

To The Planning Department
City of London Corporation

Re: Application 23/01304/FULEIA

I object to the application.

1. The development is inappropriate to the Barbican Residential Quarter. The applicant has previously stated that such office development should take place to the east not the west of the City.
2. The proposed development will cause substantial harm to the local public realm. In addition to overshadowing of the Barbican Estate itself, by way of example Ironmongers' Hall, Postman's Park, St. Botolph's Church would all be affected.
3. The best use of the land (which the applicant should consider in addition to how much cash it can generate) is not for yet more offices but other purposes such as cultural, recreational and/or residential. Since it is unlikely that the development will ever be occupied as offices, any application like the current one should include plans for repurposing.
4. The applicant fails to follow its own guidelines for sustainable development. These include retrofit and/or reuse as a first approach. The applicant claims that it has investigated alternatives to demolition and new build of yet more offices. Even though the exercise it conducted was a charade (with a truncated timetable) it is understood that alternative more sympathetic proposals were received offering comparative value to the application. These rather than the current application should be pursued.
5. The development is unsustainable. Demolition and construction would release thousands of tons of CO2 into the environment This is totally unnecessary as viable alternatives avoiding this detriment are available as the applicant well knows.
6. The proposed route for ingress to and egress from the development is not only inadequate but poses a threat to highway safety not least because a shared use would be pedestrian access to recreational facilities of the City of London Girls School and to Thomas More House.
7. There would be substantial detrimental impact on residential amenity. An effect of the scale and encroachment of the development would be that the Barbican Estate and its residential community would be hemmed in. In addition, despite the fine words of the applicant, the City is already plagued by light pollution. High rise development in proximity to the Barbican Estate will only serve to exacerbate this.
8. The application itself is disingenuous:
 - > the applicant knows that it is unlikely that there will ever be sufficient demand for the proposed development to be occupied as offices. While any actual private developer may choose to be reckless, the applicant should know better and not encourage the construction of redundant assets;
 - > materials in support of the application produced by or on behalf of the applicant are misleading (photographic tricks and spurious sustainability comparisons are but examples);
 - > there is a wider and wholly inappropriate political agenda behind the purpose of the application. The Chairman of Policy of the applicant has stated that it does not consider the City to be a residential city. The applicant should not use the planning process to ruin the lives of current residents in order to achieve this aim.

Keith Woodward
223 Lauderdale Tower
Barbican
London EC2Y 8BY

From:
To:
Subject: Planning objection: London Wall West
Date: 31 January 2024 14:42:17

THIS IS AN EXTERNAL EMAIL

I object to the planning proposal for London Wall West - application references 23/01304/FUL/EIA, 23/01277/LBC, 23/01276/LBC 'London Wall West'.

Residential amenity

City planners and developers seem to miss a very obvious point - London Wall, Moorgate, City Road, Old Street and Aldersgate form a boundary of a residential neighbourhood that sits inside a growing corporate location. The people within are proud to be City (or adjacent) residents. They feel special about living here. People, families and friends live, love and grow here. The proposed development seeks to rob them of vital things that allow them to do this. They'll lose daylight and sunlight. They'll be blinded by solar glare, with more time spent behind curtains and blinds to block it out. That's when they're able to be open without office workers looking into their homes.

The routes around their immediate home location and the City they enjoy currently will be changed forever, with disruption to those lasting for well beyond a decade based on current proposed timelines for the demolition and redevelopment, residents very casually asked to put up with this for that shocking duration.

Access will be limited to homes. Air quality will be adversely affected. They City states in 2024 "Air quality in the City of London has been improving but still breaches health targets. [Poor air quality can harm human health](#), and increase the incidence of cardiovascular and lung disease" and this development only compounds this issues, mere metres from the homes of thousands of people. And the noise and the disturbance of construction in this neighbourhood will further adversely impact this neighbourhood. There is no such thing as "considerate construction" at this scale in a residential neighbourhood. The true impact on the City's residents - the true lifeblood of (and future, larger potential for) the vibrant City the council seems so desperate is unmeasurable.

