

<b>Committee(s)</b>	<b>Dated:</b>
Planning and Transportation	26/07/2018
<b>Subject:</b> Item 12: Supplemental Report  Renaming of Part of Pedestrian Route as Barker Bridge: Consultation Response	<b>Public</b>
<b>Report of:</b> Director of the Built Environment	<b>For Decision</b>
<b>Report author:</b> Paul Beckett, Department of the Built Environment	

### Summary

This report supplements the original report relating to responses to a consultation to re-name a replacement bridge which forms part of St Alphage Highwalk as 'Barker Bridge'. The attached tables of consultation responses now include an officer comment in italics for each response received.

### Summary of Consultation Responses

1. Appendix A sets out in full the responses received and an officer comment.
2. No objections were received from Statutory Consultees: London Fire Brigade and Royal Mail (see Table 1). Two emails of support were received from local Ward Members (see Table 2).
3. Twenty emails of objection were received:
  - Three on behalf of residents groups/local organisations (see Table 3);
  - Seventeen from Barbican residents (see Table 4).
4. These objections raised the following main points:
  - The proposal conflicts with the City Corporation's published Advice Note regarding naming after individuals, and thereby sets a dangerous precedent for future applications.
  - Re-naming just the footbridge section risks confusion for visitors trying to locate the newly re-opened and realigned St Alphage Highwalk.
  - The original process of street and building naming around the Barbican Estate was made with reference to historical figures associated with the area. Mr Barker does not have sufficient profile or local connection to be recognised within the Barbican in this way. Many other historic figures would be better suited were a new name required.
  - A name with a strong cultural resonance consistent with aspirations for the Culture Mile would be more appropriate were a new name required.
  - Naming a bridge after a former Member leaves the City Corporation open to accusations of 'cronyism'.

**Contact: Paul Beckett** Policy and Performance Director, DBE  
T: 0207 332 1970 E: [paul.beckett@cityoflondon.gov.uk](mailto:paul.beckett@cityoflondon.gov.uk)

## Appendix A: Consultation Responses Received and Officer Comments

**Table 1: Statutory Consultees**

Respondent	Comment
London Fire Brigade	No objection.  <i>Officer Comment: No objection noted. The proposed name was not considered to create any wayfinding issues.</i>
Royal Mail	There are no objections to the name and we will not postcode a footbridge as there are going to be no mail deliveries.  <i>Officer Comment: No objection noted. The proposed name was not considered to create any addressing issues as there are no occupiers accessed directly from the bridge.</i>

**Table 2: Ward Members**

Respondent	Comment
David Graves (Member, Cripplegate)	I fully support this proposal.  <i>Officer Comment: Support noted.</i>
Vivienne Littlechild JP (Member, Cripplegate)	What a lovely way to commemorate a member for Cripplegate over many years. I support this.  <i>Officer Comment: Support noted.</i>

**Table 3: Residents Groups/Local Organisations**

Respondent	Comment
Nicholas Kenyon (on behalf of the Barbican Centre)	<p>While we hold the late John Barker in high esteem, not least for his chairmanship of the Barbican Centre Board as part of his service on the Court of Common Council, and admire the sentiment which has given rise to this proposal, we strongly consider the proposal to be</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· inappropriate</li> <li>· unnecessary and</li> <li>· an unfortunate precedent</li> </ul> <p>1. It is inappropriate because City Street Naming and Numbering Advice clearly states that in order to qualify to be considered for a naming, the person should have been dead for 20 years or have passed the centenary of their birth. Neither applies in this case.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· The process of naming the buildings and walkways in and around the Barbican Estate was carried out by the Corporation with great care when the Estate was planned, and in February 1967 a list of suggestions was made with special reference to historical figures associated with the area. Hence the names Gilbert, Frobisher, Cromwell, Andrewes, Milton, Bunyan and Defoe were suggested through their association with the with Ward of Cripplegate Without, and further names were added through association with the Ward of Aldersgate.</li> <li>· (This became a matter of some debate during 1967 with the Greater London Council which had to approve the</li> </ul>

