

From Peter Inskip MBE

263 Shakespeare Tower
Barbican
London EC2Y 8DR

Planning and Development Director
City of London Corporation
Department of Planning and Transportation
PO Box 270
Guildhall
London EC2P 3EJ

FAO: Gemma Delves & Amy Williams

31st January 2024

Dear Sir/Madam,

Objection to the applications; 23/01304/FULEIA, 23/01277/LBC and 23/01276/LBC

I am an architect concerned with the historic built environment and as such have served on the architectural advisory committees of Historic England, English Heritage, the World Monuments Fund, the Getty Conservation Institute and the National Trust. I am a trustee of DOCOMOMO uk.

I am a resident on the Barbican Estate.

This letter sets out my formal objection to all three applications which together comprise the proposals for the site known as "London Wall West" as follows:

23/01304/FULEIA - 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. | 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

23/01277/LBC - External alterations to existing highwalks at the Barbican Estate including to the John Wesley Highwalk and Mountjoy Close to allow for the integration of new highwalks, hard and soft landscaping, and works associated with the construction of new buildings with the development proposed at London Wall West (140 London Wall, 150 London Wall, Shaftesbury Place, and London Wall Car Park, London, EC2Y). | 140 London Wall, 150 London Wall, Shaftesbury Place, And London Wall Car Park, London EC2Y

23/01276/LBC - 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). | Livery Hall Ironmongers' Hall Shaftesbury Place London EC2Y 8AA.

OBJECTION

The proposals involve the demolition of the Museum of London and Bastion House which were designed by Powell & Moya, one of the very best architectural practices working in London in the third quarter of the 20C. The buildings are culturally significant with an elegant Miesian office block rising above an extended podium designed to house the Museum of London. The views of the complex from London Wall are important and demonstrate the fine massing of the buildings which contributes significantly to London Wall. Both buildings are beautifully detailed.

Replacing the buildings with a new structures of a larger scale will change character of the area considerably which will harm views south down Aldersgate Street, providing an undesirable termination to the street. They will also impact on the appearance and presentation of the west side of the Barbican Conservation Area, particularly where the Barbican estate opens to the street with a series of small scale structures and garden elements that are important to neighbouring area.

The Registered Landscape of the Barbican Estate will also be harmed. It is culturally significant as one of the largest landscape areas within the City containing both public and private areas. It is particularly noteworthy because of the transparency of the landscape between garden courts and across changes of level which structure a site that was previously flat. Views through, between and under buildings result in the Barbican being subtly subdivided into a series of intimate areas whilst maintain long distant views through the whole site. As part of this, Bastion House forms a focus of an important long view from the north end of the site, at the head of the ramped entrance from Fann Street, through to the south end of the Barbican Estate. However, the scale and gentleness of the Bastion House ensures a discreet termination that allows continuity even beyond. The current proposals for much larger buildings with more solid elevations will confine such views and cause considerable harm to the Registered Landscape.

The Barbican landscape is at present further extended by views to other buildings beyond the Registered boundaries. Views of St Paul's Cathedral will be lost by the proposed development from across much of the Conservation Area; again harming the thoughtful character of the original design of the listed buildings and registered landscape.

The site is at the intersection of two principal routes in the City of London and the roundabout marks it as a pivotal site within the urban fabric. In addition, the site reflects the historic boundary of the Roman wall. The previous use as the Museum of London, and the subsequent proposal for a concert hall, were appropriate to the significance of the site as part of the municipal realm. Office use as now proposed is not appropriate and will harm the City and the Barbican Conservation Area.

I would be grateful if you would take into consideration the above points when assessing the applications and note my OBJECTION to the proposals which will cause serious harm to the heritage of the City of London.

Yours faithfully

Peter Inskip

E: pinskip@inskip-gee.co.uk

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 Heard

Address: 13 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 deep concerns about the proposed development in our area, which poses significant threats to both our heritage and the environment. The potential damage to listed and non-listed heritage assets, including St Giles, Postman's Pk, and the Barbican Estate, raises alarm bells about the preservation of our cultural and historical identity.

Furthermore, the sheer environmental impact cannot be ignored, with an estimated 56K tonnes of CO2 set to be unleashed. The lack of a compelling case for demolition is troubling, especially when developers have expressed a desire to retain and refurbish. This potential breach of local, London, and national policies on heritage and the environment is a cause for serious concern and warrants careful consideration.

The issue of overdevelopment compounds our worries, as the mass and scale of the proposed buildings seem wholly inappropriate for our community. With a sufficient number of offices already in the pipeline for the City and London as a whole, the necessity for this additional development is questionable at best.

