

City of London

Postman's Park SPD

Consultation Statement

May 2018



The Postman's Park Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) was published in draft for public consultation during a six-week period from 7 March until 20 April 2018. Prior to the public consultation the draft was prepared by officers in the Department of the Built Environment in consultation with colleagues in that and other departments within the City Corporation and the text was approved by the Planning and Transportation Committee.

Regulation 12 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 require the City Corporation to prepare a consultation statement setting out the persons 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 consultation was carried out in line with the City Corporation's Statement of Community Involvement 2016.

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 website. 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. Information was provided in the City of London e-shot.

Inspection copies

A copy of the draft SPD and supporting documents was made available at the Planning Information desk at the Guildhall and the Guildhall, Barbican, Shoe Lane and Artizan Street public libraries.

Notifications

Letters and emails containing information about the draft SPD 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.

Posters and leaflets advertising the SPD consultation and inviting comments were placed in the Guildhall, Barbican, Artizan Street and Shoe Lane public libraries.

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.

Responses received

A total of 28 consultation responses were received.

Nearly 20 of the respondents were residents either within the conservation area or nearby. The other respondents were interested parties or consultees including the City of London Archaeological Trust, Historic England, Natural England and Transport for London.

The table that follows summarises the comments and explains how they were addressed in finalising the SPDs. The responses are given in date order.

Summary of comments and responses

*comments and responses are published as received and uncorrected.

#	Section	Comment	Response
1	General	<p>Resident – 7 March I am a resident / owner occupier in [REDACTED] on Little Britain and would like to contribute to the consultation referenced below.</p> <p>Please could you send me a soft-copy PDF of the SPD?</p> <p>Good plans to preserve and enhance the area will be very welcome indeed; but it will also be important to ensure residents continue to have a sustainable central London living experience (eg including in relation to parking).</p>	<p><i>Direct hyperlink to the draft SPD provided.</i></p> <p><i>General comments noted.</i></p>
2	General	<p>Resident – 7 March I would like to recommend the utmost care possible of this green space :Postman Park in the City of London.</p> <p>I do so enjoy this garden. I have shared it with many of my London friends, visitors from outside London, and abroad.</p> <p>I am very aware of the number of visitors who pass through the park. I often observe how their foot fall has a tendency to make the small area look worn and sad.</p> <p>It should be noted that the poignant plaques on display of brave souls who died trying to save fellow Londoners are especially cherished. Further more I love that they are included in an artwork at the Tate:</p> <p>Photographs of them are included by Artist Susan Hiller in Monument 1980-1981. This work then causes many ripples. The work is on permanent view in the tanks at the Tate Modern.</p>	<p><i>General comments on the desirability of preserving and enhancing the park noted.</i></p>
3	General	<p>Enquirer – 7 March Thank you for this information. Could you tell me what happened to the MICHAEL Arton sculpture 'Minotaur</p>	<p><i>Response issued explaining that the Minotaur sculpture has now been relocated to the London Wall Place development.</i></p>

#	Section	Comment	Response
4	St Botolph Aldersgate	<p>' which used to be in the park.</p> <p>Guild Vicar of St Botolph Aldersgate – 7 March Thank you for your email regarding the Postman's Park Conservation area. There are a number of factual errors in the document.</p> <p>On page 16 you state that St Botolph's is a 'Guild church and no longer holds regular Anglican services; currently it is used by an evangelical Christian group and the London City Presbyterian Church holds services on Sundays. As a grade I listed church in use for ecclesiastical purposes, alterations to the building are managed under the Ecclesiastical Exemption instead of the LBC system.'</p> <p>I write as the Church of England Guild Vicar. We do have weekly services which are advertised through The Aldersgate Talks website (www.aldersgatetalks.org) and there is a separate St Botolph's website primarily for the benefit of other users of the building (https://www.stbotolphsaldersgate.org.uk).</p> <p>I don't know what you are referring to by 'an evangelical Christian group'- we are an Evangelical Church of England church with an Evangelical ministry like many others in the City but no other 'group' uses the church. As a Guild Church we don't have a parish and aren't obliged to have Sunday services- our focus therefore is on the working population rather than a Sunday congregation which is why LCPC use the building on a Sunday. A number of orchestras also use the buildings in the evenings.</p> <p>On a different note it would be helpful to know how the proposed strategy differs from what is in place already. As you know the Corporation spent a lot of money last year on the Park so what do these new proposals mean in practice?</p>	<p><i>Response and clarifications of factual points regarding St Botolph Aldersgate welcomed; the relevant sections of text will be updated.</i></p> <p><i>Response issued clarifying the nature of the strategy proposed in the SPD.</i></p>
5	General	<p>Port of London Authority – 7 March Thank you for consulting the Port of London Authority (PLA) on the Postman's Park Conservation Area Supplementary Planning Document (SPD).</p> <p>For information, The PLA is the Statutory Harbour Authority for the Tidal Thames</p>	<p><i>Response noted.</i></p>

