

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 Hudson

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 development poses significant risks to the surroundings, affecting both listed and unlisted assets such as the Barbican, St Giles Cripplegate, Ironmongers' Hall, and Postman's Park. It is deemed unsustainable, releasing a substantial amount of CO2 during demolition and construction, disregarding the option of retention and retrofitting. This approach conflicts with the City's Climate Action Strategy and national policies. Visually, the project is criticized for being overdeveloped, out of scale, and dominating the Grade II listed Barbican Estate, landscape, Conservation Area, and the City of London School for Girls, compromising their architectural integrity. Negative impacts on residential amenity include privacy concerns, loss of daylight and sunlight, overshadowing, and increased noise.

The proposal is questioned in the context of what the City and London truly need. The City Corporation's plan to demolish both buildings and construct massive office blocks is scrutinized. The planning authority's focus on best value, emphasizing financial gains, is criticized, urging consideration for the best use of the land. The rich history of the site, including Roman, Shakespearean, Wesleyan, and Jewish cemetery influences, is neglected, sacrificing public cultural heritage and the potential gateway to Culture Mile, connecting the South Bank, Tate, St

Paul's, and beyond.

Concerns extend to adverse effects on highway safety for cyclists and pedestrians, anticipating an increase in poor air quality with additional traffic lights and potential traffic hazards with two-way traffic. The impact is accused of being misrepresented through glossy sales brochures, fly-through videos using wide-angled lenses to create an illusion of larger spaces, selective views, and airbrushing out St. Paul's from the model. The presence of dangling greenery is criticized for diverting attention and contributing to the misrepresentation of the project.

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 Lara Haworth

Address: 2 Daniels Rd London

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of the Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Other

Comment: I object to this planning proposal in the strongest possible terms. These two buildings are vital pieces of London's postwar architectural heritage. As a lifelong Londoner, my favourite museum as a child was the Museum of London, not only for the exhibits within but the building itself, which seemed to speak of a new idea of London, one that not only provided a counterpoint to the ancient city lying around it, but which also complemented it, made it anew. I have made my peace with the museum moving out, but destroying these structures in favour of faceless, bland new buildings is a desecration of those postwar ideals and a wanton destruction of our own history. Not to mention the environmental cost of demolition and rebuild. I urge you to listen to the very strong feelings of the local community, the wider London community, and a wider global community, which still sees London as a place where architectural styles from all eras are allowed to interestingly co-exist. This plan, if enacted, will damage not only the lives of the residents living immediately beside the site, but London's reputation on an international scale. I fully object.

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 Jonny Smith

Address: 7 Sterling Avenue Salford

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of the Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Other

Comment: This is a fantastic building that should not be demolished. The environmental impact will be terrible and refurbishment should be utilised. It will also damage the character of the Barbican Estate - the greatest piece of post war architecture in Britain

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 Aron Adamski

Address: 205 Alamaro Lodge Renaissance Walk London

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of the Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Other

Comment:As a worker in the City of London, This historical site of London Wall West should not host more offices which has seen a significant drop in demand. It should be used to unleash the cultural offer in the square mile, so called culture mile which is being ignored and not increase pollution. I wish to object to the application

I urge you to refuse this application.

Comments for Planning Application 23/01304/FULEIA

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/01304/FULEIA

Address: London Wall West, 140 London Wall, 150 London Wall, Ironmongers' Hall, Shaftesbury Place, London Wall Car Park, London, EC2Y (including Void, Lifts And Stairs At 200 Aldersgate Street And One London Wall) London EC2Y 5DN

Proposal: Demolition of 140 & 150 London Wall to provide a phased development comprising: the construction of new buildings for a mix of office (Class E(g)), cultural uses (Sui Generis) and food and beverage/cafe (Class E(b)), access, car parking, cycle parking and highway works including reconfiguration of the Rotunda roundabout, part demolition and reconfiguring of the Ironmongers Hall (Sui Generis), creation of a new scheduled monument viewing area, public realm alterations to Plaisterers Highwalk, John Wesley Highwalk, Bastion Highwalk and Mountjoy Close; removal of two highwalks known as Falcon Highwalk and Nettleton Court; alterations to the void, lifts and stairs at 200 Aldersgate Street and One London Wall, introduction of new City Walkway.

Case Officer: Gemma Delves

Customer Details

Name: Mr kevin almond

Address: 19 Headbourne House Law Street London

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of the Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Other

Comment: I object to the design of the proposed replacement - I regard it as a design downgrade to the existing building.