Residential amenity is also under threat, as the proposed project could result in severe harm to the Thomas More car park, increased noise from a higher volume of traffic, and a loss of privacy due to intrusive views from restaurant and viewing terraces. These potential impacts on our daily lives should not be taken lightly.

In conclusion, I urge all stakeholders involved to carefully reconsider the implications of this development on our heritage, environment, and community well-being. It is crucial that we prioritize the preservation of our cultural assets, adhere to established policies, and ensure responsible and sustainable development that enhances rather than harms our neighborhood.

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 Jane Ernstzen

Address: 25 Cromer road London

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of the Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Other

Comment: The proposed design is very average in design and detail. The green aspect seems unlikely to provide a pleasant space amongst the tall building canyon that is London wall and the Bart's redevelopment. Instead of an iconic building, museum of London, the design is yet more uninteresting and focus-less tall buildings. An event space on the top seems inaccessible and irrelevant. The removal of raised pedestrian walkways a loss. A bland and disappointing response to the remit.

City of London Corporation
Department of Planning and Transportation
PO Box 270
Guildhall
London
EC2P 3EJ
Email: PlnComments@cityoflondon.gov.uk

31st January 2024

Dear Sir/Madam,

Objection to the applications; 23/01304/FULEIA, 23/01277/LBC and 23/01276/LBC

I object to all three applications for “London Wall West”;

- **23/01304/FULEIA** - *Demolition of 140 & 150 London Wall to provide a phased development etc*
- **23/01277/LBC** - *External alterations to existing highwalks at the Barbican Estate etc*
- **23/01276/LBC** - *Demolition of Ferroners' House etc*

On the grounds set out below.

1. **Planning process**

It is premature to treat these proposals as valid applications. The pre-application and post-application consultations contained misleading and partial information and visuals, contrary to guidance and with regard to the impact on heritage assets and carbon optioneering in particular. Statutory consultees, neighbours and interested parties are therefore being asked to comment without relevant information.

Ideally the application should be withdrawn or paused to enable clarification and corrections to be provided by the developer. The third-party carbon assessment should be made public; it should be part of the application and whilst requested by the Barbican Association a month ago it has not been supplied to them.

The City's role as both developer and planning authority requires it to be particularly transparent in its dealings on this scheme. The pre-application advice sought and provided by the Corporation should be published and made available now that the planning application is submitted. Other Boroughs do this routinely, as it avoids the hassle of FOI, under which it is disclosable. The City should show similar leadership.

As has been allowed on other applications, at the very least the formal consultation date should be extended to allow for missing and misleading information to be corrected and commented on properly.

2. **Demolition breaches the Local Plan, City Plan, London Plan and NPPF policies on sustainability.**

The applicant's own Whole Life Carbon Assessment is significantly flawed in its assumptions and therefore its conclusions. Even so, the choice of such a damaging option in carbon terms breaches all the relevant planning policies at City, London and National level.

The proposed demolition and its significantly harmful carbon impact could easily be avoided by retrofitting. The City's superficial exercise to explore options with commercial developers does not meet its own policy of making sure options for retention are “fully explored before considering substantial demolition”¹. Regardless, it did prove that a retro-fit first approach is entirely viable on this site. This would be in line with the City's broader climate goals, and its wish to be seen as a leader on the topic of climate change at COP conferences and in global finance.

¹ Planning Advice Note

Since the City is both applicant and planning authority, and the carbon issue is so central to this application, the City should publish its independent third-party review of the WLCA and its pre-application advice to the applicant. It should also undertake a proper exercise of reviewing alternatives that meets the test of “fully exploring” them.

National planning policy says that the planning system should support the transition to a low carbon future in a changing climate “it should help to: shape places in ways that contribute to radical reductions in greenhouse gas emissions, minimise vulnerability and improve resilience; encourage the reuse of existing resources, including the conversion of existing buildings; and support renewable and low carbon energy and associated infrastructure”².

As it fails on this score the application should be refused by Planning.

3. Scale and massing

The scale and massing has no “regard to their surroundings and the historic and local character of the City”. The plan was originally and specifically designed to turn its back on the Barbican, and it in no way meets the City’s Local Plan requirement that “the bulk, height, scale, massing, quality of materials and detailed design of buildings are appropriate to the character of the City and the setting and amenities of surrounding buildings and spaces”.

Bringing such tall buildings in such close proximity to a long-standing residential area means that the scheme does not enjoy “a positive relationship to neighbouring buildings and spaces”. And instead of meeting the requirement to “have due regard to the general scale, height, building lines, character, historic interest and significance, urban grain and materials of the locality and relate well to the character of streets, squares, lanes, alleys and passageways”, the scheme ignores the existing character and urban grain.