#	Section	Comment	Response
		<p>between Teddington and the Thames Estuary. Its statutory functions include responsibility for conservancy, dredging, maintaining the public navigation and controlling vessel movement's and its consent is required for the carrying out of all works and dredging in the river and the provision of moorings. The PLAs functions also include for promotion of the use of the river as an important strategic transport corridor to London.</p> <p>Due to the location of the proposed conservation area, the PLA has no comments to make on the proposals.</p>	
6	General	<p>Resident – 7 March Postmans Park is a shady oasis in our City of London, it is unique and has something special that the other London park do not have and should be preserved for posterity. Please do the maximum you can to preserve it in its current form.</p>	<i>Response noted.</i>
7	Introduction	<p>City of London Archaeological Trust – 8 March Thank you for circulating the draft SPD for Postman's Park. It is generally very good; the treatment of buildings in Little Britain is particularly welcome. We at CoLAT have the following comments, all minor:</p> <p>i. Description of where the Roman city wall runs is perhaps not quite correct. It borders the south side of Postman's Park. Should you perhaps amend the opening text on p5?</p> <p>ii. We know there have been proposals to rebuild an east end for Christchurch Greyfriars. We would support the opposition to such a proposal. It is all right as it is.</p>	<i>Corrections welcomed and observations noted. The SPD will be updated to reflect the suggested changes.</i>
8	1-6 Little Britain, p.19	<p>Resident – 9 March Sir, I live in [REDACTED], Little Britain and read your plans with interest, particularly the page attached which relates to Little Britain. Allow me to comment.</p> <p>I like the idea of pedestrianising Little Britain. However residents' vehicles and tradesmen must be allowed constant access for loading, deliveries, etc., and the car park under Milton House.</p>	<p><i>Observations welcomed.</i></p> <p><i>Pedestrianizing Little Britain would enhance the character and experience of the conservation area and improve pedestrian and residential amenity. It is a long-term, aspirational measure that would be implemented when resources and circumstances allow. The text will be</i></p>

#	Section	Comment	Response
		<p>I strongly object to the ground floor of any block in this street being granted permission for commercial usage. This is a residential street and should stay that way. People have brought property in this street because it is a wholly residential street. As you are aware, every ground floor is a residential flat. When you say “animate ground floor frontages” do you mean you would grant permission for a ground floor flat to be converted and used for commercial purposes?</p> <p>I strongly object to Cross Keys Square being opened. It was bad enough (smells, noise, etc.) when 200 Aldersgate attempted to hold a monthly market for a short while in 2016. Many bedrooms back on to the square. Two gyms have operating plant backing onto the square. We have had persistent problems with making Pure Gym (and prior to that LA Fitness) turn off their air conditioning at night, intrusive noise from the Virgin gym plant and from workmen working at unsocial hours, etc. Since no protection for residents with regard to plant operating hours was incorporated in the planning permissions for 200 Aldersgate or 20 Little Britain, I have no confidence at all that any protection would be included for residents with any proposed commercial premises. The last thing residents need is to have extra noise and disturbance. Additionally, 200 Aldersgate erected a gate across the rear of the square which is always closed so presumably they don’t want constant public access either.</p> <p>I look forward to your comments.</p>	<p>updated to reflect this.</p> <p><i>The objection to commercial uses on Little Britain is noted. While it is considered that a more vibrant mix of uses would not harm the character and experience of the conservation area, the potential for adverse impacts on residential amenity is recognised. Furthermore, although historically a bustling, mixed-use street, it is recognised that tranquillity now forms part of the character of the conservation area here and that this tranquillity is in part generated by the residential use of these buildings.</i></p> <p>Accordingly, this proposal will be deleted from the SPD and the text updated as necessary.</p> <p><i>The objection to opening Cross Key Square is noted. Reopening this square and its connections to Little Montagu Court would enhance the permeability of the area and bring these historic spaces – visible on maps from 1676 onwards – back into the public realm. Usage only as a pedestrian route is not considered to have a significant impact on residential amenity. This is a long-term, aspirational measure that would be negotiated if and when circumstances allow. The text will be updated to reflect this.</i></p>
9	General	<p>Natural England – 14 March</p> <p>Whilst we welcome this opportunity to give our views, the topic of the Supplementary Planning Document does not appear to relate to our interests to any significant extent. We therefore do not wish to comment.</p>	Response noted.

#	Section	Comment	Response
10	1-6 Little Britain, p.19	<p>Resident – 19 March As a resident of Little Britain, I would like to express my views on below proposed items:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Animate ground floor frontages with appropriate commercial uses where these do not conflict with existing uses; Little Britain is entirely a residential street and, I, as a resident, would like it to remain as such. ▪ Open Cross Keys Square; I live on the ground floor and my bedroom overlooks parts of Open Cross Keys Square. I feel very uncomfortable with the idea that strangers can have a peek into my most private area of my flat. Not to mention the noise and the litter levels this may cause. ▪ Pedestrianise Little Britain to create a compelling 'microquarter' of shops/restaurants facing Postman's Park (which would contribute to the Culture Mile); Though I would be open to this day since ever since St. Bart's hospital inauguration, Little Britain has become busier than ever, I would still wish that residents can have access for drop offs, deliveries etc. 	<p><i>Observations welcomed. Please refer to the comments on response (8), above.</i></p>
11	General, 1-6 Little Britain, p.19	<p>Resident – 21 March I write to set out my views on the Corporation of London proposals regarding Postman's Park Conservation area. I write as a local resident since 1996 having witnessed changes over a significant period of time. First may I say how impressed I am with the Corporation proposals particularly as they they cleverly seek to integrate with other plans for the area surrounding the Postman's Park Conservation area such as the culture mile, Smithfield conservation area and new Museum of London site. The value of the area from an archaeological, cutural and tourist perspective is fully covered in your consultation document and need not be repeated. The question is to what extent the Corporation proposals will enhance the value of the area, preserving it for the benefit of future generations. I have witnessed degradation of the conservation area over the years by traffic congestion, inappropriate trafic alterations, a pointless King Edward Street</p>	<p><i>Observations welcomed and noted, particularly the constructive suggestions of how the Postman's Park conservation area can serve and be integrated with the Culture Mile. The idea of a pedestrianised Little Britain forming part of a route between the Culture Mile and the Cathedral is positive and has potential. We will explore options for producing a guided walk or similar.</i></p> <p><i>On the pedestrianisation of Little Britain, please see the comment on response (8), above.</i></p>

