

From:

To:

Subject: Objections to London Wall West planning application nos 23/01304/FULEIA, 23/01277/LBC, 23/01276/LBC

Date: 01 April 2024 08:01:53

THIS IS AN EXTERNAL EMAIL

I wish to register my objections to the London Wall West planning application on the following grounds:

The recent additional amendments to the planning application make a mockery of the consultation process. The publication of so many documents at this late stage make it almost impossible for anyone to review and respond to the amendments made in this application.

This is made even more difficult by the fact that any amendments that have been made are not highlighted or summarised in any kind of summary document.

The only way for anyone to assess if there are any material changes to the original application is to carry out a side-by-side comparison of the applications - a mammoth task which is inordinately time consuming and complex and not something that members of the public should realistically be expected to do.

There was no advisory note that explained the rationale or need or purpose of the new application, simply links to the new application which again contain a huge "dump" of documents amounting to 100's of pages. It simply is not acceptable to be expected to read, analyse and respond to these amendments to what is such a huge, significant and undoubtedly controversial development.

Sincerely - Barnaby Spurrier

291 Shakespeare Tower
Barbican
EC2Y 8DR

From:
To:
Subject: 23/01304/FULEIA, 23/01277/LBC, 23/01276/LBC
Date: 01 April 2024 10:31:15

THIS IS AN EXTERNAL EMAIL

I am writing to further object to the London Wall West Development Plans. In line with my previous comments, I am concerned about the impact on the environment and the failure to comply with the City's carbon targets and guidance. Equally the effect of the impact on our cultural heritage.

I would also comment on the impossibility of understanding and responding to the number of new and amended planning documents without any explanation being given and without consultation. These are unacceptable.

Elizabeth Crowther
331 Willoughby House
Barbican

Sent from my iPad

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 Julian Pickard-Garcia

Address: 10 The Postern London

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Other

Comment: Dear planning committee

I have already filed an initial objection to the initial proposal but am writing again as a concerned resident to express my strong objection to the proposed development at London Wall West and the recent amendments submitted for consideration.

While I understand the need for revisions during the planning process, the manner in which these amendments have been presented is extremely impractical and hinders a thorough public assessment of the project's true impact.

The amended documents, spanning hundreds of pages, offer no clear guidance on their purpose or the specific changes introduced. Determining if material changes exist requires painstaking side-by-side comparisons with original submissions, an unreasonable burden placed on concerned residents.

This lack of transparency and clarity creates a confusing and unsatisfactory process. It severely limits the ability of the public to provide informed feedback on the proposed amendments. The current approach undermines the principles of fair public consultation.

I urge the committee to:

- Demand revised amendments from the developer that clearly highlight ALL changes from the original submission.
- Provide a detailed summary outlining the purpose and impact of each amendment.
- Extend the public consultation period to allow sufficient time for thorough review.

Without these measures, it is impossible to meaningfully assess the amended proposal. I respectfully request that the committee takes these concerns seriously and works to ensure a transparent and accessible planning process for the community.

Sincerely,
Julian Pickard-Garcia

From:
To:
Subject: OBJECTION - LONDON WALL WEST
Date: 01 April 2024 12:37:57

THIS IS AN EXTERNAL EMAIL

It is disappointing to hear that the City are persisting in your pursuit of the above project, despite the reported huge volume of objections already lodged. Therefore, as a City of London resident I am again formally writing to you to Object to your proposals for the above site.

This redevelopment for additional commercial space is unnecessary as in the post Brexit and Covid business environment as there is more than enough underused office space already in the City. To commission yet more space is to fall for consultants' and developers' Big Lie that there is, or will be, a shortage.

The development will entail the demolition of Bastion House and the Museum of London buildings which are both of sound condition and perfectly serviceable consequently representing a waste of resources as well as a dust, noise and health hazards to adjacent residents. I also resent the fact that your proposal includes the demolition of the delightful Rotunda. This should be a treasured little gem of the City as a hidden garden for quiet reflection.

It seems that your proposals totally ignore your own guidelines for protecting the environment and carbon omissions - hypocrisy of the highest order ! Moreover, you are trying to ride roughshod over the views of local Barbican residents. Our interest is to protect and preserve this unique residential estate and Arts Centre - itself a subject of worldwide architectural and social acclaim. This status will be sorely diminished if your plans proceed to erect yet more slabs of monstrous proportions over-shadowing the Barbican. Indeed the City's attitude should be in harmony with those of its own residents' in wanting to preserve and celebrate this special area.

Whilst writing I would complain that the City are attempting to obfuscate this important issue through the dumping of massive documentation and detail with any consultation of explanation.

