

City of London

Appendix B

**Supplementary Planning Document**  
Barbican Listed Building Management Guidelines Volume 4 –  
Landscape SPD, Part 2 – Good Practice and Part 3 – Green  
Infrastructure

**Consultation Statement**

**October 2014**



Infrastructure were published in draft for public consultation during a six-week period from 29 August to 10 October 2014.

Regulations 11 and 12 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 require the City Corporation to prepare a consultation statement setting out who was consulted when preparing a supplementary planning document, a summary of the main issues raised by those persons and how these have been addressed in the SPD.

The following measures were taken to consult the public on the SPD during the consultation period:

**Website.** The draft SPD and supporting documents were made available on the City Corporation's web site. Information and a link were provided on the home page of the City's website and on the landing page of the Planning section of the website to ensure maximum exposure. The Corporate Twitter account was used to 'tweet' the details of the consultation at the start of the consultation period. Information was provided in the City of London e-shot.

**Inspection copies.** A copy of the SPDs, the SPD documents and a statement of the SPD matters was made available at the Planning Information desk at the Guildhall, the Guildhall, Barbican, Artizan Street and Shoe Lane public libraries, the Barbican Estate Office, the Foyers of Lauderdale Tower, Shakespeare Tower and Cromwell Tower.

**Notifications.** Letters and emails containing information about the draft SPDs and inviting comments were sent to relevant specific and general consultation bodies. The City Corporation maintains a database of all those who have expressed an interest in planning policy, and letters or emails were also sent to all those on the list. Notifications were also sent by email to the mailing list of residents held by the Barbican Estate Office.

**Posters and leaflets** advertising the Conservation Area SPDs consultation and inviting comments were placed in the Guildhall, Barbican, Artizan Street and Shoe Lane public libraries. There were also placed on noticeboards around the Barbican Estate

Comments were received from English Heritage, City of London Archaeological Trust, The Natural England, The Theatres Trust, The Barbican Association, Lauderdale Tower House Group, Gilbert House Group and members of the public. The tables that follow summarise the comments and explain how they were addressed in finalising the SPD.

The planned preparation of the draft SPD was posted in the Local Plan Bulletin and on the Consultations page of the City of London website. Members of the public were invited to make comments to contribute to the preparation of the draft SPD. No such comments were received. In order to assist the preparation of the draft SPD, a Working party of officers, residents and consultants was formed. 5 working party meetings were held from January to May 2014

## Summary of comments and responses

| Comment  | Response             |
|--|----------------------|
| <b>English Heritage</b>  |                      |
| <p>As the Government's adviser on the historic environment English Heritage is keen to ensure that the protection of the historic environment is fully taken into account at all stages and levels of the local planning process. Accordingly, English Heritage welcomes the opportunity to comment upon the above draft SPD.</p> <p>We have reviewed these documents against the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and its core principle that heritage assets be conserved in a manner appropriate to their significance, so that they can be enjoyed for their contribution to the quality of life of this and future generations.</p> <p>In our view the document is well researched, thorough and will contribute positively to the effective management of this important heritage asset and its setting. As such we do not wish to offer detailed comments at this stage.</p> <p>It must be noted that this advice is based on the information provided by the City and for the avoidance of doubt does not reflect our obligation to advise the City on, and potentially object to, any specific development proposals which may have adverse effects on the historic environment.</p> | No response required |
| <b>Natural England</b>   |                      |
| <p>The proposed Supplementary Planning Document guidance does not impact on the areas of interest for Natural England and merely seek to clarify and strengthen the document further, therefore Natural England do not wish to offer any substantive comments in respect of the Barbican Listed Buildings Management Guidelines.</p>   | No response required |

| Comment  | Response  |
|--|---|
| <b>City of London Archaeological Trust (CoLAT)</b>   |   |
| <p>In general, the document seems thorough and considerate of the monuments such as the City wall. Part IV is of the most interest to us. The above-ground portions of city wall and towers seem to be in good condition. We note that the site of Roman and medieval Cripplegate is beneath the north end of Wood Street, and that the outline of the medieval gate could in theory be laid out on the ground, to connect the surviving parts of the City wall on both sides.</p> <p>Despite the Corporation's efforts over the years to give St Giles church and its surroundings a number of historical references, we are not sure it is completely successful. Again, the streelines of the former buildings as they met the church and outlined both sides of Fore Street adjacent to the church could be laid out. They would anchor the church better and be a curiosity within the rectilinear emphasis of this part of the Barbican, showing the former townscape.</p> | <p>The comment is noted and the suggestion will be considered should the opportunity to undertake such works arise.</p> |
| <b>Gresham College</b>   |   |
| Gresham College has no particular comments on this development   | No response required.   |
| <b>The Theatres Trust</b>  |   |
| <p>The Trust supports the draft Supplementary Planning Document, particularly the elements related to improving access and pedestrian way finding through the estate to the Barbican Centre. We are pleased that it recognises opportunities to improve Beech Street as an important pedestrian route to and from Barbican Station (and the future Crossrail Station) and support the suggested improvements such as public art, better signage, improved lighting and other measures to improve access and the pedestrian experience.</p>   | No response required  |
| <b>The Barbican Association</b>  |   |
| <p>We write on behalf of the Barbican Association, the recognized tenants' association for the Barbican Estate.</p> <p>We are grateful to the City of London for the transparent process under which this volume of the guidelines has been produced, so far. We do feel that the officers and other contributors have listened to our concerns, recommendations and suggestions.</p>  |   |

