned that the Corporation of London is in a position of acute conflict in relation to this matter: it is both the promoter of the proposed development and the freehold owner of the adjoining Barbican Estate, as well as being the planning authority which is required to consider its own application – effectively it will be marking its own homework. To the ordinary person this seems to be a significant conflict of interest and I ask that the Planning Committee considers this application objectively and on its merits.

Yours sincerely,

Alison Rees

Comments for Planning Application 23/01304/FULEIA

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/01304/FULEIA

Address: 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

Proposal: 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.

Case Officer: Gemma Delves

Customer Details

Name: Ms Kathryn Greaves

Address: Flat 313 Cromwell Tower Barbican London

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Other

Comment: Our heritage should be protected - Sir Philip Powell & Hidalgo Moyà's Bastion House and Museum of London are two remarkable buildings that are integral to the important story of Britain's post-war urbanism. These ambitious and optimistic buildings are worth preserving for the benefit of future generations. Bastion House, the Museum of London and its rotunda are integral to the heritage of the Barbican complex. They are buildings of irreplaceable architectural merit and deserve imaginative reuse not demolition.

Comments for Planning Application 23/01304/FULEIA

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/01304/FULEIA

Address: 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

Proposal: 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.

Case Officer: Gemma Delves

Customer Details

Name: Mr John Norbury

Address: 12 Thomas More House Barbican LONDON

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Noise
- Other
- Residential Amenity
- Traffic or Highways

Comment: I totally object to this new development taking over the Thomas More vehicle access. The proposed levels of traffic will severely cause noise and disturbance to several hundred residents and flats and which has no benefit at all for those residents and which is a development that has nothing to do with the Barbican which is a world renowned Residential Estate as per its Grade II listing.

The idea that there is an alternative access higher up Aldersgate Street is ludicrous as it is a highly restricted access which is difficult for larger vehicles to use and would involve U turns that would mean vehicles would have to manoeuvre backwards and forwards to get around.

There would also be a high degree of vehicle pollution for residents and also in the sports area adjacent to the proposed traffic lanes and vast increase in vehicular, especially commercial, traffic.

All traffic on this new development should be within the new development itself, and not be a raid on the Barbican Estate property, and closing off the original museum assess is totally irresponsible and unacceptable.

The plan to restrict access to residents during the demolition and construction of the development represent a considerable restriction on access and amenity for residents, that have existed for well over 50 years, and offers no benefit to Barbican residents at any time whatsoever. and is to the long term detriment of tenants.

There also appears no consideration or detailed plans submitted to deal with changes to a listed property which is again highly improper.

Comments for Planning Application 23/01304/FULEIA

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/01304/FULEIA

Address: 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

Proposal: 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.

Case Officer: Gemma Delves

Customer Details

Name: Dr Christina Strym

Address: 17 Thomas More House Barbican London

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Other
- Residential Amenity
- Traffic or Highways

Comment: You will be creating a death trap by using an already busy residential car ramp for construction vehicles. Do you realise how many residents are partially-sighted, fragile, elderly, having cancer treatment, can only walk with assistance? It's irresponsible to propose they share a car park area where they go to pick up their packages and wait for dial-a-taxi disabled rides with construction vehicles!

Have you not read what happened today at Victoria station? It happens once a year. A lady ended up under a bus and she was a commuter not a retired lady with macular degeneration holding onto a pillar to steady herself like happens here at our busy car park. So many residents are in their 70's and 90's. They walk e-x-t-r-e-m-e-l-y slowly, cannot see, cannot hear and you are bringing death and injury onto their doorstep - literally.

You do not care about those with disability issues of which this end of the Barbican has a greater

than average number. Honestly, it's like a care home. Even Metwyn refer to the Barbican as one and they are your contractor. Why would you propose something so sinister?

It's irresponsible and evil.

Comments for Planning Application 23/01304/FULEIA

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/01304/FULEIA

Address: 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

Proposal: 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.