Respondent	Comment
	<p>naming, following objections from the postal authorities and ambulance services to some of the names, including that of Prince Rupert who had lived at the corner of Whitecross Street and Beech Lane. This gave rise to the use of some generic names, including Wallside and The Postern. The final list of names was approved by the Barbican Committee on 11 December 1967.)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Hence the conclusion should surely be that any addition to the roster of names on the Barbican Estate should be historical names with demonstrable connection to the heritage of the area. Drawing attention for residents and visitors alike to the heritage of the area is even more important now that the area forms the heart of the City of London's newly designated Culture Mile. There is no compelling reason to make an exception in this case.</li> </ul> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. We also believe the proposal to be unnecessary and confusing. As the proposal states, the bridge referred to is already part of the St Alphage Highwalk EC2 and has been designated as such since 2016, and further naming would not be in the interests of clarity of wayfinding which is a vital part of the City's new strategy for the area. It would complicate both signage and directional instructions, whereas reference to the St Alphage Highwalk, which now connects directly to the Alban Highwalk leading to Gilbert Bridge, is clear and simple. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The reference in the Planning and Transportation paper paragraph 5 to the analogy of Gilbert Bridge is somewhat misleading. Gilbert Bridge is a City highway in its own right, related to the residential Barbican Estate block Gilbert House which is over and around it, and is marked on maps as a principal highwalk route to the north/south and to the Barbican Centre. Its name indicates where it is. The proposed short Barker Bridge fulfils no such function and is not related to the surroundings in this way.</li> </ul> </li> <li>2. Finally, the proposed naming would set an unfortunate precedent. If the City were to begin to name or rename available walkways after recently deceased Members, it will be difficult to decide which Members should be thus honoured for their connection to the City and to the area, and will raise continual problems of precedence and suitability. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· In the externally facing strategy now adopted by the City generally and in particular for Culture Mile, it is therefore more appropriate that, if it were still deemed really necessary to name the bridge, it should use a name which would enjoy wide recognition by both residents and visitors to the area. (For example, the name of John Wesley would be one choice to consider because of his nearby association with Aldersgate Street.</li> <li>· However, in view of the considerations raised above, we believe that such a naming in this case would be unnecessary and unhelpful. In spite of the admiration we all share for the late John Barker, we feel that this method of commemoration, though prompted by the best motives, is inappropriate. We hope that on further consideration and consultation with other</li> </ul> </li> </ol>

Respondent	Comment
	<p>Members, this view will be shared by Planning and Transportation Committee.</p> <p><i>Officer Comment:</i>  <i>Naming after a recently deceased person is contrary to the Advice Note but Committee considered in February that it was merited in this case. The naming need not set a precedent as each case can be considered on its merits. The naming of the bridge will not create a wayfinding issue as the existing nameplate for the newly re-opened St. Alphage Highwalk will remain in place and will be adjacent to and clearly visible from the bridge. The London Fire Brigade did not consider that the naming would create a wayfinding issue. The name does not strengthen the historic or cultural identity of the area but was not intended to do so as it is in commemoration. Other forms of commemoration could be pursued if Committee were minded not to name the bridge in this way.</i></p>

Respondent	Comment
Jane Smith (on behalf of the Barbican Association)	<p>The Barbican Association objects to your proposal to rename part of St Alphage Highwalk the Barker Bridge. The BA would not normally comment on what might seem rather a small matter. But we do so because it seems to go completely against City policy for no beneficial gain to the wider City. We return to this point in point 6 below. Our objection is not because we have anything against John Barker, who clearly served the City well for many years and lived in the Barbican (your reasons for naming the bridge after him). Our reasons for objecting are as follows: 1. It is against your own policy and national guidance. You need a very strong reason to breach policy - "it would be nice to do so" isn't strong enough. 2. The policy is there for a good reason. Otherwise you get into debates about why this local councillor and not that. There are many people who have served the City well for many years and lived in the Barbican (eg ex Lord Mayors). For example, why John Barker, why not another Barbican resident who served the City well and died not that long ago (eg Douglas Woodward, and there are others)? 3. This bridge is in the Culture Mile in a City that claims to be world class. It seems parochial to be naming part of the Highwalk in a prominent part of the City after a local councillor. This is especially so at a time you are expecting more visitors and are taking measures to improve how they find their way round the area. 4. There is a well established policy for the naming of the Highwalks. Nearly all the other names of Highwalks have some historical/cultural link to the area - and visitors and others can find out what that is (Bunyan, Cromwell, Lauderdale, St Alphage, Defoe etc). Indeed, the Highwalks celebrate the historical celebrities of London. You can't even look John Barker up in Wikipedia. 5. You say it won't create a precedent- but of course it will. 6. Most importantly, as a matter of principle, we would like the City to stick to its policies. As residents we rely on what policies say to know what may and may not happen in this City we live in. It is unsettling and undemocratic for a reasonable policy to be overturned on what seems like little more than a whim. The end result is we don't know actually know what the policy is - and every decision has to be argued over anew. That's not sensible, efficient,</p>

Respondent	Comment
	<p>or a sign of good governance. We would therefore like the City to stick to its policy. We understand that the naming of the reopened Highwalks after the completion of London Wall Place was settled back in 2016. Please follow that decision and enact it. The reason for overturning it is not only not strong enough; it will carry disbenefits in its wake.</p> <p><i>Officer Comment: Naming after a recently deceased person is contrary to the Advice Note but Committee considered in February that it was merited in this case. The naming need not set a precedent as each case can be considered on its merits. The name does not strengthen the historic or cultural identity of the area but was not intended to do so as it is in commemoration. Other forms of commemoration could be pursued if Committee were minded not to name the bridge in this way.</i></p>