#	Section	Comment	Response
		<p>gyratory system and heavily polluting traffic (both noise and emissions) in the historic streets bordering the Park such as Little Britain. I believe that the proposals particularly in relation to Little Britain significantly address those concerns and I welcome them wholeheartedly.</p> <p>My views are set out below:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Over the years, by default, I have acquired great deal of experience assisting confused tourists as they search for the elusive Museum of London following a visit to St Pauls. As the museum is being re located to West Smithfield it makes sense for there to be a direct "culture half Mile" from St Pauls and Greyfriars Church to Smithfield which will seamlessly join up with the culture Mile thereby linking up with the Museum to the West and the Barbican centre to the East. Such a culture half mile would allow visitors to follow a route from St Paul's to Paternoster Square to the ruins of the Wren built Greyfriars, past the old Postal museum and statue towards Postmans Park. Visitors would then pass through the North section of Little Britain, past the sensitively designed Helical Bar development and on to to Smithfied Square. This route is rich in history and matters of interest and should become a protected route for visitors on foot. 2. In order for the cuture half mile to be pleasant the route should be pedestrianised as far as is practicable. Presently the area outside Barts hospital is a continuous traffic jam with vehicles spewing out fumes which have damaged the facades of recently cleaned buildings in Little Britain and within the conservation area generally. I invite you to view the white wall facing King Edward Street of the building at 75 Little Britain which clearly illustrates the damage being caused. Barts patient are being disturbed by the constant tooting of horns and occasional altercations between frustrated drivers stuck in traffic jams. 3. Little Britain, opposite Postman's Park, has become a de facto car park for commercial delivery drivers, minicabs, taxis and heavy goods vehicles endangering cyclists using the contra flow and significantly damaging the facade of the listed buildings along the road. Idling engines are a huge problem as drivers play cat and mouse with parking attendants. The road is full of history as illustrated by its blue plaque to John Wesley. The road was immortalised in Charles Dickens "Molly Malone". The integrity of its history should be protected by pedestrianisation. (I am not a gardener 	

#	Section	Comment	Response
		<p>however expect the pollution emanating from these vehicles cannot be beneficial for the plants and trees within the park itself). Streams of organised groups of tourists visit little Britain but are crammed onto narrow pavements risking life and limb as vehicles navigate at speed along what has become a rat run.</p> <p>4. Little Britain is used by vehicles seeking to avoid circumnavigating the pointless gyratory. I therefore agree wholeheartedly with the Corporation proposal that it be pedestrianised to help preserve the conservation area.</p> <p>5. In my view the area from Greyfriars Church to the Northern section of Little Britain should be pedestrianised with local access for residents only and ambulances. This may only be possible once the gyratory has been removed. However in the meantime I see no compelling reason why the pedestrianisation proposals for little Britain should not be implemented.</p>	
12	General, 1-6 Little Britain, p.19	<p>Resident – 22 March</p> <p>I am a resident of [REDACTED], Little Britain and have been sent by email an extract of your draft Supplementary Planning Document which was published for consultation on 7th March.</p> <p>I have received no correspondence, had no sight of any site notices or received any form of information to confirm that this consultation process has been initiated by the City Council and it is clear in review of your website that the local authority have not sought to identify any formal consultation process. Whilst very little weight can be attached to the finalised SPD, it must be the case that the limitations of this consultation exercise must cast further considerable doubt on the value of this document and, in turn, any reliance the City Council might ultimately then place upon the SPD.</p> <p>I have, however, taken the opportunity to review the draft SPD and provide my comments below.</p> <p>Whilst any action taken by the City Council to preserve and enhance the existing conservation area is to be welcomed it is difficult at this moment to understand the motivation of the local authority in producing the draft SPD.</p> <p>The only obvious candidate for redevelopment (with the exception of the</p>	<p><i>Observations noted. The public consultation on the draft SPD followed the City Corporation's Statement of Community Involvement, adopted by Members in July 2016.</i></p> <p><i>The motivation for producing the draft SPD is set out on page 7 of the document.</i></p> <p><i>Please refer to comments on response (8) above in relation to the recommendations on page 19 of the document.</i></p> <p><i>Detail of the character and significance of individual elements of the conservation area is given throughout the document, together with broad management strategies for each. These will guide development management within the conservation area, safeguard its character and represent a considerable evolution of previous policy statements. A summary of character section</i></p>

#	Section	Comment	Response
		<p>Bank of America building) is the complex of commercial buildings which surround Cross Keys Square and which have their frontage to Montague Street, the 'Museum of London' roundabout and the junction with Aldersgate Street. However, this development is quite divorced from Postman's Park, with only glimpsed views through the gated access to Cross Keys Square and by limited linkage to the corner of the existing development at Little Britain adjacent to the Methodist Chapel.</p> <p>It is, in this context, of some concern to read the suggested 'enhancements' to Little Britain that are identified on page 19 of the draft SPD. These provisions suggest that any new development might secure:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>"Animate ground floor frontages with appropriate commercial uses where these do not conflict with existing uses;</i> • <i>Open Cross Keys Square;</i> • <i>Pedestrianise Little Britain to create a compelling 'microquarter' of shops/restaurants facing Postman's Park (which would contribute to the Culture Mile);</i> • <i>Improve setting to rear in future development schemes."</i> <p>There are very limited opportunities to 'animate ground floor frontages' at Little Britain without the City Council engaging in the compulsory acquisition of established residential properties which by definition characterise the area and add substantially to the 'special architectural and historic interest'. Any such action by the City Council would be very difficult to justify given the established and positive character of the street as is already indirectly alluded to in the draft SPD. Whilst there may be some limited intervention at the entrance points to Little Britain this would have to be carefully considered given the quiet, tranquil and private character of the existing street.</p> <p>It is, in this context, important to recognise that the special character of this part of Little Britain is derived from the fact that it represents one of the few remaining wholly residential streets within the heart of the City. It is this unique character which adds to the peace and tranquillity of the Park and any attempt to introduce commercial activity in the form of bars, cafes and</p>	<p><i>will be included in the text in response to Historic England's comments below.</i></p>