| Comment   | Response  |
|---|---|
| <p>Our main points at this stage are:</p> <p>1. We appreciate that in producing these guidelines (which are limited to the hard and soft landscaping and do not include the residential blocks) conflicting views may arise but believe that the detailed approach taken is correct. We recommend that these guidelines are adopted.</p> <p>2. In particular, we believe that the approach taken in the suggestion of “significant vistas”, see 1.5.75-76, is important, and we urge its retention in the final document. We would prefer it if the wording in 1.5.76 was strengthened to make clear to users of the guidelines that the balance should be against new interventions within the arcs of these vistas.</p> | <p>1. Noted. No response required.</p> <p>2. Paragraphs 1.5.75-76 clearly state that the potential impact of any intervention in exterior spaces of the estate (not only including those identified as significant vistas) should be carefully considered. In addition, the importance of the significant vistas is identified in the Black Category of the Management Guidelines – ‘Proposals for which a LBC application would be required, which would have an impact on the significance of the estate and could cause substantial harm or loss’. This language is sufficient to ensure that any proposals are carefully considered against potential harm caused and the identified significance of the views within the guidelines.</p> |

| Comment   | Response  |
|---|---|
| <p>3. The whole western façade of the Listed estate from Fann Street to the Thomas More car park deserves a more nuanced description and consideration. It can be daunting, but in part this is a deliberate, important historical reference to the concept of a barbican as a fortification. There is a rhythm: the tall YMCA [2 Fann Street] building, the lower John Trundle House, the tall Lauderdale Tower, the lower Seddon House and the corner to the lower Thomas More House, then finishing with the Aldersgate Turret. Incorporated within this are the fortified covered walkways with the barrel-vaulted roofs. Within this rhythm, the principle entrance is via the Beech Street covered roadway with secondary pedestrian-only entrances via White Lyon Court (off Fann Street) and via the Aldersgate Turret. (There are also two ramped entrances to low-level car parks.) We believe that the guidelines should carefully consider these public façades, noting that the forbidding, stark surfaces are deliberate and should be retained and that no attempt should be made to introduce new ground-level or street-level public access routes through them.</p> | <p>3. Any changes or new additions to these elements are clearly identified in the red category, as works that require a LBC application. In order to further clarify the significance of this feature, additional text will be inserted at the beginning of paragraph 1.5.67. “The architectural rhythm of the western edge of the estate can be clearly seen in the ‘up and down’ nature of the buildings themselves, beginning with the tall former YMCA [2 Fann Street] building, the lower John Trundle House, the tall Lauderdale Tower, the lower Seddon House and the corner to the lower Thomas More House, then finishing with the Aldersgate Turret. This further reinforces the architectural impression of fortification and crenellation that repeats in a variety of forms across the estate.”</p> |
| <p>4. We expect increasing demand for bicycle racks within or close to the curtilage of the Listed estate. We would like the guidelines to recommend that racks be placed across the road from the estate, but where it is necessary for them to be in a publicly visible area of the estate itself, the guidelines should indicate careful consideration of their positioning, orientation, shape, colour and finish. Great care should be taken that neither the racks themselves, nor any bicycles attached, obstruct the routes of residents including Persons of Restricted Mobility. In addition, we would like to see a further recommendation to City officers that when bicycle racks are installed on the pavements immediately next to, but outside of, the Listed curtilage, then an approved Barbican design should be used. (An unfortunate, very recent example is the stainless steel racks on the west side of Silk Street.)</p>   | <p>4. Outside the curtilage of the listed building, bike racks will be sited where most appropriate and the design will be the standard design used elsewhere in the City of London. We are unable to place additional controls on bike racks outside the curtilage of the listed building. Within the curtilage of the listed building, bike racks have been identified in the red category as requiring Listed Building Consent, in order that the positioning, orientation, shape, colour and finish can be carefully controlled. The Access team will also be consulted in order to ensure that no obstruction will be caused.</p>  |

