

through the lower floors. 150 closed its doors to the public in December 2022. The London Museum is being established in Smithfield and currently planned to open in 2026. 150 contains public exhibition galleries on two levels, with an upper level of administrative and technical spaces and an education wing to the north-west. Public entry was at first floor level, accessed via the City's high-level walkways. A basement level contains storage space and workshops, with a sub-basement housing a car park, service ramp and plant. 140, is a 14-storey office building, developed in tandem with 150 and sits above its eastern wing, with its structure extending through 150, so that the two buildings are effectively interlocked. Both buildings were designed by the architectural practice of Powell Moya & Partners (structural engineer: Charles Weiss & Partners) and constructed (by contractor G.E. Wallis) in 1971-76. The vacant possession of 140 took place in June 2023.

1.10 In addition, the site boundary also includes parts of the Barbican and Golden Lane Conservation Area (B&GLCA), and the Grade II* Barbican Registered Park and Garden (BRP&G), partially located within the north and east of the site boundary. Those parts of the BRP&G form part of the Barbican and St Alphage's Gardens Grade II Site of Borough Importance for Nature Conservation (SBINC). The effects of the proposed development on the heritage significance of the same are considered in Part 2 of this ES Volume II. External alterations to existing highwalks at the Grade II Barbican Estate including to the John Wesley Highwalk and Mountjoy Close to allow for the integration of new highwalks will also require works which will need LBC. The full assessment of the LBC application for the integration works to the Barbican Estate can be found by reference to the table below:

1.11 The site boundary also includes sections of existing highwalk both along and bridging across London Wall, and connecting to the John Wesley Highwalk and Bastion Highwalk within the Barbican Estate. Hard landscaping and green spaces – Barber-Surgeons' Garden at the east side of the site, and the Engineers' Garden adjacent to Ironmongers' Hall – are also included within the site boundary.

4. Baseline Conditions

Introduction

4.3 Successive eras – Georgian, Victorian, Edwardian and Modern – have all added to the City's building stock within the existing framework of streets. Therefore, the City has not been defined physically by any single overriding architectural idea or stylistic era: its buildings and places are multi-layered palimpsest, having been constructed across the ages. This is key to appreciating the qualities of the City's urban character, and herein lies its potential for developmental flexibility and continued economic success into the future. Is this unusual for any City? In any event, there are buildings pre-dating the Georgian era and "Modern" encompasses over 100 years without distinctive change which can't be credible.

History of the site and locality

Introduction

4.4 Both 140 and 150, which should be considered non-designated heritage assets (NDHAs), form part of the wider reconstruction of this part of the City of London following the devastation of World War II (WWII). The site adjoins the southern and eastern boundaries of the Barbican Estate. Parts of the B&GLCA, as well as the southern section of the BRP&G. The site boundary includes a portion of historic City wall fabric which is located within the London Wall basement car park (and is presently not generally open to the public), as well as an additional section of the historic wall which is located within the eastern section of the site; both of these remains are scheduled monuments. 150 is arranged around the Ironmongers' Hall (Grade II listed), which is presently partly screened from view on Aldersgate Street by 150. The site includes part of the listed Ironmongers' Hall and the

1970s extension to its western elevation – Ferroners’ House – which is specifically excluded from the statutory listing (list entry no.: 1485812).

4.5 Initial conception for the Museum of London occurred as early as 1961, with a plan to combine the CoLC’s collections with those of the pre-existing London Museum (Ref. 1-15, p.322). Design work began in 1962 but a failed CPO of the Ironmongers’ Hall, together with arguments over cost between the three partners caused delays with deemed planning permission being granted on 28 March 1967. Even then, construction together with the interconnected 140 didn’t start until 1971 with completion in 1976. 150 closed its doors to the public in December 2022.