#	Section	Comment	Response
		<p>restaurants will inevitably ensure that this exceptional character is lost to the homogenous and ubiquitous array of coffee shops that are found in every other street in the City.</p> <p>The opportunities to open 'Cross Keys Square' are again limited by the enclosure of this area by established residential properties. The prospect of this area being opened to the public would only ever be a realistic possibility if it were linked to the introduction of bars, cafes and restaurants. Again, this form of development would inevitably detract from the quiet and tranquil character of the area and, as such, would significantly undermine the character and appearance of the conservation area which the City Council should be seeking to enhance and protect. It is also important to recognise that at night and at weekends this part of the City is particularly quiet and is quite sensitive to disturbance. These conditions make it very difficult to envisage that the Square could be easily opened up to any form of associated development without causing real harm to the amenity of local residents.</p> <p>It follows that the suggested pedestrianisation of Little Britain 'to create a compelling 'micro-quarter' of shops/restaurants facing Postman's Park' is a concept that can only serve to harm the unique character of Postman's Park and its immediate environment. It is striking, in this context, that the SPD has a number of sections entitled 'character and significance' but none of them provide any actual description of the character of the designated area or its environs. This is exemplified by the assessment of 'character and significance' at page 29 of the draft SPD which describes the physical features of the Park but does little more than describe the character and significance of the area as 'an area of open space'. It is, in this and many other respects, a flawed document and it really is of no great credit to the City Council.</p> <p>The final suggestion that new development should 'improve [the] setting to [the] rear in future development schemes' is both a statement that is difficult to fully understand or to greatly criticise. It is clearly the case that it is incumbent upon any new development to enhance the character and appearance of the conservation area and any 'policy' commitment that is</p>	

#	Section	Comment	Response
		<p>directed to achieving this objective is to be welcomed. I would, again, suggest that this document should make some attempt to explain that character if it is to serve any useful function in meeting this objective.</p> <p>I would, in conclusion, wish to confirm my objection to the contents of page 19 of the draft SPD in the terms detailed above. Overall, I also have to contend that the draft SPD cannot assist in guiding future development without clearly explaining the character and features of the area. This is a substantive flaw to this 'policy' document and the draft SPD needs to be reconsidered and largely redrafted to ensure that it fairly and accurately identifies the character of the conservation area which it seeks to protect and enhance. It follows that the draft SPD should also identify the character of the surrounding area (and, not least, Little Britain) which clearly has a positive and significant influence upon this important heritage asset.</p>	
13	General, 1-6 Little Britain, p.19	<p>Resident – 22 March</p> <p>I would like to contribute with my comments on the draft consultation of Postman Park Conservation Area (no 7).</p> <p>I have been living in Little Britain for the past 20 years. It is a lovely little road, enhanced by the old facades of the buildings and Postman's Park is like a little green oasis in the City, which gets constantly busy during weekdays. I think it would be very important to preserve the historical buildings and facades and retain this corner of peace in the City of London by limiting excessive air and acoustic pollution. Sadly it has become virtually impossible for us residents to enjoy the beauty of this conservation area as Little Britain is constantly used as the unauthorised parking bay for minicab drivers, who regularly park on a single yellow line with their engine on, ready to depart as soon as a new client approaches or speed away if the cap of a traffic warden appears on their rear-view mirror from the end of Little Britain. During the winter minicabs, taxis and commercial vehicles park with the engine on, enjoying their lunch or checking their mobile phones or even having a nap in the warmth of their cars, and the same in the summer with the air conditioning on... while all of us residents or passing-by people have to breath the fumes of their cars or endure their insults if we kindly ask them to switch their engine off. It is such an uncivilised behaviour which has gone from</p>	<p><i>Observations welcomed and noted. Please refer to comments on response (8) above in relation to the pedestrianisation of Little Britain.</i></p>

#	Section	Comment	Response
		<p>bad to worse.</p> <p><u>I really appreciated reading about the history of Postman Park Conservation area, and would happily lend my support for Little Britain to become pedestrianised, limiting the cars only to access the resident underground parking in Little Britain.</u></p> <p>The effects of the pollution generated by the cars constantly on stand-by in Little Britain can be seen on the buildings and is certainly not desirable around the small pleasant green space of Postman Park. Little Britain is a narrow residential road and needs to be preserved. The whole area appears on the contrary being developed up to Smithfield market as a new residential area which would be highly enjoyable if it wasn't for the high volume of cars constantly passing in King Edward's Street.</p> <p>Because all the traffic going east is diverted through King Edward Street, there is a constant queue of cars and buses with their engines on at the traffic lights just outside St. Bartholomew's hospital entrance in King Edward's Street, where the street narrows to allow pedestrians to cross. This happens all day outside the entrance of Postman Park in King Edward Street. It does not help that the bus waiting-bay is just outside the General Post Office Buildings.</p> <p>I confess I could not understand how, knowing how important Postman Park is to the local community (including the doctors and nurses from Barts Hospital), it has been left completely surrounded by cars and traffic with minimal enforcement against engine-idling.</p> <p>It would be fantastic for tourists and visitors to this historic part of the City if King Edward Street were also pedestrianised.</p> <p>I am totally in agreement with the Corporation's bold proposals and support them wholeheartedly.</p>	
14	1-6 Little Britain, p.19	<p>Resident (in response to number 12, above) – 22 March</p> <p>Thank you for your well written email. As a resident of [REDACTED] I agree entirely on the valid points you have made on Little Britain and the SPD. I</p>	<p><i>Observations noted. Please refer to comments on responses (8) and (12), above.</i></p>