| Comment  | Response  |
|--|---|
| <p>5. Benches – We would like to draw your attention to the Street Furniture Catalogue – Benches: “Type E[,] Location: Upper podium[,] Materials: Double sided steel frame[,] timber slats”. Whilst this design has not gained much favour with the authors of the draft guidelines (see 2.2.9), we believe that this should be reconsidered. The design has a very strong horizontal slatted element and we believe that this resonates well with the façade of Ben Jonson House on the Upper Podium. (We note the Barbican Estate Office intends to reinstate such benches in the adjacent Beech Gardens area once the current works are completed.)</p> <p>6. Appendix A1 – Mapping Drawings – “FURNITURE &amp; LIGHTING”. We note that this draft map does NOT fully reflect the locations of all the benches and lighting in the Beech Gardens area before the current works. Given the important status of the final version of these guidelines we believe that there should be further liaison between yourselves and the Barbican Estate Office to determine any different or additional locations, such as the benches in the shrubs on the south side of the “dingly dell” area and, we think, lighting by the Bryer Court pond.</p> <p>7. Thomas More Garden – we would like more prominence given to recording the design of the crenellated concrete slab paths in this garden. They clearly date from the original layout of the garden and appear carefully designed. We believe that the crenellations contain multiple references: to the concept of a barbican as a fortification, to the crenellations on the north and south walls of the church of St. Giles Cripplegate, and, more importantly and subtly, the paths appear as a horizontal manifestation of both the silhouette of Shakespeare Tower and a vertical section through the terrace blocks Thomas More House, Defoe House and Seddon House.</p> <p>We would like to record our thanks to Avanti Architects Ltd and J&amp;L Gibbons LLP for their courtesies throughout this process.</p> | <p>5. Our interpretation of the text in paragraph 2.2.9 is that Bench Type E is deemed as suitable for podium locations and around St Giles.</p> <p>6. Noted. There will be continued work between the Department of the Built Environment and the barbican Estate to ensure that the mapping is correct. However, as this is contained within the Appendix, the adoption of the SPD can continue.</p> <p>7. Paragraph 1.5.18 concerns the crenelated edging of the pathways. Changes or new additions to tiling and paving slabs also appear in the red category as requiring a LBC application. An additional sentence will be inserted in paragraph 1.5.18 to further reinforce the importance of this element. “The arrangement of the paved pathways with a crenelated edge was a deliberate act to further unify the design concept of the Barbican and the fortified nature of the site through a wide variety of elements and planes (both vertical and horizontal).”</p> |

| Comment   | Response   |
|---|--|
| <p><b>Lauderdale Tower House Group</b></p> <p>I write on behalf of the Lauderdale Tower House Group, the recognized tenants' association for Lauderdale Tower in the Barbican Estate.</p> <p>We support the comments made by the Barbican Association (BA) which have already been submitted by Garth Leder.</p> <p>We agree strongly with the BA that (using the BA's numbering):</p> <p>(2) In particular, we believe that the approach taken in the suggestion of "significant vistas", see 1.5.75-76, is important, and we urge its retention in the final document. We would prefer it if the wording in 1.5.76 was strengthened to make clear to users of the guidelines that the balance should be against new interventions within the arcs of these vistas.</p> <p>(3) The whole western façade of the Listed estate from Fann Street to the Thomas More car park deserves a more nuanced description and consideration. It can be daunting, but in part this is a deliberate, important historical reference to the concept of a barbican as a fortification. There is a rhythm: the tall YMCA [2 Fann Street] building, the lower John Trundle House, the tall Lauderdale Tower, the lower Seddon House and the corner to the lower Thomas More House, then finishing with the Aldersgate Turret. Incorporated within this are the fortified covered walkways with the barrel-vaulted roofs. Within this rhythm, the principle entrance is via the Beech Street covered roadway with secondary pedestrian-only entrances via White Lyon Court (off Fann Street) and via the Aldersgate Turret. (There are also two ramped entrances to low-level car parks.) We believe that the guidelines should carefully consider these public façades, noting that the forbidding, stark surfaces are deliberate and should be retained and that no attempt should be made to introduce new ground-level or street-level public access routes through them.</p> |  |
|   | <p>2. See Comment for the Barbican Association above.</p> <p>3. See Comment for the Barbican Association above</p> |



| Comment  | Response   |
|--|--|
| <p>(4) We expect increasing demand for bicycle racks within or close to the curtilage of the Listed estate. We would like the guidelines to recommend that racks be placed across the road from the estate, but where it is necessary for them to be in a publicly visible area of the estate itself, the guidelines should indicate careful consideration of their positioning, orientation, shape, colour and finish. Great care should be taken that neither the racks themselves, nor any bicycles attached, obstruct the routes of residents including Persons of Restricted Mobility. In addition, we would like to see a further recommendation to City officers that when bicycle racks are installed on the pavements immediately next to, but outside of, the Listed curtilage, then an approved Barbican design should be used. (An unfortunate, very recent example is the stainless steel racks on the west side of Silk Street.)</p> | <p>4. See Comment for the Barbican Association above</p> |