It is completely out of scale with its surroundings on Aldersgate St and the Barbican.

4. Design

National Planning Policy³ is designed to generally encourage development but it does say that this must add to the overall quality of the area, not just for the short term, and be sympathetic to local character and history – to “establish or maintain a strong sense of place, using the arrangement of streets, spaces, building types and materials to create attractive, welcoming and distinctive places to live, work and visit”. The London Plan and the Local Plan⁴ reflect this.

The design of this scheme, however, is a re-working of an earlier project, the Centre for Music, whose architects specifically chose a design which turned its back on the neighbourhood – to stand out rather than fit in.

Chopping and changing an already unsuitable design has now resulted in a scheme which does nothing for the quality of the area, does not respect the area’s local character and street patterns, and is completely at odds with its environment.

Office building in the City now have an extremely short life-span. One in Gresham Street, for example, is now being retrofitted less than 25 years after being built. This particular design has not been led by a commercial developer with an understanding of the market and a stake in the long-term success of the development. It is highly unlikely that the market will see this repurposed, public sector-led design as one which “adds to the quality of the area” over the longer term. If you could even find a developer willing to build it, it would be redundant in a very short space of time.

It is currently a design which is unworthy of support, either on planning or commercial terms.

5. Damage to Heritage Assets

² NPPF, Chapter 14

³ NPPF, Chapter 12 and 16

⁴ Local Plan 2015 - Core Strategic Policy CS10: Design: To promote a high standard of design and sustainable buildings

All levels of planning policy require new development to make a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness, particularly by using every opportunity to draw on “the contribution made by the historic environment to the character of a place”⁵.

The City’s own Local Plan Core Strategic Policy CS12 on the Historic Environment requires new schemes “ To conserve or enhance the significance of the City’s heritage assets and their settings, and provide an attractive environment for the City’s communities and visitors, by: 1. Safeguarding the City’s listed buildings and their settings, while allowing appropriate adaptation and new uses. 2. Preserving and enhancing the distinctive character and appearance of the City’s conservation areas, while allowing sympathetic development within them. 4. Safeguarding the character and setting of the City’s gardens of special historic interest”.

This application, however, almost completely ignores its setting as an integral part of the listed Barbican Estate and its listed and Registered landscape. It also pays no attention to the immediately adjoining Conservation Area. It causes severe harm to the setting of the Grade I listed church of St Botolph and Postman’s Park in which it sits.

Views to and from St Pauls are affected, with the scheme rendering the surrounding area a complete jumble of rooflines with no relationship with one another. A private viewing gallery is no substitute for public sightlines.

Even the scheme’s partial attempts to unveil heritage assets like the Roman Gatehouse, happily buried in a car park for decades by the City, go no way to offset the significant damage to the character, setting and sustainability all the other affected heritage and conservation assets.

The character of the listed Barbican Estate, its listed landscape and the Conservation Area are fundamentally based on the physical integration of all the various elements – indeed the compact, efficient and sustainable design of the Barbican which successfully holds all its elements together in a coherent 3D jigsaw of buildings and uses, is one of the main things that attracts plaudits and visitors globally.

Demolishing part of this is a huge mistake from which there is no going back. This character would be completely lost, and the settings of historic assets would be altered to such a degree that they would become unrecognisable.

6. Damage to amenity

Sunlight and daylight will be restricted to an unacceptable level for neighbouring homes from this scheme, which is far too close to existing homes and which creates substantial harm because of its size and scale. This has been misleadingly presented in the application and cannot be mitigated by conditions – a smaller scheme is necessary. Access for residents and emergency vehicles will be unreasonably restricted by the proposals to share access with the site. And construction impacts have been substantially under-estimated by not covering the full extent of the applications submitted. The risk of night-time light pollution from commercial uses is extremely high, as can be seen in all the City offices with 24/7 lighting.

7. Cultural element is tokenistic

The original plan for a world-class cultural centre to replace the Museum has now been scaled back to a tokenistic bit of space with no meaningful proposals for its use.

8. Securing mitigation through planning obligations

The scale and impact of this proposed development means that the planning authority will have to seek to mitigate its harmful impact via s106 Agreement as well as planning conditions etc. This is routine in all large applications in the City and is the only way that otherwise unacceptable projects (which, technically speaking, they all are) can be rendered acceptable in planning terms.

Planning obligations are as significant as the application itself and with a third party commercial developer this is normally a robust negotiation. In this case, however, the City will be negotiating with itself as both planning

⁵ NPPF

authority and developer; and cannot bind itself to the outcome. There is a reasonable risk that this will produce a less favourable outcome than a s106 with a commercial developer. For the protection of all parties, and the interests of the City electorate in whose name this scheme is being promoted, independent scrutiny of any associated planning obligations is necessary, prior to any consent.