Respondent	Comment
Helen Hulson (on behalf of the Ben Jonson House Group)	<p>After discussion at the committee meeting of the Ben Jonson House Group on 14.03.2018, I am writing to you to register our objection to the proposal to rename the reconstructed bridge over Wood Street "Barker Bridge". We wish to emphasise that our objection in no way diminishes our respect for the late Mr Barker or for his valuable contribution in service to the City of London. We object to the renaming of the bridge in Mr Barker's name for the following reasons: 1. The naming of the highwalks in this area is based on relatively renowned historical figures with City associations. If the bridge is to be renamed, we feel this principle should be followed. 2. The City guidelines refer to an interval of 20 years following death before an individual's name is to be considered in the naming of a public way. Mr. Barker died in 2017 so his name does not fulfil this requirement. We suggest that this proposal be deferred until 2037, when it could be reconsidered. 3. Mr. Barker is one of several relatively recently deceased local people who have made significant contributions in their service to the City of London and the local community. To rename the bridge in his name would set a precedent, both in terms of public expectations and in terms of historic practice for the naming of public ways. 4. We believe that other ways of publicly honouring Mr Barker could be considered without overturning a set of principles guiding the naming of public ways, which are both sensible and have a unifying effect. 5. These are the sources of our objection to the proposal to rename the reconstructed bridge over Wood Street, "Barker Bridge". We earnestly request that you give them your serious consideration.</p> <p><i>Officer Comment: Naming after a recently deceased person is contrary to the Advice Note but Committee considered in February that it was merited in this case. The naming need not set a precedent as each case can be considered on its merits. The name does not strengthen the historic or cultural identity of the area but was not intended to do so as it is in commemoration. Other forms of commemoration could be pursued if Committee were minded not to name the bridge in this way.</i></p>

**Table 4: Local Residents/General Public**

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Comment</b>
Maggie Urry	<p>I am writing to object to the proposal to rename the St Alphage Highwalk bridge as Barker Bridge. The Barbican Estate has a tradition of naming buildings and walkways after significant historical figures with a local connection - Shakespeare, Milton, Lauderdale, Wesley and so on. This was maintained when the Fann Street YMCA was refurbished as Blake Tower. St Alphage was a Saxon saint and an Archbishop of Canterbury over 1,000 years ago. The remains of the church named after him on London Wall date back to medieval times and that church was built on the site of a much older church named after St Alphage, thought to date to back to 1068. thus St Alphage has had a connection with the area for nearly a millennium. The highwalk leads to St Alphage garden, and so it's name indicates it's connection with that site. While Mr Barker was no doubt an admirable servant of the City for many years, his achievements can hardly rank alongside St Alphage, and his connection with the area is of negligible standing compared to the church and garden named after St Alphage. Renaming the bridge after Mr Barker does not even meet the City's own guidelines for naming streets and buildings after people, since he died less than a year ago, and the proposal to change the name from St Alphage Highwalk would, in my opinion, set a precedent for renaming other Barbican buildings and walkways which would be detrimental to the character and ethos of the Barbican Estate. Mr Barker was awarded an OBE during his lifetime for his services to the City and that should be sufficient recognition of his contribution to the area.</p> <p><i>Officer Comments: Naming after a recently deceased person is contrary to the Advice Note but Committee considered in February that it was merited in this case. The naming need not set a precedent as each case can be considered on its merits. The name does not strengthen the historic or cultural identity of the area but was not intended to do so as it is in commemoration. Other forms of commemoration could be pursued if Committee were minded not to name the bridge in this way.</i></p>
Jane Smith	<p>I am writing in a personal capacity to object to the proposal to rename St Alphage Highwalk after John Barker OBE.</p> <p>I have nothing against Mr Barker personally and he clearly served the corporation well for many years. But</p> <p>a) It is clearly against City policy</p> <p>b) it breaches the guideline that someone needs to be dead for 20 years, and that guideline is there for a good reason. Who will know who Mr Barker is in 20 years?</p> <p>c) It's nonsense to say that it won't set a precedent. Of course it will.</p> <p>d) Fairness. Why Mr Barker? Why not name a bridge after Douglas Woodward, who died a couple of years ago and had an equally distinguished record of service to the City (including establishing the City Heritage Society) and lived in the Barbican so had a connection to the area? Arguably his claim is greater because of his role in setting up the City Heritage Society</p> <p>I'm sure there are others who fall into that category. Ernest Angell, Stella Currie.....etc</p>

