



Planning Applications Sub-Committee

SUPPLEMENTARY PACK 3

PUBLIC ACCESS COMMENTS

Date: TUESDAY, 10 FEBRUARY 2026

Time: 1.45 pm

Venue: LIVERY HALL, GUILDHALL

4. **SITE COMPRISING LIVERPOOL STREET STATION, 50 LIVERPOOL STREET, SUN STREET PASSAGE, 40 LIVERPOOL STREET (IN PART), HOPE SQUARE AND BISHOPSGATE PLAZA LONDON, EC2M 7PY (25/00494/FULEIA AND ASSOCIATED LISTED BUILDING CONSENTS 25/00474/LBC, 25/00479/LBC, 25/00475/LBC, 25/00476LBC AND 25/00477/LBC)**

Report of the Chief Planning Officer and Development Director.

For Decision
(Pages 3 - 724)

This page is intentionally left blank

REFVAL	SURENAME	FORENAME	COMMENT	HOW RECEIVED	DATE RECEIVED	OBJECTION/ SUPPORT
25/00494/FULEIA	Wapshott	Martin	The redevelopment will cause irreparable harm to the stations incredible heritage and history. The plans are an eyesore not in keeping with the local area. It is shameful that the history and heritage of the station and local area might be harmed so disgracefully.	PA	15-May-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Dickens	Julian	The proposal is completely out of scale with and unsympathetic to the Grade II Listed Great Eastern Hotel.	PA	16-May-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Bannon	Tina	Because it is due a refresh for accessibility	PA	19-May-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Hantman	Michael	The station is old and not fit for purpose. This is long overdue to be redeveloped.	PA	19-May-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Joyce	Beverley	Revamp is long overdue	PA	19-May-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Samani	Ushma	The train station needs to be fully accessible and there is a need to support the Destination City policy for a fit for purpose train station allowing one to not just travel but create a sense of arrival to the square mile.	PA	19-May-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Montgomery	Adam	As the UK's busiest station The station is in desperate need of investment from both an operational a public benefits perspective. There is no step free access and accessibility is below standard . The office accommodation above will support the economic growth and demand for high quality grade A office space.the benefits of this application outweighs any heritage concerns	PA	19-May-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Hunter	Nick	I use Liverpool Street every day as a commuter, coming in from London Fields and changing onto the Metropolitan line. I warmly support the new proposals for the station. I think the design of the scheme is fantastic and elevates the status of the station to match other great London stations. The opening up of the concourse and restoration of the roof will be fantastic. The temporary disruption will be worth it for the lasting effect on London.	PA	19-May-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Hossak	Chris	Use it every day	PA	19-May-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Davies	Louis	Looks excellent	PA	19-May-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Dodd	Millie	I want to see London Liverpool Street transformed into a destination we can be proud of.	PA	19-May-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Futter	Erin	London Liverpool Street is so inaccessible in its current state. It is in desperate need of a revamp to make it fit for the future.	PA	19-May-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	McKay	Mark	Public transport and drive to a sustainable future - we must invest in our railways and public transport	PA	19-May-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Dowman	Ivan	Great accessibility project, along with a phenomenal to change Liverpool Street station for the travelling community	PA	19-May-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Walker	Emma	Good for UK Plc	PA	19-May-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Nelmes-Adams	Ellice	A much required scheme in the public interest	PA	19-May-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Riddlestone	Claire	As Britain's busiest station, this development will be transformative for passengers and the residents of London.	PA	19-May-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Dyson	Jayne	Great scheme which will enhance customer experience	PA	19-May-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	McMahon	Andrew	These plans will transform Britain's busiest station to be fit for purpose and regenerate the wider area	PA	19-May-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Green	Jeremy	Proposals look great.	PA	19-May-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Jardine	Jacqueline	Believe in the aspiration and the difference it will make to passengers, customers and communities.	PA	19-May-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Woods	Aj	This is fabulous!! We desperately need this infrastructure renovation to make it fit for purpose	PA	19-May-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Gisbourne	Ben	I fully support this significant improvement to the station and associated benefits to the local area.	PA	19-May-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Skivington	Chris	Use Liverpool St frequently for work and this scheme will be transformational in creating a much improved environment for what is the UKs busiest rail hub.	PA	19-May-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Rydings	Erin	I sometimes commute into Liverpool St Station and believe it would be good for the city.	PA	19-May-25	S

25/00494/FULEIA	Ferry	Andrew	London Liverpool Street has always been a hub for me travelling to and from the capital. I find there is no space to sit and it's always overcrowded with people standing along railings because there of this. I think it's about time it had a revamp.	PA	19-May-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Flute	Edward	I think it will be an excellent boost for the local area and the city as a whole.	PA	19-May-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Lutz	Vincent	A landmark station which is in dire need of modernisation! The design is also flattering of the area and with so much change happening in the City it is good to see Network Rail investing in their infrastructure!	PA	19-May-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Harvey	Julie	To improve station facilities.	PA	19-May-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Clarke	David	Station desperately needs updating and the tax payer shouldn't n be asked to pay for it if instead the development can fund it.	PA	19-May-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	McGlinchey	Megan	Its great.	PA	19-May-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Bhatti	Sameem	Accessibility and increased ergonomic movement	PA	19-May-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Tong	Caren	Fantastic design and will help resolve station over-crowding	PA	19-May-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Durie	Kristen	Supporting passenger benefits , job creation and economic growth and showcasing heritage railway assets	PA	19-May-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Verfuert	James	As a Fellow of the Royal Institution of Chartered Surveyors (FRICS) and formerly a Fellow of the Chartered Institution of Highways and Transportation (FCIHT), I am pleased to offer my support for the proposed scheme at Liverpool Street. The scheme presents a clear and well-considered set of benefits for passengers, with significant improvements to connectivity, accessibility, and user experience. These enhancements will serve to future-proof one of London's key transport hubs and ensure it continues to meet the evolving needs of both residents and visitors. In addition to the passenger benefits, I welcome the scheme's contribution to sustainable transport objectives. By supporting modal shift and improving active travel links, the development aligns with wider city and national ambitions to decarbonise travel and enhance air quality. The proposals also offer notable improvements to the public realm and inclusively benefits. Kind regards James	PA	19-May-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Thrower	Rachel	The proposal looks to sensitively address the heritage issues whilst creating a station which will serve the future passenger needs	PA	19-May-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Fisher	Mark	As a user of the station I believe it will greatly improve the station and of larger benefit for what is becoming a thriving part of the City not only for commuting but for local residents and visitors to London.	PA	19-May-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Bilolika	Akshay	The station is too overcrowded. London needs to grow.	PA	19-May-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Liu	Helen	I work close by and would like to see more retail stores in the area	PA	19-May-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Francisconi	Jacopo	The plans will modernise this key transport hub, improve accessibility, and accommodate the growing number of passengers using the station. I particularly support the integration of heritage features with new infrastructure, as well as the emphasis on sustainability and improved public space. These enhancements will benefit commuters, local businesses, and visitors to London alike.	PA	19-May-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Grigoriadou	Eleni	I love the new designs! The seems to be respecting the history of the station while modernising it.	PA	19-May-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Brennan	James	Privately funded station overhauls like this, and the social value they create, is at the heart of future infrastructure delivery.	PA	19-May-25	S

25/00494/FULEIA	Morris	Aaron	It is the major gate way for the city and the east of England including Stansted airport. The volume of passengers alone works justify and support the upgrade which will in turn generate more jobs for the local environment.	PA	19-May-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	McGill	Danielle	Requires redevelopment and regeneration.	PA	19-May-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Lynch	Joseph	Improved station facilities, more space and capacity, more attractive.	PA	19-May-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Stone	Jamie	I commute into Liverpool Street everyday and especially on the way home, the concourse and platforms become very crowded with people waiting around or alighting from trains. I'll support any plan that aims to mitigate that, and the plans making the station look so futuristic is of course a bonus!	PA	19-May-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Donnison	Matthew	It's overcrowded	PA	19-May-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Douch	Jeremy	Modernisation and providing a station fit for the demands into the future. Liverpool St Station is a key London transport hub and provides sustainable transport infrastructure to access the capital, a key Underground interchange and seamless connectivity with buses / walking and cycling to and from destination points. We need to invest in world class rail infrastructure that enhances our sustainable movement network.	PA	19-May-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Darney	Scott	Commuter into Liverpool St 5 days a week and would welcome improvements and redevelopment	PA	19-May-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Clarke	Simon	I am a constant station user.	PA	19-May-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Clark	Bradley	A much needed regeneration of an overcrowded often unpleasant station.	PA	19-May-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Hurst	Peter	I believe the plans to be fair to the current architecture and support growing demand and operation. The relocation of the departure board is highly supported.	PA	19-May-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Smith	James	Area needs development, station currently has poorly designed walking routes and looks dated. New design looks clean and modern while maintaining grand Victorian architecture - new walking routes a big plus	PA	19-May-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Jones	Tom	A great development for the area.	PA	19-May-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Hurst	Lia	When I visit London, this is the station my line arrives at. It would be wonderful to see it redeveloped.	PA	19-May-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Tatham	Andrew	Development to enable better passenger handling and far more reliable services such as escalators that work is required.	PA	19-May-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Pigott	Charles	Having been instrumental in the Rosehaugh Stanhope development in the 80's for Bishopsgate I can determine that this development supports a way of thinking that preserves the heritage of the 'architect' in the manner of resolving an urban situation that has become lost in time and space. The resilience of Network Rail to serve as a client and develop a concept that is self supporting by utilising their area to generate the construction income is a positive logic for development and will mark the future for other institutions to look forthrightly at their property portfolio. Can you question the architecture on scale or heritage values when the end result will allow the function of the station to respond far more appropriately to our urban population? This scheme is not a signature, but a blueprint for our collective recovery. I can only thank acme for being so bashful in such extraordinary circumstances.	PA	19-May-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Allen	Jack	The plans to redevelop Liverpool Street Station are fantastic. As a commuter who regularly uses the station, I know that it's not fit for the number of passengers that it serves in its current state. I've looked over the plans and it's obvious that it will provide everything the station desperately needs like a bigger concourse, more escalators and lifts, new toilets, and a better experience for passengers with new shops and restaurants. I absolutely support this.	PA	19-May-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Reid	Kenneth	A project that will be transformational for this transport hub.	PA	19-May-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Futter	Daniella	The plans celebrate the stations unique heritage.	PA	19-May-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Lampier	Jonathan	I think the design is a great step up from the previous proposal. The grand brick arches and creation of an upper concourse that opens into the park at the back of the station are moves that will make this a grand station.	PA	19-May-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Combs	Andy	This is one of the busiest stations and therefore, long overdue a significant transformation that will truly be beneficial for those who use this station daily. I'm in complete support for this application.	PA	19-May-25	S

25/00494/FULEIA	Sonteman	Antonia	I am a wheelchair user and have to travel through Liverpool Street Station regularly to visit family. The current lift situation is appalling and more lifts are desperately needed to cope with the demand from disabled people and those with pushchairs. Last time I travelled I waited 20 minutes for the lift to take me from the underground to the station concourse - about 12 steps for an able bodied person. This is totally unacceptable, especially when a zigzag ramp could probably be put in. In addition, the provision of accessible toilets is awful. It is about time that Liverpool Street Station became one of equality and accessibility for all.	PA	19-May-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Chu	Charlie	Positive regeneration.	PA	19-May-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Grey	Ben	The proposals present a significant opportunity to enhance the provision of green infrastructure at Liverpool Street Station, which is currently very limited.	PA	19-May-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Lino	Mario	Liverpool Street Station is in real need of an overhaul to cope with current and future passenger numbers. The fact that the improvements would be privately funded makes it even better.	PA	19-May-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Lucioni	Sara	The station is currently inaccessible and is in need of an upgrade.	PA	19-May-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Bansal	Jay	To see improvements to the station for its future.	PA	19-May-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Howell	Robert	Liverpool st is my main London station and I love it	PA	19-May-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Buckley	Emma	Station improvements would be greatly appreciated - this is my local line.	PA	19-May-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Ahuja	Ashwin	Grow the economy, boost infrastructure. Win win!	PA	19-May-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Furey	Wendy	Because there are serious problems currently for elderly people like myself.	PA	19-May-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Jump	Michael	It's vitally important to have a station that's fit for all to use. The current station is woefully inadequate in terms of services to the general public, but even more so for the disabled, families with children and the elderly. I am almost blind, with walking issues, and find access extremely difficult. A modern major station in our capital city should be a symbol of how we see ourselves. Currently it's over-crowded with inadequate toilet facilities and virtually no lift provision. Give us a modern station we can use properly and also be proud of!	PA	19-May-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Huyghe	Lizy	I support this transformational, station first scheme that not only offers an immense amount of public benefits through the proposed station enhancement works, but also contributes to the urban fabric through its contemporary architecture inspired by traditional railway architecture, through sustainable design, through celebrating its heritage and enhancing the stations civic presence with improved urban connections.	PA	19-May-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Futter	Ian	I commuted through Liverpool Street station for a number of years and have always wondered why the station is so inaccessible to people with disabilities. While most have London has seen refurbishments over the past 20+ years - Liverpool Street station appears to have been forgotten. A redevelopment of the site is well overdue - especially with the new Elizabeth line access now.	PA	19-May-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Rodgers	Dean	This design is an improvement in every way from the last design. I do however think taller buildings in line with the tall buildings in this area would have been more striking but understand there is objections to this.	PA	19-May-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Futter	Claire	London Liverpool Street Station would benefit greatly from an upgrade to make it accessible to all. And the plans that are currently in the pipeline celebrate the unique heritage of the station.	PA	19-May-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Ambrose	Rachel	I use the station frequently	PA	19-May-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Hurst	Lia	When I visit London, this is the station my line arrives at. It would be wonderful to see it redeveloped.	PA	19-May-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Capps	Dale	I really enjoy travelling to London it's very convenient station	PA	19-May-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Krolwiak	Jan	Important Business hub for Clients to/from London as well as workforce	PA	19-May-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Mack	Alistair	improvement long overdue.please do not delay any longer.	PA	19-May-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Talabi	Babatunde	Much needed, Long Awaited	PA	19-May-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Bradley	Jon	Active user of the station and in agreement redevelopment is needed	PA	19-May-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Shaw	Charlie	really cool project which will redevelop and make the area prosperous	PA	19-May-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Penny	Charlotte	Using it everyday and the station needs it with the sheer amount of users!	PA	19-May-25	S

25/00494/FULEIA	Stermer	Sandra	I work close to Liverpool Station and support an upgrade. Especially if the underground will be clearer and more accessible.	PA	19-May-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Oyedepo	Helen	My family use this Station when they come from the Country side to visit me in London, It is also an important and famously used location since centuries ago.	PA	19-May-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Peluso	Diego	I support the planning application for the redevelopment of Liverpool Street Station. This project is crucial for modernizing one of London's busiest transport hubs, ensuring it can efficiently accommodate the growing number of passengers. The scheme looks stunning and it could finally compete with the modern neighborhood.	PA	19-May-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Serjeant	Julie	I like using the train from my local station to London & use it when I visit family in London	PA	19-May-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	McGinley	Kevin	Fantastic project. Transform the station at no cost to us taxpayers.	PA	19-May-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Robertson	Dave	I commute via the station and the experience is depressing. V poor accessibility and overcrowded. This application is a fantastic opportunity to combine fantastic design with desperately needed station improvements. There is nothing to be proud of in the existing station whereas the proposed station's appearance is international class.	PA	19-May-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Taine	James	Lovely design. I work next to the station and this would be a big improvement.	PA	19-May-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Gallant	Gemma	I support these plans because the station sorely needs more variety in its commercial offering - clothes shops etc -as well as improved accessibility. We need more escalators and lifts. Bringing my bike on the train is great but a real challenge to get it through the station, with me often having to carry it up or down the stairs as there is either a queue for the lift or it is out of order. I welcome the improvements!	PA	19-May-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Di Bello	Marcos	Frequent user of the station and acknowledge need to enhance the station for future use	PA	20-May-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Bolster	Mandy	Looks good and much needed!	PA	20-May-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Donald	Guy	Liverpool St station looks and feels 1990s, bringing it up to date would be great both as transport hub but also as a destination in its own right like St Pancras.	PA	20-May-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Giebultowski	Marcin	I'm a railway user and supporter and I support every activity improving the way railways work.	PA	20-May-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Foster	David	Better accessibility from street to platforms for my journeys out of Liverpool Street.	PA	20-May-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Le Breuilly	David	Big cathedral like spaces are needed. Step free access and accessible facilities needed too. This proposal gets my support.	PA	20-May-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Le Breuilly	Imanol	The cathedral like entrances are almost Gaudi and will be an very impressive feature arriving into Liverpool Street. The increase in concourse space and improvements to access are also welcome.	PA	20-May-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Lane	Izzy	It's nice to see the concourse being opened up, so it focuses on the trains. Moving the retail outlets up to the balcony, and out of the way of the station, is a huge improvement.	PA	20-May-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Earle	Richard	This important transport hub needs redevelopment to ensure that it can cope with passenger numbers in the future, and be a welcoming, efficient railway station for the current times.	PA	20-May-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Kill	Steve	The beautiful design, especially the vaulted ceilings.	PA	20-May-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Sanghera	Nav	This is a frequently used train station and any improvements to this city will be good for all, commuters and visitors of the city.	PA	20-May-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Hogg	Marialba	It would be a considerable improvement.	PA	20-May-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Jump	Jennifer	As a frequent but elderly traveller ease of access in stations is important to me, particularly lifts that work. This new plan sounds to have been well-thought out for all users.	PA	20-May-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Galimberti	Eleonora	Liverpool st was the first station I walked into when I first arrived in London 8 years ago. It holds a special spot in my heart and I believe it's time for a glow up! The scheme is gorgeous and it truly checks all the boxes. ACME is an excellent and considerate architectural firm and they really thought of everything.	PA	20-May-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Martlew	Ken	I am in a wheelchair and the access at Liverpool Street isn't adequate particularly to the Underground, hopefully this redevelopment will put that right.	PA	20-May-25	S

25/00494/FULEIA	Dann	James	I believe this would be a very worthwhile cause to redevelop London Liverpool Street station. In view of the large volume of people that use it, the station and facilities need to be updated for the 21st century.	PA	20-May-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Rickard	Paul	Economics wellbeing of london and the uk.	PA	20-May-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Thakur	Matthew	The old station was showing its age. Revamp long overdue, and it sounds like the public-private partnership for financing it was a good deal.	PA	20-May-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Kendall	Harriet	I often travel through and the station desperately needs to be overhauled, and be truly inclusive! I love the look of the office space and the location seems really sustainable.	PA	20-May-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Webb	Nick	This is an architectural design of outstanding quality, that will enhance current provision significantly.	PA	20-May-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Rose	David	To improve access for disabled people.	PA	20-May-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	White	Billy	Better Environment.	PA	20-May-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Moemken	Daniel		PA	20-May-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Woods	Thomas	It is long overdue and as a carer with a wheelchair-using partner, the current provision for lift access is extremely poor.	PA	20-May-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Barter	Stephen	I believe this an outstanding design, which respects the heritage, combined with much needed accessibility and capacity improvements which will be transformative for the City of London and surrounding areas, funded by the new office building. It will have a significant 'multiplier' effect.	PA	20-May-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Cook	Dave	Dreadful design! There may well be issues with the layout of the station at the concourse end and a missed opportunity for greater oversight development, but, really, is this the best that they can come up with? The 'square mile' has any number of other sites requiring more urgent redevelopment - not somewhere which was comprehensively redeveloped within our own lifetime! To my own eyes, the issues from a passengers perspective are easily resolved - declutter!... this has already happened at the platform barriers with the removal of the little retail units but much more elsewhere could be achieved.	PA	20-May-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Davies	Evelyn	It's essential we futureproof Liverpool Street whilst keeping some of it's history and culture.	PA	20-May-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Purwanto	Alex Bergman	I love a London that is constantly developing and I think the redevelopment of London Liverpool Street station will make the area more smart and liveable!	PA	20-May-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Bromilow	Neil	Great design.	PA	20-May-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Sowunmi	Ibrahim	I like to see the development of the urban Centre into and highly accessible and regional nearly powerful focal point that will channel throughout of the city. The more capacity the better	PA	20-May-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	John	Pablo	More trains	PA	20-May-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Chapman	Imogen	Provides the updated station people need	PA	20-May-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Foat	Ashling	Believe in it	PA	20-May-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Rudbeck	Christian	Regular user of London and Street	PA	20-May-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Murchison	Francesca	Station need work	PA	20-May-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Gbolade	Lanre	It will bring needed critical infrastructure upgrades to this part of London, making it full accessible and therefore equitable for all Londoners and visitors.	PA	20-May-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Capitanio	Monica	A thoughtful scheme that enhances essential infrastructure while delivering high-quality, contextually sensitive architecture.	PA	20-May-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Greenbank	Ben	Capacity and public realm improvements	PA	20-May-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Stokes	Poppy	I like how the proposal is in keeping with the original design but looks like it will improve my life as a daily user - about time someone came up with a creative solution!	PA	20-May-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Dominedo	Luca	Regular user, seen different stations	PA	20-May-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Hunt	Rosie	Improved access and more modern facilities	PA	20-May-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Davies	Jeremy	Eases congestion and looks fabulous	PA	20-May-25	S

25/00494/FULEIA	Higginson	Tom	The station does not meet the needs of the modern day - lack of accessibility is a fundamental issue. I like the cathedral like space of the concourse and the connectivity to surrounding areas. The commercial office block is a well designed and elegant structure that will add to the townscape and is wholly in keeping with the City's plans and aspirations as a world hub.	PA	20-May-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Bull	Jude	Excellent design that will transform the way I can use and access the station - desperately needed, looking forward to it. thanks!	PA	20-May-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Halford	James	Commute into the station regularly and like the impressive plans of modernising it whilst keeping a lot of traditional features.	PA	20-May-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Sewraz	Ashisha	Will benefit given I commute to Liverpool Street everyday for work.	PA	20-May-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Woldu	Luwam	I support the redevelopment of Liverpool Street Station as it promises to enhance accessibility for the public, including wheelchair users. The introduction of ticket barriers, escalators, and increased general space will help to reduce congestion throughout the station, all while preserving the building's heritage.	PA	20-May-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Combs	Joseph	More developments like this are needed to grow the UK economy and make life better for everyone.	PA	20-May-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Harley	Katie	I think this will be an exciting new development for the station. I am fully behind it.	PA	20-May-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Mills	Stephanie	This is the heart of the city and the station needs to reflect our ambition.	PA	20-May-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Invernizzi	Greta	This project reimagines a vital urban area of London, boldly merging visionary, future-facing design with the city's deep-rooted architectural heritage. It positions London at the forefront of global innovation while honoring the timeless character and traditions that define its identity.	PA	20-May-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	FELLINGHAM	CHRISTOPHER	Much needed boost to the local economy, capacity of the station and a great investment.	PA	20-May-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Abbott	Mark	I like the proposed open concourse and balcony spaces. I like the improved access to exchange square. I approve of not covering the historic Great Eastern Railway building.	PA	20-May-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Burton	Claire	Providing accessible travel	PA	20-May-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Blazheieva	Hannah	I beleive this is the best scheme and it will bring a lot of amazing improvements	PA	20-May-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Comaish	Richard	Queues waste time.	PA	20-May-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Harlow	Steve	I commute everyday and Liverpool st station has been left behind in terms of facilities and renovation. It's time for a facelift	PA	20-May-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Beardsley	Stuart	Yes	PA	20-May-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Whitefield	David	The concourse at present is completely inadequate to contain the volume of passengers waiting to board , especially when , as on the evening of Saturday 17th May there is an interruption of services	PA	20-May-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Gould	Justin	Make travel easier	PA	20-May-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Gibbons	Morag	I love Liverpool Street it need s updated tube maps iam very happy to have my say because iam use the train to London on Tuesday and prefer to use the train from Manningtree to London Liverpool Street	PA	20-May-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Biwden	Sarah	Will be good	PA	20-May-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Newton	Jessica	yes	PA	21-May-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Muirhead	Jonny	I am a regular train user + wish to see as many station upgraded + improved as possible. The main station I use is Lincoln Central, which needs a thorough upgrade + where there is regular congestion at the exit barriers. The footbridge to the central platforms is too narrow, barely allowing for single file, two way traffic in peak times. The platform canopies would also be perfect for solar panels to help Network Rail move faster towards net zero.	PA	21-May-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Young	Beatrix	Station needs upgrade and scheme is exciting and sympathetic at same time.	PA	21-May-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Hammond	Karen	I am a passenger & former commuter.	PA	21-May-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Kelly	Peter	Place is a nightmare to navigate. Any overhaul badly needed!	PA	21-May-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Brede	David	I travelled through and to Liverpool Street and indeed worked there for many years at Harwich House and the General Offices.	PA	21-May-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Grant	Krista	It needs redevelopment.	PA	21-May-25	S

25/00494/FULEIA	Buttery	George	I believe that Liverpool Street needs work to make it fit for both the present and the future. I think the plans developed are reasonable and ambitious plans that would meet this requirement, and that this should proceed at pace to ensure that the station is brought into line with 21st Century requirements, especially now that it is the busiest station in the whole country.	PA	22-May-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Hughes	Gary	It's too congested when waiting for your train. Especially as the Norwich service is called late	PA	22-May-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Drummond	Adam	Major terminus stations are the gateway to London for thousands of people every day. They need to facilitate seamless journeys from outside the city to wherever else in the city people are going to. But they need to be more than just functional. People coming through Liverpool Street are either commuting, in which case it's going to be a place they experience every day for years, or visiting, in which case this is their welcome to London. In both cases the small things add up and it's even more important that these are pleasant experiences, so terminus stations need to be modern, vibrant and welcoming rather than trudging and utilitarian.	PA	22-May-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Lopato	Carolina	We need a fully inclusive and accessible station to support the local end users.	PA	22-May-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Jenkins	Aled	Sustainable destination needed at Liverpool Street Station.	PA	22-May-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Barton	James	Sustainability , approach to change and architecture	PA	22-May-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Gamble-Shields	Helen	It will be a catalyst for improvement, access, inclusion	PA	22-May-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Scannell	Louise	An exciting proposal to revitalise this key London station - improving the experience for passengers and creating a positive addition to the skyline	PA	22-May-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Springall	Alex	Fully accessible ststion	PA	22-May-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Fyfe	Oliver	Would like an improved station for commuting near my office	PA	22-May-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Fattah	Lana	As a frequent user of the station and having seen and experience how inaccessible and overcrowded it can be its clear to me the station needs a significant redevelopment. The submitted proposal balances the needs of the station while creating a dialogue between the existing, something the station has historically done several times to address the needs of the city and passengers. The new entrances create much needed connections and access to the surroundings.	PA	22-May-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	McLaughlin	Laura	I regularly use Moorgate and would like to see the development of Liverpool st station to improve access from this location. It is in need of better access and overhaul.	PA	23-May-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Strudwick	Paul	There disabled toilets are a disgraced mainly due to the over use in the early hours when they cannot be bothered to open the able bodied toilets	PA	23-May-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	White	Lauren	The station needs better accessibility for disabled customers, prams etc. not very user friendly at the moment	PA	23-May-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Ellerton	David	The hotel isn't going to submerged in theses plans and more care has also being given to the upgrade of the station. With what appears to be impressive entrances . It is important to work with the original structure as much as is possible thus equipping for future growth in years to come .	PA	23-May-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Playle	Ross	Sympathetic to the Victorian architecture; more accessible, spacious and bright.	PA	23-May-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Vickers	Kevin	Liverpool Street desperately needs to be upgraded to handle current and future planned passenger volumes, and to provide a higher quality of customer experience. It is old, and tired currently.	PA	23-May-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Jappy	John	Reduced congestion within the station	PA	23-May-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Hilman	Kelly	Fully accessible station needed with create offer	PA	23-May-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Brown	Adam	Good design and station passenger flow improvement	PA	23-May-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Bell	Lucas	This will bring much-needed improvements to overall passenger experience and important investment to the city gateway, as well as bringing wider economic benefits. The social value will also be a great addition.	PA	23-May-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	McCafferty	Declan	London needs development	PA	23-May-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Burge	Ben	Use it daily and needs improving	PA	23-May-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Markwell	Adam	Long needed to improve capacity	PA	23-May-25	S

25/00494/FULEIA	Redgewell	David	new to abetter public transport Network interchanges for passengers with reduced mobility and partly sighted passengers wheelchairs users bus and underground and rail users	PA	23-May-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Hopson	Peter	Totally support the objectives of investment into our public infrastructure and building upon the global attraction of the City of London.	PA	23-May-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Ramroop	Marsha	It's so important this space is accessible and inclusive. I hope this helps.	PA	23-May-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Perela	Anna	It is a much needed scheme for the City	PA	27-May-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Clinch	Melvyn	Amazing quality design and needed investment	PA	27-May-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Killilea	Ailish	I want station improvements here.	PA	27-May-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Kirker	Greig	Great development for Liverpool Stret	PA	27-May-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Wells	Andrew	Lessen waiting time	PA	27-May-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Bradbury	David	It would be great to see the station improved. It's an important and busy gateway from East Anglia into London and to the south and onwards to Europe. Any changes to make it easier and more pleasant to use would be welcome, especially if the new building looks as good as the plans.	PA	27-May-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Symons	Sean	As a visitor to London I see this as a great project which will drive growth and investment into the local area. The design is well considered against the heritage context	PA	27-May-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Griffith	Ian	Not an easy station for me to find my way around.	PA	27-May-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Kapinga	Monalisa	I want to see London Liverpool Street be transformed into a gateway to the City of London	PA	27-May-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Doughty	Rosie	Step free access, eased congestion, improved signage and protection of the old architecture .	PA	27-May-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Owen	Jennifer	I know the lead architect personally. I have seen the plans, and understand that the original Victorian features of the station will be unchanged. The new station will provide much better facilities for travellers. We do need to modernise and improve structures as our needs in London change.	PA	27-May-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Plumpton-Walsh	Norman	Yes its a bit of an ante station at the moment	PA	27-May-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Wilby	Dave	It's my station. I work there	PA	27-May-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Rowena Thomas Usmar	Margaret	I've been using Liverpool Street since 1958	PA	27-May-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Firth	Richie	I use the station for my commute it could definitely do with flowing better	PA	27-May-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Skinner	Steve	to reduce congestion and increase passenger comfort	PA	27-May-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Ade	Chris	The station is barely accessible, and saying "barely" is being kind. The layout isn't what I'd call intuitive either. The plans will improve both of these things at the very least amongst other awesome improvements. I'm completely here for it and very excited about such a change. Make it happen, it's about time.	PA	27-May-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Hickman	Jack	Needs modernisation. Great design and more space in London. Onwards!	PA	27-May-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Tucker	Aaron	I regularly commute through Liverpool Street station and it's clearly in need of a major overhaul. I think the proposal strikes the right balance between preserving historical aspects of the area while also creating a development fit for the future. Certain historical societies seem ready to object to any and all progress and should be ignored.	PA	27-May-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	McGlinchey	Kevin	As this is one of Londons busiest stations, it is long overdue a complete overhaul and revamp, general face-lift. New passenger lifts are required.	PA	27-May-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Adams	Mike	used for many years	PA	27-May-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Bine	Ian	The additional capacity and access will minimise crowding at busy times, and make it quicker and easier for users to move around, and help keep everyone safe.	PA	27-May-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Whittaker	Mark	The station needs more capacity and the new design looks good!	PA	27-May-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Whitlock	Mark	I use it regularly to access London and to traverse to Heathrow via lizzy line.	PA	27-May-25	S

25/00494/FULEIA	H	A	Seven years of disruption to add extra lifts and escalators. Really? The design is still poor, the light airy nature of the current station will be lost under artificial light, especially as the new tower will block sunlight into what's left of the train shed. I suspect the medieval theifdom that is the city will wave this version through now as heritage has been considered, ignored and thrown in the bin again. Is that the best offer? Of course, money talks!!!	PA	27-May-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Kerslake	Sue	Coming from Norwich I use it often as an older person travelling on my own with a suitcase it is the worse for step free access. The accessible toilets are often out of action massive queues & generally not pleasant . Also from the underground I always end up where there is steps as there is no signage .	PA	28-May-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Goodall	Tom	Great scheme with potential to completely regenerate major transport hub.	PA	28-May-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Grantham	John	Change is good!	PA	28-May-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Kinnear	Sandra	i do travel a lot	PA	28-May-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Kinnear	Sandra	i do travel a lot	PA	28-May-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Mortimer	Andrew	Much in need of regeneration.	PA	28-May-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Thomas	Richard	Great design.	PA	28-May-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Balkan	Alex	I support a greater variety of cafes, restaurants and shops, and more sitting spaces. In my commutes through the station, I like to stop by to either work, eat or explore the shops. The options currently are pretty limited and space for seating can be non-existent in peak times. It can get very crowded when walking. Giving people space is good for health and safety. Yes, these plans are a win-win for London, commuters across the UK and builds our international reputation and attraction. It's great for people's lives and great for the economy. It has my backing.	PA	28-May-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Wilson	Sam	The station is in dire need of modernisation, improved accessibility and an environment befitting of one of the capital's major transport hubs. The proposed designs are high quality and the height is appropriate for this location in the city.	PA	28-May-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Chuah	Leah	Modernise the development	PA	29-May-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Boty	Michael	Regularly use LLS station, it needs some TLC to make it great.	PA	30-May-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Hale	Paul	I enjoy training travel and since retiring I often pass through Liverpool St Station from my home in Suffolk. Liverpool St has become very overcrowded and claustrophobic. When waiting for a platform to be allocated for the train to Norwich, the central concourse becomes almost impassable. I used to use the bar when I had time to kill. This has now gone so I now avoid the station until much closer to my departure time.	PA	30-May-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Jonnerby	Jakob	I wish to register my strong support for the proposed redevelopment of London Liverpool Street station. This vital project promises a much-needed transformation of one of London's busiest transport hubs, delivering significant benefits for passengers, the local community, and the wider London economy. I myself am a frequent user of the station, both to visit the vibrant Spitalfields market nearby, as well as the most convenient access point to Stansted Airport.	PA	30-May-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Magner	Richard	To support this iconic Station.	PA	30-May-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Sheldrake	Allan	i just wishe the public address system would work again.	PA	02-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Barham	Steve	Travel to London.	PA	02-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	chau	nina	i like to see london better is self.	PA	02-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Rowley	Kevin	very busy station.	PA	02-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Hamel de Monchenault	Morgan	I pass through the station weekly, and it could do with an uplift!	PA	02-Jun-25	S

25/00494/FULEIA	Ricketts	Marc	Now at one time there were proposed plans to Expand the Railway from London Liverpool Street to London Bridge. But it didn't happen. So I Think they Should plan to bring it back in the future. Like for example. When i got a Train from Bush Hiil Park to London Liverpool Street one morning. i changed for a Bus. But the Traffic wasn't moving. So in the end. i gave up and walked it to London Bridge Railway Station and got another Train from there. So will anybody look into all this for the future?	PA	02-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Young	Gary	The station need modernising for the future. Signage and the display bards are well dated. It should be easy for people to navigate around the station and better toilet facilities.	PA	02-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Marshall	Stephanie	Public transport hubs are essential.	PA	02-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Rodwell	Roland	Travelling to London.	PA	02-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Weeks	Kevin	I an a regular passenger though the station for decades and this historic station needs a new lease of life to cope with demand and future proof it.	PA	02-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Lewis	Pete	less congestion.	PA	02-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Lee	Martin	I use the station frequently and it is overcrowded and concerning for personal safety. It is very difficult to get platform access when there are thousands of people milling around and they prevent access to our platform.	PA	02-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Hickling	Elaine	Wheelchair accessibility is awful.	PA	02-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Hattersley	Roy		DC	02-Jun-25	R
25/00494/FULEIA	Colson	Justin	I use the station regularly and have not found it to be overcrowded since the Elizabeth Line diverted most traffic away from the concourse. The existing structure has much architectural merit, and there is no justification for imposing commercial property above it, reducing natural light. Network Rail usage figures are misleading as so many passengers use only Elizabeth Line, not using the main concourse.	PA	03-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Arnold	Hannah	Because as disabled person the pain and fatigue the lack of lifts at Liverpool Street creates is discrimination.	PA	04-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Cutter	Gordon	We need a better accessibility.	PA	04-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Jenny Crow	Petra	More, more accessible and cleaner accessible toilets are desperately needed at this station.	PA	04-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	McFadden	Clare	Disabled people have the same rights to travel as anyone else and without these elevators they will not be able to do that. This is 2025 not 1776!	PA	04-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Toscani	Adam	It's in need of a make over. It's old, it's tired and it's overcrowded in times of disruption.	PA	04-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Fawcett	Mary	Disabled, horrendous trying to use London stations, underground and buses. Wheelchair and scooter uses are seen as an inconvenience.	PA	04-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Alvarez	Teresa	The station needs to be more accessible.	PA	04-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Wodehouse	Robert	Make travel in London more integrated.	PA	04-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Alvarez	Teresa	The station needs to be more accessible	PA	05-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Briody	Chantel	I am a wheelchair user. I love visiting liverpool.	PA	05-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Scott	Richard	I am partially disabled and fell down the escalator at the station so I would recommend installing lifts!	PA	05-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Brown	Alan	I use the station regularly and have not found it to be overcrowded since the Elizabeth Line diverted most traffic away from the concourse. The existing structure has much architectural merit, and there is no justification for imposing commercial property above it, reducing natural light. I regularly take my mother in her wheelchair and this station is appalling for access and the new plans look even worse. The station is beautiful and it will be destroyed by additional support columns and removal of natural light. Profit and greed are driving this development, nothing else!	PA	05-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Soave-Smith	Cosmo	Everyone here is saying there could be improvement made to the station but no one is questioning whether destroying the character of the famous building is worth it? The proposed changes are a horrendous betrayal of our commitment to preserving beautiful London in favour for corporate greed. I find almost all of the supportive comments to be suspicious as heck, all just saying 'yes needs improvement' with no mention of the huge destruction of the heritage site. 100 metres of skyscraper on top of lovely Liverpool Street Station? Absolutley grim idea that gives the public an elevator and takes away a generational landmark. Please please reject this proposal and tell corporate greed to LEAVE US ALONE	PA	05-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Burge	Ben	Use it daily and needs improving.	PA	05-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Woolf	Craig	Great for the economy.	PA	05-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Thomas	Sophie	Needs renovation and accessibility for all.	PA	05-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Davis	Christopher	This scheme is an outrageous aberration of our built and railway heritage. No one with any sense of basic, human-focused architectural design - let alone heritage sensitivity - could consider this scheme appropriate. The demolition of the existing architecture is unjustifiable, wasteful and senseless. The additions are totally insensitive in scale and material terms to the existing hotel building, and the enviable historic setting, which should be protected as a globally historically significant railway terminus. This scheme constitutes a further erosion of the Bishopsgate area of the City of London and will add to already exacerbated pavement level wind issues and daylight starvation. If I had presented this scheme at architecture school it would have been torn off the wall - it should be denied at all costs.	PA	05-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Littlewood	Janet	I support the objection submitted by Civic Voice and would like to object to this proposal. The application does not conform to the Local Plan policies on height of buildings. The proposed office block on the Liverpool St frontage is far too bulky and high and dominates the adjoining Grade II star hotel. The upper floors project into the public highway and alter the street scale, street scene and character of the Conservation Area. What are Conservation Areas and listed building status for if not to protect and enhance the areas and buildings? To have any relevance this must include the impact neighbouring developments have on them. This proposed development sadly neither protects nor enhances. I trust these comments will be taken into account when deciding this application.	PA	05-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Ramage	Ron P	So i can enjoy my travel experience when i go through the station.	PA	05-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Rosa Bolinson	Hannah	Yes make them assessable for all people no need for male and female toilets just toilets	PA	05-Jun-25	S

25/00494/FULEIA	Greene	Michael	The impact on the character and appearance of the area would be my grounds for objection. The station and its associated buildings are the little that is left of what defines the neighbourhood, despite the construction that has already engulfed the area. Doubling down on this architectural vandalism is not a reason for allowing this request. Once places like these are gone, they are gone forever. There is nothing that I can see in this proposal that would outweigh the cost of the loss of these beautiful historic buildings and the little open space that comes with them. All in the pursuit of profit for the builders; the proposal is not for facilities that are critically lacking in London. Are we that desperate for another shopping concourse and hot food take away. These wonder places that have survived this long, have survived for a reason; they define our city. Those who in the past have been beguiled by slick presentations and 'artists impressions' have allowed our past to be knocked destined to be forgotten. The developers rub their hands together,, spend the profits and move on to destroy the next much loved thing that thing they can find. This is how we came to lose London. Now we have the Barbican estate... and look up a 'before and after' for No 1 Poultry building. Go to Madrid, Paris, Lisbon... anywhere that wasn't flattened by bombing in the war and we don't see what we have allowed here. Now we knock down what the Germans left untouched? Surely, there is a concrete and glass monolith elsewhere that these people can can knock down. I know that we can't keep everything but this plan for the destruction of yet another significant piece of our historic architecture is to be deeply lamented.	PA	05-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Green	Nicholas	This is an iconic building, a unique and loved part of the fabric and history of London. It should not be partially demolished. Rather it should be protected. Those of the sites around it which are not historic can be redeveloped, but the historic ones must be left. They can be renovated and modern interiors remodelled but the original fabric must be preserved. As part of the unique history of London it makes no sense to replace with a modern alternative just to line the pockets of developers. So for residential amenity - for those who live in the area and on London generally and use the station and for those visiting London and bringing valuable commercial benefits to London, these proposals are wrong and should be rejected. Member of the public and Past ward member. This will destroy the character and soul of the station and the area. It is architectural vandalism of the sort John Betjeman prevented at St Pancras and we are all glad he succeeded there as we see how wonderful it is today. Network Rail's justification for rejecting a far preferable alternative is baseless, and that there are alternative approaches that would: Cost significantly less Cause years' less disruption to station users Would not entail demolition of a large section of the station building Would not entail the construction of a 20-storey office block through and on top of the station On every ground this is the wrong approach to developing this site. It is a part of the nations heritage not for networking rail to destroy with the poorly conceived, venal, shoddy and vandalistic approach proposed. It should and must be rejected.	PA	05-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Clarke	Daniel	Because London is continuously welcome more and more people and it needs these upgrades to fulfil these requirements and demands	PA	05-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Middleton	Peter	because its getting to bit push in there now a days	PA	05-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Camp	Alex	Leave our historic train stations alone! There's no need for more bland liminal office space	PA	05-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Brittain	Jeremy	Travelling through this station could be so much better/enjoyable with these plans.	PA	05-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Staley	David	A welcome to the best City in the world.	PA	05-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Parkes	Angela	More toilets, preferably some at ground level to enable those like me with poor mobility to gain access. Provide more seating in the concourse.	PA	05-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Nock	Anthony	More space & less congestion	PA	05-Jun-25	S

25/00494/FULEIA	Taylor	John	To aid the disabled community get around the station more easily. The one lift by the Ticket office was not fit for purpose years ago as it was so small. I think a good size glass one on the concourse near the Escalators would be I think an ideal solution. Also the circle/H&C/District lines made accessible. This has been done at Kings Cross but not Liverpool Street where other trains go from. I just think the whole station needs looking at completely. Toilets need better signage. Disabled one I think has moved from by the First class lounge. Ive been to that station and suffered the access issues there due to the lack of good accessibility. In fact, the access to the Circle Line etc. could be a discrimination issue. These lift problems including lifts should have started after the old DDA Act came in but now the Equality Act.	PA	05-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Miller	Matthew	As a commuter to the city and a proud fan of both rail history and the storied history of the city, I fully support these plans. Liverpool Street has been in need of a revamp for some time, and these plans are both functional as well as beautiful. It will absolutely make my life easier, and doubtless will do the same for other commuters and travellers alike.	PA	05-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Shepherd	Jake	Heritage retained, facilities upgraded	PA	05-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Smith	C M	so the residents and visitors to the city will be better serviced	PA	05-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Livesey	Karen	Flat 33 Coleman Court Station Road Coleman Clacton-on-Sea	PA	05-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Dyson	Freya	irreversible harm will caused to the historic character and architectural heritage of the area paving the way for further overdevelopment.	PA	05-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Glenton	Tim	I use the station regularly. This is terrible destruction of our cultural heritage. The planning agency behind this has been cynically encouraging people to support because they say the only way to get new toilets is to support the destruction of heritage assets and removal of almost all natural light with a monstrous tower above the station. This is nonsense. The disruption for all travellers for years will massively out weigh any benefits long term. The proposed plans are unsightly and no in line with the heritage style of the building.	PA	06-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Kennett	Helen	To make travel easier for elderly and disabled customer and parents/carers with pushchairs and prams.	PA	06-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Cheskin	Claire	Disabled access is not very good between the street entrance and ticket hall, frequently the little lift is broken down.	PA	06-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Hui	Duncan	The station is way overdue for a refurbishment. The latest plan looks great and should be implemented.	PA	06-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Smith	Dawn	Disabled people need to be able to move around the country like the able bodied time to update all the stations across the country, we all deserve to travel as and when we wish and staff should be available on stations to help them . Perhaps it's time for new accessible trains??	PA	06-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Fletcher	Lewis	Excellent cause - I commute into Liverpool Street each day, I admire the changes already happening and future development opportunities for this historic station.	PA	06-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Shaw	Mark	The station is far too small for the number of passengers.	PA	06-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Taylor	Boyd	East Anglia needs it.	PA	06-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Griffin	Lloyd	Yes.	PA	06-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Wakely	Virginia	As a female, I want to see female toilets available at ground level not underground; clearly sign posted as a safe space for women and girls only. There currently are not enough toilets available at Liverpool Street Station.	PA	06-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Crew	Steve	Worked for 30 years in The City and in and around Bishopsgate and Liverpool and Broad Street. This is a bold design with some outstanding features.	PA	06-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Rolph	Andrew	There are currently insufficient lifts for wheelchair users to access the London Underground and Elizabeth lines from the mainline station.	PA	06-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Tillson	David	Make it happen.	PA	06-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Freeman	Michael	Whenever there are train delays the concourse becomes dangerously crowded.	PA	06-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Freeman	Michael	Whenever there are train delays the concourse becomes dangerously crowded.	PA	06-Jun-25	S

25/00494/FULEIA	Glover	Sally	I find it very hard to go down stairs (and can't use down escalators). I am not registered disabled so no radar key. As I get older it is often really challenging for me to get the 2 hr journey from home to office. I struggle down the stairs at Liverpool Street but it is hard. Heaven help people with small children / prams / luggage.	PA	06-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Campbell	Paul	Economic growth. Passenger capacity. Improved facilities and leisure offer.	PA	06-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Roderz	Will	It's going to revitalise the busiest gateway into the city.	PA	06-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Wilson	Caleb	hi hi ! im visually impaired and live in bury saint edmunds, but i have to travel to london (bury saint edmunds -> ipswich -> london liverpool street) on the train due to being registered at moorfields eye hospital and while the station is one im more familiar with, the part of the station we usually end in has naut had a single lift in sight & purely only either stairs or escalators and unfortunately, most londoners are naut the most patient or respectful when it comes to others, especially the visually impaired, so having more lifts would be an absolute godsend even if they end up being swamped by people who don't need to use them ^^	PA	06-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Shaw	Mark	The lower level concourse is still far too small for the number of passengers using it. There is too much retail space adjacent to very high pedestrian traffic flows that should be removed to increase the concourse space, as currently at rush hour it is almost impossible to actually cross the concourse to get to the platforms due to sheer numbers of people. This scheme increases the area for seating slightly but doesn't go anywhere near far enough to increase the total quantum of concourse area. I have sent an email with a mark up of the concourse showing where retail should be removed/made smaller.	PA	06-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Allen	Stephanie	Liverpool St is even more important as a showcase of London, now the Elizabeth Line is there, so it needs much better facilities: more toilets; on platform level; accessible and gender neutral.	PA	06-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Allard	Trevor	Because it is the busiest train station in the country.	PA	06-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	MacKay	Sheena	Liverpool Street needs level access toilets for pwople with luggage, not just the accessible toilet that needs a rafar key. I'm perfectly mobile but im small, in my late 60s and its quite dangerous trying to negotiate the stairs with luggage. Ive almost fallen down severql times. Also need access to both sides of the platforms without having to negotiatt the stairs and bridge or travel to another statjon just to get onto the right platform.	PA	06-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Aldous	Teri	Because it needs it!	PA	06-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	.	Nick	Much needed. Long overdue. Give the gateway to the City the station it deserves.	PA	06-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Thornton	Michael	Don't want to have to walk all the way to the other end of the station & back Just To Go to the overcrowded toilets	PA	06-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Dawsey-Hewitt	Savannah	I have a bladder condition and lack of toilets in stations is an access issue for me.	PA	06-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Brookes	Daniel	I use Liverpool Street daily and the proposed plans will greatly improve that experience.	PA	06-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Taylor	Boyd	Please consider the massive, predicted increase in the population of East Anglia and build a railway station fit for the future.	PA	06-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Jump	Andy	It would make it easier and safer to travel through Liverpool st.	PA	06-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Potter	Margaret	Easier to get off station.	PA	06-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Rolph	David	Better access for disabled people who by the way have a lousy trip around this station, there is currently only one central lift down to underground ticket hall and to Elizabeth line. The station grts too crowded and becomrs a death trap. Autistic people really find it difficult to manage. I know all this because i am both physically disabled and have autism.	PA	06-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Thomas	Paul	I do regular business in the Liverpool Street area and crucial upgrades to infrastructure to promote flow and improve safety deserve support.	PA	06-Jun-25	S