Case Officer: Gemma Delves

Customer Details

Name: Mr Francois-Xavier Villemin

Address: Flat 154, Thomas More House Barbican London

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Noise
- Other
- Residential Amenity
- Traffic or Highways

Comment: I object to this application to demolish buildings that are heritage assets, fully part of the Barbican Estate and well-loved by its residents. Furthermore, the proposed replacement buildings have no architectural merit, but inappropriate mass and scale. They will undoubtedly harm the whole estate by their lack of proportion.

I also find that demolishing and rebuilding will bring unacceptable harm to the environment - unleashing 56,000 tonnes of CO2. The focus of the City should shift from maximizing short-term profit to valuing its existing architecture and residential areas, and becoming a model for low carbon emissions.

So this application in my view is in breach of local, London and national policies on heritage and the environment.

On a residential aspect, I am also worried by the highly negative impact of these plans on Thomas More House (reduced car park access, noise from additional traffic, restaurant and terraces

overlooking private homes). I believe that the existing buildings have been designed with great taste and character, and they do not deserve to merely disappear - a sympathetic upgrade would be so much more appropriate.

Comments for Planning Application 23/01304/FULEIA

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/01304/FULEIA

Address: 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

Proposal: 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.

Case Officer: Gemma Delves

Customer Details

Name: Mr Daniel Stone

Address: 266 Rowley Gardens Hackney, London

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of the Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: Although not a resident of the Barbican, I am a Londoner with both a personal and professional attachment to the Barbican estate. I personally frequently visit and enjoy walking through the high walks and feel that the redevelopment is imposing on that openness and public realm. I also object to the principle. There are two perfectly good buildings already on site. The disruption and waste from demolition can surely not be considered as environmentally or socially sustainable.

Comments for Planning Application 23/01304/FULEIA

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/01304/FULEIA

Address: 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

Proposal: 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.

Case Officer: Gemma Delves

Customer Details

Name: Mr Alexander Roa Perez

Address: 8 Cullum Welch House London

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Noise
- Other
- Residential Amenity
- Traffic or Highways

Comment: I strongly object to this application on the grounds that it would cause great harm to the heritage assets of the City of London, including the Barbican and Golden Lane estates, St Giles Cripplegate, but also St Paul's Cathedral.

There is no compelling reasons to build more office space, especially in buildings of that mass and scale, for such a high environmental cost. Demolition and rebuilding will cause high emissions that have not been seriously considered - neither has refurbishment, despite the recent case of M&S Oxford Street store.

I fail to see any consistency between this application and Culture Mile project - this is erecting barriers on the straight line between the Tate Modern and the Barbican Centre, which goes via St Paul's Cathedral. I do not think that the City has considered the indirect benefits of repurposing heritage buildings and creating, for instance, the Culture Mile hotel in Bastion House and an extension of the Guildhall School of Music and Drama and City of London School for Girls

amenities in the former Museum of London. In my view, there is a high potential to create a vibrant destination in the heart of the City, which would increase the value of the neighbouring office buildings and bring back lots of businesses which have deserted it since Covid. But not with these plans which just look at the site as if it was isolated and had been bombed by the German army.

Comments for Planning Application 23/01304/FULEIA

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/01304/FULEIA

Address: 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

Proposal: 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.

Case Officer: Gemma Delves

Customer Details

Name: Mr Robert Dufton

Address: Flat 55, Thomas More House Barbican London, United Kingdom

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Noise
- Other
- Residential Amenity
- Traffic or Highways

Comment: Damage to listed and non-listed heritage assets in this area and to the setting of many listed heritage assets (eg St Giles, Postman's Pk, the Barbican Estate)

Unacceptable harm to the environment - unleash 56K tonnes of CO2. The case for demolition has not been proven - developers have said they want to retain and refurbish.

Breach of local, London and national policies on heritage and the environment.