Respondent	Comment
	<p>d) The highwalks are in the Culture Mile - so the names on the estate should make sense to people in some broad cultural terms - currently they do because they are historical figures of literary or religious or military prominence - Bunyan, Ben Jonson, Defoe, St Alphage, Cromwell, Lauderdale. Even the more minor characters who give their names to Barbican buildings and highwalks have some historical interest. Mr Barker hasn't even got a wikipedia entry - no one will know who he is.</p> <p>e) This is the City of London, not an outer London Borough. People come from all over the world to visit the Barbican and will come increasingly to the Culture Mile. Naming the highwalks after a local councillor is parochial, not appropriate to a place that claims to be world class.</p> <p>Please take account of this objection in your statutory consultation.</p> <p><i>Officer Comment: Naming after a recently deceased person is contrary to the Advice Note but Committee considered in February that it was merited in this case. The naming need not set a precedent as each case can be considered on its merits. The name does not strengthen the historic or cultural identity of the area but was not intended to do so as it is in commemoration. Other forms of commemoration could be pursued if Committee were minded not to name the bridge in this way.</i></p>
John Whitehead	<p>As a 40+ year long Barbican resident I object to this proposal and support the existing rule that 20 years should elapse the death of any eminent citizen and naming streets, etc after them.</p> <p>I have no wish to enter in to such a debate, but I could make an equal case for naming the bridge after Douglas Woodward, for instance, or Stella Currie, or even Dennis Delderfield!</p> <p>The passage of time will give a better perspective on their respective contributions to the City.</p> <p><i>Officer Comment: Naming after a recently deceased person is contrary to the Advice Note but Committee considered in February that it was merited in this case. The naming need not set a precedent as each case can be considered on its merits.</i></p>
Bruce Badger	<p>Regarding the posted notice of the proposal to call a new foot bridge "BARKER BRIDGE" (image and planning proposal attached).</p> <p>I knew Mr. Barker and had a great deal of respect for him, but I do not think it would be appropriate to name a portion of the highwalk for him for a number of reasons. Please take this message as an objection to the proposal.</p> <p>The pattern of highwalk naming has been to use the name of a well known historical figure associated with the City. Mr. Barker only fairly recently passed away and is not a widely known historical person. I can think of other recently deceased people who have a link with the City and are much more widely known, but I would not suggest their names either. If, in 20 years or so, we look back and think Mr. Barker should be recognised as proposed then this could be revisited, but now is too soon after his death and doing so would obviously create a precedent, a precedent which I think is</p>

Respondent	Comment
	<p>undesirable.</p> <p>If you're looking for a name for the new footbridge, surely there are other historical figures who could be recognised. Perhaps a women could be considered; and that would be a welcome first for many. Could you please point me to, or let me have as an attached PDF, the rules, guidelines and criteria the City uses when selecting names for highways, highwalks, paths etc?</p> <p>Perhaps the people within the City who wish to recognise Mr. Barker could establish a fund to pay for a piece of street furniture in his name or perhaps a portrait to be hung in the offices used by common councilors?</p> <p>Naming a public way after a living or recently deceased (&lt;20 years) council member, however well liked, seems wrong on many levels. Please don't.</p> <p><i>Officer Comment: Naming after a recently deceased person is contrary to the Advice Note but Committee considered in February that it was merited in this case. The naming need not set a precedent as each case can be considered on its merits. The name does not strengthen the historic or cultural identity of the area but was not intended to do so as it is in commemoration. Other forms of commemoration could be pursued if Committee were minded not to name the bridge in this way.</i></p>
Jane Northcote	<p>I write to object to the proposal to name the bridge on St Alphage Highwalk after John Barker.</p> <p>I have nothing against John Barker.</p> <p>I object to the City contravening its own policies.</p> <p>The policy is clear:</p> <p>"Regarding naming proposals relating to a deceased person, the City Corporation's Advice Note follows the English Heritage guideline that 20 years should have elapsed before the case is considered to give time for the merit of the individual to be properly established. Mr Barker died in May 2017, aged 87, and so consideration of the naming application today is not consistent with the Advice Note."</p> <p>The rule is a wise one: there are good reasons why one might want to wait 20 years before commemorating someone in this way.</p> <p>As a matter of principle, as a City Resident, I would like the City to abide by its own policies. We rely on policies to know what is permissible and what isn't. It is undemocratic and chaotic for policies to be overturned unless the need is pressing and the matter openly debated, with options presented.</p> <p>The need is not pressing. We have been offered no options in this case.</p> <p>I therefore object to this proposal.</p> <p><i>Officer Comment: Naming after a recently deceased person is contrary to the Advice Note but Committee considered in February that it was merited in this case. The naming need not set a precedent as each case can be considered on its merits.</i></p>