25/00494/FULEIA	Murphy	Kevin	The proposed development is much needed and its design is of a very high standard. It is, as the proposals demonstrate, entirely possible to develop above and around the station in an appropriate fashion that preserves and sustains the heritage significance of the various heritage assets affected. The development will enhance the station's landmark status and - very importantly - significantly improve the operation of Liverpool Street station as one of London and Britain's major urban rail terminals. I strongly urge the City of London to grant the necessary permissions for the proposed development.	PA	06-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Hall	Vicki	I travel up to Liverpool Street regularly and often have to queue for the toilets. I also find going up and down the stairs increasingly difficult as I age so would like some access to toilets on the platform level.	PA	06-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Ambrose	Rachel	I have IBS, the current disabled toilets are a disgrace. The fact that the regular toilets are downstairs make life hard enough. The disabled loos are also often taken up by prams and parents changing nappies. We need our own accessible toilets.	PA	06-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Bixby	Tina	The current toilets are often busy and can be smelly. Toilet's at each end of the station would help.	PA	06-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Daniels	Robert	More space at Liverpool Street station.	PA	06-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	.	Holly	There is not enough toilets for the size of the building and the services ran.	PA	06-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Abarno	Gerardina	I travel into London for work and use the station daily. It's the hub of the financial district and I'd like to see the station be at the same level as London Bridge.	PA	06-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	.	Friedemann	London Liverpool Street is a vital station in the heart of London, for many travelers coming from Stansted Airport it is also the first place to visit. Unfortunately, it is very ugly and just not a good station. It's time to change that and give the city the station it deserves.	PA	06-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Lewton	Anita	Over 1 mill people a day - no need to think about it - free toilets like Europe!	PA	06-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Verow	Sally	Only access to toilets are downstairs.	PA	06-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Walton	Darren	Long overdue, it needs to be ready for the future.	PA	06-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	.	Callum	This station is packed almost all the time and feels overcrowded.	PA	06-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Chapman	Sally	All it needs is better access like lifts. Not escalators. Especially a lift to the deeper underground lines.	PA	06-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Zak	Paul	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, the proposal would result in substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the existing station concourse roof structure and its replacement with a new design, which would also negatively affect the setting of the surviving 19th-century train shed. The introduction of extensive retail units within the historic train sheds-including the addition of two elevated retail galleries-would cause significant harm to the special interest and heritage significance of the Grade II-listed asset. The scheme would adversely impact the setting of surrounding listed buildings, particularly the Grade II*-listed hotel, the last continuously operating 19th-century hotel in the City. The construction of a 20-storey tower above the station concourse would diminish the hotel's historic character and significance. The proposed development would also cause substantial harm to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, where the prevailing character is defined by low- to medium-rise buildings. The introduction of a tall building in this location directly contradicts the 2015 City Plan, which mandates the refusal of tall structures in inappropriate areas, including Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights policy zone. Moreover, the scheme would negatively affect the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets across the City and beyond, including many of the Grade I-listed churches designed by Sir Christopher Wren and the nearby St Botolph's church	PA	06-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Faulkner	Michael	National Planning Policy Framework, Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church.	PA	06-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Dinmore	Ian	I object to this desecration of an iconic London Landmark. The design is purely to maximise revenue for the state through Network Rail leasing. There will be very few passenger benefits and not enough to compensate for the blot on the landscape. I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: 1. The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed 2. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causes a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. 3. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. 4. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, including many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches and nearby St Botolph's Church. 5. Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional."	PA	06-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	King MBE MA	Charles	Although Liverpool Street station is not directly in the East Surrey Transport Committee's area as the busiest station in Britain it is used by many of our members. We would like to make the following comments in support of the revised proposed redevelopment. We are of the view that the present station layout is unsatisfactory on a number of counts. It is hidden from the street and the entrance is often missed by bus passengers. The interchange between trains, buses and taxis is not clear or easy. The interchange between trains and the Underground is poor and doesn't have step free access to Metropolitan and Circle lines and only by escalators to the central line. The concourse is very cluttered and crowded especially at times of disruption. We believe relocation of retail will provide a better more spacious and pleasant area for people taking refreshments, while waiting for trains or meeting and greeting passengers. This redevelopment will improve the passenger space on the concourse including an improved ticket office, adequate provisions of toilets and a dedicated location for people with disabilities and reduced mobility at times of disruption. The new layout will provide passengers with, improved information and connections to buses and taxis. It will make the outside of the station more visible, improve access from the street. We welcome the improvements to interchange with the bus stops in Bishopsgate. We also welcome the additional exit at the east end of the station. The new layout will provide step free access to both underground lines by lifts enabling wheelchair users access to and from the Underground as well as the Elizabeth line. This will also improve interchange between the underground lines and between the underground lines and the Elizabeth line. We believe that all the important historic parts of the station including the various memorials will be kept and clearly be visible to the public. Charles King East Surrey Transport Committee	PA	06-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Underhill	Harry	The proposed plans would be to the detriment of Liverpool Streets rich heritage that extends far before the station's presence in the 1870s, the purposed designs also do not compliment or contribute to the architectural detail of the current station. The plans also do not contribute to the long term need of housing and retail businesses that many consider lacking in the area.	PA	07-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Underhill	Harry	Whilst the station will benefit greatly from updated facilities (particularly access for those less-able) and the concourse can become busy at peak hours or when delays occur, it can be done in much more efficient manor. A third plan should consider the heritage and character of the station, this will ensure the new Liverpool Street is an asset to the City of London for many decades to come (unlike the current plan which will lead the station to grow dated quickly and become a well known eyesore). Whilst network rails figures do reflect the rebirth of rail travel into our City, it is overinflated by Elizabeth line traffic which a bigger main concourse will not help. As someone who is familiar with Liverpool Streets legacy but still sympathetic of modern requirements and rail priorities (as I work for LUL) I would be happy to put ideas forward (07877 524753)	PA	07-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Powell	Annie	I object to this form of the development for several reasons. One is the destruction to the historic roof which will mutilate and irrevocably alter this station. I also feel other aspects of the plan, such as the massive expansionsion of retail units which will require major alterations to the fabric of the buildings will have a negative impact, losing the unique nature of the station. Furthermore, the huge building intended to be stuck on top of the station will not only damage the Victorian nature of Liverpool Street, it will destroy the local I object because the destruction of the roof will ruin the Victorian station permanently. The over expansion of retail outlets also destroys its historic nature. The huge tower plonked on top destroys not just the station and historic hotel, but wrecks the entire local conservation area. As a daily Weaver Line user, I can't bear the thought of this wanton destruction of a key part of our heritage, especially linked to working class and immigration history, sacrificed to big bucks.	PA	07-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Powell	Annie	I object to this form of the development for several reasons. One is the destruction to the historic roof which will mutilate and irrevocably alter this station. I also feel other aspects of the plan, such as the massive expansionsion of retail units which will require major alterations to the fabric of the buildings will have a negative impact, losing the unique nature of the station. Furthermore, the huge building intended to be stuck on top of the station will not only damage the Victorian nature of Liverpool Street, it will destroy the local I object because the destruction of the roof will ruin the Victorian station permanently. The over expansion of retail outlets also destroys its historic nature. The huge tower plonked on top destroys not just the station and historic hotel, but wrecks the entire local conservation area. As a daily Weaver Line user, I can't bear the thought of this wanton destruction of a key part of our heritage, especially linked to working class and immigration history, sacrificed to big bucks.	PA	07-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Powell	Annie	I object because the destruction of the roof will ruin the Victorian station permanently. The over expansion of retail outlets also destroys its historic nature. The huge tower plonked on top destroys not just the station and historic hotel, but wrecks the entire local conservation area. As a daily Weaver Line user, I can't bear the thought of this wanton destruction of a key part of our heritage, especially linked to working class and immigration history, sacrificed to big bucks.	PA	07-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Hutson	Kristian	I strongly object over the proposed partial demolition of this grade2 station. The proposed building is heavily out of character for a conservation area. Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." There is no need for this ofice complex, it is nothing to do with upgrades of the station. It is an excuse to try and make money at the expense of our heritage.	PA	07-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Boardman	William	The new plans are monstrously oversized and are not sympathetic at all to the design; it's so unessential and disrespectful to the architect who had the skill and vision to design a beautiful station. This design looks awful!	PA	07-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Dickson	Daniel	Firstly, the proposal would cause substantial harm to the Grade II listed station by demolishing the existing concourse roof and replacing it with a new structure. This would also compromise the setting of the surviving 19th century train shed, diminishing the building's historic character. Secondly, the introduction of extensive new retail units within the 19th century train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, would significantly damage the special interest and architectural significance of this listed heritage asset. Thirdly, the development would harm the setting of surrounding listed buildings, particularly the Grade II*listed hotel the last continuously operating 19th century hotel in the City. The proposed 20 storey tower over the station concourse would seriously undermine the hotel's historic significance and its visual relationship with the area. Furthermore, the scheme would cause substantial harm to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area by introducing a tall building into a part of the City characterised by low and medium rise architecture. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires planning permission for tall buildings to be refused in inappropriate areas, such as Conservation Areas and the St Paul's Cathedral Heights area. The proposal would also negatively affect the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets across the City and beyond, including many Grade I listed Wren churches and nearby St Botolph's church. Finally, it is important to reference the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) in any objection Paragraph 213 of the NPPF states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) Grade II listed buildings, or Grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." This proposal clearly fails to meet that standard and would result in unacceptable harm to important heritage assets.	PA	07-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Jones	Alan	I object to this terrible proposal; it is overbearing, and the modernist design does not go with the station.	PA	07-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Roberts	Thomas	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to the sheer inappropriateness of the proposed design in the location.	PA	08-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Mitchell	Tim	I object to this application, because the plans appear to cause significant harm to nationally important heritage assets. Such a tall building in that area would appear to be contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas. In addition, paragraph 213 of the National Planning Policy Framework states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." This scheme causes such harm and should therefore be rejected.	PA	09-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Bryant	George B.		DC	09-Jun-25	R
25/00494/FULEIA	Parkes	Adam	I use the station when i commute into work on the London Overground (i work in the Liverpool street area) and the station is badly in need of modernising to align it with the standard and quality of other London stations (King's Cross, St Pancras) - there are often queues and crowding in the morning to get up the escalator to Bishopsgate (so extra capacity would be an improvement). The single current lift is terrible too - i dont use it as it is so slow and often out of service.	PA	09-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Freer	Martin	I use the station to get to work. It is in desperate need of significant improvement to make it usable, inclusive and accessible to its many users. These plans look set to make the station great.	PA	09-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Charlie	Divya	i work near liverpool street station and use it frequently. it is getting too chaotic and dangerous during peak times. need a better and organised flow of people with some calmer spaces.	PA	09-Jun-25	S

25/00494/FULEIA	Berner	Rachel	I work in this area and can see the benefits of this new redevelopment in improving the station. It is much needed and time to bring it in line with other leading stations.	PA	09-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Morgan	Nigel	Can't manage steps!	PA	09-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	O'Connor	Anne-Marie	I use the station.	PA	09-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Hamilton	Ann	not enough lifts & more escalators (that work)	PA	09-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Clennell	Janice	To make it easier for less abled people.	PA	09-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Brandon	Sharon	More toilets.	PA	09-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Smith	Jamie	Can we have European style train station locker storage please.	PA	09-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Davies	Richard	My main line station for trips from Norwich! I also teach Design and Technology and find the railways and infrastructure very interesting. I try to impart this in to my pupils. Any possible school related content, trips or grants would be fantastic. My main line station for trips from Norwich! I also teach Design and Technology and find the railways and infrastructure very interesting. I try to impart this in to my pupils. Any possible school related content, trips or grants would be fantastic.	PA	09-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Burstow	Richard	As the busiest London Station it needs to be able to handle more people and have more facilities at ground level.	PA	09-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Liddiard	Karen	For Disabled, and parents SAFETY EQUALALITY.	PA	09-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Mitrovic	Daniel	Regeneration would provide a iconic uplift to a busy station that's not seen much change or investment in years	PA	09-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Mary Ward	Alice	I had to get out of my wherlchair and limp to escalator and daughter had to carry wheelchaur fir me. This is a mainline station, dreadful service fir handicaped oeople and people with pushchairs fir children. Dreadful "no" setvice.	PA	09-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Liles	Lyn	I'm disabled so need lifts to enable me to travel	PA	09-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Weller	Martin	For humanity	PA	09-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Syme	Bobby		DC	09-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Mary	Linda	Have difficulty managing stairs at LStreet and have been unable to open disabled toilet with Radar key!	PA	09-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Kidd	David	aesthtics are important to stress free travel	PA	09-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Douglas	Gillian	It is a very busy area and people should be able to access a toilet when they need one. Looking for, or queuing for toilets should not be necessary.	PA	09-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Myerson	Peter	Liverpool Street station is a very busy place and I love that vibrancy but it would be great to see the station as more than just a place to pass through.	PA	09-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Tobiasson	Anneli	need it!	PA	09-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Jones	Pam	Some people are disabled, some have babies, some are just plain exhausted. A modern, civilised society provides adequate lifts for all of us.	PA	09-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Partington	Alan	I like the idea in principle but I don't want to lose the architecture. More toilets would be good but they need to be available to people with heavy luggage.	PA	09-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Gill Pendreny	Christina	Just clean toilets with working facilities rhe current ones are a disgrace to the UK we have the filthiest airoorts and train stations in the world	PA	09-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Mx	Itxaso	It is really the best improvement and most accessible proposal!	PA	09-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Frost	Diana	There are too few escalators and I often travel with luggage. Acc sing the toilets is particularly difficult and vital having already travelled almost 2 hours from home when I reach the station.	PA	09-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Lane	Paula	I find it difficult to get on the escalators due to the speed that they go	PA	09-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Phame	Kathy	I have friends that are disabled in.	PA	09-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Cox	Gregory	I use Liverpool Street Station every workday on my commute into the City for work. It is dangerously overcrowded at times in the peak. It is an unpleasant experience at the moment, and the station is desperately in need of being opened up and expanded upon in order to improve the passenger experience.	PA	09-Jun-25	S

25/00494/FULEIA	Smith	Sylvia	Toilet facilities on concourse level!	PA	09-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	BOACHIE	CHRISTIAN	Ease congestion.	PA	09-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Over	Jo	I'm older and have difficulty if travelling with a suitcase and my little dog so a lift would really be beneficial.	PA	09-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Griffiths	Annie	Need more toilets, lifts for the disabled, escalators that work	PA	09-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Boenke	Anita	Too far to walk to the lifts.	PA	09-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Gibbs	Michelle	Last time i needed toilets, the queue was out the door and close to the stairs!	PA	09-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Palmer	Paul	Liverpool Street Station is long overdue for regeneration. Platforms 10 and upwards were not built in a sympathetic way to the lower numbered platforms with their historic architecture. Likewise the concourse with its grotty roof. The new development at the Boardgame end of the concourse is stunning, but it doesn't transition well into the rest of the station, and it's like crossing a threshold to go back in time. Congestion isn't a huge problem though, apart from when there's cancellations and people amass. Would like some nicer seated areas for higher quality foods and drink. At present it's mostly fast food or cafes. Would love something like Searcy's has at St Pancras. There's not even a good bar, just a high capacity Wetherspoon's. So maybe a more modern cocktail bar.	PA	09-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Doyle	Mary	Because I want to feel included as a wheelchair user.	PA	09-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Petikam	Lohit	I live in City of London and support any improvements for the public.	PA	09-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Rook	David	Escalators not lifts too much interruption with lifts	PA	09-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Wilson	Paula	I support this plan for a better London.	PA	09-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Lancer	Graham	I have a walker so cannot do stairs so installing lifts are very important for me. To help get to the underground from the main line platforms also to get out the station. This is a large and important station and interchange so lifts are needed urgently.	PA	09-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Vellani	Valerie	More people now require the lift because less able or afraid to use escalators.	PA	09-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Sharp	Catrin	The station is currently significantly constrained and as the busiest in Britain, this will only get worse. The submitted proposals deliver an elegant upgrade to create a new station interior that will provide a wow factor on arrival and importantly create extra capacity and ensure it's fully accessible.	PA	09-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Rayment	Helena-David	I use an electric powered wheelchair & cant walk.	PA	09-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Chambers	Joe	The current layout is poor and difficult to navigate, especially at peak times. The station also looks tired and in need of some investment.	PA	09-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Fawcett	Maria	Liverpool Street is a very busy station, that I use every day for work.	PA	09-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Hardwick	Michael	Good idea.	PA	09-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Earley	Richard	The concourse is too crowded and the station is too hidden away.	PA	09-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	McDermott	Joanna	I walk with a stick. Many times I arrived at the station to find the one lift out of service.	PA	09-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Hayes	Angela	That is disabled people need to travel too.	PA	09-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Fleming	Sam	Improvements to public transport infrastructure are a catalyst for sustainable economic growth. Get building!!	PA	09-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Bennewith	John	It's become quite chaotic	PA	09-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Maria Cecilia Nugent	Donna	to maintain much better access for disabled commuters.	PA	09-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Clough	Isla	I use this station so would like to see it improved	PA	09-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	O'Connor	Erik	Need more capacity	PA	09-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Day	Roger	Urgent need for ibsd sufferers	PA	09-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Jackson	Freddie	Iconic timeless ambitious design	PA	09-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	.	Laurie	Not enough public toilets around. The current toilets in Liverpool Street station were excellent after refurbishment but have got really bad again. People just don't respect things and trash them ruining it for others.	PA	09-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Chilvers	Donovan	Liverpool stree is miles behind kings cross and st panca	PA	09-Jun-25	S

25/00494/FULEIA	Dummer	Justin	Because Liverpool Street is iconic station need to fit for purpose for the next 100 years	PA	09-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Mills	Steve	The current station is ugly and unwelcoming.	PA	09-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Townsend	Michael	Liverpool Street is too busy a transport hub to be a museum piece. A modern station for the current era can't be held back for a 19th century office block.	PA	09-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	.	Nico	I think the current toilets are perfectly fine but they're not taken care of that well, oftentimes I'm there half the stalls are out of order	PA	09-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Veenstra	Folkert	Better disabled access. London Liverpool Street area can be quite difficult as a wheelchair user.	PA	09-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Rule	Charlotte	the station needs an upgrade	PA	09-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Vargas	Helen	Because it's disgusting the lack of toilets in the station and across London ... lots of adults especially older adults and children and cancer patients or others having treatments need to go to the toilet frequently, quite often the toilets are out of order, too filthy to use, and are too busy it's disgusting going to the toilet is a human basic need this should be a major consideration and there should be more single sex toilets than unisex and also there should be family toilets	PA	09-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	McCarthy	Robert	Now comfortable with the design.	PA	09-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Pencharz	Matthew	I support sensitively delivered development, which, while protecting our heritage, does not freeze us in aspic and creates the jobs, homes, growth and transport capacity the country so desperately needs.	PA	09-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Oates	Jonathan	The development will provide a much improved experience for passengers, in particular those with disabilities. It's also essential that London maintains modern transport infrastructure to succeed as a City and to help the UK economy grow..	PA	09-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	White	Jillian	As a disabled person I wholeheartedly support the campaign for more lifts. They are necessary for parents with children, the elderly, people with luggage as well as the disabled for whom using stairs or escalators is unsafe	PA	09-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Taylor	Debbie	more concourse level toilets please. The basement ones need luggage to be carried downstairs which can be difficult.	PA	09-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Del Tufo	Iantge	Use after trains from Cambridge	PA	09-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Owen	Jennifer	I know the lead architect personally. I have seen the plans, and understand that the original Victorian features of the station will be unchanged. The new station will provide much better facilities for travellers. We do need to modernise and improve structures as our needs in London change.	PA	09-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Hind	Beatrice	The lack of lifts causes undue inconvenience, discomfort and anxiety to passengers with mobility issues or disabilities and mothers of young children especially as one cannot take luggage on escalators.	PA	09-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Martin	Phillip	I'll be more happy for them to have toilets that work. There does need to be more ladies.	PA	09-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Harvey	John	I am a wheelchair user.	PA	09-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Yoshida	Keigo	This project looks good and well considered. Looking forward to seeing this project going forward.	PA	09-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Haynes	Matthew	It makes it easier for the users/passengers.	PA	09-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Leonard	Shaun	I have a soft spot for Liverpool Street station I commuted in and out over the years back in the 1980s when it was first being modernised it will be great to see more improvements making the station more accessible and offering a wider range of more reliable services.	PA	09-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Nigel	Brown	The rolling stock is new, the station needs to be updated to match	PA	09-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Watson	Sandra	Long queues when you need to get the next train.	PA	09-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Cable	Za	Main route into London for me. I would not believe its the busiest! Needs better toilets with flat access like Kings cross. Better taxi rank, like Kings cross. Trains running late so can attend events that finish late and you can get get home without worrying of missing last train.	PA	09-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Goodwin	Lynne	Convenient, desperately needed to reduce queues and make the journey more attractive.	PA	09-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Healey	Valerie	Yes	PA	09-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Knight	Marion	Liverpool Street is my destination for entering London. Toilets there are insufficient. Sometimes long queues build up.	PA	09-Jun-25	S

25/00494/FULEIA	Blackmore	Az	it's hell in there. that station is hell and horror. i can't bare it.	PA	09-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Abbott	Annie	I'm partially sighted and I find it difficult to use the stairs to the main toilets.. Their are only a couple of disabled toilets on the concourse, which always seem busy.	PA	09-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	McDonagh	Lucy	Equal access for all who use the station - don't discriminate against the less abled.	PA	09-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	McBride	Alan	Infrastructure including improving/upgrading railway stations is a fundamental requirement for successful regeneration	PA	09-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Maria French	Malgorzata	Better and easier travel for everyone. Especially those who have limited Mobility.	PA	09-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Dennis	Penny	Because we all deserve to travel safely and confidently	PA	09-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Livoti	Zina	Less queues and maybe toilets in two parts of the station would be good	PA	09-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Els	Nick	The station hasn't been significantly ungraded since pre mission impossible days... much needed update and space creation essential to go with the shiny 'new' trains...	PA	09-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Owens	Sheila	Liverpool street	PA	09-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Cater	Sue	Liverpool Street station gets so very busy that it is uncomfortable to use.	PA	09-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Lumsdon	Michael	I'd just like the toilets to be clean.	PA	09-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Peck	Barbara	More lifts and more facilities for disabled person. Platforms to be lower so you dont have to jump off the train. Passenger assistance. More toilets for people with disabilities.	PA	09-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	De'Ath	Carolyn	To improve accessibility.	PA	09-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Hack	Ian	The station is a key part of the infrastructure for the whole area. Improvements will benefit all who visit and work in the area.	PA	09-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Beynon	Stephen	I am a regular user of Liverpool Street station. I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: 1. The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. 2. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. 3. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. 4. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. 5. The National Planning Policy Framework in your objection, paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." The people responsible should focus on making the station a beautiful and well functioning transport hub rather than developing office space. Think Paris.	PA	09-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Morley	Phillip	Just leave the Liverpool Street building alone. There is little left of it since the last redevelopment and this should be left as it is. I'm all for a new development, but not when there is an absurd design that rips out what remains of the past and when you're essentially consigning the building to the underground. There are enough high rises in the area, why not just build on those or some ugly 1960s buildings. safeguarding it's history. You can do better than this and just leave is alone.	PA	10-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Rahman	Umar	More toilets will help for better comfort for passengers, particularly for those with disabilities	PA	10-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Hopkin	Andrew	To modernise one of london's iconic railway terminus stations	PA	10-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Sawallich	Lou	Dangerous congestion and queuing for barriers and queuing for escalators out, escalaters that are frequently broken! Too small to cope with volumes of today!	PA	10-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Crawford	Simon	it might alsostop fare dodgers too, therefore helping to keep fares as low as possible for all concerned.	PA	10-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Smith	Anna	make thi gs more accessible for everybody	PA	10-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Wilson	Andrew		DC	10-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	.	George	Old and outdated building	PA	10-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Andrews	Nigel	Most of the time they are out of order!	PA	10-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Harrison	Claire	Comfort and dignity of passengers	PA	10-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Wilson	Annette	More free toilets at Liverpool Street	PA	10-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Bolton	Vivienne	More accessible toilets, mums with young children and prams find it near impossible to access the present toilets which are often in a disgusting state dud to homeless etc usibg them to keep temselves clean. Soecial toilet/ shower facility for homeless peopke???, elderly folk often find the thought of using the stairs daubting !! Going down on an escalature is something many elderly, disabled, frail, and people with mobility issues also mums with prans or very pregnant bumps!!!	PA	10-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Tyrell	Amy	The horrendously long queues that are at the ladies toilets add to the stress of travelling in london	PA	10-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Craig	Neil	It's time to update the station its way to busy most of the time	PA	10-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Hagger	Zanna	Several blocks unisex accessible cubicals free for everyone without discrimination.	PA	10-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Barker	Ian	A present it is a shambles - make it something to be proud of	PA	10-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Turpin	Daniel	I use the station on a regular basis, and strongly believe development is needed.	PA	10-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Seaney	Kate	To encourage people to use the railways by providing better and easier use of Stations	PA	10-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	van den Haag	Colin	Because its too small!!!	PA	10-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Rozario	Viviene	To help underground users travel quicker	PA	10-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Taylor	Michael		DC	10-Jun-25	R
25/00494/FULEIA	W	Donell	Liverpool Street station desperately needs an overhaul as it's currently not fit for purpose at all especially with the Elizabeth line operating	PA	10-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Lee	Kath	We need to use toilets!	PA	10-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Scott	Steve	The current access to and from the station is, quite frankly, drab. These plans would completely transform Liverpool Street to the advantage of the city of London and also to all commuters using the station	PA	10-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Lake	Howard	There are not enough toilets on Liverpool Street Station. And almost all are not as accessible as they coujd be, underground down an escalator.	PA	10-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Ann Saxton	Sandra	A central London station that is an absolute disgrace for accessibility for anyone with a disability, push chair or large suitcase is a disgrace.	PA	10-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	G Raymond	Lillian	because me and a lot of other people cannot do stairs or escalators	PA	10-Jun-25	S

25/00494/FULEIA	Burrows	Michael	Having worked at Liverpool Street many years ago, the present layout was a lot more spacious than the previous layout. Now with more and more people travelling this layout is due for an upgrade to make the station more spacious. I was there today 05th June and the station felt very cramped.	PA	10-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Littleton	Robert	It looks good	PA	10-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	McKinley	Susan	I am a wheelchair user and need the lift. The one near the underground is often out of order and jerks and jumps. It's frightening to use. I always have to queue.	PA	10-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Morris	Jill	A human necessity.	PA	10-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Hewitson	Sally	Liverpool Street	PA	10-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Hurst	James	Make it happen, city of London deserve it	PA	10-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Norton	Margaret	I am supporting this project because we need to make sure that station is accessible to all and is can cope with the increase passengers going forward. Infrastructure is critical to economic growth and a iconic gateway into the City of London is long overdue.	PA	10-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Goodman	Keegan	It's a station that many many people use and although it's undergoing renovation works, it feels like it needs more with an update to the signage boards as they feel very out of date for a major London transport hub for most of east London, and east anglia.	PA	10-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Young	Neville	Its a great station but overcrowded and desperately needs this.	PA	10-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	John Haselton	Phil	It is so Out dated and needs to move with the times , it is the Coset main line station to the Capital of the Banking World	PA	10-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Hamilton	Shelly	despite you ugrading the toimetstmost of them are either out of order or not fit the sinks and dryers are a joke abd if you can get in the accessable toilets they aren't any better i would like to see more but unless you provide the staff as well whats the point!	PA	10-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Gumble	Suzy	due to medical conditions im unable to use escalators or climb stairs so it restricts my options of stations.	PA	10-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Parkin	Harry	the current station is not cute	PA	10-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Wintle	Paulene	To help passengers who struggle with mobility	PA	10-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Leaver	Darran	The new plans prepared would appear to treat the Andaz Hotel with the respect it deserves. Any retained/existing Victorian fabric or design intention of the original station appears to also have been respected, preserved or replicated in the proposed redevelopment plans.	PA	10-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Pearman	Harry	For pro-development	PA	10-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Evans	Caitline	Disabled access needed for the benefit of all, my mother used Liverpool st to get to London and this would greatly improve her experience and health	PA	10-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Sykes	Janet	Toilets are an essentailpart of travel no matter vwhere they are and train toilets are not always clean for what ever reason.	PA	10-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Evans	Richard	We need more accessible toilets on site. Desperately.	PA	10-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Evans	Richard	We need more accessible toilets on site. Desperately.	PA	10-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Evans	Mary	As an ambulant disabled person I love being able to travel via Greater Anglia trains but in arrival at Liverpool Street sometimes cant access the existing toilets which are also used by young families, and am unable to access the Central Line at all.	PA	10-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Catley	Alex	As a regular user of Liverpool Street I have seen over the years the over crowding and suffered with the effects of the poor weather. This is a much needed upgrade and the concepts look impressive.	PA	10-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Newcombe	Simon	To assist with the design-in of Sustainable lighting and controls	PA	10-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Elkins	Michael	The concourse is overcrowded. There aren't enough toilets when it is busy I missed my train once.	PA	10-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Carvell	Emma	Better step free access (I am a wheelchair user) and preservation of Victorian architecture.	PA	10-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	.	Joe	It's an amazing architectural extension to a station that needs an upgrade.	PA	10-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	.	Joe	It's an amazing architectural extension to a station that needs an upgrade.	PA	10-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Daly	Liam	Too crowded.	PA	10-Jun-25	S

25/00494/FULEIA	.	Aarushi	Because the current toilets are overcrowded, there is always a queue in the womens toilet and it smells bad.	PA	10-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Jarvis	Richard	Just too crowded all day.	PA	10-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Bonandi	Angelo	To make London Liverpool a place to spend time not to just leave.	PA	10-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	G	Chris	It's my railway hub and is starting to look a bit 'tired' despite a big refurb many many years ago.	PA	10-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Campos	Amy	Please include adequate public toilet facilities to make train travel more accessible for those of us who need them.	PA	10-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Bell	James	More space.	PA	10-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Smith	Miriam	My husband is disabled so more lifts would be an improvement, especially when the one we use is out of action!	PA	10-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Guisse	Tony	Because it looks amazing - Victorian in the scale of its design.	PA	10-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Ma	Cheryl	Not enough toilets or stairs/lifts.	PA	10-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Lancer	Phillip	Liverpool street is large station and needs refurbishing.	PA	10-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Chessher	Sue	I use this station frequently when I travel in from Suffolk. Improvements are always good but how will you cope with overcrowding at busy times. It's crazy and stressful as it is.	PA	10-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Champion	Benjamin	The plans will provide an enhancement to the streetscape around the station, improve flow within the ticket halls, and make use of "dead" space above the station.	PA	10-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Gardiner	Josephine	More toilets are needed with better signage outside them like a sign pointing outwards from the wall so it can be seen from a distance with a man or woman figure for the normal toilets and a wheelchair for the disabled person's toilet.	PA	10-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	.	Hannah	I want more baby change facilities.	PA	10-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Allen	Mary	Very important for those who cannot manage stairs!	PA	10-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Mira Wilson	Ariel	Yes please more toilets the lack of them is annoying.	PA	10-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Shepherd	Steve	Its very poor service for such a busy station.	PA	10-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Armstrong-Plews	Neil	The station is very limited for anyone with a disability, only one lift serving the whole station and a step free door thats so out of the way hardly anyone knows about it.	PA	10-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Cooper	J.		DC	10-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Fleming	Maryanne	We travel through Liverpool St frequently. I am perimenopausal, my husband is diabetic. We are limited in what we can do if we are too far from a toilet.	PA	10-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Johnstone	Eddie	Add more lifts and better access for disabled people.	PA	10-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Mair	Karren		DC	10-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Jones	Gareth		DC	10-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Broome	Derek		DC	10-Jun-25	R
25/00494/FULEIA	Goodfellow	Angela	Basic human requirements. Sometimes people are unwell and need the rest room urgently.	PA	10-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Smith	Bea	Yes.	PA	10-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Hayes	Aisling	Its a nightmare trying to use escalators when you have a pram.	PA	10-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Mitchell	Marian	I cannot access the Ladies when carrying luggage due to stairs. I am not disabled just frail.	PA	10-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	O'Keefe	Carolyn	A revamp is well overdue, with the right facilities, shops and eateries in place it could be much more pleasant.	PA	10-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Emes	Sarah	Most congested, historic station in London? Careful evolution of services for busy travellers and long distance travellers is essential.	PA	10-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Hedges	Sue	A lift or slope is needed between the main concourse and the tube entrance from the mainline platforms. At the moment steps are unavoidable , which are difficult for anyone with a physical disability, luggage or a baby buggy etc.	PA	10-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Corbett	Hilary	I am disabled.	PA	10-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Turner	Andrew	Liverpool Street is overcrowded and difficult to navigate even at quiet times of the day.	PA	10-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Gander	Terry	There are a lot more elderly and disabled people about these days.	PA	10-Jun-25	S

25/00494/FULEIA	Fearne	Andrea	To reduce the overcrowding on the concourses and platforms.	PA	10-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	.	Justina	Toilets are essential to all, this should be non-negotiable.	PA	10-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Watson	Sian	To improve access for disabled people and parents.	PA	10-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Roe	Peter	Its a madhouse on that concourse. The real problem is that London is overcrowded and the infrastructure is creaking under the strain.	PA	10-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Gorman	Corrina	Needs updating.	PA	10-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Latif	Yasmin	There are not enough public facilities at stations especially for the disabled and mothers / baby facilities.	PA	10-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Lee	Adrian	The current station is not fit for purpose and the design is impractical. I like the design of the new station and it needs to evolve from the current station.	PA	10-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	De Soto	DRew	Architecturally unsympathetic to the current, historical building. The plans proposed destroy yet another vista in historical London.	PA	10-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Barrett	Lisa	The current station isn't fit for purpose. It cant cope with the levels of people who use it and it doesn't deliver the facilities (such as provision of toilets and waiting rooms) that are expected of a such an important station. It is wholly inadequate that it can not cater for anyone who requires additional support to make their journey. The station needs the presented redevelopment in order to cater properly for those that need to use it, now and in the future.	PA	10-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Jones	Thomas Llewelyn	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: How a large skyscraper can be placed on top of an existing structure and deprive it and the surrounding area of sunlight - I think it's appalling that a new block be built with such enormous detriment to the existing structure used by millions of people. I also object to the fact that the developers claim this will help overcrowding - while building new exits will help Liverpool Street station, putting an office block filled with people and support workers will undoubtedly cause more crowds as these office users will probably arrive by train/Underground, setting any benefits of new exits back as more people end up using Liverpool Street not only for their journeys but also so they can go into this block to work.	PA	10-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	cassar	gary	Why do you always ruin things? The build looks great and everyone loves it except those 'in power', so what's new?	PA	10-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	O'Driscoll	John	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church.	PA	10-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	O'Dell	Heather	Please protect the heritage of the station, it is Grade 1 listed. No history will be left in London and the capacity for storing trains will be severely limited. I commuted through Liverpool Street for over 25 years. Please respect history and not build a carbuncle of a development as a station. Concentrate on other projects elsewhere please. Where are the funds coming from in these stretched economic times anyway when many other matters in London need tackling like the serious crime levels in London and funding for Police.	PA	10-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Collison	Helen	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. Make sure to reference the National Planning Policy Framework in your objection, otherwise your objection may be dismissed: Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional."	PA	10-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Mittins	Lesley	I have objected to this development before on the basis that an historic Grade II listed building is to be cannibalised and desecrated. Some years ago the beautiful ceiling structure above platforms 11 - 18 was removed which meant that the ceiling was lowered and oppressive - and now the developers want to do the same to the other side of the station. If this happens the Victorian splendour that was the original station will be gone for ever. I lived near the station in the early days and for many years I travelled through it five days a week to get to work when I moved out of London. A beautiful airy station was changed to what we have today - and not for the better. The current development is bad enough but this new proposal for a +/- 20 storey building above the station beggars belief. It will overshadow the whole area and is totally inappropriate. The previous development caused years of disrupted travel and I've no doubt any such new development will again cause chaos for commuters. Fortunately this is no longer my problem, but the change of direction of access to the concourse then meant that passengers were forced to fight their way across to their relevant platform - total chaos. It was much easier before this happened. We do not need a glorified shopping mall: it is a station to get people from A to B, not to cause even more crowding by people wandering around shopping. The current plan is about as good as the first plan - utterly hopeless.	PA	10-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Ridler	Katharine	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station from the demolition of the roof of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. This would also compromise the setting of the surviving 19th-century train shed. The insertion of far too many new retail units in the 19th-century train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing great harm to the special interest and significance of this Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact on the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets, especially harm to the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning 19th-century hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area by imposing a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which REQUIRES the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. National Planning Policy Framework paragraph NPPF 213 states: 'Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional.' Please refuse permission to this inappropriate application. I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to: nationally important heritage assets. Specifically, I object to the harm to the Grade II-listed station by the demolition of the roof structure of the existing concourse and its replaceme	PA	10-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Pearson	Rosalind	object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. In the National Planning Policy Framework Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." More specifically, I raise objections to: The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church.	PA	10-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Pink	Alan	I object to this overbearing and ill placed scheme. Paragraph NPPF 213 of the planning guidelines states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." There is no justification, in my opinion, for treating this site as an exception. I am a fairly frequent user of the station and own a flat in the City of London	PA	10-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Larking	Barry	Our national heritage is defining. Once it is lost it is lost for ever.	PA	10-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Slade	Melanie	I'm appalled that this is even being considered. So shortsighted to demolish a third of a listed building ... I mean how is this even allowed?? Liverpool Street is such a beloved and beautiful station, it breaks my heart to think it going to be ruined by greedy developers like so much of London. We don't need a massive tower built on top of the station to blight the conservation area of Bishopsgate, not to mention the light which will be lost. This station means so much to many people, I mean it played such a big part in bringing children to safety in the second world war, the history that is enmeshed in that building is irreplaceable. Aside from the actual construction, noise, pollution and general inconvenience that the build will have on the passengers, people that live and work around that area will be immense. I am writing to ask you to stop this madness before it's too late, so many of London landmark s have been destroyed, please don't let this become another.	PA	10-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Potter	Chria	I thoroughly object to the demolition of an iconic piece of Victorian engineering, re consideration needs to be given to the plans	PA	10-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Clarke	Rosemary	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." For the reasons above, this proposal cannot be arguable as "exceptional" & most certainly not "wholly exceptional" to warrant such damage on the nearby grade I listed landmark buildings.	PA	10-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Masarati	Devon	Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." There numerous elements of substantial harm within the planning application, namely The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. I am particularly concerned about the fact that it is within the St Paul's Heights area, since it sets a dangerous precedent.	PA	10-Jun-25	O
Page 34 25/00494/FULEIA	West	Kate	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to nationally important heritage assets. I have worked in the City for more than 3 decades and regularly travel to and from (and passed by) Liverpool Street station and the surrounding area. The unique structure, nearby hotel and Bishopsgate Conservation Area are pleasing and proportionate to the area. The Planning Application relating to the proposed redevelopment of Liverpool Street Station (the "Proposal") would include demolition of part of a listed building and the planned new building is ugly, overbearing and out of keeping with the area. I am particularly concerned with the height and overbearing planned tower block which will negatively impact the current Liverpool Street setting In general, I am in favour of new buildings or renovation of existing buildings where they are sympathetic and complementary to the present rich heritage so many who live and work in the City enjoy but this Proposal is damaging to both the station, the Vic	PA	10-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Hector	Trevor	Like all alterations and changes it will be good to leave the station as it was originally designed for and only alter necessary work needed for health and safety and general improvement without destroying the original building for future generations to enjoy as everything around the station is changing, high rise glass boxes with no character.	PA	10-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Middleton	Paul	Leave the grade 2 listed roof alone. Daylight on the main concourse is one of the joys of Liverpool St. It is our St Pancras of the east. It appears that they intend to build over yet more platforms plunging more passengers in to darkness. Passengers arriving on platforms 1 & 2 + other side will not get to see the train shed. The mezzanines swallowing up the air space under the great train shed are wholly disrespectful to the architecture. From 18 platforms under glass we will be down to 6. The artist impressions are misleading especially Sun St Passage where they imply loads of daylight coming through - off the wall of black building opposite that will be cast into eternal darkness by the proposed monstrosity above. At least the 1980's embraced the great shed. The 1980's scheme was one of the last and best of British Rail station rebuilds. Do not undo this great work. Respect daylight, Respect grade 2 listing, Respect history.	PA	10-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Whybra	Julian	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. Specifically, I object to: The substantial harm to the station through the demolition of the roof structure and its replacement, which would also compromise the setting of the surviving Victorian train shed. The insertion of extensive of new retail units within the train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of this Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets, in particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning Victorian hotel in the City - through the construction of a twenty-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterized by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. I refer you to the National Planning Policy Framework Paragraph NPPF 213 which states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional."	PA	10-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Barrell	James	I object to this planning application as it would cause significant and irreversible harm to a nationally important heritage asset and would degrade the public life of the frequent and occasional users of the station. I raise specific objections to the following: 1. The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. 2. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. 3. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. 4. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. Paragraph 213 of the National Planning policy framework states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." Assets of significant value such as Liverpool Street Station should be protected at all costs and necessary improvement works such as installation of required additional lifts should not justify the crass overdevelopment proposed in this application. Kind regards, James Barrell	PA	10-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Scowen	Nicky	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station buildings and inclusion of new retail units which will either encourage yet more fast food outlets or shops full of rubbish (ducks?!). The impact to the setting of surrounding listed and unlisted heritage assets by the inclusion of a brutalist tower dwarfing not just the station but the rest of the Bishopsgate Conservation Area. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas. The National Planning Policy Framework Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." There is nothing in the proposed development that enhances the area in any way. I have commuted through the station for over forty years and seen many changes, not all for the better. Please take note of the many objections being lodged to this plan and for once do the decent thing. Don't build over what remains of the city - it already looks too much like any other city anywhere so let's keep some character for future generations.	PA	11-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Sanver	Mary	To Tom Sleigh, I object to the harmful plans to the application to partially demolish application and re develop Liverpool Street station, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. My objections are in reference to the National Planning Policy Framework Paragraph NPPF 213 which states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." I look forward to hearing from you regarding this as a nearby resident and member of the public.	PA	11-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Davis	Daniel	It is in need it's hard to get around with my disabled sister.	PA	11-Jun-25	S

25/00494/FULEIA	Miller	Ruthanne	The station should be accessible for those with disabilities and those with children. It is now 2025 so that should happen. It should be right that someone with a disability to be able to use the train station with ease.	PA	11-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Lee	Reece	As a regular user of this station. It's clear in comparison to other mainline stations that the infrastructure is outdated and the accessibility has not kept up with the needs of the UK and the city of London. The plans look to fix many issues with the station.	PA	11-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Meikle	Andy	It's needed doing for a long time - gets far too congested.	PA	11-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Starr	Megan	The station needs the support.	PA	11-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Maspero	Rupert	It seems like a very reasonable proposal in size and scale if a little small. It will tidy up and organise the surrounding area which is in dire need of repairs and maintenance.	PA	11-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Holden	Mary	I am not disabled just old and I find the station increasingly hard to navigate. I can't use escalators and the lifts are old and much to small which means you have to queue to use them. Also the volume of people make the escalators unsafe - an accident waiting to happen.	PA	11-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Wyett	James	I commute 5 days a week to Liverpool Street.	PA	11-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Bergman	Malin	I agree that the station needs improvement - especially to ease congestion and improve accessibility. I also agree that a financially self supporting scheme makes a lot of sense.	PA	11-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Cohen	Richard	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: 1. The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. 2. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. 3. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. 4. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. 5. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. Finally I would like to cite the National Planning Policy Framework which states that "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." There is no doubt that the harm this proposed development will cause to a Grade 2 listed building is substantial and the development should not be allowed to proceed.	PA	11-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Harwood	Gillian	I object to this application, which would cause very great harm to the significance of one of our much-loved and important heritage assets. I believe the harm would be so great as to totally contravene Paragraph NPPF 213. The proposed re-development would mean the destruction of the roof structure of the existing station concourse. The insertion of new structure for retail units etc. which would destroy the significance of this Grade II-listed heritage asset. I particularly object to the impact of the over-scaled office development on top of the station which would be so harmful to the surrounding heritage buildings and become one more example of our regrettable 21st century wish to put profit before people and place.	PA	11-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Phillips	A	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. The National Planning Policy Framework, paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." To carry out these works in a manner that destroys part of this historic building and builds yet another abominable tower block that people hate to live in, let alone look at, all in the hopes of generating money is highly reprehensible.	PA	11-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Daw	Pete	The station is not fit for 21st century public transport.	PA	11-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Palau-Manderson	Frances	[Toilets] Need quick unclogging, CCTV, security, replenishing soap and hand sanitizers.	PA	11-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Shakespeare	Alex	Fed up with stopping outside station.	PA	11-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Armitage	Janine	There's a real problem with the lifts at Liverpool Street station. I am disabled and rely on these lifts to travel between floors and very often the ones that are there are out of service. This makes travel for disabled people very hard. So please upgrade the old lifts and install some smart new ones that are spacious enough for a wheelchair or mobility scooter user to access.	PA	11-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Walt-Erasmus	Elrika	Crowd and luggage friendly toilets . Enough seating. Clear signage.	PA	11-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Alleganza Ratcliffe	Rita	More lifts and toilets.	PA	11-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Watson	Beanie	As someone with an invisible disability the number of public loos often preoccupies my mind when I'm travelling around London.	PA	11-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Wright	Cynthia	Yes.	PA	11-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Mayers	Diane	I have a disability and need to use the toilet frequently. If I dont have a toilet nearby. I wont be able to travel on the tubes and use Liverpool street station at all.	PA	11-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Harding-Murray	Louise	More public toilets including accessible ones are needed at Liverpool st station.	PA	11-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Reeves	Michelle	The lifts are to small for disabled users prams and luggage.	PA	11-Jun-25	S

25/00494/FULEIA	Bow	Laura	I am a frequent user of the toilets at Liverpool Street station and I am dismayed at the state of them. There are usually several out of order, tap is often lacking or in short supply and the taps don't all work. We need new ones but we also need to ensure the ones that we have work!	PA	11-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Edwards	Vanessa	Accessibility.	PA	11-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Archer	Elaine	For those of us with mobility issues, we need lifts at stations. I'd appreciate a lift one stop down the Central line, at Bethnal Green station too. Can't understand why there aren't lifts at all stations that run into Liverpool Street, including the overground stations.	PA	11-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	John	Andrew	The current station is outdated, it needs to be opened open and its original glory restored ready for the return of Great British Railways.	PA	11-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Deliss	Leopold	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: The scale of the development, which will have a negative impact on the area, and is motivated by greed alone. Additionally and very importantly, the substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The proposed development is in direct contravention of National Planning Policy Framework where Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional."	PA	11-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Didier?Serre	Alexis	There is always a queue for the ladies toilets especially at Liverpool St.	PA	11-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Booth	John	As a retired Town Planner I embrace change and the need to create business and commercial opportunities. This development is flawed on two counts - since COVID the demand for the type of space that will be provided has reduced significantly in central London. with so many people working from home either full-time or part-time. To allow a speculative development of this nature to go ahead at the expense of the loss of one of the Country's iconic buildings goes against the principals of planning law. It would have to be in the National Interest for this development to go ahead and destroy an Iconic building - this development is not in the National interest, it isn't even in the scheme of things significant in terms of the Capital's economy. In this context I urge for refusal of planning consent.	PA	11-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	King	C	Just do it!!	PA	11-Jun-25	S