Best regards

Darrell Corner

565 Ben Jonson House
Barbican
London EC2Y 8NH

From:
To:
Subject: Objections to London Wall West.
Date: 01 April 2024 13:21:15

THIS IS AN EXTERNAL EMAIL

Dear Sir/Madam,

Re. 23/01304/FULEIA
23/01277/LBC
23/01276/LBC

I oppose the London Wall West plans. The City of London's release of a whole new tranche of planning documents is completely heedless of ordinary people's ability to digest or make sense of this material in time to comment before the deadline of 6th April. I have no doubt that the timing is deliberate as this has been done in the run up to Easter when schools are breaking up and people are away.. Given the City is marking its own homework - both putting forward the planning applications then sitting in judgement on them (how is this impartial?) - one can only conclude that the planning process is being gamed in the City's favour. If the City and its friends in the construction industry are both going to benefit from the plans being realised then the whole process needs to be totally transparent instead of the sham we now have to put up with. In a recent article in the business pages of The Evening Standard about new City building projects the journalist referred to opposition to them as suspiciously organised. He did not justify this. What's suspicious is his support for the City of London's rampant appetite for demolition and office block construction heedless of heritage, need, the environment and effect on community. It is evident the City is going through the motions regarding consultation and is intent on forcing its will come what may. Shame on you.

Tony Lee
301 Seddon House
EC2Y 8BX.

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 Patrick Gibbons

Address: Flat 206 Seddon House Barbican London

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Other
- Residential Amenity

Comment: I wish to add an additional objection on four grounds.

1) I have become aware of the disruption, noise and dirt that the planned demolition will cause on the Thomas More Carpark ramp. This will be deleterious to everyone living at the western end of the Barbican estate and will slow down our delivery vehicles.

2) The governance of this planning process is severely questionable. Why was such the recent huge document dump actioned? What is the purpose of such a move, other than to conceal something?

3) The predictions for climate impact change from carbon are more drastic now than ever. Dumping huge amounts of carbon into the atmosphere (and hundreds of tonnes of building material into landfill) are completely immoral.

4) The proposal is not aligned with the emerging London local plan or the City's own ESG commitments. There are no values guiding this operation.

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 tom Sparks

Address: 203 Shakespeare Tower Barbican London

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Noise
- Other
- Residential Amenity

Comment: Having seen the proposal for the development at the London wall site I am left a little staggered by the images that look like a set of third rate look dev pieces for an nth rate science fiction movie, Just more cookie cutter Autodesk inspired architecture that leaves me feeling depressed, how these childish buildings are going to sit comfortably with Barbican estate is completely beyond me.

Why is it so difficult for the 'planners' to imagine reusing the structures that are already in place? even if that would entail reworking the interiors. The buildings that are sprouting with alarming speed in the area surrounding The Barbican are decreasing in quality and visual interest with each new 'project'.

In my opinion leaving one's creative 'fingerprints'

on a job is not always a sign of visionary greatness, sometimes it's best to do as little as possible, rather than the opposite...

The absolute inevitability of tastelessness is dispiriting beyond words, and the efforts to 'sell' this

misguided project to people, seem solely aimed at property developers.

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 Dominic Silcott

Address: 21 Heriot ave 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:- 23/01304/FULEIA - Demolition of 140 & 150 London Wall to provide a phased development etc

- 23/01277/LBC - External alterations to existing highwalks at the Barbican Estate etc

- 23/01276/LBC - Demolition of Ferroners' House etc

I OBJECT to all three applications on the grounds set out below.

1. Planning process: It is premature to treat these proposals as valid applications. The pre-application and post-application consultations contained misleading and partial information and visuals, contrary to guidance and with regard to the impact on heritage assets and carbon optioneering in particular.
2. Demolition breaches the Local Plan, City Plan, London Plan and NPPF policies on sustainability. No consideration has been given to the retention options on which the soft market

test was based.

The applicant's own Whole Life Carbon Assessment is not robust. The most sustainable option has never been considered. Once demolished, there is no going back.

3. The scale and massing of the scheme being proposed have no "regard to their surroundings and the historic and local character of the City". The scheme is completely out of scale with its surroundings on Aldersgate St and the Barbican.

4. Design: National Planning Policy states that development must add to the overall quality of the area, not just for the short term, and be sympathetic to local character and history. This proposal is not sympathetic to the surrounding urban landscape.

5. Damage to Heritage Assets - no consideration has been given to the designation of Bastion House and the Museum of London as Non-designated Heritage Assets. The setting of some of the City's most important listed assets (Barbican, St Giles, Postman's Park) will be substantially harmed.

6. Damage to amenity: Sunlight and daylight will be restricted to an unacceptable level for neighbouring homes from this scheme creates substantial harm because of its size and scale. This has been misleadingly presented in the glossy images.

