

**Carroll, Ray**

---

**From:** Su Rogers [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 07 February 2024 12:02  
**To:** lpalondonwallwest  
**Cc:** Delves, Gemma; PLN - Comments  
**Subject:** Objection to Application Number 23/01304/FULEIA

THIS IS AN EXTERNAL EMAIL

We are writing to object in the strongest possible terms to the planning application 23/01304/FULEIA, described above.

We question the need to demolish any of the existing buildings. Demolition work is one of the most immediate and damaging activities for the environment with a very high carbon footprint. It also creates noise, vibration and dust, which would be detrimental to the health of the residential community, especially people with breathing difficulties. Many residents in the Barbican will work from home, and the noise will be a disturbance. Removing the waste materials from the site during the demolition period will mean a continuous stream of heavy lorries carrying skips, circulating around the area throughout the day. This is an intolerable imposition on a quiet and calm neighbourhood. The City of London School for girls will also be seriously impacted.

The Barbican Estate, is a modernist complex of buildings comprising 2,000 homes, an art centre the Guildhall School of Music and a secondary school. Pedestrian circulation throughout the Barbican is by the high walks, which link all of the residential units and provide an alternative route through the estate to the surrounding areas for commuters, sightseers and joggers. The proposed scheme demolishes seven of these high walks, thus altering the accessibility to many parts of the estate and undermining one of the key features in the original design.

At the centre of the proposal are two commercial towers. The design of these two ugly bulbous towers are completely inappropriate for the location adjacent to the Barbican and to the historic context of London Wall. That the architects (USA) should propose such an inappropriate design illustrates how unaware they are of the historical context in which they are working. We also note that the proposal provides for no additional residential accommodation. A missed opportunity.

We ask that you refuse this application.

John Miller + Su Rogers, Architects  
10 the Beauchamp Building  
Brooke's Market  
London EC1N 7SC  
[REDACTED]

# 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 Philip Ellaway

Address: 16 Defoe House Barbican LONDON

## Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Residential Amenity

Comment: Bastion House and the former Museum of London building are both of great architectural merit, providing a sensitive combination of low and high rise space at the end of London Wall - as originally intended to allow light and air into a mixed commercial and residential neighbourhood. Accepting that re-use will be more challenging than demolition, it is surely preferable to adding more bland, tightly packed office space in a district that does not require it in the era of increased home working. The City's money could be better spent in finding intelligent ways to refurbish both this site and the acres of mediocre Victorian buildings that escaped the Blitz but now need work if the streetscape is not to become another soulless disaster of the type erupting from the ruins of the Battersea Power Station site. Save this site from bland visual jokes that, like most jokes, don't bear telling more than once. Ask the architects to show us what their proposals will look like in 50 years' time. It's highly unlikely they will wear as well as the present buildings.

# Comments for Planning Application 23/01304/FULEIA

## Application Summary

Application Number: 23/01304/FULEIA

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

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

Case Officer: Gemma Delves

## Customer Details

Name: Miss Anne-Lucie Norton

Address: 9 Hardinge Road Hardinge Road LONDON

## Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of the Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Other

Comment: The buildings are significant architecturally speaking and form a genuinely coherent collection of mixed use. These days we do not tear down good buildings to replace them with bland, undistinguished and completely unnecessary office buildings of which there are more than enough in the area to supply weakening demand. Be more creative with the buildings we have.

# 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 Jethro Au-Yeung

Address: Atlas House Exeter

## Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of the Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Noise
- Other

Comment: We need to preserve this beautiful modernist building. Retrofitting it is a lot of environmental-friendly than demolishing and re develop a new one.

# Comments for Planning Application 23/01304/FULEIA

## Application Summary

Application Number: 23/01304/FULEIA

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

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

Case Officer: Gemma Delves

## Customer Details

Name: Dr Kris Scheerlinck

Address: 563 Ben Jonson House London

## Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: This will damage the entire neighbourhood, especially the Barbican. These existing buildings should be re-used, not demolished for profit. The value of these existing buildings is too high to ignore.

# 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 Roland Jeffery

Address: 209 Crescent House Golden Lane Estate 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 applications on the following grounds:

- The wholesale demolition of Bastion House has not been adequately justified over a scheme of refurbishment
- the exposure of the flank and rear walls of the Listed Ironmongers' Hall makes walls that were not intended to be exposed into main elevations, to the detriment of the listed building; this amounts to serious harm to the setting of the Ironmongers Hall and therefore to the Hall itself
- The re-arrangement of the roundabout beneath the current Museum will cause significantly greater traffic flows along Aldersgate Street/ Goswell Road as far as Old street. There appears to be no modelling of this aspect of the impact of the scheme.
- I object to the demolition of the blue brick rotunda which could be a powerful and attractive landscape feature capable of re-use as part of the scheme. This is the exact starting point of the A1. It is therefore the origin of the road numbering across England. It marks the origin of the Roman Road north. It is a fine modern Gateway to the City. With a roundabout with open to the

sky on all sides, the Rotunda could be transformed.

- I would not object to the wholesale demolition of the Museum of London building apart from the Rotunda as it never worked well as a museum, and is very difficult to convert to other uses; it was not Powell & Moya's finest hour.