25/00494/FULEIA	Vickers	Graham	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: - The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. - The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. - The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. - The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. - The failure to take into account Paragraph NPPF 213 of the National Planning Policy Framework, which states that: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional."	PA	11-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Gruss	Marius	Extremely disappointed ! Why I have to ask do we need more office & shopping spaces , none of this is needed or wanted at Liverpool Street Station. I suspect another money laundering scheme, Please go back to the UAE or DUBAI	PA	11-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Laughton	Stephen	I object to this application on the basis of the significant and irreparable harm which it would cause to a heritage asset of material national importance. Having worked in the vicinity of, and therefore commuting via, Liverpool Street Station for more than 25 years, I am acutely aware of the need to modernise and increase the capacity of the station and associated travel infrastructure. Furthermore, I am aware of the predilection of some to oppose change and progress, not matter how necessary or how sympathetic. However, while parts of this scheme may be necessary, both to benefit users and as a means to finance upgrades, it most certainly is not sympathetic. Liverpool Street Station is a heritage asset of immense importance, forming a monument to Victorian engineering at the dawn of the steam age and advent of mass transit. The character and history of the original architecture have already been significantly harmed by previous developments, which rather than opening up and celebrating our heritage, have left the magnificent stations and its surrounds (including the historic hotel, station concourse, and train sheds) hemmed in by inappropriate and hyperbolic development. This planning application / development represents the last opportunity to save this asset for future generations - an asset as valuable to our history as ancient woodland or pristine coastline - the manmade, like our natural habitat, once its gone, its gone. The size of this development, the destruction of our history, and irreparable damage to our connection with the past, are clearly inappropriate for the setting, and MUST be sent back to the developers with a clear message to only come back with a plan which preserves, celebrates, and embraces this national asset.	PA	11-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Venner	Peter	I first visited Liverpool Street Station in 1967 (whilst studying Architecture). I was impressed by the utility of the building and it's outstanding architectural and engineering beauty...qualities that are rarely, if ever, found in contemporary designs - and never in railway terminals!. It is a tragedy that we allow the exchange of the lovely buildings we inherit for the mundane convenience, short sighted profit and, ultimately tragic loss, of our heritage to contemporary planners.	PA	11-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	DOWNES	DEREK	It is a hugely destructive scheme.....	PA	11-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Owen-Lloyd	Mark	Liverpool Street station is in a very poor state, mostly as a result of its poorly executed renovation thirty years ago. the gantry of semi-derelict retail units, too-small public concourse and inadequate escalators can be simply remedied. Destroying it and adding that very dull glass box above it will remove any architectural value that the building retains. The virtue-signalling wishes on the top floors are particularly sad. I urge the Corporation to reject this plan and make teh developer come up with something really exciting that befits the City of London, one of the world's great business centres. These plans are placeless - they could be central Manila. They do nothing for the railway passenger .	PA	11-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Edwards	Gregory	Station is old, needs a refresh to manage traffic better, provide a better experience and make moving through the station easier.	PA	11-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Sampson	Lloyd	The current station is not fit for purpose and this will not only create more capacity but create a station we can be proud of. Creating a legacy.	PA	11-Jun-25	S

25/00494/FULEIA	Scott	Margaret	Desperately needed. One tiny lift from platforms to taxi/ground level. I dread going to Liverpool Street in my wheelchair.	PA	11-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Ortiz	Abigail	Moving to Norfolk so will now be using this station more.	PA	11-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	cade	cheryl	I travel regularly to London and use this station. I recognise that it needs extensive improvement to help people with disabilities and the general flow of the public around the station. My objection is the same as it was when the first plans were drawn up. 1) That the current design is not in keeping with the grade 2 victorian building, smothering it with a hyper-modern complex. 2) that the current plans do not reflect the needs of the city (office space is no longer at a premium) 3) Lack of daylight within the station complex, raises issues of how environmental this project is. 4) the details of how it will improve the facilities for the disabled do not seem well considered apart from at platform level (you need to get to the platform first) Thank you	PA	11-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Freemantle	Julie	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The station roof is reminiscent of a cathedral and the natural light enhances the architecture. This would be lost. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. National Planning Policy Framework :Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." I love this station. The changes proposed would be damaging. We lost the Euston Arch, please not the character of this gem of a station.	PA	11-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Middleton	Clark	I object to the destruction of the St Pancras of east London. I specifically object to: 1) Demolition of the concourse roof, compromising the setting of the remaining trainshed and leaving the concourse in darkness. 2) Inserting retail units within the trainshed, plunging more platforms into darkness. I doubt they would let you build a tower block on St Pauls Cathedral, so leave this cathedral alone.	PA	11-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Hicks	Grant	I vehemently object to the intended redevelopment of Liverpool Street Station, and the planning application for these extensive works, which would destroy much of the historical and valuable Victorian building. Grant Hicks	PA	11-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Shields FRSA	Andrew	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. My objection takes note of the National Planning Policy Framework, paragraph NPPF 213, which states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." Specifically, I raise objections to: 1. The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. 2. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. 3. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. 4. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. 5. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church.	PA	11-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Okwabi	Patricia	I object to this application, as it poses a significant threat to the preservation and recognition of nationally important heritage assets. In particular, I object to the following aspects of the application: - The hypocrisy of saying "let's save London's history" by knocking down something old and replacing it with something new. - The endless amount of disturbance it would make to the neighbourhood and tourists trying to find their way round the station. - Those who struggle with mental health problems such as anxiety or PTSD and those who have neurodivergent/neurological disorders (and conditions) will be overwhelmed. Preservation would also be best for those who have memory problems or disorders and that "familiar place" or those memories that they are struggling to hold onto may fade due to the change. - Those with babies, young children or elderly relatives/passengers may also struggle to cope with the noise. - The loss of an original building and the replacement with a new one could make it unsafe; they, the developers and the builders, would have to find a way to stabilise the whole building, so that they don't tear down anything historical or of a significant/rare nature. The main communities that would be affected would mainly be, but not limited to: - Those with mental health disorders or conditions (again: Anxiety, PTSD or stress related disorders). - Those with neurodivergent disorders (e.g. Autism, ADHD, Tourette's). - Those with memory problems, issues, conditions and/or disorders (e.g. Dementia, Alzheimer's, Amnesia, traumatic brain injuries).	PA	11-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Murray	Caroline	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to the idea of increasing the number of shops, cafes, etc., the increasing height of the building, creation of an auditorium at Level 18 with ancillary terrace; creation of a public amenity terrace. All this will add to the crowding and confusion at the station, as well as destroying its historical and heritage areas. I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. Substantial harm to or loss of: (a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional.	PA	11-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Smith	Jef	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. Specifically I object to the demolition of the roof structure, the insertion of retail units within the train sheds, the construction of a tower over the station concourse and the harm to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area. I have used this station throughout my life and am very sad that consideration should be given to such a destructive scheme.	PA	11-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Woodhead	Catherine	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. To reference the National Planning Policy Framework: Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." This isn't!! And from an environmental perspective we don't need more tall buildings trapping the pollution in this area. I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important h	PA	12-Jun-25	O
Page 46 25/00494/FULEIA	240b Merton Road	Danish	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: - The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. - The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. - The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. - The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. -In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. The National Planning Policy Framework Paragraph 213 clearly states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." Regards Danish Irfan	PA	12-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Hunt	Eva	I object to this application and to the substantial harm it would cause to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. I reference the National Planning Policy Framework Paragraph NPPF 213 stating: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional."	PA	12-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Payne	Gareth	It will allow more people with disabilities to access train services.	PA	12-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	MacRae	Caroline	Yes.	PA	12-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Hall	Nat	I'm mobility challenged and cannot use stairs. The one time I used them I fell and landed on the cast iron landing. It caused a small fracture on my cervical spine. Please, please make way for decent lifts from the ticket office down to the platforms.	PA	12-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Hastie	Phil	It's my gateway to London. Need more disabled toilets.	PA	12-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Risiott	Sharon	I am disabled.	PA	12-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Reeves	Joanne	Less congestion in the station.	PA	12-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	DAO	MATTHEW	Frequently travel here, would be an amazing upgrade for only the most visited station of all of UK!!	PA	12-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Chadfield-Mohr	Brian	Disabled myself.	PA	12-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Abildgaard	Kirsten	ACCESSIBILITY.	PA	12-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Moran	Laurence	Liverpool St needs a complete upgrade. It's the busiest station but still feels and looks like it's furnished from an by gone era.	PA	12-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Milbank	Kim	I am a disabled person and find it difficult to negotiate stairs. There needs to be more lifts especially trying to access the underground.	PA	12-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Lucas	Jacque	I am a senior who struggles to move on a moving train - often need the loo when I get there! Yes please!	PA	12-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Keane	Michael	Better.	PA	12-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Punter	Rachel	This needs to happen because Liverpool Street is such an essential transport hub for London and the East of England. The passenger numbers have grown, the station needs to grow to keep up, this will be good for the City of London because there will be greater demand for office space in the area.	PA	12-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Room	Elaine	Please help alleviate the problems of people like me with mobility issues.	PA	12-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Galloway Gale	Jan	So I can use public transport.	PA	12-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Thorpe	Denise	As well as my gateway to London it's the gateway to the East Coast.	PA	12-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	.	Vee	more accessibility. not having to pay cash to use the toilet will be useful. also having more toilets that support the RADAR key.	PA	12-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Kuo	Hao-Tsun	Current movement of people adds wasted time.	PA	12-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	May	Mica	Liverpool Street is a busy and essential station.	PA	12-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Keen	Brenda	Need the passenger support for all customers.	PA	12-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Thomson	Susan	Being older, carrying a case upstairs is impossible.	PA	12-Jun-25	S

25/00494/FULEIA	.	Dean	Because it the East of England's main hub London Station.	PA	12-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Sansom	Mary	Toilets are a necessity. They are needed, at every station. And no payments please. I was at Waterloo London and they wated #2.00!	PA	12-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Terry	Gillian	The toilets are spacious but constantly busy. (I used them only yesterday.) They are also accessible down two flights of stairs and I realise there are disabled available but these need permission from a member of staff.	PA	12-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Prothero	Davey	Regular user of the station and support the plans.	PA	12-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Turner	Debby	My husband can't manage steps nor escalators.	PA	12-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Parkin	Sue	The one little lift out of the underground to platform level is often out of service. Without any helpful people around, I am stuck with my suitcase.	PA	12-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Leefe-Griffiths	Islay	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. Make sure to reference the National Planning Policy Framework in your objection, otherwise your objection may be dismissed: Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional.	PA	12-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Hepworth	Eli	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. Finally, in reference to the National Planning Policy Framework this states that "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." In this case this criteria is not met.	PA	12-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Stone	James	Dear Sir/Madam, I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19th train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. This plan goes against the National Planning Policy Framework: Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional" Yours Faithfully James Stone	PA	12-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Smith	P	Hello, I object as the scale of development is too substantial.	PA	12-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Gallagher	Tim	I object to this application as it will detrimentally affect the historic buildings that make up the station and the hotel.	PA	12-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Seal	Catherine	I object to this inappropriate plan to demolish (partially) a lovely old station and plonk on top of it an entirely out-of-keeping and out-of-scale modern 'spreadsheet' design block. I object on the grounds of loss of heritage and inappropriate, wrong scaled over-station development.	PA	12-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	bundy	michael william	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to this nationally important heritage. More specifically, I raise objections to: The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's Broadgate church. I make reference the National Planning Policy Framework Paragraph NPPF 213, which states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." As a local resident and daily visitor to the Liverpool Street area, I object to this alarming development in the strongest possible terms, and invite you to reject it. Michael Bundy	PA	12-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Wood	Simon	to whom it may concern I strongly object to the proposed redevelopment of Liverpool Street Station (Planning Application Ref: 24/01224/FULEIA) by Network Rail and Sellar, which involves partial demolition and inappropriate alterations to this Grade II* listed Victorian masterpiece. The plans threaten the station's historic character and the surrounding Bishopsgate Conservation Area, causing substantial harm to its heritage value. The proposed 20-storey office tower cantilevered over the station and the Great Eastern Hotel is wholly incompatible with the station's architectural integrity. It would overshadow the iconic trainshed and obscure key heritage features, such as the Victorian clock towers and the station's unique roof structure, which are integral to its historic significance. The Victorian Society, Historic England, and other heritage groups have rightly highlighted that this development prioritizes commercial gain over preserving a vital piece of London's history. While I acknowledge the need for improved accessibility and capacity, the current plans fail to balance these needs with heritage preservation. The demolition of parts of the listed station concourse and the insertion of a bulky office block demonstrate a lack of sensitivity to the station's cultural and architectural importance. Alternative solutions, such as those proposed by heritage organizations, could enhance accessibility and passenger experience without compromising the station's historic fabric. The public consultation process has been inadequate, with nearly 2,000 comments showing significant opposition, despite Network Rail's claims of support. The proposed design disregards the station's role as a landmark gateway to the City of London and risks irreversible damage to its character. I urge the City of London Corporation to reject these plans and explore alternatives that respect Liverpool Street Station's heritage while meeting modern needs. Yours faithfully	PA	12-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Sainty	Brett Jon	The project will cause substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station and also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. Refer to NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional."	PA	12-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	DOYLE	STEPHEN	I strongly object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the nationally important listed station, its setting, and the surrounding Bishopsgate Conservation Area. The scheme proposes: - Demolition of much of the listed station, including the entire historic concourse - a key part of its architectural and historic significance. - Construction of a 20-storey tower above the station, causing major harm to the setting of the Grade II*-listed hotel (the last continually functioning 19th-century hotel in the City). - Insertion of significant retail within the historic train sheds - the oldest and most important parts of the station. - A tall building in an area of low- to mid-rise scale, contrary to the City of London Local Plan (2015), which opposes tall buildings in Conservation Areas and the St Paul's Heights Area. The development would also harm the setting of numerous heritage assets across the City, including several Grade I-listed Wren churches and St Botolph's. The proposal conflicts with Paragraph 213 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), which states that "substantial harm to or loss of Grade II listed buildings should be exceptional." No such exceptional justification has been made. I support upgrading the station's facilities, but not at the cost of its historic character or the architectural integrity of the City. I urge the planning authority to reject this scheme.	PA	12-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Jones	Edgar	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: First, the substantial and lasting harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse. The replacement structure will seriously compromise the setting of the surviving nineteenth century train shed. Secondly, the inclusion of many new retail units within the train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of damage and destruction to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. These actions contravene the National Planning Policy Framework as paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." I write from the standpoint of a citizen of London who regularly uses the area and station for work and leisure and also a published historian of industrial architecture - E. Jones (1985), Industrial Architecture in Britain 1750-1939, London: B.T. Batsford.	PA	12-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Borley	Caroline	Reasons for objection:1. The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed;2. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset;3. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse.The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church.4. National Planning Policy Framework, Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional."PLEASE RESPECT THIS WONDERFUL STATION WHICH I HAVE USED FOR YEARS. I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: 1. The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement	PA	12-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Murray	John	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to:The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed.The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset.The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse.The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church.Make sure to reference the National Planning Policy Framework in your objection, otherwise your objection may be dismissed:Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to:	PA	12-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Ashton	Norman	"I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise an objection to:" The removal of the concourse - part of the heritage for East Anglian Travellers.	PA	12-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Denton	Joshua	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: - The significant and damaging alterations/demolitions being proposed to the listed Liverpool Street Station, its hotel, concourse and train shed. - The precedence that such action would set when it comes to demolition of other valuable listed buildings. - The irreparable damage this will cause to the local area. I sincerely hope this proposals is rejected.	PA	12-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	O'Neill	Susan	Demolition or part of this historical building is offensive.	PA	12-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Sutton-Mattocks	Robert	I object strongly for a number of reasons. Mostly because the scheme destroys a rare survival of a stunning Victorian railway terminus including very sympathetic restorations done in 1980s that restored a rare Venetian style building currently occupied by Mcdonalds. The streetview of this entrance has hardly changed for 100 years and it will be flattened. The station concourse itself looks very similar to how it was in Victorian times and is actually flooded with light. It's a welcome entrance to London commuters. All of this will be lost as a tower block will be built above the concourse and a it will become a depressive dark underground concourse . It is exactly the sort of scheme that the City of London should be trying to stop as it is charged with making London a world-beating city. Who wants to work in a grey city without heritage buildings? It is what makes London unique and attracts workers and investment from cities that have lost their heritage and character. Finally I object as this is a very poor way to help traffic and transport in the area. For years the area will be blighted by the construction of the offices above. What the station needs is proper investment in renovating the current heritage station and improving rail services, not destroying the station for the benefit of office developers. The station will become much more difficult and expensive to manage or renovate in the future as Network Rail will have to negotiate with the office owners and renters above the station rather than having nothing built above it.	PA	12-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Brough	Michael James Arman	I am afraid the same remarks apply to this new proposal, or much the same, as I had submitted before when the matter was subject to the previous application. Please leave Liverpool Street station well alone. The proposals are still grossly insensitive and appear driven far more by commercial development considerations than by any effect on operational capacity, either in terms of passenger/rail user throughput or in terms of daily train movements. The story at this site has been one of shortsighted loss (Broad Street Station should NEVER have been lost, as its footprint could have been used to provide real operational expansion) and the same consideration applies to the Bishopsgate site (Bishopsgate was Liverpool Street's immediate predecessor, built by what was then the Eastern Counties' Railway and long converted to a good station). Architecturally, Liverpool Street has lost the eastern trainshed in favour of oversailing office accommodation to the detriment of the passenger environment, but gained a fine concourse constructed in harmony with the surviving western trainshed. What is now proposed takes a hatchet to that achievement and I can see no real benefit to station users and the wanton demolition of a very fine piece of work. Rail users are sick of the restlessness of commercial development 'agitation' as it seems to rear its head relentlessly. A main line railway station is just that. Don't keep trying to harm the station environment in order to please opportunistic private capital investors. I know that this lies in the City and the attraction of private capital is strong but essentially these major railway termini are conceptually beyond that kind of consideration. They are national assets rather than local buildings and one could argue that planning applications concerning them should be determined nationally, and be governed by national transport policy rather than by individual local councils, however eminent and historic those councils may be.	PA	12-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Kelly	Patricia	I object to this application because of the significant harm it would cause to the nationally important heritage of the station itself and the area around it. This proposal is surely contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework para NPPF 213 in that it requires the destruction of a major part of the roof structure of the grade II listed station. The proposals will also adversely impact the setting of the train shed by the changes to the concourse and surroundings to support the multi-storey tower and the addition of a large amount of new retail space at a high level within the train area - significantly changing the view and impact of the canopy. It also appears contrary to the 2015 City Plan which requires the refusal of plans for tall buildings in inappropriate areas. The proposed tower would dominate the Bishopsgate Conservation area, adversely affect the setting of the Grade II listed Station Hotel and impact the skyline and setting of Grade 1 listed city churches. As a long-term user of the station I appreciate the need to improve traffic-flow (and accessibility of toilets) especially at peak commuter time. This proposal however will cause long term damage to a beautiful, important and historic set of buildings in return for bland offices and a shopping mall for which there is unproven need.	PA	12-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Fowle	Michael	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets at Liverpool Street Station. I have used this station for 60 years and know it has a great City of London landmark.	PA	12-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Gunning	Adrian	I object to the proposal of a tower block being built on top of the historic and beautiful Liverpool Street station. The scheme is too large and will ruin a listed railway station. Having saved the station and hotel from ruination some years ago you are now proposing to build on top of it which will take away natural light and completely wreck the interior of the station roof. The public do not want more tower blocks and endless shops. They want trains in a train station that work!	PA	12-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	COUPER	REBECCA	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." Finally, I am deeply concerned that Bishopsgate is losing its access to sunlight as more and more glass towers are being erected. The plans as far as I can ascertain, destroy the original charm of the building's silhouette and amount to cultural vandalism.	PA	12-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Ryan	Alastair	I object. This proposed new building is utterly disproportionate. Just ridiculous. Burying railway stations underneath office blocks is always a bad idea as well. Cannon Street is still poor. Fenchurch St too. What about New Street in Birmingham? Think of Penn Station in New York, which the city bitterly regrets to this day? Stop it	PA	12-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Davenport	Antony	This monstrous office block with no architectural merit, will completely dominate the small amount of the wonderful Victorian building, that is being left. It involves demolition of wonderful heritage assets and the insertion of new retail units within the train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches.	PA	12-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Darn	Kerri	I have various objections to the proposal. The existing station functions well and is a successful melding of 1980s style with the existing Victorian building with low impact to the original building. In order to make way for the large block on top light will be totally blocked out from the station beneath impairing the experience for users. Even in the cgi mock up of the new building the listed hotel immediately next to it is cast into shadow. The proposal shows no respect of deference to this building of national importance. It swamps and dominates the space rather than integrating to it. The proposal is inappropriate for the site and moreover the existing building has been built and further developed in a way which is sympathetic to its setting and therefore should be preserved and cherished.	PA	12-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Beckett	Matthew	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: The demolition of the existing station concourse roof - part of the Grade II-listed station - which would result in the loss of historic fabric and undermine the architectural and historic integrity of the structure. The proposed replacement structure fails to respect the character of the station and would also diminish the setting of the surviving 19th-century train sheds. The insertion of extensive new retail units, including two large elevated retail galleries, within the historic train sheds. This would have a profoundly negative impact on the special interest of the listed station by obscuring key views, cluttering historic space, and introducing incongruous modern forms. The proposed 20-storey tower over the station concourse, which would harm the setting of surrounding heritage assets, including the Grade II*-listed hotel adjacent to the station - the last functioning 19th-century railway hotel in the City of London. The tower would also impact views to and from a number of other designated heritage assets. The proposal's failure to preserve or enhance the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, where the introduction of a tall building is manifestly inappropriate. The area's character is defined by low- and medium-rise historic buildings. This proposal contravenes the City of London Local Plan (2015) and would also harm the setting of multiple listed buildings, including Grade I-listed Wren churches and St Botolph's. Under Paragraph 213 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings... should be exceptional." No such exceptional justification has been provided here. The scale of harm is unacceptable, and I urge that this application be refused in line with national and local heritage policy.	PA	12-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Moran	Colin	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets as there is little in these plans that is at all sympathetic to the history and listed status of Liverpool Street Station This proposal should be rejected until it is re designed to take into account the heritage and listing status of the building as the proposals on offer are clearly inappropriate Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." This proposal is exactly the reasons what paragraph NPPF 213 was created for Thank you	PA	12-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Cross	Anthony	I object to the proposed plans for Llverpool St station. Developers are all the same, little or no regard for the Nation's heritage.It's all about making money. You can't reinstate heritage, once it's gone it's gone forever. Not that you care.	PA	12-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Rushton	William	object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to both: The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset.	PA	12-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Corrin	Chris	I strongly object to the application which in my view would cause huge damage to the very fine and nationally important architectural integrity of the great Victorian Liverpool Street station which I have always greatly admired and which has survived despite the inexorable destruction of so many fine historical buildings in the City.	PA	12-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Killick	Tom	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I object to: 1. The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. 2. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. 3. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. 4. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. The National Planning Policy Framework (paragraph 213) states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional."	PA	12-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Longley	Stuart	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to a nationally important heritage asset. The station needs refurbishment, but demolishing part of it and topping it with such an overbearing design will irreversibly damage the historic character of the station and the attached hotel and concourse. The historic buildings and architecture of the City contribute to its uniqueness and bring in huge amounts of tourists and income. They need to be adapted for modern use in a way that respects and maintains their character, rather than plonking a massive tower block on the roof.	PA	12-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Harrison	James	I object to this application on grounds of irreparable harm not only to this Grade II-listed heritage asset but also to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, considering the proposed 20-storey block being inserted into an area characterised by low to medium scale architectural massing. The development is not sympathetic to the local built environment. I'd note that the 2015 City Plan *requires* the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate locations such as conservation areas. I do not see how the proposed development is compliant with policies DM12.2 or DM12.3 of the 2015 City Plan. In particular, the demolition of the concourse roof structure, which adversely impacts the setting of the 19th Century trainshed roofs, flatly contradicts Policy DM12.3 subsection 1, 'to resist the demolition of listed buildings.' Further, the proposed retail development within the trainsheds themselves negatively affects their special interest and significance, which is at odds with Policy DM12.3 subsection 2, 'to grant consent for alteration of a listed building only where this would not detract from its special architectural or historic interest, character and significance or its setting'. I would also draw attention to Paragraph 213 of the National Planning Policy Framework, which states that substantial harm or loss of Grade II listed buildings should be exceptional.	PA	12-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Alexander	Victoria	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: Thousands of travellers and passersby go through this beautiful C19th construction which is Grade II listed every day. The loss of this substantial amount of natural light would significantly reduce the well-being of all of these people. These plans compromise the setting of the C19th Tramshed and the surrounding heritage assets which enhance the area and are significant for the historical relevance to the area, including the last hotel from this period that is still in use as such. This is a plan that is just MUCH TOO TALL. Contrary to the 2015 City Plan, this planning proposal harms the area of so many local sites of significance historically including Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of many heritage assets in the City and beyond, such Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and the nearby St Botolph's church. There is also excessive amounts of retail inserted into the scheme - this does not enhance the area or the user experience. This is just a way to make money out of travellers and is distasteful for the heritage area as well as the user experience. There are empty retail spaces already both in and outside of the concourse. I urge the planners to refuse this plan that would result in the loss of a much loved Grade II listed station that we all love as it is and as it should remain. Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional."	PA	12-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Sebag-Montefiore	Victoria	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: Thousands of travellers and passersby go through this beautiful C19th construction which is Grade II listed every day. The loss of this substantial amount of natural light would significantly reduce the well-being of all of these people. These plans compromise the setting of the C19th Tramshed and the surrounding heritage assets which enhance the area and are significant for the historical relevance to the area, including the last hotel from this period that is still in use as such. This is a plan that is just MUCH TOO TALL. Contrary to the 2015 City Plan, this planning proposal harms the area of so many local sites of significance historically including Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of many heritage assets in the City and beyond, such Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and the nearby St Botolph's church. There is also excessive amounts of retail inserted into the scheme - this does not enhance the area or the user experience. This is just a way to make money out of travellers and is distasteful for the heritage area as well as the user experience. There are empty retail spaces already both in and outside of the concourse. I urge the planners to refuse this plan that would result in the loss of a much loved Grade II listed station that we all love as it is and as it should remain. Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional."	PA	12-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Grierson	James	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. National Planning Policy Framework Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." The proposed scheme represents gross over-development, is incredibly poorly designed and will cause substantial harm 1. To the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. 2. The construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of this Grade II-listed heritage asset. 3. The adverse impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. 4. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. 5. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church.	PA	12-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Reid	Margaret	I object to this application which would harm to an important heritage asset. I object to the demolition of the roof of the concourse; this would compromise the setting of the train sheds The impact of a 20 storey tower over the concourse & in an area of low & medium buildings is inappropriate & contrary to the 2015 City Plan Aware of these objections I visited for the 1st time & was hugely impressed by the grace & elegance of the facility. Please save this gem for our Capital City. The plans seem to be completely at odds with Paragraph NPPF 213 which states that loss of or harm to grade 11 listed buildings should be exceptional.	PA	12-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Edwards	Alan	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to nationally important heritage assets. More specifically: 1. **Demolition of the station concourse roof** Removing the existing roof of the Grade II-listed station and replacing it with a new structure would significantly damage its historic character and the setting of the original 19th-century train shed. 2. **Overdevelopment within the historic sheds** The introduction of extensive retail units, including two elevated galleries, would overwhelm the internal space, severely affecting the architectural integrity and significance of this heritage asset. 3. **Impact on nearby listed buildings** The proposed 20-storey tower would harm the setting of the Grade II*-listed hotel-the last continually operating 19th-century railway hotel in the City-and other surrounding listed structures. 4. **Harm to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area** A tall building in this low- to medium-rise historic area conflicts with the 2015 City Plan and disrupts the character of this protected space. It would also intrude on views affecting many designated and undesignated heritage assets, including Grade I-listed Wren churches and St Botolph's. Paragraph 213 of the <i>*National Planning Policy Framework*</i> states that "substantial harm to or loss of... grade II listed buildings... should be exceptional." This scheme does not meet that test. I urge the planning authority to refuse this application.	PA	12-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	McCarthy	Jan	Having used Liverpool St station for over forty years, I do not believe the plans for high raise buildings on the site is appropriate for an iconic railway station.	PA	12-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Burch	Lizebeth	How can Planners even CONSIDER a dreadful scheme such as the one proposed for Liverpool Street Station? You continue to brutalise this part of London by building more and more soulless high-rises; now you want to destroy an historic and beautiful structure for incomprehensible reasons. Since Covid, office space has gone begging, and there is NO NEED for more of these towers. Why is permission being granted for buildings which themselves will be outdated and demolished within 50 years? It seems to us that these schemes are to the (temporary) benefit of the developers ONLY. Once destroyed, important historic buildings can never be replaced. The Station is of major architectural value, and functions beautifully, as well. With only a few modifications to the existing concourse, it will last and be beautiful for another two hundred years. We strongly urge the Planners to reconsider this horrible idea, and reject it. Historically and architecturally, it would be criminal to carry out any scheme which destroys the basic fabric of this Rail Station. Please deny permission. Thank you.	PA	13-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	White	Maria	I object to the substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving 19th century train shed. We don't need this ugly construction - tourists, members of the public and I don't like it - and it's not good for the environment to build something that doesn't need building. I object to the insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the 19th century train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, which will cause a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The construction proposal will have a detrimental impact to the setting of the surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, it will harm the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning 19th century hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. This plan will cause substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. My full objection to the planning proposals for Liverpool Street Station are made in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework where paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional."	PA	13-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	.	Mervdm	Given the other train station developments, Liverpool Street is looking tired	PA	13-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Bazalgette	Jack	Liverpool Street St is packed and stressful	PA	13-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Yandoli	Dennis	Im curious	PA	13-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	MacGillicuddy	Kieran	Build baby build	PA	13-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Evans	Tomos	More accessibility	PA	13-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Sandes	Caroline	As per my letter to Mr Tom Sleight, I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional.	PA	13-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Sanford	Kaylee	While Liverpool Street Station could benefit from thoughtful redevelopment to improve functionality and reduce overcrowding, this proposal is entirely counterproductive. Expanding the station to ease pressure, only to build a 20-storey tower block and pack in even more people through added retail and office space, completely defeats the purpose. This is not sympathetic restoration, it's commercial overdevelopment that sacrifices historic character for short-term gain, and in the long run, it worsens the very problems it claims to solve. This proposal is not only culturally irresponsible, it is also legally questionable. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) is clear in its guidance: 'Paragraph 213 states that "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) Grade II listed buildings, or Grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." There is nothing exceptional in this scheme, only another glass-and-steel high-rise, indistinguishable from so many others, that offers nothing to the cultural or historic fabric of the city, nor solves the current issues at hand. The scheme further contravenes the City of London's 2015 City Plan, which mandates that tall buildings must not be constructed in inappropriate areas such as Conservation Areas or within protected views of St. Paul's Cathedral. This development clearly falls foul of those guidelines. This proposal threatens the functional viability, architectural integrity and historical character of Liverpool Street Station and its surroundings. Once this damage is done, it cannot be undone. This will not solve overcrowding and poor functionality of the area, I believe it will only exacerbate the issue, whilst slowly destroying our beloved city.	PA	13-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Palmer AssocRICS, FRPH, AISSE	Alan	The development is overpowering and does nothing to enhance the surrounding original environment but detracts from the what the CITY OF LONDON history and standing as a city once was.	PA	13-Jun-25	O
Page 66 25/00494/FULEIA	Barraclough	Richard	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. Paragraph NPPF 213 of the National Planning Policy Framework states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." The effect of the proposals would mean: Substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station Substantial harm to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan Adverse impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets Huge damage to heritage value of the C19 train sheds There is nothing in these crass and insensitive proposals that in my opinion could justify their acceptance.	PA	13-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Corrin	Richard	I think this proposal is an abomination of one of London's last truly beautiful structures. To tear it down is to spit in the face of our city and what we as the public deserve to have around us - testaments to shared excellence. Keep London Beautiful!!!	PA	13-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Eden	Anna	I object strongly to the destruction of parts of Liverpool Street Station and the grossly oversized replacement proposed. Although this is a revised proposal, it is still far too big and will seriously affect the original station and the surrounding historic area.	PA	13-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Knight	Chris	I strongly object to this application, which would be hugely detrimental to Liverpool Street station, a heritage asset, and its environment. I contend that the application does not comply with the National Planning Policy Framework in that, if approved and implemented, it would do substantial harm to listed buildings, both the station itself and the adjacent hotel. More specifically, there would be substantial harm to the station by virtue of the demolition of the roof structure of the concourse. There would be considerable harm to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area by the imposition of a tall building, a twenty storey tower, which I believe would be contrary to the 2015 City Plan.	PA	13-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Boggis-Rolfe	Harry	I object to partial demolition of this listed building, to the effect the scale of what is proposed will have on the area and to the destructive effect it will have on the pleasure one gets from using this station. Improvements for public use can be achieved without such a development, although I use the station daily and am quite happy with things as they are	PA	13-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Liddiard	Jean	I object to this application as particularly harmful to the significance of nationally important heritage assets, too many of which have already been destroyed or disfigured. The National Planning Policy Framework should be applied,, especially paragraph NPPF 213. Specifically I object to the demolition of the existing roof structure, especially the incongruous 20 ft tower over the concourse, and the impact on the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, contrary to the 2015 City Plan .Other aspects of the scheme are inappropriate and destructively garish, such as the two retail galleries proposal, at a time when retail is generally struggling and units are empty or filled by tatty popups.. A great city fortunate to have unique great buildings, especially by Wren, which survived the Blitz, should cherish not destroy them. Let us have some remaining pride in what we have achieved in our past legacy and hope we may one day restore a future one.	PA	13-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Rule	Chris	For Disabled Access as the lift in the foyer of Liverpool Street station to the underground station foyer is only capable of holding a certain amount of weight and gets stuck when people use the lift and come in with loads of heavy suitcases and pushchairs.	PA	13-Jun-25	S

25/00494/FULEIA	Yager	Deirdre	I have fond memories of Liverpool Street stn and feel it should be viewed as a hard working mainline London station, not an opportunity for developers. I do not deny it would benefit from appropriate refurbishment and modernisation. I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: - the substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. -The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. - The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. - The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. I refer to the National Planning Policy Framework: Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional	PA	13-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Elliott	John	I object to these proposals. They constitute a massive overdevelopment of the site, involving partial demolition of a listed building that was the subject of an award-winning major improvement less than 40 years ago. As well as the damage to the station itself, there would be a deleterious impact on the surrounding properties including the listed station hotel and the surrounding Bishopsgate Conservation Area	PA	13-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Thorne	Graham	I object to this proposal in the strongest terms on the grounds below Harm to Grade II and II* listed buildings Unnecessary additional retail space in appropriate tall buildings in this area Conflicts with NPPF 213	PA	13-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Rayner	Elizabeth	This development will leave the main concourse area with little if any daylight. This is not environmentally friendly and one only has to look at the disastrous platform areas at Birmingham New Street to realise the effects of effectively having a sub-surface station which is what these proposals will turn Liverpool Street into. One of the main assets of the current building is that daylight reaches the main circulation area and this should be preserved and not sacrificed for what will be short term profit.	PA	13-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Cooper	J		DC	13-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Fletcher	Robert	I mainly object to the proposed demolition of the train sheds. Living along the Great Eastern Main Line I have known Liverpool Street well. Local architects G and F Sherrin designed the 1912 arcade to Broad Street which I think went in the 1980s.	PA	13-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Blair	Peter	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to:- The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed.- The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset.- The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse.- The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. With reference to the National Planning Policy Framework:- Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." This is a Grade II Victorian structure. Cannot see how the construction of a 20-storey office block through and on top of the station respects the national importance of this site in any way. I object strongly against th	PA	13-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Hass	Philipp		DC	13-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Gill	David	The proposed development whilst improving to some extent rail travellers would be out of keeping with the listed railway station and hotel complex to the detriment of its historic character and should be refused.	PA	13-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Dunstone	Denis		DC	13-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Henderson	Martin		DC	13-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Martinez	Manuel		DC	13-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Green	Nick		DC	13-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Barnett	Jacqueline		DC	13-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Daffern	Adrian	I feel that too much of our heritage architecture is being destroyed in the name of obtaining profit from the land Network Rail owns. We need to remember the efforts and risks taken by our forbears to provide us with the railway network we enjoy. Euston (the first intercity terminus) was destroyed, What next Brunel's Paddington? I note that in the 1970's John Betjeman led a successful campaign to preserve this station. What has changed? Sadly modern architecture is of generally uninteresting and unimpressive style lacking in craftsmanship of former times. Please retain this interesting and impressive building.	PA	13-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Jones	Robin	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. The National Planning Policy Framework (Paragraph NPPF 213) states that: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." It is clear this application involves very significant harm to a grade II listed building.	PA	13-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Everett	Nicholas	I object to the development as it destroys a perfectly good facility that functions well as is part of the original Great Eastern railway building. This will be lost for ever.	PA	13-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Moffatt	Andrew	This will destroy the integrity of the existing building and train sheds. The overall massing of the building is too big, will cause too much shading and will fundamentally destroy this part of Broadgate. Whilst the Corporation is hellbent of wrecking the City for profit and greed, perhaps it could step back and actually consider both the public and environment - this development will serve neither.	PA	13-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Diwell	Christine	I object to this application. It will cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets not least for the following reasons: - Substantial harm to the Grade II listed station through demolition of the roof structure of the station concourse with replacement by a new structure. This would also compromise the setting of the surviving 19thC train shed. - Extensive additional insertion of retail units within the 19thC train sheds, including two elevated retail galleries would cause high level harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II listed heritage asset. - Specifically, harm will be significant to the Grade II* listed hotel, the last continually functioning 19thC hotel in the City by construction of a 20 storey tower over the station concourse. - Substantial harm of the scheme as a whole will be caused to Bishopsgate Conservation Area.	PA	14-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Vallely	Dominic	As a nearby resident and regular user of Liverpool Street I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets and much loved station. Specifically, I raise objections to 1. The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." This is an underwhelming commercial development that doesn't meet the local plan. 2. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. 3. In an increasing landscape of 'steel and glass towers' I am concerned about the impact on listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. Please reject this application	PA	14-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Law	Sophie	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to the following: The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. I note that paragraph NPPF 213 in the National Planning Policy Framework states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." What is being proposed here is far from exceptional and would cause substantial harm to and loss of grade II and grade I listed buildings throughout.	PA	14-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Tooker	Maxim	I object, in the strongest possible terms, to the application. This is an egregious assault on the city of London's heritage and I am appalled and disgusted that such a proposal to 'improve station amenities' is supposedly only able to be supposed by the viability strategy of demolishing listed buildings and permanently damaging the situation of others. the massing of the above station building is not sympathetic or supportive of the listed Great Eastern Hotel, overshadows and ruins its position, and the demolition of the listed Post modern station buildings, which both enhance and beautify the original Victorian station, is a shockingly destructive and exposes network rails selfish disdain for its heritage assets, as they tragically proved at Euston and very nearly at St Pancras. I am appalled and disgusted that such a blighting of infamy is being blackmailed against Londoners as the only possible way to make 'station capacity upgrades' viable, and I implore the City of London to object and silence this depraved and audacious proposal. If this is to be approved, it will be one of the most lamented and infamous demolitions of our generation in London.	PA	14-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Roberts	Lynn	I object to this planning application (25/00494/FULEIA, of 5 June 2025). I agree entirely with Andrew Wilson's letter of objection. Bobby Syme makes the important argument that the scheme causes significant 'impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets [especially] ...the Grade II* listed hotel ... through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse'; and substantial harm 'to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan... In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets... such as many of the Grade I-listed Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church'. Civic Voice makes very similar points. I agree with Michael Taylor, that: '...the illustrations and descriptions around the planning proposals appear cynical and aim to distract the viewer and local residents from what the Victorian Society has described as a "perverse view of the site as ripe for development"... The illustrations shown do not fully demonstrate the development's impact, and ...are faded into the skyline, so I believe are not a true representation of the final result'. I agree with George Bryant, that removal of part of the high concourse &c '... is countered by the proposed demolition of a portion of the train-shed.... The cumulative effect of the proposed development would be to obliterate any visual presence the station would have from the street. Demolition of the remaining portion of the original station building and the ...1990s entrance pavilions would be replaced by [buildings out of scale]... with the station. These would also visually isolate the Great Eastern Hotel and eliminate any visual connection with the station. While the ... pavilions are not of great historic value, they do provide a recognizable and historically sympathetic entrances to the station'.	PA	14-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Phillips	Janet	As a regular user of Liverpool Station, I object most strongly to this application, for the harm that will be caused to a nationally important heritage asset. The National Planning Policy Framework states, 'Substantial harm or loss of Grade 11 listed buildings or grade 11 listed parks and gardens should be exceptional'. It is my contention this application will do irreparable harm as follows: The amazing roof structure, one of the glories of the station, will definitely suffer more than substantial harm. There are too many retail units proposed with two additional upper galleries. There will be a huge impact on the Great Eastern Hotel blighted with a horrific 20 storey modern building over the concourse. There are already too many high, tall buildings in this conservation area already dwarfing other significant heritage buildings eg. St Botolphs and St Helen's Churches. I am in no doubt that Liverpool Street Station does need further improvement as it has an enormous number of passengers which will further increase. An improvement in toilet facilities is definitely needed for example. This application in it's present form need to be rethought. Newer proposals safeguarding the heritage of the magnificent Victorian station, whilst making it suitable for future needs, should be submitted.	PA	14-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	McMahon	Shirley	I object to this project as this area has already got a significant amount of high story buildings which is dwarfing the old London listed buildings. As a private historian we need to keep our famous landmarks, buildings including our grade 2 listed train station. Please find another area where this building will be most the most beneficial.	PA	14-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Kalkhoven	Paul	I object to this oversized development which will severely damage the integrity of this Grade 2 station and its surroundings, particularly the loss of daylight on the concourse. The improvements of public amenity do not justify the overall negative impact that the immense bulk of this building will have on this important public building. I object to this proposal because of the negative and destructive impact this development will have on the public and semi-public domain. The architectural quality of this design does not reflect the importance of Liverpool Street station as the UK's busiest station and therefore as a major national public space, in particular because of the following aspects: - The loss of daylight in the concourse area - the over-scaled and bulky development over the station - its negative impact on the setting of the listed buildings	PA	14-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Downer	Philip	The revised proposals for Liverpool Street by ACME architects are insupportable. While their renders carefully try to avoid showing the full bulk of the office block that they propose to drop on top of the Victorian station, accompanied by the extensive demolition of the style-appropriate improvements made in the 1990s, it is clear that this is another air-grab that takes little account of any consideration beyond the maximisation of office space. The usual "green" cascade of pointless shrubs down the corners of this block do nothing to offset its inappropriateness. The brick-faced arches proposed for the station entrances are ahistorical and witless. And claims that somehow this is all driven by a desire to improve passenger access to the concourse and platforms are just laughable. Or would be laughable, if one of London's great terminus stations wasn't being wrecked in the process. There is no good reason for this development to go ahead, other than the maximisation of profit for a handful of faceless organisations who are happy to wreck the future in pursuit of profits for today. This proposal should be rejected.	PA	15-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Tremellen	Murray	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. This runs contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework: paragraph NPPF 213 states that "substantial harm to or loss of [...] grade II listed buildings [...] should be exceptional." I am particularly concerned by the substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station which will be caused by the demolition of the existing concourse roof. As well as compromising the setting of the surviving nineteenth-century trainshed, the 1990s concourse extension is a highly-significant structure in its own right. Great care was taken to create authentic iron roof trusses matching those of the original Victorian trainshed: as such, it represents a very rare twentieth-century revival of Victorian building techniques, and the result is of exceptionally high quality. Its demolition would deprive future generations of the chance to experience a landmark building which represented a vital turning point in attitudes to Victorian architecture and the conservation of Britain's architectural heritage. Moreover, the proposed tower block on top of the new concourse would almost entirely deprive this part of the station of natural light. This will create a miserable travelling experience for the passengers who actually have to use the station day in, day out. Their interests are quite obviously being sacrificed to developers' profits. As an architectural historian, I have studied the redevelopment of Euston station in the 1960s: one of the most persistent passenger complaints about the new station was the lack of natural light on the concourse and platforms. Finally, the proposals will cause harm to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area and surrounding listed buildings, notably the station hotel. I therefore urge you to reject this damaging proposal and force Network Rail to develop more respectful, sensitive and humane plans for the improvement of the station.	PA	15-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Mason	Hugh	I object to this proposal as it will cause significant harm to nationally significant heritage assets. When Liverpool Street station was redeveloped in the 1990s it was done in a way which was sensitive to its heritage, and on condition that several buildings (including the 'McDonalds building') would be reconstructed. This proposal undoes all of that. It also significantly harms the conservation area around Bishopsgate, and the sheer size and scale of the proposed office buildings will block light into the station, impact surrounding heritage assets, and completely gut the character of an area which has been sensitively preserved for its architectural and historic character. Furthermore, this proposal is in flagrant breach of existing policy. Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." I don't see how the case has been made that this proposal should be in any way 'exceptional'. There is also significant harm to the existing Grade II*-listed hotel from this proposal, through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. How can the City of London approve it, given the proposal is in such an unambiguous breach of the national planning policy framework? I don't see why Network Rail can't refurbish the existing concourse and remove some of the shops to improve flow. Why do large parts of the station need to be demolished to do this? The City of London must heed to the significant objections to this proposal. If it does not, it is not fit for purpose as an institution.	PA	15-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	WARD	JOHN	As a user of Liverpool Street Station, I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: 1. The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. 2. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. 3. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II* through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. 5. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's Church. 5. The National Planning Policy Framework [Para 213] states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." This proposal does not satisfy that exception.	PA	15-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Harris	Julie	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: The changes to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The large number of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The real harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church.	PA	15-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Williamson	Andrew	It is completely unnecessary to destroy the existing historic building in order to facilitate station upgrades. I agree with Historic England that preserving the Victorian character and the rich history of the building should be prioritised in addition to the need for increased demand and that the current proposal is destroying an excessive amount of historic fabric.	PA	16-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Emmerson	Sue	Toilets difficult to access Poor seating Crowded Difficult for people with disabilities	PA	16-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Worman	Esmeralda	There are not enough Lifts at Liverpool Street as I am a Dwarf Person and I find that there are not enough Lifts at Liverpool Street Station.	PA	16-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Hodson	Diana	because many people need lifts	PA	16-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Groot	Willian	Great designs. Pram access from the concourse to the tube entrance needs improvement. Those six or so stairs down to the ticket barriers.	PA	16-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Bailey	Andy	I use the station everyday, It needs an urgent upgrade and many more stairs up / exits.	PA	16-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Cornwall	Matt	Long overdue, seeing other station developments, not just in London, but nationwide.	PA	16-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Goldthorpe	Rich	Get rid of the horrible mezzanine floor at the end of the platforms!	PA	16-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Green	Rita	Lifts st liverpool st station	PA	16-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Matthews	Ann	The station although beautiful in its architecture can feel very cramped and crowded especially at rush hour and weekends	PA	16-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Deeming	George	the space needs to be more accessible.	PA	16-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Wheldon	Sally	I find it very difficult to use stairs, especially with a suitcase, so lifts are essential for me and many more elderly people.	PA	16-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Tierney	Jayne	The present station is featureless. As the busiest station it deserves to be upgraded in the same way as King's Cross.	PA	16-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Glasby	Chris	Liverpool Street station certainly needs modernising. There are very few places to sit whilst waiting for trains and the toilet facilities are awful.	PA	16-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Wilson	Will	The city of London needs a modern world class station	PA	16-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Mayes	Melvin	I have used Liverpool Street all my life, its my entrance to London and needs to reflect the great city that London is. Sadly the current statiion does not acheive this but you sense it could and should do as you pass through.	PA	16-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Sullivan	Chris	Desperate need of an upgrade!	PA	16-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	M	Andrea	Lifts are a way of providing inclusivity and enabling people with disabilities- e.g. with restricted mobility, in wheelchairs or mobility scooters, young children- in prams/ pushchairs- pets, cycles etc. to travel and reach their destination quickly and safely.	PA	16-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Sharpe	Louise	To enable the station to be accessible for everyone.	PA	16-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Outram	John	It's a really horrible building !	PA	16-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Elliot	Keith	Less able & those with lots of luggage need the lifts.	PA	16-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Inglis	Lydia		DC	16-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Lucas	Graham	Better travelling experience for all.	PA	16-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Knight	Gary	For disabled and elderly plus mums and dads with pushchairs.	PA	16-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Norman	Pat	Not having lifts makes slow progress for everyone especially people with mobility problems.	PA	16-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Daly	Lorraine	It is just more civilised and convenient.	PA	16-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Chapman	Kevin	To improve access through the station	PA	16-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	.	Rosie	I'm disabled and we need them	PA	16-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Richardson	John Robert	More space, less congestion and less stress.	PA	16-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Quinsee	Sylvia	Use this station a lot and would be excited to see a revamp!	PA	16-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Woodley	Dal	Simply not enough toilets.	PA	16-Jun-25	S