Overdevelopment of the site - mass and scale of the buildings are inappropriate.

There are enough offices in the pipeline in the City and London as a whole.

Residential amenity will suffer substantial harm - impact on Thomas More car park will be severe; noise from high volume of traffic and noise; restaurant will look right into our homes; viewing terraces will mean a loss of privacy

Comments for Planning Application 23/01304/FULEIA

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/01304/FULEIA

Address: 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

Proposal: 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.

Case Officer: Gemma Delves

Customer Details

Name: Ted Reilly

Address: 192 Shakespeare Tower Barbican London

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of the Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Other
- Traffic or Highways

Comment: Traffic

The traffic modelling that supports this application is out of date and does not properly include the areas that will be impacted by the development. Particularly concerning is that the modelling is based on the TfL LMAP approved Future Base LinSig model for Region 11. Region 11's most northerly point does not include the entrance to ramp into the Thomas More car park, which we now have been informed will handle two way traffic into and out of the proposed development. Most worrying is the MMQ length (Mean Maximum Queue Length) for southbound Aldersgate traffic at the AM peak. This is estimated to increase from 5.1 to 22.8 PCUs (Passenger Car Units) A PCU in queue is about 10 metres giving a MMQ of 228 metres. This means the traffic will be backed up from the roundabout to Beech Street. The report is silent on the standard deviation of this MMQ length. If it follows normal traffic distribution patterns it means that traffic in the AM peak will often be backed up as far as Fann Street

Carbon

The City has a rightly celebrated Carbon Reduction Plan. It hopes to reduce carbon output in kTCO₂e by 19.4 in 22/23 and 18.3 in 23/24, totalling 37.3 . The demolition resulting from this proposal will generate 45 kTCO₂e, 20% more than two whole years City-wide savings.

Cultural Loss

I used to walk my grandchildren up from St Pauls to the Museum and then on to the Barbican. I'm not sure I'll be around for my great grandchildren, but what will they see, two barren towers, with a token indeterminate cultural offer. What has become of the City?

From: Judith Silveston, 312 Shakespeare Tower, Barbican, London EC2Y 8NJ

Date: 30 January 2024

Re: Planning Application: 23/01304/FULEIA

OBJECTION

I object to the above planning application on the following grounds:

Retention and re-use, not demolition and rebuilding

The City Corporation flaunts its zero carbon policy while at the same time proposing a scheme involving demolition and new build at London Wall West. Vast amounts of carbon will be released. The Corporation's approach to considering retaining and re-using the existing buildings is derisory, requesting re-use options only under duress and then within a time scale that scarcely enabled a considered response.

I really like the Museum of London building, especially the way it spirals down, and consider it would make a great centre for all sorts of cultural activities. The Corporation talks a lot about culture, but nothing seems to happen eg the Culture Mile.

Retention and re-use of the existing buildings should be the primary consideration, not demolition and rebuilding, especially as new office buildings appear to be intended to have a short life.

Totally wrong size and bulk of proposed new buildings

The size of the proposed new buildings and their bulk are horrendous. The computer generated images show how massive the proposed buildings are, how totally out of scale and out of sympathy they are in relation to the buildings in the surrounding streets, in particular the view from St Pauls, and to the Barbican estate, which it would overwhelm.

Access and pollution

The proposals for access of contractors, residents and service vehicles via the Thomas Moore House Car Park access ramp during demolition and construction are set out in detail by others. They are unacceptable.

Office demand

It is clear that office occupancy is still significantly below that pre-Covid, as illustrated by the reduction in tube fares on Fridays, and is unlikely to return to those levels. The City has no tenant for the site, the proposal is driven by greed, and could prove to be a very costly white elephant. This is another reason for retention of the present buildings and their re-use, for example, of the Museum of London as a cultural centre that would enhance the reputation of the City, rather than showing it up as a hypocritical speculative developer of the worst sort.