Comments for Planning Application 23/01304/FULEIA

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/01304/FULEIA

Address: London Wall West, 140 London Wall, 150 London Wall, Ironmongers' Hall, Shaftesbury Place, London Wall Car Park, London, EC2Y (including Void, Lifts And Stairs At 200 Aldersgate Street And One London Wall) London EC2Y 5DN

Proposal: Demolition of 140 & 150 London Wall to provide a phased development comprising: the construction of new buildings for a mix of office (Class E(g)), cultural uses (Sui Generis) and food and beverage/cafe (Class E(b)), access, car parking, cycle parking and highway works including reconfiguration of the Rotunda roundabout, part demolition and reconfiguring of the Ironmongers Hall (Sui Generis), creation of a new scheduled monument viewing area, public realm alterations to Plaisterers Highwalk, John Wesley Highwalk, Bastion Highwalk and Mountjoy Close; removal of two highwalks known as Falcon Highwalk and Nettleton Court; alterations to the void, lifts and stairs at 200 Aldersgate Street and One London Wall, introduction of new City Walkway.

Case Officer: Gemma Delves

Customer Details

Name: Mr Theo Budgen

Address: 301 Cromwell Tower Barbican London

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Other
- Residential Amenity

Comment: This is yet another short sighted proposal for more office space in the City of London that just simply is not needed. This land could be much better utilised for the good of the public.

Comments for Planning Application 23/01276/LBC

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/01276/LBC

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

Proposal: Demolition of Ferroners' House alongside external alterations to the facade and roof level of Ironmongers' Hall, internal reconfiguring to cores and back of house areas and associated works in association with the development proposed at London Wall West (140 London Wall, 150 London Wall, Shaftesbury Place, and London Wall Car Park, London, EC2Y).

Case Officer: Gemma Delves

Customer Details

Name: Mr Aron Adamski

Address: 205 Alamaro Lodge London

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of the Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Other

Comment:As a worker in the City of London, This historical site of London Wall West should not host more offices which has seen a significant drop in demand. It should be used to unleash the cultural offer in the square mile, so called culture mile which is being ignored and not increase pollution. I wish to object to the application

I urge you to refuse this application.

Comments for Planning Application 23/01277/LBC

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/01277/LBC

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

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

Case Officer: Gemma Delves

Customer Details

Name: Mr Aron Adamski

Address: 205 Alamaro Lodge London

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of the Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Other

Comment:As a worker in the City of London, This historical site of London Wall West should not host more offices which has seen a significant drop in demand. It should be used to unleash the cultural offer in the square mile, so called culture mile which is being ignored and not increase pollution. I wish to object to the application

I urge you to refuse this application.

Comments for Planning Application 23/01304/FULEIA

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/01304/FULEIA

Address: London Wall West, 140 London Wall, 150 London Wall, Ironmongers' Hall, Shaftesbury Place, London Wall Car Park, London, EC2Y (including Void, Lifts And Stairs At 200 Aldersgate Street And One London Wall) London EC2Y 5DN

Proposal: Demolition of 140 & 150 London Wall to provide a phased development comprising: the construction of new buildings for a mix of office (Class E(g)), cultural uses (Sui Generis) and food and beverage/cafe (Class E(b)), access, car parking, cycle parking and highway works including reconfiguration of the Rotunda roundabout, part demolition and reconfiguring of the Ironmongers Hall (Sui Generis), creation of a new scheduled monument viewing area, public realm alterations to Plaisterers Highwalk, John Wesley Highwalk, Bastion Highwalk and Mountjoy Close; removal of two highwalks known as Falcon Highwalk and Nettleton Court; alterations to the void, lifts and stairs at 200 Aldersgate Street and One London Wall, introduction of new City Walkway.

Case Officer: Gemma Delves

Customer Details

Name: Mr Adam Hogg

Address: Flat 119 Andrewes House Barbican London

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of the Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Noise
- Other
- Residential Amenity
- Traffic or Highways

Comment: The Museum and Bastion House should not be demolished but retained and refurbished because:

Sustainability

- These distinguished buildings are not at the end of their life.
- Credible interest has been shown to retain the buildings and develop them for cultural purposes.
- The option of a Major Refurbishment option 2 has been excluded from detailed analysis when it offers the most favourable carbon emissions impact. Why?
- Proposal is in direct opposition to the UK National and GLA policies as well as CoLC's own policies on Carbon emissions impacts.
- Unless the proposed carbon emissions are locked into the scheme to become legally binding site, purchasers are likely to abandon them making the proposals effectively meaning less.
- Inappropriate use of the site

- The site is part of the Cultural quarter with the Arts Centre, the new Museum and the opportunities being offered by Smithfield East. Putting offices on LWW would disadvantage the Destination City offering.
- Draft City Plan 2040 discourages further major office development in the northwestern part of the city.
- The proposed scale and mass is out of proportion to the surrounding conservation areas and bears no relation to the original post war plan for the area.
- Replacing the museum with the Centre for Music was acceptable, to replace it with offices with a minimal cultural element which cannot be guaranteed, is not.