| Comment   | Response  |
|---|---|
| <b>Gilbert House Group</b>  |   |
| <p>The Listing of the Barbican Estate Buildings including all the open spaces between them provides a protection in law of this 20th century architectural heritage in the City of London. These Management Guidelines are welcomed as a thorough description of how this preservation and conservation can be achieved. We wish to thank the authors and all those who have contributed to them.</p> <p>Comments are offered below to give added emphasis to observations made or actions hinted at:</p> <p>The following general points are particularly welcomed:</p> <p>1. 1.2.4 The special interest and significance of the Estate is a central focus throughout the document as is the need for best practice and conservation principles.</p> <p>2. 1.2.7 The Traffic Light system regarding the need, or not, to apply for Listed Building Consent (LBC) is welcomed and is a strong framework of guidance. This was the framework set out in Volume 2 of this series of four concerning the Listed Building Management Guidelines for the Barbican Estate. Keeping the same system provides welcome consistency. It is said of the Traffic Lights content that ‘the list is not exhaustive’. (page 9)</p> <p>Comment: this caveat is welcomed as new contingencies always arise. It is noted that a key criterion for the need to apply for LBC is whether proposed works ‘would impact on the Estate’s character and significance’.</p> <p>3.1.2.8. The emphasis on repair, maintenance and upgrade plus guidance on best practice is a valuable object, so, too, is the following sensible emphasis ‘It is the object of these Guidelines to provide a more informed and systematic framework for regulating such interventions.’ i.e. repair, maintenance and upgrade.</p> <p>4. 1.6.10- 1.6.13 – Access and Legislative requirements: we welcome very greatly the inclusion of these paragraphs and trust that the spirit and intentions are followed through with vigour by the planners.</p> <p>Comment: for example It is not clear in practice that ‘all residents have access to all gardens’ independently. (3.2.4). We ask for a serious review of wheelchair access to all key areas of the Barbican including the gardens.</p> | <p>1. Noted. No response required</p> <p>2. Noted. No response required</p> <p>3. Noted. No response required</p> <p>4. Noted. This comment will be passed to the Barbican Estate Management and the Access team.</p> |

| Comment   | Response  |
|---|---|
| <p>5.1.7.10 Amber Traffic Lights (sec. 1 Page 65) – a definition of the word ‘temporary’ is very welcome indeed in the Blue Guidelines..</p> <p>6 1.7.11 Red Traffic Light – works that require an LBC. (Sec.1 Changes or new additions – Blue Guidance Notes page 67.) The following statement is especially welcomed: ‘Retrospective changes to re-instate or achieve best practice design are encouraged but are also subject to an LBC application’. Welcome, too, is the following paragraph beginning: ‘As a general principle, any works to exterior hard landscape should take opportunities to redress previous localised, ill-matched or piecemeal remedial work.....’etc</p> <p>7. 1.2.9 Finally the intention is welcomed that this Volume is to be a ‘working manual’ and that it will be reviewed in the light of use and experience, new advances etc.</p> <p>The following observations about specific headings in the Executive Summary are offered to emphasize some of the points in the paragraph quoted or hints of possible actions:</p> <p>1.2.10 and elsewhere eg 2.3.12) Wayfinding<br/>Comment: this may not be an issue for the general public. Visually ‘less is more’. ie. avoid signage clutter.</p> <p>1.3.15-1.3.17 Planting (3.1.5, 3.1.6, 3.1.15. and elsewhere)<br/>Comment: The detail of 3.1.15 is welcomed. 1.3.12, 3.1.5 and 3.1.6 are also noted: we favour as close an adherence to any original planting guidance as is sensible and support firm central curatorial control of the planting, eventually within the proposed ELMS.</p> <p>1.3.25 Gridded Tiles<br/>Comment: there is a place for these but they are not visually entirely in keeping. Encourage a conservative approach – if over-extended they could give rise to a noise issue.</p> <p>1.5.16 The Water Cascade<br/>Comment: the acknowledgement is welcomed that the water flow is sadly diminished and that a convincing volume of water is essential. The waterfall is a sad thing these days. It used to be a great feature of the landscape and was clearly envisaged as such.</p> | <p>5. Noted. No response required</p> <p>6. Noted. No response required</p> <p>7. Noted. No response required</p> <p>Wayfinding – Noted. No response required</p> <p>Planting – Noted. No response required</p> <p>Gridded Tiles – We assume that the gridded tiles referred to, are the non-slip type – with a grid cut into the surface. This type is being phased out and work will slowly be undertaken to replace this with a new non-slip, non-gridded tile across the estate.<br/>Water Cascade</p> <p>Noted. No response required</p> |