Respondent	Comment
E Hirst	<p>I write to OBJECT to the proposal dated 20 February 2018 to re-name the soon to be re-opened footbridge as the "Barker Bridge" on the following grounds.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. This breaches both City published policy and national guidance on both the key criteria - Mr Barker has not been dead for 20 years, and he did not have a significant and demonstrable connection to the site in question.</li> <li>2. The test of what is significant and demonstrable in the context of the Barbican is set by the existing naming on the Estate - Bunyan, Milton etc</li> <li>3. The officer's report sets out no evidence for the significance of Mr Barker with regard to this honour</li> <li>4. As there is no evidence that the impact of Mr Barker living and working locally is so great that its significance is likely to be demonstrable 20 years after his death, there can be no reason for selecting him for this honour over all the other potential candidates who have been dead for 20 years and whose reputations are there for all to see. (Mr Barker does not even warrant a mention in Wikipedia)</li> <li>5. The breach of policy for no clear reason does set a very unwelcome precedent</li> <li>6. The proposal, so soon after the 2016 decision on street naming and numbering is an unwarranted waste of public money.</li> </ol> <p>Emergency services and others who rely on the SNN data to give them unequivocal positional information when responding to incidents will all have to update their systems less than 12 months after the matter was suitably settled in consultation with all concerned.</p> <p>The existing City Policy and national guidance is there for a reason, and was put in place to make sure that a) only those who have made a lasting contribution are honoured and b) there is not a time-consuming and wasteful debate each time a street naming and numbering decision comes up. I'm extremely surprised that the Committee and the officers writing the report have such little regard for upholding established policy.</p> <p>Can I suggest that if Mr Barker's family and the Corporation wish to honour his memory now, they seek donations that do not rely on the public purse and find an alternative and more fitting memorial?</p> <p><i>Officer Comment: Naming after a recently deceased person is contrary to the Advice Note but Committee considered in February that it was merited in this case. The naming need not set a precedent as each case can be considered on its merits. Emergency services' address databases are already regularly updated automatically from the national land and property gazetteer and so one more change would not be an issue for them. There are no occupiers accessed directly from the bridge and the Fire Brigade did not consider the change would create wayfinding issues. The name does not strengthen the historic or cultural identity of the area but was not intended to do so as it is in commemoration. Other forms of commemoration could be pursued if Committee were minded not to name the bridge in this way.</i></p>

Respondent	Comment
Michele Cohen	<p>I understand that there is a proposal, being consulted on, to name part of the new St Alphage High walk the Barker Bridge - after John Barker, the common councillor for Cripplegate who died last year. Ref No SXALHW1000.</p> <p>I understood that this is against City policy and national guidance (which says someone should be dead for at least 20 years before they are so marked - in order to judge their impact)</p> <p>There are plenty of other people who could be acknowledged. In this centenary of the vote for women, are you seriously not even taking that into account.</p> <p>You are the ones that can make a change in our small part of the world. Please do the right thing.</p> <p><i>Officer Comment: Naming after a recently deceased person is contrary to the Advice Note but Committee considered in February that it was merited in this case. The naming need not set a precedent as each case can be considered on its merits. The name does not strengthen the historic or cultural identity of the area but was not intended to do so as it is in commemoration. Other forms of commemoration could be pursued if Committee were minded not to name the bridge in this way.</i></p>
Lydia Goldberg	<p>I would like to inquire as to the renaming of part of St Alphage high walk to Barker Bridge.</p> <p>In whose honour is this renaming?</p> <p>And if not a woman, could we make a concerted effort to redress the fact that every building in the Barbican is named after a celebrated man of the City.</p> <p>And may I make the suggestion of Beeton Bridge:</p> <p>1836 Isabella Mayson (Mrs Beeton) born</p> <p>Isabella Mayson is born in Milk Street, off Cheapside. In 1856 she marries publisher Samuel Beeton and her organisational abilities and dynamism contribute greatly to the success of their publishing house. She is best known, however, for Beeton's book of household management.</p> <p><i>Officer Comment: The name does not strengthen the historic or cultural identity of the area but was not intended to do so as it is in commemoration. Other forms of commemoration could be pursued if Committee were minded not to name the bridge in this way. The bridge is part of the already named St. Alphage Highwalk. It could be left with that name or an alternative name could be considered if proposed.</i></p>
Cherry Hart	<p>I am opposed to the renaming of the St Alphage Highwalk Bridge to that of Barker Bridge; not least because the proposed change has no relevance to the location and bears no historical significance to the area either.</p> <p>With the demise of the church, the surroundings were (and I believe still are) designated as St Alphage Gardens. Therefore, the bridge being so named provides a good reference point for the remains of what has been preserved of the St Alphage church, which I understand were designated a Grade II listed structure, as well as a</p>