The City may have aspirations to be 'Wall Street on Thames', forgetting that it already has so much more to offer and should build on these non-office space offerings. Been to Wall Street on a weekend? I have. It's no aspiration.

Sustainability and climate change

The proposed demolition and development fly in the face of the City's stated environmental goals.

As described by Christopher Hayward, Policy Chair of the City of London: "The City Corporation is now moving towards a "retrofit first" approach, where reuse and refurbishment of existing buildings, structure and materials must be given serious consideration in any planning application. The new guidance applies to major developments - those with a greater floorspace uplift than 1,000 sqm - and developments which propose knocking down most of the existing structure." We are told that "best value" is his guiding principle for this proposal but it's clearly in his environmental commitments and ignores "best use" as a result. Value is more than revenue to a City that will be here long after we are not.

Residents have been told by the City's Policy Chair that viable alternatives for refurbishment were presented to the City in soft market testing, but these have been ignored and details not shared for fair consideration in the assessment of the proposed redevelopment's suitability.

And, it's very worrying that the proposed demolition is estimated to release thousands of tonnes of embodied carbon into the environment, and the planning estimates of what this amount will be have been questioned as the result of dubious data, along with dubious claims about the structural safety of Bastion House.

Mass and scale

The proposed redevelopment must see demolition as an absolute last resort. Bastion House and the Museum of London are not simply vacant buildings. They are a part of and immediately link to a residential neighbourhood. They are important and distinguished buildings that can remain as vital and vibrant elements of a reimagined City. They sit in and near heritage assets that will be unduly harmed by the proposed development. The Barbican Estate, St Giles', Postman's Park and St Boltoph's will all be adversely affected by the proposed development, as it towers over, shadows and engulfs them.

The development will also set a dangerous precedent for future development of similar scale and mass that will further adversely impact these areas, as such developments become the norm, without any appreciation for the history and cultural potential of the site. I ask that you consider having this built next to your bedroom. Thoughts?

History and cultural potential

The proposed development sits in an area of significant historical value and, as a result, cultural potential for the City's stated goals of being a cultural hub and 'vibrant' quarter. Office space is not the answer for achieving these goals. The Museum of London was an important gateway to the City and the cultural delights of the Barbican, and its loss to office space on the site is a great shame. Options for suitable replacements have not been given due public consideration under the test of "best value" which is an opaque and curiously private process.

Office demand

And finally, office development should be the option of last resort. Its is speculative and reckless. Office demand will not return to pre-pandemic levels in our lifetimes, and there is no proven demand for this proposed office space. Office working patterns have changed forever, and AI will likely automate thousands of jobs of City workers. 90% of respondents to a November 2023 UK Finance survey claimed to be "already leveraging Predictive AI in back-office functions, yielding tangible benefits. Although Generative AI is relatively new, more than 60 per cent believed it has the potential to deliver significant cost savings and improvements to operational effectiveness." "Operational effectiveness" is thinly veiled code for fewer people. And that means less floor space. The reduction in demand for both is already visible in the City's failing and empty retail outlets. The City has millions of square feet of office space already at approval status, there's simply no need for more at this time - giving rise to the serious consideration of alternative uses via refurbishment.

I object.

Richard Stanley
103 Andrewes House
EC2Y 8AY

To The Planning Department
City of London Corporation

Re: Application 23/01277/LBC

I object to the application.