| Comment   | Response  |
|---|---|
| <p>1.5.73 GSMD Roof Garden.<br/> Comment: it is good to see this area brought into the guidelines. The Roof Garden has been neglected for almost 15 years. Recently there has been a modest tentative improvement but there is a good opportunity to develop the Garden.</p> <p>1.5.74 Regret that this GSMD roof garden used to be accessible to residents about 10 years ago via gated access using resident keys. This is no longer the case. Request that this garden could be opened again for residents maybe on the same day (s) as the Conservatory is open.<br/> Green Space in general: no usable area in the City should be neglected and there is another roof space above the canopy covering the podium walkway heading south from the South Entrance to Gilbert House. Many years ago it was planted but not now. Could this also receive mention and attention in Landscape Volume 4.</p> <p>Character Analysis of the Estate Landscape Spaces by Zones (pages 30-52).<br/> 1.5.13 – the sunken ‘dells’-‘a highly distinctive architectural feature’.<br/> Comment – these ‘dells’ are beautiful and deserve repair and cleaning. The paving of the dells is crumbling.</p> <p>1.5.15 – the lake and its ‘aerator’ fountains (also 2.2.19 and 2.2.20).<br/> Comment: The aerator fountains in mid lake look good but they create ‘white noise’.</p> <p>1.5.18 (also 1.6.10 and 11) – paved pathways in the gardens<br/> Comment: some paving slabs in both gardens are now very uneven and are a hazard for all users including children, especially anyone with a mobility problem, pushing a pram and/or with poor sight. Proper levelling and maintenance of this aspect of the gardens is required.</p> <p>1.5.23 – St Giles Terrace and the restriction of vehicular traffic (see also 2.1.4 Ponding below) .<br/> Comment: We endorse the comments here particularly in respect of controlling and restricting vehicular traffic.</p> <p>1.5.63 – ‘Along the remainder of the Silk St frontage there is also the ...’ Silk Street vehicular entrance to Barbican Car Parks –<br/> Comment: this main car and taxi entrance to the Barbican Arts Centre does not at all reflect the Barbican Arts Centre it serves. It requires a complete overhaul and renewal.</p> | <p>1.5.74 – GSMD roof – will explore additional access arrangements with GSMD management.</p> <p>Green Space – descriptions of the planted areas cannot be exhaustive, however the principles relating to the management of the spaces are to be accepted across the board. In relation to this particular space – there may be a ‘working at height’ safety issue involved in its maintenance. This comment will be passed to the Barbican Estate Management team.</p> <p>1.5.13 – Sunken Dells – Noted. No response required<br/> 1.5.15 – Noted. Comment passed to Barbican Estate Management Team</p> <p>1.5.18 - Noted. Comment passed to Barbican Estate Management Team.</p> <p>1.5.23 – Noted. No response required.</p> <p>1.5.63 - Noted. No response required.</p> |

| Comment   | Response  |
|---|---|
| <p>1.5.70, 1.5.71, 1.5.72 Car Parks.<br/> Comment: we understand that the Car Parks, funded through their own separate account, operate on a very tight budget. There is a resident view that they need very much improved maintenance and particularly careful management. The term 'good stewardship' does not entirely express the upgrade which is required.</p> <p>Pressure for Change (pages 53-57)<br/> 1.6.7 – Physical deterioration<br/> Comment: we endorse fully the comments about the deterioration of the tiling all around the Estate and the need for high quality repair and maintenance of this large and vital area.<br/> Comment: The Barbican walkways are effectively part of the City's public streets and should therefore be kept in as good a state of repair and maintenance as any other street. At the moment they most definitely are not.</p> <p>Part Two – Good Practice Guidance (pages 70-94)<br/> 2.1.14 – Ponding, cracking and poor run-off etc (see also 1.7.10 point 5 and para. 1.5.23 above.)<br/> Comment: The deteriorations mentioned here describe the situation on St Giles Terrace, where illegal parking contributes to the damage, and surrounding lower walls. We trust that there will be continued efforts to remedy this deterioration and the perceived drainage problem on the Terrace. we welcome the proposition that there should continue to be diagnosis in order to identify and if necessary 'to correct the underlying technical defects'.</p> <p>2.2.17 Bins.<br/> Comment: We agree that there should be as much standardisation of Barbican bin design as possible though achieving one type/design of bin which suits each specific purpose around the Estate, as suggested, may be difficult. For example - We understand that the bins outside the Barbican Arts Centre were chosen with care to ensure the bins in this location are covered to ensure that food remnants do not attract pigeons, foxes or rats.</p> <p>2.2.25 and 2.2.26 Bicycle stands.<br/> Comment: The unified recommended design of all stands is welcomed (2.2.26. However it seems much too open-ended just to say that stands should be 'located where convenient.'</p> | <p>Car Parks – Noted. This is an issue of the management of the estate. The comment will be passed to the Barbican Estate Management Team.</p> <p>Pressure for Change. Noted. This is an issue of the management of the estate. The comment will be passed to the Barbican Estate Management Team.</p> <p>Good Practice Guidance. Noted. This is an issue of the management of the estate. The comment will be passed to the Barbican Estate Management Team.</p> <p>Bins. Noted. No response required.</p> <p>Bicycle stands. The text in 2.2.26, bullet point 3, will be altered to say 'located where appropriate....'</p> |