Heritage

- The proposals cause widespread harm to many heritage assets, including the complete loss of two undesignated heritage assets. This harm is not outweighed by heritage benefits elsewhere.

Public and Residential Amenity

- Reduction in light in sun and daylight for the Girls School and the residents of Thomas More, Mountjoy house, Wall Side, and Monkwell Square.
- The entrance to Thomas More car park the only entrance and exit from the proposed development will increase pollution, noise and congestion and compromises the safety of pedestrians and cyclists.
- Demolition and a rebuild will prolong the agony for residents.

Office Demand

- Changes in office culture, the development of hybrid working has generated a different demand for office accommodation.
- More than fifteen applications for tall buildings in the Eastern cluster are in the planning pipeline, another two are not needed in the West.

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 Katya Duffy

Address: 8 Manor Avenue London

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of the Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Other

Comment: This is an unnecessary development to create office space that is not needed.

The demolition and proposed rebuild would have a huge impact on the environment.

Bastion House and the former museum of London building should not be demolished as they are valued examples of post war architectural design.

As a frequent visitor to the Barbican I am worried about the impact the proposed scheme would have on the public realm between the former Museum of London building and the Barbican.

The proposed buildings undermine the design integrity of the Barbican.

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 Holms Coats

Address: 68A Barnsbury Road London

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of the Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Other
- Residential Amenity
- Traffic or Highways

Comment: I object to the proposals to demolish Bastion House and the Museum of London, including the Rotunda:

CARBON - demolition is the wrong signal to be making, given climate breakdown and the challenge to radically cut GHG emissions, in both operational and embodied energy use, and makes a poor fit with the City of London's commitments and net zero targets, consultant justifications notwithstanding.

HERITAGE VANDALISM - demolition fails to acknowledge and respect the postwar civic design heritage these buildings are part of, including the raised walkway, and the proposal would replace these with buildings from nowhere or anywhere.

UN SUSTAINABILITY GOALS - the proposal is out of step with the retrofitting injunctions that come out of the UN Sustainability Goals.

HISTORICAL SIGNIFICANCE - the proposal is a poor response to London Wall's history as a thoroughfare and gateway and is obtuse about the existing Rotunda's deliberately fortress-like

form and character.

OFFICE OVERSUPPLY - the proposed 'use type' of commercial office space is already in oversupply - other uses including housing, education, arts and community uses would better match citizens' needs

OVER DEVELOPMENT - the scale of the development is inappropriate in its height and bulk - and images shown are not in fact the volume limits of what this permission might allow to be developed in reality

PUBLIC REALM - the proposal would be a very real disbenefit in terms of inappropriate scale and overshadowing (making the canyon effect even worse) and with the privatisation of views to St Paul's.

From:
To:
Subject: Planning Objection 23/01304/FULEIA
Date: 31 January 2024 16:18:16

THIS IS AN EXTERNAL EMAIL

RE PLANNING APPLICATION 23/01304/FULEIA OBJECTION

Dr Carolyn Thomas
183 Shakespeare Tower
Barbican
London EC2Y 8DR

Member of public/neighbour

1. Overdevelopment of the site

The office blocks proposed for this small site have a huge visual impact. They would be an overpowering presence amongst heritage buildings in an important historical and cultural area of the city.

2. Loss of Heritage Buildings

The heritage and architectural value of the existing buildings on the site (Bastion House and The Museum of London) has been discounted.

3. Adverse Effects on Residents in the Neighbourhood

In a recent article, Chris Hayward (Policy and Resources Chairman of City of London Corporation) is quoted: "We haven't ever considered ourselves as a residential city" (The New York Times, Dec 13/31st, 2023). With this belief held at the top of City administration it is unsurprising that direct and immediate effects on residents in the neighbourhood of the site have not been given any weight. If this development goes ahead residents will suffer increased noise, loss of sunlight and privacy, increased traffic and traffic congestion, air pollution, and traffic chaos with loss of the Rotunda.

4. Sustainability

The planning application depends on the demolition of the existing buildings. It will release tens of thousands of tonnes of CO2. This route as opposed to retrofitting and imaginative use of the site is incompatible with national net zero policy and the City's

own 'Climate Action Strategy'. Possible alternatives which retain and retrofit the buildings have been ignored.

5. Discounting of Alternatives to Demolition

The planning application discounts the CO2 saving that would be made by retrofitting and reuse of the existing buildings. Several credible retrofitting options for development of the site were received after soft marketing during the consultation period. These alternatives would have provided the most carbon friendly options. It is worth noting that the City is relaxing retrofitting/remodelling rules for redevelopment of unused/underused/unloved offices in less prestigious sites in the City - converting them for hospitality/cultural/educational uses.