- I do not share the evaluation of Historic England that the harm to listed assets is less than substantial. The cumulative effect of harm to the Barbican, St Giles Church, Ironmongers Hall and the scheduled monuments is substantial. I consider Historic England should be challenged on their methodology for concluding no substantial harm. The Barbican was designed carefully to form a new setting for St Giles and the scheduled monument this is, with the designated landscapes, a set piece. The proposed development will represent a massive disruption to their setting and, therefore, harm to them.

**From:** Paul Wilkinson  
**Sent:** Monday, November 22, 2023 07:59  
**To:** Fred Rodgers  
**Cc:** Hayward, Christopher (Deputy); chairbarbassociation; Averil Baldwin  
**Subject:** Re: London Wall West

Dear Fred,

Thank you for your response; your concerns are noted.

Best wishes

Paul

**Paul Wilkinson | City Surveyor | City of London**

**From:** Fred Rodgers  
**Sent:** Monday, November 20, 2023 8:52 AM  
**To:** Paul Wilkinson  
**Cc:** chairbarbassociation; Averil Baldwin; Hayward, Christopher (Deputy)  
**Subject:** Re: London Wall West

THIS IS AN EXTERNAL EMAIL

Dear Paul,

Many thanks for your response to my email to Chris Hayward of 13 November. I'm well thanks and trust you are too.

It's quite clear from your response that City Corporation hasn't complied with its own requirement - *This means working with developers, local residents and other stakeholders from the earliest possible stage in the development process until the submission of an application to shape and guide development proposals that are most suitable to their context* - since your only explanation is that "the City considers it has engaged extensively with residents and key stakeholders".

In any event, whatever your explanation might be now, it contradicts a City Corporation's press statement from a year ago. Here is the link to what was promised - including the 3D model - prior to submission of the planning application - <https://news.cityoflondon.gov.uk/city-corporation-to-amend-proposals-for-london-wall-west-scheme/>. Chris Hayward was presumably aware of this press release as well.

I'm sorry if the facts aren't to your liking but the last revision in the design hasn't been consulted on. Neither has the effect of that design on the setting of Ironmongers' Hall. Also a written commitment from City Corporation on its proposals is now being blatantly ignored at the same time as it intends to ignore its only recently adopted consultation obligations.

As far as the independent third party is concerned, as City Corporation is part of the application team, how is it intended to show that the third party reviewer is independent of City Corporation? The planning development team is responsible for engaging the independent third party and the full process of that engagement should be disclosed.



I quoted Bernard Morgan House in my first email to Chris Hayward as the choice of the independent reviewer of the applicants' financial viability appraisal was a very expensive cock-up at best. Unfortunately, this was only revealed after planning permission was granted.

London Wall West, is, at its heart, an abuse of the planning process, since City Corporation has already stated its intention not to take the scheme forward and any subsequent developer is unlikely to want to carry it out. Unfortunately, a repeat of a similar lack of full disclosure prior to approval is anticipated as well.

Perhaps, though, it's fortuitous, that your Department won't be developing the site, irrespective of whether or not planning permission is granted. Your Department's complete lack of resident concern was highlighted in its arbitrarily withdrawal from the CoLPAI liaison group four years ago.

City Surveyor's representatives on the Group couldn't tolerate criticism of the proposal to instal an onsite concrete crusher next to residential blocks - the residents of two having then just survived potential obliteration from a contractor caused gas leak. Four years on, the first residents have yet to occupy their £650,000 plus - building only cost - flats there; £1 million fire compartmentalisation has had to be carried out in Frobisher Court; the remainder of the Barbican Estate is in desperate need of renewal as is Golden Lane Estate and the other HRA estates; and, then, there's Blake Tower!

You may not have been in post through all the above and your predecessor claimed he was kept away from City Corporation's housing stock. However, the above examples are good enough reasons for residents to understand that they remain an "inconvenience".

Best regards,

Fred

Fred Rodgers

**From:** Paul Wilkinson

**Sent:** Monday, November 16, 2023 16.07

**To:** Fred Rodgers

**Cc:** Hayward, Christopher (Deputy); chairbarbassociaation; Averil Baldwin

**Subject:** Re: London Wall West

Dear Fred,

I hope that you are keeping well.

The Policy Chair has asked me to respond directly to you on matters relating to London Wall West.

In response to your email sent on Monday November 13 at 4:06 PM, I can assure you that in its capacity as landowner and applicant, the City considers it has a) engaged extensively with residents and key stakeholders and b) followed the City Corporation's Carbon Options Guidance Advice Note.

As we have previously stated, we will be submitting a planning application this month and the extensive documentation included within the application will be publicly available when City Planning Officers have formally registered and validated all documentation. This documentation will include amongst other things:

- Details of the public consultation undertaken to date;
- Full reference to the listing of Ironmongers' Hall; and
- An updated Whole Life Cycle Carbon Assessment and Optioneering Assessment that has been reviewed by an independent third party.

After Planning Officers have registered and validated the planning application, details will be provided of the plans for statutory public consultation. I encourage you to engage with that formal process.

If you are unhappy with this response or the performance of the Corporation, you are welcome to follow our complaints procedure and if necessary, escalate to the Local Government Ombudsman.