| Comment  | Response  |
|--|---|
| <p><b>John Whitehead</b></p> <p>In respect of Volume 4 I will restrict myself to one point. There is a serious omission in section 1.5.62 – Miscellaneous Estate Perimeter Zones. There is no reference to the important approach to the Barbican from Golden Lane to the north.</p> <p>Golden Lane, partly within the London Borough of Islington, is substantially tree-lined creating a soft counterpoint to the hard lined views of the Barbican as it is approached from this direction. On the west wide Golden Lane borders the Grade II listed Golden Lane Estate, also by CPB.</p> <p>Between Golden Lane Estate and the Barbican are just two buildings.</p> <p>Closest to the Barbican is the former Cripplegate Institute building at 1 Golden Lane. Although now converted to office use, the Victorian facade of this building is also listed. Between 1 Golden Lane and the Golden Lane Estate is the police section house at 43 Golden Lane, built contemporaneously with the Golden Lane Estate. Although not itself listed, 45 Golden Lane, designed by the then chief architect of the Metropolitan Police, was clearly built to match and complement the building lines of Golden Lane estate itself, and as such forms an essential architectural link between the two BPB estates in the Barbican and Golden Lane.</p> <p>There are two immediate entry approaches to the Barbican from Golden Lane. Golden Lane joins the Beech Street tunnel via a monumental proscenium arch with flats above. On the west side of this, close to 1 Golden Lane is a rising walkway, remodelled at the time that 1 Golden Lane was converted to commercial use, which curves and rises up to the Barbican podium.</p> <p>Preliminary Ecological Assessment<br/>I have two points to make about this assessment. The report is substantially based on a single day's survey conducted during March and as such only gives a very sample snap shot of the Barbican's full ecological diversity.</p> | <p>The comment is noted; however there is mention of both these elements in other parts of the document. The entry into Beech Street from the north via Bridgewater street and Golden lane is covered in paragraph 1.5.55. The ramp is mentioned in paragraph 1.5.43 which concerns the Upper podium/Ben Jonson terrace.</p> <p>This comment is noted. However, it is unavoidable as any assessment will inevitably take place only at one fixed point. Further work is intended to develop an ELM for the entire site.</p> |

| Comment  | Response   |
|--|--|
| <p>There is, for instance, no acknowledgement of the ornithological diversity that the Barbican supports, including regular visits by jays and herons, occasional sightings of woodpeckers and even a woodcock (in Thomas More Gardens) and a kingfisher (on the lake by Wallside), as well as our resident peregrine falcons.</p> <p>Secondly, the report singles out cotoneaster horizontalis as an invasive species which should be rooted out and burned wherever encountered. Putting aside the fact that I have planted one example myself in the one of the two concrete planters that I garden in an award winning, wildlife friendly manner in front of Breton House, I strongly challenge the suggestion that this plant is a menace that merits the same treatment as Japanese knotweed.</p> <p>Cotoneaster horizontalis provides berries that are readily taken by birds, including many winter migrants and it can attractively soften the lines of concrete planters when planted at the corners.</p> <p>Many residents also use this plant in their window boxes (see the first floor level at the west end of Defoe House). Is the planting of this species on balconies to be banned?</p> <p>Sorry, but this is a nonsense. Cotoneaster horizontalis grows very slowly and any unwanted self-seeded plants can be simply removed.</p> | <p>We are taking advice from the landscape consultant regarding this point.</p>                  |
| <p><b>John Taysum</b></p>  |  |
| <p>Please enter my comments into the consultation process for the final draft of the Barbican Listed Building Management Guidelines Volume IV Landscape.</p> <p>My comments are about the main text, but also details of the Appendix A1 Mapping Drawings, Appendix A2 Street Furniture Schedule and captions to Appendix A9 Photographic Survey.</p> <p>Main Text:</p> <p>At 1.5.46 in the fifth line, the original 1980's layout, should read, the original 1970's layout.</p> <p>At 1.5.48 the last word, godwhattery, may be incorrect spelling; suggest godwottery, or use less obscure words.</p>  | <p>Amended - now reads '1970s design (1980s layout)'</p> <p>Amended – now reads 'godwottery'</p> |