History

4.7 In this largely post-war landscape, the 1920s Ironmongers’ Hall, and the adjoining 1970s Ferroners’ House appear as anomalies in their small scale and the former’s Neo-Tudor design. 150 was designed to wrap around Ironmongers’ Hall. The hall of another livery company, the Neo Georgian Barber-Surgeons’ Hall (built 1966-1969), is situated to the east of Bastion House in Monkwell Square. There are other livery halls within the vicinity of the site and also a number of late 20th century and early 21st century commercial buildings which have replaced all but two of the six mid-20th century slab blocks, such as London Wall Place. The Grade I listed Church of St Giles Cripplegate, now within the Barbican Estate, and the surviving portions of City wall, within and close to the Barbican Estate, are important indicators of the long history of this area.

4.16 As a result of WWII, the population of the City of London plummeted to a meagre 5,000 by 1952 (Ref. 1-17). The scale of destruction following WWII bomb damage and clearance is clearly seen in the 1950s OS map (Fig. 4.8). The original idea for a large scale residential scheme to the north of the new main road (between Aldersgate Street and Fore Street) called London Wall originated in the 1950s and was first meaningfully represented in the joint LCC and City of London Plan of 1955. This developed into the Barbican Estate, a monumental Brutalist scheme designed by the partnership of Chamberlin, Powell and Bon between 1955 and 1959, and built between 1962 and 1982. Today, the buildings within the Barbican Estate, other than the Church of St Giles, are all Grade II listed and the landscape of virtually all of the Estate is within the BRP&G and all of it is incorporated in the B&GLCA. The Grade II listing was on 05 September 2001, Grade II* listing on 20 February 2003 and adoption of the B&BLCA on 08 October 2018. Although the area immediately to the east of 140 is included in the BRP&G, despite being outside the Barbican Estate, the Engineers’ Garden, which was landscaped by P S Stagg, the then City Corporation Superintendent of Parks and Gardens, around 1976 and lies between Ironmongers’ Hall and the Barbican Estate, isn’t included within the BRP&G.

4.17 The Barbican Estate was of importance to the redevelopment of the site: the highwalk, or pedway as it was known at the time, was a crucial element of the site’s design. However, although 140 and 150 were not designed in conjunction with the Barbican Estate, there is an obvious synergy. The only requirement for development on the site was that the buildings should connect into the Barbican Estate and City wide network of pedestrian highwalks. 150 was conceived as a sprawling, low-lying mass, predominantly clad in white tiles, and with a dark brick rotunda at its southwestern tip. 140 was the last to be built of six commercial slab blocks, designed to line the main route of London Wall. All but one other of which (City Tower) have since been demolished. The 1970s OS map shows the site boundary empty (with the exception of the fragments of historic City wall) but already in development adjoining the part completed Barbican Estate (Fig. 4.9). The 1980s OS map is the first to show the buildings on the site, including the final form of London Wall with the Rotunda at its western end (Fig. 4.10). The 1980s map also shows a more complete Barbican Estate.

4.18 From the 1980s onwards, a number of large scale commercial buildings have been constructed in the locality of the site, most notably Sir Terry Farrell's post-modern Alban Gate (125 London Wall) to the east. This building contrasts with the simple linear form and curtain walling of 140. By spanning London Wall, it also severed the visual relationship between the buildings on site and the townscape east of Alban Gate. Further large-scale commercial development of the area continued with the construction 200 Aldersgate Street in 1991-1992 to the west of the site. On the southern side of London Wall, Richard Rogers Partnership's 88 Wood Street in 1993-2001 was followed by Foster + Partners' One London Wall in 2003 and Eric Parry's 5 Aldermanbury Square in 2007, with construction now underway, as 2 Aldermanbury Square, of Allies and Morrison's 55 Basinghall Street on the site of Swanke Hayden Connell's City Place House -1988-1992. Also on the east of the site and on the northern side of London Wall, MAKE's London Wall Place, completed in 2017 and Foster + Partners' Moor House, 120 London Wall completed in 2004. Further east and on the south of London Wall. at 1 Coleman Street, the mid-20th century slab block Austral House was replaced by a building with a more curvilinear and modulated expression (David Walker Architects, completed in 2006). All of these recent additions to London Wall have altered its character, whilst it has remained a major roadway lined by large, commercial buildings. Moor House (Moor House 1961); Alban Gate (Lee House 1962); 5 Aldermanbury Square (Royex House 1962); and London Wall Place (St Alphage House 1962) have replaced four of the six slab blocks. The other two are 140 and City Tower, formerly Britannic House and refurbished and reclad by Orms in 2013. Roman House, Wood Street – converted to flats in 2014 by The Manser Practice for Berkeley Homes - was the first office block to be erected under the "masterplan".