Judith Silveston

Comments for Planning Application 23/01304/FULEIA

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/01304/FULEIA

Address: 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

Proposal: 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.

Case Officer: Gemma Delves

Customer Details

Name: Mr Gareth Gardner

Address: 5 Frigate Mews London

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of the Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Other

Comment: The existing buildings are absolutely fantastic and a crucial part of the wider Barbican development. To demolish them would be a tragedy. They should be preserved and reused. The proposed replacement is extremely unpleasant and will be of great detriment to this critical corner of the City.

Comments for Planning Application 23/01304/FULEIA

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/01304/FULEIA

Address: 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

Proposal: 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.

Case Officer: Gemma Delves

Customer Details

Name: Mr Jack Mama

Address: 21-23 voss street London

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of the Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Other

Comment: This is a beautiful building that should be kept and renovated

From:
To:
Subject: OBJECTION TO 23/01304/FULEIA - DEMOLITION OF THE MUSEUM OF LONDON AND BASTION HOUSE
Date: 30 January 2024 21:40:12
Importance: High

THIS IS AN EXTERNAL EMAIL

I am writing as a Barbican Estate resident to formally object to the proposed demolition of Bastion House & the Museum of London building/central garden area.

I have the following concerns:

- The height and size of the planned replacement buildings are out of scale, proportion and character for our area, dwarfing everything around them, destroying what little coherence is left around the Barbican. The development erodes the architectural integrity of our neighbourhood, including the Barbican Estate. The area around Bastion House and MoL has a rich and deep history which should be enhanced, not disregarded and overshadowed.
- The environmental impact in terms of air quality, noise, CO2 emissions and traffic is completely contradicting the City's Climate Action Strategy. A more sustainable, carbon neutral development should be considered, like Repurpose and Refitting the existing structures.
- There are already way too many office developments in our area but no affordable retail or workshop spaces for artisans, artists, craftsmen and small independent shops. These sites would be a perfect opportunity for providing local cultural, educational and creative amenities, enhancing the creative skill infrastructure of our neighbourhood. Which also attracts visitors and tourists.
- The threat to current greenspaces (such as Barber-Surgeons' Garden), existing wildlife (which is already struggling) as well as potential loss of light to adjacent residential buildings and the City of London Girls School.
- The increase in noise as well as light pollution are also factors which significantly affect our quality of life.
- The potential solar glare hazard from the reflected sunlight is already a problem for us, forcing us to temporarily close our blinds due to eye discomfort at certain times of the day.

Any development should respect our area's unique architectural and historical context and character while enhancing quality of life and respecting our fragile environment. I feel the current proposals fail to address these criteria and urge the planning department to explore alternatives and make the best innovative use of what is already there in order to reduce negative impact on climate and local community.

Thank you for considering my objections.

Regards

Silvia Crawford
73 Lauderdale Tower
Barbican
London
EC2Y 8BY

From: Ronald P Silveston. 312 Shakespeare Tower, Barbican, London EC2Y 8NJ.

Date: 30.01.2024

Ref: Planning Application: 23/01304/FULEIA

OBJECTION

I object to the planning application referenced above on the following grounds:

Sustainability and Climate Change – Demolish and New Build vs Retention and Re-Use.

The application's approach for total demolition of Bastion House and the old Museum of London buildings completely flaunts best development practice of retaining and re-using existing buildings wherever possible. The City has developed its own climate action policies, which it claims are based on best practice but is now advocating a scheme which will release a huge amount of embodied carbon solely for its own financial gain.

Disproportionate size and bulk of the proposed buildings.

The proposal would create an eyesore completely out of keeping with the surrounding streets, the Barbican Estate London Wall and St.Pauls. The proposed New Bastion House will be more than two and a half the volume of the current Bastion House and the proposed Rotunda building more than twice. The negative impact of such a development will be far-reaching.