| Comment   | Response  |
|---|---|
| <p>At 2.1.8 about Paving. The Beech Gardens and White Lyon Court re-paving is referenced. I am involved in the Project Board for this as representative for Bryer Court and have expressed concerns that some areas of the re-paving are of poor quality in several respects. The sample areas agreed in advance with CoL planners for public consultation have been destroyed in the subsequent re- paving, so we no longer have exemplars of the approved tiling specification to refer to. Therefore the need has arisen to identify an exemplar for quality control. An exemplar location should really be agreed and given in these guidelines to maintain the same high standards of re-paving throughout the Barbican. I suggest the Project Manager, Chris Bate is consulted about this by LBMG planning officers while both projects are on-going.</p> | <p>Noted. Ongoing work on the paving is taking place. An exemplar, once identified, will be included in part 2 – good practice guidance, which is intended to be a working document that can be added to as specifications and exemplars for specific types of work are identified.</p> |
| <p>At 2.2.19 Water Features. Second line should read Types D/E/F (these are the lake, central zone).</p>  | <p>Amended – now reads ‘Types D / E / F’</p>  |
| <p>At 2.2.20 second line should read Types A/B/G (these are on the north podium).</p>   | <p>Amended – now reads ‘Types A/B/G’</p>  |
| <p>Appendix A1 Mapping Drawings:</p> <p>On Barbican Estate Character Areas Map in the Upper Podium/Ben Jonson Terrace Area, Briar Court is incorrect spelling, Bryer Court would be correct. Also the study boundary dotted line is not correctly mapped along the east (rear) of Bryer Court – it should conform to the Barbican Listing Boundary and include the flight of stairs, adjacent podium area and ramp from 03 car park level to Bridgewater Square. Elsewhere the caption Guildhall School of Music and Dance is not correct, it should read the Guildhall School of Music and Drama.</p>  | <p>All mapping will be amended prior to finalisation of the document.</p> <p>Amended</p>  |
| <p>On the Podium Levels layouts, 2 Fann Street (the former Barbican YMCA building) is missing.</p> <p>Also missing are Bridgewater Square and Bridgewater Street which have vehicular connection with the Barbican at street level 02 and 03 ramp, and Beech Street respectively.</p>   | <p>Amended</p> <p>Amended</p>   |
| <p>On the Green Infrastructure Map, Bryer Court pool should have aquatic planting indicated along its western length (outside the footprint of the Bryer Court building).</p>   | <p>Amended</p>  |



| Comment  | Response                                     |
|--|--|
| <p>On the Furniture and Lighting Map, the Barbican Day Nursery Play Area on Bridgewater Square should be coloured in pink to indicate it as a play area within this study (as referred to at 1.5.61 in the main text). Also, because of the current waterproofing works in the vicinity of Bryer Court there are omissions to the mapping of lighting and seating provision: there should be three Type A lighting columns along the eastern edge of Bryer Court pool; there should be numerous Type F lighting bollards in the raised beds/cleared planters; a curved path with two bench seating stations is missing from the raised beds/cleared planters and there is no indication of stepped seating in the hard landscaping of this part of Beech Gardens; the position of bench seating that is shown may not be quite right. All the Beech Gardens Project area needs further checking with residents to make sure this map accurately records what existed there before the works started.</p> <p>Appendix A9 Photographic Survey caption corrections:</p> <p>on Photos 71, 74 &amp; 155, Beech Street Gardens is not correct naming, according to the CoL street signs it is Beech Gardens.</p> <p>on Photo 72, Briar is not correct spelling, Bryer would be correct.</p> <p>on Photos 78, 79, 82 &amp; 85, Bretton is not correct spelling, Breton would be correct.</p> <p>Otherwise, a very useful and timely contribution to life at the Barbican.</p> | <p>Amended</p> <p>Amended</p> <p>Amended</p> |
| <b>Steve Daszko</b>  |  |
| <p>Thank you for your recent email regarding draft plans/guidelines for The Barbican. As a City resident and business operator, I think it's crucial that the listed status of The Barbican is maintained to a high degree.</p> <p>The time taken so far over the Beech Gardens project has been, quite frankly, far too long.</p> <p>As a City resident, I am often in The Barbican and it's a great place. Whilst not a resident there (I live in Golden Lane), I appreciate it's listed status.</p>   | <p>Noted. No response required.</p>          |