4.19 The last financial boom saw property developers exploring the potential of expanding and consolidating the cluster of tall buildings in the City, which became more widely known as 'the Eastern Cluster' - now "City Cluster". The Cluster lies 800m-1km to the east of the site. Several major design proposals for tall buildings to complement those already existing have been completed and consented in the last 20 years. Completed in 2004, 30 St Mary Axe (known as 'the Gherkin') to the south of the site of the bombed Baltic Exchange, is a recognisable landmark on the City of London's skyline. To its west is 22 Bishopsgate by PLP, completed in 2020, which at 62-storeys is currently the tallest building in the Cluster. The 46-storey Heron Tower, also by PLP to the east of the site was completed in 2011. To its north, completed in 2021, is the lower One Bishopsgate Plaza (43 residential storeys), again by PLP. Close to the south-west of Devonshire Square is 100 Bishopsgate by Allies & Morrison at 40-storeys, which was completed in 2019. The distinctive wedge-shaped No.122 Leadenhall Street (the Leadenhall Building) is a 225m, 48-storey office building designed by Rogers, Stirk, Harbour, completed in 2014. Nos. 52-54 Lime Street (known as the Scalpel), designed by KPF, 39-storeys high, is to the south of 30 St Mary Axe. To the west of 30 St Mary Axe, at 1 Undershaft, is Golvin Melvin Ward Partnership's St Helens (formerly Aviva Tower) built 1969 but likely to become the site of the 295 metre One Undershaft designed by Eric Parry Architects, the third iteration of which is awaiting planning permission. 100 Leadenhall Street, a consented 56-storey tower by SOM will be equivalent in height to 22 Bishopsgate and together they will form the 'shoulders' of the Cluster, either side of its pinnacle at One Undershaft. This more recent completed or consented development in the City has sought to consolidate the dynamic and commercial character of this area of London and its new visual identity in the form of a distinctive tall buildings cluster – hardly objective. Excluded from the Cluster is the Tulip "observation tower" designed by Foster + Partners which, after gaining consent from CoLC for construction at 20 Bury Street, was called in and eventually rejected by the Secretary of State for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities. "The highly unsustainable concept of using vast quantities of reinforced concrete for the foundations and lift shaft" was a quoted reason as was "a muddle of architectural ideas"!

4.20 The site is located outside of this City core, close to the more height-sensitive setting of St Paul's Cathedral, a strategic historic landmark in London, St Bart's the Great and

Smithfield Market. Presently, the site forms a remnant of a former urban vision for the City which quickly proved unsuccessful, particularly in the segregation of roads and pedestrian routes. Since the 1990s, redevelopment of the area around London Wall has attempted to recapture the pedestrian access at ground level and has introduced buildings with activated entrances at street level. The highwalk connections which form part of 150 were very limited in the final scheme, with two links to the Barbican Estate – one via Highwalk and the other via Bastion Highwalk. A nib of the Barbican Highwalk extends south of Mountjoy House but was never brought into the site as intended (Figs. 4.15 and 4.16). Instead, the low brown brick wall is evidence of the incomplete original highwalk masterplan (Fig. 4.16). Where is the evidence that the “urban vision” “quickly proved unsuccessful”? It is difficult to look on 140 and 150, as well as Ironmongers’ Hall as a “remnant” of anything nor that the segregation of pedestrians from roads was “unsuccessful”. Within the area bounded by Aldersgate Street, London Wall and Wood Street, with its highwalks, it’s difficult to understand why access at street level is either needed or desired. After all, air pollution at street level here is high.