1. The development is inappropriate to the Barbican Residential Quarter. The applicant has previously stated that such office development should take place to the east not the west of the City.
2. The proposed development will cause substantial harm to the local public realm. In addition to overshadowing of the Barbican Estate itself, by way of example Ironmongers' Hall, Postman's Park, St. Botolph's Church would all be affected.
3. The best use of the land (which the applicant should consider in addition to how much cash it can generate) is not for yet more offices but other purposes such as cultural, recreational and/or residential. Since it is unlikely that the development will ever be occupied as offices, any application like the current one should include plans for repurposing.
4. The applicant fails to follow its own guidelines for sustainable development. These include retrofit and/or reuse as a first approach. The applicant claims that it has investigated alternatives to demolition and new build of yet more offices. Even though the exercise it conducted was a charade (with a truncated timetable) it is understood that alternative more sympathetic proposals were received offering comparative value to the application. These rather than the current application should be pursued.
5. The development is unsustainable. Demolition and construction would release thousands of tons of CO2 into the environment This is totally unnecessary as viable alternatives avoiding this detriment are available as the applicant well knows.
6. The proposed route for ingress to and egress from the development is not only inadequate but poses a threat to highway safety not least because a shared use would be pedestrian access to recreational facilities of the City of London Girls School and to Thomas More House.
7. There would be substantial detrimental impact on residential amenity. An effect of the scale and encroachment of the development would be that the Barbican Estate and its residential community would be hemmed in. In addition, despite the fine words of the applicant, the City is already plagued by light pollution. High rise development in proximity to the Barbican Estate will only serve to exacerbate this.
8. The application itself is disingenuous:
 - > the applicant knows that it is unlikely that there will ever be sufficient demand for the proposed development to be occupied as offices. While any actual private developer may choose to be reckless, the applicant should know better and not encourage the construction of redundant assets;
 - > materials in support of the application produced by or on behalf of the applicant are misleading (photographic tricks and spurious sustainability comparisons are but examples);
 - > there is a wider and wholly inappropriate political agenda behind the purpose of the application. The Chairman of Policy of the applicant has stated that it does not consider the City to be a residential city. The applicant should not use the planning process to ruin the lives of current residents in order to achieve this aim.

Keith Woodward
223 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: Mr Michael Jardine

Address: 70 Waynflete Square London

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of the Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Other

Comment: This appears to be greedy and shortsighted- these are exemplary buildings from the point of view of 20th century built heritage and provide the context for the Barbican, which surely should not be harmed with another new (enormous) shiny tower.

The Corporation will claim that it's always keen to challenge designers and developers to provide the highest quality in new buildings: why not show some environmental leadership and promote a new standard in adaptive re-use whilst maintaining the existing elegant aesthetic of the the Museum/ Bastion House complex?

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 Orlando Figes

Address: 612 Seddon House, Barbican, London EC2Y 8BX

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Noise
- Other
- Residential Amenity
- Traffic or Highways

Comment:As a Seddon House resident I object in the strongest terms to this proposal, which represents a prime example of corporate greed asking for a free rein at the cost of residential, community and environmental interests. There is absolutely no need for yet more office and retail space in the area. Since the pandemic the demand for office space has been in sharp decline. The offices on Aldersgate street are mostly empty now. The environmental damage which this development would bring to the area is well documented, and on its own should be enough to rule out the proposal, without consideration of the noise, disruption and pollution caused by the ill-conceived construction plans (the ludicrous idea of using the Thomas More car park for hundreds of lorries every day is an insult to the residents). The proposed demolition of the buildings on the site is an act of vandalism. There are many better ways to re-purpose and develop them which would preserve the architectural heritage and social purpose of the Barbican. How about more housing for a start?

To The Planning Department
City of London Corporation

Re: Application 23/01276/LBC

I object to the application.