Best wishes

Paul Wilkinson  
Paul Wilkinson | City Surveyor | City of London |

---

**From:** Fred Rodgers  
**Sent:** Monday, November 13, 2023 4:06 PM  
**To:** Hayward, Christopher (Deputy) <[Christopher.Hayward@cityoflondon.gov.uk](mailto:Christopher.Hayward@cityoflondon.gov.uk)>  
**Cc:** chairbarbassociation; Averil Baldwin  
**Subject:** Re: London Wall West

THIS IS AN EXTERNAL EMAIL

Hi Chris,

Many thanks for your email.

As far as the proposed planning application is concerned, according to 4.8 of City Corporation's May 2023 Statement of Community Involvement:

*The City Corporation is committed to early and ongoing consultation engagement on planning applications. This means working with developers, local residents and other stakeholders from the earliest possible stage in the development process until the submission of an application to shape and guide development proposals that are most suitable to their context. The pre-application process requires respect and understanding for stakeholders' interests, open, accessible and reasoned communication, and informative and meaningful engagement.*

As we have to go back into the annals of time to re-aquatint ourselves with City Corporation's stalled community involvement, it's difficult to remember whether City Corporation's last publicly disclosed

proposal was ever submitted to public consultation. Since there has been no effort on the part of City Corporation to work with local residents - notwithstanding your much hyped "residential reset" in addition to 4.8 - is this going to be another of the many cases of City Corporation ignoring its own rules to the detriment, as always, of residents?

It may well be, of course, that City Corporation's proposal hasn't changed for well over a year. If so, the obvious lack of imagination in sticking to an old design apart, there seems to have been no consideration of the listing of Ironmongers' Hall in the meantime.

If there is a new Whole Lifecycle Carbon Assessment, then why, like its predecessor, hasn't this been made public? Probably worse, though, is that the WLCA has been "submitted to planning officers and independently reviewed by a third party".

The lack of transparency in the submission of the WLCA, ahead of the planning application and its apparent independent review, suggests that City Corporation has taken a privileged advantage to deliver a *fait accompli* during a period when there should be open consultation. Certainly, unless Simon Sturgis was the independent "third party", there must be doubts over the credibility of that review.

I will address the other points in your email in due course. In the meantime, I would appreciate your explanation as to why City Corporation considers it is entitled to ignore its own adopted procedures as well as transparency in the planning process.

Best regards,

Fred

Fred Rodgers

On 13 Nov 2023, at 12:47, Hayward, Christopher (Deputy) wrote:

Dear Fred,

Thank you for your email, I trust you are well also? My apologies for the delayed response.

You are correct that, as per my letter, submission of a planning application for the redevelopment of London Wall West is targeted for later this month. As I have said, the City Corporation is under a duty to achieve "best consideration" for the site, which relates to financial considerations and is readily demonstrated via a full marketing exercise. It is my hope therefore, as landowner, that we will be able to go to the market with the benefit of planning permission. That said, when marketing and selling the site, the City Corporation will evaluate the various bids weighing up price *and* securing best use of the land.

The proposed redevelopment would deliver c.456,000 sqft (net) of commercial and cultural accommodation and significant public realm improvements. A recent report compiled by Arup and Knight Frank outlines that demand for City office space is high and is likely to remain

so. Indeed, it reports that we can expect an additional 85,000 additional jobs in the City by 2042, according to employment projections by the Greater London Authority, which will in turn drive the requirement of up to an additional 1.8 million sq.m of office space, on top of the 800,000 sq.m delivered between 2016 and 2023. This research is supported by published reports from all the major real estate commentators. They all emphasise that office occupier demand is bifurcating towards Grade A accommodation which meets higher ESG standards, Sustainability, and Wellness criteria.

The soft market testing carried out by the City Corporation this year, sought to establish the market's interest in re-use schemes for the site. This was an informative exercise, the results of which will help shape our marketing and sales process. Unfortunately, I cannot share the report that you refer to, as a substantial portion of it provides confidential and commercially sensitive information from the soft market testing exercise.

I can assure you that the City Corporation has considered re-use schemes, indeed we published our Whole Life Carbon Assessment report in May last year. In addition, and in accordance with the City Corporation's Carbon Options Guidance Advice Note, a further carbon optioneering report has been submitted to the planning officers and independently reviewed by a third party. As a result, a Whole Life Carbon Assessment and Optioneering Assessment will form part of the planning application submission. I can also assure you that we will continue to explore appropriate cultural anchors for the site which take into consideration Destination City and our other priorities.

Residents and key stakeholders will be updated further once a planning application has been submitted, as this is the next formal milestone in the process.