#	Section	Comment	Response
		<p>would therefore also like to object to the contents of page 19 of the SPD with the exception that I would welcome the pedestrianisation of Little Britain as this would add value to the peaceful and quiet nature of the park, the church and most importantly to the Watts's Memorial to Heroic Self Sacrifice.</p>	
15	1-6 Little Britain, p.19	<p>Resident – 23 March We are the owners of [REDACTED], Little Britain. We were very interested to hear of the plans to potentially pedestrianise Little Britain. We would wholeheartedly support this proposal for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We are disinclined to open the windows in summer due to the traffic noise • Even when the windows are only open via the vents, black soot accumulates on the ceiling above the windows and on net curtains - we removed our net curtains due to this recurring constantly despite them being regularly washed; the water in the bath (where we washed them) turned black from the soot! • We feel that the character and peace of the area would be greatly enhanced by pedestrianising the road • We perceive that our quality of life would be enhanced <p>We assume that access to the parking garage under the building would still be permitted for residents?</p>	<p><i>Observations noted. Please refer to comments on response (8) above in relation to the pedestrianisation of Little Britain.</i></p>
16	1-6 Little Britain, p.19	<p>Resident – 23 March I own a flat in Little Britain and I am emailing to support the draft's suggestion that Little Britain be pedestrianised. As things stand it is used day and night as a carpark by assorted taxis and vans, seriously detracting from its amenity value. Pedestrianisation is an excellent idea.</p>	<p><i>Observations noted. Please refer to comments on response (8) above in relation to the pedestrianisation of Little Britain.</i></p>
17	1-6 Little Britain, p.19	<p>Resident – 24 March I am a resident of the conservation area. I should like to express strong support for your plan regarding the rearrangement of the gyratory system and the creation of a pedestrianised area. Not only would this increase the amenity of the space for all residents – it would also greatly improve the environment immediately to the front of the hospital.</p> <p>There is one important item not mentioned in the plan. Residents of 1-6 Little</p>	<p><i>Observations noted. Please refer to comments on response (8) above in relation to the pedestrianisation of Little Britain.</i></p>

#	Section	Comment	Response
		<p>Britain and 75 Little Britain have some 50 car parking spaces under 75 Little Britain, to which they would continue to require access even after Little Britain were to be pedestrianised. This could presumably be achieved by blocking through traffic with access only for residents from the St Martin Le Grand end of Little Britain.</p> <p>[ADDRESS REDACTED]</p> <p>Thank you for this opportunity to comment on your plan.</p>	
18	General & specific sections noted	<p>Historic England – 28 March</p> <p>Thank you for consulting Historic England on the Draft Postman's Park Conservation Area SPD.</p> <p>As the Government's adviser on the historic environment Historic England 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, we welcome the opportunity to comment upon the above draft consultation.</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>Comments</p> <p>Historic England welcomes the publication of this document, which will help to provide a positive framework for the management of the conservation area and listed buildings. We do not have any substantive comments but in our view, the proposed SPD would benefit from minor re-ordering and editing to provide greater clarity.</p> <p>Page 5. Introduction. The document would benefit from a clear summary of the overall significance of the conservation area as part of the opening</p>	<p><i>Observations noted and suggestions for edits welcomed.</i></p> <p><i>The Introduction will be updated to include a clear summary of the character and significance of the conservation area and the section on characterisation will be edited accordingly. The general environmental and architectural characteristics will be summarised.</i></p> <p><i>The Planning Policies section will be updated as suggested.</i></p> <p><i>The Buildings section will be updated to incorporate the suggested amendments.</i></p>

#	Section	Comment	Response
		<p>introduction. This should comprise of a brief paragraph reflecting the historic, architectural, and communal significance embodied by the area.</p> <p>The section titled Environmental is a little unclear, as the pairing of contrasting and complimentary features is curious but not a defining factor of environmental significance (although it may be a symptom of the areas spatial and historic development). The areas special character is complex and drawn from the layers of significance which reflect the development from the Roman City to the present day and encompasses medieval religious complexes, the influence of the GPO, the hierarchy of street patterns, historic associations and the juxtaposition of intimate public spaces alongside grand commercial and religious architecture. Today it is an area characterised by dense office development, but also valuable and unique public spaces which offer much needed places to reflect and relax.</p> <p>As such, change within the conservation area needs to be informed by a clear understanding of the significance of the assets affected and their settings and a need to preserve its unique character. We would suggest adopting a summary of character based on section 3 of the Leadenhall Market CA Appraisal which sets out the defining characteristics of the area in a clear format.</p> <p>Page 7. Planning Policies .</p> <p>National Policies. You may find it useful to mention that the NPPF is supported by the Planning Practice Guidance . https://www.gov.uk/government/collections/planning-practice-guidance</p> <p>Historic England's Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning Notes give general advice against the background of the NPPF on managing change and setting out a positive strategy for the historic environment https://historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/gpa3-setting-of-heritage-assets/</p> <p>It would be helpful to incorporate the boundary section (page 12) alongside</p>	