25/00494/FULEIA	Back	Archie	Great idea!	PA	16-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Wallis	Kevin	Sounds good to me!	PA	16-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Watson	Susan	50 years ago i started using Liverpool Street Station 50 years ago . 50 years later and still no easy access lift available .	PA	16-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Reed	Jason	I love these plans! Let's do them faster, please.	PA	16-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Byam	Ashley	The current toilets are in dire need of upkeep and repair, also the station is one of the busiest in London and can't handle the overwhelming demand for use of the facilities. More toilets are certainly needed!!	PA	16-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Williams	David	Its an essential access point to the City of London and the business district and needs more using.	PA	16-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Bridges	Jeffrey	I use this station frequently.	DC	16-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Mendoza	Henry	I use London Liverpool Street every day travelling in and out of London as a commuter who lives in Colchester but works in the city. It is a busy and crowded station and anything that helps it feel less congested and confusing and more inviting is hugely welcome.	PA	16-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Verebes	Sam	It will be beautiful and iconic. This is the first impression of many to the city.	PA	16-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Alistair	Mark		PA	16-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Alistair	Mark	Desperately needs improving and love the new plans.	PA	16-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Shipp	Samuel	The station is an overcrowded, sweaty, dilapidated eye-sore and I love the new plans!	PA	16-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Sykes	Jan	I'm disabled myself and know the stress and struggles of trying to conquer steps a lift would really aid me and loads of other people.	PA	16-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Sharpington	Kim	I'm disabled and there isn't enough help for us!	PA	16-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Brunning	Fergus		DC	16-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Boyd	Ailsa		DC	16-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Williams	Robbie	I object to this application on two grounds. Firstly for the substantial demolition of both the original and the very effective 80s/90s revamp of Liverpool St Station. Both in its own right and for the effect it would have on the remaining, neighbouring heritage buildings. A building of such scale is not appropriate for this site. Secondly the station itself will be substantially diminished by being under such a bulky edifice, especially in terms of natural light, the abundance of which is one of the attractive qualities of the existing station. One only needs to visit Cannon Street station to see how depressing the alternative can be. Let alone the energy cost and emissions implications of eliminating natural light in the station.	PA	16-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Damsell	Eileen	I am not opposed to the principle of upgrading the station's facilities, but strongly oppose Network Rail's latest scheme, which would cause substantial harm to the historic station and its setting, and to the surrounding Conservation Area. Upgrading the operational capacity of the station does not need to come at such a heavy cost to London's historic and architectural integrity. National Planning Policy Framework Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. I am not opposed to the principle of upgrading the station's facilities, but strongly oppose Network Rail's latest scheme, which would cause substantial harm to the historic station and its setting, and to the surrounding Conservation Area. Upgrading the operational capacity of th	PA	16-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Damsell	Eileen	I am not opposed to the principle of upgrading the station's facilities, but strongly oppose Network Rail's latest scheme, which would cause substantial harm to the historic station and its setting, and to the surrounding Conservation Area. Upgrading the operational capacity of the station does not need to come at such a heavy cost to London's historic and architectural integrity. National Planning Policy Framework Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. I am not opposed to the principle of upgrading the station's facilities, but strongly oppose Network Rail's latest scheme, which would cause substantial harm to the historic station and its setting, and to the surrounding Conservation Area. Upgrading the operational capacity of th	PA	16-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Rawcliffe	V	I have been alerted to this planning application by the Victorian Society and object to the planning proposals as they cause harm to the Grade II station building its concourse and its sense of place surrounded by low to medium height heritage assets. The National Planning Policy Framework (Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional") . The 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. This planning proposal seeks to desecrate the Grade II-listed station a heritage asset and causes substantial harm to its sense of place in a nationally important heritage landscape due to: a) The demolition of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure that compromises the sense of place to the surviving C19 train shed. b) The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries (demand / impact on existing retail unknown) negatively impacts and causes a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. c) The proposed 20-storey tower over the station breaches the 2015 City Plan requiring refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. The proposed tower negatively impacts the sense of place and therefore causes harm to the surrounding low to medium scale landscape which includes the Grade II-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City, and to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area. The proposal also breaches the 2015 City Plan d) The proposed scheme has a wider impact on the setting and therefore on the wider sense of place of numerous designated assets.	PA	16-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Bellwood	Angela	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to:1. The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. This would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. 2. The insertion of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. 3. The impact on the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. 4. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. I think that the City has quite enough skyscrapers already and is likely to loose its historical context if any more go up. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. In the National Planning Policy Framework, Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." I would also add that as a City Guide I knew the City architect who did the last conversion on Liverpool Street station and he would be turning in his grave at the present plan. I object to this application, which would cause s	PA	16-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	van Rensburg	Johann	It looks tired now. The new plans looks lovely.	PA	16-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	.	Piggypine	With members of my family having kidney disease, any extra toilets are a godsend.	PA	16-Jun-25	S

25/00494/FULEIA	Hargreaves	Janet	I object to this application which would cause significant harm to an important heritage asset. It is as important to London as Grand Central Station is in New York. The suggested demolition of the roof structure of the existing station and its replacement structure would compromise the setting of the C19 train shed setting. The extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds would cause a high degree of harm to the significance of the Grade II listed heritage asset. Paragraph NPPF 213 (National Planning Policy Framework) states that 'substantial harm to or loss of : a) grade II listed buildings, or grade ii registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional. The imposition of a tall building in an area of low and medium scale buildings would be out of character. The 2015 City Plan requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in 'inappropriate' areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. i do not believe that the planning application, as stated, has made a valid case for this to be an exceptional circumstance and would be out of character for the area.	PA	16-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Bosworth	Nicholas	I totally object to trying to build above the existing station building, thus ruining the original esthetics of the original Victorian structure. It will not make any difference to the efficiency of the train services, which is the most important thing.	PA	17-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Vicente	Daniel	It's time.	PA	17-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Quintiliano-Carnevale	Matheus	It's a good project, with quality architecture.	PA	17-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Pearce	Steven	Liverpool Street Station deserves an upgrade not only because of its operational importance but also because it presents a unique opportunity to blend heritage preservation with cutting-edge design, ensuring it remains a fitting gateway to one of the world's leading cities.	PA	17-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Solomon	Jack	As a disabled person, I don't understand why more stations don't have toilets. The toilets at the closest station to me (Beacontree) close at 3pm and are not open on a weekend which is the busiest part of the week. It baffles me and infuriates me.	PA	17-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Gibson	Wayne	It needs to be modernised and replaced by something better for future generations. To move with the times, to create a space for future generations to enjoy.	PA	17-Jun-25	S

25/00494/FULEIA	Brown	Alistair	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. My objection is also based on the National Planning Policy Framework. Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." This scheme does not meet the NPPF criteria and should be rejected.	PA	17-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Agustin	Laura		DC	17-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Taylor	James	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: - The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. - The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. - The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. - The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. - In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. In summary, I refer the planning authority to the National Planning Policy Framework. Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." I do not believe this proposal can be described as 'exceptional'.	PA	17-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Palau-Manderson	Frances	[Toilets] Need quick unclogging, CCTV, security, replenishing soap and hand sanitizers.	DC	17-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Cohen	Richard		DC	17-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Clarke	Tim		DC	17-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Nicholas	Joseph	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to a number of nationally important heritage assets. Specifically, I object to the following aspects of the application: -- The demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure would cause substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station. It would also compromise the setting of the surviving 19th century train shed; -- The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the train shed, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, would cause substantial harm to the Grade II-listed heritage asset; -- The construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse would adversely impact the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets, in particular the Grade II*-listed hotel (the last continually functioning 19th century hotel in the City); -- The imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings would cause substantial harm to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. The scheme would also adversely impact the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as the nearby St Botolph's church and many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches; -- Finally, the scheme is contrary to paragraph 213 of the National Planning Policy Framework, which states that "Substantial harm to or loss of grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional".The applicants have not advanced any argument why their proposal merits any such exception. I therefore urge that the application be refused.	PA	17-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Finetti	Marco	I object to this application, as it would substantially alter the character and integrity of the Grade II-listed station through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The entire character of Bishopsgate Conservation Area would be compromised and create a bad precedent for numerous other heritage assets in the City. This application would also be inconsistent with the National Planning Policy Framework's paragraph NPPF 213, by causing substantial harm to grade II listed buildings. Thanks for your attention.	PA	17-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Kuekes-Patel	Barbara	More lifts are needed at all stations but especially at Liverpool Street. There also needs to be more air flow through the station.	PA	17-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Elliott	Anna	To ease congestion in the station.	PA	17-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Byard	Debbie	There's always queues there aren't enough for the number of people who use the station	PA	17-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Medhurst	Glenna	Evening peak is a nightmare, people rushing everywhere. Coomuters have no patience for Stansted passengers, getting the train is life or death, they just charge through, barging anyone who dares to get in the way. I don't know how the changes will work, but something needs to be done.	PA	17-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	.	Jack	Needs more capacity	PA	17-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Woolley-Butler	Jasmin	Because it's a horrible experience traveling from the station. Anxiety inducing.	PA	17-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Lauret	Javier	The station looks dated and needs a better retail and leisure offer	PA	17-Jun-25	S

25/00494/FULEIA	Rutter	Andrew	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: By demolishing a large proportion of the existing Liverpool St. Station, replacing the roof and building some sort of two tier level within the remains so completely destroys the architecture of the station, its setting with the hotel and its relationship with neighbouring streets, and that of Bishopsgate Conservation Area. The Station has the advantage 365 days of the year of daylight through the roof and tall windows. To have such a 'box' structure of about 20 stories above would make the remains of Liverpool St Station an underground claustrophobic box . Why have another level of retail in a smaller area, with more escalators and ramps? It would just spoil the optics of the grand train shed roofs and the columns. It would spoil the location of the 'Great Eastern' Hotel enormously. Diminishing it by the scale of what would then separate it from the reason it was built originally, a station hotel for the age. I'm not a Londoner, but appreciate the Capital City moves with times, but as it lost so much during the 'Blitz' and post war thoughtless reconstruction in parts, such as Euston, it's not necessary to compete with Dubai. It has its own historical and visual character without trying to copy or outdo other such places on the edge of deserts. Recently I walked from Fenchurch St Station to Liverpool St Station through the modern redeveloped streets (somewhat windswept at times), and yes very impressive. But what was more pleasant, walking into that area around and including Liverpool St Station, St. Botolphs Church, etc.	PA	17-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Denney	Nancy	To the Chair of the Planning and Transport Committee, Mr. Tom Sleigh, I object to this application which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. I refer to the National Planning Policy Framework, Paragraph NPPF 213 which states that" Substantial harm to or loss of :) a) grade II listed buildings or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional. Specifically, my objections are to, a) any demolition of the existing station concourse and roof to be replaced with a new structure, compromising the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. b) the insertion of numerous retail units within the C19 train sheds as well as in two elevated retail galleries, all of which are detrimental to the special interest and significance of this Grade II-listed heritage asset. c) the detrimental impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets, in particular to that of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City, - by the construction of a 20 storey tower over the station concourse. d) the adverse impact the scheme would have on the Bishopsgate Conservation Area by placing a tall building in an area of low and medium height buildings. This is in contravention of the 2015 City Plan which requires that planning permission for such structures be refused when they are inappropriate within a particular area such as this where there are, for instance, a number of Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches as well as St. Botolph's Church. It beggars belief that, in the light of appalling mistakes made in failing to protect our country's architectural gems in the all too recent past, we seem to have learned nothing. Can't we do better than this? It wouldn't happen in Vienna, Koln or Prague, Yours sincerely, Nancy Denney	PA	17-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Werry	Carol	I object to this application which will cause harm to an important heritage asset. Specifically I object to:- The grade II listed station roof will be demolished and replaced by a new structure that will in turn compromise a surviving C19 train shed. The proposed new retail units within the C19 train shed and 2 elevated galleries will cause harm to a grade II listed asset. The grade II listed hotel which is the last C19 hotel in the City will be impacted by the proposed 20 storey tower over the concourse The Bishopsgate conservation area which has low and medium sized buildings would be harmed by the 20 storey tower. The 2015 City plan requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas such as conservation areas and the St Pauls Cathedral Heights area. This is not an appropriate place for a 20 storey building. Additionally there will be an impact on nearby heritage assets such as Wren churches especially St Botolph's. I bring to your attention the National Planning Policy Framework which supports my objections above . Paragraph NPPF213 states that"substantial harm or loss of:a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional. If this scheme goes ahead substantial harm will be done to the station ,the hotel and the surrounding area.	PA	17-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Robbie	Elliot	The proposal dwarfs and disrespects the amazing heritage of the site it builds on. The glass boxes placed on top and around take away from the architectural interest of the station, and will cause this unique part of the city to be lost in the boring international style. There are far better ways to approach a context like this, and this should be rejected	PA	17-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Rebicsek	Marika	As a wheelchair user, lifts need to be near Bishopsgate, not just Broadgate which adds 10 mins to get to Bishopsgate!!! Not fair. The lift by the old ticket hall is DREADFUL. Someone got in with me, I told them not to! Said it would make it too heavy cos my wheelchair heavy. They refused to leave. The lift started juddering! They left quickly! I don't use that anymore!	PA	18-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Carey	Carolyn	We travel up regularly with wheelchair lift became overcrowded last time and bounced its way down so scary	PA	18-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Lawrence Alden	Stephen	World-class transport gateway to Europe's leading financial district.	PA	18-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Cowlin	Janice	It will make journeys more efficient and less stressful for passengers	PA	18-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Corrigan	Nigel	worst main terminus in the city	PA	18-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Denney	Nichola	Easier access access to ticket barriers from concourse	PA	18-Jun-25	S

25/00494/FULEIA	Nelson	Catherine	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. I believe this application is in contravention of the National Planning Framework Paragraph 213, which states that "substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." Looking at particular issues, I add my personal voice to all the objections raised by the Victorian society, with which I am in full agreement: * The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. * The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. * The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. * The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. * In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. I urge you to create a better solution which marries new functions with precious heritage.	PA	18-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Ledger	Peter	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. The National Planning Policy Framework, Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." The current proposals completely ignore this requirement. I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: - The substantial harm to	PA	18-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	King	Stephanie		DC	18-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Christie	Jonathan		DC	18-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Alexander	James	Liverpool Street Station is of importance for its heritage which must be preserved. With thanks. James	PA	18-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Hazell	Emma	I object to this application, as it would substantially alter the character and integrity of the Grade II-listed station through an entirely unnecessary construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. With flexible working now and many people working from home, there seems little point in building yet another tall building, when many of the existing skyscrapers in and around the city of London have plenty of capacity anyway. I also object to the additional retail space, when it is clear that more and more retail units all over the country are shutting and the way people shop has changed enormously over the last fifteen years. The application would also be inconsistent with the National Planning Policy Framework's paragraph NPPF 213, by causing substantial harm to grade II listed buildings.	PA	18-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Wareham	Mark	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." More specifically, I raise objections to: The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church.	PA	18-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	KERR	NICOLA	I am objecting to these proposals as they will cause substantial harm to Grade II listed buildings and are therefore contrary to NPPF 213. I use the station regularly on my commute between London and Norwich. The proposal to demolish the existing roof structure and construct a 20 storey tower over the station concourse will cause irreparable harm to the setting of the station and the hotel (Grade 2*) in the Bishopsgate Conservation Area and is contrary to the 2015 City Plan. I urge you to refuse this proposal and retain the heritage assets in their current setting for all to enjoy.	PA	18-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Hopkins	John	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: 1. The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. 2. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. 3. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. 4. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. The National Planning Policy Framework Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." I would argue that the proposals in the application constitute "Substantial harm".	PA	18-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Renouf	Elissa	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to * The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. * The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. * The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. * The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. * In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. I refer to the National Planning Policy Framework Paragraph NPPF 213 which states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional."	PA	18-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Wood	Andrew	"I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to:" 1 The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. 2 The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. 3 The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. 4 The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. 5 In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. National Planning Policy Framework Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." and this development cannot be justified under this statement	PA	18-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Mullan	Peter	I object to this application, specifically: - The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. - The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. - The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. - The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. - National Planning Policy Framework : Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional."	PA	18-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Hall	Antony	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure, which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. Paragraph 213 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional."	PA	18-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Spikes	Joe	Plans will destroy character of a valued victorian building.	PA	18-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Vizinyte	Skirma	It does not seem like the best way to treat a listed building	PA	18-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Judd	Mary	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. I reference the National Planning Policy Framework Paragraph NPPF 213 which states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional."	PA	18-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Byfield	Ben	I object to this revised scheme which will cause substantial damage to the historic fabric of the station and wipe away the architecturally significant modern concourse. The proposed scheme will harm the setting of the surviving historic fabric, including the adjacent hotel. The extremely fine work in the modern concourse demonstrates that the skills remain available to produce a beautiful modern station, though retrofitting the existing structure to improve access would be preferable from an ecological and heritage conservation standpoint.	PA	18-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Jepson	Susan	I object to this application which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: 1. substantial harm to the Grade II listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19train shed 2. substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low/medium scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas and the St Pauls Cathedral Heights area. Also the scheme would adversely affect the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets such as many of the Grade1 listed Wren City Churches and nearby St Botolphs Church. Paragraph NPPF213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: grade II listed buildings or grade II registered parks or gardens should be exceptional".	PA	18-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Bute	Lady Jennifer	I object to the proposals for Liverpool Station as they are directly opposite in effect to the beauty of the design of this wonderful old statlon. They will ruin the appearance of the station. Jennifer Bute.	PA	18-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Moyes	Shirley	Why are you doing this to a beautiful building, we don't need more retail units! We need more beautiful buildings	PA	18-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Bass	Tim	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: (i) The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. (ii) The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. (iii) The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. (iv) The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. (v) The application is in direct violation of the National Planning Policy Framework. NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional" The proposal is big, ugly, uninspired and unsympathetic. It's paramount this beautiful piece of our heritage is preserved and given the protection from this greedy opportunism it deserves.	PA	18-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Everett	Robert Henry	I object to this application because of the significant harm that it will cause to important listed heritage assets. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, and to the NPPF. The setting of the listed train shed will be completely changed, and the volumes of the interior irremediably altered by the proposed insertion of the proposed retail galleries. I have travelled from and to Liverpool Street for over 40 years and so remember how the last renovation gave the station much more light and enabled the appreciation of the original work; this would be utterly lost in the new proposals. The enormous proposed tower would completely overshadow the listed station hotel, completely harming its setting and undermining its significance. The proposed new roof structure over the concourse would undeniably harm the setting of the 19th century train shed. This is a deeply disrespectful proposal which would seriously alter the character of the Bishopsgate Conservation Area.	PA	18-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Denwood	Christine	As a member of the Victorian Society, I am opposed to the scheme because of its impact on surrounding listed heritage assets, including the Bishopsgate Conservation Area. There is a preponderance of glass and concrete hideousness in the City of London. The 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." Could you spend your money on improving the existing lifts at Liverpool St Station? I helped some Spanish visitors recently to get from the Overground to the Underground with their luggage. It was a big challenge. Please concentrate on improving the Rail network outside London.	PA	18-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	.	Colin	It's a confusing station to navigate presently. It's a confusing station to navigate presently.	PA	19-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	.	Colin	It's a confusing station to navigate presently. It's a confusing station to navigate presently.	PA	19-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	de Villiers	Rob	Yes.	PA	19-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Mellor	Sarah	Because it will be better for visitors.	PA	19-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Bowling	Emily	Object, reasons being the 1. irreversible loss of natural light (inside and out) 2. claims by network rail of station overcrowding (which appear to be untrue)	PA	19-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Cowan PhD MArch BArch VSO	Gregory	Needs a tidy up.	PA	19-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Bright	Beverley	Makes life easier for people in wheelchairs & pushchairs.	PA	19-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Snell	Damon	Liverpool St is an iconic station but in need of major upgrades. The roof is urgent as it leaks terribly. If the passenger numbers grow as predicted Liverpool St as it is will not cope. It needs future proofing.	PA	19-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Tyler	Sharon	Liverpool Street Station is an architectural gem and should not be damaged for profit. The station concourse is completely fit for purpose, I do not accept the argument Network Rail is making for the proposed works	PA	19-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Mortimore	Julia	This is completely unnecessary. It's a beautiful and legendary building and works BRILLIANTLY as a station and concourse. Of all in London this one 'feels' one of the safest, most accessible and less crowded! This stinks of backroom deals.	PA	19-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Hayward-Cox	Sarah	I object because this a beautiful heritage building in amongst a sea of concrete and glass. The juxtaposition of a Victorian masterpiece against the surrounding equally beautiful modern architecture is the very reason London is so special. It would be extremely shortsighted to change a landmark of this calibre to make it blend. The concourse is fit for purpose as it currently stands.	PA	19-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Littlewood	Alexander	I Object to this proposal of reconstructing the historic site of Liverpool St railway station as believe it will cause irreversible damage to this wonderful piece of Victorian Railway station architecture which should be preserved!.	PA	19-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Eates	Nicola	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets.	PA	19-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Fletcher	Hedy	cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional."	PA	19-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Lewis	David	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets and to public amenity. More specifically, I raise objections to the substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure, which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. Also the impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets, especially harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The National Planning Policy Framework is very clear in this regard: Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." New York City has forever regretted building a skyscraper over Penn Station. London's public transport amenities are world class. If a tower is built it will overshadow and oppress many thousands of commuters and travellers each year. There is no reason private monetary gain should be allowed to trump essential public needs. There are plenty of places to build in London without sacrificing the comfort and dignity of essential infrastructure. Democracy is about respecting the everyday citizen. Please don't leave us to scuttle into London like a rat.	PA	19-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Boyce	Andrew	I wish to object to the development 25/oo494/FULEIA I consider the level of demolition of existing features unacceptable for a listed and historic structure and the introduction of retail units unsympathetic. The suggestion that a 20-storey tower be erected here, dominating the site, would be a negative and visual blight. The alterations to the setting, eg. the concourse, is an unacceptable level of change for an important listed structure. I consider this goes against national planning advice NNPF213. As a visitor to London, I often go to visit or to look at historic buildings, and I am sure they have a significant economic benefit for the capital. This change would degrade an important structure, rendering it less attractive, and therefore a negative impact on visitors. I expect my letter will receive scant attention, as this seems to be entirely motivated by economics, and ignoring the duty of local authorities have for historic and listed structures.	PA	19-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Hickman	James	I object to this proposal on the basis that the station building is perfectly adequate for the function it provides and the light provided by the current roof is pleasant and far better than the artificial lighting that would be required by the proposed build. The high rise building proposed, sitting amongst lower level buildings feels to me to be in stark contrast to the existence of the Bishopsgate Conservation area. I draw attention to the National Planning Policy Framework par 213: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." This whole development would be destructive to a Grade 2 building and wholly unnecessary.	PA	19-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Hargreaves	Nicola	This is the needless destruction of a beautiful building and for what? Please don't let this monstrosity go ahead and kill a beautiful space full of light and interesting architecture. The City doesn't need it. People will question the idiocy in the future if this goes ahead	PA	19-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Bayliss	Paul	I wish to object to this scheme. The station and hotel would be engulfed by the development and the railway architecture lost for ever. The Liverpool Street station is an important part of the Conservation area and Grade 2 listed. It is vitally important to protect and conserve the station and the C19 hotel built to serve travellers, a function which it still fulfills.	PA	19-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Machin	Penny	TO CLLR TOM SLEIGH, Chair, Planning Committee I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. In objecting, I also refer to the requirements of National Policy Framework paragraph NPF 213. More specifically, I raise objections to: 1. The substantial harm the proposed development will do to the Grade II-listed station, caused by the demolition of the existing roof structure over the station concourse with its proposed replacement by a new structure. This will also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. 2. The insertion of extensive numbers of new retail units in the C19 train sheds - it is axiomatic that this will cause a significant level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. 3. The consequent, wholly unavoidable, and therefore significant harm to the surrounding heritage assets that would be caused by the proposed 20 storey tower over the station concourse. Particular attention must be paid to the harm that would be caused to the Grade II*-listed hotel, that is - importantly - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City. 3. Substantial harm to the entire Bishopsgate Conservation Area, contrary to the 2015 City Plan. This requires refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, including in Conservation Areas. Particular attention should also be paid to the harm the proposed development would cause to the many Grade I-listed Wren City churches, as well as St. Botolph's close by.	PA	19-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Goodall	John	I object to the substantial harm that will be done to the station and its setting. It will have a massive impact on the building and the experience of travellers through it. The proposals will also cause substantial harm to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area. The creation of a high-rise in this area is contrary to the 2015 City Plan. It also runs contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework and specifically Paragraph 213, which states: 'Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional.'	PA	19-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	McKay	Emma	The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church.	PA	19-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Wire	Tessa	I strongly object to the proposed partial demolition and redevelopment of Liverpool Street Station. This scheme would cause substantial harm to several nationally significant heritage assets, in breach of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and the City of London Local Plan. The demolition of the existing station roof would irreversibly damage the Grade II-listed Liverpool Street Station, eroding its architectural and historic integrity. Replacing this with a modern concourse roof compromises the relationship with the surviving Victorian train shed, diminishing the station's special character. In addition there will be increased traffic, congestion and noise, plus shortage of public services. The proposed insertion of extensive new retail galleries within the 19th-century train sheds further disrupts the spatial experience and fabric of the historic structure. This commercialisation fails to justify the harm it causes to the station's special interest. Additionally, the construction of a 20-storey tower directly above the station concourse would have a severe impact on the setting of the Grade II-listed Great Eastern Hotel*-the last continually functioning 19th-century hotel in the City. The tower would dominate this heritage asset, overshadowing its carefully preserved proportions and historic role in the station complex. The scheme also harms the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, introducing a tall building into an area defined by medium- and low-rise development. This directly contradicts the 2015 City Plan, which requires that tall buildings be refused in Conservation Areas and protected views, including the St Paul's Heights area. Under NPPF Paragraph 213, substantial harm to Grade II-listed buildings must be "exceptional." No such justification has been provided. For these reasons, I urge the City of London to refuse this application.	PA	19-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Morris	John	I object strenuously to this application, which offers a hideous threat to some of the most valuable - and nationally important - of London's heritage assets. My working days are long over, but I spent more than 30 years travelling via Liverpool Street station; the grand old building (and its hotel neighbour) were part of my and my wife's lives, and later, those of our sons, and we love their dramatic Victorian brio. From the submitted drawings, it's difficult to imagine a project so indecently out of touch with its setting. Apart from the specific harm to the (Grade II-listed) station caused by the replacement of a major section of roof, and the intrusive addition of endless retail units, there is the loss of significance of the hotel (Grade II*-listed) through the planned erection of a 20-storey tower. It scarcely needs to be said that the effect on the local Conservation Area would be catastrophic. How can this act of architectural Philistinism be permitted against the guidance of the National Planning Policy Framework? Or in the face of the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas? To consider submerging some of east London's historic gems in the shadow of this monstrosity suggests an almost Trumpian ego. Please, do London a favour - and chuck this plan in the bin.	PA	19-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Corper	Maddy	Please add more lifts that are reliable?	PA	19-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Theodore Ralph	Brain	It is the Gateway to the East and well deserving of an appropriate up-grade.	PA	19-Jun-25	S

25/00494/FULEIA	Horne	Katie	This is blatant exploitation and greed. We don't need another office block and Liverpool Street station is so beautiful. Historic and perfectly adequate working railway station	PA	19-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Rodgers	Fred	As the third line of the executive summary to AECOM's preliminary ecology appraisal states that Primrose Street is to the north of the site, Liverpool Street to the south, with the A10 to the west as well as Sun Street Passage, perhaps accuracy isn't a prerequisite. Certainly the reference to Barbican Wildlife Garden as - "The wild garden in the north-west corner of the estate contains a small meadow dominated by rough meadowgrass (Poa trivialis). An area of planted woodland contains a mixture of native trees and shrubs". suggests this was written either by someone who hadn't seen the Garden or many years ago, or both. It's name should give the game away. As for - "The series of large lakes are largely bare of vegetation" - presumably relates to the estate's two lakes which have reeds and water lilies in abundance, as well as fish, ducks, moorhen, coot, heron and cormorant. Again another EIA relies on open source GiGL data as City Corporation refuses to require the use of paid for data only. Ironically, Black Redstarts nest in Guildhall which isn't to the north-west of the site, is it? Buddleia may be an invasive species but its presence is unlikely to bring the station toppling down. More importantly it's a favourite food of various butterflies which are relatively common species in the City. Butterflies are, of course, good pollinators, along with moths, beetles, flies and hoverflies.	PA	19-Jun-25	R
25/00494/FULEIA	Lalani	June	Not all people are able to negotiate stairs.	PA	19-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Myers	Alexandra	I strongly object to plans to develop Liverpool Street Station by building offices above the concourse. Not only would this destroy the beauty and heritage of the building but it would greatly diminish the experience of arriving at this beautiful station. The natural light would be lost and this station would lose its amazing roof. It should be preserved and the plans to develop it should be dropped.	PA	19-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	clark	Carolyn	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. I object to -the overdevelopment of the area and destruction of the character and heritage so important to residents and visitors alike. - The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The proposals ignore the National Planning Policy Framework Paragraph NPPF 213 which states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." There is no 'need' for this development, there is a need to preserve the heritage which is so rapidly disappearing from London and the East End.	PA	19-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Stevens	Helen Gail	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: the destruction of this beautiful and well loved landmark through which I have travelled since a child. The character of Liverpool Street Station will cease to exist if this ugly and unnecessary office block is plonked on top of it with accompanying loss of light, character and heritage, not to mention the disruption to people's travel plans and their happy experience of travel through the station. There are empty office blocks all over the city; why do we 'need' more? This is a cynical money making scheme which no member of the public wants to be built. Please refuse this application. "I object to this application which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections for the following reasons: 1) this proposed development will cause substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof of the concourse and its replacement with a new structure, which would also compromise the setting of the 19th century train shed. 2) The insertion of large amounts of new retail units in the 19th century train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. 3) this building is a significant landmark beloved by travellers from far and wide. The proposed development will reduce this heritage building to a dark and poky area overshadowed by this monstrously ugly and unwanted office block, 4). There are already buildings full of empty offices in this area and throughout the City. There is no demand for more office space as so many people now work from home. 5) The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area by the imposition of a tall building in an area	PA	19-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Sampson	Henry	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. The National Planning Policy Framework, Paragraph NPPF 213, states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional". Don't make this application succeed.	PA	19-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Bee	Kevin	Please don't go ahead with this! With more people working from home, and with SO much empty office space in the city, it is unnecessary, unhelpful, and risks disruption to tens of thousands of commuters and Londoners	PA	19-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	D'Ercole	Angela	I object to the proposed development of Liverpool Street Station for the following reasons;1/ Liverpool Street Station is of architectural Victorian importance.2/ Liverpool Street Station has architectural importance in the era of rail travel.3/ It has a unique importance in the era of British rail travel.4/ There are areas of London that can be developed , especially ugly post war buildings that were poorly constructed and are an eyesore to our Capital.5/ It is a travesty of heritage to destroy the capital's rail stations.6:/ in Europe and all over the world railway stations are afforded promotion & pride , they are the beginning and ending to a journey, there protection warrants protection from unnecessary development.Angela D'ErcoleFlat 190 Ewell RoadSurbiton SurreyKT6 6EX	PA	19-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Lucking	Aoife	The proposed plans would ruin a beautiful and historic building	PA	19-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Carter	Eric	I wish to register my objections to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework. Paragraph 213 of the NPPF states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." Specifically, I raise objections to: The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II* listed hotel through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings.	PA	19-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Byham	Sarah	Why is it necessary to build on top of a Victorian glass roofed gem....there are many other sites that don't turn our counties heritage into monstrous developments in the name of profit.	PA	19-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Hearne	Sarah	I object to the development of Liverpool Street station . Liverpool Street is my gateway into London. It's such a beautiful building and deserves to be protected and not built on top of. Is another office building really needed? I doubt it. What a waste of money.	PA	19-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Mercer	Victoria	I object to the redevelopment of Liverpool Street Station. I've used the Station for over 35 years as I work in the Liverpool Street area. We do not need any more new building works in the area as we are losing our history and what is charming about the area. Many good buildings have been demolished. I love the fact that there is natural light and history in Liverpool Street Station. It is a busy station that works well?	PA	20-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Crake	Paul	Liverpool Street Station is a listed building, of architectural and historical importance. It is a vital part of the public domain, adding to the character of The City; a heritage asset that helps to root the modern city in its development to a global centre. The last major remodelling of the station was overall a huge success, and it continues to function very well as a modern transport interchange. And, as civic space, it also adds to the sense of the grandeur and importance of The City. But that last remodelling should also be taken as a warning: the least successful element is the oppressive low roof over half the platforms where air rights development was permitted. This new proposal would multiply those dismal effects throughout the station: it would be a claustrophobic entombment of the public spaces. The new "feature" entrance would be appropriate for desert architecture in Dubai, but adds nothing to this public space. The importance of clearly signalling from a distance the entrances to transport hubs has long been recognised: the existing Liverpool Street structures do that well, whereas these proposals use none of the familiar design cues. As a piece of public communication in the streetscape it fails. And the primary purpose of this station is to be part of a vital public transport infrastructure, not to offer maximum profits to a developer seeking to exploit and degrade the public realm. These proposals represent an over-development of the station, would reduce its effectiveness as a transport interchange, and would degrade the heritage environment.	PA	20-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Morison	Colin	This building has great historical and aesthetic significance and must not be demolished or degraded in anyway.	PA	20-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Hancock	Judith	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. My objection is based on Paragraph NPPF 213 of the National Planning Policy Framework which states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." Specifically I object to the impact on the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, significant harm to the character of the Grade II-listed hotel through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse, as well as the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The proposed development is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas. This scheme would cause harm to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. In addition the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church, would be negatively impacted by this scheme. Finally, extensive retail development within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated galleries, would result in a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. Sufficient retail and hospitality opportunities exist already in and around this location, for rail travellers, visitors and residents. The construction of further such outlets is unnecessary in such a sensitive and unique heritage location.	PA	20-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	ellis	Christine	totally unnecessary. Leave Londons heritage alone.	PA	20-Jun-25	O

Page 104

25/00494/FULEIA	Leach	Alistair	Paragraph 213 of the National Planning Policy Framework states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." The demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure, which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed constitutes substantial harm to the Grade II-listed Liverpool Street station. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causes a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact on surrounding listed heritage assets is affected. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The scheme would cause substantial harm to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church.	PA	20-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Garai	Janet	"I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: The new design is unappealing in scale and out of character with both the Victorian parts of the plan that are to be retained and the surrounding buildings. I understand the need for the station to accommodate passenger growth and for better access for all users but I believe that a more sensitive plan can be devised that retains more of the Victorian structure and character of the original.	PA	20-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Bramwell	Andy	This is a vast improvement on the previous Herzog & de Meuron scheme. It places enhancement of the historic station at the heart of the scheme rather than commercial office space.	PA	20-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Spicer	Kate	Liverpool St is a great station but just too over crowded.	PA	20-Jun-25	S

25/00494/FULEIA	Maynard	Katie	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to the substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. I also raise objections to the insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. Additionally, I also raise objections to the impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. Finally, I raise objections to the substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. I with to note the National Planning Policy Framework, specifically paragraph NPPF 213 which states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." in my objections to the proposed developments.	PA	20-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Ashworth-Jones	Patricia Lesley	I am disabled.	PA	20-Jun-25	S