As ever

Chris

---

<image001.jpg>

**Deputy Christopher M Hayward | Policy Chairman**

City of London Corporation | Guildhall | London | EC2V 7HH

[07971 608056](tel:07971608056)[christopher.hayward@cityoflondon.gov.uk](mailto:christopher.hayward@cityoflondon.gov.uk) | [www.cityoflondon.gov.uk](http://www.cityoflondon.gov.uk)

**Executive Director & Private Secretary: Jennifer Beckermann**

[jen.beckermann@cityoflondon.gov.uk](mailto:jen.beckermann@cityoflondon.gov.uk)

**Policy Chairman's Private Office:**

[policychair@cityoflondon.gov.uk](mailto:policychair@cityoflondon.gov.uk)

---

**From:** Fred Rodgers

**Sent:** Sunday, November 5, 2023 9:19 PM

**To:** Hayward, Christopher (Deputy)

**Subject:** Re: London Wall West

THIS IS AN EXTERNAL EMAIL

Hi Chris,

I must say I'm surprised not to have received any response yet to my email below. That, though, gives me an opportunity to correct two obvious errors.

Your letter, of course, uses neither "best value" nor "best price". Instead it uses "best consideration" and "maximum financial return". However, I don't think these errors affect my point.

I await your considered response.

Best regards,

Fred

Fred Rodgers

On 19 Oct 2023, at 22:04, Frederick Rodgers wrote:

Hi Chris,

I trust you are well.

I note that the decision to apply for planning permission for the redevelopment of LWW has now been confirmed. However, as you are well aware, the Officer's report on which that decision was based has not been made public.

You may be aware that the draft City Plan 2040 requires consideration of retrofitting first, something that the Local Plans sub Committee endorsed yesterday. Despite its obvious limit in scope, I understand that the recent soft marketing exercise produced a significant interest. As a result, it seems incongruous that City Corporation intends proceeding with a planning application when the first question it will have to answer is why can't the buildings be retrofitted.

The answer to that question, according to your recent statement, is City Corporation has to obtain best value from this asset for City Fund. Your statement also referred to a duty to obtain the best price but you obviously know the difference between the two. As an aside, you are aware City Corporation obtained the best price for Bernard Morgan House - £6 million over market price - but the best value would have been the delivery of onsite affordable housing. All the more so as the £30.4 million received seems to have been squandered by City Police on its various aborted/failed projects.

City Corporation's answer to the first question will obviously be that "we get more money from the ultimate sale through obtaining planning permission first" but this wouldn't necessarily be better value. In any event, though, it seems difficult to run your argument without producing evidence. Presumably the undisclosed report claims the difference in potential price between selling now and selling with the benefit of planning permission justifies the latter. As it will be disclosed with the planning application, as even City Corporation, surely, can't get away with a lack of transparency here, perhaps you could arrange to publish it now please. Doing so would avoid another FOI request to an overworked Information Officer.

Even if City Corporation obtained planning permission, unless the lease had restrictions requiring the implementation of the planning permission, the lessee will seek to obtain more value from the asset at the cost of City Fund. But, as BMH

and 150 Aldersgate Street demonstrate, the fewer restrictions in a lease, the bigger the premium a lessee will pay.

According to the latest draft City Plan 2040, again approved by LPSC, the Smithfield and Barbican Key Area of Change is an area appropriate for hotels. My understanding is that one alternative use for Bastion House would be as a hotel, a use that would complement Destination City and provide added value to that initiative.

I also note that City Corporation's Sports Strategy has just been published and investment in sport and recreation is important. The lack of sports facilities in the City is mirrored in the lack of play spaces and, if Destination City is to be any more than a drain of money from the City to non-resident consultants and the like, it's important to expand its offer to visitors. The Museum of London building could become a sports and leisure centre which would also provide added value to Destination City.

Best regards,

Fred

Fred Rodgers

---

**From:** Fred Rodgers  
**Sent:** Tuesday, February 13, 2024 9:39 AM  
**To:** Wilkinson, Paul  
**Cc:** Policy Chair; Richards, Gwyn  
**Subject:** Re: City Question Time

THIS IS AN EXTERNAL EMAIL

Dear Paul,

Many thanks for your email received at 06.23 yesterday morning and, again at 16.51 yesterday afternoon.

As the Policy Chair suggested last week, your email hasn't provided me with an acceptable answer. In fact, it has raised some further questions, as you can see from my comments in red below.

I would like this email exchange - and attachment - to be treated as a further objection to the planning applications and posted on the planning portal accordingly. I've therefore copied in the Director of Planning and Development

Finally and, again for the record, a copy of the pre-planning application email exchange is attached.

Best regards,

Fred

Fred Rodgers  
100 Breton House  
Barbican  
London  
EC2Y 8PQ  
UK

On 12 Feb 2024, at 06:23, Wilkinson, Paul wrote:

Dear Mr. Rodgers,



Following the Policy Chairman's commitment at City Question time on 30<sup>th</sup> January for an officer to provide a technical response to your question, please note that I have been given responsibility for responding to your question.

Firstly, please accept my apology for not responding to you sooner – this was down to me as I had a response prepared before going on annual leave last week and I failed to send which is an error on my behalf.

Moving on to your question, the carbon optioneering considered several options for assessment in accordance with the City's Planning Advice Note. An initial long list was considered, which was then distilled down to a short list for further assessment. This shortlist was agreed with CoL planning officers.