9. Development viability

This application is based in large part on the architects' plans at the time of the Centre for Music, when a significant proportion of the site was to be given over to cultural use without affecting the commercial viability of the development overall. It is hard to understand why all that cultural space now has to be office use – if the previous scheme was viable then why does this latest one have to have so much office space in it?

A viable scheme, with a range of uses more suited to the City's obligations as a public landowner, and meeting the need of the City to diversify in order to be attractive to commerce, is entirely feasible on this site. The area needs specialist housing for older people, next to existing residential, and part of this site would be very suitable. A mixed scheme would achieve the planning goal of economic growth without the significant disbenefits of carbon emissions, heritage damage and loss of amenity.

Even at this late stage, the applicant should be encouraged to withdraw this scheme and develop a much more imaginative and forward-looking project. If not, I urge you to reject this application.

Your sincerely,

E. Hirst

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 Adriana Medina Lalinde

Address: 915 Frobisher Crescent London

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Noise
- Residential Amenity

Comment: I'm objecting application 23/01304/FULEIA on the following grounds:

- Negative impact on local residential amenity: loss of sunlight and privacy, plus increase in noise, in particular by the proposed restaurant overlooking Thomas More House.
- Failure to respect the heritage of neighbouring buildings such as grade 1 listed St. Giles Cripplegate, St. Botolph's, Ironmongers' Hall, Postman's Park and the Barbican Estate.
- Failure to consider greener and sustainable alternatives: the development will release tens of thousands of tonnes of CO2 during demolition and construction. This is incompatible with CoL's Climate Action Strategy and national policies, which state that demolition should be a last resort.
- Adverse effect on highway safety for cyclists and pedestrians and increase in poor air quality.

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 Fiona Sonola

Address: Flat 2 Heydon house London

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of the Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Other

Comment:.

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 Andrew Ormsby

Address: 102 Mountjoy House Barbican London

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Other
- Residential Amenity
- Traffic or Highways

Comment: The City's own climate strategy calls for the retrofitting and refurbishing of existing buildings, a critical capability for net-zero future. The renovation and refurbishment of the existing buildings has received minimal attention compared to the effort spent in planning their demolition. The City has many older buildings and could and should lead the country in showing how solutions other than demolition and replacement are possible.

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 Andrew Ormsby

Address: 102 Mountjoy House, Barbican, London EC2Y 8BP

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Other
- Residential Amenity
- Traffic or Highways

Comment: The mass and scale of the proposed development is huge. The building replacing Bastion House will be more than double the size of the existing building while the additional new buildings will further add to an already fast-growing collection of ever larger buildings in the City. Their impact will be considerable and the token area proposed (but not guaranteed) for gardens and open space seems woefully inadequate.

From:
To:
Subject: London Wall West - 23/01304/FULEIA - OBJECT
Date: 31 January 2024 13:14:21

THIS IS AN EXTERNAL EMAIL

I OBJECT to the plans for London Wall West.

The City's own climate strategy calls for the retrofitting and refurbishing of existing buildings, a critical capability for net-zero future. The renovation and refurbishment of the existing buildings has received minimal attention compared to the effort spent in planning their demolition. The City has many older buildings and could and should lead the country in showing how solutions other than demolition and replacement are possible.

The mass and scale of the proposed development is huge. The building replacing Bastion House will be more than double the size of the existing building while the additional new buildings will further add to an already fast-growing collection of ever larger buildings in the City. Their impact will be considerable and the token area proposed (but not guaranteed) for gardens and open space seems woefully inadequate.

Meanwhile, the demand for all this new office space is uncertain. Projections of continued growth in demand are like all economic forecasts - likely to be wrong. There is no tenant, so the development is speculative, driven only by the City's drive for financial return. Just a few years ago, the City planned a new Centre for Music on this site. Have these needs disappeared? What about the repeated pleas for extra space for the City of London School for Girls? Further development within the school's existing footprint is impossible but the old Museum of London buildings are ideal for education and would allow the school to expand the provision of excellent services to a wider audience.

The City is an attractive place to live and work partly because it retains a balance between the competing demands of commercial office space and the important heritage sites. The loss of the significant and widely-admired existing buildings and their replacement with yet another collection of office towers will take the City further towards a monoculture that provides only office space to commuters. Prized assets such as Postman's Park, St Giles and the Barbican Estate itself will be increasingly dwarfed by new towers.