Respondent	Comment
	<p>gateway towards the gardens. Whereas, naming the bridge after the deceased City councilman, Mr Barker, seems somewhat of an emotional 'knee jerk' and would wipe out all the historical links with the area leaving nothing that only living memory will keep safe. Mr Barker may have made a contribution to the area as a City councillor (as I am sure have many others) but it is of very limited significance by comparison and one that I feel sure the next generation will question and consider unwarranted. I would therefore ask you not to proceed with this change of name.</p> <p><i>Officer Comment: The name does not strengthen the historic or cultural identity of the area but was not intended to do so as it is in commemoration. Other forms of commemoration could be pursued if Committee were minded not to name the bridge in this way. The bridge is part of the already named St. Alphage Highwalk. It could be left with that name or an alternative name could be considered if proposed.</i></p>
Peter L Smith-Bullion	<p>The Chair of our Barbican House Group has forwarded your invitation to respond to the proposal to rename “St. Alphage Highwalk Bridge” to “Barker Bridge”. Accordingly, I wish to place on record my request that this proposal be rejected and the existing name “St. Alphage Highwalk Bridge” be retained. As a resident of a Barbican property, and working in the City of London for over 5 decades, I appreciate the strong reference to the heritage and close location to the St. Alphage Garden and former Church, that the St. Alphage Highwalk Bridge currently demonstrates, as against a relatively unknown former City Councilman. What is being proposed would be similar to renaming “Threadneedle Street” with the long history to the Merchant Taylors, as “Restaurant Row” to reflect many of the food and drink business establishments located on the Street. Also, I am at a complete loss to understand why it has taken the developers so long to re-open these highwalks, which just seem to have provided many months of useful excess storage capacity for the developers, rather than providing the safe walking pathways for pedestrians.</p> <p><i>Officer Comment: The name does not strengthen the historic or cultural identity of the area but was not intended to do so as it is in commemoration. Other forms of commemoration could be pursued if Committee were minded not to name the bridge in this way. The bridge is part of the already named St. Alphage Highwalk. It could be left with that name or an alternative name could be considered if proposed.</i></p>
Gillian Laidlaw	<p>I object most strongly to the proposal to rename part of the St Alphage Highwalk the Barker Bridge. To name a location after a local councillor is the kind of decision which a petty local authority makes, not one of the greatest cities in the world with a long and</p>

Respondent	Comment
	<p>proud history and connections with many, many famous individuals. The decision to name this walkway was confirmed in April 2016; revisiting the decision is a shocking waste of my money as a community charge payer. More significantly the suggestion is against established City policy which requires an individual to be dead for 20 years to ensure that they have left a lasting legacy. As Mr Barker is not widely known now his reputation is unlikely to have increased in 20 years and he will never be as distinguished as those whose names have been given to other parts of the Barbican Estate: Shakespeare, Cromwell, Defoe, even the lesser known Andrewes was a bishop who helped write the King James's Bible. It is nonsense to suggest that such a decision would not set a very unwelcome precedent.</p> <p>I urge you to abandon this ridiculous proposal and reconfirm the naming of the St Alphage Highwalk.</p> <p><i>Officer Comment: Naming after a recently deceased person is contrary to the Advice Note but Committee considered in February that it was merited in this case. The naming need not set a precedent as each case can be considered on its merits. The name does not strengthen the historic or cultural identity of the area but was not intended to do so as it is in commemoration. Other forms of commemoration could be pursued if Committee were minded not to name the bridge in this way. The bridge is part of the already named St. Alphage Highwalk. It could be left with that name or an alternative name could be considered if proposed.</i></p>
Richard Tomkins	<p>I am a resident of the Barbican Estate and I wish to object to the proposal to rename a section of St Alphage Highwalk "Barker Bridge".</p> <p>I am very concerned that this proposal has not been accompanied by any consultation with local residents. I do not know whether the bridge in question is technically part of the Barbican Estate but St Alphage Highwalk is certainly part of the network of highwalks that serve the Barbican Estate and Barbican residents, more than anyone, would be affected by this proposal. Yet they have not been consulted other than by an inconspicuous notice posted at the site itself.</p> <p>I would urge you at the very least to make use of the Barbican Estate Office electronic bulletin to communicate this proposal to Barbican Estate residents and to extend the deadline so that they may have an opportunity to comment.</p> <p>My own objections are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The lack of consultation with local residents, as set out above.</li> <li>2. The bridge forms part of St Alphage Highwalk and should be called St Alphage Highwalk. Giving it another name would confuse people looking for St Alphage Highwalk. It would have to be called "Barker Bridge, leading to St Alphage Highwalk," which does not make sense when it could just be called St Alphage Highwalk.</li> <li>3. The deceased received full recognition of his contribution to public service during his lifetime with the award of an OBE which would have been followed by an investiture at Buckingham Palace. That was an appropriate recognition for a working lifetime of public service and no additional recognition is called for.</li> </ol>