My concern, which has now increased, is the fact that the WLCA published on 31 May 2022 didn't contain Option 2 but only a part demolition and a full demolition option. Its intention was merely to justify - quite dubiously as it turned out - and promote the scheme on which the applications are based. As a result, the submitted Carbon Optioneering Study including Dashboard 1 and Dashboard 2 document is simply retro-optioneering and thus lacks objectivity. You claim "an initial long list was considered which was then distilled down to a short list for further assessment" and that the shortlist was "agreed with CoL planning officers" but, if this was the case, why? If there's any written evidence to support your claim please supply it. In any event, you seem to suggest that CoL planning officers have been complicit in determining what options were included in the Optioneering Study. That seems bad enough as regards a third party developer but surely fatal as regards CoL and a copy of the Handling Note for the applications should be published with delay.

Option 1 is presented as a hybrid between a minor and a major refurbishment, responding to the requirement in the Carbon Options Guidance document to present a "baseline" option.

Option 1 is tantamount to doing nothing and wouldn't require planning permission, so making it, at best, self-serving box ticking. Surely, the City of London deserves better.

Option 2 is therefore reflected in the baseline assessment, whilst in Option 3a and Option 3b, Bastion House is part retained and part redeveloped. It is not considered feasible to retain Bastion House in an Option 2 scenario for office use without significant changes in the medium or longer term.

I'm sorry but phrases such as "not considered feasible" carry no weight unless supported by evidence. The refurbishment of Bastion House under Option 2 must be "feasible" since it's offered as an option, although not in the optioneering document, for obvious reasons.

Further, Option 2 does not maximise the development potential of the masterplan site, which is principally the reason this option was discounted as part of the engineering exercise and with option 3 being considered a more realistic option for comparison analysis.

What is the "masterplan"? When and where has one been approved? Since the applications are admitted to constitute a paper exercise, these are at the time cost of genuine applications. The "development potential" is both irrelevant and contrary to the accepted retrofit first policy. Who

“considered” and why was Option 3 considered “more realistic” and who by? Presumably “engineering” is meant to be “optioneering”.

The proposed scheme has been through Dashboard 1 (of the Planning Advice Note) review and details of Dashboard 2 are set out in the application submission. The application is therefore considered to accord with the City’s Carbon Guidance. It is acknowledged that the application scheme generates a high initial embodied carbon spend. Following the initial build, the proposed development provides the option that needs the least additional embodied carbon over its presumed 60-year life span compared with the other options that include more refurbishment. We would also expect the buildings to last more than 60 years, but this is the period for assessment. The optioneering exercise demonstrates that more interventions options generate higher embodied carbon emissions. But this is balanced out against the operational carbon output and wider sustainability benefits of the scheme, which are plentiful for the full redevelopment. In addition, the new build calculations include the ambitious recycled content and reuse targets proposed in the Circular Economy Strategy.

The “initial build” adds 57,017 tCO<sub>2</sub>e to the hundreds of thousands of tonnes consented to date since the adoption of the Climate Action Strategy. How much worse off would we be embodied carbon wise without it?

The lower operational carbon claim is irrelevant when Option 2 would provide, along with the decarbonisation of the grid, significantly lower operational emissions than at present. Option 2 would deliver even more plentiful sustainability benefits including a saving in embodied carbon and the potential saving in operational carbon.

With regards to the SPD Sustainability draft approved on the 12th of December 2024 and expected to go through public consultation during the spring of this year as well as the Climate Action Strategy 2020-2027, it is recognised that the proposed scheme requires significant carbon investment, nonetheless, the assessment of the extent of retrofit versus redevelopment has also been considered following the GLA Circular Economy Guidance (2022) and the City’s Planning Advice Note. The wider benefits regarding urban greening and biodiversity, climate resilience, mobility strategy and the circular economy targets established for the new scheme should also be considered alongside the strategy to decarbonize the Citigen grid.

The decarbonisation of Citigen would also benefit Option 2. As regards the so-called “wider benefits”, these can all be achieved under Option 2 - at least to an extent compatible with the accepted need to retrofit first. In fact, the failure to propose retrofitting makes a nonsense of City Plan 2040, the Climate Action Strategy as well as the Sustainability SPD and causes reputational damage to the City of London.

Best wishes

Paul

**Paul Wilkinson | City Surveyor | City of London |**  
***Before you print think about the ENVIRONMENT***

---

**From:** Fred Rodgers  
**Sent:** Thursday, February 8, 2024 11:42 am  
**To:** Hayward, Christopher (Deputy)  
**Cc:** Colthurst, Henry (Deputy)  
**Subject:** Re: City Question Time

THIS IS AN EXTERNAL EMAIL

Dear Chris,

Many thanks for insisting that my question was answered last week. As your answer included the assurance that Officers would be confirming your answer in a letter, I wonder when I might expect to receive it.

Whilst the concern of Henry, I was surprised that there were obvious errors in the information presented to a formal, statutory even, meeting. Surely this should have been checked and corrected prior to distribution.

Finally, I very much appreciate the efforts you are making regarding your residents' reset. It's a pity not only that more residents aren't engaging with it but both elected members and officers are failing to do so as well. However, both Jo and I have engaged with Brendan Barns and had a very positive 90 minute meeting with him last Friday.

Best regards,

Fred

Fred Rodgers  
100 Breton House  
Barbican  
London  
EC2Y 8PQ  
UK

On 29 Jan 2024, at 08:50, Fred Rodgers wrote:

Dear Chris,

I trust you're well.