#	Section	Comment	Response
		<p>the map on page 8.</p> <p>You may wish to consider mentioning that the London Plan is currently under revision and includes strategic policies for the historic environment, transport and freight, the London View Management Framework and local views and the Central Activities Zone. The London Plan recognises the City of London's vital contribution to the economy and cultural identity of London. However, as the new London Plan is unlikely to be published before the SPD you may consider that the existing City of London Local Plan will remain compliant to the emerging policies.</p> <p>Page 13. Buildings</p> <p>The relative scale of the conservation area allows the component buildings to be identified individually. However, it would be useful to describe the spatial characteristics, street pattern and urban grain as a general introduction and incorporate a thumbnail map of the sub-area/building in the wider context of the conservation area if possible. There are also collective cross building characteristics such as general scale, height and the use of high quality materials which could be drawn out in the introduction.</p> <p>Page 15, St Botolph Aldersgate. Presumably this should read "unaffected" or survived the Great Fire.</p> <p>The last paragraph should read "amalgamation of the churchyards".</p> <p>Page 19. The reference to a "compelling" microquarter, might be better phrased as "attractive".</p> <p>Page 22. The second paragraph of the Character and Significance would benefit from editing to be clearer, eg. "The church was rebuilt in 1677-87 by Wren, who subsequently added its distinctive tower, completed in 1704. Widely recognised as one of Wren's finest churches the main body of the church was again destroyed in WW2. The remaining tower has an architectural complexity etc...".</p>	

#	Section	Comment	Response
		<p>Page 35, Aldersgate Street/St Martin Le Grand. The opening sentence implies that the road runs under Aldersgate which is no longer the case. Should this therefore read under which the road ran?</p> <p>Conclusion</p> <p>Historic England supports the publication of this document and we hope the above comments will assist in its delivery. If you require clarification or wish to discuss any specific issues raised please do not hesitate to contact me.</p> <p>Finally, it must be noted that this advice is based on the information provided by you and for the avoidance of doubt does not reflect our obligation to advise you on, and potentially object to, any specific development proposal which may subsequently relate to this or later versions of the Guidance, Appraisals and Management Plans, and which may have adverse effects on the environment.</p>	
19	1-6 Little Britain, p.19	<p>Resident – 30 March</p> <p>Various of our neighbours have alerted us to the above document and annexes which are an addendum to the local Plan for the Conservation Area in which we live. We have not seen any notice of this posted either in the affected area or to those affected which seems a little unusual.</p> <p>We consider the proposal to pedestrianize Little Britain (the street from 1-42) to be a positive development. This stretch of Little Britain is one of the only fully residential streets in The City (as our neighbour [NAME REDACTED] has noted in his letter/email to you) and we do believe the residential environment should be enhanced in this way. In our view, pedestrianisation would take the disruptive traffic out of the street, much of which has little to do with the residential usage of the street.</p> <p>However, we are somewhat mystified by the almost casual reference to the fact that the street could be enlivened with small shops and restaurants as part of the branding of the Barbican area as the Culture Mile. The report says</p>	<p><i>Observations noted. Please refer to comments on responses (8) and (12), above.</i></p>

#	Section	Comment	Response
		<p>and we quote</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Animate ground floor frontages with appropriate commercial uses where these do not conflict with existing uses; • Open Cross Keys Square; • Pedestrianise Little Britain to create a compelling 'microquarter' of shops restaurants facing Postman's Park (which would contribute to the Culture Mile); <p>As far as we are aware all the premises in the street are fully occupied residential apartments organised under a single management company and whose owners own their properties on long leases. We are also mystified by the reference to Cross Keys Square which has been largely unused since 200 Aldersgate was built and these apartments in Little Britain converted to residential use in the mid 1990s. In fact, the single retail use in the street – the wine bar at the end of the street – has never attracted the kind of patronage to make it profitable and currently it is vacant. The key issue here is of course the proposal to add retail uses and we find this to be quite contrary to the idea of the conservation area and vociferously oppose it.</p> <p>The other advantage of pedestrianisation would be that the traffic problem which can be severe during the day could be solved. The street is one way for vehicles and two-way for bikes. Ambulances use it as well and although most go around the loop in front of the BT building and along King Edward Street to Barts, some do take the short cut through Little Britain and this is fraught with danger. Moreover, during the working day despite the parking restrictions, limos waiting for business people and vans of various kinds are parked there with engines idling adding to pollution. At the start of the street where it touches Aldersgate, people park to visit Pret a Manger for take away food. All this is really dangerous and we have seen many close shaves in the last 4 or so years since the bikeway came in and retail uses came to occupy the ground floor of 200 Aldersgate. When the change to two ways for bikes was proposed, we pointed out these dangers to and from bikes and pedestrians in Little Britain due to the two way biking conflicting with one-way traffic and vehicle parking in disabled spots and after 6-30pm, parked cars. But this did not seem to be of concern at that point. In our view, something needs to be done to solve the traffic and pollution problem in the street and</p>	