1. The development is inappropriate to the Barbican Residential Quarter. The applicant has previously stated that such office development should take place to the east not the west of the City.
2. The proposed development will cause substantial harm to the local public realm. In addition to overshadowing of the Barbican Estate itself, by way of example Ironmongers' Hall, Postman's Park, St. Botolph's Church would all be affected.
3. The best use of the land (which the applicant should consider in addition to how much cash it can generate) is not for yet more offices but other purposes such as cultural, recreational and/or residential. Since it is unlikely that the development will ever be occupied as offices, any application like the current one should include plans for repurposing.
4. The applicant fails to follow its own guidelines for sustainable development. These include retrofit and/or reuse as a first approach. The applicant claims that it has investigated alternatives to demolition and new build of yet more offices. Even though the exercise it conducted was a charade (with a truncated timetable) it is understood that alternative more sympathetic proposals were received offering comparative value to the application. These rather than the current application should be pursued.
5. The development is unsustainable. Demolition and construction would release thousands of tons of CO2 into the environment This is totally unnecessary as viable alternatives avoiding this detriment are available as the applicant well knows.
6. The proposed route for ingress to and egress from the development is not only inadequate but poses a threat to highway safety not least because a shared use would be pedestrian access to recreational facilities of the City of London Girls School and to Thomas More House.
7. There would be substantial detrimental impact on residential amenity. An effect of the scale and encroachment of the development would be that the Barbican Estate and its residential community would be hemmed in. In addition, despite the fine words of the applicant, the City is already plagued by light pollution. High rise development in proximity to the Barbican Estate will only serve to exacerbate this.
8. The application itself is disingenuous:
 - > the applicant knows that it is unlikely that there will ever be sufficient demand for the proposed development to be occupied as offices. While any actual private developer may choose to be reckless, the applicant should know better and not encourage the construction of redundant assets;
 - > materials in support of the application produced by or on behalf of the applicant are misleading (photographic tricks and spurious sustainability comparisons are but examples);
 - > there is a wider and wholly inappropriate political agenda behind the purpose of the application. The Chairman of Policy of the applicant has stated that it does not consider the City to be a residential city. The applicant should not use the planning process to ruin the lives of current residents in order to achieve this aim.

Keith Woodward
223 Lauderdale Tower
Barbican
London EC2Y 8BY

From:
To:
Subject: LWW planning application 23/01277/LBC
Date: 31 January 2024 14:59:45

THIS IS AN EXTERNAL EMAIL

Objection from Terry Trickett, 605 Mountjoy House, Barbican, EC2Y 8BP

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

Ps. The document 'A Barbican resident's response to a deeply flawed proposal for London Wall West', as referred to above, is accessible at <https://acrobat.adobe.com/id/urn:aaid:sc:EU:a44cfdc9-9e2d-4ea1-80a0-51cbc5f92a5a>

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 Istvan Polay

Address: 23 Arkwright road London

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of the Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Other

Comment:A great brutalist architecture heritage should not be demolished or replaced but renovated/retrofitted. Please consider the architectural and cultural value!

From:
To:
Subject: LWW planning application 23/01304/FULEIA
Date: 31 January 2024 15:06:12

THIS IS AN EXTERNAL EMAIL

Objection from Terry Trickett, 605 Mountjoy House, Barbican, EC2Y 8BP

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

Ps. The document 'A Barbican resident's response to a deeply flawed proposal for London Wall West', as referred to above, is accessible at <https://acrobat.adobe.com/id/urn:aaid:sc:EU:a44cfdc9-9e2d-4ea1-80a0-51cbc5f92a5a>

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: Mrs Helen Clifford

Address: 15 Defoe 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's application for LWW site planning permission and listed building consent raises concerns about severe noise and air pollution impacts on Barbican Estate residents. The proposed "car-free" development redirects LWW traffic into the Grade II Listed Barbican Estate, creating a fragmented access/egress system. Multiplex Construction's assumption of restricting the Thomas More Service Yard to construction traffic poses challenges for residents. Concerns stem from a review of the DELIVERY AND SERVICING PLAN, criticizing its lack of clarity and disregard for residents' rights. The scheme lacks a comprehensive plan for reconstructing the Thomas More Service Yard. Overall, the application reflects a confused and impractical approach for a site deserving better consideration.

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 Costanzo Capece

Address: 915 Frobisher Crescent 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: In the past I had objected the previous plan. This new plan looks worse than the previous one.