25/00494/FULEIA	Mills	Ryan	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church I make reference the National Planning Policy Framework in my objection: Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional."	PA	20-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Jones	Melvyn	I object I think the proposed plans to redevelop Liverpool st station would cause irreparable harm to the environment and to our heritage. The comparisons with Euston and St Pancras are telling in that the victorian st pancras building has helped regenerate a previously run down area of London whereas Euston's redevelopment is only causing more problems and the building is unloved. Any redevelopment of Liverpool st must retain the original concourse building and engine shed to act as a destination in its own right as well as a transport hub. The city needs to grow and evolve but this can be most successfully done by respecting its victorian heritage and architecture.	PA	20-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Webster	Sian	I object to plans to develop this beautiful old station. I do not see the necessity and I treasure the wonderful architecture of Liverpool Street Station. Shops and offices can go elsewhere. Places like this need preservation not money making schemes that will spoil them. Please do not allow the ruination of our splendid station.	PA	20-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Giles	Suzanne	I object to this plan, which would cause significant harm to the significance of a nationally important railway station, which is a heritage asset. I object to: the substantial harm to this grade II listed station, through the demolition of the existing concourse roofing structure. I use this station regularly and it is still fit for purpose. The daylight through the elevated roof makes it light and airy. I refer to the National planning Policy Framework, para NPPF 213 which states Substantial harm to, or loss of a Grade II listed building should be exceptional.	PA	20-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	M. Bird	Jeanette	Yes extra lifts are vital to those that require them. Spend money on useful things.	PA	20-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Girling	Kate	This building is part of our national heritage. We do not need offices above a station. Commuting and using a railway is a necessity and should be as pleasurable as possible. Vandalising this building will increase our stress and we would lose a beautiful building	PA	20-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Roberts	Philip	"I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to proposed building alterations and refurbishments as there is clear public space and no overcrowding. Also, to build office space on top of the beautiful Victorian glass roof would diminish the natural wonder of the architecture.	PA	20-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Parsons	Annabel	I use Liverpool Street station very regularly for both work and pleasure. It is a beautiful, historic and very functional station- with fantastic light and airy high vaulted glass ceilings and plenty of space even during busy periods. The proposed plans would destroy a much loved landmark and fantastic example of historic Victorian architecture and appear not to bring significant benefit to the travelling public for which it was intended. It is clear that it could be better managed, and refurbishment in line with its purpose and historic status would be welcomed- but not its obliteration under a vast office block. Please don't do this, it makes us all sadder and poorer to lose the character and history of the place we love and live in.	PA	20-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Craighead	Debra	I object to this planning application on the basis of destroying a beautiful building in order to gain more retail space and profits for its owners. This application would completely destroy its unique aesthetic and it would be lost to future generations. Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional."	PA	20-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Tonkinson	Robert	I object strongly to the development.	PA	20-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	France-Miller	Simon	I object to the redevelopment of Liverpool Street Station. This station should be protected properly. I object to this application: the demolition of the roof of the existing station; the concourse redevelopment which will cause further harm to the station; development of the train shed; adding new retail units, inc. retail galleries. The construction of a tower over the station concourse.	PA	20-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Franklin	Toby	It is simply necessary to preserve such a fabulous architectural and historical setting	PA	20-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Murdoch Frost	Denise	I object to redevelopment of heritage buildings .. to even imagine a large structure on top of this Victorian building is incomprehensible .. there are too many conservation areas and buildings being dismantled and redeveloped in the name of improvement when really it's about contracts and money making for the select.	PA	20-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Kontofrios	Alexander	Ruining a major historic landmark with a design that is ugly, pointless and anti-human. Forcing the community that uses the station to endure yet more years of building disruption. We have had enough, we need it to stop.	PA	20-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Woodfine	Rachel	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: This being against the National Planning Policy Framework: Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." The significant harm which would be given to the Grade-II listed station through the demolition of the roof structure, and include of too many retail units causing damage and impact to the listed structure. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church.	PA	20-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Cant	Sarah	I object to the partial demolition of Liverpool Street Station as the building is part Victorian and needs conserving and also for the total inconvenience and destruction that will occur for passengers of Network Rail that is totally unnecessary.	PA	20-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Holmes	Helen	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to:- - The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. - The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. - The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. - The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. - In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. - The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional."	PA	20-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Parker	Nicholas	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I believe the application is in breach of NPPF Paragraph 213. I raise objections to the substantial harm the proposed development will cause to the station and associated train shed, and to the harm caused to the wider conservation area by the erection of an entirely appropriate tall structure.	PA	20-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Billingsley	Paget	I object. I massively object. This is a beautiful legacy of our past. Please do not destroy it by building the proposed new building and alterations to the station, please leave it with its integrity. Newer is not better, surely we must have learnt this by now in the city with all the demolishing and rebuilding of 'modern' buildings that haven't faired well over the past 4 decades. This still looks good after a century- please leave our architectural heritage for the generations that come after us.	PA	20-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Meece	Stephanie	This plan is unacceptable. The destruction of the heritage station cannot be permitted. I use the station frequently, and the concourse works - there is no excuse to build above it.	PA	20-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Stephens	Jon	I have used this station from Colchester and Norwich for over 50 years. Following the much needed work undertaken many years ago this is one of the most straightforward stations in London to use. The structural engineering is magnificent and the mix of retail and rail premises feels right. It is an oasis of calm before moving on to work or other activity. There is ample space to sympathetically install any necessary acces services/lifts etc at the moment. The combination of many years of building misery for travellers and local residents and workers, with the possibility that there will be more retail space than ever needed at a time when retail is moving online and a significant percentage of work is being undertaken from home requiring less office space renders these plans both unfit for purpose and runs the risk of a massive empty white elephant in the city.	PA	20-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	McCloy	A	I wish to object to the harmful plans to partially demolish and inappropriately redevelop Liverpool Street Station, planning application reference number: 25/00494/FULEIAI object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to:The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed.The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset.The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse.The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church.This objection references the National Planning Policy Framework:'Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional."	PA	20-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Smith	Naomi	A ludicrous suggestion and one which will destroy our heritage forever.	PA	20-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Callaghan	Will	I object to the grotesque office building that's going to tower over this neighbourhood and beautiful station. I regularly passed through Liverpool St on route to my mother in Colchester. It was my favourite part of the journey and one of London's greatest stations. Offices lie vacant in London. I wonder about the motives behind this one. Please reject it. Thanks for reading.	PA	20-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Sanders-Smith	Sara	I object to Liverpool Street station becoming a site for additional development.	PA	21-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Mercer	Sarah	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of Liverpool Street Station and its nationally important heritage assets. Paragraph 213 of the National Planning Policy Framework states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." More specifically, I raise objections to: * The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. * The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. * The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. * The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. The proposed changes would cause irreparable damage and destruction to a listed structure and would set a precedent that could pave the way to the loss of more of our built heritage. I implore you to reconsider.	PA	21-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Wilson	Anne	I object to the proposal to convert my main railway station to a shopping mall cum office block plus station. This proposed development will not benefit travellers who are becoming an afterthought in this building, and, if it goes ahead, the country will lose yet another of its architectural assets of special interest.	PA	21-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Lowry	Sarah	Destruction of a perfectly adequate station and our cultural history.	PA	21-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Clarke	Janet	I have travelled through this station many times. Please leave it in its lovely Victorian state. Don't ruin the area by replacing it with a 'carbunkle'!	PA	21-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Barrett	Amanda	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to:" The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed." The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset." The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse." The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church." This goes against the National Planning Policy Framework: Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional."	PA	21-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Maller	M	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church.	PA	21-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Davies	Nicola	It's lovely as it is, wonderful roof, light, enough space. It's heritage architecture.	PA	21-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Hardman	Gill	The plan to build on top Liverpool Street Station will substantially damage the beauty of this thoughtfully planned space, particularly the magnificent roof. There seems to be little focus on preserving the integrity of this valuable element of the station. I object to the plans. London has already been damaged, aesthetically, and this plan will continue that trend. One only has to look to Paris to see a city where the emphasis is on preservation and enhancement of the beauty of a city, for the benefit of its citizens, is foremost in the minds of planners.	PA	21-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Knipe	Wendy	" object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: the sitting of an office block on top of a listed glass roof. Also the detrimental effect to the heritage site directly surrounding the station. A grade two listed building should not be destroyed in this way and accessibility issues on the concourse can be dealt with without the building of a vast office block on top of the roof.	PA	21-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Parkes	Matt	This development is far too large and is an attempt by Network Rail to make money. Liverpool Street station works just fine as it is and the pretence that this development is designed to improve the station is just that. London is awash with empty office building do we really need more? The development is oversized, and further encroaches on Spitalfields and diminishes the smaller scale buildings around it. It is totally unacceptable and indefensible.	PA	21-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Buckthorpe	Derek Edward	The siting of such a large modern building so close to this historic station setting seems to me a bad decision. Once our heritage is changed by modern development it will never be given back. The building will remain submerged by the modern and will no longer be protected from those who have it in mind to make money in the short term from its removal.	PA	21-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Palmer	Steven	This is a travesty, in that the presentation is very misleading and barely alludes to the immense building that would overtake Liverpool St Station...highly destructive to the character of the area, and a terrible precedent for more of this unethical and nefarious "development". A shameful and dishonest attempt to deceive the public as to the extent of this "development:" ...Would totally alter the character of the area, which I visit frequently.	PA	21-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Crudgie	Crudgie	Massive carbuncle blighting beautiful old building	PA	21-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Reeve	Elizabeth	Liverpool Station is an astounding building celebrating Victorian architecture and functions perfectly well as the major entry into London from the east of England. It has very good facilities for the traveller providing access to all of these facilities for all members of society. The building is brightly lit by copious amounts of natural light in the daytime. The concourse is not over crowded. Liverpool St Station has been the welcome to London for travellers for 150 years and personally to me and my family for generations.	PA	21-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Coles	Clare	It is important that we keep this historical building it would be a travesty to build on top of it and lose All the historical beauty of this building	PA	21-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	M Abraham	Alexandra	I am writing to object in the very strongest terms to this monstrous development. It takes no regard of the historic nature of the station concourse i'm purely a money making enterprise for the developers. I do not understand how the developers have the brass neck to propose something so hideous and so deeply inappropriate.	PA	21-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Orsi	Anne	The size of this building overshadows historic buildings and blocks light to the street and other buildings. The architecture is insipid and not in keeping with the surrounding area.	PA	21-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Taylor	Marnie	This will not enhance the history of the station	PA	21-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Wilson	Maureen	This building should be celebrated and looked after by all. The area does not need this change.	PA	21-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Nemov	Angel	I object to this application which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: - The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof of the concourse and its replacement with a new structure, which would also compromise the setting of the 19th century train shed. The National Planning Policy Framework, Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." - The insertion of large amounts of new retail units in the 19th century train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. - The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning 19th century hotel in the City - through the construction of a twenty-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low-and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches and nearby St Botolph's church. Therefore, I urge that the application be refused.	PA	21-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	PATEL	DHRU	I object to this application which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to the demolition of the concourse roof and impact of the retail units which will affect the historical setting of the 19th century train sheds. I also object to the extreme height of the proposed building above the station which will adversely impact the surrounding heritage assets and the Bishopsgate Conservation Area. The National Planning Policy Framework Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional". The current proposal contravenes this.	PA	21-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Burton	Matt	Destruction of Victorian architecture.	PA	21-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Grant	Cynthia	This represents signifucant and unnecessary overdevelopment. A crass and crude proposal for a well loved station	PA	21-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Eastaugh	Colin	I object to this application which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: The proposed building because it goes against the National Planning Policy Framework, specifically paragraph NPPF 213 which states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." The demolition of the roof of the concourse and its replacement with a new structure, which would also compromise the setting of the 19th century train shed. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets, including the last continually functioning 19th century hotel in the City - through the construction of a twenty-storey tower over the station concourse. The impact on the Bishopsgate Conservation Area by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low-and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area.	PA	21-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Thompson	Ian	I would like my objection to this proposal. With reference to the National Planning Policy Framework: Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." This clearly is not an exceptional piece of architecture, a massively over scaled blob of a building plonked on top of an award winning, human scale, intimate and classic piece of Victorian Architecture. This is yet again, development for the benefit of the few, forever causing harm to the many who enjoy and need this space for their daily use. An exceptional development would be one that contributes both visually, and practically to the needs of the users, both current and future and is subservient to the already exceptional building that has served our city since 1874. This proposal is clearly not exceptional- anyone can see that and future occupants and users of this station will be denied the benefit of enjoying the simple joy of sunlight overhead, the feeling of lightness lost to a massive, dense structure ripping out the heart of the architecture. The proposed tower above the station is not needed. It is purely being proposed as an exercise in commercial gain; gain for the very few at the cost of our greater city. The proposal makes clear its distaste for the great beauty and benefit of the historic building, forcing on it a grossly incongruous, unresolved and hideously ill considered piece of computer generated architecture. There is a distinct lack of any sympathy for the context, history, light, generosity and poetry of the current building. This is not exceptional at all and so I have to strong object to the proposal.	PA	21-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Oakes	Louise	I object to this development as it'll reduce a superb example of a victorian building with beauty, light and space to a basement of a office block , of which there are plenty already built. My own city of Liverpool, like London, has had many uninspiring, rectangular blocks put up with no sense of style. In contrast, the building built before the 1950s have style, proportionality and decoration. All of which are missing from the new blocks (which just what they are, with no more imagination than a pile of wooden building blocks) as is the case with this mistaken idea for Liverpool Street Station. The money would be better spent on improving the train network for the 21st century.	PA	21-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Barrett	LIAM	This is a totally inappropriate development that will dwarf the beautiful buildings already there and change the character of the area dramatically. A more sympathetic design could still deliver the improvements and amenities desired.	PA	21-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Stone	Mark	The proposed new building will dwarf the original station and block light.	PA	21-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Whitehead	William	Another example of London's heritage being overshadowed, bullied and vandalised. The grandeur and inspiration of the Victorian architecture will be lost in yet another alienating corporate landscape. Where has the sense of proportion gone in the London cityscape? This is a terrible plan and should be shelved.	PA	21-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Whelan	Tim	I object to the current plans due to the size of the office building being planned. The building is inappropriate to the local area, there being more than enough tall buildings already and I can see no argument worth making that the disruption caused to travellers will be worth any benefit in the long term. I urge Network Rail to consider a better balance of need between passengers, people who use the Bishopsgate area, and property developers. I also feel strongly that the current online publicity asking for public support for this project is deliberately misleading, with the sly mention of a 20 story office building almost a joke. I can't trust people leading a project if their initial proposals are as dishonest as these are.	PA	21-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Bristow	Julia	It's much too high.	PA	21-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Burton	Andrea	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." There is nothing exceptional about this development other than it will cause substantial and significant harm to the conservation area and adjacent listed buildings.	PA	21-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Thompson	Penelope	I object to this application which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: the effective desecration of a familiar building whose history is valued and valuable . The scale of this proposal is overwhelming . The impact of the development is out of proportion to any benefit to local people and travellers.	PA	21-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Witting	Julia	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. It is contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework paragraph NPPF 213 which states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional."	PA	21-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Mackie	Edward	I object, as a daily user of this station there is no necessary reason for this redevelopment. This building should be preserved as part of our heritage.	PA	21-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Gill	Brendan	Blocking the view of a significant and grand building	PA	21-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Bailey	Joan	Dear Mr Tom Sleigh I object to application 25/00494/FULEIA, to make significant and inappropriate changes to Liverpool Street Station. Bearing in mind paragraph NPPF 213 of the National Planning Policy Framework,, which states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional of Victorian architecture and if significant historical importance to the heritage of our Capital City. In particular, like many other objectives including the Victorian Society, I am concerned by the following: The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof of the concourse and its replacement with a new structure, which would also compromise the setting of the 19th century train shed. The insertion of large amounts of new retail units in the 19th century train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning 19th century hotel in the City - through the construction of a twenty-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low-and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches and nearby St Botolph's church. Thank you.	PA	21-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Simmonds	Liam	Points of objection in line with National Planning Policy Framework, Paragraph NPPF 213: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional.": - The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof of the concourse and its replacement with a new structure, which would also compromise the setting of the 19th century train shed. - The insertion of large amounts of new retail units in the 19th century train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. - The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning 19th century hotel in the City - through the construction of a twenty-storey tower over the station concourse. - The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low-and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches and nearby St Botolph's church.	PA	21-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Pennington	David	Tragic destruction of heritage. Eroding culture and heritage for a profit. Decisions not to be made that impact future generations.	PA	21-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Faccinello	Antony	I object on the following grounds: 1. The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. 2. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. 3. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. 4. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. I reference the National Planning Policy Framework in making this objection, specifically Paragraph NPPF 213, which states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional."	PA	21-Jun-25	O
Page 118 25/00494/FULEIA	Marshall	Helen	I object to this application which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to - The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof of the concourse and its replacement with a new structure, which would also compromise the setting of the 19th century train shed. - The insertion of large amounts of new retail units in the 19th century train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. - The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning 19th century hotel in the City - through the construction of a twenty-storey tower over the station concourse. - The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low-and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches and nearby St Botolph's church. - I draw attention to the National Planning Policy Framework, Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional.	PA	21-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Campman	Stefanie	Dear Sir/Madam, I object to the Liverpool Street Station planning application because the development would cause irreversible harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets, contrary to national and local planning policy. The proposal would result in substantial harm to the architectural and historic significance of the Grade II-listed station, and compromise the integrity and setting of the surviving 19th-century train shed, of key heritage value. The new retail development within the historic train sheds would further erode the station's special interest. The construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse would have a profound impact on nearby listed buildings, most notably the Grade II*-listed hotel, the last continually functioning 19th century hotel in the City. The scale of the tower is entirely unsympathetic and would overwhelm the historic setting. The Bishopsgate Conservation Area offers sensitive historic streetscape. The introduction of a tall building in this context is inappropriate and in direct conflict with the 2015 City Plan. The proposed development would also impact the setting of numerous other designated and undesignated heritage assets, and the cumulative harm to these assets cannot be justified. Paragraph 213 of the National Planning Policy Framework states that: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." In this case, the scale of harm to the Grade II and Grade II*-listed buildings and to the conservation area is not justified by any exceptional public benefit. As such, the application fails to meet the requirements of the NPPF and should therefore be refused. For all the reasons outlined above, I respectfully urge the Planning Authority to refuse this application. With regards, Stefanie Campman	PA	21-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Rose	Lisa	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. In paragraph NPPF 213 it states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." This is a beautiful building and is more than capable of doing its designated role.	PA	21-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Malcolm	D.V.	I OBJECT vehemently to the monster under consideration for development in the area of Liverpool Street Station. Aren't there enough high-rising monsters throughout London already? Truly, don't be like the Americans and destroy or lose our heritage in the faux name of "progress." London clearly doesn't need another high-rise to tarnish its heritage. PLEASE do not allow this to happen. Keep London, London! -- D.V. Malcolm	PA	21-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Shinners	Steve	Liverpool street station is a beautiful building and should be left as it is. Any development of this site is going to ruin this ironic railway station. Keep it as it is and build the office block development somewhere else, maybe out of London altogether.	PA	21-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Kay	Melanie	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: 1. The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. 2. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. 3. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. 4. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. 5. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's. I would draw your attention to the National Planning Policy Framework: Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." Yours faithfully Melanie Kay	PA	21-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Eliot	Antonia	A sad plan for an outstanding station in the tradition of our great station buildings	PA	21-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Hayes	Marc	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. Make sure to reference the National Planning Policy Framework in your objection, otherwise your objection may be dismissed: Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional. Thank you	PA	21-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Parkin	Elizabeth	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to What are the key issues to cover in my objection? The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. Make sure to reference the National Planning Policy Framework in your objection, otherwise your objection may be dismissed: Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional."	PA	21-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Mapstone	Paul	Don't destroy our heritage.	PA	21-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Oliver	Janet	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to a number of nationally important heritage assets. Specifically, I object to the following aspects of the application: -- The demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure would cause substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station. It would also compromise the setting of the surviving 19th century train shed; -- The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the train shed, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, would cause substantial harm to the Grade II-listed heritage asset; -- The construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse would adversely impact the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets, in particular the Grade II*-listed hotel (the last continually functioning 19th century hotel in the City); -- The imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings would cause substantial harm to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. The scheme would also adversely impact the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as the nearby St Botolph's church and many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches; -- Finally, the scheme is contrary to paragraph 213 of the National Planning Policy Framework, which states that "Substantial harm to or loss of grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional".The applicants have not advanced any argument why their proposal merits any such exception. I therefore ask for the application be refused.	PA	21-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Hardie	Nicola	Dear Planning Committee, As a daily Liverpool Street commuter, I fully object to (and as a proud London worker, wholeheartedly reject) the proposed plans for this monstrosity of a building. This proposed building will detrimentally impact the original historic building's design ethos and the daily journey of all commuters lucky enough to use this incredible, historic station. Yet again, developers wish to run roughshod through the amazing and much loved history of this great city, for nothing but personal gain. They say they care about the original building and their plans will improve upon the current locale. They do not. On either count. If they could raise this history to the ground and build a full grand new dream from ground up, they would - only incredibly naive people would think otherwise. Let's not forget that London's various planning committees have historically committed multitudes of grievous injustices over decades to much of London, that younger generations now cannot revel in, be amazed by, learn from and enjoy. So much history gone or impacted so severely, it's as good as gone. This station is a glorious architectural example that all of London should relish, cherish and protect. The joy of the current Liverpool Street station building is its light, its life and its history. These proposed plans will kill all of this, turning the station and its surroundings into a footnote in history. While the developers rub their hands with glee and make a pretty penny from all that 'lovely new property space'. Is that what City of London Planning Dept want their legacy to be? Or do you want to proactively challenge developer greed and protect what all Londoners and commuters hold dear - integrity, honesty and a proud history of what came before us, to pass onto future generations. Please register my wholehearted objection to this planning proposal, with my great hope that you will vigorously reject the application. Yours sincerely	PA	21-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Hardie	Nicola	Dear Planning Committee, As a daily Liverpool Street commuter, I fully object to (and as a proud London worker, wholeheartedly reject) the proposed plans for this monstrosity of a building. This proposed building will detrimentally impact the original historic building's design ethos and the daily journey of all commuters lucky enough to use this incredible, historic station. Yet again, developers wish to run roughshod through the amazing and much loved history of this great city, for nothing but personal gain. They say they care about the original building and their plans will improve upon the current locale. They do not. On either count. If they could raise this history to the ground and build a full grand new dream from ground up, they would - only incredibly naive people would think otherwise. Let's not forget that London's various planning committees have historically committed multitudes of grievous injustices over decades to much of London, that younger generations now cannot revel in, be amazed by, learn from and enjoy. So much history gone or impacted so severely, it's as good as gone. This station is a glorious architectural example that all of London should relish, cherish and protect. The joy of the current Liverpool Street station building is its light, its life and its history. These proposed plans will kill all of this, turning the station and its surroundings into a footnote in history. While the developers rub their hands with glee and make a pretty penny from all that 'lovely new property space'. Is that what City of London Planning Dept want their legacy to be? Or do you want to proactively challenge developer greed and protect what all Londoners and commuters hold dear - integrity, honesty and a proud history of what came before us, to pass onto future generations. Please register my wholehearted objection to this planning proposal, with my great hope that you will vigorously reject the application. Yours sincerely	PA	21-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Williams	Alexander	I object to this application in the strongest possible terms. It is significant detrimental to both the heritage station and the 1990s development. The station is and will remain fit for purpose and is on of London's great railway termini. Creating a gloomy office block with a subterranean concourse will significantly damage this important part of the City of London. The design lacks architectural merit and has clearly been created to maximise office space, at the detriment to rail passengers and everyone in the City of London. Sensitive modifications to the existing structure would fix all the issues Network Rail has raised with the current station, rather than this blatant commercial development. Should this be approved it will be considered by future generations the way Euston is today. The City of London must reject this application.	PA	21-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	LaRocca	Sarah	I am writing to oppse the proposed development of the Liverpool Ststion. Please keep its Victorian architecture undisturbed. London is a marvelous city, full of breathtaking architecture and history. The Liverpool Station is an important part of the history of the East End in the 19th century. Already, so much has been lost. As a member of the Victorian Society, I sincerely request that the integrity of its design and history remain undisturbed by a huge modern tower block.	PA	21-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Weidmann	Lianne	I have worked in this area for 30 years and strongly object to this application because of the substantial harm it would cause to this heritage rich area for - as I see it - no significant gain. In particular, I object to: The harm that would be caused to the Grade II listed station via the demolition of the concourse roof and its replacement with a new structure that would be out of keeping architecturally with the current structure. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II listed hotel - the last continually functioning 19th century hotel in the City - through the construction of a twenty-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low-and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches and nearby St Botolph's church. The substantial harm caused by [what will become] this twenty storey office block [which clearly falls within the exceptional category required by the National Planning Policy] significantly outweighs any benefit to be derived. Is additional office and retail space really required in this area given the current level of building development? And the suggested improvements to access and toilets at Liverpool Street are improvements that ought to be made in any event given that they fall within National Rail responsibility, and could be made without this monstrosity.	PA	21-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Francomb	Peter	Liverpool Street station is a light and airy masterpiece of Victorian architecture. What is being proposed is an overbearing monstrosity.	PA	21-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Chinnery	Christine	I object to this application which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: - The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof of the concourse and its replacement with a new structure, which would also compromise the setting of the 19th century train shed. - The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning 19th century hotel in the City - through the construction of a twenty-storey tower over the station concourse. - The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low-and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches and nearby St Botolph's church. And finally, Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional. In this case, it appears totally unnecessary.	PA	21-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Palmer	Dycella	Planning Application 25/00494/FULEIA. I object on the grounds that allowing the proposed building will do substantial harm to what should be a cherished national asset. If we are to take seriously National Planning Policy Framework, Paragraph NPPF 213 which states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional" then this application would be refused. It cannot be right to allow the construction of such a monstrously large edifice. It is not in keeping with the surrounding buildings. It is overwhelming in terms of scale. The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station would be caused through the demolition of the roof of the concourse and its replacement with a new structure. This would compromise the setting of the 19th century train shed. The insertion of large amounts of new retail units in the 19th century train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries would cause a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The negative impact to the setting of nearby listed heritage assets would be significant. In particular, the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning 19th century hotel in the City - through the construction of a twenty-storey tower over the station concourse. There would be substantial harm to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area by imposing a tall building in an area which is characterised by low-and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond. Examples include many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches and nearby St Botolph's church.	PA	21-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Bevan	David	The building must be preserved for posterity.	PA	21-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Cordery	Ann	I object to the above application which I believe would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections for the following reasons: This development would cause substantial and irrefutable harm to the Grade 11 listed station, through demolition of the concourse roof and its replacement with a new structure, compromising the setting of the 19th Century train shed. New retail units which are proposed for insertion into the 19th century train sheds, to include construction of two elevated retail galleries, would inevitably cause harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade 11 listed heritage asset. The impact this development would cause to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets, in particular the significance of the Grade 11 listed hotel (the last fully functioning 19th century hotel in the City) which would be dwarfed by the construction of a twenty storey tower over the station concourse. The harm caused to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area would be substantial, by the imposition of such a high and visually overpowering structure in an area of low and medium scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate settings, ie Conservation Areas and the St Pauls Cathedral Heights area. Inevitably the scheme would impact on the setting of heritage assets in the City and beyond, including many of the Grade 1 listed Christopher Wren Churches in the City and nearby St Boltoph's church. I reference the National Planning Policy Framework. Paragraph NPPF 213, which states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade 11 listed buildings, or grade 11 register parks or gardens, should be exceptional. Please register my wholehearted objection to this development.	PA	21-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	THORON-DURAN	MOLLY	This building would be an unmitigated disaster locally and nationally for numerable reasons. Please help the supporters of this disastrous project come to their senses and cancel this building project forever, for the sake of Great Britain..	PA	21-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Karie	Gabriella	This is completely unnecessary. There are plenty of unused office buildings that could be utilised. It is an utter disgrace to even consider this.	PA	21-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Anderson	Melanie	Because of our buildings history. This needs to be maintained and kept just how it is	PA	21-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Bailey	Emma	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: 1. The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. 2. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. 3. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. 4. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. It is important to note that Paragraph NPPF213 of the National Planning Policy Framework states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional."	PA	21-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Barrett	James	This decidedly terrible scheme will wreck the historic character of the area - just at a time when it is becoming a marketable commodity that stands to bring more to local people than do the businesses that would use this monstrosity, were anybody to be foolish enough to allow its construction.	PA	21-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Berry	Jane	Dwarfs surrounding buildings in a totally unsympathetic manner and would alter the area to its detriment In this age of working from home there is not a need for more office buildings when so many are standing empty You have not demonstrated any benefits to the residents and general public who visit this area for work or leisure	PA	21-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Baker	Howard	I object to this application which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: The significant damage inflicted upon the Grade II-listed station due to the demolition of the concourse roof and its subsequent replacement with a new structure would also jeopardize the setting of the 19th-century train shed. The introduction of a considerable number of new retail units within the 19th-century train sheds, including the development of two elevated retail galleries, would result in a substantial level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The effect on the setting of adjacent listed heritage assets is noteworthy. Specifically, there is a risk to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continuously operating 19th-century hotel in the City - due to the erection of a twenty-storey tower above the station concourse. The considerable harm that the proposed scheme would inflict on the Bishopsgate Conservation Area arises from the introduction of a tall building in a locale characterized by low- and medium-scale structures. This is in direct opposition to the 2015 City Plan, which mandates the denial of planning permission for tall buildings in unsuitable locations, such as Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. Furthermore, the scheme would affect the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets within the City and beyond, including many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches and the nearby St Botolph's church. National Planning Policy Framework;. Paragraph NPPF 213 articulates: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional".	PA	21-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Hathcock	Susan	The area around Liverpool Street station as well as the station itself are among the most interesting and complex in London. Please don't overwhelm and destroy its unique atmosphere with this great, hulking development.	PA	21-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Lowde	Alex	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of a grade 2 nationally important heritage assets. The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The National Planning Policy Framework Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." The design itself is unbelievably poor. Lacking the boldness and vision of the Herzog de Meuron proposal. Opting instead for a a bricolage pastiche assemblage of various Victorian architectural styles. And a generic dated modernity for the towers themselves. This proposal is visually so much more impoverished than the previous. It needs a much bolder vision. .	PA	21-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Briar	Joanna	I object to the redevelopment as buildings of historic importance should be preserved for future generations. Protect our heritage!	PA	21-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Holford	Peter	I object to this application which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. I objected to the original proposal and I can see no significant improvement in the latest application. I may live elsewhere now but as a Londoner born and bred with deep roots in the East End, I object in the strongest terms to this monstrous development. My objections are: 1. The present station is a grade II listed building - a fine example of Victorian design with a magnificent glass roof. The demolition of the concourse and the top-heavy development on top will create another Euston - a claustrophobic and dismal experience for travellers. 2. The Grade II* listed hotel would be effectively destroyed with entrances hammered through the facade and a 16 storey pile cantilevered over what remains of a great building. Would you do this to St Pancras? The proposed building would be more than twice the height of the existing listed building. It would dwarf it and destroy any idea that this is an area of significant heritage. 3. This is a conservation area, a classic example of one of the Victorian railway hubs of London. The effect on the Bishopsgate Conservation Area would be catastrophic This proposed development is contrary to the 2015 City Plan which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches and nearby St Botolph's church. The NPPF Paragraph 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." A grave mistake was made at Euston 50+ years ago. Are you going to allow a repeat?	PA	21-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Batt	Frank	I object to this application on the grounds of it being over development of this historic area	PA	21-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Fowler	Edward	I would like to object to this application on the grounds that it is a duty of the planning authority to preserve the nature of the City and protect the historic fabric of the City, as perParagraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." The office block planned to sit behind the station is a monolithic block that totally overshadows the Grade II listed hotel and station. The scheme would cause substantial harm to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low-and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches and nearby St Botolph's church. The scheme would cause substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof of the concourse and its replacement with a new structure, which would also compromise the setting of the 19th century train shed.	PA	21-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Cronin	Catherine	I object to this application which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof of the concourse and its replacement with a new structure, which would also compromise the setting of the 19th century train shed. The insertion of large amounts of new retail units in the 19th century train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning 19th century hotel in the City - through the construction of a twenty-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low-and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches and nearby St Botolph's church. The National Planning Policy Framework, Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional."	PA	21-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Barber	Claire	I Object to this development, Liverpool St is a beautiful victorian naturally lit station and should not have anything built above it.	PA	21-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Carpenter	John	This will block out light! It must not be allowed!	PA	21-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Tsochev	Filip	We suggest the following opening line: I object to this application which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: - The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof of the concourse and its replacement with a new structure, which would also compromise the setting of the 19th century train shed. The National Planning Policy Framework, Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." - The insertion of large amounts of new retail units in the 19th century train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. - The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning 19th century hotel in the City - through the construction of a twenty-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low-and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches and nearby St Botolph's church. Therefore, I urge that the application be refused.	PA	21-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Cousins	Margaret	Sledge hammer to crack a nut. An obvious overdevelopment to solve issues. Too tall and environmentally intrusive with loss of existing building character.	PA	21-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Dixon-Coote	Fleur	There is absolutely no reason to destroy this beautiful building.	PA	21-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Phillips	David	Say No! To this monstrous blot on the landscape.	PA	21-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Lawrence	Sandra	This development is entirely out of character with its local surroundings. Liverpool Street station is a piece of living history and should be celebrated as such, making it as successful a reinvention as King's Cross St Pancras - recreating with sympathy, rather than aggression. Development, in sympathy with the building and its surroundings, would add quality to the area. This is not that project. While it may have short term gain, something so very out of keeping with the local community is likely to repel further investment, not attract it.	PA	21-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Mills	Charlotte	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. I also reference the National Planning Policy Framework in my objection: Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional."	PA	21-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Waldmann	Paul	I believe the appearance of the new development to be completely out of sympathy with the surrounding architecture and overwhelming in scale	PA	21-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Mernick	Philip	Ugly and unnecessary.	PA	21-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Millar	Michelle	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to:" What are the key issues to cover in my objection? The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. Make sure to reference the National Planning Policy Framework in your objection, otherwise your objection may be dismissed: Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional.	PA	21-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Routh	Chris	I spend about 1 week a month staying in Spitalfields as I certainly couldn't afford to live there permantly but this hideous monstrosity will overwhelm the surrounding buildings and mark a further advance by developers to turn Bishopsgate in to a dark canyon. It is certainly not needed or wanted because the three things the area doesn't need is more office space, more retail and more food and drink outlets.	PA	21-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Gowans	Sophie	It would cause unnecessary damage to a grade II listed building. The roof should be preserved rather than removed a tower built on it.	PA	22-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Palmer	Steven	This is a travesty, in that the presentation is very misleading and barely alludes to the immense building that would overtake Liverpool St Station...highly destructive to the character of the area, and a terrible precedent for more of this unethical and nefarious "development". A shameful and dishonest attempt to deceive the public as to the extent of this "development:" ...Would totally alter the character of the area, which I visit frequently.	PA	22-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Monaghan	Iain	The proposed development represents a further step towards the elimination of any remaining vestige of London's historical character. What is currently an imposing and impressive reminder of Victorian ambition and ingenuity appears, in the current plans, to be subsumed into a massive, tower block that appears to display no ambition other than to make as much profit as possible and no ingenuity other than to attempt to persuade the public that the only means by which m of the normal process of repairing and updating public facilities as repairs and the modernisation of 'improvements', most of which appear to be capable of being carried without	PA	22-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Eley	Wendy	Dear Sir/Madame Please find enclosed my objection for the purposed redevelopment of Liverpool St station. I am objecting to this for a few reasons but mainly I love the station the way it is due to the fact it's already been redesigned from when I was a little girl, it lets in so much natural light I fear this would change with said new plans, also it means knocking down some more of our old buildings which is getting rid of more of our history! I hate the new glass boxes they will replace them with and think there is enough glass in the city now! We need to maintain the old buildings which adds to our history and story of the city of London, we already lost way too many historical buildings during the war so I'd absolutely hate to lose anymore! Hopefully we get enough support to stop this from happening Many thanks Wendy Eley	PA	22-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Kermond	Sara	This appalling proposal would damage a heritage listed structure and also the Bishopsgate conservation area. The Liverpool St Station roof would be destroyed. The supposed benefits are spurious and describe amenities which the station is obliged to provide in any case. Please do not allow these developers to encase this glorious station in a hideous looming development and damage both it and the conservation area. I appreciate the developers are monied and persistent but you are meant to care about the area not glossy mendacious land grabs.	PA	22-Jun-25	O
Page 138 25/00494/FULEIA	Hickman	Helen	Dear Tom Sleigh I recently became aware of a planning application for the unnecessary destruction of Liverpool Street Station. I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional. This proposal is not because of exceptional circumstances and will further leave the area deprived of an already fully functional historic building.	PA	22-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Heanue	Lorenzo	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional."	PA	22-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Bloom	Anthea	It is an historical monument. I have worked in the city for 40 years. So much office space is empty now so why do we need more offices. The plans are horrible , out of character and ruining a piece of history. Totally unnecessary	PA	22-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	moorcroft	Lesley	"I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets	PA	22-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	David Scott	Lesley	"I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets	PA	22-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Gooch	Simon	Proposed development is completely out of character with existing, historical buildings, dwarfing surrounding development and will just be a(nother) monument to the 'pigs in the trough' philosophy of make money while you can, regardless.	PA	22-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Potter	Heather	With reference to the following https://www.gov.uk/guidance/national-planning-policy-framework Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed building. "I object to this application which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to:" More specifically, I raise objections to: 1. The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof of the concourse and its replacement with a new structure, which would also compromise the setting of the 19th century train shed. 2. The insertion of large amounts of new retail units in the 19th century train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. 3. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning 19th century hotel in the City - through the construction of a twenty-storey tower over the station concourse. 4. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low-and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches and nearby St Botolph's church.	PA	22-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Hillyer	Simon	Preserve and restore the station, don't cover it with an unnecessary office and commercial development. Network rail should be preserving railway history.	PA	22-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Smith	Verity	The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. Make sure to reference the National Planning Policy Framework in your objection, otherwise your objection may be dismissed: Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional.	PA	22-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Maxted	Alexander	Liverpool Street Station is a Grade II-listed building of national importance. These plans are in direct violation of the National Planning Policy Framework (paragraph 213). Moreover, the new structure poses potential threat to the surviving C19 train sheds, as well as unnecessary demolition of the station's distinctive roof structure. The imposing scale of the new building would affect the surrounding buildings in the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, which violates the 2015 City Plan, stating that new buildings in a conservation area should be in keeping with the size and scale of their neighbours. I fail to see why a new retail space is necessary at all in an area characterised by its iconic historical markets such as Spitalfields and Brick Lane. New offices, too, seem redundant in an area already overpopulated with corporate spaces. I urge you to reconsider these plans, which display shameful disregard towards one of the most emblematic, indispensable historical buildings in London, and towards the entire Bishopsgate Conservation Area.	PA	22-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Barrett	Sue	Preservation of a beautiful substantial historical building that is an asset to our cultural heritage	PA	22-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Darrah	Clare	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to the denigration of this asset which will be overwhelmed and engulfed by this proposal. The area is already overcrowded and the increase in footfall in the surrounding area will make the use of this asset even harder. The size and scale of the proposed buildings are completely disproportionately large and will overwhelm the asset.	PA	22-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Barrett	Susan	Destruction of a cultural asset	PA	22-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Tarquini	Holly	Please leave Liverpool St Station a-line: it is magnificent, it works really well and it is architecturally significant. I understand NR's need for money but I beg you to raise this some other way. Please. I regularly use LSS and have done all my life.	PA	22-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Tenney	Kathleen	I strongly object to this planned development around and on top of Liverpool Street Station. Whilst I am not opposed to progress and improvements to a station that myself and family have used for MANY generations, not only is it a desecration of part of our heritage, but to have a 20 story building sitting on top of it looks totally ridiculous ! We MUST preserve and cherish our historical buildings, as other countries do, or we risk ending up as a soulless concrete wasteland.	PA	22-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	McDonell	Miriam	I am writing to strongly object to this planning application, which I believe would cause substantial and irreversible harm to nationally significant heritage assets. As someone who arrived into Liverpool Street often during childhood, I feel this proposal on a deeply personal level. I used to call the station "the White Palace"-a space full of light and character that sparked my imagination every time I walked through it. Yes, that was nearly 40 years ago, and childhood memories may be easy to dismiss-but this place left a lasting impression. It wasn't just a station-it was a gateway into London's architectural grandeur, its history, its soul. The current scheme threatens all of that. Specifically, I object to: The substantial harm this proposal would inflict on the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by introducing a tall building completely out of step with the existing low- and medium-rise character of the area. This clearly contradicts the 2015 City Plan, which explicitly states that tall buildings should be refused in inappropriate locations-such as Conservation Areas and the St Paul's Cathedral Heights area. It would also damage the setting of many heritage assets, including Grade I-listed churches by Christopher Wren and nearby St Botolph's Church. The impact on surrounding listed heritage assets, especially the Grade II*-listed Liverpool Street Hotel-the last continuously functioning 19th-century hotel in the City. Crowning the station with a 20-storey tower is not only visually intrusive, it also disrespects the architectural narrative and scale of the area. More broadly, this development flies in the face of the National Planning Policy Framework. Paragraph 213 is clear: "Substantial harm to or loss of Grade II listed buildings... should be exceptional." Nothing about this application qualifies as exceptional, and it certainly does not justify the loss. While I appreciate the need for modern amenities, we do not need yet another Tesco Express or New Look ...	PA	22-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Bolding	Paul	There is no conceivable way that this proposal complies with NPPF16 and in particular para 213 and the requirement that harm to Grade II listed buildings should be "exceptional". It reflects poorly on the City if this dismal application is regarded as exceptional. It plainly would cause substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof of the concourse and its replacement with a new structure, which would also compromise the setting of the 19th century train shed. The insertion of extensive retail units in the 19th century train sheds, including two elevated retail galleries would cause a high degree of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The project would negatively impact the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning 19th century hotel in the City - would be harmed by the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. It would cause substantial harm to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area by the imposition of a tall building in a townscape of low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas. In addition, the scheme would impact the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches and nearby St Botolph's church.	PA	22-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Swift	Isabelle	I object to the loss of a working building, of historical importance - that still serves its function and works well.	PA	22-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Box	Cindy	The building needs to stay as it is, the beauty in this will be destroyed by the monster suggested to go on it.	PA	22-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Foster	Gillian	This is an abhorrent proposal that should not be entertained by a serious authority. This is a protected site of significant historical interest and is aesthetically pleasing. The current concourse is pleasant, open, airy and provides ample space for the range of activities it offers. To block out the light and to destroy the very nature of this beautiful old building in the name of corporate profit alone would be quite simply a travesty that no responsible planning authority could allow. Corporate greed and corruption is driving this abysmal proposal as evidenced by the cynical attempt to mislead both public and planners by the use of passenger complaints as evidence of support for this project. Please be absolutely clear. No one is under any illusions as to the real nature of this proposal and if the planning authority agrees they will be openly sanctioning a corporate profit grab at the expense of a part of Britains historic infrastructure and architecture. Shame on this proposal. I object in the strongest possible terms.	PA	22-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Howells	Julie	I wholly OBJECT to this proposed redevelopment of a beautiful Victorian building. A structure of this historical importance belongs to all of us and should not be up for grabs for making a quick profit at the expense of ruining important architecture. Once it's gone it's gone forever and we are all the poorer for that. Not everything should come down to profit and money. There are plenty of creative ways to better this space without ruining its main features. Shame on you Network Rail!!! PLEASE PLEASE do not allow this to happen.	PA	22-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Ashworth	Peter	I strongly object to the desecration of a national monument by the building proposed. This latest building application is no better than the previous one and is totally out of all proportion to the surroundings. No one will benefit from this monstrosity other than the developers and council. Meanwhile Londoners would have to put up with 8 or more likely 10 years of disruption and chaos caused by such a development. The station is a monument to people who made London great and now greedy developers wish to desecrate that achievement with a monstrous carbuncle, which is so greatly over sized as to cause nothing but disgust and disruption to all who use this area on a daily basis.	PA	22-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Dorst	Anne	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional."	PA	22-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Carpenter	Beatrice	Over development around the area that suffocates an old building. Lack of natural light in the building	PA	22-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Limentani	Rick	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. I travel through Liverpool St station multiple times a week and it is an architectural delight that makes up for the disappointing state of the train service. The station itself runs well and has plenty of space. This change is entirely unnecessary and is an overreach that will damage the heritage for future generations	PA	22-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Nguyen	Tracy	This new plan is too large, not considerate of existing structures and their history. Will block light and is all private. It is not needed. There are no benefits shown to the public and the area is already dense with buildings with a lack of trees and light space. More concrete means more heat. Dear Sir/ Madam,	PA	22-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Harper	Martin	When I first saw the design for this proposed construction, I could not believe my eyes. In that area there are already vast amounts of empty retail premises, and who are the offices for? Again already there are huge amounts of empty offices in that area. To my mind the design will already add - for no real purpose - to London's increasingly cluttered skyline, of very samey structures. However, my specific objections with regards to the National Planning Policy Framework are as follows: The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof of the concourse and its replacement with a new structure, which would also compromise the setting of the 19th century train shed. The insertion of large amounts of new retail units in the 19th century train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning 19th century hotel in the City - through the construction of a twenty-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low-and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches and nearby St Botolph's church. Thank you.	PA	22-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Burns	Steven	This area is already full of overbuilt spaces.	PA	22-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	White	Stephen	1.The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof of the concourse and its replacement with a new structure, which would also compromise the setting of the 19th century train shed. 2. The insertion of large amounts of new retail units in the 19th century train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. 3.The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning 19th century hotel in the City - through the construction of a twenty-storey tower over the station concourse. 4.The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low-and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches and nearby St Botolph's church. 5. With reference to the National Planning Policy Framework. Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." I do not believe the proposed development fulfils this requirement	PA	22-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Kindberg	Sally	As a City of London Guide and author of many children's books including one about London, I object most strongly to this new proposal which completely disrespects the rich history of London and its architecture. How can Network Rail afford this scheme if it seemingly can't afford to improve its network of train services? Who will benefit from this scheme? This is NOT for the public's benefit and certainly not for local people. Stop destroying our history! Tourists from all over the world visit London to see our architecture, not identical shopping malls etc.	PA	22-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Reeves	Max	To whom it may concern I am Objecting to this Development as a Local Resident in the Strongest possible way. My Objections are based on the following. The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof of the concourse and its replacement with a new structure, which would compromise the setting of the 19th century train shed. The insertion of large amounts of new retail units in the 19th century train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II -listed hotel - the last continually functioning 19th century hotel in the City - through the construction of a twenty-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low-and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches and nearby St Botolph's church. Paragraph NPPF 213 of the National Planning Policy Framework states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." We love our local Station the way it is not this proposed monstrosity. Max Reeves	PA	22-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Rennie	Kim	We don't need a massive office block on top of a listed Victorian building in order to provide step-free access/lifts and less clutter etc. Network Rail can do this right now should they so wish - e.g. by removing 50% of the retail clutter.	PA	22-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Hindley	Ollie	Do not destroy what's left of our great capital city. We need to remember our heritage and preserve the beauty of Liverpool Street station. On of the most beautiful in UK.	PA	22-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Marsh	Robert	I object to the scale of the development which completely obliterates the station. The blocking of light will be awful. There is huge character which is at risk of destruction.	PA	22-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Murray	Caroline	I object to this application which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to the substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low-and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches and nearby St Botolph's church. Also, the substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof of the concourse and its replacement with a new structure, which would also compromise the setting of the 19th-century train shed.	PA	22-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Forrest	Simon D	The development totally overwhelms the station that itself was brutally diminished during the 1980s when the high numbered platforms were rafted over. The station needs to have more natural light in it. This will not be the case if this horrible building is erected. Liverpool Street needs sympathetic development, not the butcher's job that is proposal. Please turn this down and ask for plans that make Liverpool Street a greener and sustainable place to use. No huge monoliths overbearing it but open spaces with plenty of natural light.	PA	22-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA Page 147	Lawrence	Monica	I object to this application which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: The substantial harm that would be caused to the Grade II-listed station by the demolition of the roof of the concourse and its replacement with a new structure. This would also compromise the setting of the 19th century train shed. The intention to insert large amounts of new retail units in the 19th century train sheds - to include the construction of two elevated retail galleries - which would cause a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of this Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact this would have on the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, the incalculable harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel through the construction of a twenty-storey tower over the station concourse. This is the last continually functioning 19th century hotel in the City. The scheme would cause substantial harm to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low-and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact adversely on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches and nearby St Botolph's church. The National Planning Policy Framework, Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." In light of the above points of objection, and the National Planning Policy Framework itself, this development should be refused planning permission.	PA	22-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Counsell	Suzanne	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, sho	PA	22-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	SMALL	ROBERT	It is hard to believe that the C of L is even considering this revised application plan, and the adverts I've seen on social media encouraging people to support the building because it will improve access and toilets at Liverpool St Station, are misleading. It is Network Rail's legal responsibility to provide that anyway! A 20 storey block in this low level area will be a huge eyesore and damaging to the Grade II-listed station and the Liverpool Street Station Hotel, a Grade II*-listed building. This 20 storey block in a low level Grade II* area is definitely in conflict with the 2015 City Plan which requires the REFUSAL of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in 'Conservation Areas' and the 'St. Paul's Cathedral Heights' area. Also the National Planning Policy Framework, Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." An eight year predicted time scale, even if it is accurate, will be a horrendous disruption for the public and businesses to endure, to only end up with a twenty storey monstrosity overshadowing this special area. Please reject this application, again.	PA	22-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Small	Rob	It is hard to believe that the C of L is even considering this revised application plan, and the adverts I've seen on social media encouraging people to support the building because it will improve access and toilets at Liverpool St Station, are misleading. It is Network Rail's legal responsibility to provide that anyway! A 20 storey block in this low level area will be a huge eyesore and damaging to the Grade II-listed station and the Liverpool Street Station Hotel, a Grade II*-listed building. This 20 storey block in a low level Grade II* area is definitely in conflict with the 2015 City Plan which requires the REFUSAL of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in 'Conservation Areas' and the 'St. Paul's Cathedral Heights' area. Also the National Planning Policy Framework, Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." An eight year predicted time scale, even if it is accurate, will be a horrendous disruption for the public and businesses to endure, to only end up with a twenty storey monstrosity overshadowing this special area. Please reject this application, again.	PA	22-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Hall	Suzanna	I OBJECT to the plans submitted to demolish part of Liverpool Street Station and construct offices above it. This horrific act will forever ruin the wonderful victoriana architecture. Its a shameful submission, we, as a nation need to be proud of our heritage and loving preserve it for future generations. The greed if network rail is palpable. Please stop this, inputs 'tracks' before we lose one of Londons most beautiful, historic stations.	PA	22-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Brown	Elizabeth	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. Furthermore Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." As a child as an adult and now as an older person I have always loved this building and can see no substantial need outlined to require redesign let alone "exceptional need" in the project submitted	PA	22-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Hewitt	Anna	"I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to; * The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. * The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional."	PA	22-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Roberts	Tom	I object to this application which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets.	PA	22-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Davis	Susan	I object to this application which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof of the concourse and its replacement with a new structure, which would also compromise the setting of the 19th century train shed. The insertion of large amounts of new retail units in the 19th century train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning 19th century hotel in the City - through the construction of a twenty-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low-and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches and nearby St Botolph's church. Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional."	PA	22-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Whitaker	Roger	Dear Sir, I wish to object to the proposed redevelopment of the Liverpool Street Station area. The proposal is out of scale with the original station building and would not serve to enhance or preserve the character of the station or the Conservation Area. Previously I lived nearby from the 1950's and am a retired local government town planner. This station should retain its 19th century character and not be ruined by the proposed development. Your faithfully Roger Whitaker (MRTPI retired)	PA	22-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Johnson	Alex	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: - The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. This would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. - The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. - The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. In support of this objection I refer to relevant parts of the National Planning Policy Framework. In particular, I note that Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional."	PA	22-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Sutton	Robert	I object most strongly to this application, which would substantially harm the significance of a Grade II-listed National Asset, contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework. The current concourse is light, uncrowded, and pleasant to pass through, especially in comparison to, for example, Euston Station. This alone should make it worthy of preservation. The station also contains the 19th century train sheds, and the Grade II-listed hotel, the last such continually functioning hotel in the City. There are already enough ill-considered new buildings in the Bishopsgate Conservation Area. To allow another to stand head and shoulder above these is completely unnecessary and would run contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires refusal for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, Conservation Areas, and the St Paul's Cathedral Heights area.	PA	22-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Yardley	Erminia	As usual when it comes to building monstrosities the Council is very quick, but what you have not realized is that people are important and what you are trying to build is awful and ugly to look at! I thoroughly object!	PA	22-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Hartweg	Ursula	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets.	PA	22-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Howe	Fiona	It would be a travesty to take down such a beautiful station.	PA	22-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Selby	David	The latest proposals for the development of Liverpool Street Station are to say the least grossly disproportionate in scale, of questionable economic justification, and of abysmal architectural quality. Surely in this day and age with such a wide choice of excellent architects, planners and developers we can do better than this. It is not too late to have another look. I would suggest a National Competition run by credible institutions such as the RIBA, RICS and representatives of the client and in consultation with interest groups such as the Victorian Society and others, to formulate a sensible brief and to seek the best team for what must be one of the most important sites in London and the UK. David Selby Retired Architect - London	PA	22-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Sherston	Alexandra	Liverpool Street Station is a wonderful, light and airy terminus which is good for the spirit of all travellers passing through and, presumably, for all those that work there. This will be lost for ever for everyone if the proposed development happens. Not only is it completely out of character with the vicinity of the station thus robbing the design of the station of it's charm, but it is ugly, undistinguished, monstrous and will block out the light that makes Liverpool St Station feel light, airy and welcoming. It's not clear to me what the benefits of this proposed development to the public are. I firmly oppose it. I genuinely hope that it does not go ahead.	PA	22-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Finch	Scott	This would be an absolute travesty. It would obscure the magnificent Victorian architecture, a reminder of when this country could build things properly.	PA	22-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Machin	Steve	I am writing to object to this application as it would result in significant damage to nationally important heritage assets. In more detail, the application would significantly: ~ compromise the nature of the the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the concourse roof and its replacement by a new structure; ~ harm the setting of the 19th century train shed through the presence of large amounts of new retail units (including the construction of two elevated retail galleries); and, ~ result in significant damage to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. What is more, the construction of a twenty-storey tower looming over the station concourse would: ~ deleteriously affect the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets; and, ~ cause harm to the significance of the Grade II* listed hotel (which I understand is the last continually functioning 19th century hotel in London). Contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas (such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area), the scheme would: ~ significantly affect the Bishopsgate Conservation Area by constructing a tall building in an area characterised by low-and medium-scale buildings; and, ~ seriously damage the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond (such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches and nearby St Botolph's church). Finally, my objection is also based on Paragraph NPPF 213 of the National Policy Planning Framework which states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional."	PA	22-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Woolland	Caroline	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving 19th century train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the 19th century train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning 19th century hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. I draw your attention to the National Planning Policy Framework Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional."	PA	22-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Appleton	Joanna	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. My objection goes against the National Planning Policy Framework where Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional."	PA	22-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Ziegler	Felicity	I object to the proposed alterations to Liverpool Street station. The National Planning Policy Framework states: "Substantial harm to or loss of grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." This proposal is not 'exceptional'. It would harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure and its replacement with a new structure. Further, it would effect the setting of the surviving C19 train sheds. The C19 Grade II-listed heritage train sheds would be "harmed" by the insertion of large amounts of new retail units. The placing of a 20-storey tower over the station in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings, including the Grade II* listed hotel -the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - would cause "substantial harm" to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, Furthermore, the scheme would impact on the setting of a number of heritage sites in the City and beyond, including many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church.	PA	22-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Watson	Stephanie	"I object to this application which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to:" Follow in your own words with these legal points for objection. . POINTS FOR OBJECTION . - The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof of the concourse and its replacement with a new structure, which would also compromise the setting of the 19th century train shed. - The insertion of large amounts of new retail units in the 19th century train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. - The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning 19th century hotel in the City - through the construction of a twenty-storey tower over the station concourse. - The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low-and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches and nearby St Botolph's church. - Be sure to reference the National Planning Policy Framework, otherwise your objection may be dismissed. Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional."	PA	22-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Webb	Nicky	I object to this application which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. The proposed development would be an act of horrendous cultural vandalism. Paragraph 213 of the National Planning Policy Framework, states that developments should only cause "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens" in exceptional circumstances - I have seen absolutely NO evidence that such circumstances exist. Specifically, I raise objections to: - The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof of the concourse and its replacement with a new structure, which would also compromise the setting of the 19th century train shed. - The insertion of large amounts of new retail units in the 19th century train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. - The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning 19th century hotel in the City - through the construction of a twenty-storey tower over the station concourse. - The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low-and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches and nearby St Botolph's church.	PA	22-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	connor	jackie	I object to this application which will cause substantial harm to the significance of a nationally important heritage asset. - the demolition of the concourse roof compromises the historical train shed - the development threatens surrounding historical assets including the beautiful Great Eastern Hotel - the scale of the development is unacceptable and threatens to impose tall buildings in a conservation area characterised by low and medium rise buildings, contrary to the 2015 City Plan -In all of these matters I refer you to the National Planning Policy Framework which states "Substantial harm to or loss of a) grade 2 listed buildings or grade 2 registered parks or gardens should be exceptional" (Para NPPF 213)	PA	22-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Sayer MBE	Tim	The development is completely out of scale with the existing station.	PA	22-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Nicholas	Ronny	I object to this development with reference the National Planning Policy Framework - Paragraph NPPF 213: "Substantial harm to or loss of Grade II listed buildings or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." In particular, my objections relate to: 1. Risk of substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station because of the demolition of the concourse roof & its replacement with a new structure. 2. Installation of many retail units in the 19th century train sheds, including two elevated retail galleries. This will be detrimental to the visual aspects of special interest and significance in a Grade II-listed heritage asset. 3. Construction of the twenty-storey tower over the station concourse will create a harmful impact on the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets, in particular the Grade II*-listed hotel, the last continually functioning 19th century hotel in the City. 4. Substantial harm will be caused to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area by the construction of such a building in an area characterised by low-and medium-scale structures. This would be contrary to the 2015 City Plan which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as Conservation Areas & the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. 5. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches and nearby St Botolph's church.	PA	22-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Casselle	Joanne	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: * The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. * The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. * The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse.	PA	22-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Dickman	Janet	I object as this would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically I object to the substantial harm to the Grade 2 listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure which would also comprise the setting of the C19 train shed. The insertion of massive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds including the construction of 2 elevated retail galleries causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade 2 listed heritage assets. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular harm to the significance of the Grade 2* listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the city- through the construction of a 20 storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to Bishopgate Conservation Area by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- medium scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas such as the Conservation Areas and the St Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond such as many of the Grade 1 listed Christopher Wren City churches and nearby St Botolph's church. Paragraph NPPF213 states "substantial harm to or loss of ; a) grade 2 listed buildings or grade 2 registered parks or gardens should be exceptional"	PA	22-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Rand	Anthony	This will make it harder to travel in and around Liverpool Street station, it will also change the appearance to the area. And also feel it's a monstrosity to a beautiful old station	PA	22-Jun-25	R
25/00494/FULEIA	Barker	Rosie	I object to this application that show disregard for the structures and settings of Grade II listed buildings which is not in accordance with the National Planning Policy framework paragraph, NPPF 4213 More specifically I object to: -the insertion of new retail units in the 19th century train sheds and the demolition of the roof off the station which would cause harm to the site's special interest and significance. - the overshadowing of the Grade II listed hotel by the office block that is twice the hotel's height. - the impact on the conservation area by the imposition of a tall building where other buildings are otherwise low or medium scale f.a.o.Tom Sleight, Chair of the Planning & Transport Committee and quote Planning Application 25/00494/FULEIA.	PA	22-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Gray	Julia	Don't destroy the beautiful building that is Liverpool St station, no one needs more office space.	PA	22-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Cunningham	John	The proposed development is out of scale in relation to the station and hotel. It will overwhelm both historic structures and block out light from the station concourse. There is no real need for additional office accommodation in this location.	PA	22-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Gittins	Clare	"I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to a perfectly functioning station concourse being rebuilt. The destruction of a Grade 2 listed roof by a skyscraper being plonked on top of it is indefensible.	PA	22-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Finch	Linda	This an architecturally beautiful and significant building that should not be messed with! Is it not listed?? If not I'm surprised and it should be to protect it and its fantastic design and should be saved for future generations to see and admire. Save Liverpool Street station at all costs!!	PA	22-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Bringlow	Peter	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. Contrary to Paragraph 213 of the National Planning Policy Framework, this planning proposal would cause substantial harm to or loss of a grade II listed building	PA	22-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Taylor	Robert	I object to the historic building losing all natural light below an eyesore of an office block, destroying the aesthetic value of Victorian architecture.	PA	22-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Barber	Bernadette	Destruction of heritage building with such disregard	PA	22-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Leftwich	Darren	My objection is purely on the grounds of scale and loss of architectural heritage. At present Liverpool Street Station has external character from three sides, it is distinct and noticeable. The plans are totally out of scale and makes the streetside views of the station anonymous. It looks no different to any other glass fronted office block - not a train station with so much heritage. Within the station there seems to be a total loss of the Victorian feel - remember, this is the first point of entry into London for many overseas visitors and the plans are indistinguishable from most post-war station rebuilds across Europe - this is not London, this is not the UK. A train station is a train station, it is not an office block or commercial space. Cherish our heritage so that in decades to come Liverpool Street Station is not viewed as another "Euston mistake".	PA	22-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Clayton	Abi	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to the substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. I object to the insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. I object to the impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse and the substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. I reference the National Planning Policy Framework. Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional. Thank you	PA	22-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	gillan	justine	I really object to British Rail making any changes to the roof and subsequent loss of light at this beautiful railway station.. It would be an absolute travesty to destroy the heritage of this building.. Please don't give planning permission	PA	22-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Kirkman	Sarah	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to the following: - The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. Which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. - The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. - The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. - The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. Regarding the National Planning Policy Framework, specifically paragraph 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." I don't believe this is. I believe the destruction of these magnificent buildings would be a travesty, once gone they are lost forever. And what's the point of a listing if it can just be ignored.	PA	22-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Longhurst	Jennie	For the last 10 years I have traveled through here every day and the occasional weekend but so has my mum, dad and most of my family the area has evolved and the change in adding More hates has made it smother but the one thing I love about Liverpool St is the like the architecture and the openness and taking that away is only going to make the experience dark dingey and sadly like all the other stations sterile keep The history and the light	PA	22-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Roberts	Tim	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: *The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. *The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. *The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. *The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. Referencing the National Planning Policy Framework, paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." This does not seem to constitute an exceptional case.	PA	22-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Blaxland-Horne	Dimitri	This is not only a threat to a grade 2 listed property but will cause disruption as well as disregard to the low level buildings of the area . We need to look at preservation as opposed to constant destruction of our heritage.	PA	22-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Goldie	Charles	I object to this application, which would cause appreciable harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I object to the overriding of Paragraph 213 of the National Planning Policy Framework: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." No such exception is warranted for this scheme. I object to the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings, which would cause substantial harm to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, and which is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas. I further object to the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure, which would cause substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station. Lastly, I object to the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse, which would cause grievous harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel.	PA	22-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Ambrose	Michael	I object to this application which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. I am aware of the National Planning Policy Framework and Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional. I believe that this application goes against that. Specifically, I raise objections to: The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof of the concourse and replacing it with a new structure, which would also compromise the setting of the 19th century train shed. I know the building well as I worked in the City for many years and travelled to this station. Also my great grandparents lived in the area for decades. The insertion of many new retail units in the 19th century train sheds, including the construction of two raised retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. It is an historic building that deserves better. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets such as harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning 19th century hotel in the City! The construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse will do that. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area by having an overbearingly tall building in an area characterised by low-and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. Also, the scheme would impact the setting of numerous heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches and nearby St Botolph's church which I know so well from my family research.	PA	22-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Hackney	Roz	I object to this application which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objection to: The substantial harm that would be caused to the Bishopsgate Conservation area, introducing an enormously tall and incongruous structure effecting the overall low and medium-scale surrounding buildings. This would be contrary to the 2015 City Plan which requires refusal of planning permission for tall out of scale buildings in inappropriate areas, in particular Conservation areas and within the St Pauls Cathedral Heights area. Just one example would be the impact on the Grade 1 listed Sir Christopher Wren Churches and the nearby St Botolph's Church. These important beautiful aspects of our heritage are already fighting to be seen within the sky line and from ground level. In addition the proposed works required to facilitate the planned building would require substantial changes to be made to the Grade 11 existing buildings and structures. This includes the roof of the concourse compromising the 19th century train Shed, with additional harm enabling the construction of two levels of additional retail galleries. Further more I feel the towering twenty storey wall of glass above the station concourse would impact in a detrimental way to the significance of the Grade 11 listed 19th century functioning Hotel. The city embodies such a rich history marked out by its buildings green spaces and the Thames, what remains has to be protected. I consider it imperative that any further building that takes place is respectful of the existing structures and surroundings, and that the laws that are in place for good reasons are adhered to. Therefor consideration should be given to The National Planning Policy Framework Paragraph NPPF 213 which states "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade 11 listed buildings, or grade 11 registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional"	PA	22-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Griffin	Nigel	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: 1. The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. 2. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. 3. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. 4. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. This application is contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework. Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." There are no grounds to consider this application as exceptional, such as the building being unsafe.	PA	22-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Marshall	Peter	I object to this application which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to:- The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof of the concourse and its replacement with a new structure, which would also compromise the setting of the 19th century train shed. The National Planning Policy Framework, Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional."- The insertion of large amounts of new retail units in the 19th century train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset.- The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning 19th century hotel in the City - through the construction of a twenty-storey tower over the station concourse.The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low-and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches and nearby St Botolph's church.Therefore, I urge that the application be refused.	PA	22-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Macmillan	Callum	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. With reference to the National Planning Policy Framework. Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." This plan will an irreparably damage an beautiful historical structure, such that future generations of our population will not in anyway be able to appreciate what we have right now.	PA	22-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	WELDON	AMY	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the appearance, integrity, and significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: - The damage to the structural integrity and historic appearance of Liverpool St. Station; - The wasteful desire to add more shopping and office space to a city where, as a frequent visitor from the US and contributor to London's economy, I already observe quite a lot of vacancies post-pandemic; - The manner in which this project has been pursued without clear and accurate disclosure to the public of how it will actually look and be constructed (presentation of some models has been deceptive); and the manner in which reasonable objections to this project appear to have been ignored for some years. In short, the project's stated goals (better traffic flow and lifts for an historic station) can be accomplished without the deceptive, unnecessary cover of multistory new construction that no one except developers seems to want. Thank you for your consideration.	PA	22-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Mulcare	Zoe	I object to a hugely disproportionate high building that will dwarf this grade 2 listed Victorian building in a rare area of low and middle range buildings. The church of St Botolphs, the small park, rare oasis in the city, will be ruined by the loss of sky. The view from our flat on Wormwood St will lose almost all its remaining sky, already we have sheets of glass and chrome on the other side looking south. Awful to have massive structures either side. Contravenes 2015 City Plan regarding out of proportion development. Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional."	PA	22-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Whitehouse	Mr	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance or nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to:"The Victorian Society DONATE NOW MENU About Us News Events Support Us Shop Recorded Talks Advice Endangered Buildings Regional Groups Contact How to object to the harmful plans to partially demolish and inappropriately redevelop Liverpool Street Station Follow us: Twitter Bluesky Threads Acme's plan shows the bulk of the proposal. The Great Eastern Hotel is dwarfed by the tower and overstation development. Plan: Network Rail and Acme. We have prepared this guide to help anyone who wishes to write an objection to the plans to partially demolish and inappropriately redevelop Liverpool Street Station How do I object to Network Rail and Acme's plans for Liverpool Street Station? You must object in writing; either online or by letter. You must say in the opening line of your objection that "I Object....", and if submitting your objection online on the planning portal you must also click the right button that indicates you 'Object.' Where do I find the planning application for Liverpool Street station? Direct link to planning application and to object Or search for planning application reference number: 25/00494/FULEIA	PA	22-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Langdon	Christopher	I object on three grounds: 1) The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area by the imposition of such a tall and out-of-scale building. 2) This proposal is contrary to the 2015 City Plan which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, e.g. Conservation Areas & St. Paul's Cathedral Heights Area. 3)The scheme, if approved, would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City including numerous Christopher Wren designed churches and nearby St Botolph's. 4) The National Planning Policy Framework, Paragraph NPPF 213 clearly states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." This cannot be seen as an exceptional case.	PA	23-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Hall	Ant	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. I reference the National Planning Policy Framework below: Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional."	PA	23-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Drew	Gary	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: The destruction of parts of the current Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of a Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the beautiful Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. Paragraph 213 of the National Planning Policy Framework "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional."	PA	23-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Bunce	Jamie	I object to the destruction of a culturally significant monument.	PA	23-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Wallis	Emma	I write to object to Network Rail and Acme's plans to partially demolish and inappropriately redevelop Liverpool Street Station which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. Upon making this objection, I specifically reference Paragraph NPPF 213 of the National Planning Policy Framework which states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional."	PA	23-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Norman	Nils	I object to this application which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to its height, the shadows it will create and its complete disregard for other architecture in this historical area.	PA	23-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Horton	David	I am not opposed to the principle of upgrading the station's facilities, but strongly oppose Network Rail's latest scheme which appears to be much more about maximising profit than improvements to the passenger experience. Specifically, I object to: * The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving 19th century train shed. * The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the 19th century train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. * The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning 19th century hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. * The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. * Finally, the scheme is contrary to paragraph 213 of the National Planning Policy Framework, which states that "Substantial harm to or loss of grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional". The applicants have not shown why their proposal merits any such exception.	PA	23-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Kidsley	Alex	I strongly object to any changes to this station it should be prepared admired for future generations to see what beautiful architecture is	PA	23-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Hawkins	Clare	The station as is at Liverpool Street is a fundamental part of the area architectural history being grade 2 listed. I can trace my family back three hundred years at least in this area and our historical sites are slowly disappearing under rolling tide of shops and offices which duplicate and repeat suffocating the unique and irreplaceable sites. The damage to the structure and the last C19 hotel would be a travesty and absolutely unnecessary as any access changes can be made without fundamental damage to the site.	PA	23-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Taylor	John	Make it easier to get around	PA	23-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Hinds	Paula	To make it easier, for disabled people, parents with prams and tourists with luggage to get safely around	PA	23-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Hines	P	Liverpool Street station needs better accessibility access for those people who are unable to use stairs	PA	23-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	O'Malley	Will	I struggle with transport in London due to my difficulty with heights/open spaces which means I can't use escalators and rely on lifts. I've also seen how busy hubs with only 1 lift (including brand new Elizabeth line stations) leave disabled people, people with pushchairs and tourists with luggage waiting half an hour or more to exit stations. Stations especially busy hubs like Liverpool St. desperately need greater lift availability	PA	23-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Jones	Adam	The station suffers from overcrowding and is in need of modernisation.	PA	23-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Sen-Gupta	Juliet	The toilets including single-sex toilets for women. only need to select Liverpool Street as a national action with an international standard.	PA	23-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Taylor	Christopher	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. Making reference to: National Planning Policy Framework Paragraph NPPF 213 which states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." Yours sincerely Christopher Taylor	PA	23-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Langworthy	Ben	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. As stated in The National Planning Policy Framework Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional."	PA	23-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Fitzlyon	Penny	More loos please. Otherwise im likely to have the embarresment of wetting myself	PA	23-Jun-25	S