As far as this week's event is concerned, I hope you will be fully briefed on the costs incurred by City Corporation to date on the various London Wall West projects. Not having any details at the last event, despite your promotion of the scheme, was surprising, to say the least.

My question for Tuesday:

Buro Happold has failed to use its Option 2 - major refurbishment with a continuing office use for Bastion House and a mixed use for the Museum building, which I understand was the choice of the responders to the soft marketing exercise - for comparison in its latest WLCA.

Instead, Buro Happold used its Option 1. This is a minor refurbishment which Buro Happold specifically states would require a major refurbishment in 15 years time. So it has ignored the option of an immediate major refurbishment, which would enable an early lengthy letting. Instead, 15 years on retrofit "first" becomes retrofit "last"!

City Corporation's planning application, whether or not it's approved, let alone implemented, creates, according to Buro Happold, 57,017 tCO<sub>2</sub>e. So how can you justify pursuing a planning application that fails to meet the basic requirements of both City Corporation's own carbon guidance and its draft Sustainability SPD - to Retrofit First?

Best regards,

Fred

Fred Rodgers

**From:**  
**To:**  
**Subject:** Re: Objection to LWW development  
**Date:** 14 February 2024 15:25:24

THIS IS AN EXTERNAL EMAIL

I am following up on my comments below with a further specific objection. It appears from the plans that residents using the Thomas More car park will lose access to the four electric car charging points because the City intends to take the space for access to the new site both during the construction phase and thereafter. This will lead to a significant loss of amenity to residents who, like me, purchased an electric car on the basis that I would have somewhere to charge it. There appears to be no mention in the plan of relocating the chargers to another part of the residents' car park. That is the very least the developer should do if these terrible plans are approved. There has been absolutely no consultation with local residents about these plans affecting the Thomas More car park.

Sincerely,

Martin Luff

On 27 Jan 2024 at 12:39:08, Martin Luff wrote:

I object to the plans to demolish and redevelop 140 and 150 London Wall (planning application 23/01304/FULEIA) for the following reasons:

1. The huge development will cause immense environmental damage. The demolition will release vast amounts of CO2 and severely degrade local air quality. The plan for this site is entirely inconsistent with the City's claims that it wants to address pollution and climate change. There are viable alternatives for redeveloping the existing buildings, which the City has chosen not to pursue because their overriding objective appears to be maximising short term profit rather than considering the best use for the site.
2. The enormous mass of the proposed new office blocks will cause substantial harm to the neighbourhood and cause loss of light to neighbouring residents and the local school. The new office buildings will loom over the local area, degrading the quality of the surrounding neighbourhood. The presentations and visualisations prepared by the City are PR pieces that do not honestly depict how overbearing and massive the buildings would be.
3. The proposed vehicular access down the ramp adjacent to Thomas More and Mountjoy Houses will cause significant noise and air pollution for local residents and school children at the City of London School for Girls. It will also cause a loss of amenity with reduced access to the residents' car park (which is currently used both for resident parking as well as the sole access for emergency vehicles, taxis and food deliveries) and cause an increased risk to the many residents who use this area for pedestrian access. Given the size of the site, there is no reason the planners could not have designed better access from another part of the site that would not cause such significant harm to the school and local residents.
4. There is no shortage of available office space in the City, much of which can be renovated to be made more attractive for new tenants. Building huge new offices in this location is unnecessary and the damage that will be caused far outweighs any claimed

benefits. The main purpose of the development appears to be to maximise profits for the City. This is not the best use of the land, considering the location and the level of harm and loss of amenity that the development will cause.

5. The development gives almost no recognition to local history and cultural heritage, with only cursory acknowledgement given to the Roman walls. The development focuses almost entirely on building offices that are not needed and are not the best use of the land.
5. The City has claimed that the existing buildings cannot be retained. That is not true. The existing buildings can be renovated and repurposed and there is clear interest from other developers to do just that. The City, however, is considering profit over what is the best use of the land and ignoring the damage that will be done by their plans.

Martin Luff

207 Mountjoy House

Barbican

EC2Y 8BP

# 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 Cennydd John

Address: Ironmongers Hall London

## Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Noise
- Other

Comment: We operate a nursery school that is located in Ferroners House - it is registered with Ofsted and has secured a Good rating, servicing the needs of some 80 families in the local community (both residential and professional) who rely on our care to attend to their careers. We were shocked to discover that our school had been demolished as part of the scoping exercise and initial design phase for development without any consultation or call to either the staff teams or myself, as the founder of the schools, to talk through the concept of the development prior to design or application. I would have thought that it would have been at least courteous to do that, given the likely impact that we're due to experience as a school and as a community.

I might add that we were initially housed in Jewin Chapel on Fann street prior to Taylor Wimpey's acquisition of the former police station house on Golden Lane. Again, our school was overlooked in the preliminary planning phase and so the Corporation factored us into a S106 quite late in the day to rehouse us in Westminster. They agreed with us that the development constituted both too much risk in terms of noise, dust and pollution - the Corporation's own EHO assessment confirmed this - that we had to be relocated for the development to proceed. This development is both far larger and much nearer to where we are situated and I'm surprised that we're finding ourselves in a position, again, wherein we have to remind the Corporation that we are indeed here, with very young children (some as old as 6 months) due to be situated in and around a building site.