#	Section	Comment	Response
		<p>the pedestrianisation looks like it would help.</p> <p>The rest of the report – which is most of it – seems sensible and Postman's Park has continued to improve during the last two or more years with sensible tree felling and sympathetic landscaping and we applaud this. We consider the proposal for adding shops and restaurants to Little Britain however would in fact detract from current use of Postman's Park which is a gentle retreat for city workers and for reflective contemplation of the fine buildings around the area. Moreover, we doubt very much that this is a serious proposal for it would involve enormous disruption to the frontages of the buildings and access to the apartments.</p>	
20	General, 1-6 Little Britain	<p>Resident – 1 April</p> <p>Thank you very much for sending the Postman's Park Conservation Area Supplementary Planning Document.</p> <p>First of all I would like to congratulate with you for the nice work you did by offering to residents of this aea an excellent opportunity to evaluate the whole zone and its relevance from an historical point of view.</p> <p>Being a resident since 2004 of [REDACTED] Little Britain, I recommend, as you underline in your report, that this street could benefit from being pedestrianised. Access by car can be made for residents only since Milton house as a garage for residents.</p> <p>I am in favour of all other suggestions you recommend.</p>	<p><i>Observations welcomed and noted. Please refer to comments on response (8) above in relation to the pedestrianisation of Little Britain.</i></p>
21	1-6 Little Britain, p.19	<p>Resident – 2 April</p> <p>I refer to the previous correspondence of my neighbours, namely the email of [NAME REDACTED] dated 13 March 2018, the emails of [NAME REDACTED] and [NAME REDACTED] both dated 22 March 2018 and the email of [NAME REDACTED] dated 30 March 2018.</p> <p>I agree with the comments of my neighbours and strongly object to the following suggested enhancements on page 19 of the draft SPD:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "Animate ground floor frontages with appropriate commercial uses where these do not conflict with existing uses; • Open Cross Keys Square; 	<p><i>Observations noted. Please refer to comments on responses (8), (12) and (19) above.</i></p> <p><i>Please refer to page 12 of the SPD. By virtue of its scale, mass and detailing, the large development to the rear provides an unsympathetic setting for Nos. 1-6 Little Britain. If an opportunity arises to redevelop this site, the setting of the Little Britain buildings could be improved.</i></p>

#	Section	Comment	Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pedestrianise Little Britain to create a compelling 'microquarter' of shops/restaurants facing Postman's Park (which would contribute to the Culture Mile)" <p>I would support the pedestrianisation of Little Britain (allowing for residents' vehicles, deliveries and the use of the car park under Milton House). However, I strongly object to this being for the purpose of creating "a compelling 'microquarter' of shops/restaurants facing Postman's Park".</p> <p>The fourth suggested enhancement on page 19 of the draft SPD – "improve setting to rear in future development schemes" – is unclear. The City of London Corporation should provide further details on this enhancement so that we can properly comment.</p>	
22	1-6 Little Britain, p.19	<p>Resident – 6 April</p> <p>I would like to add my comments to your consultation.</p> <p>I am 18 years old and live in Little Britain. I would very much support the pedestrianisation of the road to improve the area surrounding the Postman's park.</p> <p>At present the road is nearly always full of cars with their engines running which ruins the air quality in the area. Some of the exhaust fumes stink so much they waft into the park.</p> <p>It is used as a dropping off and collection point for visitors to the hospital who often take over the pavement with wheelchairs and sometimes drips, believe it or not, while they smoke in the lobby of my building.</p> <p>If the Road is pedestrianised it will make the road much more pleasant for everybody including staff and patients from Barts hospital who use the Postman's Park to relax.</p>	<p><i>Observations noted. Please refer to comments on response (8) above in relation to the pedestrianisation of Little Britain.</i></p>
23	1-6 Little Britain, p.19	<p>Resident – 10 April</p> <p>I think that pedestrianising the area around Postman's Park would be beneficial to the environment because it would reduce many harmful gasses produced by vehicles in the surrounding area.</p>	<p><i>Observations noted. Please refer to comments on response (8) above in relation to the pedestrianisation of Little Britain.</i></p>

#	Section	Comment	Response
		<p>Furthermore, these vehicles are proving to be a problem for pedestrians around the park because they often wait leaving their engines on.</p> <p>I really hope you pedestrianise Little Britain to improve everybody's health and clean up the environment.</p>	
24	1-6 Little Britain, p.19	<p>Resident – 11 April</p> <p>I am writing to support strongly the idea of improving the area around Postman's Park. Such a scheme would very much enhance this historic area for residents and tourists.</p> <p>Closing Little Britain, and making the North end of St Edward's street a traffic free or, at least, a pedestrian prioritised, area would very much improve the experience of residents of Little Britain and the surrounding area. It would also be a real plus for patients in the hospital their friends and relatives and hard pressed hospital staff.</p> <p>At present a good many patients emerge for some 'fresh air' from the entrance on St Edward's Street, to be confronted with a steady stream of traffic with accompanying noise and fumes. How much better it would be if they could have a peaceful place to sit, or be able to make their way across a traffic free area to Postman's Park.</p> <p>We live overlooking the hospital entrance, and I regularly see visitors to patients, sometimes in distress, meeting and talking outside the hospital, trying to make themselves heard above the traffic noise. An area where they could sit to converse quietly, to grieve or just to sit, at what for some is clearly a difficult time would be marvellous.</p> <p>An added bonus would be the removal of the bleeping traffic controls which I know are a real nuisance and disturbance to ourselves and many of our neighbours when the windows are open in the summer. Traffic noise is to be expected, but the noise from the traffic lights is unbelievably irritating and impedes the right to quiet enjoyment of our flats. Even if a wider scheme proves impossible to deliver it would be appreciated if something could be done to mitigate the noise from these devices.</p>	<p><i>Observations noted. Please refer to comments on response (8) above in relation to the pedestrianisation of Little Britain.</i></p>