6. "Our basic policy is office first"

This is a direct quote from Shavran Joshi, the current Chair of Planning and Transportation Committee in the City (New York Times, Dec13/31 2024). Such a policy drives the current planning application.

But do we need more offices? The world is changing very rapidly. The status of the London Stock Exchange is slipping and the attractiveness of the City of London has dimmed following Brexit and the pandemic. Working from Home has firmly taken root.

The City of London has provided real estate-based opinion that workers will return to offices and there have been estimates that City of London will need an extra 13 million square feet of office space by 2040. How much weight can be given to this? WFH is already established. But in the next 15 years there will be other changes driven by accelerating technology, the impact of AI on work practices and other other planet-changing projections. 'Office first' on this scale is a gamble. Empirical evidence demonstrates that people are not returning to offices: the Square Mile is empty on Fridays and hardly vibrant on Mondays. The Mayor of London is trying to set up a three month trial of off peak fares on Fridays on the Underground to tempt people back to their offices.

Do we need offices on this unique site? With no overall town planning, London suffers fragmented development. The Square Mile seems to have a planning strategy of using prime sites for new 'prestigious' offices, with Google Office-type perks, to counteract WFH. With this short term trajectory in 15 years we could see an empty Canary Wharf and expensive, pimped up but half empty white elephants in our historic square mile. And we will have lost opportunities for a well thought out cultural and educational development of the site.

7. Lost opportunities

Whilst the City pushes office-based development such as London Wall West, there is a recognition that much of the footfall and vitality in the City has already been lost. The culture washing, mysterious 'Cultural Mile' was a failure, but nevertheless 'Destination City' was launched in May 2022. It was described by the Policy Chairman

Chris Hayward, as “marking a a generational opportunity to write a new chapter in the City’s history” intended to increase footfall and attractiveness to the public seven days a week. It sets out ‘a vision for the Square Mile to become a world-leading leisure destination for UK and global visitors, workers, and residents to enjoy.’ So far, Destination City is an embarrassment. Instead, why not invest in an imaginative, climate friendly rethink of the London Wall West development. Retrofitting of Bastion House and the old Museum of London could itself be a *destination*. It could seed a cultural and educational renewal of the whole area. The current planning application misses the opportunity to develop a focussed cultural offering on this unique site linking with St Paul’s and other nearby historic gems.

8. Consultation Process

Some very minor changes to the application followed consultation- but the big issues have not been addressed. The whole process met considerable resistance; there were errors, determined preconceived goals and the publicity was misleading. For example, the proposal to demolish Bastion House rested on the City’s mistaken understanding of its construction and projected short life. Engineers and architects have now corrected the error. Bastion House is not about to fall down and it is suitable for retrofitting.

From the outset the PR presentations of London Wall West were illusory, and visual misrepresentations remain in the current application. The massive sizes of the office blocks are minimised by sleight of camera angle and some airbrushing. There is no acknowledgement of the full visual impact the proposal would have on the historic area including the environs of St Paul’s and the world famous residential Barbican Estate.

The City agreed eventually set up a soft marketing exercise to explore alternatives to demolition. To this end, almost at the conclusion of the consultation period, submissions for other options were invited. An unrealistically short period was allowed for submission (6 weeks minus two Bank Holidays). Even with this very small window some credible alternatives were put forward which involved retrofitting with lower CO2 emission and imaginative re-use. There has been no consideration of these options in the current planning application.

Comments for Planning Application 23/01304/FULEIA

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/01304/FULEIA

Address: London Wall West, 140 London Wall, 150 London Wall, Ironmongers' Hall, Shaftesbury Place, London Wall Car Park, London, EC2Y (including Void, Lifts And Stairs At 200 Aldersgate Street And One London Wall) London EC2Y 5DN

Proposal: Demolition of 140 & 150 London Wall to provide a phased development comprising: the construction of new buildings for a mix of office (Class E(g)), cultural uses (Sui Generis) and food and beverage/cafe (Class E(b)), access, car parking, cycle parking and highway works including reconfiguration of the Rotunda roundabout, part demolition and reconfiguring of the Ironmongers Hall (Sui Generis), creation of a new scheduled monument viewing area, public realm alterations to Plaisterers Highwalk, John Wesley Highwalk, Bastion Highwalk and Mountjoy Close; removal of two highwalks known as Falcon Highwalk and Nettleton Court; alterations to the void, lifts and stairs at 200 Aldersgate Street and One London Wall, introduction of new City Walkway.