Respondent	Comment
	<p>4. The proposal is contrary to the City's naming guidelines and represents exactly the kind of situation the guidelines were designed to prevent. When a highly-regarded individual dies, there are understandably calls for a response, but the naming guidelines sensibly demand a 20-year cooling-off period so that long-term decisions can be based on mature consideration of the individual's contribution to history rather than an emotional response to their sudden death. In this case, the individual's death is still recent and no reasons have been put forward for an exception to the City's well-founded policy.</p> <p>5. The City's streets are traditionally named after historical figures, not public servants. It would be a radical departure from City tradition to start naming streets after people on the basis of their contribution to public service instead of their contribution to history. Large numbers of councillors, many of them already OBEs, would qualify on that basis and so would many council employees, including many deserving people at the bottom of the income ladder. This would be a major shift in City policy and would require consideration at the highest level.</p> <p>6. It would obviously be undesirable for councillors to start naming streets after each other. It would reflect badly on the reputation of the City by attracting accusations of cronyism and self-aggrandisement.</p> <p>To sum up, I request that the bridge in question should simply become a part of St Alphage Highwalk and that any consideration of whether to honour the deceased with a street name should be deferred for a minimum of 20 years, as required by the City's guidelines.</p> <p><i>Officer Comment: The consultation process conformed with existing practice; making direct contact with statutory consultees and local ward members and posting a site notice. Nearby occupiers would be contacted if their address would need to change; this was not the case. The suggestion to consult the Barbican Estate Office on relevant proposals will be implemented in future.</i></p> <p><i>Naming after a recently deceased person is contrary to the Advice Note but Committee considered in February that it was merited in this case. The naming need not set a precedent as each case can be considered on its merits. The name does not strengthen the historic or cultural identity of the area but was not intended to do so as it is in commemoration. Other forms of commemoration could be pursued if Committee were minded not to name the bridge in this way. The bridge is part of the already named St. Alphage Highwalk. It could be left with that name or an alternative name could be considered if proposed.</i></p>
Frances Calman	<p>I write as a Barbican resident in opposition to this proposal. Other landmarks in the Estate are named after noteworthy historical characters with connections to the Barbican and surrounding area. Without wishing to belittle the contributions that Councillor Barker made to the Estate, I feel that this would set a dangerous and perhaps controversial precedent where local pressure groups could lobby for other places to be named after their particular local hero. I</p>

Respondent	Comment
	<p>understand that the City of London normally sets a 20-year embargo after someone's death before proposing to name something after them. I believe that this is entirely appropriate and allows history to judge the importance of the contribution that they have made. I urge you to reconsider this proposal.</p> <p><i>Officer Comment: Naming after a recently deceased person is contrary to the Advice Note but Committee considered in February that it was merited in this case. The naming need not set a precedent as each case can be considered on its merits. The name does not strengthen the historic or cultural identity of the area but was not intended to do so as it is in commemoration. Other forms of commemoration could be pursued if Committee were minded not to name the bridge in this way. The bridge is part of the already named St. Alphage Highwalk. It could be left with that name or an alternative name could be considered if proposed.</i></p>
John Murch	<p>I have seen the notice stating a proposal to name part of the Barbican Highwalk, a bridge, after the recently deceased Mr. Barker. While I have no doubt that Mr Barker was an excellent man and contributed greatly, however I do feel that it is inappropriate to start a precedent in naming areas after recently deceased persons. Please take this as an objection to the proposal and I would suggest that the committee reconsiders and selects a more historical name in line with the rest of the estates names. Perhaps a woman's name would be appropriate.</p> <p><i>Officer Comment: Naming after a recently deceased person is contrary to the Advice Note but Committee considered in February that it was merited in this case. The naming need not set a precedent as each case can be considered on its merits. The name does not strengthen the historic or cultural identity of the area but was not intended to do so as it is in commemoration. Other forms of commemoration could be pursued if Committee were minded not to name the bridge in this way. The bridge is part of the already named St. Alphage Highwalk. It could be left with that name or an alternative name could be considered if proposed.</i></p>
Gordon Griffiths	<p>I would like to object to the proposal to rename part of the new High walk bridge after John Barker.</p> <p>This is not because I have anything against John Barker, who clearly served the City well over many years and lived in the Barbican (the reasons given for naming the bridge after him).</p> <p>a) It is against City policy and national guidance (which says someone should be dead for at least 20 years before they are so marked - in order to judge their impact).</p> <p>b) they say it won't create a precedent - but of course it could.</p> <p>c) Aren't there other people with an equal or greater claim to such an accolade - e.g. Douglas Woodward, and I'm sure people can think of others - so there'll be all sorts of demands for naming of High walks</p> <p>d) This is in the Culture Mile in a City that claims to be world class. It seems awfully parochial to be naming part of the High walk in a</p>