The City has a responsibility to generate an income, but it also needs to recognise and support its heritage, the cultural history and potential of this important site. The ambitions of the "culture mile" seem to have been completely lost.

The proposals seem to have given insufficient consideration to access by road. Thomas More car park, providing space for multiple Barbican blocks and hundreds of residents, is served by a single ramp from Aldersgate Street. The ramp and the entrance to the car park, used by not only by resident's cars, pedestrians and cyclists is frequently congested with supermarket and other deliveries and will become much busier with traffic for the planned new office buildings. The proposed new road layout ignores the needs of traffic existing this car park to travel north up Aldersgate Street and towards Goswell Road. Right turns from this ramp are illegal, so traffic currently uses the Museum rotunda roundabout to head north. In the new traffic scheme there is no roundabout. Northbound traffic will have to make some kind of larger circuit of the City in order to head north, or make an illegal and dangerous turn.

I am profoundly disappointed that the City has persisted with these damaging and unimaginative plans which will residential amenity. There seems to be no ambition beyond the provision of yet more office space. I hope that these plans are rejected.

(Dr) Andrew Ormsby
102 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: Dr Andrew Ormsby

Address: 102 Mountjoy House, Barbican, London EC2Y 8BP

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Other

Comment: The demand for all this new office space is uncertain. Projections of continued growth in demand are like all economic forecasts - likely to be wrong. There is no tenant, so the development is speculative, driven only by the City's drive for financial return. Just a few years ago, the City planned a new Centre for Music on this site. Have these needs disappeared? What about the repeated pleas for extra space for the City of London School for Girls? Further development within the school's existing footprint is impossible but the old Museum of London buildings are ideal for education and would allow the school to expand the provision of excellent services to a wider audience.

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 Andrew Ormsby

Address: 102 Mountjoy House, Barbican, London EC2Y 8BP

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 an attractive place to live and work partly because it retains a balance between the competing demands of commercial office space and the important heritage sites. The loss of the significant and widely-admired existing buildings and their replacement with yet another collection of office towers will take the City further towards a monoculture that provides only office space to commuters. Prized assets such as Postman's Park, St Giles and the Barbican Estate itself will be increasingly dwarfed by new towers.

The City has a responsibility to generate an income, but it also needs to recognise and support its heritage, the cultural history and potential of this important site. The ambitions of the "culture mile" seem to have been completely lost.

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 England

Address: 11 Coastguard Cottages Rye

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of the Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Noise
- Residential Amenity
- Traffic or Highways

Comment: Unnecessary overdevelopment and removal of an existing asset to the local community. We should be repairing and updating existing buildings to save energy and unnecessary waste of valuable resources and materials.

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 Andrew Ormsby

Address: 102 Mountjoy House, Barbican, London EC2Y 8BP

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Noise
- Other
- Residential Amenity
- Traffic or Highways

Comment: The proposals seem to have given insufficient consideration to access by road. Thomas More car park, providing space for multiple Barbican blocks and hundreds of residents, is served by a single ramp from Aldersgate Street. The ramp and the entrance to the car park, used by not only by resident's cars, pedestrians and cyclists is frequently congested with supermarket and other deliveries and will become much busier with traffic for the planned new office buildings. The proposed new road layout ignores the needs of traffic existing this car park to travel north up Aldersgate Street and towards Goswell Road. Right turns from this ramp are illegal, so traffic currently uses the Museum rotunda roundabout to head north. In the new traffic scheme there is no roundabout. Northbound traffic will have to make some kind of larger circuit of the City in order to head north, or make an illegal and dangerous turn.

I am profoundly disappointed that the City has persisted with these damaging and unimaginative

plans which will residential amenity. There seems to be no ambition beyond the provision of yet more office space. I hope that these plans are rejected.

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 Liliana Ferreira

Address: 140 Thomas More House London

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: I strongly OBJECT to the London Wall West planning on numerous grounds (planning application reference 23/01304/FULEIA).

- * 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.

I urge the City of London to listen to its residents and reconsider the plans to demolish the former Museum of London and Bastion House and look for a more sustainable and creative solution for this site.

Yours sincerely,
Liliana Ferreira

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: Martin Young

Address: 42 New Rd Rochester

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of the Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Other

Comment:As a regular visitor to the Barbican I object to this development.

It is contrary to the City of London's stated policy on climate sustainability and will needlessly release huge amounts of CO2 and other pollutants.

It will despoil a world class modernist architectural zone with an incongruous, needless and unimaginative project.

It will add to London's existing over provision of unwanted office space.

it will be a missed opportunity to reimagine and reuse the existing high quality architecture and preserve both these buildings and the existing built environment for future generations.