Three footbridges extend from the site across the busy vehicular route of London Wall, however the highwalk ends in the buildings they connect to, ultimately leading pedestrians to ground level and an unattractive and hard urban environment next to the main road which encircles the Rotunda. In contrast with the adjoining Barbican Estate, the architectural and spatial quality of the post-war buildings on the site and along London Wall proved to be low and to connect poorly into the surrounding townscape. Presumably the “unattractive and hard urban environment” is the same one that has been activated with street entrances. All three bridges lead to the south of London Wall – two to Aldersgate Street and the other to Noble Street. The final sentence above hardly warrants comment since it’s clearly subjective at best.

Existing Buildings on the site

4.21 As noted, 140 and 150 were both designed by Philip Powell and Hidalgo Moya and comprise the two main buildings on the site. They were conceived as elements of a single scheme, with the commercial 140 aiding the funding of 150 and constructed from 1971 to 1976.

4.22 The London County Council (LCC) plan of the mid-1950s centred around the widening and extension of London Wall, known as Route XI (see Fig.4.18). This was to be an urban motorway, with pedestrians entirely removed from the roadside, and instead contained within the aerial routes that formed the large network of walkways known as the pedway. The site is one of the few remaining elements of this wider post-war development scheme centred on London Wall, which saw the construction of six curtain-walled office blocks, arranged equidistantly to either side of the widened road. Whilst there is some historic interest associated with 150 for these reasons, little else of the masterplan remains today beyond the broad roadway and hard edges of Route XI. The walkway has been fragmented and bypassed by further development of London Wall, diluting the aspirations of the plan. Irrespective of anything else, that the development existed is a reason to preserve its significant remains.

4.23 The site includes the roundabout junction with Aldersgate Street and London Wall, at the centre of which is the Rotunda. This node was also intended as an important intersection for the pedway routes, however the routes did not continue on from this area as planned, and consequently pedestrians experienced this part of London Wall at street level, with the blank brickwork of the Rotunda only adding to the inhospitable character of the environment (Ref. 1-18). The original design had two bridges from the Rotunda, one to the west and the other to the south. A third bridge ran south from Bastion Highwalk and this also remains.

4.24 Both 140 and 150 have a Certificate of Immunity from listing (COI list entry number: 1465513), granted in August 2019. The 2019COI was a renewal of a 2015 COI (Ref. 1-20); it expires on 20 August 2024. The 2019 Historic England (HE) COI advice report acknowledged that whilst “both buildings have a degree of architectural and historic interest”, Historic England (HE) and the SoSCDMS ultimately determined that “No significant new information has been provided for this assessment of the buildings and we continue to consider that they do not meet the very high bar set for buildings of their date and type and should not be added to the statutory List.” (Ref. 1-19, p.3). The 2019 HE COI report notes the mundane appearance of 140 and its lack of architectural quality when compared to other commercial buildings of a contemporary date, several of which are listed in recognition of their innovation and design quality (Ref. 1-19, p.3) **The fact that no notice of the proposal to extend the COI in 2019 was given to anyone other than the Twentieth Century Society denied the ability to provide “new evidence”, particularly the absence of objectivity in the various reports of KP which appeared to be the only documents relied on in both 2015 and 2019 – all three of which, with my comments in red, are set out below.**

However, “lack of enthusiasm” isn’t “dislike”. One reason for a lack of enthusiasm though, if that was the case, since KP seems to be the only source for this could have been the strict design brief for Bastion House as one of the six towers. City Tower in Aldermanbury Square is another surviving tower. This was to be as part of the “family” with “individuality achieved by detail”. However, there was freedom in the “plan type” as this could be either central core or end core” but it had to be “such that clear glass concept not disturbed” and “glazing, clear glass spandrel to be within existing colour range”. Later, between 1974 and 1976, minutes of a CoL meeting recorded – “It was adjourned for further information as to the cost of upgrading the entrance hall etc .. the Chairman feeling (sic) that it would be very difficult to go back on the instructions to the architect not to produce a prestigious building”!