25/00494/FULEIA	Charlton	Kate	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: - The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. - The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. - The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. - The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. Paragraph NPPF 213 of the National Planning Policy Framework states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." The damage caused by this proposal does not justify harm to listed buildings and should be reject it in its entirety.	PA	23-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Gray	Anna	I object to this horrendous application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. There is nothing wrong with this station concourse and building as they stand currently. It requires National Rail and Acme to do their job and manage it. Liverpool Street is a fabulous station and a joy to visit. The National Planning Policy Framework, paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." Far from being exceptional, the proposal will cause: - substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. - new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. - Negative impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. - Substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's. Please don't let this happen.	PA	23-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Plummer-Braeckman	Judith	I object to this proposal on the grounds that it will cause damage to a heritage asset and also increase traffic in an already congested area.	PA	23-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Zeeman	Nicolette	Tom Sleigh, Chair of the Planning & Transport Committee and quote Planning Application 25/00494/FULEIA Dear Tom Sleigh, I object to this application which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. I am writing under the rubric of the National Planning Policy Framework. I object to the Liverpool Street Station redevelopment scheme currently proposed. The station complex includes Grade II-listed buildings of great interest and character. Just like the formerly proposed destruction of St Pancras, this is a pretty monstrous scheme that may look desirable now, but will be regretted in the future. It will cause substantial harm to a number of Grade II-listed buildings. The construction of a twenty-storey tower over the station concourse is a really brutal proposal and will have a dreadful impact on the whole surrounding area. It will involve the demolition of the grand old roof of the concourse. It will have a major impact on the character and appearance of the Grade II-listed hotel. It will cause substantial harm to the whole Bishopsgate Conservation Area by imposing a very tall building in an area characterised by more medium-scale buildings. This runs against the 2015 City Plan which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas. It will also be visible from a distance and will have an impact on the setting on many other heritage assets in the neighbouring and not-so-neighbouring areas of the (sometimes) beautiful City of London.	PA	23-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Launert	F	Development as proposed would harm the integrity and appearance of the original structure and have a negative impact on the surrounding neighbourhood.	PA	23-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Faulkner	Suzanne	I regularly use the station when I travel in from Norwich and used to live just round the corner on Wentworth Street. It is a lovely station - light, airy, easy to navigate and well designed. Some of the suggestions in the proposals sound good, like using some of the hotel spaces for the station. But overall it seems very wasteful and lacking in historical deference. Do not destroy the beautiful 1980s improvements. We know from the past that we should preserve architecture from different eras - not just what is considered old and fashionable. And do not dwarf the gorgeous hotel with an unfitting tower block. Allow the hotel to shine. The proposals risk turning a beautiful station into a monstrosity. You've just spent ages, and lots of money, fixing the mistakes made to Kings Cross in the 1960s. Don't make a mistake to Liverpool Street that will have to be put right in the future.	PA	23-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Elliott	Neil	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets.	PA	23-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Weinberg	Sarah		DC	23-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Bellamy	Vivienne		DC	23-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	White	Peter	I object to the proposed overdevelopment. Our industrial and victorian heritage should be protected. This site should be listed and protected from any future development.	PA	23-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Lyng	Georgie		DC	23-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Poland	Kate	I object to this application which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. I have used the station for more than four decades and have never experienced any problems with overcrowding or access; the shops that there are are always empty so why create space for more? I also have environmental concerns about carbon emissions and creating heat through construction. But I also raise objections to the damage that will be caused to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof of the concourse and its replacement with a new structure. This would also compromise the setting of the 19th century train shed. The insertion of large amounts of new (unnecessary) retail units in the 19th century train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, will cause a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The shops that are already there are not used much. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low-and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches and nearby St Botolph's church. It also contravenes the National Planning Policy Framework: Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." Also, there is little need for more office space when much of what already exists is unused.	PA	23-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	MacIntyre	Ken	I object to this application, which would by any reasonable standard cause substantial harm to the significance or nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to the substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station: The demolition of the roof structure concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units would cause a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The construction of a 20-storey tower over the station would cause substantial harm to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. Paragraph 213 of the National Planning Policy Framework states: "Any harm to, or loss of, the significance of a designated heritage asset (from its alteration or destruction, or from development within its setting), should require clear and convincing justification. Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." The application should be rejected. Regards Ken MacIntyre	PA	23-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Cater	Ben	I Object to the plans - I complained about the previous proposals and hadn't realised that those complaints had been scrapped and that I needed to object again. I object for the same reasons - briefly, the scale of the new development against a grade 2* listed building, and also that London doesn't need these gargantuan developments any more. Thanks to Brexit, existing commercial property owners in London have trouble renting out existing space. Anyway, this scheme is hugely out of proportion to the surroundings and local needs	PA	23-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Mayou	Richard	I object most strongly to these proposals which would do irreparable harm to buildings of high historic and architectural importance. The proposed loss of historic structures and the erection of overbearing new building would mean the loss of an outstanding public amenity. The proposals do not conform with the National Planning guidance, I strongly object to these proposals: - Destruction of important, historic and attractive station buildings - The site and size of the tower block - The cost and disturbance when it has been shown that a much better alternative is possible	PA	23-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Wilson	Gillian	I object to the proposed changes to Liverpool Street Station as this would have a negative impact on preserving the importance and significance of the architectural heritage of the area. This would destroy and spoil a fine Victorian building. The proposals seem to be at variance with recommendations from Historic England in preserving old buildings. Both aesthetically and from a heritage and conservation point of view, the plans/drawings and proposals would be detrimental to the historic integrity of the station building. Not only this, the station building plays a prominent and crucial role in defining the local architecture / architectural neighbourhood in this part of London. This seems to be happening with numerous buildings in the East End of London whereby horrendous 'compromises' between old and new are spoiling our heritage. Once lost it can never be replaced. This is so backward looking and reminiscent of 1970s outdated approaches. I really strongly object to this. I object to the proposed plans to develop Liverpool Street Station. This is a unique and beautiful Victorian building which will be spoiled forever if the proposals go ahead. Maintaining the historic architectural integrity of buildings in the East End of London is crucial in maintaining the character of the area. It is backward looking to destroy historic, fine architectural details - these need to be preserved. These proposals are against the approach of Historic England which is to preserve where possible. So many fine buildings have been lost in the East End. Or - they are demolished with just their front elevation standing. This is backward looking and reminiscent of 1970s planning / building monstrosities. Please leave this beautiful station building alone. I regularly travel through this station and every aspect of it works perfectly well as it is.	PA	23-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Hyde	Fiona	As an heritage professional, I must object to the wanton destruction of our historical architecture and the complete disregard for our industrial history. This plan is using complaints against Network Rail as an argument for changing a space that is patently fit to do the job it currently does and there is no need to change it in such a drastic and unnecessary manner. Save our Victorian heritage, please.	PA	23-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Harrold	Samantha	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure-which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." For all of these reasons I object.	PA	23-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Buckthorpe-Cooper	Richard	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets, which should be protected under the National Planning Policy Framework. Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional.". More specifically, I raise objections to: The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. he insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church.	PA	23-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Porteous	Rebecca	I object to Planning Application 25/00494/FULEIA which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to demolition of the roof of the concourse and its replacement with a new structure, which would also compromise the setting of the 19th century train shed. I also object to the impact of proposals on the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets, including to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning 19th century hotel in the City - through the construction of a twenty-storey tower over the station concourse. The scheme would cause substantial harm to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low-and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches and nearby St Botolph's church. I object! Thank you.	PA	23-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Wilson	Gillian	I object to the proposed changes to Liverpool Street Station as this would have a negative impact on preserving the importance and significance of the architectural heritage of the area. This would destroy and spoil a fine Victorian building. The proposals seem to be at variance with recommendations from Historic England in preserving old buildings. Both aesthetically and from a heritage and conservation point of view, the plans/drawings and proposals would be detrimental to the historic integrity of the station building. Not only this, the station building plays a prominent and crucial role in defining the local architecture / architectural neighbourhood in this part of London. This seems to be happening with numerous buildings in the East End of London whereby horrendous 'compromises' between old and new are spoiling our heritage. Once lost it can never be replaced. This is so backward looking and reminiscent of 1970s outdated approaches. I really strongly object to this. I object to the proposed plans to develop Liverpool Street Station. This is a unique and beautiful Victorian building which will be spoiled forever if the proposals go ahead. Maintaining the historic architectural integrity of buildings in the East End of London is crucial in maintaining the character of the area. It is backward looking to destroy historic, fine architectural details - these need to be preserved. These proposals are against the approach of Historic England which is to preserve where possible. So many fine buildings have been lost in the East End. Or - they are demolished with just their front elevation standing. This is backward looking and reminiscent of 1970s planning / building monstrosities. Please leave this beautiful station building alone. I regularly travel through this station and every aspect of it works perfectly well as it is.	PA	23-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	ELMANSOURI	ABDELAZIZ	I object to this unnecessary redevelopment conducted by greed.	PA	23-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Gadenz	Molly	I object to this application. It would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. National Planning Policy Framework, paragraph 213 states: 'Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional.' The Grade II-listed Liverpool Street station is guaranteed to be compromised if this proposal is allowed to proceed. The demolition of the roof of the concourse and its replacement with a new structure, and the insertion of large amounts of new retail units in the 19th century train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, will cause a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The scheme would also cause substantial harm to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area by the imposition of a 20-storey tall office block in an area characterised by low-and medium-scale buildings. Quite simply, the proposed structure is not at all appropriate for this setting and would completely overpower the area. The 2015 City Plan requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches and nearby St Botolph's church. I was a resident of east London from 2011 - 2022. London's storied history and heritage is a treasure. I fear it is being chipped away with the sweep of wholly unsuitable developments such as this one. I ask that you please reject this proposal.	PA	23-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Kozakevych	Anastasiia	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets.	PA	23-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Sanford	Kaylee		DC	23-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Cooper	Alan	I am objecting with reference to the National Policy Planning Framework, Paragraph NPPF 213 which states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." I have used Liverpool St station since the 1950s and until today, when I continue to enjoy passing through such a fine, airy, light example of Victorian transport architecture. I am horrified by the new proposal to effectively submerge this building beneath a 20 story juggernaut of no outstanding merit. The scheme would cause substantial harm to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low-and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches and nearby St Botolph's church.	PA	23-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Brooker	Sarah	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to the vandalism to our heritage for the price of greed. We have already lost a substantial amount of our National Heritage assets to poor substandard and frankly ugly buildings which won't last 5 minutes. If this was in another country they would preserve it. I can't even believe people are even contemplating this!	PA	23-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Powell	Kenneth	I object to the mutilation and partial destruction of Liverpool St station. It deserves a careful update not this crass proposal.	PA	23-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Browne	Tim	The development of the station is ghastly. Liverpool Street station will totally change from the bustling open space, to just another city street with an imposing tower. The current issue with the entrances will remain as no new entrance or exit is being created. A good development would be opening up the frontage of the station for easier pedestrian flow, as was previously planned with the hotel's help.	PA	23-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Oakes	F	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections as follows; Firstly under the National Planning Policy Framework Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." Secondly the substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure, Thirdly the impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. Finally the substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area	PA	23-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Cole	Louisa	I object because the station serves its purpose adequately as it is & it is an architectural monument that should be preserved.	PA	23-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Hill	Timothy	No regard has been taken to protect the original features of the original building. The proposed new building is deleterious to this is excessive and unnecessary having commercial interests as the main objective and none to its heritage	PA	23-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Jenkins	Annabel	How terribly sad that this new building is even being considered. It is impossible to come up with any decent comment about this structure: Out of character Unattractive Too large Completely inappropriate The suggestion should have been thrown out.....	PA	23-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Nutton	Elaine	The size dwarfs a historic station leaving no daylight. It is far too high. This site has potential for a stunning addition, which this design isn't.	PA	23-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA Page 181	Finatti	Cecilia	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: - the damage to a heritage building and the historic Bishopsgate neighbourhood - the natural light which would be taken away from commuters, i.e. the public whose welfare should be put first - the poor choice of investment here since there are train stations in much worse repair and which are far more crowded, and beyond that we need better rolling stock and train infrastructure far more than we need flashier shops in train stations Railways were one of the very best things to ever come out of this country. We should honour that through innovation which can give people faster and more reliable trains (such as signals that don't constantly fail, more comfortable trains, well planned timetables that allow people to connect well to local buses etc) and we should not destroy the history and beauty of Grade II listed buildings that were witness to this history. Innovation is good but not at the expense of beauty that's there for all to enjoy, such as gorgeous 19th century architecture. I strongly object to the current proposal. Please spend the money to make the trains run on time. This is not a station in need of the extent of change proposed. It needs maintenance, not destruction. Please don't take another step towards dismantling the London we all love.	PA	23-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Male	Alison	The building will overshadow every building around it, including the beautiful Great Eastern hotel. It will block light from the station concourse and Exchange Square, which is an area appreciated by many city workers. It is an ugly design, not at all in keeping with its surroundings.	PA	23-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	hamilton	julia	Too huge, too imposing. Changing the skyline. Too many new office workers, not enough facilities. Overcrowding. Lack of light	PA	23-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Barlow	Liane	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. Make sure to reference the National Planning Policy Framework in your objection, otherwise your objection may be dismissed: Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional."	PA	23-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Demierre	Darian	It's an absolutely hideous proposal that is counter intuitive to the very history and charm that draws in millions of pounds worth of capital from the tourism industry each year. What makes cities like London and Paris so appealing is the preservation of its history and culture.	PA	23-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Stevens	Helen Gail	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: the destruction of this beautiful and well loved landmark through which I have travelled since a child. The character of Liverpool Street Station will cease to exist if this ugly and unnecessary office block is plonked on top of it with accompanying loss of light, character and heritage, not to mention the disruption to people's travel plans and their happy experience of travel through the station. There are empty office blocks all over the city; why do we 'need' more? This is a cynical money making scheme which no member of the public wants to be built. Please refuse this application. "I object to this application which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections for the following reasons: 1) this proposed development will cause substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof of the concourse and its replacement with a new structure, which would also compromise the setting of the 19th century train shed. 2) The insertion of large amounts of new retail units in the 19th century train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. 3) this building is a significant landmark beloved by travellers from far and wide. The proposed development will reduce this heritage building to a dark and poky area overshadowed by this monstrously ugly and unwanted office block, 4). There are already buildings full of empty offices in this area and throughout the City. There is no demand for more office space as so many people now work from home. 5) The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area by the imposition of a tall building in an area	PA	23-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	McGrady	Miriam	NIMBY ! Can You Not !	PA	23-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Bartos	Jessica	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to:	PA	23-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Kidd	Gill	It's about time the 'money men' took a look at what they are destroying, please appreciate our heritage you may not come from this area but generations of my family did and we are not that far away now and I have used Liverpool Street daily during my working life/and in retirement as do my children now. Please Liverpool Street is beautiful as it is, doesn't need your type of improvement.	PA	23-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Grifo	Alisa	The proposed development is simply too large for the location. It does nothing to support the existing buildings in the area.	PA	23-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Matthews	Anne-Maree	I object to the plans to change this beautiful historic building.	PA	23-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Cook	Stephen	The building will be an eyesore and ruin the historic architecture of the area.	PA	24-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Burgess	Rachel	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. These plans contradict the National Planning Policy Framework. Paragraph 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional."	PA	24-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Mattinson	Jemma	To: Tom Sleight; Chair of the Planning & Transport Committee I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of a nationally important heritage asset. The proposed development contradicts paragraph NPPF 213 of the National Planning Policy Framework which states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." I specifically object to: - The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure - The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset - The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse - The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church.	PA	24-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Kitchlew	Rachel	Liverpool Street Station should be preserved as an iconic part of London's architectural and cultural heritage. The push to redevelop it isn't about genuine structural concerns-it's driven by private building contracts, commercial gain, and a planning system riddled with opaque deals and potential corruption. Blaming the station's condition is a convenient narrative used to justify a lucrative rebuild, when in reality, it is poor management and neglect that have led to complaints. With proper care and public-focused oversight, the station can continue to serve the city without erasing its history.	PA	24-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Cole	D V	"I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. Why disrespect and disrupt the station that works perfectly well as it is. More office space is unnecessary and redundant.	PA	24-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Lightfoot	Amber	It will wreck the station and 8 years of disruption.	PA	24-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Healey	Louise	I wish to register my objections to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework. Paragraph 213 of the NPPF states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." Specifically, I raise objections to: The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II* listed hotel through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings.	PA	24-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Terry	Hugh	A chance to change East London for the better!	PA	24-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Brooks	Peter	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. This is just a money making scheme which will destroy a grade 2 building just to add more office space to City of London. There's nothing wrong with the station functioning as transport hub. I strongly suggest you to reject this application.	PA	24-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Sandes	Caroline		DC	24-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Thrussell	Liz	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: Please refer to the National Planning Policy Framework. Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." - The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. - The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. - The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. - The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church.	PA	24-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Holland	James		DC	24-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Calvert	Kate		DC	24-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Pearson	Rosalind		DC	24-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Griffiths	Catherine		DC	24-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Collins	Lydia M C		DC	24-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Campbell	L		DC	24-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Bolt	Christophe		DC	24-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Yeatman	Michelle	Keep the Victorian history by not destroying the Liverpool Street Station roof and concourse!	PA	24-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Dun	Jamie	I object to this proposal in its entirety. Particularly the demolition of the c19 grade II listed hotel within the station. My husband and I took our first holiday together in London and based ourselves in that hotel. We watched the station buzzing below us from our window. It was my first time in London and we visit the station whenever we are in town. To build over the top of the concourse would remove the beauty and romance of this historic building. It would destroy something beautiful in the name of profit and greed. Why on earth would you want to destroy something so beautiful? Make it better but don't put a high rise on top of an historic building. It sets a precedent and removes the enjoyment and appreciation of an historic era of architecture in a part of the city with no other high rises in it. Please rethink this - preserve the existing structure for the enjoyment of future generations of visitors to London. Thank you.	PA	24-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Forshaw	Alec		DC	24-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Hook	Genine		DC	24-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Macbay	Sara	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." Given that this proposal does not meet NPPF criteria, the planning application should be rejected.	PA	24-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	White	Gill		DC	24-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Berry	John	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. I would draw your attention to Paragraph NPPF 213 of the National Planning Policy Framework which states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional."	PA	24-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Humby	Martin		DC	24-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Baldwin	Renuka	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." Given this proposal does not meet NPPF criteria, the planning application should be rejected.	PA	24-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Fujisaki	Ayaka	I am writing to express my firm objection to the revised redevelopment proposals for Liverpool Street Station. The proposal to construct a twenty-storey office block on top of the station is an act of extraordinary insensitivity and short-sightedness. The structure would tower over the Grade II*-listed Great Eastern Hotel, obliterating its presence and casting both the hotel and the station concourse into shadow. This is not respectful development - it is civic vandalism dressed in corporate gloss. The developers' tokenistic nods to 'green terraces' are insulting. No amount of rooftop foliage will conceal the bulk or mitigate the visual and environmental damage of this enormous intrusion. The building's scale is completely at odds with its historic surroundings and will have a devastating impact on the station's character, light, and function. Moreover, the fact that previous objections have been summarily disregarded with the release of this 'new' version is unacceptable. Slight cosmetic tweaks do not constitute meaningful revision. The community spoke - and it has been ignored. The arrogance of this approach cannot go unchallenged. Liverpool Street Station is not a blank slate for commercial exploitation. It is a vital piece of London's architectural, historical, and civic fabric. To allow this redevelopment to proceed would be to sacrifice one of the capital's key landmarks to unchecked overdevelopment, setting a dangerous precedent for other heritage sites. I urge you in the strongest possible terms to reject this scheme. We cannot afford to lose such significant places under the weight of commercial gain disguised as 'improvement'.	PA	24-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Willey	Christopher		DC	24-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Medlam	Sarah		DC	24-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Coben	Diana		DC	24-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	King	Trevor	"I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to the destruction of existing roof and other historical buildings This development is simply a profit centred effort with no thoughts for the end user	PA	24-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Langton	Rachel		DC	24-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Smart	Julian	I personally object to the network rail plans on redeveloping of Liverpool Street station as it will destroy the original Victorian architecture in a similar way to what British Rail did to Cannon Street station and Fenchurch street stations. This is the 200 year of the creation of railways and we need to preserve this. Could you see St Pancras station being partly demolished for a new modern high rise office block? This was preserved by the HS 1 company but also through Benjamin Britten's campaigns. We need to preserve our railway history and not partly destroy it for high rise offices, consider demolishing the Bank of England or the Royal exchange? Neither would be acceptable. Likewise the Network Rail plans are not acceptable.	PA	24-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	MacDonald-Haig	Caroline	I object to this new proposal for Liverpool Street Station. It completely dwarfs the majestic Victorian ~Station, one of the finest in London. We need to hang on to our rich and inspirational heritage of which Liverpool Street Station is such a brilliant and dizzily imaginative example. The vision and optimism and originality of this building reminds us of the great possibilities inherent in our Victorian infrastructure. The proposed new development behind is wholly characterless and surely surely development can be devised which does not leach out so much of the original building.	PA	24-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Barnett	Anthony		DC	24-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Price	Melissa	This needs to be preserved!	PA	24-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Poldervaart	Helena		DC	24-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Grocutt	Matthew		DC	24-Jun-25	
25/00494/FULEIA	Elks	Laurence		DC	24-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Truin	Laura		DC	24-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Truin	Bill		DC	24-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Smith	Jeanne		DC	24-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Hilliard	Elizabeth		DC	24-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Horton	Venetia		DC	24-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Golding	Anne		DC	24-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Terry	Miranda		DC	24-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Smith	Robert		DC	24-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Startup	Henrietta		DC	24-Jun-25	O
Page 190						
25/00494/FULEIA	Young	Alexander	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: - The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed Liverpool Street station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. - The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. - The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. In substance the proposed development will cause substantial harm to grade II listed buildings and their setting. There is clearly no exceptional need for this development (I use the station often and it is fit for purpose) and we risk greatly compromising a jewel in the city for yet another faceless nameless office block.	PA	24-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Cox	Angela	Because this will help ,other passengers ,who are not able to walk or carry I object to the following planning application no.: 25/00494/FULEIA.	PA	24-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Pertwee	C	I believe there is no further requirement for retail and office in this part of London. Not to mention the harm it do to a Grade II* listed hotel. In reference to National Planning Policy Framework: Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." as part of my objection. regards C Pertwee Dear Mr Siegn,	PA	24-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Knight	Susan	I wish to object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: 1. The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed; 2. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset; 3. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse; 4. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. Referencing The National Planning Policy Framework where Paragraph NPPF 213 states: Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional. Thank you for registering my objection.	PA	24-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Edge	Jack	I object to this application and its destructive mistreatment of the City's heritage and historic architecture. Disabled access and functioning facilities are important, but should not come at the expense of beautiful, historic and listed architecture. Proposals for a 20-storey tower are unnecessary expenses when the focus should be on redeveloping the station in a way that looks after the area's heritage. Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional."	PA	24-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Pearson	Will	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to the partial demolition of a grade II listed building in the heart of our historic capital, and the construction of a monolith tower in the middle of a historically low rise area of our great city. Paragraph NPPF 213 of the National Planning Policy Framework states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." It is clear to anyone and everyone reading this that the proposal would be a clear violation of this framework, not to mention the height of the proposed monstrosity being in direct contradiction to the 2015 City Plan, which forbids tall buildings in conservation areas (including the Bishopsgate Conservation area) and in the vicinity of Saint Paul's Cathedral. The wanton destruction of our heritage sets us uniquely apart from our European neighbours, as we allow greed and short-termism to undermine what millions here hold dearly. The mistakes of the post war reconstruction era are set to be repeated if we allow continued destruction of our nation's beauty, in order to appease developers who laugh our history off as theirs to destroy for profit. The risk this proposal presents to the integrity of Britain's last continually operating C19 hotel, and the imposition of yet more retail units in a heritage asset is a tragedy, and gives encouragement to others wishing to profit whilst the people of Britain lose yet more of their shared heritage.	PA	24-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	MacMillan	Julia	I object to this application. This scheme has no merit and would cause substantial harm to a nationally important heritage asset. In particular I objections to: - The demolition of the glorious roof structure. This will cause substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station and would also compromise the setting of the surviving train shed. - Far too many new retail units being inserted at the expense of a Grade II listed heritage asset. This is a train station and not a retail destination. I specifically object to the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the heritage asset. - Overwhelming the Hotel. This is a gross overdevelopment and will dominate the street and skyline above and around the station. It will detract from the beauty and the setting of all the surrounding buildings and in particular harm the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel. - A tall building out of place in a Conservation area. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas. - Contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework. I raise this objection in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework. Paragraph 213 states: 213. Any harm to, or loss of, the significance of a designated heritage asset (from its alteration or destruction, or from development within its setting), should require clear and convincing justification. Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional; b) assets of the highest significance, notably scheduled monuments, protected wreck sites, registered battlefields, grade I and II* listed buildings, grade I and II* registered parks and garden	PA	24-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Millington	Paul	This development will substantially harm the character of the building and the surrounding environment.	PA	24-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Clews	Catryn	I object to this development, the concourse and restoration is functional and beautifully preserved. Any development would ruin it for generations to come.	PA	24-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Sully	Gregory	The plan not only breaks the sight lines of this majestic station but hides several iconic structures including the largest arched bridge building straddling the train-line that is visible from the station and a lovely sight when I visit and travel through the station	PA	24-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Ferron	Douglas	I feel it's not needed and is currently a great monument and restoration which I would be very sad to see disappear.	PA	24-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Rogers	Jeremy	This building is a substantial part of London's heritage and should be left as is. I strongly object to the plans which provide nothing more than an unattractive device to make money through rents, whilst damaging the visual environment.	PA	24-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Milne	Catriona	Liverpool Street station is a beautiful, well restored building that should be preserved as it is.	PA	24-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Searle	Adrian	"I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to:" Not needing any further office space in London	PA	24-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Ring	Carmel	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. I make reference to the National Planning Policy Framework - Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." "I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through t	PA	24-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Ring	Carmel	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. I make reference to the National Planning Policy Framework - Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." "I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through t	PA	24-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Carlinsmith	Evan	London does not need another hideous block of offices stop destroying historic architecture and heritage under the lie of progress.	PA	24-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Taylor	Kim	Oh look another glass and concrete office/retail monstrosity. Because that's what London definitely needs more of. That's what tourists queue up to see, take photos of, go home with memories of, not the beautiful historic buildings, sod them! Who wants to see Listed buildings with incredible architecture, fascinating history, and uniqueness, when you can see yet more 'Lego' glass and concrete, and shop in more Costas, Greggs, and whatever mini-supermarket branch gets the franchise? We have enough concrete and glass, and no it doesn't look sleek, modern and stylish, it looks faceless, featureless and boring. You can't even open any of those acres of windows. Everyone is sealed in to either freeze or bake with 'climate controlled' environments which don't work properly and are environmentally damaging. The National Planning Framework clearly states, "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional. (Paragraph NPPF 213). More offices is not an exceptional enough reason. Neither is more coffee shops. The 2015 City Plan requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as Conservation Areas, (such as The Bishopsgate Conservation Area), and the St Paul's Cathedral Heights area. On top of that there are all the other amazing heritage buildings in the City that will be impacted. The grade I listed Christopher Wren City churches, St Botolph's church, and so many more, listed and unlisted.	PA	24-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Payne	Helen	I object to this planned development. This latest scheme would cause substantial harm to the historic station and its setting, and to the surrounding Conservation Area. Upgrading the operational capacity of the station should not come at such a heavy cost to the nation's historic and architectural integrity.	PA	24-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Layzell-Smith	Ian	I object to the proposed development which, unlike the sympathetic development of the 1980's, is totally out of keeping with the significant heritage assets at Liverpool Street station and will cause significant harm to them. The massing of the proposed development is entirely inappropriate within the streetscape and will completely overwhelm the existing heritage structures. The current concourse is airy and spacious being full of natural light whereas the proposed development will result in the complete loss of that character. Furthermore, so far from enhancing and enabling better appreciation of the attractive Victorian train shed it will result in a jarring disconnect with it. Although Network Rail state that no heritage assets will be demolished by the carrying out of the development, the harm which will be caused to them is tantamount to their destruction and I find it hard to believe that it would be permitted in any other European capital, particularly given that Liverpool Street station is the one of the first points of contact to London, for visitors arriving by train from Stansted. Also, as someone who has traveled to and from Liverpool Street station almost every weekday for the past 30 years, I can say that the justifications put forward by Network Rail for the proposed development are entirely specious. I have rarely if ever known the concourse to be overcrowded and the difficulties occasionally experienced in getting on and off the platforms have already been addressed by the recent increase in the number of ticket gates. There is absolutely no need for this damaging development to go ahead therefore and the other claimed benefits in terms of improved access can easily be achieved without it.	PA	24-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Berridge	Simon	dear developer, please go and do something in dubai or somewhere. thanks	PA	25-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Hokianga	Dean	"I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to Management using complaints about their obvious inadequate management to support, falsely, their plan to demolish the beautiful structure that is filled with wonderful sunlight & positive air supply. Also the seemingly insane need for Councils & the like to destroy whatever historical beauty there is by plonking yet another P.O.S tower block on top of it an area, just to make more money to pay for their own personal renovations & god-awful extensions. There must be a plethora of back-scratching & back-handers going on within Local & National Govt to keep messing around with structures in the UK, just to keep money moving at so many very pointless schemes & to justify many peoples positions within. Tell you what - there's a swath of land out by New Addington right by an airport at Biggin Hill - how about your new fancypants scheme goes out there eh ?? At least you won't wreck an important historical & architectural landmark just for the sake of some precious egos.	PA	25-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Brady	Rick	This development will be to the detriment of this important icon of the Victorian era. This insensitive development needs to be reconsidered as this listed building needs preserving in it's entirety for future generations.	PA	25-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Jones	Stephanie	I travel to London a lot and lived there for 16 years. Each time I return, a little more of London's Victorian past has been destroyed. Canary Wharf now looks like a Soviet housing estate. High rises dwarfing and diminishing the beauty and landscape. Liverpool St Station is an original highlight, a truly beautiful historical building. Why destroy it ? You will destroy something beautiful for profit. This cannot be allowed to happen. It would never be acceptable in Paris or Prague. Don't make London ugly. Keep London Victorian heritage. No new building will compare and it's why people visit London. This isn't our heritage to destroy. I implore you to stop and think of the history lost. Forever.	PA	25-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Hamps	Rosemary	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." and these plans do not meet the framework policy. It would cause substantial damage to the grade II listed station - most notably due to the demolition of the roof. The imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings would be contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as the Bishopsgate Conservation Area and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area.	PA	25-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Bailey	Simon	Please leave this beautiful building alone. The design of the station's roof is so beautiful and light. We can't lose this beautiful piece of architecture. Especially just for profit and greed. There are so many unused office buildings in London that are not being used, do we really need another one.	PA	25-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Smith	Jennifer	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure, which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The National Planning Policy Framework Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." More retail or office space in a modern world where shopping is done online and the high street is declining, and when most people work from home, is not exceptional. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church.	PA	25-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Dedden	Bob	It's a legacy building of the city. Leave it alone.	PA	25-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Crawford	Sharon	This is a beautiful Victorian station, the development is for commercial reasons only and will not benefit the station.	PA	25-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Willis	Matthew	I am a commuter and I think this is just Network Rail's plan to over-develop the station and is just mismanagement	PA	25-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Penfold	E	Historical buildings not a millions of pounds profit for the top dogs but are history before profit this building works it does not need knocking down for a cheap crap modern replacement that won't last 20 years	PA	25-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Falls	Julie	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional."	PA	25-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Brown	Lisa	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional. We have more than enough high rise office blocks and an excess of retail units left empty throughout London's dwindling local high streets. This development is unnecessary and does not help the local community at all. I work in London and have done so for 30 years. Seeing the unique beautiful architecture of London destroyed for financial gain of a small number of parties does not help the communities it destroys. I oppose to the ripping up of our heritage for no good reason and the destruction of what makes London so unique. Please object to this plan	PA	25-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Collins	Theresa	I strongly object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. The proposed scheme is inappropriate and amounts to over development of the site. More specifically, I raise objections as follows; Firstly under the National Planning Policy Framework Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." Secondly the substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure, Thirdly the impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. Finally the substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area. Furthermore how dare you entertain such a proposal. It shows a flagrant disregard for our heritage.	PA	25-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Crompton-Taylor	Jane	Dear Sirs I object to the proposal 25/00494/FULEIA on the grounds that -the proposed height is too high and would overwhelm an important and loved station and hotel, shading out the concourse from natural light-the station is fine as it is and the demolition is not needed-the current amenities in the station, lavatories, places to eat and other shops are not currently an issue, they are adequate and clean and do not need an upgrade-the concourse is not over crowded, even during rush hour it manages the considerable number of people and access points are safeJane Crumpton-Taylor ex commuter and frequent user Dear Sirs I object to the proposal 25/00494/FULEIA -the proposed height is too high overwhelming station & hotel, shading out the concourse from natural light -the station is fine as it is -demolition is not needed & current amenities in the station, lavatories, places to eat and other shops are adequate and clean and do not need an upgrade -the concourse is not over crowded, during rush hour it manages the considerable number of people & access points are safe Specifically >There will be substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof of the concourse and its replacement with a new structure, which would also compromise the setting of the 19th century train shed. >The insertion of too many new retail units in the 19th century train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. >The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning 19th century hotel in the City - through the construction of a twenty-storey tower over the station concourse. >The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area by a tall building in an area characterised by low-and medi	PA	25-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Wareham	Mark		DC	25-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Backe-Hansen	Melanie	I strongly object to the proposals for Liverpool Street Station which would cause enormous harm to the heritage (not to mention beauty) of the historic railway station. The proposals would be devastating to the surviving elements of the 19th century station and the surrounding structures, trains sheds, the hotel (all of which is grade listed as heritage assets that should be preserved), and elements that should be celebrated and enhanced while still upgrading for the 21st century. I don't understand why there is a need to decimate the historic features, the conservation area protection, and cause substantial harm or even complete destruction of listed buildings, which are protected within the National Planning Policy Framework! I said this in my first objection but should we not see St Pancras station as a celebration of the incredible heritage station as an example of how this can be done. Why destroy the heritage!! The City is losing so much of its surviving heritage. Celebrate and protect the heritage and it will become a destination and place to be proud of. I understand the station concourse needs to be improved and updated and provision of more facilities is also an option but the destruction of the heritage and historic built structure (also the light and surroundings around the station) would be such an incredible loss and would be detrimental to Liverpool Street Station but also the surroundings, including Bishopsgate and St Bolttoph's church. The building of tall buildings in Bishopsgate is also contrary to the 2015 City Plan designed to protect the conservation areas and the surrounding areas and the impact on nearby heritage buildings. I STRONGLY object to these proposals.	PA	25-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Kitchlew	Horton		DC	25-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	March	Pauline		DC	25-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Eastaugh	Colin		DC	25-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Cox	Rachel	No need. Keep concourse and natural light. Preserve historical building for future generations.	PA	25-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Derbyshire	Win		DC	25-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Poll	Cornelia Van Der		DC	25-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Bell	Christopher	To support the hub of Liverpool St.	PA	25-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Akerman	Julie		DC	25-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Dunbar	William		DC	25-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Shelton	Amy		DC	25-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Crumpton-Taylor	Jane	Dear Sirs I object to the proposal 25/00494/FULEIA on the grounds that -the proposed height is too high and would overwhelm an important and loved station and hotel, shading out the concourse from natural light-the station is fine as it is and the demolition is not needed-the current amenities in the station, lavatories, places to eat and other shops are not currently an issue, they are adequate and clean and do not need an upgrade-the concourse is not over crowded, even during rush hour it manages the considerable number of people and access points are safeJane Crumpton-Taylor ex commuter and frequent user Dear Sirs I object to the proposal 25/00494/FULEIA -the proposed height is too high overwhelming station & hotel, shading out the concourse from natural light -the station is fine as it is -demolition is not needed & current amenities in the station, lavatories, places to eat and other shops are adequate and clean and do not need an upgrade -the concourse is not over crowded, during rush hour it manages the considerable number of people & access points are safe Specifically >There will be substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof of the concourse and its replacement with a new structure, which would also compromise the setting of the 19th century train shed. >The insertion of too many new retail units in the 19th century train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. >The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning 19th century hotel in the City - through the construction of a twenty-storey tower over the station concourse. >The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area by a tall building in an area characterised by low-and medi	PA	25-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Smith	Terry		DC	25-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Kemp	Richard	I object to this application which contravenes the National Planning Policy Framework (see NPPF para 213). Damage to national heritage can never be undone and is almost always regretted when it is too late. Changing the structure of the station for short-term commercial/retail gain is unacceptable. The station and its setting will be harmed by a huge glassy tower, incompatible with the height and appearance of historic buildings in the Bishopsgate Conservation Area and contrary to the 2015 City Plan. Network Rail should use assets in less sensitive locations to make its quick bucks! The existence of other mistaken developments in the vicinity should not be an excuse for creating more harm. There is nothing "exceptional" about this application to justify the substantial harm it will do to Grade 2 heritage: Liverpool St Station and its surroundings (including some at Grade 1).	PA	25-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Braasch	Corinna		DC	25-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Drew	Gary		DC	25-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Wright	Ian		DC	25-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Simon	Charles		DC	25-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Hopper	David	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. Finally, I refer to the National Planning Policy Framework and quote Paragraph NPPF 213 which states "Substantial harm to or loss of : a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church.	PA	25-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Cobb	Fiona		DC	25-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	wright	ian	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional. The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church	PA	25-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	SHIELD	Luann	It has no sympathy with the listed building in front of it. Totally out of keeping with such a beautiful piece of history. Architects can do better than this.	PA	25-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Cordery	Ann		DC	25-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Ventham	Melanie	I object to Network Rail building an office block on top of Liverpool Street Station - this is a historical landmark in London and should not be ruined by this plan. If they need offices I am sure there are plenty nearby they can rent.	PA	25-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Anslow	Geraldine		DC	25-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Lusby	Linda	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to the spoiling of a beautiful Victorian structure which provides a safe space for travellers. The proposed construction would cause significant disruption to the area for a very long time & on completion would not bring further benefit.	PA	25-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Glanville	Toby	I object to the plans laid out to make these considerable alterations to a beloved and functional mainline station which is part of our National Heritage, and as such needs to be celebrated and protected. Yours sincerely, Toby Glanville	PA	25-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Gray	C		DC	25-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Hewson	Chloe		DC	25-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Mill	Alister		DC	25-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	West	Janice		DC	25-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Ross	Peter		DC	25-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Wyatt	Theresa		DC	25-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Haywood	Doug		DC	25-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Abbott	Keith		DC	25-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Salanson	Aron	"I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to:" demolishing the building	PA	25-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Talbot	Duncan	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." Therefore, this development should not occur without overwhelming support of the public - which is most definitely not the case in this matter.	PA	25-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Strickland	Paul		DC	25-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Strickland	Paul		DC	25-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Langley	Jane B		DC	25-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Lidiard-Phillips	Melanie		DC	25-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Musk	Nancy	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: - The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. - The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional."	PA	25-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Clayton	Abi		DC	25-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Murphy	Helen		DC	25-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Edwards	Rowan		DC	25-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Akerman	Wi		DC	25-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Platt	Elizabeth	When will companies stop stripping away this country's heritage? The station's concourse is not the issue here, it is yet another greedy attempt to asset strip with more unwanted office space. Anyone involved in the promotion of this project should be ashamed.	PA	25-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Strowman	Andrew		DC	25-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	MacDonogh	Giles	Liverpool Street Station is one of the best surviving nineteenth century railway termini. Although damage was done to its interior when new shops were installed on the concourse, the roof remains quite spectacular and must be preserved at all cost. Better still would be to restore the concourse to something more like its original appearance. Giles MacDonogh MA (Oxon) FRHistS	PA	25-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	RAWLINGS	PETER	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. In the National Planning Policy Framework: Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional."	PA	25-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Eden	Anna	Liverpool Street station is a handsome building. Partially demolishing it and building a totally inappropriate huge monstrosity on top of it will ruin it. We have few enough of such elegant buildings, please don't wreck it.	PA	25-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Broadbent	Richard	I wish to object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. I would like to refer to paragraph NPPF 213 of the National Planning Policy Framework which states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) Grade II listed buildings, or Grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." More specifically, I raise objections to the following: i) The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving 19th-century train shed. ii) The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the 19th-century train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. iii) The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning 19th-century hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. iv) The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. I believe this is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church.	PA	25-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Davison	Jane		DC	25-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Spires	Jefferson		DC	25-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Sindall	Andrew	I object to the substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof of the concourse and its replacement with a new structure, which would also compromise the setting of the 19th century train shed. Also to the insertion of large amounts of new retail units in the 19th century train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. Also to the impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning 19th century hotel in the City - through the construction of a twenty-storey tower over the station concourse. Finally, to the substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low-and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches and nearby St Botolph's church. I also refer to para 213 of the National Planning Policy Framework, which states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." I do not believe this scheme meets this criteria and should therefore be dismissed.	PA	25-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Walby	Susan	Thus historically important building should be restored and treasured to enhance its magnificence. The structure should be maintained and celebrated as a sound and solid part the City. Diminishing its splendour with inappropriate and less substantial add-ons must be resisted. I object to this application on grounds of irretrievable and substantial harm it will cause to the fabric and status of this nationally important heritage building and its environment. I raise objections to the harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. The National Planning Policy Framework clearly states in paragraph NPPF 213: Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or	PA	25-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Dalrymple	Diana	The architecture is stunning and must remain as it is. I vehemently object to any alterations. Everything beautiful in this country is being eroded, for no logical reason. What is the point? The railways don't work, noone can afford the fares and half the population is working from bed, so won't be travelling anyway.	PA	25-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	MacGowan	John	I object to this planning application. I feel it is yet another step in the destruction of the City's architectural heritage. I used to work in one of the Broadgate offices when it was developed in the 1980s. At that time it was an homogeneous development . Since then nothing apart from the Broadgate Circle of the original development is left. The new buildings are frankly hideous and I feel there is no sense of a little enclave behind Liverpool Street Station. British Rail has done a great job destroying its heritage elsewhere in London witness the disaster of Euston. I feel that they should not be allowed to destroy an important remnant of the Victorian legacy in this part of the City. I imagine that any application to redevelop Leadenhall Market for example would be thrown out very quickly which is what I think you should do with this one.	PA	25-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Stacey	Jackie	I object to this development which will severely impact Grade 2 listed Liverpool Street Station especially the development of a 'tower block' on top of the concourse of the station. This will impact the. look of this very old station and introduce yet more people to an already crowded concourse.	PA	25-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Borley	Caroline	Reasons for objection:1. The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed;2. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset;3. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse.The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church.4. National Planning Policy Framework, Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional."PLEASE RESPECT THIS WONDERFUL STATION WHICH I HAVE USED FOR YEARS. I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: 1. The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement	PA	25-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Reynolds	Eric	there is no clear information to explain or justify the over scale and damaging proposal as being required to fund the additional escalators and lifts. the lifts and escalators could be provided at a fraction of the cost of the proposed scheme. construction over an active transport railway building will be very expensive and as the applicant says will not be viable. that being so there is no reason to grant permission for such a damaging to heritage and the environment and financially risky proposal. the proposed scheme will be very disruptive to the traveling public during the process of construction. the proposal flies in the face of the clear requirement that we should all avoid waste in demolition. the proposal will further damage the environment with additional carbon produced as part of the process.	PA	25-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	SIDA	GEOFFREY	THIS IS TOTALLY UNBELIEVABLE OVER DEVELOPMENT, WHO NEEDS ALL THIS MASS OF BUILDINGS AND DESTRUCTION IN THE PRECESS LOSING HERITAGE SITES.	PA	25-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Griffiths	Caroline	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. The National Planning Policy Framework Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional."	PA	25-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Emanuel	Robert	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to the substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. There is no need for new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries which will cause a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. There will also be an impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. I object to the substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. I refer to the National Planning Policy Framework Paragraph NPPF 213 of which states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." and I object to this application. I have had the pleasure of commuting to Liverpool Street station for many years and I strongly object to this application which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. I raise objection	PA	25-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Sydee	Steve	I am writing to object to this planning application on the grounds that it would result in significant harm to nationally important heritage assets. My specific concerns are as follows: 1. The proposed demolition of the existing station concourse roof and its replacement with a new structure would cause serious damage to the significance of the Grade II-listed station. It would also detract from the setting of the surviving nineteenth-century train shed. 2. The scheme includes the insertion of extensive new retail units within the historic train sheds, including two elevated retail galleries. This would inflict considerable harm on the historic and architectural interest of the Grade II-listed asset. 3. The National Planning Policy Framework, Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." Points 4, 5 and 6 below clearly cut across this directive. 4. The proposal would negatively affect the setting of surrounding listed buildings. Of particular concern is the impact on the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continuously operating nineteenth-century hotel in the City - which would suffer from the visual dominance of a 20-storey tower constructed above the station concourse. It is simply way too out of scale with the current buildings. 5. The introduction of a tall building into the Bishopsgate Conservation Area would be deeply harmful, disrupting an area characterised by low' and medium-rise development. This directly conflicts with the City Plan 2015, which explicitly opposes tall buildings in unsuitable locations such as Conservation Areas and the St Paul's Cathedral Heights policy area. 6. Furthermore, the development would diminish the setting of numerous and much-loved designated and non-designated heritage sites, including many of the City's Grade I-listed Christopher Wren churches and the nearby church of St Botolph.	PA	25-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Richardson	Margot	I object to the current proposals for Liverpool Street Station as it is a nationally important asset. The proposed development would do substantial harm to this listed building. I believe there is no need for yet more retail units. Having a tall structure as proposed is contrary to the City Plan 2015 and would be detrimental to the whole area. The National Planning Policy Framework NPPF 213 states Substantial harm or loss of a grade 2 listed building should be exceptional.	PA	25-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Lewis	Alan	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. In particular: 1) The scheme would cause substantial harm to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, since the scale and massing of the building is in opposition to an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. 2) It would cause substantial harm to the Grade II listed train shed and the demolition of the roof of the existing structure would comprise the surviving part of the train shed. 3) The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." I therefore urge you to reject the existing application.	PA	25-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Copeland	Caran	I object to this application, which in my opinion would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets in an area that has already suffered the loss of many historical sites. The National Planning Policy Framework states "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional" Can you explain to me how you feel your plans for such imposing structures are so necessary to the area. The loss of natural light to commuters could well have a detrimental effect on them mentally as having endured long days in artificially lit offices they are once again subjected to long waits in a now "underground" area. The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. Also this is my families history. We gradually move eastwards out of the City as commuters into London - this architecture links me directly with generations of my family travelling into London and seeing the same views on arrival. I would also cite the impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. I am also concerned as to the level of disruption this work will cause to fellow commuters and travellers for no doubt much longer than is cited.	PA	25-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Levy	Charlie	i am disabled so a lift is very helpful.	PA	25-Jun-25	S