| Comment  | Response   |
|--|--|
| <p><b>John Thirlwell</b></p> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to respond to this consultation paper. I am a resident of Defoe House and therefore look over Defoe Place and Thomas More Garden.</p> <p><b>Beech Street</b><br/> Although it is described as a 'radical transformation', I fully support Beech Street's being closed to through traffic. Current air pollution monitoring demonstrates that the ventilation points generate NO2 levels in Defoe Place considerably above EU norms but fell below when Beech Street traffic was temporarily restricted during the works at Silk Street. In any case, the pavements and cycle lanes are inadequate for current needs, which, as your paper suggests, can only increase. Restricting vehicle traffic to local traffic only would facilitate making Beech Street much more user-friendly for pedestrians and cyclists and would facilitate improving its visual character.</p> <p><b>Wayfinding</b><br/> This is critical. Apart from supporting the idea of improving the yellow line by Silver Jubilee-style markers (2.3.11), there needs to be much more signage to help people find their way to transport points. I regularly encounter lost souls almost spinning as they try to work out where, for instance, Barbican or Moorgate tube stations lie. The nature of the Barbican means that people lose most of their directional bearings via other buildings or roads. Clear directions to these transport points and, in time, Crossrail, are essential.</p> <p><b>Vistas</b><br/> I understand the need to improve access to the estate, but am concerned at any suggestion that there might be a new north-south ground level route through the estate which would ruin the vistas along the lake, either from the Centre, the sunken pods or from the western end / Thomas More Garden. I would urge improvement or constructing of lifts, escalators and stairs to get people up to the highwalk/Podium level as soon as they enter the estate</p> | <p>Beech Street – Noted. No response required.</p> <p>Wayfinding - Noted. No response required.</p> <p>Vistas - Noted. No response required.</p> |

| Comment  | Response  |
|--|---|
| <b>Hazel Brothers</b>  |   |
| <p>My comments relate to Part 3 Green Infrastructure</p> <p>Conclusions p.25 and 27 about sustainability and enhancement to provide greater habitat value for declining species of birds, is all admirable and just what I would want to see around the Barbican. But it is not necessarily happening in practice, several established stands of ivy, for instance, have been removed to introduce "more colour".</p> <p>Elsewhere in the document the eradication of cotoneaster is recommended. There is nothing the matter with this shrub in - as here - a garden setting. I trust you will not allow the removal of it from Breton House podium, where it provides cover and food for BAP species such as house sparrow.</p> <p>By the way, your document is very hard to navigate. It would have helped if</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>** Pages were numbered in a single sequence</li> <li>** Table of contents referred to page numbers</li> <li>** Glossary of terms defined ALL terms and acronyms (I had to google "BAPspecies" for an explanation.</li> </ul> | <p>We are taking advice from the landscape consultant regarding this point.</p> <p>Document Navigation – Agreed. Navigation and contents pages will be improved prior to adoption. There is a glossary of terms in Appendix A4.</p> |
| <b>Jane Bickerton</b>  |   |
| <p>I support this consultation plan. In particular the idea of only using the beech tunnel for traffic access and improving pedestrian access. The suggestion for more retail shops and the newly opened cinemas and restaurant offer an interesting retail area. The potential for the new film school might also offer an opportunity for public access to see what happens there.</p> <p>I also support the idea of artist/craft studios/retail spaces around Frobisher court.</p> <p>The suggestion of walled gardens is particularly interesting and wonder whether the wall alongside the lake opposite the Barbican art centre has the potential to be developed as such, as well as air vents on Beech highwalk.</p>   | <p>Noted. No response required.</p> <p>Noted. No response required.</p>   |

| Comment  | Response  |
|--|---|
| <p>Is there anyway we might support residents to keep their balconies green? I believe these areas are the ultimate responsibility of the houses and the corporation and not the individual owners. How might we support more greening?</p> <p>I would like to add three further comments to the consultation plan:</p> <p>The podium level "Beech Street" provides a patterned tile which can be viewed from Ben Jonson House. Over time the pattern seems to have changed when cracked tiles have been replaced. The pattern is a work of craft and art and I would suggest it be recognised and illustrated and added to your consultation plans. Outside Shakespeare on the second level this pattern appears to have been particularly distorted. I believe this overall pattern on Beech gardens will become more apparent when and if the exhibition hall coverway is removed. Do you have the original pattern for the tile? Could this pattern be included in the plans?</p> <p>Originally there was a gate on both sides of Fann street wild garden. Since 2003 the gate double gate adjacent to the play school has been locked with a padlock and the other gate not used because of the play area of the school. Could we again be able to enter this garden from both points. It certainly would add to my personal enjoyment of the garden.</p> <p>Is there any possibility of designated areas for children and bicycle riding, skate boarding and roller skating?</p> <p>This consultation is very exciting. I love living in the Barbican.</p> | <p>This is a management issue. The comment will be passed to the Barbican Estate Management Team.</p> <p>This is not something we have been aware of. We are exploring this issue further with residents.</p> <p>This is a management issue. The comment will be passed to the Barbican Estate Management Team.</p> <p>This is a management issue. The comment will be passed to the Barbican Estate Management Team.</p> |