Case Officer: Gemma Delves

Customer Details

Name: Mrs Jo Burch

Address: 4 Bannister Close Oxford

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of the Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: It would be wanton destruction of a beautiful and sound building. It would destroy the visual and architectural integrity of the Barbican scheme. It will be environmentally disastrous, creating huge and unnecessary amounts of additional Carbon Dioxide. The scheme goes against the local planning aims and is not sustainable.

Comments for Planning Application 23/01304/FULEIA

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/01304/FULEIA

Address: London Wall West, 140 London Wall, 150 London Wall, Ironmongers' Hall, Shaftesbury Place, London Wall Car Park, London, EC2Y (including Void, Lifts And Stairs At 200 Aldersgate Street And One London Wall) London EC2Y 5DN

Proposal: Demolition of 140 & 150 London Wall to provide a phased development comprising: the construction of new buildings for a mix of office (Class E(g)), cultural uses (Sui Generis) and food and beverage/cafe (Class E(b)), access, car parking, cycle parking and highway works including reconfiguration of the Rotunda roundabout, part demolition and reconfiguring of the Ironmongers Hall (Sui Generis), creation of a new scheduled monument viewing area, public realm alterations to Plaisterers Highwalk, John Wesley Highwalk, Bastion Highwalk and Mountjoy Close; removal of two highwalks known as Falcon Highwalk and Nettleton Court; alterations to the void, lifts and stairs at 200 Aldersgate Street and One London Wall, introduction of new City Walkway.

Case Officer: Gemma Delves

Customer Details

Name: Mr Peter Burrows

Address: 192 Cromwell Tower Barbican London

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Noise
- Other
- Residential Amenity

Comment: The oversized new buildings will dominate the area, overshadowing Barbican residences, reducing sunlight and sky and increasing the canyonisation of the most important residential area of the City.

The Museum of London building is an important part of the mid century architecture of the Barbican and would be better repurposed as a museum, for example a Jewish museum as it is in the area of an historic Jewish cemetery.

Demolition rather than repurposing goes against the City of London's own net zero targets

From:
To:
Subject: Objection to London Wall West Planning Application 23/01304/FULEIA
Date: 31 January 2024 16:31:47

THIS IS AN EXTERNAL EMAIL

As a longstanding owner and occupier of London House on Aldersgate Street, I OBJECT to the planning application 23/01304/FULEIA for the following reasons:

-Office Demand: A large percentage of current office space in the City of London is unused and there is no suggestion that more is needed. Flexible working post pandemic has resulted in a decline in office use. A more diverse use of residential, retail, education, community and cultural would be a beneficial welcomed mix.

-Carbon: The current 2 buildings (Bastion House and the Museum of London) have been shown to be safe and retrofittable, yet this application is for full demolition resulting in tens of thousands of tonnes of carbon, which is hugely irresponsible and would contravene National and City of London Corporation climate change action policies.

-Health: During demolition (estimated for approximately 6 years) and construction there will be an enormous amount of harmful particles released, impacting the surrounding area for a number of years. The air quality will be compromised for London House residents (80 apartments) and for our concierge in reception where the entrance doors are continuously opening. Being able to have our windows open will not be an option. In addition, the tennis/netball courts and playing fields (immediately adjacent to the car park slope) used by both residents and the City of London School for Girls on a daily basis, will be heavily polluted whilst participating in sport.

After completion, the proposed one access route for all the LWW buildings and Ironmongers' Hall will have an increase in traffic, especially of large delivery vehicles. The deterioration in air quality will have an impact on health. Again, having our windows open will not be an option.

-Privacy/Residential Amenity: Local residents and office workers and even the City's own City of London School for Girls will be negatively impacted by privacy lost from overlooking, loss of daylight, loss of sunlight, solar glare, overshadowing and office light pollution. The health and well-being of the local community is not being prioritised by these new proposals.

For front facing apartments in London House (which all have living room and bedroom windows facing the proposed development) and the London House roof terrace will be heavily impacted.

There is also the issue of antisocial behaviour and noise pollution from the proposed 24-hour roof garden in the new north building and new highwalk (Aldersgate east side from John Wesley highwalk to the new Rotunda Building). The proposed new highwalk seems largely redundant and creates a privacy issue.

-Safety: The proposed changes to the traffic flow in the area, particularly with respect to Thomas More carpark is not feasible or properly considered.

The Thomas More car park would be the new permanent route for ALL traffic entering and exiting LWW, with no planning provision for vehicles wanting to travel north on

exiting.

The increased traffic volume would increase noise, pollution and could be dangerous, increasing the risk to pedestrians, cyclists and slowing deliveries/services. The Thomas More car park is used by many residents as a pedestrian thoroughfare, many of whom are elderly, and is the emergency services access point for many residents.