The Museum of London (150)

History and design of the Museum of London

4.26 Early designs for the Museum initially involved demolishing Ironmongers’ Hall (Fig. 4.17), which at the time was considered old fashioned and an impediment to the wider redevelopment scheme, which involved plans for connections into the Barbican Estate as part of the City of London Highwalk scheme. Fig. 4.17 is a representative drawn copy of the architect’s initial design thinking for the Museum of London, printed in The Illustrated London News (February 18, 1967, p.11). It shows the more wholesale redevelopment of the Site with the demolition of Ironmongers’ Hall, which would have more easily enabled the connections into the **adjoining** Barbican Estate, depicted in an illustrative form in this drawing. **It is questionable whether any weight should be given to this drawing, as the first scheme was approved by the Royal Fine Art Commission on 13 February 1967 and this clearly includes parts of the actual Barbican Estate and not in illustrative form.**

Powell and Moya were assertive in the need for **Ironmongers’** Hall to be demolished: “In February 1963, Philip Powell wrote to the City Architect, E.G. Chandler: “we have come to feel more and more strongly that the retention of the Ironmongers’ Hall could compromise the design of the Museum” (Ref. 1-22, p.1). These plans were abandoned **in early 1967** following a failed attempt to obtain a compulsory purchase of the Ironmongers’ site. Consequently, the Museum designs incorporated the livery hall, resulting in the present-day plan which has two northern wings, either side of the Ironmongers’ Hall (Ref. 1-22, p.5). The retention of the Hall also resulted in alterations to plans for an extended highwalk along the southern perimeter of the Barbican Estate, which would have connected the staircase at the southwestern corner of the school playing fields to Mountjoy House and the Museum of London. As the project progressed, it was increasingly Bernard Throp who took over the lead from Powell, working alongside project architect John Cantwell (Ref. 1-18, p.110). Powell

later expressed a dislike and frustration with the design – largely as a result of the constraints imposed as a result of the retention of Ironmongers' Hall (Ref. 1-18, p110). KP seems to be the sole source of this “dislike” but he has also expressed it as a “lack of enthusiasm”. However, “lack of enthusiasm” isn't “dislike”. One reason for a lack of enthusiasm though, if that was the case, since KP seems to be the only source for this, could have been the strict design brief for 150 as one of the six towers. City Tower in Aldermanbury Square is another surviving tower.

This was to be as part of the “family” with “individuality achieved by detail”. However, there was freedom in the “plan type” as this could be either central core or end core” but it had to be “such that clear glass concept not disturbed” and “glazing, clear glass spandrel to be within existing colour range”. Later, between 1974 and 1976, minutes of a CoLC meeting recorded – “It was adjourned for further information as to the cost of upgrading the entrance hall etc .. the Chairman feeling (sic) that it would be very difficult to go back on the instructions to the architect not to produce a prestigious building”!

4.27 The final design of 150 therefore wrapped around the Ironmongers' Hall, changing the plan form of the whole building. It is clad in white tiles, which contrast against both the dark brick of the Rotunda and the adjoining dark bronze coloured cladding of 140. The original entrance. was a large, pitched glazed roof over a courtyard – this was enclosed in 1992 and a new entrance fully replaced the original concept. The two galleries were once connected by an internal barrel-vaulted glazed ramp.

4.28 Much of 150's external expression remains as designed and executed, with the white tile cladding remaining, something matched by a similar treatment to the later Barbican Arts Centre. However, since completion, 150 has undergone several internal alterations, to improve wayfinding within the building itself and to increase usage of the walkway that connects London Wall to the Barbican Estate and the townscape to the east. The only internal element specifically designed by Powell and Moya as part of the integrated architecture of the museum space – the glazed linking ramp between the two gallery spaces, which also led directly to the Royal coach – was removed in 2010 as part of the Wilkinson Eyre refurbishment works.