My position in 2018 is the same as now - with effective and proactive planning, such developments can be navigated but not if there is no consideration or thought granted to those who are in situ and are facing significant disruption to their operations, as is the case at present. We have been told nothing about what plans they have for our school and require it quickly



# 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 Cennydd John

Address: Third Floor, Ferroners House, Ironmonger's Hall London

## Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Noise
- Other

Comment: We operate a nursery school that is located in Ferroners House - it is registered with Ofsted and has secured a Good rating, servicing the needs of some 80 families in the local community (both residential and professional) who rely on our care to attend to their careers. We were shocked to discover that our school had been demolished as part of the scoping exercise and initial design phase for development without any consultation or call to either the staff teams or myself, as the founder of the schools, to talk through the concept of the development prior to design or application. I would have thought that it would have been at least courteous to do that, given the likely impact that we're due to experience as a school and as a community.

I might add that we were initially housed in Jewin Chapel on Fann street prior to Taylor Wimpey's acquisition of the former police station house on Golden Lane. Again, our school was overlooked in the preliminary planning phase and so the Corporation factored us into a S106 quite late in the day to rehouse us in Westminster. They agreed with us that the development constituted both too much risk in terms of noise, dust and pollution - the Corporation's own EHO assessment

confirmed this - that we had to be relocated for the development to proceed. This development is both far larger and much nearer to where we are situated and I'm surprised that we're finding ourselves in a position, again, wherein we have to remind the Corporation that we are indeed here, with very young children (some as old as 6 months) due to be situated in and around a building site.

My position in 2018 is the same as now - with effective and proactive planning, such developments can be navigated but not if there is no consideration or thought granted to those who are in situ and are facing significant disruption to their operations, as is the case at present. We have been told nothing about what plans they have for our school and require it quickly

# 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 Cennydd John

Address: Third Floor, Ferroners House, Ironmonger's Hall London

## Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Noise
- Other

Comment: We operate a nursery school that is located in Ferroners House - it is registered with Ofsted and has secured a Good rating, servicing the needs of some 80 families in the local community (both residential and professional) who rely on our care to attend to their careers. We were shocked to discover that our school had been demolished as part of the scoping exercise and initial design phase for development without any consultation or call to either the staff teams or myself, as the founder of the schools, to talk through the concept of the development prior to design or application. I would have thought that it would have been at least courteous to do that, given the likely impact that we're due to experience as a school and as a community.

I might add that we were initially housed in Jewin Chapel on Fann street prior to Taylor Wimpey's acquisition of the former police station house on Golden Lane. Again, our school was overlooked in the preliminary planning phase and so the Corporation factored us into a S106 quite late in the day to rehouse us in Westminster. They agreed with us that the development constituted both too much risk in terms of noise, dust and pollution - the Corporation's own EHO assessment confirmed this - that we had to be relocated for the development to proceed. This development is both far larger and much nearer to where we are situated and I'm surprised that we're finding ourselves in a position, again, wherein we have to remind the Corporation that we are indeed here, with very young children (some as old as 6 months) due to be situated in and around a

building site.

My position in 2018 is the same as now - with effective and proactive planning, such developments can be navigated but not if there is no consideration or thought granted to those who are in situ and are facing significant disruption to their operations, as is the case at present. We have been told nothing about what plans they have for our school and require it quickly

# 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 Krishna Kakad

Address: 36 London House 172 Aldersgate Street London

## Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Noise
- Other
- Residential Amenity
- Traffic or Highways

Comment:As a London House resident, I will be impacted by loss of daylight and sunlight, will experience overshadowing and office light pollution from the North building. There is likely to be noise pollution from the proposed 24hr roof garden and new proposed highwalk impacting on privacy of our front facing residential unit in London House. During the 6 year demolition and construction period, there will be enormous amount of harmful particles released in the air impacting our health and (potentially) safety. Such a large development site will mean enormous amount of delivery vehicles resulting in reduction of our air quality as well as traffic congestion at our door step, for such a long time period.

More importantly, in this day and age of focussing on retrofitting and re-purposing buildings, I am not sure why this proposal is for demolishing (an existing tower) and creating two huge towers and generating so much more embodied carbon. Also, at a time when lots of office buildings in the City of London and other commercial hubs across London are sitting vacant, we are creating more

office space and generating tonnes of carbon emissions. City of London is one of the most concrete filled boroughs and we are not showing any signs of stopping after having experienced true wrath of climate change (ever hotter temperatures) in the last few years.

# 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: Caroline Pardy

Address: 54-55 Myddelton Square London

## Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Noise
- Other
- Residential Amenity
- Traffic or Highways

Comment: I wish to object the proposal for London Wall West.

A retrofitting of the site would be a better solution than the current proposal which disregards the environmental impact and the climate target of the City of London. The destruction of Bastion house and the Museum of London will emit thousands of tonnes of carbon, damaging the health of Barbican Residents, city workers and also the local surrounding school such as CLSG.

The site should not be turned into further office blocks and its scale should be greatly reduced considering the historical importance of this heritage site and its proximity to St Paul Cathedral.