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 Nick Astbury

Address: 522 WILLOUGHBY HOUSE Barbican London

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of the Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Other

Comment: Dear Sir/Madam

Re: The London Wall West scheme. As Barbican Residents we have been increasingly surrounded by new office developments during the past 20+ years. Another vast development instead of The Museum of London and Bastion House is completely unnecessary and contrary to the City's Climate Action Strategy, as it would add over 50,000 tonnes of CO2 to the already over-polluted atmosphere. The current buildings are attractive and could be re-purposed. The huge new development will cause light pollution, noise and lack of privacy to nearby Barbican residents who already have endured years of surrounding building work. There is virtually no cultural space (as initially envisioned) but rather more office space that in the current climate is not needed. We urge you to please withdraw this scheme.

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 Percy Preston

Address: 115 Willoughby House London

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Noise
- Other

Comment: The Museum of London and Bastion House are fine examples of the architecture of the period. The space should be salvaged and repurposed. This is even more the case when you consider the environmental impact (carbon, waste and noise) that will inevitably be generated by demolishing and rebuilding. The City of London should be leading the way in building a sustainable future, not encouraging more irresponsible developments.

From:

To:

Cc:

Subject: Objections to London Wall West planning application nos 23/01304/FULEIA, 23/01277/LBC, 23/01276/LBC

Date: 02 April 2024 08:01:06

THIS IS AN EXTERNAL EMAIL

I wish to register my objections to the London Wall West planning application on the following grounds:

I note that on the latest planning application the scheme has not been discussed with LFB. Can we be assured that all the necessary consultations and approvals with regards to fire safety are granted and adhered to? In particular I would also like assurance that the impact of the new use of the Thomas Moore carpark ramp for so many additional service vehicles will have no negative impact on the LFB's assessment of the access for emergency vehicles to the residential buildings accessed by the ramp.

Sincerely - Barnaby Spurrier

291 Shakespeare Tower
Barbican
EC2Y 8DR

Comments for Planning Application 23/01304/FULEIA

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/01304/FULEIA

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

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

Case Officer: Gemma Delves

Customer Details

Name: Mrs Jill Jones

Address: 62 Shakespeare Tower Barbican London

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Other
- Residential Amenity

Comment: Dear Ms Delves

We object to this current proposal 23/01304/FULEIA for the following reasons

1. Size and scale of the proposed buildings. The massing is of a scale not yet seen in the area adjacent to the Barbican, both too high and wide, setting an enormous precedent. It is inconsistent with the Local Plan for this part of the City of London and will disrupt the views of St Pauls Cathedral (protected by the London Building Acts of 1888 and 1894). These views are not only enjoyed by local City residents/workers, but are a feature for tourism on the South Bank where the view of St Pauls' is clear, with only the three listed Barbican Towers in the background.
2. The proposed destruction process of the existing buildings will be highly damaging - especially on carbon release. It is contra to good global practice and this approach already seems backward - looking - not in tune with current global propulsion on environmental goals nor at a local level, e.g. recent Ministerial rejection of plans e.g. to demolish the Oxford Street Marks and Spencer store (August 2023). Ref: APP/X5990/V/3301508
3. Office Space risk vs Strategic planning opportunity. It is unsurprising the proposal confirms

there is demand for office space in the City. However, there should be a truly independent verification of estimates. With City based businesses already wrestling with how to fill space as employees drive lifestyle-based changes and more flexible attendance, this level of independent assessment is critical, as prolonged empty commercial/office space propels a downward momentum on engagement and use (One New Change is already suffering from this as the development does not cater for visitor footfall). Additionally, how does this proposal fit with the City's Visitor Strategy? We ask for a) an independent review of office space requirements and b) Review of how this fits with the Visitor strategy. Currently, this proposal appears already out of date with both vision and employment practice

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 Scott Palmer

Address: Flat 102, Willoughby House Barbican London

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer made comments neither objecting to or supporting the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: The graded parts of the site should not be touched. Much of the site is under the Barbican graded boundary. I think some redevelopment is a good idea but should include a maximum amount of public space which can be used and some of the features of the current site should be kept including the iconic rotunda, some of the original white tiles walls and even Bastion House which is also iconic. I doubt the cascading green waterfalls of plans in the architect drawing will materialise. It looks like an over promise.

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 Robert Dufton

Address: 55 Thomas More House Barbican London

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Noise
- Other

Comment: I am a City resident of 25 years standing and since 2010 have lived in Thomas More House on the Barbican. I have objected before to the scheme on environmental grounds in terms of the impact on my future health caused by the TMH ramp becoming the sole access route, leading to noise, pollution through HGV deliveries. I am now complaining because of environmental impact of the carbon and waste, non-compliance with the City's own carbon targets, guidance and the emerging local plan, the impact on the heritage.

In addition I am complaining about the lack of transparency in terms of the City's refusal to make a public report relating to its wish to obtain a new certificate of immunity from listing for the existing buildings on the site.