#	Section	Comment	Response
25	General	<p>City of London Access Team – 12 April</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The submission of an Equality Analysis Test of Relevance is welcomed. - It is pleasing that access improvements within Postman's Park would be encouraged. 	<p><i>Observations noted.</i></p>
26	1-6 Little Britain, p.19	<p>Resident – 13 April</p> <p>We have a flat in [REDACTED] Little Britain, since 2008 and even if we live in Rome, Italy , and we come to London a few times each year , we strongly support the project "the Postman's Park Conservation Area" that plans to make the pedestrian area; access by car can be made for residents only since Milton house as a garage for residents.</p> <p>We are in favour of all other suggestions you recommend.</p>	<p><i>Observations noted. Please refer to comments on response (8) above in relation to the pedestrianisation of Little Britain.</i></p>
27	General, Streets...	<p>Transport for London – 19 April</p> <p>Thank you for consulting TfL on the Postman's Park Conservation Area Draft SPD. We note that once adopted, the Postman's Park Conservation Area will become a formal Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) sitting alongside the borough-wide strategic policies in the City of London Local Plan.</p> <p>Please note that these comments represent the views of Transport for London (TfL) officers and are made entirely on a "without prejudice" basis. They should not be taken to represent an indication of any subsequent Mayoral decision in relation to a planning application based on the draft SPD. These comments also do not necessarily represent the views of the Greater London Authority (GLA). Any views or opinions are given in good faith and relate solely to transport issues.</p> <p>We remind the City Corporation that the draft London Plan was launched for consultation on 1st December 2017. This document is now a material consideration in determining applications and in assessing general conformity of emerging local policy. As such, we will have regard to this Plan, amongst others, when assessing and responding to local planning policy consultations.</p> <p>Cycling</p> <p>The Mayor's Transport Strategy and draft London Plan promote active travel over other modes of transport. As a result the aspirations to prioritise walking and cycling in Postman's Park including by limiting access by private motor vehicles are supported by TfL. However, it will be necessary to carefully consider the impact of future proposals for street works on cycling accessibility and bus operations, as explained in further detail below.</p>	<p><i>Observations noted and welcomed.</i></p> <p><i>The wording of the Little Britain section will be updated to reflect the need to maintain cycle access.</i></p> <p><i>The importance of safeguarding bus infrastructure is recognised and noted. However, it is considered reasonable to observe that the buses queueing at the bus stand detract from the settings of numerous heritage assets and pedestrian experience of the conservation area. The wording of the entry on page 35 of the SPD will be amended to reflect the necessity of maintaining bus infrastructure while also aspiring to improve conditions along King Edward Street</i></p>

#	Section	Comment	Response
		<p>The SPD also notes that Cycle Hire docking stations on King Edward Street and Newgate Street are useful amenities, which is welcome. We would appreciate if this language can be strengthened to specify that they should be retained in perpetuity and further capacity enhancements (i.e. expansion or additional docking stations nearby) may be needed depending on future demand.</p> <p>Cycle Grid Phase 2 is proposed along Little Britain, linking Gresham Street with Little Britain via St Martin's le Grand. As a result, fully pedestrianising Little Britain (pg. 35) is not consistent with this proposal. TfL therefore requests assurance that designated space for Cycle Grid Phase 2 will be provided. It may be advisable to amend this document to state that Little Britain will be restricted to general traffic and should become a shared space which both cyclists and pedestrians can use.</p> <p>Buses</p> <p>The draft SPD also expresses a desire to remove the bus stand on King Edward's Street (pg. 35) as it interrupts views. TfL strongly objects to this proposal. The removal of vital bus infrastructure without providing alternative facilities that are to TfL's satisfaction to enable the bus network to be maintained and expanded where necessary, has financial and efficiency consequences for TfL and is therefore contrary to draft London Plan policy T3 B. Furthermore TfL expects that identifying alternative locations would be practically difficult and therefore, TfL requests the deletion of this aspiration from the SPD.</p> <p>The SPD also includes an aspiration to remove the gyratory system (pg. 34) part of which is identified as on the Strategic Road Network (SRN). Whilst the removal of gyratory systems can support active travel such as walking and cycling, TfL considers that the document should promote and demonstrate the application of the Mayor's Healthy Streets approach.</p> <p>The proposals come at the expense of the resilience of the bus network. TfL welcomes further discussion and engagement with the City Corporation on any emerging proposals to ensure they retain or re-provide sufficient accessible space where buses can turn. This is necessary to maintain the reliability of the bus network and safeguard ongoing bus operations.</p> <p>In summary, all existing turning space, stops and stands currently used by TfL Buses in the area must be safeguarded in the SPD document.</p>	

#	Section	Comment	Response
28	1-6 Little Britain, p.19	<p>Resident – 20 April</p> <p>I live in Little Britain and welcome a plan for the area.</p> <p>I have lived here since the flats were developed, some 20 odd years.</p> <p>Our quality of life has deteriorated over those years.</p> <p>We are faced with continual abuse of parking arrangements with cars, delivery lorries etc constantly parked on the single yellow lines during the day. While following complaints from myself and fellow residents visits from parking wardens have increased it does not stop continuing parking here during the day. Add construction vehicles for the Barts Square development and its sometimes unbearable.</p> <p>Please note that deliveries are predominantly for the surrounding areas not for residents' deliveries.</p> <p>Please also note that there are increasing taxis dropping off patients for Barts on Little Britain even though there is designated dropping off access via Giltspur Street.</p> <p>Heavy lorry use of the road and sometimes parking by them on pavements has lead to deterioration of the pavement and road surface.</p> <p>I welcome the thought that through access to the road could be stopped through pedestrianisation with the proviso that I can maintain access to my parking space at 75 Little Britain.</p>	<p><i>Observations noted. Please refer to comments on response (8) above in relation to the pedestrianisation of Little Britain.</i></p>