25/00494/FULEIA	Hornsey	Philip	I object to this application, which would cause substantial and irreversible harm to a nationally important heritage assets, and create a dangerous precedent whereby any listed building can be built on top of, greatly undermining the character and heritage of the City of London. More specifically, I raise objections to: - Substantial and irreversible harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. - The demolition of entrances, surrounding features and buildings (such as those on the Southern entrance) which, although not listed, were designed to be sympathetic to the overall character and heritage of the station. - The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. - The general substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. - The impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. I note that Paragraph NPPF 213 of the National Planning Policy Framework states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional."	PA	25-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Bannister	Beatrice	I object to this application on so many levels. It would cause significant harm to one of the most emblematic train stations in the world, not only London. It is a grade 2 listed building and as such extreme care should be taken to keep it and its surrounding in it's current state. The National Planning Policy Framework clearly states that any harm or loss of a grade 2 listed building should be "exceptional". It seems that the new planning doesn't take the importance of this much loved building into account. Travelling into London from my hometown in Suffolk has always been an absolute joy to alight in this light-filled Cathedral of a train station. This area of London is filled with historical buildings which give London an extremely special feel. The plans will transform Liverpool Street into another high-rise office block with little imagination. Please consider my objection and re-think these plans.	PA	25-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Neal	Geoffrey	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: - The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. - The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. - The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. - The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional.	PA	25-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	SMITH	HILARY	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: The damage to a Grade II Listed building and the last still functional 19C hotel building in the City of London. As the daughter of a Jewish refugee who arrived at Liverpool Street Station to marry my father in May 1938, the place has particular poignancy for me.	PA	25-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Owen	William	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. As per the National Planning Authority Framework : Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional."	PA	25-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Boggis	Debra	"I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to you always changing things for no good reason. The station functions well as it is. I urge you to think about its history and importance! Not everything needs changing.	PA	25-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Anderson	Jane	object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise object to: The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. With reference to the National Planning Policy Framework: Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional."	PA	25-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Burton	Geoff	You should not be changing an hidtoric building to the extent you propose. Liverpool Street station is great as it is	PA	25-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Daws	Gareth	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. This objection is in reference to National Planning Policy Framework Paragraph NPPF 213 "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional."	PA	25-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Boardman	Jane	I use Liverpool St Station a lot to visit the country cousin. It's a very nice station. I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, It really is beautiful, I think I met the architect on a guided tour once, not the original one obviously, we lost the North London Line calling in there, I have to change at Stratford now to get home.. Why are you doing more horrors to our London Landscape? Cleaning the roof would be a good move. Look at the nightmare that is Euston Station. Is that the ambition? The kindertransport memorials, To get the boat train. Are you planning to destroy the whole of the London skyline?	PA	25-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	sengupta	shampa	National Planning Policy Framework Paragraph NPPF 213 for the reasons below: -The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. -The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. This scheme would cause substantial harm to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church.	PA	25-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Hjiej-Andalousi	Denise	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed together with the insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. There is no need for more office buildings in London it is reported that Canary Wharf has a high office vacancy rate, with estimates ranging from 14.3% to 18.6% equating to over 2 million square feet of office space vacant. Many shops are closing in London so it would be better to support the high street rather than add more shops to stations which damage the original historic buildings. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. I believe these plans do not comply with the National Planning Policy Framework especially Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered p	PA	25-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Brack	Hannah	Are you having a laugh? Which off-shore conglomerate is planning this rape on culture and the British historical monument beloved to Londoners which is the Victorian Liverpool Street station who's architecture and design shows proper class and beauty drawn with the fair hands of proper designers of the day, not some computer generated big dick like souless tower block pile of dung heap inspired by rancid thinking and with as much life and love as a rotting corpse. I OBJECT. I strongly object, as you may have gathered. Which corrupt planning committee stands to benefit from brown envelopes emitting the foul stench of corruption like stagnant pond water? Who is deciding to imprison Liverpool St Station entombing it under a vast and hideous gargantuan urinal of an office block? Who are you all? How much embalming fluid do you plan to throttle the existing gem of a building with to satisfy your greed and lust for dirty money, capitulating to mammon with no thought for the humanity you are charged with serving? Who? Why? I OBJECT. I OBJECT. I OBJECT. I love Liverpool St Station, its part of my DNA with my only traceable ancestors hailing from round the corner in Brick Lane. Like those who disturb the ancient sacred burial grounds of the indigenous natives of London, a curse upon you all. Many thanks for your kind help with this, Yours faithfully, Hannah Brack.	PA	25-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Boldizar-Tripp	Stephen	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections firstly to Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church.	PA	25-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Snow	Alex	It will be detrimental to a lovely station building. It is a terrible idea. Leave it alone!	PA	25-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Bailey	Jonathan	Another huge, ghastly and featureless lump to add to the others.	PA	25-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Mann	E	"I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to:"	PA	25-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Baker	James	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to:" What are the key issues to cover in my objection? The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. Make sure to reference the National Planning Policy Framework in your objection, otherwise your objection may be dismissed: Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional."	PA	25-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Yousaf	Zia	Dear Sir/Madam, I am writing to strongly object to application 25/00494/FULEIA, which proposes the partial demolition and redevelopment of Liverpool Street Station and the adjoining former Great Eastern Hotel. This scheme is unnecessary, harmful, and reflects a worrying trend of profit-driven overdevelopment at the expense of heritage, sustainability, and public interest. The station-restored sensitively in the 1990s-functions well and does not require radical alteration, let alone a glass-and-steel tower overwhelming its historic fabric. Respected heritage bodies including Historic England, the Victorian Society, and the Twentieth Century Society have raised serious concerns about the irreversible damage this proposal would cause. Their expert views are echoed by widespread public opposition from commuters, historians, and local residents. The demolition also contradicts the UK's climate and conservation commitments, destroying embodied carbon and replacing it with unnecessary new construction at a time of changing work habits and office overcapacity. Approving this plan would undermine the protection of listed buildings nationwide. I urge you to reject it and preserve Liverpool Street Station as a vital piece of our shared history-not a casualty of speculative development.	PA	25-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Cresswell	Paula	I object to the planning application 25/00494/FULEIA as the plans will result in substantial harm to the significance, and integrity, of nationally important heritage assets. Specifically, I object to: 1. Demolition work on the existing concourse roof which would constitute harm to a Grade 2 listed building and compromise the setting of the 19th century train sheds. 2. The planned extensive retail units, including two elevated retail galleries, to be situated within the 19th century train sheds, which would harm and diminish the interest and significance of a Grade 2 listed building. 3. The harm that would result to the setting of surrounding Grade 2 listed heritage assets, including the Grade 2* listed Great Eastern Hotel 4. The detriment and degradation that would result from a 97 metre tower, dwarfing the listed Great Eastern Hotel and surrounding listed buildings in the Bishopsgate Conservation Area.	PA	25-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Armstrong	William	Earlier today, I emailed an objection to PLNComments@cityoflondon.gov.uk re this matter; whilst I did not use this pro forma, would you please confirm that my email will, nevertheless, be treated as an objection to the application. Many thanks.	PA	26-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Filby	Angela	I object to this lovely naturally lit building being destroyed.	PA	26-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Baystead	Tracey	I OBJECT to this planning application,, which will destroy our heritage and history.	PA	26-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Cookes	Helen	"I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to:" The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. National Planning Policy Framework Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional."	PA	26-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Jackson	Brooke	I object to this application which I believe would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. I object to plans to cause substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station, through the demolition of the beautiful roof structure of the existing station concourse. I object to plans to cause harm to the Grade II-listed hotel and the concourse experience the construction of a 20-storey tower which is incongruous with the immediate surroundings and would decrease the natural light at the station. The imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. Per the National Planning Policy Framework, Paragraph NPPF 213 states: Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional. I believe these plans would harm the grade II listed buildings and also diminish the public's experience of these nationally important assets.	PA	26-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Eve	Lyn	Existing toilet facilities are inadequate	PA	26-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Tomlinson	Mandy	Over-due for a facelift. Particularly the lift and toilets.	PA	26-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Tanner	Louise	I think that the station needs an upgrade and the private sector develop could hold the key. Way reduced in mass from previous scheme aswell	PA	26-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	.	Charlie	It's a bit naff now. Please make sure that 75% of the space is used for women's facilities. Men need less space to wee!	PA	26-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Lai	Ian	Generate business in the area	PA	26-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Athwal	Anika	Great for the local area and businesses. My family and I support plans to redevelop London Liverpool Street Station	PA	26-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Donnelly	Alex	I support growth and whilst I am a huge lover of architecture I think that if done properly we should always move the city forward as has been the case for 2000+ years. It is very important to me that the architecture is sympathetic.	PA	26-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Branchini	Charles Anthony	I STRONGLY OBJECT TO THE BANAL AND UNIMAGINATIVE PROPOSALS FOR THE REDEVELOPMENT OF LIVERPOOL STREET STATION AND SURROUNDING AREAS PLEASE PLEASE PLEASE PRESERVE ONE OF THE MOST DISTINCTIVE AND CHARACTERISTIC VICTORIAN RAILWAY STATIONS REMAINING IN THIS HISTORIC CITY. ITS ARCHITECTURAL HERITAGE, A REMINDER OF A PARTICULARLY DISTINGUISHED ERA DESERVES TO BE PRESERVED AT ALL COSTS. OTHER DEVELOPED COUNTRIES FIND THE RESOURCES TO AVOID SCHEMES LIKE THE ONE PROPOSED SO DON'T FAIL LONDON'S 10 MILLION RESIDENTS NOW	PA	26-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	McGuigan	Michael	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to the following aspects of the plans. There will be substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving 19th Century train shed. I am further concerned by the insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the 19th Century train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries. This will cause a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. In addition, the impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets will, in particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning 19th Century hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. We need to protect this hotel from unnecessary change. In conclusion, I hope that you pay attention to the National Planning Policy Framework which states in paragraph 213: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional. Please be mindful of protecting our beautiful capital city from destructive aesthetic and structural change. Many thanks.	PA	26-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Cox	Wedad	"I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional.	PA	26-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Phillips	A	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. I would also like to make reference to the National Planning Policy Framework, paragraph NPPF 213 which states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." By all means, add step free access to the station but do it without demolishing part of this historic building or building yet another abhorrent tower block to go with it.	PA	26-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Bradley	Simon	I object to this application, which be extremely destructive to the fabric and context of nationally and internationally significant heritage assets. The especially damaging provisions include: Substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station, by demolishing the roof structure of the existing concourse in favour of a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving Victorian train shed. The insertion of substantial structures for new retail units within the historic train sheds, including the construction of two elevated shopping galleries, which would cause serious harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed complex. The impact to the wider setting of listed heritage assets, notably the Grade II*-listed hotel, which would be compromised by the proposed construction of a 20-storey office tower over the station concourse. Substantial harm would also be caused to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by imposing a tall building on an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. Such an insertion would contravene the 2015 City Plan, which directs the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St Paul's Cathedral Heights area. The scheme would also have a negative impact on the setting of other designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed City churches, and St Botolph Bishopsgate church to the south. The National Planning Policy Framework provides clear direction on the correct response to this proposal. Specifically, Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." I object to this application, which would be substantially harmful to the fabric and significance of nationally important heritage assets. The proposed harms include: 1 Substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station b	PA	26-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Johnson	Will	I strongly object to the proposed scheme, as it will have a hugely detrimental long term affect on the station environment and to the historic and listed parts of the station. If the main aim of the exercise is to ease passenger bottlenecks, then how much better to do it incrementally - look at the major improvement recently brought about by expanding the gateline. It wouldn't be too hard to increase the number of lifts and escalators within the station without undergoing the major upheaval that is envisaged by the current scheme. Consider the example of Euston - surely we could do without a second major London terminus being embroiled in years of reconstruction.	PA	26-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Jarwood	Ben	Whilst I support the infrastructure improvements to Liverpool Street Station such as the step-free access, new lifts and additional entrances; I object to the prioritisation of private corporate interests at the expense of one of London's finest surviving examples of Victorian railway architecture. This station is not only a key transport hub but a listed building of historical and architectural significance. The proposed glass office block, whilst scaled back, is jarring, out of scale and lacking in the character that a listed building like this deserves. I urge you to separate the public-facing improvements from the destructive corporate interests. If these proposals were unbundled, focusing on preserving the station's heritage while delivering practical improvements for passengers, I believe there would be far greater public support. Please do not allow short-term corporate development to erase the long-term cultural value of a living piece of history.	PA	26-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Brazil	Candida	Any buildings that are listed should be left un touched, obviously. These are what preserve Liverpool Station's character, despite the 'retail outlets' - of which there are far too many already, so please don't add to them.	PA	26-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Lord	Raymond	I object to this application which would cause substantial harm to the significance of important heritage assets. More specifically I raise objection to; 1) the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse 2) the insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the 19th Century train sheds 3) the impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets through the construction of a 20 storey tower over the station concourse 4) the substantial harm to the Bishopsgate conservation area, contrary to the 2015 City Plan I refer you to the National Planning Policy Framework, where paragraph NPPF 213 states 'substantial harm to or loss of grade II listed buildings or grade II listed registered parks or gardens should be exceptional.'	PA	26-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Fry	Peter	I'm writing to object to this proposal, which risks irrevocably eroding the historic character of Liverpool Street Station and its environs. Replacing the glorious C19 concourse roof with a modern structure would not only obliterate a key element of the Grade II-listed fabric but also jar with the surviving train shed beyond. Flooding the shed with two elevated retail galleries and dozens of shops reduces its lofty grandeur to a shopping mall, whittling away at its special interest. Topping the concourse with a 20-storey block would dwarf the adjacent Grade II* hotel-London's last continuously operating Victorian lodging-and stick out like a sore thumb in the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, where the 2015 City Plan forbids tall buildings that undermine its low-rise grain. This scheme fails the NPPF's requirement (para 213) that substantial harm to or loss of Grade II assets must be exceptional, not routine.	PA	26-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Mumford	Victoria	Reference the National Planning Policy Framework Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional. I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to the substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. Also the impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. Plus the substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church.	PA	26-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Sultana	Nasima	Disabled people and those with pushchairs need to use it to help them get upstairs and downstairs.	PA	26-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Shanahan	Caroline	Liverpool Street is a hub location.	PA	26-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Smith	Lis	As soon as possible. Half of toilets unavailable.	PA	26-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Smith	Nick	I object to the proposed development on the following grounds: 1. Detrimental Impact on the Built Environment The proposal would cause significant harm to the architectural and spatial character of the station forecourt. The removal of the glass ceiling would eliminate the natural light that currently floods the area, diminishing both its aesthetic and functional value. 2. Questionable Justification for Congestion Relief The claim that the development is necessary to alleviate congestion-on the basis that it will fund these infrastructure improvements-is specious and unconvincing. This rationale lacks substantive evidence. 3. Flawed Passenger Growth Modelling The projected increase in passenger numbers is based on dubious modelling. LST has 18 platforms feeding into just four tracks, a structural limitation that inherently caps its capacity. Without the possibility of adding more tracks, the station's ability to accommodate additional trains and passengers is fundamentally constrained. The application should be refused.	PA	26-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Barnard	Mark	With reference to the National Planning Policy Framework paragraph213 : substantial harm to or loss of grade II listed building or grade II registered parks or gardens should be exceptional. I object to this application which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to the major harm to the grade II listed Liverpool Street Station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and replacing it with a new structure which would compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The current concourse roof is light-giving and creates a spacious effect giving a positive and helpful ambience for rail passengers making their onward journeys into East Anglia or those having just arrived to connect further on into the city. Taking this away would be damaging in so many ways. There is no need for a large office development that would engulf this delightful and historic station and the associated Great Eastern Hotel.	PA	26-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	O'Neill	Mark	I object in the strongest possible terms to the redevelopment of Liverpool Street station. There are plenty of of I object in the strongest possible terms to the redevelopment of Liverpool Street station. There are plenty of office spaces available in the City of London and it certainly doesn't need any more. Keep the natural light on Liverpool Street.	PA	26-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	O'Neill	Mark	I object in the strongest possible terms to the redevelopment of Liverpool Street station. There are plenty of of I object in the strongest possible terms to the redevelopment of Liverpool Street station. There are plenty of office spaces available in the City of London and it certainly doesn't need any more. Keep the natural light on Liverpool Street.	PA	26-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Lombard	Carine	A historic building and part of london's history to be replaced with modern ugly crap buildings to make rich people richer, ENOUGH!!!!	PA	26-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Dreher	Calvin	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: - The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. - The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. - The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional.	PA	26-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Arnold	Kate	"I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to:" The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. Make sure to reference the National Planning Policy Framework in your objection, otherwise your objection may be dismissed: Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional."	PA	26-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Rayner	Christine	I object to this development plan, which will virtually destroy an important Grade II listed building. This part of the city has already lost much of its character due to development projects like this. I do not see such an urgent need for more toilets, and I object that there is a need for more Chain stores selling take away food and other amenities, of which there are already many in this area. This sort of development does not benefit local residents and there are already plenty of services for tourists. It would be a shame to destroy this beautiful building which is an important part of the UK's cultural heritage and is the reason that London has so many tourists!	PA	26-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Kincaid	Sarah	I object to this plan to destroy much of Liverpool Street station. This is a valuable building that greatly contributes to the cultural heritage of the country, and adds character to this neighborhood. Already Spitalfields market has been developed beyond recognition, and it is sad to see Such insensitive projects in the City and in the East End. The so-called amenities that it would provide are not needed and not worth the loss.	PA	26-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Horton	Lucinda	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. I would like make reference to the National Planning Policy Framework in this objection: Paragraph NPPF 213 states: 'Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional.' More specifically, I raise objections to: * The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. * The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. * The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. * The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church.	PA	26-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Shepherd	John	Please stop this insane scheme which will ruin Liverpool Street Station and surroundings.	PA	26-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	See	Paul	This is an abomination truly out of character with the station, I object to this proposal most strongly.	PA	26-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Andrews	Henry	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church.	PA	26-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Macnab	Jane	Adverse impact on a beautiful Victorian building	PA	27-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Blegvad	Chloe	Liverpool St Station is excellent as it is today- the plans for building above it are totally " over the top" - proposing a vast & high monster of an edifice out of proportion with its surroundings-	PA	27-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Maudsley	Paul	I strongly object to the proposed redevelopment of Liverpool Street Station, which threatens to erase a vital part of our architectural and cultural heritage. The plan to demolish the historic concourse and surrounding structures is not progress-it is vandalism disguised as modernisation. These beautiful, irreplaceable spaces tell the story of London's past, connecting generations through their design and atmosphere. To destroy them for the sake of commercial gain is short-sighted and culturally irresponsible. We must preserve the character and history that define this iconic gateway to our city.	PA	27-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Scott	Joanne	I object to the application to redevelop Liverpool Street station. The development would harm the Grade II listed building. The replacement roof structure which would compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The overdevelopment of the units within the C19 train sheds would cause significant harm to the National heritage asset. Contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework, Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." The Grade II listed* hotel nearby would be harmed by the construction of a 20 storey tower block over the station concourse. Contrary to Policy HC1 of the London Plan, 2021. The proposed tower block would harm the Bishopsgate conservation area. Contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas.	PA	27-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Collins	Clare	1 object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. I raise objections to; The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. Make sure to reference the National Planning Policy Framework in your objection, otherwise your objection may be dismissed: Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional."	PA	27-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Holman	David	Modernisation, better experience.	PA	27-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Lockhart	Kenny	I'm a taxi driver and we need access all around this area.	PA	27-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Apps	Katharine	Everything needs to be accessible for all.	PA	27-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Shelley	Michael John	I avoid LLS if I can because of access hassles.	PA	27-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Patterson	Doreen	Disabilities.	PA	27-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Magnitsky	Shirley	Many need a lift to enable access.	PA	27-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Edmund-Jones	Stephanie	I object to the plans for development of Liverpool Steet Station, this Grade II listed building is of significant architectural importance to our country, especially to London. The beautiful natural light that floods the concourse reduces the need for electrical light, which must be better for our environment, for commuters and staff working under natural light is positive for our mental health. The substantial harm to this Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure will have immense impact on the surrounding area and would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. London has huge historical significance to not only its residents but to whole of the UK, please reconsider your plans and look after our beautiful buildings not destroy them and the history that they bring.	PA	27-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Robinson	Alice		DC	27-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Warwick	David		DC	27-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Harris	Peter		DC	27-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Streeter	Patrick		DC	27-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Goodall	M A		DC	27-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Tingey	G. N. G.		DC	27-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Biavati	Eugenia		DC	27-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Frew IHBC	Russell		DC	27-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Theatres Trust			DC	27-Jun-25	R

25/00494/FULEIA	Matthews	Rachel		DC	27-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Monck	Dan	This overdevelopment of this part of the City of London is wholly unnecessary, and destructive: - Economically unnecessary - in the context of changing workplace needs, and failing to address wider housing need of our corner of London. - Evidently economically unsustainable. - Whilst the architecture of the original Broadgate development was not good - at least it enabled the well restored Liverpool Street station to 'breathe' a bit. The new proposal is even more bombastic and overwhelming.	PA	27-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Eaton	Damian		DC	27-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Dale	Tracy	This should be a priority for Sadiq Khan, preserve and regenerate these wonderful stations we have! Essential regeneration required.	PA	27-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	LeGrove	John		DC	27-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Leaver	HA		DC	27-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Murrell	Kathleen		DC	27-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Hawkes	Christina		DC	27-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Thomas-Gring	Chelsea		DC	27-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Field	Jo	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. My objection is reference to the National Planning Policy Framework: Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional."	PA	27-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Lawton	Jacqueline	More access to the underground without use of the escalators we do not all like them and are quite dangerous for the elderly lift down please.	PA	27-Jun-25	S