Just a few comments following my objections above:

The proposed development is completely out of all proportion to the characteristics of the surrounding area. The height and mass of the proposed buildings is excessive, overbearing and by creating this it sets a new precedent. These will dwarf all surrounding buildings, especially London House. This development should not be in close proximity to a densely populated residential area but concentrated in the eastern part of the City with other office towers (Bishopsgate) and the western part of the City being kept for cultural and residential. For the new north building, the architects have completely ignored the original City of London plans which state Aldersgate and Aldersgate Street (one of the oldest and historically significant roads in the UK and site of both Roman and Saxon City gates) should have unobstructed views.

It would be good to think that the Corporation is concerned for their residents well-being and not just wishing to maximise financial gain. The amount of money (approximately £11m spent to date) the local authority is spending on pursuing this development is shocking.

The entire consultation process has been insulting to those living and working in the local area. The website pre application was not kept up to date and contained inaccurate information. Requests for scale model/dimensions was constantly ignored. Any information that was provided attempted to disguise the scale of the development through manipulated and highly selected images. The period between documents being available and the deadline for objections was scheduled strategically over the Christmas holidays, which obviously is far from ideal.

The overwhelmingly objections from residents to this application should not be ignored. I strongly urge you to REJECT this application.

Please acknowledge receipt of this email.

Kind regards,
Mina Lad

78 London House, 172 Aldersgate Street, London, EC1A 4HU

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 David Bradshaw

Address: 143 Cromwell Tower Barbican London

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of the Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Noise
- Other
- Residential Amenity
- Traffic or Highways

Comment:As a Barbican resident I object for the following reasons:-

- * The proposed development is inappropriate and 'out of kilter' with the adjacent conservation and listed areas especially the Barbican's Grade 11 buildings.
- * Tens of thousands of tonnes of CO2 would be released during demolition and construction which is contrary to the City's own Climate Action Strategy.
- * The City has ignored proposals to retain and refurbish the existing buildings for which there have been alternative viable redevelopment proposals.
- * The visual impact and scale would dominate and seriously compromise the architectural integrity of the area.
- * The immense scale would have a negative impact on adjacent residents whose daylight, sunlight and privacy would be severely compromised.

* The proposed use of the Thomas More car park by delivery vehicles for the offices would be impractical and bring further noise and inconvenience to residents.

D.J.BRADSHAW

31 January 2024

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 Susie Barrass

Address: 83 Railway Crescent Shipston on Stour

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of the Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Other

Comment: These buildings should be sensitively restored and repurposed. There is too much destruction which adds to needless pollution, and the loss of historic architecture.

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 Bernard Hughes

Address: Flat 107 Willoughby House Barbican London

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Other
- Residential Amenity

Comment: I have previously submitted an objection but realise a sentence was missing and compounded. Bastion House is an important part of the mid century story of the City of London and sits well alongside our Barbican estate. The sister building at the Moorgate end of London Wall has been beautifully restored. The new proposals are far too dominant and cut into this important mid century story. Residential amenity will severely be damaged by this current proposal.

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: Gerard Moore

Address: Flat 44 Anglia House 66 Salmon Lane London

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of the Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Other

Comment: These are historic buildings and a great example of mid-20th Century architecture. They need to be saved

\

**OBJECTIONS TO THE CORPORATION OF LONDON'S
LONDON WALL WEST PROPOSALS : LWW PLANNING
APPLICATION 23/01304/FULEIA; AND ASSOCIATED
APPLICATION FOR LISTED BUILDING CONSENT
CHANGES,23/01277/LBC**

**From : Drs A R and Y A Burne, Thomas More House,
Barbican, London EC2Y 8BT**

Date : 31 January, 2024

Introduction

As residents in the Barbican since 1995, of which the past 16 years have been spent in Thomas More House, we wish to register our strongest opposition to the Corporation of London's plans, under both the planning application titles noted above, for the redevelopment of London Wall West.

Summary

These planning applications involve destruction of the current Museum of London building and Bastion House; the construction of two, monolithic office buildings, which it is proposed be would be 17 storeys high, and thus wholly overbearing, would block light, sunlight and vision for adjacent and very close residential buildings the Barbican estate; and the impact of complex and very congested entry and exit plans for vehicles, during both building and thereafter.

Such offers set out in these proposals for supposed amelioration of their impacts - through hard or soft landscaping, and some claimed civic amenity on the few surrounding areas remaining - are both very small scale and unconvincing as off-sets. There

has been no effective effort by the Corporation to look seriously at alternative plans – required for submission on a very rapid timescale - involving rival development projects which would retain and re-use existing buildings.