The amount of space available to the public is tiny. There is a massive increase of private space allocation from the current split between public spaces (former Museum of London) and private ones (offices).

Health of children: the playing fields of the City of London School for Girls are very close to this development. Noise and dust from construction works will last for years.

Loss of residential amenities: the highway system would be brutally reduced. Sunlight will be blocked. The overall volume of the proposed buildings is a massive increase from the current one.

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 Oakes

Address: 91 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: I strongly object to the proposals for London Wall West: 23/01304/FULEIA, for the following reasons:

1. The proposed buildings are out of scale with the surroundings and have poor contextual references. It's an overdevelopment of the site with bloated buildings designed for profit from buying and selling real estate, but not for making a great city. The sense of "place" is neglected, in particular, respect for surrounding structures, heritage buildings and the wider context. Additionally, I suspect canyonisation and microclimate impact could be significant.

2. Construction's dirty secret is demolishing and replacing any existing building and 56 thousand tonnes of CO₂ will be generated by this proposal. Thomas Heatherwick in his book: Humanise, states that building demolitions generate 126 million tonnes of waste a year - 2/3 of all waste in the

UK. Clearly then, the existing buildings should be repurposed.

3. The design will have an enormous detrimental impact on local residents. There will be a loss of privacy due to overlooking terraces and there will be a sense of enclosure and overbearing. Overshadowing will reduce winter solar gain to many flats and necessitate increased heating requirements with increased CO2 emissions and cost.

The proposed restaurant would impact the existing private amenity of residents with overlooking, noise and light pollution.

The proposed increase in site traffic and changes to TMH car park during construction and in use, will impact residents with noise and inconvenience and appear not to be feasible.

There is plenty of research evidence of the negative impact on wellbeing and mental health from poorly conceived built environment interventions, particularly after poor consultation processes or protracted construction phases.

4. I feel a lack of trust for the Corporation of London for ignoring its own environmental policies and for pursuing a very commercial and damaging design strategy, purely to raise funds.

As From: 62 Thomas More House, Barbican EC2Y 8BT

30 January, 2024

To the City of London Planning Committee

Dear Sirs

London Wall West Redevelopment: Planning Application No23/01304/FULEIA Notice of Objections with reasons. Also Objections to related applications 23/01304/FULEIA and 23/1277/LBC

These objections are raised in my capacity as Long Leaseholder of Flat 62 Thomas More House. I have written separately in my capacity as owner-occupier of a flat in Lauderdale Tower. However the proposals have even more adverse impact on residents/owners of flats in Thomas More House because of its proximity to the London Wall West site and of the proposed use of the car park ramp as access. Hence I believe this merits a separate letter of objection.

General Objections

These include:

1 Environmental Harm – including the impact of the demolition itself and subsequent extended period of construction (we are told up to 10 years). This will generate thousands of tons of embodied carbons (CO₂). Even if the resulting buildings will be more sustainable than adapting the current buildings (which is debatable given the excessive life cycle used for such calculations), this will not compensate for the massive adverse effects of demolition and construction over many years.

Non-compliance with key policies - The proposal is contrary both national and local climate change policies (NPPF 2023) including those of the applicant itself (Sustainability SPD December 2023).

The deleterious impact on air quality especially but not only for residents of most of the Barbican Estate for some ten years, - at a time when most responsible local authorities are attempting to improve this and there is increasing evidence of the adverse impact on long term health

Ignoring alternatives to demolition with lower levels of harm: I understand that three 'credible' (to quote the applicant) developers have expressed interest in adapting/updating the existing buildings and that experts have issued reports attesting to the safety and viability of both Bastion House and The Old Museum of London rotunda for refurbishment and/or repurposing. Why have these not been seriously considered?