4.29 It has been established that 150 does not possess the special interest required for statutory listing. The reasonings for which are fully outlined in the Historic England COI advice reports in 2015 and 2019 respectively (Ref. 1-19 and Ref. 1-20). Perhaps “established on subjective and unchallenged evidence”?

Bastion House (140)

History of Bastion House

4.30 140 was one of six office slab blocks, situated at angles to the road along Route XI (London Wall). When built, it was the last of the tower blocks along London Wall and the most westerly in the sequence (Fig. 4.18). 140 was designed by Powell and Moya alongside 150 and partly funding it. Typically, Powell and Moya's practice did not design commercial buildings. The building is a slab block of approximately 17-storeys and is set on a podium with the lower levels forming part of 150. It was conceived as part of the masterplan of highwalks along Route XI (London Wall) and across the City of London.

4.31 140 is comprised of bronze-coloured curtain walling, with paler biscuit coloured piloti. Pevsner remarks that “*Its sombre bronze curtain walling rebukes the undistinguished materials of the earlier London Wall towers*” (Ref. 1-15, p.323). It was the darkest in colour of the six London Wall commercial buildings and has a Miesian quality which was described in the Architects Journal of 1996 as 'in anonymous Miesian mode' (Ref 1-19, p.3). Powell is known to have disliked the building (Ref. 1-18, p.110) and it also never received any

contemporary commendation in the architectural press. See above re “disliked” and below re commendation.

4.32 140 has been little altered externally since its conception, except from the removal of the 1970s lettering from the east elevation.

4.33 Internally, however, office spaces to each floor and reception spaces have been reconfigured and the HE COI advice report notes the “near universal replacement of the 1970s fixtures and fittings.” (Ref. 1-19, p.10). Changes at the entrance level have been both internal and external (Ref. 1-22, p.11).

4.34 When assessed for statutory listing, 140 was acknowledged as the first commercial work undertaken by Powell and Moya, and the only remaining, largely externally unaltered, commercial office associated with the post-war masterplan for London Wall. There is some historic interest associated with 140 for these reasons, but the fragmentation of the walkway and redevelopment on London Wall has largely eroded the aspirations of the masterplan, therefore limiting the historic interest of 140. Surely the erosion has increased historic interest.

4.35 Historic England, when conducting a nationwide review of 20th century commercial buildings for potential listing in 2014, did not place 140 on its shortlist (14 buildings were listed as a result of that review). In terms of the architectural interest of 140, the stringent design principles for the London Wall offices laid down by the local authority, limited the architects design freedom. Whilst there is a Miesian quality to 140, it was described in the Architects Journal of 1996 as 'in anonymous Miesian mode', and when compared to listed post-war office buildings it appears mundane and somewhat old-fashioned in its treatment, lacking in architectural quality and innovation. Obviously, the buildings 140 is compared to are relevant here but objectivity is necessary here and not unsupported opinion.

PART 2 – BUILT HERITAGE ASSESSMENT

Listed Buildings and Registered Parks and Gardens

12.33 The site includes part of the Ironmongers’ Hall (Grade II), and Ferroners’ House which is specifically excluded from the designation 140 and 150 have Certificates of Immunity from Listing (COI) which are valid until August 2024 (Ref. 1-19). Furthermore, the buildings have not been identified by CoLC officers as NDHAs. The site also includes: two sections of the historic London Wall which are both scheduled monuments; part of the BRP&G. These designated heritage assets that fall within the site boundary are assessed in the text below. The listed buildings of the Barbican Estate (Grade II), located just to the north of the site, have also been assessed in the main text below given that they also form part of the BRP&G and the proposals include new connections and integration works to the highwalks within the Barbican Estate which require LBC. The lack of identification as NDHAs by CoLC officers requires explanation.