In all, these disturbing proposals appear to be ill-founded, and especially so for a small site of very high heritage and historic value, immediately adjacent to Grade II listed buildings and Grade II* listed gardens. The switch from the proposed earlier plans for a new Music Centre and its significant cultural and community benefits, both locally and internationally, as championed by the Corporation is as damaging as it is depressing. It can only be fuelled by what the Corporation now holds as its sole consideration – namely development of buildings generating the highest income for itself, irrespective of any consideration for its own tenants and the widely recognised value and importance of site.

We concentrate on our more detailed objections under the following headings, as below

Fundamental need for office space of this size

- We understand that the City of London is already considering and processing applications for some 0.5m sq metres of office space, with the same volume currently under consideration.
- These figures exclude the proposed high addition from their proposed LWW development
- There is no tenant now in prospect – and we understand that earlier expressions of interest from a Canary Wharf based financial company have elapsed
- Significant changes have occurred during and post- Covid times in working patterns. Far more are now working from home and increasing numbers of hybrid models for work/home balance are common. Yet current analyses indicate that these changes in working patterns, overall,

are likely to be a permanent feature for employers and employees

- There is little evidence that the City has assessed any of these factors
- There are many other options to satisfy future rental or purchasing demand, a good number within City's ownership or control
- While this is a matter for the Corporation to consider very carefully, there would seem to be substantial risks to Corporation itself in respect of its intention to go for the highest commercial returns, and trusting in the sale of the site with permitted development rights for commercial office space of this scale and exposure. Even in the current climate, let alone long-term uncertainties, the LWW scheme appears highly speculative
- Moreover, it would be open to developers taking on the present ideas for the site, as now, to submit plans and proposals to mitigate their own future sales revenue or rental risks though seeking further planning consent for even larger buildings than now. The post-construction and recent height additions to buildings in Aldersgate Street provide little comfort

Corporation's intentions

- The LWW site plans are driven by the Policy and Resources Committee and Investment Committee's views (of 21 and 22 September 2023) and a "duty to achieve best consideration" following a legal requirement to extract "maximum financial return" from the site. This appears to be a restricted interpretation – with little weight given to the duty to the need to consider factors other than those related to hoped-for revenue, as the City Corporation had publicly assured all during its consultations

- We note that this contrasts markedly with the approach taken when steps were taken to agree, in principle, making this same site available for a new Centre for Music in 2015, with public City comment at the time on the London Wall West's high cultural value and potential
- The 2023 approach sets aside an equal and parallel duty in law to review "the best use of the land". This appears not to have been taken into account, including the sustainability of current buildings and their quality. Environmental factors do not seem to have featured either
- There was a "soft market" test in 2023 to invite alternative ideas for site development at LWW. This permitted only a very compressed 31 days for respondents to produce ideas and accompanying plans. We gather that the Corporation concluded, and publicly commented at the time, that this test had nonetheless been successful; and that "credible responses" (to use the precise words of the Corporation) had been submitted to them.
- However, all that work and comment has been quickly set aside in the flight for a purely commercial and market-driven solution.
- It is also at odds with the letter to residents in 2023 by the Corporation acknowledging the value of retaining the Museum and Bastion House, coupled with the stated wish to explore alternatives to demolition.
- Hence both the genuineness of the Corporation's external statements, and their consistency with outcomes, must give rise to their original and true intentions

The Cultural, historic and historic significance of LWW

- A huge corpus of appreciation and analysis has been written about the importance of this key site in terms of its historic,

heritage and cultural value. The Corporation will be more than familiar with it all. And indeed it has contributed in many ways in its actions and investments to safeguard and protect these assets, recognising their Saxon and Roman origins

- In the Corporation's own separate plans, investments and promotion, the LWW site is treated as an important gateway to the Cultural Mile, as is the adjacent Barbican site and its listing
- This important history and heritage appears now to have been set aside completely in these proposals, and their colossal impacts, by the same body which has long emphasised their value, but is now in a dash for revenue, regardless of any impacts
- Both the Museum and Bastion House buildings should be protected permanently in recognition of the heritage assets which they are
- The present buildings have been designated as "at risk" by the Twentieth Century Society, given their quality and construction, matters which the Corporation has failed to recognise or address
- There has been little convincing reference, either in the decision to proceed with a purely commercial development, or in terms of evolving public and planning policy, about the desirability of the re-fit, re-use and re-purpose of such buildings
- Thus, we see no reflection, under current plans, in thinking or appropriate reflection of the Corporation's own advice note for all developments, of the need to follow their Whole Life Cycle Carbon and City Plans to 2040; and thus the need for all developers to consider and set out preferences other than the demolition of existing buildings

- In respect of LWW, this, once again, and on current proposals, appears to be a serious (let alone inconsistent) failure in Corporation planning and analysis, and its own avowed policies to govern the future of the site