2 Loss of two heritage assets (albeit not listed) - namely Bastion House itself and the Museum of London and its rotunda designed by Powell and Le Moya on of the UK's major post war architects

3 The Mass and Scale of the proposed two office blocks – the plans show the replacement for Bastion House is more than 2.5 times the volume of the current building. The second high rise block is more than twice the volume of the current rotunda and will in effect be a massive wall on the corner of the Barbican Estate at the end of Aldersgate Street/London Wall in place of the low rise Museum of London. Individually, and together their size is disproportionate to the existing townscape. Their height is out of all proportion compared with the building heights running North South at the West end of London Wall – with the sole exception of Lauderdale Tower which does not obstruct the North-South view along the old Roman Road.

This mass and scale has several negative effects including:

Substantial harm to the setting of other designated heritage assets especially but not only to the Grade 2 listed Barbican Estate itself, Postman's Park, the Watts Memorial and St Giles Church. The two towers will dominate the skyline and cut out much blue sky currently visible from all the neighbouring buildings – whereas the Barbican Estate and London Wall were developed together to include plenty of space between buildings.

Impact on the Cultural Mile and 'Destination City'. The rotunda is supposed to be the 'gateway' of the 'Cultural Mile' - running along the old Roman Road North; also a key access for the flagship Barbican Centre. But iconic buildings such as St Paul's Cathedral won't even be visible from most of the cultural mile that is North of these new buildings; and a huge monolithic building is hardly an attractive 'gateway'. In short, the scheme ignores the setting of this site and its location within the culture quarter of the City, which latter it will clearly undermine.

Misleading images – the impact of the plans on the surrounding area is misrepresented by the glossy pictures circulated – the use of fly through video and wide angle lenses make the open spaces look bigger than they are and the views are highly selective. Using outlines rather than filled in shapes to show the positioning of the new buildings gives no sense of their bulk and its impact. Some shots even remove St Paul's so you can't see the impact of the buildings on it when looking N-S down Aldersgate Street.

Loss of Residential Amenity – generally to residents of the Barbican Estate and especially to Thomas More House residents

It is self-evident that buildings of the proposed height and bulk will have a massive impact on the amenity of residents of the Barbican Estate. There will be a **huge reduction in light and loss of visible sky** to many buildings on the Barbican Estate including Mountjoy and Seddon but especially to our flat in Thomas More House that faces south onto the Museum of London. There will be also serious **loss of privacy** for residents of many such blocks especially our flat but also for Seddon and Mountjoy, including but not only from the viewing terraces and from the proposed 11th floor restaurant directly overlooking Thomas More House. In addition, the **light pollution** from such large and tall buildings will be unacceptable and affect residential blocks even further away including Defoe and Lauderdale.

The **noise and disturbance** will be excessive – and not only during the period of demolition and construction. This will come from increased pedestrian and vehicular traffic during the day but also the use of the public areas after working hours well into the night..

The **proposed use of the Thomas More House car park access ramp as the only vehicular access to the new development** represents another massive reduction in amenity to residents who currently use the TMH car park – not only during demolition and construction but continuing afterwards. We understand that the TMH car park will be completely closed for 5 years – how will residents be able to accept deliveries eg of groceries, or of large scale items; use stores or cycle racks; or even move into and out of their homes? How will their guests arriving by car be able to access their hosts? Competing with commercial deliveries afterwards will not be easy even assuming that access for residents is restored - of which there seems to be no guarantee.

We are also concerned by the **'health and safety'** risks of the proposal for such joint use of the access ramp – caused by a likely huge amount of commercial deliveries as well as Barbican Estate related traffic. The ramp is currently access for the Girls' school tennis courts, for cyclists living in

four residential blocks and for their private cars; (including for access to Lauderdale Tower car park when the other access is not available -as is frequently the case). Pedestrians attempting to walk N-S along Aldersgate will also face increased risks.

And what about **emergency fire and ambulance access** to the relevant Barbican blocks. How will this be ensured both during and after construction ?