Respondent	Comment
	<p>prominent part of the City after a local councillor</p> <p>e) All the other names of High walks have some historical link to the area - and people can find out what that is (Bunyan, Cromwell, Lauderdale, St Alphage, Defoe etc). You can't look John Barker up in Wikipedia.</p> <p>"Most importantly, as a matter of principle, I would like the City to stick to its policies. As residents we rely on what policies say to know what may and may not happen in this City we live in. It is unsettling and undemocratic for a reasonable policy to be overturned on what seems like little more than a whim. The end result is we don't know what the policy is - and every decision has to be argued afresh."</p> <p><i>Officer Comment: Naming after a recently deceased person is contrary to the Advice Note but Committee considered in February that it was merited in this case. The naming need not set a precedent as each case can be considered on its merits. The name does not strengthen the historic or cultural identity of the area but was not intended to do so as it is in commemoration. Other forms of commemoration could be pursued if Committee were minded not to name the bridge in this way. The bridge is part of the already named St. Alphage Highwalk. It could be left with that name or an alternative name could be considered if proposed.</i></p>
Jim Davies	<p>Whilst I have no real problem with the idea of naming things after people of noteworthy deeds, I feel that the City should wait at least the allotted 20 years before naming things after people. This should be done at least for the reason of letting the dust to settle a little, as recent memory provides many examples of formerly important and famous persons slipping into infamy in the years following their deaths. I would therefore like to complain about the City not doing so in this instance. On this matter I think that the City should reflect on their own example of Sir Humphrey Gilbert; he was made to wait almost 400 years before the posthumous naming of his aforementioned house.</p> <p>Additionally, I am unaware of why John Barker would be a more suitable namesake for the bridge than Saint Alphage, who was murdered by Viking raiders on that spot. Has the City consulted any members of Christian orders about the renaming? Incidentally, Saint Alphage had to wait nearly millennia to have that part of the high walk named after him. I therefore am also complaining that the deeds of John Barker are not comparable to the deeds of a Saint, and so should not take precedence over them.</p> <p>I am also complaining at the suggestion that this 'exceptional' case would not set a precedent. All exceptions create precedents by their very existence. This action would clearly undermine the advice note on street naming and numbering in the City.</p> <p>Finally, I am complaining at idea that this case is either unusual or high profile, and therefore requires the attention of the Planning and Transportation Committee rather than delegated officers. It is neither. John Barker was unknown to me before his death, and is still unknown to most people in this area, and so can not be reasonably referred to as 'high profile'. All that seems to be unusual about this case is that the Planning and Transportation Committee</p>

Respondent	Comment
	<p>have taken a specific interest in it. I would be more than happy to see the Planning and Transportation Committee bring this matter up again in 20 years.</p> <p><i>Officer Comment: Naming after a recently deceased person is contrary to the Advice Note but Committee considered in February that it was merited in this case. The naming need not set a precedent as each case can be considered on its merits. The name does not strengthen the historic or cultural identity of the area but was not intended to do so as it is in commemoration. Other forms of commemoration could be pursued if Committee were minded not to name the bridge in this way. The bridge is part of the already named St. Alphage Highwalk. It could be left with that name or an alternative name could be considered if proposed.</i></p>
Maureen Flannery	<p>I saw a notice recently regarding the naming of one of the latest high walk to be Called barkers Bridge. I wish to object because Your current policy says people named must be dead for 20 years and I am sure that the policy has sound reason for this Having looked up Barker, it doesn't appear to be listed, so no international recognised connections. This is a city that wants its self to be internationally known!.</p> <p>All other Barbican walks building have connections with one another. If you want to go against col policy, at least celebrate it with an internationally known name. Celebrate the architects, Chamberlain, Powell and Bon.</p> <p>It would be better not to have a local Cllr who supported a political party, keep it neutral.</p> <p>Rethink, but do look at your policies, going against them could have serious repercussion elsewhere.</p> <p><i>Officer Comment: Naming after a recently deceased person is contrary to the Advice Note but Committee considered in February that it was merited in this case. The naming need not set a precedent as each case can be considered on its merits. The name does not strengthen the historic or cultural identity of the area but was not intended to do so as it is in commemoration. Other forms of commemoration could be pursued if Committee were minded not to name the bridge in this way. The bridge is part of the already named St. Alphage Highwalk. It could be left with that name or an alternative name could be considered if proposed.</i></p>