The access to car park will be greatly reduce for barbican residents and visitors as well as for emergency services. I would also add that I have two young children & we frequently use the Thomas More car park to access the flat & the increased traffic would result in this being a

dangerous and polluted environment which would render this access route not possible to use with young children.

I urge you to refuse this applicaiton



# 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 Abdul Bhanji

Address: Flat 4, London House 172 Aldersgate Street London

## Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Noise
- Other
- Residential Amenity
- Traffic or Highways

Comment:

I am the owner of Flat 4, London House, 172 Aldersgate Street, London , EC1A 4HU.

I would like to lodge an objection on the London Wall West Development on the following grounds:

1. PRIVACY/LOSS OF AMENITY: The development is far too overpowering for London House. It will be overlooking London House resulting in massive loss of daylight, loss of sunlight and office light pollution from the proposed North building. There will also be Antisocial and noise pollution from the proposed 24hr roof garden and the new proposed highwalk will create privacy issues for my flat which is front facing.

2. HEALTH: During (approx. taking 6 years) there will be an enormous amount of harmful particles released impacting the area for many years. After demolition, the proposed access route for all the LWW buildings (on Aldersgate Street just opposite London House) will mean an increase of large delivery vehicles resulting in a reduction of our air quality. Both during and after demolition opening my windows will be an issue.

Abdul Bhanji

---

**From:** Fred Rodgers

**Sent:** Monday, February 19, 2024 3:37 PM

**To:** Richards, Gwyn

**Cc:** Wilkinson, Paul; Hayward, Christopher (Deputy)

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

THIS IS AN EXTERNAL EMAIL

Dear Mr Richards,

I'm afraid I've only just been referred to Appendix D on pages 56-60 of the submitted "Carbon Optioneering Study including Dashboard 1 and Dashboard 2". As a result, I've now seen an undated "Third Party Review Responses" seemingly from ARCADIS.

I may be naive but I would have thought that an independent third party review of the WLCA would be of that document. Also that such a review would have been obtained by you from a third party of your choice but at the cost of the Applicant. Obviously that isn't the case here.

Instead, the Applicant has submitted a unilaterally determined extract from an apparently larger report, seemingly prepared by ARCADIS but selected by or on behalf of the Applicant on undisclosed instructions. That hardly seems to be independent, all the more so when it's contained within a Buro Happold prepared document.

It may well be the case that, according to 2.1 on page 9 and Appendix E on pages 61-62, a third party review workshop was held with ARCADIS and you/your Officers. This isn't mentioned in the provided PPA nor have you responded to my recent email pointing out the omission. However, it appears that representatives from Buro Happold and/or the Applicant were also at the workshop. Again, that hardly seems to be independent.

In any event, please treat this email as a further objection to the above applications. It would also be of assistance if you could add the PPA and any notes of pre-application discussions to the documents already on the planning portal.

Best regards,

Fred Rodgers

100 Breton House  
Barbican  
London  
EC2Y 8PQ  
UK

On 3 Feb 2024, at 19:59, Fred Rodgers wrote:

Attachment available until 4 Mar 2024

Dear Mr Richards,

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

[Click to Download](#)

23\_01304\_FULEIA Fred Rodgers Objection Part 2 .pdf

23.6 MB

# 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 Elizabeth Rose

Address: 4 Firth Street Skipton

## Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of the Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Other

Comment: The carbon footprint of the project is a cause for concern. We're at a time where we should look to more sustainable options such as retaining and retrofitting structures, leading the way for the next generation of architects to use more sustainable methods when developing our cities.

The scheme also seems out of place within its context, towering over the neighbouring Barbican flats, and I believe this should be reconsidered to achieve a better harmony between the existing buildings and the new structure.

# 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 Aaron Shardey

Address: 89a Corrance Road London

## Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of the Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Other
- Residential Amenity

Comment: A callous mistake by the City of London to even consider such a project. The Barbican is a world renowned location for its architecture, culture and heritage. Do not allow for developers to take that away from London with yet another poorly designed and ill-considered sky scrapers that adds absolutely no culture to our city. Reimagine the space and reuse. The BT Tower is being reimaged, these things are not impossible.

# 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: Zoey Chang

Address: 274 Latymer Court Hammersmith Road London

## Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of the Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Noise
- Other
- Residential Amenity

Comment:whats the point of another soulless office building while there are so many more in London that are half empty? We need to preserve London history instead of destroying it especially when the supposed new building will not be benefiting the general public as its main goal, and at the same time create noise, pollution and even more carbon footprint. We don't need any more carbon footprint if it's not clear enough with the annual report of greenhouse gas amount hovering above the north pole.

On top of all that, demolishing completely fine buildings to build new ones just seem such a waste of money and resources all together. Why not find a piece of land elsewhere if you so feel the need to build your giant glass monsters.

# 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 Sam Weston

Address: 16 Riverside Gardens Berkhamsted

## Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of the Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: Outrageous to destroy an important piece of London's history.



# 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 andrea edwards

Address: 21 Biddestone Grove Walsall

## Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of the Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: It would be a shame to get rid of the history of London. Many people come to visit London just for the history and culture of many of the buildings.