We note also in relation to the applications for Listed Building Consent for altering the Barbican highwalks that there is no mention of the works required to Thomas More House Service Yard – these are hardly ‘ancillary’ works but central to the proposed shared access during and after construction. This is a serious omission.

In summary the idea of joint use of the Thomas More House car park ramp for access to the new development is wholly misconceived. The fact that this is apparently the only possible option in itself shows how inappropriate is the whole concept of planting a massive tower block in this location right on the corner of a large residential estate.

Compromising the attractiveness of the Barbican Estate as a residential quarter in the heart of the City contrary to its whole raison d’etre

The Barbican Estate was originally conceived as an ‘Oasis in the heart of the City’ - explicitly in order to attract talented people working in the City to come and live in the City. Given the changes in working patterns and the fact that many City workers now want to ‘work from home’ (ie avoid commuting) for part of the week, we question the City’s calculations regarding likely demand for future office space - especially as we watch many large law firms for example, reducing their office space by 50% - whilst still growing their business and workforce. However, even if we are wrong about that, we would argue that maintaining an attractive ‘Oasis’ will be key to maintaining the City’s competitive advantage in attracting the best talent - and this development will manifestly undermine this by undermining the amenity of the Barbican Estate and other nearby residences. It represents a huge derogation of the purpose of the Estate that was created by the applicant itself. There is an argument for more rather than less residential accommodation in the City.

Overall impact on the whole Grade 2 Listed Barbican Estate

This application (and the related ones to alter the walkways and other areas of the Grade 2 Listed Barbican Estate represent a massive intrusion into the Estate - seriously undermining the integrity of the architectural and landscaping concepts that informed its design. Both the substantive application and the ‘facilitating’ applications for Listed Building Consent should be rejected.

Finally, we were very concerned to read of Chris Hayward’s view (NY Times 13 December 2023) that *‘we’ve never considered ourselves a residential City,,,peppercotting residential development .. constrains business development’*. The first part of his statement is manifestly untrue; and the alleged conclusion is not supported by the evidence. It also ignores the fact that many small and local businesses in the City rely on custom from residents to thrive. More important - this sort of statement begs the question whether there can even be a fair and legitimate planning process when the City is judge and juror in its own cause !

Yours faithfully

Sally Woodward

Long Leaseholder, 62 Thomas More House, Barbican, EC2Y 8BT
(and Owner occupier of 223 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: Dr Angeles de Cara

Address: 158 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: I am writing to you with regard to the planning application with reference 23/01304/FULEIA. I have been a resident of the Barbican Estate since 2001 and wish to oppose in the strongest terms to this development, which will see a deterioration of the lifestyle of City residents and no improvements to the City workers or visitors. The Barbican Estate and surroundings have seen terrible developments which have all gone against the residents' interests and against the spirit in which the Estate and other estates were built and planned in the 1960s and 1970s. The Barbican has become an attraction in itself given its architectural features which used to include wide highwalks that allowed pedestrians to avoid walking next to noisy and polluted streets, in safe environments. Ever since the demolition of Milton Court, the residents of the City have seen these highwalks be demolished and not replaced with anything equivalent. Furthermore, the newer developments have been architecturally unsound and have created streets which are wind tunnels, as London Wall and the area between More Lane and Silk street currently are, unpleasant spaces whose only purpose has been to build unnecessarily tall buildings,

aggressive with the surroundings or any living creature.

It is with great sadness that we residents have seen the Corporation ignoring residents' needs in a council that has the lowest tree canopy in any built environment in Europe. If there's a shortage of anything in London, it's housing and services that are required, certainly not further offices. I firmly believe there's no study that can make any evidence of shortage of office space in the City, while there's plenty of evidence of the Corporation of London's vested interests in granting this permission.

Both residents and visitors highly appreciated the Museum of London. Similarly to the Barbican Arts Centre, it provided a well beloved space where families could take their children, with plenty of activities going on.