Impacts of demolition on CO2 emissions

- We recall the statement of the Chair of Policy and Resources (November 2022) after the COP27 Summit which he attended : “And though each annual climate summit is tasked with the gravest challenge – protecting the only home we have ever known – we should feel confident that the City can continue to be leaders in creating a more sustainable future”
- The proposed development plans for LWW involve the demolition of two buildings, the building of three more (two of which massive in their scale and on estimates from independent analysis this would release at least 45,000 tonnes of embodied CO2
- The conflict with the Whole Life Cycle Carbon and City Plans to 2040 could not be more evident

The proposed new buildings

- The mass size, scale and nature of two the office blocks, each at 17 storeys proposed are unacceptable. They would dominate a small site, and would overbear for residential buildings in close proximity – Thomas More House, Mountjoy House, the Grade II* listed Barbican gardens and also impact neighbouring homes at, for example, Postman’s Park
- Should the plans proceed with the permissions as now outlined, residents in very close proximity would face two huge and overbearing towers, each comfortably over 200 ft

high on typical current inter-floor spacings for office buildings.

- The new block near the current position of Bastion House is some two and a half times the volume of the building it would replace
- Both new towers would substantially block daylight and sunlight to the south and west of the site from these Barbican homes, and in addition to substantial loss of amenity and privacy
- The concept of putting a north-facing restaurant for 160 persons, overlooking Thomas More House, is a dreadful prospect, and just a further of example, among many, of the disregard shown for the Corporation's own tenants and their outlook and privacy

Access

- The existing ramp from Aldersgate Street serves the needs of vehicles going to and from TMH, Seddon House, Lauderdale, Mountjoy and Lambert Jones Mews.
- It is now planned as the same access route towards the proposed development site, involving a considerable and continuous pattern of construction and commercial vehicles visits of every kind, not just during the potential 6 (or more) year build period but beyond, as a permanent feature
- No consideration appears to have been given to the visits of emergency vehicles, deliveries, services, cyclists or pedestrians and their safety and operations
- Access will undoubtedly cause damaging problems in terms of noise, obstruction and air quality considerations, let alone safety, none of which are addressed
- This represents yet another poorly planned aspect of the LWW proposals, intruding heavily on the site, and with outcomes showing complete disregard of the interests of the Corporation's own tenants

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 Charles Thomson

Address: 61 Castle Brooks Framlingham Woodbridge

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of the Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: I am Charles Thomson of 61 Castle Brooks, Framlingham IP13 9SG, a member of the public.

I wish to object to this application in the strongest possible terms. My objections are moral, aesthetic and practical.

Moral: I understand that the City of London supports this proposal because it

maximises their profit. However, the City of London has a greater duty to its citizens, to do what is in their interests. There are very few residents in the city of London - but a significant proportion of them are in the Barbican and they would be adversely affected by this development. The proposal is also directly against the stated aims of the City and the UK generally to control carbon emissions. This is a speculative development with no particular tenants in mind and could stand empty for years.

Aesthetic: The proposed buildings are far larger than anything in the immediate surrounding area

and would be out of scale and lack any sympathy with the architecture of Aldersgate Street. They would transform the appearance of Aldersgate Street and London Wall, destroy views of St Pauls and deny afternoon and evening sun to much of the Barbican estate. They would have a severe impact on the appearance of the historic buildings nearby. The destruction of buildings that are widely considered suitable for re-use is contrary to the City of London's stated priorities and to do it to achieve such a negative result is indefensible. This is an area close to one of the remaining parts of London Wall, with other areas that need protection such as the churches and Postman's Park. The destruction of the peaceful rotunda area at the Museum of London seems like needless vandalism. I own flat 80 at London House, 172 Aldersgate Street which would be particularly badly affected by these proposals, losing a substantial proportion of my daylight and a large proportion of my views. London House would be dwarfed by a huge building directly across Aldersgate Street, which is not wide enough to accommodate a building of that scale.

Practical: Have the planning committee been given a project plan for the use of the access ramp? To remove the detritus from the condemned buildings plus bringing in all the material for the new build would be many thousands of lorry loads. What are the implications for the existing users of the ramp during construction and afterwards? It seems likely that there would be a substantial negative impact on the residents and the local streets. From the comments of the Ironmongers, it appears that the City does not even own all of the site. There is widespread public cynicism about planning processes, particularly in a case like this where the City appears to be on both sides of the process. It is very important that the public reaction should be taken into account to reduce any such suspicion. Approval of this project would massively increase the suspicion.

This proposal is not in the public interest, not in the interests of the residents of the City of London and not in the interests of anyone who cares about global warming. The public reaction is very strongly against this proposal and it should therefore be rejected.