Best Use of the existing site

Will the City need another office block of this magnitude in ten years' time? The current application is speculative, lacking any coherent business plan, seemingly being driven solely by greed. There are multiple other locations within the city more suitable for office development. Why plan another which will not enhance The City in any architectural way and will totally ignore the environmental value of retention and the cultural and educational opportunities the site offers. If the Cultural Mile stands for anything these proposed buildings must never be built.

Comments for Planning Application 23/01304/FULEIA

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/01304/FULEIA

Address: 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

Proposal: 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.

Case Officer: Gemma Delves

Customer Details

Name: Mr Olivier Nicolai

Address: 6O4Mountjoy London

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Noise
- Other
- Residential Amenity
- Traffic or Highways

Comment: I wish to object to the current proposals for London Wall West applications (23/01304/FULEIA as well as 23/01276/LBC and 23/01277/LBC) for the following FOUR reasons;

1) The proposal is voluntarily misleading and inaccurate on its carbon footprint. The amount of pollution generated by destroying the existing site and rebuilding it with massive tower 1 and 2 will be massive with hundred of thousand of tonnes of CO2 well above what has been indicated (as per Arcadis report).

2) It will SERIOUSLY harm the health of the local pupils including the one from CLSG, local workers and local residents, including me on the edge of the Mountjoy less than 20 meters away from the enormous skyscraper replacing Bastion House. It will be a material nuisance to Mountjoy Residents in term of daily sunlight. The City of London does not care about its own net zero target and is just driven by greed ignoring the needs of its local citizens.

3) There is no need for additional office space. Commercial real estate is in free fall, working from home is partly here to stay and interest rate won't go back to the low levels of the previous decade ever. This project is unnecessary and driven by greed.

- The development will blocked most of the Thomas More Car Park which is a lifeline for many elderly residents and the congestion will put residents needing emergency services at risk . It will also greatly increase the pollution for residents and for the CLSG school children on a daily basis.

- The site could be re-used with Bastion House improved and refurbished into an hotel or residential property while the exisiting museum of London could be partly given to CLSG with the rest being dedicated to Arts since the CoL is calling itself the Culture Mile. Building enormous skyscraper, creating wind corridor and pretending to put a green space in the middle which will have no sunlight most of the year is voluntarily misleading.

I urge you to refuse this application.

Comments for Planning Application 23/01304/FULEIA

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/01304/FULEIA

Address: 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

Proposal: 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.

Case Officer: Gemma Delves

Customer Details

Name: Mrs Patricia Borg

Address: 4 Nore Road Leigh On Sea

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of the Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Noise
- Other
- Residential Amenity
- Traffic or Highways

Comment: I strongly object to the proposals. The plans will have a hugely adverse impact on the environment and local area. The development will add further noise, light and air pollution to the City with no real benefit to local residents, visitors or those working nearby. The City seems to have missed a real opportunity to capitalise on the area's cultural history and create a space that would draw visitors of all kinds (and not just those travelling to London to satisfy the in-office requirements of their remote working policy).

Comments for Planning Application 23/01304/FULEIA

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/01304/FULEIA

Address: 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

Proposal: 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.

Case Officer: Gemma Delves

Customer Details

Name: Mr Jonathan Dow

Address: 134 Thomas More House Barbican LONDON

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Noise
- Other
- Residential Amenity
- Traffic or Highways

Comment: I am again writing to you in order to object to planning Application reference: 23/01304/FULEIA

1. The proposed development will cause irreparable damage to the local area/community - including listed and non-listed heritage assets.
2. The proposal for the site clearly represents a building of a size and scale that is simply far too massive. At best the proposal, despite the repeated attempts to 'sell' the development through glossy literature, is for a dull ding/development that is ugly at best.
3. To date I have not read a case for the demolition of existing heritage and non-heritage buildings that has been proven.
4. There are already far too many empty offices and/or proposed developments for the city. Prior to any further office developments being agreed the city must do the responsible thing have a