TVBHIA Part 29 -24 Barbican Estate: St Giles' Terrace – outside St Giles Cripplegate



Existing

6.326 This view looks south-west from St Giles' Terrace, past the west end of the Grade I listed St Giles Cripplegate, towards the site. A small part of St Giles is visible on the left of the frame. The existing Bastion House is prominent in the centre of the view, with its rectilinear, dark mass appearing to float above the podium containing the former Museum of London, which is mainly obscured in this view by the Wallside Highwalk.

Fred Rodgers 03 February 2024

From: Fred Rodgers

Sent: Saturday, February 3, 2024 7:59:34 PM

To: Richards, Gwyn

Subject: Re 23/01304/FULEIA, 23/01276/LBC and 23/01277LBC

THIS IS AN EXTERNAL EMAIL

Dear Mr Richards,
Attachment available until 4 Mar 2024

Attached is part 2 of my objection to the above for posting to the planning portal please.

By the way, I note that my last email to you has been posted to the portal. I have no problem with this but I expected a response to the fact that an important letter is missing from one of your files.

However, the absence of a response affords me the opportunity to point out that Buro Happold has failed to understand that drawings of buildings under construction are constantly being amended. With Bastion House and the Museum of London, some drawings were produced in 1975.

Finally, the email from your Case Officer, Gemma Delves, of 12 December re 23/01304/FULEIA, states that "all ecology and biodiversity information submitted with the application will be independently assessed". Has that happened yet and, if so, can the result be published please. On the subject of independent review, when is the review of the submitted WLCA going to be published?

Please post this email to the portal along with the attachment.

Best regards,

Fred Rodgers

100 Breton House
Barbican
London
EC2Y 8PQ
UK

Comments for Planning Application 23/01304/FULEIA

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/01304/FULEIA

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

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

Case Officer: Gemma Delves

Customer Details

Name: Mr Minesh Shah

Address: 54 Spencer Rd Harrow

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of the Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Other

Comment: Dear Planning Officer

I object to the destruction of any building that has value to the local area, wider society and the architecture of any city at large...

The destruction on this building is clearly not something anyone with a modicum of intellect would advocate...

I therefore object to it's demolition and advocate its sensible and thoughtful reuse...

Faithfully

Minesh Shah

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 Deborah Tompkinson

Address: Flat 56 London House 172 Aldersgate Street 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:LOSS OF AMENITY FOR LOCAL RESIDENTS

It is obvious that there will be a significant loss of amenity in the reduced daylight and sunlight for residents and citizens living locally. Privacy is also clearly going to be an issue of residents of London House as well as the Barbican. One notes that overlooking will also affect the City of London Girls' School - a factor that should be given particular concerns because girls need the privacy and the facility for abuse by male predators should not be underrated.

The City has had one building that focussed sunlight to a level that was dangerous. Even if this one does not melt cars, the Council should be thinking about the safety aspects for drivers driving towards this unaesthetic erection from the wrong direction at the wrong time of day.

SAFETY AND LOSS OF AMENITY

The loss of traffic routes will impact residents' amenity by impeding access by necessary services

such as ambulances, delivery vehicles, and taxis. The environment will be hostile and not one which will provide (or encourage) lone women to feel safe, therefore needing the taxis (which will not be able to deliver customers to their door).

OVERBEARING DESIGN OUT OF KEEPIN WITH RELATIVELY LOW LEVELS AROUND IT
The designs are ugly and even by the current standards of the City, overbearing. The fact that existing overbearing buildings exist does not justify more being approved.

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 Adrian Gale

Address: 1 Phoenix Lodge Mansions Brook Green London

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of the Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Noise
- Residential Amenity
- Traffic or Highways

Comment: I am an emeritus professor of architecture, a practitioner over many years and a long standing member of the RIBA.

I have considered the planning application for buildings on the site of the Museum of London and the neighbouring high level access ways. Insufficient study has been given to the long term implications of both traffic and pedestrian routes.

Professor Adrian Gale (emeritus)