25/00494/FULEIA	Bennetts	Rab	This development is completely inappropriate. The justification to build above a fine station is purely to raise money for station improvements. Network Rail do not have to do this and should raise money by other means. The costs have been inflated to include the proposed building's substructure, which is misleading. Also, the images are deliberately misleading as the scale is far bulkier than these images suggest. The PR campaign by Network Rail is also misleading, as it invites favourable responses only, with reference to station improvements. The station roof is listed and is a very fine extension to the Victorian station itself. Putting a huge office building on top of this space will simply ruin it.	PA	27-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Keiller	Diana	I strongly object to this application because I believe it would be harmful to nationally important heritage assets. In particular, I object to: 1. The loss of the architecturally attractive and historically important internal roof structure of the station. 2. The building of a high block above the station which is out of keeping with the area and out of scale with surrounding lower buildings. The National Planning Policy Framework states that: "Substantial harm to or loss of grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." I would like to object on the grounds that this scheme does cause substantial harm to grade II listed buildings and would be detrimental to the area. This significant loss is unable to be rectified if this scheme is allowed to go ahead, and I urge you to reconsider before it is too late! Kind regards, Diana Keiller.	PA	27-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Ward	Martin		DC	27-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Hodgkinson	Judith	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to a development out of scale with the station building in surrounds. Good historic buildings have their place in all of our towns and cities and deserve appropriate development around them.	PA	27-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Black	Barbara		DC	27-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Walker	David		DC	27-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	King OBE	John		DC	27-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Wertheim	David		DC	27-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Duplain	Julian		DC	27-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Ouroussoff	Harriet	I object to this application, which would cause immense harm to a national heritage asset. I specifically raise objections to: The substantial harm to a GRADE 2 listed building, through the demolition of the original Victorian wrought iron and glass roof, and its replacement with a new structure. This would also compromise the 19th C train shed. the introduction of new retail units and galleries within the train sheds, causing incredible harm to the Grade 2 listed asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding heritage assets, including immense harm to the intact C19th hotel, one of the few existing station hotels still in use, through the construction of a 20 storey tower. This is a conservation area, the scheme would cause substantial harm to this area, which is characterised by low rise medium scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan which stipulates refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas. the scheme would impact on many designated and undesignated assets, such as the many Christopher Wren churches and nearby St Botolph's Church. Paragraph NPPF 213cof the National Planning Framework states: "Substantial harm to or loss of a. Grade 2 listed buildings, or grade 2 registered parks or gardens should be exceptional" This proposal is monstrous, disgraceful. Liverpool Street Station is a beautiful part of London's history. Whoever came up with this plan should hang their head in shame, it's amounts to insane vandalism. The station does need more access, for sure, but there are better ways to fund it, whilst having respect and care for an iconic building. I imagine this plan is the quid pro quo of the developers - I'll insert lots of new shops, escalators and lifts if you let me build a monstrous tower block above the station". I do not condone this kind of bargain, the City of London should not even entertain this kind of thing. I would like to see Liverpool Street Station preserved whole.	PA	27-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	de Laroche	Philippe	I object to this application on the grounds that it would result in significant harm to the value and integrity of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I object to the following: Harm to the Grade II-listed station: The proposed demolition of the existing station concourse roof structure and its replacement with a new structure would cause significant harm to the architectural and historic integrity of the Grade II-listed station. It would also compromise the setting of the surviving 19th-century train shed, diminishing the station's overall heritage value. Insertion of retail units within the 19th-century train sheds: The proposed introduction of extensive retail development within the historic train sheds-including the construction of two elevated retail galleries-would result in a high level of harm to the listed station. The level of commercial intervention is inappropriate for the character and fabric of the listed building. Impact on the setting of surrounding listed buildings, particularly the Grade II-listed hotel: The proposed 20-storey tower over the station concourse would cause considerable harm to the setting and significance of the adjacent Grade II listed hotel. This is the last continually operating 19th-century railway hotel in the City. The dramatic scale and massing would be an overwhelming figure and undermine the hotel's heritage value. Substantial harm to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area: A tall building in an area characterised by predominantly low to medium-rise development would cause substantial harm to the established character of the conservation area. This is contrary to the City of London's 2015 Local Plan, which requires the refusal of tall buildings in inappropriate locations, including Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Heights area. Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional."	PA	27-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Schofield-Hughes	Michelle	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: -The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. -The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. -The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. -The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional."	PA	27-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Hunt	Matt	I strongly reject this proposal. If additional amenities are required for elderly or disabled passengers then they should be introduced without removing a heritage building. I commute through this station on a daily basis and have watched the surrounding area become a corporate maze of glass structures that lack character and environmental consideration. Please retain some of the traditional London heritage and character that Liverpool Street Station possesses to remind everyone that the City is not just for major financial companies. It belongs to a much bigger history and has an important building. Regards Matt Hunt	PA	27-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Jervis	John	I strongly object to the planned development, in line with the National Planning Policy Framework, which will damage both the Grade II-listed station, the surrounding listed buildings and the wider conservation areas. These are all important national assets, being degraded on very flimsy grounds through both direct interventions such as demolition and elevated retail, and highly intrusive overstation development, and with an aggressive and misleading social media campaign, as a means to upgrade a concourse that is, in truth, in good condition, and Network Rail should be able to fund any accessibility improvements itself without recourse to this damaging, cynical proposal.	PA	27-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Wheatcroft	Gillian	I object to this proposed development. The demolition of the roof structure and the planned works would harm the Grade II listed station. The hotel would suffer, the entire building and complete area including Bishopsgate Conservation Area would be irrevocably compromised by the proposed tall building. The area is characterised by low to medium scale buildings and the revised proposal would obliterate the setting. The views and sight lines would be severely impacted and close out light and a sense of history. It must not be allowed to proceed. Let future generations see and enjoy historic settings with a focus on retaining these wonderful historic conservation areas and important places which make London special and valued.	PA	27-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Mattocks	Sally	I object to the development plans as they impact negatively on an important and irreplaceable building that is part of the history and character of the area. The plans are in contravention of the NPPF of which paragraph 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional."	PA	27-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA Page 237	Benge-Abbott	Tim	As a regular user of Liverpool Street Station I object to this development on the following grounds: - the architectural character of the station will be entirely lost - Destruction of a Grade 2 listed building. Paragraph 213 of the National Planning Policy Framework states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." - This substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the fine Victorian roof structure over the existing concourse and its replacement with a new structure would compromise the setting of the surviving 19th century train shed which has already been shortened at the north/country end by new development. - The building planned to go over the site is grossly oversized in height and ground area for the Bishopsgate Conservation Area and contrary to the 2015 City Plan. It would also overwhelm the remaining historic building, currently a hotel. - St. Pancras and Kings Cross are examples of stations that have had their historic form recognised and conserved with modifications that add to, rather than detract from, their historic significance. Liverpool Street station is no less significant for its historic importance in the City of London and its Victorian features and setting should be retained. This planning application would destroy what remains of the Grade 2 listed building and turn it into a subterranean retail park and featureless terminus.	PA	27-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Wright	Celia	I think you only have to look at the absolute disaster which is the redevelopment of Euston station to know that this is a bad idea. Why do we keep letting developers chip away at the history & architecture that makes London, London? A twenty storey office block on top of the station, turning the concourse into a dark, hollow space and casting even more shadow over Bishopsgate & Liverpool Street. A twenty storey office block in a climate where there is already 23.4million sq/f of unoccupied office space in London (according to a Q3 2024 report by Knight Frank). Why? Leave us some of London, please. We don't need more office space, and we certainly don't need it at the cost of losing more of the history of this city	PA	27-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Hornsey	Philip	I object to this application, which would cause substantial and irreversible harm to nationally important heritage assets and create a precedent whereby any listed building can be built on top of, greatly undermining the character and heritage of the City of London. More specifically, I raise objections to: - Substantial and irreversible harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure, which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. - The demolition of entrances, surrounding features and buildings (such as those on the Southern entrance) which, although not listed, have merit and were designed to be sympathetic to the overall character and heritage of the station. - The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. - The general substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. - The impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. I note that Paragraph NPPF 213 of the National Planning Policy Framework states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." This application fundamentally undermines the framework and for this reason alone should be rejected.	PA	27-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Moore	Lou	I strongly object to office buildings being built on the site of Liverpool Street Station. Overdevelopment and Out of Character with Area The scale and massing of the proposed building are excessive and not in keeping with the architectural character of the surrounding area. Liverpool Street is known for its heritage architecture , and this development would significantly alter that. Impact on Local Infrastructure and Amenities The proposal would place undue pressure on existing infrastructure, including public transport, road networks, and local services. This area already experiences congestion, and the additional strain from new residents or businesses would exacerbate the issue. Loss of Light and Privacy The height and positioning of the building would lead to overshadowing of neighbouring properties, resulting in a significant loss of natural light and privacy for existing residents. Environmental and Heritage Concerns Noise, Traffic, and Safety Issues Construction and post-completion usage would result in increased noise levels, disruption, and potential safety risks for pedestrians and cyclists in this busy location. For the above reasons, I urge the planning committee to reject this application. Development must be balanced with the needs of the community and should enhance-not harm-the character and quality of the neighbourhood. There are so many empty office buildings in London already Thank you for considering this objection. Yours faithfully Lou Moore	PA	27-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Caldwell	Paul	I worked in Moorgate for a number of years and very much enjoyed Liverpool Street station and still walk through it today when I am in the area. I do not believe this scheme is appropriate as it will cause substantial harm to a grade II listed building which has been a key part of the City of London since the 1870s. Also I understand that the National Planning Policy Framework, Paragraph NPPF 213 states "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." This scheme just harms heritage assets.	PA	27-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Morley	Jeremy	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: - extensive destruction of parts, especially the roof structure, of the Grade2 listed station which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed - high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset by the insertion of extensive numbers of retail units - The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. - The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. None of this is in line with the National Planning Policy Framework para 213 "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." The proposed scheme does not present any exceptional need rather than desire for profit.	PA	27-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Stratton	Alastair	It's outrageous and will destroy the character of the station and surrounding area. Totally unnecessary and a gerrymandering of the process by the architect and developers	PA	27-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Forbes	Heather	I cannot believe that you would want to build something on top of this beautiful station. Why oh why would you do that. This station is beautiful, bathed in natural light. Makes me look forward to coming into London. Stop decimating out beautiful buildings in London. Go somewhere else. Please leave this beautiful building as alone. I know money talks. But I want this station to survive so my grandchildren can enjoy the beauty of it too. You will ruin the whole appearance by doing this. Please stop and think about our heritage.	PA	27-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Davis	Ewan	This planning application will do irreparable and serious harm to the Grade II-listed station. Demolition of the concourse, and indeed the sympathetic modern additions, would in itself compromise the setting of the surviving 19th-century train shed. But to place a building on top, that lacks any character and restricts natural light would destroy the setting completely. It would result in the loss of a heritage asset (including both the station and the Grade II*-listed Great Eastern Hotel (now Andaz London Liverpool Street - the last continually functioning 19th-century hotel in the City). Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." It is clear that this would be breached by the proposals, as they are not exceptional. The scheme would also cause substantial harm to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of an inappropriately tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. I use the station every day, commuting to work. It is plain to me that any bottlenecking or issues with congestion is due to poor maintenance (such as not appropriately fixing escalators or leaks), rather than issues with the design of the station itself. If changes were absolutely necessary, these could be made, surely, without compromising the integrity of the iconic design of the station. It will make the station a undoubtedly dark and intimidating space. It would be a devastating loss to the unique, sensitive architectural fabric of The City.	PA	27-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Birbeck	Robert	I object due to the extreme scale of this development which is completely overbearing next to such an important heritage asset.	PA	27-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Simpson	Antony	A Symbol of London and the Uk. This building needs to be Listed and Protected	PA	27-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Smart	Julian	I strongly object to this application since it will cause substantial harm to an assets of great significance to the nation. This harm includes the destruction of the station concourse roof, the changes to the setting of the 19th century hotel, and the damage to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area and to the settings of nearby heritage assets by adding a very tall building. Paragraph 213 of the NPPF states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." The benefits to the plan do not outweigh the harms in this case, and improvements to the station could be achieved by much less intrusive means.	PA	27-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Hyde	Viv	I strongly object to the proposed plans 25/00494/FULEIA as they will cause substantial harm to the significant value of Heritage assets such as Liverpool St Station. This grade II listed building should be preserved for the exemplary piece of architectural design it is. These plans will also have negative impact on the surrounding	PA	27-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Terry	Joanna	Dear Kieran Liverpool Street Station is beautiful, efficient, light and airy. Please, please don't let this magnificent station be ruined for the sake of another high rise building. My husband is a structural engineer who has spent his whole career working for one of the most well known and respected firms in the world; specifically on tall buildings; and I mostly love them and find them exciting. However in this case I absolutely do not. I've been using the station frequently for the past 50 years and even at the busiest of times it works. I sincerely hope you look 50 years ahead and see what you could leave for future generations by refusing this planning application. They will thank you, as will we.	PA	27-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Grant	Charlotte	This is a greedy and unnecessary destruction of an important site of London's Victoria Heritage. Liverpool Street station has historic and literary significance as well as being a busy station. This scheme is out of proportion and aesthetically bankrupt. London's Victorian heritage architecture should be preserved and enjoyed not sacrificed to corporate greed.	PA	27-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Dempsey	Clare	The destruction of this station would be an architectural disaster. I have used this station for decades without once feeling that it need up dating or amending. It is beautiful, light and airy even when it is full of passengers due to the numerous faults found on Network Rail's tracks. Not to mention the massive disruption to commuters so soon after the completion of the Elizabeth Line, which will in turn, cost the London economy, particularly those businesses near to the station. I urge the planning authorities to dismiss this application and future ones which fundamentally change the character and beauty of the station especially those that add no benefit or merit to the commuters which the station is primarily suppose to serve.	PA	27-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Hood	Carlos	I object firstly because the proposal clearly contravenes NPPF 213, there being no exceptional circumstances to justify the propsal going ahead. In particular: - the scheme is totally disproportionate to the existing Grade 11 Station & Hotel buildings; - it would do great harm to the Bishopgate Conservation Area, contrary to the 2015 City Plan; - the scale of the new development, including the degree and length of the building works, will cause major disruption to rail staff and in-station commercial activities, as well as to a very significant number of local residents & businesses. Although I do not live local to the proposal, I visit the Bishopgate district weekly, and quite frequently travel from Liverpool St. Station.	PA	27-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Gatrell	Sally	I object in no uncertain terms to the proposed hasty demolition of Liverpool Street Station. This would be unnecessary destruction of our irreplaceable history and heritage.	PA	27-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Corcoran	Angela	I use this station 4 times a week to get to and from work. I use it as a meeting spot for friends and family and often sit enjoy coffee under the beautiful structure. Its part of our railway heritage and part of many Londoners lives. Visitors to our great city come and see buildings like this and are in awe of them. They're what makes London the incredible and unique. I strongly object to this proposal and will damage this special destination.	PA	27-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Hunt	Sophie	The irreversible destruction of our railway heritage is acceptable.	PA	27-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Brown	Harry	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to the following key points: 1. Substantial Harm to the Grade II-Listed Station The proposal involves the demolition of the historic roof structure over the existing station concourse. This action would cause significant and irreversible harm to the architectural and historic significance of the Grade II-listed station. Furthermore, the new replacement structure would compromise the setting and visual integrity of the surviving 19th-century train shed, a key element of the station's historic character. 2. Inappropriate Retail Insertion within the 19th-Century Train Sheds The planned insertion of extensive new retail units, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries within the historic train sheds, represents a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the listed heritage asset. This level of internal intervention will erode the historic spatial quality and visual coherence of the station, undermining its heritage value. 3. Impact on Surrounding Listed Heritage Assets The construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse would cause particular harm to the setting of the nearby Grade II*-listed hotel, which holds the distinction of being the last continually operating 19th-century hotel in the City of London. The proposed scale and massing are entirely at odds with the historic townscape, resulting in a dominating and intrusive presence that diminishes the hotel's significance and setting. 4. Substantial Harm to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area and Wider Historic Cityscape The scheme's introduction of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-rise development would fundamentally conflict with the character and appearance of the Bishopsgate Conservation Area. This directly contravenes the 2015 City Plan, which explicitly requires the ref	PA	28-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Wakelin	Jane	No case given to justify the loss of the existing buildings.	PA	28-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Wartnaby	Simon	I object to this application which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof of the concourse and its replacement with a new structure, which would also compromise the setting of the 19th century train shed. The insertion of large amounts of new retail units in the 19th century train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning 19th century hotel in the City - through the construction of a twenty-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low-and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches and nearby St Botolph's church. Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional."	PA	28-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Thomas	Sarah	Stop ruining our historic buildings for money	PA	28-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Cheyney	Julie	I object to this as it will cause substantial harm to nationally important heritage assets. I raise objections to the wanton disregard to the conservation area as this huge building would impact on the setting of the various designated and undesignated buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan which requires refusal of planning permission to tall buildings in appropriate areas. With the surrounding wonderful Grade I and II buildings this area is most inappropriate for such a tall building. The National Planning Policy Framework should be adhered to as it states in Paragraph NPPF 213: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional."	PA	28-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Harrison	Fran	I strongly object to this proposal from network rail which will destroy our national heritage.	PA	28-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Doonan	Alexandra	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. More specifically, I draw attention to paragraph NPPF 213 which states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional.". This proposal is in no way exceptional.	PA	28-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Wilkins	Anna	I am alarmed and fully object to these proposals, our beautiful railway buildings have cultural significance and should be protected. I also find the disruption to rail passengers totally unnecessary, I can't see any additional benefit. I object to: The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. I would also like to highlight the National Planning Policy Framework and paragraph NPPF 213 which states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional.	PA	28-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Midwinter	Kathryn	I object, please don't spoil this beautiful station. This application, would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. The National Planning Policy Framework:- Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional."	PA	28-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Tolstoy	Alexandra	This building is totally out of character and unsuitable architecturally. We need to preserve our architecture, not hide and destroy it.	PA	28-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Carter	Col	Absolutely terrible design and London does not need this. Corporate greed at its worse !	PA	28-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	French	Sheree	I absolutely OBJECT to the destruction of this beautiful Victorian station - this is not acceptable! Let's look at Grand Central Station in New York - it can work with the keeping of the Victorian heritage. Lool at how they achieved this! I have commuted into Liverpool Street for over 30 years at peak time and it's always been busy but I have never felt unsafe due to crowds! The opening of more barriers has helped with the people getting off the trains.	PA	28-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Keating	Hayley	Liverpool Street station is a beautiful, characterful, busy and functional station which does not need destruction or development. It would be an absolute travesty for this to go ahead. I fully object to this plan.	PA	28-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Brickell	Margaret	Loss of integrity of a landmark building	PA	28-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Cheng	S	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. We do not need an over-station development, no need for more giant office space! The Moorgate entrance has already been redone, leave the train station as it is!	PA	28-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Cheng	S	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. We do not need an over-station development, no need for more giant office space! The Moorgate entrance has already been redone, leave the train station as it is!	PA	28-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Cheng	S	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. We do not need an over-station development, no need for more giant office space! The Moorgate entrance has already been redone, leave the train station as it is!	PA	28-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Kennedy	Marianna	This scheme destroys the character of Liverpool st station and seems particularly insensitive to the existing infrastructure which is harmonious with its surroundings. Surely covering a listed building in this way is unnecessary and the space could be created elsewhere. So many local developments are so underused and not even inhabited .	PA	28-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Schofield	Nadine	I object to Network rail and Acme's plans for redevelopment of Liverpool Street station, they will destroy the unique heritage and beauty of the station building , a fundamental part of London's History. The plans do not improve the area or customer experience. They disregard history and discourage visitors and tourist by destroying the soul and character of this part of London, which has already seen far too much insensitive building work which alienates the community by not seeing the quality that the building serves to the area and its importance in architectural terms to the city.	PA	28-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Cargill	Jonquil	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to:the damage to the conservation of the history of the area and the significance of the visual and cultural heft of Victorian train stations in defining this. Referencing National Planning decisions.Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional."	PA	28-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Sanderson	Liz	I object to the proposal to redevelop Liverpool St station - I use it most days and love its character. It should be restored not lost and modernised! It's beautiful, and the vast majority of the time smooth running and easy to navigate. The only problems occur when there are network issues - This is not a fault of the station or its design, I frequently look up to the ceiling as I was all along the platforms and often wish it could be cleaned and restored to original glory. What I absolutely DO NOT wish is for an enormous office block to be built on top of it! Please DO NOT do this! Once lost this can never be reclaimed - It's is beautiful and characterful and should be preserved,	PA	28-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Birkby	Michelle	This is a beautiful, historic, important station, not a bit of bare land. You can't just drop an ugly office block on it and strip it of its beauty, of its light, of its space. This is like encasing a wooden carving in a block of concrete - the carving is still there but all you can see is the concrete. This is the kind of cultural and architectural vandalism London is supposed to be against. We are not New York, consistently destroying for the sake of new and ugly. We are London, where are history is treasured and preserved	PA	28-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Carter	Kathy	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. Please don't change another piece if history	PA	28-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Schofield	Nadine	I object to Network rail and Acme's plans for redevelopment of Liverpool Street station. They will destroy this uniquely beautiful building, which serves the community and is an asset to the area, drawing visitors and is linked directly to the historic heritage of the area. The plans will take light and make the area unsafe and undesirable for residents and visitors and will not serve to improve the experience of Londoners and commuters. This is a historic and important part of London and its history must be preserved for future generations and this insensitive and I'll considered scheme will do irreparable damage to the area and not serve to improve the experience for the public. I wholeheartedly object.	PA	28-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Dale	Phil	So much of London's history has been lost and or changed, surely some of London should be unchanged as its fine as it is. Then the younger generation can see some of old London as it should be!	PA	28-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Johnston	Lucy	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional. I grew up nearby, my home town has been cut up and scarred by bullish redevelopment that doesn't enrich the area nor celebrate its heritage or history. Please revisit these plans in mind of keeping what is important.	PA	28-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Rossi	Nancy	I object to this plan to destroy the Liverpool Street Station concourse in order to improve it, and to overwhelm a beautiful historic station in order to erect a massive office block. I worked in Spitalfields for many years and every time I entered the station I thought how pleasing the marriage of old and new was. And how grateful I was to those architects who had thought enough about context and preservation to make it work. This new plan is just absurd, to destroy something useful and valuable in order to improve it. I don't believe this risky new venture is justified..	PA	28-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Valentine	Hugh	I object to this application in the belief it would cause substantial harm to the significance of a nationally important heritage asset. You - we - have an obligation to protect it. There is no need for yet more bland offices and retail outlets. The scale of the proposed development is out of keeping with the surrounding area. The outsize and unappealing proportions of the proposed building, which is to squat above the station itself, will be a terrible, ugly and bland addition to the area. To this layperson, it seems that the proposed development contravenes NPPF 213 (the National Planning Policy Framework), which states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." Please say no to this proposed development. H W J Valentine London E1	PA	28-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Robbins	Shannon	I object to the alterations in this plan. They are not sensitive to the historic building. We don't need more large builds. Don't take the character away from this station. Please I'm begging you.	PA	28-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Pugachev	Aliosha	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to the demolition of the buildings.	PA	28-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Evans	Jane	I object most vehemently to this application which will cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage building. More specifically, I raise objections to: - Substantial harm to the fabulous Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof and its replacement with a new structure, which will also compromise the setting of the 19th century train shed. - The insertion of large amounts of new retail units in the 19th century train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the station. There are enough shops already in the area. - The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the Grade II -listed hotel - which has been in use continually - through the construction of a twenty-storey tower over the station concourse. - The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low-and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches and nearby St Botolph's church. London does not need another huge building. I bring to your attention the National Planning Policy Framework - Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." Thankyou	PA	28-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Donovan	Helen	The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional."	PA	28-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Beck	Nicola	I strongly object to the development of the building above Liverpool Street station. How is it appropriate to obliterate our cultural past in favour of meaningless, ugly development. That is nothing more than cultural and social vandalism.	PA	28-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Relph	Anthony	Would significantly change the appearance of a listed building.	PA	28-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Moyle	George	I strongly object to the proposed "development" of Liverpool Street Station - a stance I hold for the apparent barbarism that the location will be subjected to. The gradual erasure of Londons past is vivid across the city, and the plans for Liverpool Street Station is yet another site to fall victim. Any suggested defence that the station will not be entirely demolished is a feeble excuse- for to bury the station beneath modern day architecture is a gross disturbance to what already stands here. To devour the location in the planned ways serves one true purpose - financial gain - financial gain without care for the great losses that will ensue as a result of the proposed. There are internal alterations to aid accessibility that I am sure could be made sympathetically, and certainly do not require the barbaric overhaul suggested, but what is being spoken of is the introduction of brutal railway infrastructure and more eateries and retail sites. It is of NO doubt in all certainty that railway infrastructure needs drastic change, but not at historic stations, the great sums of money that will be used in the proposed plans should be used elsewhere to ensure a more efficient and reliable service in London. What is being spoken of here, the un-development of Liverpool Street Station, is not to be acted upon with ease, for once you blitz these aspects of our history there is no returning - none. Dear Tom Siegn,	PA	28-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Farquharson	Emma	As a resident of this beautiful city, I object to this application which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. Ref: Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." More specifically, I raise objections to: The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the stunning roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure, which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units (which are not needed) within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The scheme would cause substantial harm to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. The unique character of London is being eaten up by monolithic, ugly and often empty office structures. Please, please think of the legacy this would leave!!	PA	28-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	French	Tom	I add my voice to those objecting to this proposed act of corporate vandalism against this beautiful 150 year old station. The group property director of Network Rail previously said that the station would be sensitively restored and would showcase its heritage architecture. This official assertion is completely wrong. The Station would obviously not be sensitively restored, and its heritage architecture would surely be completely compromised.	PA	28-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Yardley	E	I object to this application which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets, contrary to Section 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 and the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). More specifically, I raise objections to: 1. Heritage harm to Grade II listed station structures The proposal involves demolition of the historic concourse roof and installation of new retail galleries and an oversailing office block. This will significantly diminish the legibility and setting of the 19th century trainshed, causing substantial harm to the listed building's special architectural and historic interest - contrary to NPPF paragraphs 199-202, which require great weight to be given to the asset's conservation and for any harm to be clearly and convincingly justified. 2. Adverse impact on neighbouring listed assets and conservation area The proposed 20 storey L shaped tower would overbear the Grade II listed Great Eastern Hotel and detract from the character of the Bishopsgate Conservation Area. It fails to preserve or enhance the area's low medium scale historic context, contrary to policies in the City Plan 2015 and NPPF paragraph 200. 3. Failure to show exceptional justification The NPPF (para 213) states that substantial harm to Grade II buildings should be 'exceptional' and only permitted in wholly exceptional circumstances. No such exceptional justification has been provided - benefits such as step free access and retail are enhancements that could be achieved through less harmful, more sympathetic interventions. 4. Conflict with strategic development plan policies on tall buildings The proposal conflicts with the City Plan's guidance restricting tall buildings outside designated zones and Conservation Areas, and fails to demonstrate that it preserves local heritage and character. Conclusion: For these reasons, I urge the Committee to refuse permission for application 25/00494/FULEIA	PA	28-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Draper	Alison	It's an historical building that should be left as it is	PA	28-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	O'Brien	Paul	I'm a regular user of this beautiful station - often during rush hour - and see no reasons why it should be redeveloped. It adequately caters for the demands of passengers. The only complaints I hear are of the train operating companies not the station. I can think of many other stations that would benefit from such investment, particularly in facilities. I also experienced the last redevelopment of the station which caused years and years of disruption and noise to rail users. I see little justification to put rail users through this again.	PA	28-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Ward	Karen	I OBJECT to this application which would cause substantial harm to a nationally important heritage asset that is Liverpool Street station. More specifically I raise objections to the substantial harm which will be caused to the Grade 2 listed station through the demolition of the roof structure and the station concourse and its replacement with a modern new structure. This development would also compromise the setting of the surviving 19th century train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within this train shed would also cause significant harm to the special interest and historic significance of this Grade 2 listed heritage asset. The imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low and medium scale buildings would also have a detrimental impact on the Bishopsgate Conservation Area - designed to protect this important area of the City including the Christopher Wren City and churches and the St Paul's Cathedral City Heights area. This is also contrary to the 2015 City Plan which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas such as Conservation Areas and St Paul's Heights. The substantial harm caused by this scheme is also contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework which states in Paragraph NPPF 213 "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional". This development is not exceptional and should not be allowed to go ahead and for all these reasons above I send my OBJECTION.	PA	28-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	White	Tania	I object vociferously to the proposal to add any external structure that compromises this exquisite stations heritage appearance such as is proposed. I can't understand why this has come as far as it has. What a blatant disregard for national heritage and setting. When it's gone it's gone people. This station always has been a joy. Tourism in England isn't for office blocks. This is a lasting legacy of beautiful architecture that sets unique sense of place and is reliant on its integrity and light dynamics. This should not have even got passed initial meetings. Time to listen to the outrage. Tania White	PA	28-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Toft	Emily	I object to these proposals to ruin a beautiful Victorian building. It will cause huge disruption but more importantly it will negatively impact on the character of the area. Historical buildings need to be preserved, not destroyed. Fewer tourists will ever want to come to London if all the old and well designed buildings are replaced with tedious and ugly tower blocks and office blocks. This is not progress, it is vandalism.	PA	28-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Trebacz	Agata	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional.	PA	28-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Gates	Lisa	"I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to a company steamrolling cultural heritage buildings for financial gain. London absolutely does not need more office blocks	PA	28-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Blacklock	Debra	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. the National Planning Policy Framework in paragraph 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional. I use Liverpool Street station to get to work. It's a beautiful building and it concerns me that someone is seeking to destroy it to make money.	PA	28-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Rogers	Sarah	I object to the development because it is inappropriate and will unnecessarily spoil a listed Victorian building.	PA	28-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	OHara	Emma	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to:" What are the key issues to cover in my objection? The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. Make sure to reference the National Planning Policy Framework in your objection, otherwise your objection may be dismissed: Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional."	PA	28-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Cordwell James	Michael	I object to the proposed plans to redevelop Liverpool Street Station. I believe they are destructive of a well functioning, spacious and well lit concourse that has served commuters very well for generations. Upgrades to accessibility can be carried out without the destruction of Grade 2 listed national heritage sites. I believe London is much impoverished by such developments, made in the pursuit of profit rather than public service. Liverpool Street is a major transport hub, and serves commuters, not developers. I also find that the large monolith it is proposed be erected above the station is detrimental to the historic Bishopsgate Conservation Area and in contravention of the 2015 City Plan. These kind of architectural gems from the Victorian area are few and far between, and in my view are to be cherished and preserved at all cost if London is to retain any integrity at all as a world capital.	PA	28-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Roenisch	Rowan	As set out in the National Planning Policy Framework Paragraph NPPF 213 I believe the proposals represent exceptional and substantial harm to this Grade II listed building, Liverpool Street Station. They also set a very dangerous precedent for the survival of this historically distinctive part of London. The scheme damages this nationally Grade II-listed station through the demolition and replacement of the existing station concourse roof structure; whilst compromising the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. Sometimes we can forget just how significant the London terminals are not only to this country's history, but Europe and world. Further, whilst other historically important 19TH century stations in London may have set a precedent with recent crude insertions of inappropriate commercial facilities, it would be tragic that this important terminal should have its special architectural character also wantonly destroyed by inappropriate intrusions into the spacious train sheds. Such spaciousness was a vital characteristic of their design and function, and reminds us of the polluting smoke and steam, as well as the noise and bustle of these important Victorian terminals. Tragic to lose the experience of these vast open spaces which will bring awe to future generations for their essential scale. In terms of the broader context, the proposed exceptionally high, 20 storey high-rise scheme savagely diminishes and rudely intrudes upon the setting and character of this medium-rise Conservation Area, its local listed buildings and historical assets, especially the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City. We should never forget that we today have a special responsibility, as only fleeting custodians of this architectural heritage which belongs as much to future generations as us. It is not just the fabric as such that is important, but permitting the experience of the original structure and its setting that gives us an understand	PA	28-Jun-25	O
Page 257 25/00494/FULEIA	Lord	Pauline	"I object to this application which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: 1. The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof of the concourse and its replacement with a new structure, which would also compromise the setting of the 19th century train shed. 2. The insertion of large amounts of new retail units in the 19th century train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. 3. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning 19th century hotel in the City - through the construction of a twenty-storey tower over the station concourse. 4. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low-and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches and nearby St Botolph's church. I reference the National Planning Policy Framework, paragraph NPPF 213 which states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional", whereas in this application this harm is intrinsic.	PA	28-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Cherr	Jonathan	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: The needless destruction of the fabric of historic London and its transportation history. As you know, Paragraph NPPF 213 of the National Planning Policy Framework states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional. This applies in particular to the planned destruction of the roof of the concourse. The planned insertion of extra retail space is also wrong, both historically and practically, as the new retail units will compromise the historic structure and place an undue burden on it as a retail space. Retail space demand is shaky at best in London. The inevitable downmarket units to fill the space and financial expectations will bring down your project, and so the neighborhood. The construction of a 20-story tower will also harm the context of the Grade II*-listed hotel and will badly rupture the skyline of the surrounding neighborhood. Buildings like this tower are assaultive; the loom over and diminish the neighborhood and its denizens and violate history and aesthetic context. Most people want, enjoy, and take pride in the historic and aesthetic context in which they live; they want to feel they're living in a place where so many have gone before, that they're a part of this history too, and that it will remain for those that follow when they're gone. This project will rupture those values while providing nothing of real value to the neighborhood, the community, or London. I urge you to block this project. Thank you for your kind attention.	PA	28-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Hare	Susan	Heritage	PA	28-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Mason	Teena	I have travelled regularly through this station my whole life, it is an important and beautiful piece of grade 2 listed industrial heritage which I enjoy on every visit. I object in the strongest terms to the preposterous suggestion that demolishing the beautiful roof, and hiding the structure behind elevated retail units will in any way enhance the station. The developers suggest it should become a 'destination in its own right'. What they mean is a high rental income shopping centre. It is. Railway station, a gateway to London, a stunning architectural treasure, in the midst of a thriving local conservation area of retail, galleries, and traditional markets. The station, in it's protected surroundings, is already a destination in its own right and network rail should be ensuring it is preserved and fit for purpose, not seeking to destroy it whilst avoiding that responsibility. Nothing in this proposal will enhance the area for businesses or residents. The national planning policy framework is there to protect our national heritage from exactly this kind of inappropriate development. Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional."	PA	28-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Davies	Robert	I object to the Liverpool St. plans. I occasionally enjoy visiting London (despite being ridiculously expensive from the north of England) and Spitalfields/Bishopsgate is one of my favourites. Fantastic nationally important treasures all around. Building this type of monstrosity would in my opinion be detrimental to the charm of such a fantastic place. R Davies	PA	28-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Mason	Isaac	I believe that it is the job of the planning authority to protect listed buildings, not support developers in finding ways to work around those protections. Liverpool Street station is a part of our engineering and architectural history, and it sits in an area of significance to the history of London as a whole, beautiful preserved often in spite of failures by council to stand up for residents and visitors. Please do not allow yet another money grabbing scheme to take precedence over our heritage. It was shared with me as a child and I was taught to appreciate it. I would like the opportunity to share that appreciation with future generations, but currently I only see my nations heritage being ruined by big business and the greed fuelled development benefiting a few, to the cost of all of the rest of us. We have conservation areas, listed buildings status, and a National Planning Policy Framework (Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional.") and yet still a small group of dedicated individuals are having to fight to protect assets belonging to all of us so that authorities do not sell it all out. Please do not allow this destruction of our heritage. It is not in any way exceptional, it's just a high rental retail and office development. Entirely ordinary. Entirely exploitative.	PA	28-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Doncaster	B	Destroying the antiquity of the station, for financial reasons, thus destroying our railway heritage. This is a short sighted, appalling proposal and remember, the site belongs to us all and should be a heritage site. I frequent the station, at times, throughout the year and it WORKS well. If any money should be spent anywhere, it's on the rail network NOT Liverpool Street Station.	PA	28-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Pendleton	John	The area doesn't need more office space - it just needs a station that is fit for purpose, with more and more reliable lifts and perhaps some better retail spaces	PA	28-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Collett	Graham	Concourse far too large. Destroying the historical parts of the station.	PA	28-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Walmsley	Peter	The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. NPPF paragraph 213 states "substantial harm or loss of grade 2 listed buildings or grade 2 listed parks or gardens should be exceptional"	PA	28-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Hurley	Claire	I strongly object to this application, the loss of the architecturally attractive and historically important internal roof structure of the station. The building of a high block above the station which is out of keeping with the area and out of scale with surrounding lower buildings, blocking out a great deal of light. I am so tired of seeing ugly buildings dominate an area, these are not the things that people come to the area to see and enjoy and they ruin the character of the place that people do actually enjoy looking at. The National Planning Policy Framework states that: "Substantial harm to or loss of grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." I would like to object on the grounds that this scheme does cause substantial harm to grade II listed buildings and would be detrimental to the area. This significant loss is unable to be rectified if this scheme is allowed to go ahead, and I urge you to reconsider before it is too late!	PA	28-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Sadler	Sean	I object to the proposed plan for Liverpool ST Railway Station	PA	28-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Musgrave	Stephen	This development as proposed will ruin the station and blight the immediate area in perpetuity. It is unnecessary and entirely out of character with the current built environment.	PA	28-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Sussmann	Karin	LIVERPOOL STREET STATION is such an iconic landmark in London. It would be a pity to change it with such a monstrous building on top. Would you dare to do something so unsensible to another landmark in London e.g. Houses of Parliament, the Towerbridge?	PA	28-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Sambrook	Karen	We are rapidly losing London's victorian architectural heritage. This will swamp and effectively hide the Victorian station, block any natural light that the Victorians graced us with the glass and metal structures over the platforms. May be in keeping with the tall office blocks in the vicinity but absolutely not in keeping with the station itself. Its size, swamping, and hiding the Victorian architecture of the station is just plain ugly.	PA	28-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Bell	James	I object to the scheme as it will destroy a beautiful part of railway heritage. It is unnecessary & will not benefit the travelling public. The concourse in its present state is beautiful & fit for purpose.	PA	28-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Jones	Jill	I object to this beautiful building being ruined by the addition of offices above it. Plenty of unused offices in the City.	PA	28-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Hanson	Nicholas	How have we not learned from what was done to Euston? I object strongly to the proposal to demolish the concourse at Liverpool Street Station in order to build a 1980s-inspired office block on the top. A few brick archways in the renders do not make up for the damage this will do to one of our finest stations: the station was designed to be flooded with natural light, which will now be substantially reduced; the beautiful Victorian pillars are gone in the renders, replaced by out-of-character bulky modern supports, while the exterior is dwarfed by the ugly tower blocks. We should be celebrating our railway heritage not continuing to destroy it in the misplaced spirit of Beeching, placing profit over service. I also object strongly to the manipulative campaign on social media where objections to the design are counted as 'support' merely because people have engaged with the developers'; please factor this into consideration. I may not live in London, but I consider this station a national asset that belongs to us all. Once it is gone, it is gone forever.	PA	28-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Windsor	Jennifer	As a Londoner born in this great, historic city, I object to this application which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: the harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof and replacing it The inappropriate, out-of-scale construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, which will be detrimental to the Grade II-listed heritage asset I refer you to the National Planning Policy Framework: Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional. .	PA	28-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Arding	Kate	I object to this application which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. The National Planning Policy Framework Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional. More specifically, I raise objections to: he substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof of the concourse and its replacement with a new structure, which would also compromise the setting of the 19th century train shed. The insertion of large amounts of new retail units in the 19th century train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning 19th century hotel in the City - through the construction of a twenty-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low-and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches and nearby St Botolph's church.	PA	28-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Brady	Tessa	The current building is light and airy, giving a sense of calm. The proposals would ruin this feel, giving a more oppressive feel.	PA	28-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Edwards	Terry	The proposed rebuilding of Liverpool Street Station has nothing to do with improvement of the station and everything to do with commerce. And not in a good way. The character of this area is being chipped away with every brick wich is removed in the name of regeneration. When will developers realise that the beauty and value in our city of London lies equally in it's history and inhabitants, not in sky-high buildings and sky-high rents? Regeneration and rebuilding is welcome when the proposals are sympathetic to the sites they're designed for. This proposal is not fit for purpose.	PA	28-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Woodley	Paul	I strongly object to this planning application which if approved would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. Having lived in a Grade II-listed building on Commercial Street on and off since 1982 I know the area well and have seen the major changes during that time, some good and some bad. I have used Liverpool Street station many thousands of times and have always found it easy to navigate and a joy to use. This plan is addressing a problem that does not exist in order to screw as much profit out of the site as possible while at the same time destroying a beautiful building. The improved access and toilets argument put forward by the applicants is nonsense. My 90 year old blind father has had no issues going through the station when he visits London and found the disabled toilets there convenient. Demolishing the roof of the concourse is vandalism. Putting a vast 20 storey office block on top will ruin the appearance of the station and adjacent buildings including the neighbouring Grade II*-listed hotel. It will also blot out the light from the concourse. This development will be a blight on the wider Bishopsgate Conservation Area and question has to be asked - do we need yet another office building in these post-Covid WFH times? As has been noted by other objectors, this plan completely flouts the National Planning Policy Framework which says: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional". This design is not exceptional. It is just part of the game that developers play, offering up an unsuitable oversized plan in the hope of getting something smaller eventually approved - as has happened with the Bishopsgate Goodsyrd site.	PA	28-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Brownhall	Lucy	I object to this proposal because it will partially destroy a beautiful Victorian building which is surely a National Heritage site. I travel to London often and I do not see congestion in this concourse. This work is not necessary and will be destructive of a valuable building. It will also result in a darker concourse, which will feel depressing and unsafe. The National Planning Policy Framework, Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." This proposal definitely constitutes substantial harm to this glorious building.	PA	28-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Marston	Terry	I must object to this proposal on several grounds. As a member of London Historians I consider this to be against the development of London and merely another attempt to make more money without consideration of the needs of the city or its users. As I have detailed later the National Planning Policy Framework is being ignored by this proposal and also the proposals will raise the profile of the building dominating the surrounding area against local policy decisions. The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure, which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. The National Planning Policy Framework Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional."	PA	28-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	eason	Fraser	this will cast the whole area into darkness, especially inside the station and add nothing to the area but noise pollution for years and years to come	PA	28-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	McMenemy	Clare Frances	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. I reference the National Planning Policy Framework Paragraph NPPF 213 as my main objection which states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." I object in no uncertain terms that this should go ahead.	PA	28-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Frater	Aaron	A large part of buildings character comes from natural light, stop destroying our heritage !!	PA	28-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Freedman	Matthew	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. I make my objections with particular reference to the National Planning Policy Framework paragraph NPPF 213, which states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." More specifically, I raise objections to: The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church.	PA	28-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Baker	Fiona	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. The proposed planning application is in direct contravention of the National Planning Policy Framework which states (Paragraph NPPF 213): "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." There can be no justification for deliberately ignoring the national framework and desecrating this unique asset.	PA	28-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Kenningham-Brown	Antony	I object to the application to redevelop Liverpool Street station. The development contravenes National Planning Policy Framework, Paragraph NPPF 213 which states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." The development would result in significant harm to the Grade II listed building. The replacement roof structure would destroy the setting of the surviving nineteenth-century train shed. Over-development of the retail units within the station would cause significant harm to the National Heritage asset. There are currently many empty retail units within the station, which indicates over-supply. The Grade II listed hotel next door would be harmed by the construction of a 20-storey tower block over the station concourse. This hotel itself contains other listed buildings within its structure, all of which would be compromised and lost. Contrary to Policy HC1 of the London Plan, 2021. The proposed tower block would harm the Bishopsgate Conservation Area. This would be contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas. Vacant office space in the City has increased since the pandemic, largely due to people continuing to work from home in preference to commuting. This suggests that any uptick in numbers could be accommodated elsewhere. This trend will also affect the number of passengers in future years, as will the aging profile of the country's population, thus belying the figures produced by National Rail. National Rail have been disingenuous in ascribing their inability to manage the station effectively as support for their plans. (Accessibility could be improved without the destruction of this vital national asset.) As a regular traveller to Liverpool Street station at both peak and off-peak times, I have rarely, if ever, witnessed any of the overcrowding and congestion that	PA	28-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Hughes	Louise	Dear Tom Sleigh, I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: - the partial demolish of an historic railway heritage asset that is as important as other preserved sites in London at Kings Cross and other areas. The loss of historic buildings at stations such as Euston etc. is a huge loss to the fabric of the city and our experience of living and interacting with it - the plans are absolutely ugly beyond measure and ruin the area	PA	28-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Savage	Andrew	The plans to alter the beautiful roof is unacceptable, the owners have a responsibility for this beautiful architecture, and any change is wrong. This amazing construction needs to be preserved for future generations, and not allow Network rail to commercially exploit it's land avoid it's responsibilities for our heritage	PA	28-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Jowers	L	Buildings like Liverpool st station should not be built around or on top of; dwarfed, overwhelmed by architectural monstrosity. It's more of an insult than knocking it down. London with each year loses its charm, planning laws subservient to corporate greed. Look at Paris. Constrained compartmentalized development protects the beauty of a great city. London is a shadow of its former self. Its skyline and waterways plastered with architectural abomination. A disgrace.	PA	28-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Scott	Paul	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. The National Planning Policy Framework in: Paragraph NPPF 213 states that: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional."	PA	28-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Wright	Lisamarie Mary	National Planning Policy Framework. I object to the destruction of this impressive example of Victorian architecture that encompasses all that is great about British engineering and construction. To destroy this beautiful building is nothing short of evil and an enemy action against Britain. I have been to the station a few times. I feel that this station and similar stations in London offer a chance to see a part of what made London an icon of the world. It is still appreciated to this day by thousands of people, even if they do not know the history of the station. To erase this would be a crime in not only this present time but the future as well. I ask you to cancel these plans. I also ask any relevant bodies to protect Liverpool Street from this and any further possible destruction plans.	PA	28-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	young	caroline	This is a national heritage asset that would be severely harmed. Reference is made to the National Planning Policy Framework. Paragraph NPPF213 states : "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade 11 listed buildings, or grade 11 registered parks or gardens should be exceptional." The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area ,by the installation of a tall building in an area characterised by low and medium=scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas like conservation areas and the St Pauls Heights Area. I totally Object	PA	28-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Bond	Simon	I object based on substantial disruption to the travelling public for absolutely no benefit to said passengers, I also object to being bombarded on social media by biased and selective messaging. The station is great as it is (post the increase in station barriers after removal of retail units) and could be even better with a few minor low cost adjustments.	PA	28-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Lowes	Jessica	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. Paragraph NPPF 213 of the National Planning Policy Framework states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional."	PA	28-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Hudswell	Lesley	I object to this application which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: I grew up in London and I know this station well. This proposed development is obnoxious both practically and aesthetically. POINTS FOR OBJECTION: The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof of the concourse and its replacement with a new structure, which would also compromise the setting of the 19th century train shed. The insertion of large amounts of new retail units in the 19th century train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning 19th century hotel in the City - through the construction of a twenty-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low-and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches and nearby St Botolph's church. I refer you to the National Planning Policy Framework. Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." I trust you will note these points and reject the application.	PA	28-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Murray	Juliet	This is a beautiful historical structure that we must preserve at all costs. I have used this station and service for some time, it would be devastating to bulldoze any part of it for unnecessary offices.	PA	28-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Ridealgh-Bradshaw	Elaine	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to destroying our heritage , creating a depressingly dark shadow over the buildings that are standing there already. Why cant you create something that works with the current environment instead of against it?	PA	28-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Aves	Peter	I object to this application as it would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, the substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof of the concourse and its replacement with a new structure, which would also compromise the setting of the 19th century train shed. the National Planning Policy Framework states: "substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." Please stop allowing the destruction of the London cityscape. the public consultation for the first Liverpool St Station scheme which only showed the lower half of the model was a scandal.	PA	28-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Bellwood	Angela	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: 1. The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. This would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. 2. The insertion of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. 3. The impact on the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. 4. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. I think that the City has quite enough skyscrapers already and is likely to lose its historical context if any more go up. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. In the National Planning Policy Framework, Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." I would also add that as a City Guide I knew the City architect who did the last conversion on Liverpool Street station and he would be turning in his grave at the present plan. I object to this application, which would cause s	PA	28-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Blythe	Thomas	To whom it may concern: I object to the proposed redevelopment to Liverpool Street Station and surrounding area, and would like to cite National Planning Policy Framework Paragraph NPPF 213 "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." This proposed development seems to be highly inappropriate, a dreadful and flagrantly wild abuse of the local area architecturally, not to say wildly costly on very shaky grounds. Sincerely, T Blythe.	PA	28-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Clarke	Harry	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets	PA	28-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Moreno	Laura	Please do not allow for this version of the station. The station is good enough now, the neighbourhood doesn't need any more offices. We need better rental options!!!	PA	28-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Hapgood	Pierce	I object to the new plans to redevelop Liverpool Street station. In its current form the concourse is one of the most beautiful historical sites to see in this country on the train lines. It is part of our national heritage and most are in awe of such beautifully constructed architecture upon seeing it. The funds could be better spent elsewhere perhaps?	PA	28-Jun-25	R
25/00494/FULEIA	Wilks	Stuart	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to the disproportionate scale of the proposed development which will substantially damage the appearance and amenity in the existing area. The city generally has a good approach to large scale development, but if permitted, this development on the fringe of the city in an area which contains a significant amount of heritage architecture will ruin one of the few remaining pieces of significant 19th century architecture we have left.	PA	28-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Cyplik	Dyana	Liverpool Street Station should remain as is.	PA	28-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Selby	David	Dear Chair of the Planning & Transport Committee: Tom Sleight, Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. Keep our heritage intact for our children. Once Liverpool Street Sation is gone in its current form, it is gone forever. It is more than just about the money. Please deny the request to redevelop the Liverpool Street Station sight. Thanks you. David Selby	PA	28-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Gibson	Hilary	I object to the major alterations and the height of the new office block being proposed and think that every should be done to preserve this building in its entirety	PA	28-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Etches	Danielle	I object to this application which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to the following aspects of the proposal: 1. Substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station building The proposed demolition of the roof of the station concourse and its replacement with a new structure would result in irreversible harm to the architectural and historic significance of the Grade II-listed station. This intervention would also compromise the historic relationship and setting of the original 19th-century train shed, a defining element of the station's heritage value. 2. Insertion of new retail units within historic train sheds The proposal includes extensive commercial development inside the 19th-century train sheds, including the addition of two elevated retail galleries. This would introduce a dominant and intrusive commercial presence into a sensitive heritage space, leading to a high level of harm to the special interest and character of the listed station, undermining its integrity and historic function. 3. Impact on surrounding heritage assets, notably the Grade II-listed hotel* The construction of a twenty-storey tower above the station concourse would significantly harm the setting and historic value of the adjacent Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continuously operating 19th-century hotel in the City. The scale, height, and visual dominance of the proposed tower would erode the contextual relationship between the hotel and the station, damaging their historic coherence. 4. Harm to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area and wider historic environment The imposition of a tall building within the Bishopsgate Conservation Area - an area defined by its predominantly low to medium-scale historic townscape - would cause substantial harm to its character and appearance. This runs counter to the provisions of the 2015 City Plan, which explicitly requires the refusal of tall buildings in sen	PA	28-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	McFarlane	I.	Dear Sir/Madam I object to this application which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to:" - The fact that this proposal is not in line with the National Planning Policy Framework. Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." - The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low-and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. - The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof of the concourse and its replacement with a new structure. - The impact of this scheme on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches and nearby St Botolph's church. - The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning 19th century hotel in the City - through the construction of a twenty-storey tower over the station concourse. This is a very special part of the local area. This planning application is not in any way sympathetic to , or in keeping with the existing environment. I do hope planning is refused.	PA	28-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	QUAYLE	JONATHAN	I object strongly to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to the demolition of the existing station concourse. The removal of this beautiful & iconic space, would destroy the integrity of the whole Victorian structure. Whilst acknowledging improvements are needed to the station, this seems to be a case of throwing the baby out with the bath water. Improvements could be made, as they have been in other stations (Waterloo, St Pancras etc) without major demolition and intrusion. There seems to be an unbalanced push to the introduction of large unnecessary retail elements to fund this project, whose inclusion will be at the cost of the bright, light filled iconic concourse, that still functions beautifully for its original purpose. Whilst the busy spaces that intersect it need improving due to congestion etc, including yet another shopping centre in a central London travel hub in an ever changing retail world, seems utter madness, the high streets of the UK are dead and dying. In reference the National Planning Policy Framework:- Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." This application is in no shape or form exceptional. The brick replacement structure is a pastiche, with the exception of the brick colour, it has no respect for anything around it, above it retail & office space, something not in short supply in the city, there are plenty of poorly built interwar and later buildings that could make way for the needed space that is being argued for here. To destroy a work of art, a cathedral of industry, to make way for another branch of Pret, seems a lousy way to celebrate our forefathers who created this masterpiece. If we allow this debacle to go ahead, we will be no better than those who oversaw the destruction of the Euston Arch.	PA	28-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Ford	Rachel	Will not be fitting with the character of Liverpool.	PA	28-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Billenness	Sally	I object to this proposal which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: 1) The demolition of the roof of the concourse and replacement with a modern structure which will compromise the setting of the 19th Century train shed. 2) The new retail outlets planned in those train sheds which would significantly alter the character of the sheds. 3) The damage that will be done to the setting of the listed buildings by dwarfing them and cutting the available light - the hotel has always been one of the larger buildings in the area and it's character stems from this, to put a building more than twice the height around it would completely destroy the whole character. 4) The local Bishopsgate Conservation Area is an area characterised by low and medium scale buildings - these plans would destroy that. These plans would impact on many Grade I listed buildings too. I believe that this proposal would cause significant harm without being in any way exceptional; NPPF Paragraph 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." I totally object.	PA	28-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Straughan	Susannah	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. In particular, I object to: 1) The harm that would be caused to the Grade II-listed station by the demolition of the roof structure of the current station concourse. The replacement roof structure that is proposed would compromise the setting of the 19th century train shed that survives. 2) The proposed new retail units and elevated galleries within those train sheds, which would damage the significance of this Grade II-listed heritage asset. 3) The overall harm that this scheme would bring to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area - namely the erection of a tall building within an area of low- and medium-height buildings. This is contrary to the provisions of the 2015 City Plan, which requires planning permission to be removed for such tall buildings in Conservation Areas. According to Paragraph NPPF 213 of the National Planning Policy Framework: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." I believe this application should be turned down on the basis of these objections and the above-mentioned provision of the NPPF. Yours faithfully, Susannah Straughan	PA	28-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Ogbourne	Jeannette	There is no good reason to destroy the beauty of this building. We have to protect these iconic structures from ugly modernisation. Additional offices are not needed at this station. There are so many empty offices already. The money which has been allocated to this unnecessary destruction of a beautiful roof can be far better spent on maintaining a better train service.	PA	28-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Sheppard	Marie-Lise	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections in regards to Paragraph NPPF 213: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional. The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. Yours sincerely Marie-Lise Sheppard	PA	28-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Learmonth	Jo	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's. The National Planning Policy Framework, paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." Liverpool Street station has been a fundamental part of our family's life for almost 30 years. This plan is neither necessary or welcome.	PA	28-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Bates	Clive	The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. Make sure to reference the National Planning Policy Framework in your objection, otherwise your objection may be dismissed: Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional."	PA	28-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Bugden	Claire	I object to the plans for their disruption to the existing facility and the vulgarity of the proposed structure.	PA	28-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Witz	Susan	I object to this application, which would cause serious harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. I stay at the Andaz London Liverpool Street (Grade II listed) two months out of the year whilst visiting family in the area. I have been doing this since 2019. There are many options for accommodation in London but I've fallen in love with this neighborhood--its history, the architecture, the convenience. The Andaz itself is an architectural masterpiece and introduces such a lovely contrast to the tall business buildings along Bishopsgate. Needless to say I spend much of my travel time going to/from Liverpool St. Station. All the rail lines are so well organized and I find I can go almost anywhere from Liverpool Street Station. I am puzzled when I read the justification for this application. I take all the lines (overground & underground) at all times of the day and rarely find it crowded. The charm of the Liverpool Street Station is unique and should be preserved. It represents an important part of London's history. This application, if approved, would cause severe disruption for a long period of time. Would the benefits outweigh the costs, the inconvenience, the disruption? I think not. Please preserve Liverpool Street Station & the Andaz as is. Submitted respectfully, Mrs. Susan Witz.	PA	28-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Tyrrell	Siobhan	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance or nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to:- substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. With reference to the National Planning Policy Framework - Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." I strongly object to this planning proposal, and I am a Londoner and regularly commute through this beautiful Victorian station. This historic building should be fully protected and left untouched. Sincerely Siobhan Tyrrell	PA	28-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Salter	Jenny	Liverpool Street is fine as is. Perfectly serviceable. Absolutely no need for more space for offices or restaurants or shops. Those already in the station are generally quiet. Leave LS as it is.	PA	28-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Dean	Gareth	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. Given the recent fire at the Hotspur Press, likely due to the ongoing challenges to planning decisions and listing of significant industrial heritage, this scheme presents another significant, negative impact on 19th century industrial innovation and design. From an intangible heritage perspective, this station represents the staging point for journeys into and out of London, and it is in this capacity that I have fond memories of the station and would hate to see it lose its character through an insensitive and unnecessary development.	PA	28-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	DEANE	K	Removing the original victorian parts. Once gone it's irreplaceable	PA	28-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Bush	Annaliese	Liverpool street station is a beautiful example of Victorian architecture I can't believe anyone would want to demolish this. It's iconic and there's no reason to get rid of it. It works as it is.	PA	28-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Markham	Sarah	I strongly object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. I'm sure that I don't need to remind you of the National Planning Policy Framework p, Paragraph NPPF 213 which states that : "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." This is a beautiful and precious building and we should d be doing all we can to protect it, not destroy it.	PA	28-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Kruger	Friederike	Preserving the heritage	PA	28-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Hart	George	Dear Sir, I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to the monstrosity that is proposed to overpower this historic railway station. I contributed to the fist and successful LISSCA campaign. I see absolutely no justification for the almost complete destruction proposed by the current planning application. Will you never learn? Tidy it up by all means. Get rid of the tacky junk food stalls obscuring the gate line, add more seats, improve access for the disabled. Leave the main structure alone. Once destroyed it can never be replaced. Does the City of London want to go down in history as corporate vandals? London's history is better than that. George Hart	PA	28-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Richards	Paul	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: The destruction of the Victorian Station, The Abuse of a Public Transportation Hub in London, The complete change and destruction of the surrounding area, which has already under gone a major change and redevelopment of the area.	PA	28-Jun-25	O
Page 279 25/00494/FULEIA	Morris	Adam	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. I'd like to point to the National Planning Policy Framework, paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." Please consider your decision!	PA	28-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Murray	James	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed Liverpool Street station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel, the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City, through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The proposal looms over the hotel and will cause unacceptable harm to its setting. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low to medium scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. The scheme is not in accordance with Paragraph NPPF 213, which states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." The proposed architecture is of mediocre quality and makes little effort to work in harmony with its surroundings. I urge you to reject this scheme	PA	28-Jun-25	O
Page 280 25/00494/FULEIA	Hampton	Keith	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. I refer to the National Planning Policy Framework: Paragraph NPPF 213 which states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional.	PA	28-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	McDonnell	Jess	Less than substantial harm is posed to the Grade II listed station building, the setting of the adjacent listed buildings and heritage assets, and surrounding Conservation Areas (Bishopsgate, New Broad Street, Finsbury Circus) within the City of London. The towers will harm the historic context in the surrounding Boroughs, specifically Hackney and the Spitafields area. The inarticulate incongruous massing of the tower demonstrates a lack of any contextual understanding and fails to even acknowledge let alone respect or take cues from the heritage asset. Rather than look to integrate sensitivity into the historic context the development appears to be primarily driven by the intention to maximise floorplate and airspace. Any public benefits cannot be demonstrated to adequately balance the harm to the station itself or the surrounding historic environment. The harm is considered to sit at the upper end of less than substantial and the application should therefore be refused.	PA	28-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Littlefair	Sally	The size and monolithic design of the building seems totally out of character with the immediate environment and will dwarf the existing architecture.	PA	28-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Webber	Clare	Liverpool Street Station should be preserved in its entirety. Its functions a railway network perfectly well and should not be developed for other purposes. The area of Bishopsgate is already developed to its limit and in places over modernised?! Liverpool Station should be retained for its architectural beauty.	PA	28-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Greenwood	Jamie	I object to this proposal as this development will destroy the well balanced 90s extension of the station and remove all natural light onto the concourse. I am unsure how constructing a towerblock on top of the concourse area helps alleviate congestion in the main part of the ticket hall as it does not increase the actual floor plan of the concourse. I thought we had moved past trying to build over station train sheds as we can see how dark and gloomy stations such as Fenchurch St and Euston's concourse are in comparison to stations where natural light is allowed to flow in unobstructed such as in KGX, St Pan and Paddington.	PA	29-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Miller	Katherine	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: - Paragraph NPPF 213 of the National Planning Policy Framework states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." This applies to the substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. - This would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. - The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. - The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. - The proposal mentions improving station accessibility but these improvements can happen without demolition and construction that fundamentally alter the station.	PA	29-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Malpass	Amanda	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: 1. The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. Make sure to reference the National Planning Policy Framework in your objection, otherwise your objection may be dismissed: Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional."	PA	29-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Stevens	Paula	I am appalled that this incongruous development is being considered. The National Planning Policy Framework Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." The development is not exceptional, it is a tall building in a low rise landscape and is in the Billingsgate Conservation Area. Why make a city plan in 2015 and then ignore it?	PA	29-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Topping	Nicholas	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. Make sure to reference the National Planning Policy Framework in your objection, otherwise your objection may be dismissed: Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional."	PA	29-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Pearce	Elaine	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to the substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. The National Planning Policy Framework paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional."	PA	29-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Gooch	Janice	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: The key issues to cover in my objection are: The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. Under Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional. Whilst there may be seen as some public benefits, this should not outweigh the harm identified or go against existing policy.	PA	29-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Kedgley	Julia	I strongly believe we need to preserve our rich heritage from disappearing. I am concerned that the proposal will forever change the look and feel of the building and area into more non descriptive modern buildings. I am concerned about blocking of the light and the abundance of high buildings taking over and overshadowing the station building area.	PA	29-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Boyd	Carolyn	You cannot destroy this beautiful station just for office space. Its beauty and history need to be preserved. The whole area is unrecognisable to 10 years ago. Spitalfields market is soulless and corporate now compared its wonder before the redevelopment, don't do the same to Liverpool Street station.	PA	29-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Ward	Christy	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to development that would remove the current connection to the beautifully crafted heritage building, as this building provides natural light, a sense of our place in history and aesthetic stimulation; all essential to human wellbeing.	PA	29-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Topping	Chloe	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. Make sure to reference the National Planning Policy Framework in your objection, otherwise your objection may be dismissed: Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional."	PA	29-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Conway	Andrew	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. the National Planning Policy Framework - Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional."	PA	29-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Luther	Rosa	I object. Degradation of historical building.	PA	29-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Hurcum	Sarah	I object to this application which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically I raise objections to the substantial harm to the Grade 11 listed station, the Grade 11 listed hotel and the Bishopsgate Conservation area. The National Planning Policy Framework para NPPF213 states 'substantial harm to or loss of grade 11 listed buildings and grade 11 listed parks and gardens should be exceptional.	PA	29-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Lisowska	Zofia	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: the substantial harm that would occur to the original train station building, and the ways in which the insertion of a 20 storey tower in a heritage setting (which is a listed conservation area) would violate the national planning policy framework - paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." This development would not be exceptional in any way, and the building of such a contrasting building in an area characterised by its heritage should be stopped.	PA	29-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Williams	John	The proposed scheme would cause unacceptable harm to heritage assets including the listed Great Eastern Hotel and listed parts of the station including the train sheds. The proposal would also be detrimental to passenger experience, particularly in the concourse which would lose natural light. The proposed development is not in keeping with the existing style of the station and is inappropriate in terms of scale, height and massing.	PA	29-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Kemp	Chris	Please leave this attractive example of Victorian architecture alone, it works fine as it is and London certainly doesn't need more office space or shops! The plans would destroy and overwhelm the character and design of the original station.	PA	29-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Baker	Jeannie	I object to the demolition of Liverpool Street station particularly for a 20 story office block to be built on top when there is so much unused office space in the city already. I object to the natural light being taken from commuters and employees. I approve of internal improvements regarding access but not units for shops and restaurants when again, there are so many already in the city and may remain empty if rent is too high. It's such a stunning building I don't understand why anyone would even suggest changing it. Not everything in life has to be modernised! I imagine the cost to do all this will be horrific and a huge imposition on commuters. I'm sure money (if there actually is any for this project) could be better spent maintaining this gorgeous station.	PA	29-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Castle	Rebecca	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional."	PA	29-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Clift	Martin	I Object! This is cultural, environmental & logistical terrorism. Density of development in this area is already massively in excess. If you want to raise more money for your business - try focusing on your actual raison d'etre - providing affordable reliable environmentally friendly travel for all.	PA	29-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Connolly	Sarah	Dear Tom Sleigh I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to:" The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional."	PA	29-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Caw	David	I wish to register my objection on the grounds it will be "a blot in the landscape " The whole scheme is flawed and attempts to hide it's aims by stating there will be improvements in toilets etc . It will forever alter the skyline and dwarf a Victorian wonder . I worked for TFL and we dealt with many planning applications ie Camden Town and Tottenham rd both failed in their original forms . However nether were as radical as the Liverool St proposal . Please get the scheme stopped and review the aims and objectives . It is necessary for some improvements to the station then carry them out in a phased manner. Reading the scope works it is easy to remove the non urgent work and recast the yields on a reduced scheme that is aesthetically in keeping with the station I am living in Spain having retired there . My address in the UK is my daughters where I return to when I am back . Regards David Caw	PA	29-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Scheggia	Joanne	I object!!! This is a beautiful building with stunning architecture and I did use this station daily on my commute from the East end of London to NatWest Drapers Gardens for many years. It has already been partially developed in the 80s taking away the little individual shops but the roof and outside was left intact. Why add yet another office block to destroy what is left of The original square mile!! Complete greed that is why!!! Next St Pauls Cathedral will go along with the Bank of England!! It's our architecture which brings tourists from all over the World to London, to admire and marvel at what they haven't got!!! The concourse is too crowded or dangerous!! Banking industry alone has lost a massive percentage of staff that would have used that station daily!! Network Rail are just looking to profit from it and must not be allowed to do so!!!	PA	29-Jun-25	O
Page 288 25/00494/FULEIA	Harris	Lillie	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: - The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. - The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. Paragraph NPPF 213 of the National Planning Policy Framework states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." The newer planning proposals are a significant improvement on the previous ones, which were a blocky, white monstrosity. However, the mock-up images do not give a clear enough perspective of how the new 20-storey block will impact the street scene, and how it feels to walk around the area as a pedestrian. I believe that the scale of the new building will feel much more substantial in real life than the angled mock-up (which tries to imply it will barely be seen beyond the existing hotel). The proposed new building block is completely out of scale with the area, and will negatively impact the public realm, access to daylight (which is currently a huge draw for pedestrians), and the risks of damage and degradation to the existing listed buildings is highly concerning.	PA	29-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Plane	Helen	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional."	PA	29-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Artemis	Sophie	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise these objections: The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. the National Planning Policy Framework, Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional."	PA	29-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	BRIANT	RUTH	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to heritage assets and an important part of our national history. I raise specific objections to: substantial damage to Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the concourse roof structure. Grade II listing is supposed to protect significant buildings. The setting of the surviving 19th-century train shed would also be compromised, counter to National Planning Policy Framework, Paragraph NPPF 213: "Substantial harm to or loss of Grade II listed buildings... should be exceptional." The insertion of many new retail units and elevated galleries within historical train sheds will result in much harm to the special interest and significance of this Grade II-listed heritage asset. Has research been carried out to prove that these extra retail units are necessary? The last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City (Grade II*) will be negatively impacted by the proposed construction of an out-of-proportion and overshadowing 20-storey tower. This proposal shows no awareness or sensitivity to the surrounding listed heritage assets. The Bishopsgate Conservation Area enjoys low/ medium-scale buildings, and the imposition of a tall building in this area is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. The scheme hasn't taken into account the numerous heritage assets in the neighbourhood, such as nearby St Botolph's church and many Grade I-listed Wren City churches. The scale and style of the proposed development isn't appropriate; it hasn't considered the local area's existing buildings, ignores the heritage of a significant and much-loved bustling Victorian railway station with a grand, confident and exuberant soaring roof. Partially demolishing and redeveloping this Station ignores Listing, NPPF, City Plan 2015 and Conservation Areas.	PA	29-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Speechley	Graham	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. I refer to Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." More specifically, I raise objections to:	PA	29-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Dinmore	Ian	I object to this desecration of an iconic London Landmark. The design is purely to maximise revenue for the state through Network Rail leasing. There will be very few passenger benefits and not enough to compensate for the blot on the landscape. I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: 1. The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed 2. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causes a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. 3. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. 4. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, including many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches and nearby St Botolph's Church. 5. Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional."	PA	29-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Begley	John	I object to planned expansion and redevelopment of the Station. Although not a resident of London, My daughter does reside in London. I have had the occasion to use the station dozens of times in the past year. The station appears to quite easily handle the current traffic load and most likely handle an increase of a factor of two or three times the passenger movements it currently supports. The investment of money in rolling stock and rail infrastructure would serve the public greater than investing in commercial real estate ventures.	PA	29-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Wustemann	Louis	Liverpool Street, since its last sympathetic overhaul, is one of most pleasurable stations in London to use, along with Kings Cross. These plans dwarf the Victorian buildings with no obvious gain for most passengers.	PA	29-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Grant	Kay	I object to this application which would cause substantial harm to a beautiful station roof & to the significance of important heritage assets. Under the National planning policy framework the loss of a grade II listed building would be terrible. Let's treasure our beautiful heritage & celebrate what others before us made rather than construct another modern eyesore.	PA	29-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Walsh	Kathleen	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. This station is local to me, and I also object strongly to the disingenuous survey by the group "Time for London Liverpool Street," on Facebook and other social media platforms. This survey merely asked if we would approve of more toilets and disabled access in the station, neglecting any mention of the destruction of historical areas. This is disingenuous at best, exploiting people's natural sympathy for the disabled is actually offensive. Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional. Why are we adding this building and destroying heritage in the process when there are many empty offices all over the City in need of refurbishment or renewal?	PA	29-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Brumpton	Kimberley	The destruction of Liverpool Street station would be disastrous for London. Our architectural heritage in London is slowly being eroded by greed. The development would not be beneficial for London as it would not provide anything beneficial for the London community, other than to line the pockets of the developers. Like other historical cities around the world, we should be protecting our historical architecture and not be replacing it with buildings and shops that will most likely sit empty for several years before being used. We should conserve our buildings, not rip them out to be replaced with ugly structures that will only serve to ruin the landscape of what's remaining of a once great city.	PA	29-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Adams	Paul	I find the plans to partly demolish and restructure Liverpool St Station utterly disgraceful. It is neither needed nor wanted. This beautiful Victorian building is unique and an outstanding example of our heritage. It should be preserved in its original form for future generations to admire.	PA	29-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Harrison	James	I strongly object to this application on both planning and cultural grounds. The scheme would cause substantial harm to nationally important heritage assets, especially the Grade II-listed station. The demolition of the concourse roof and its replacement with a modern structure would compromise the architectural and historical integrity of the 19th-century train shed. The proposal to insert extensive retail units, including two elevated galleries, within the train sheds would damage the special interest of the listed structure. These additions are intrusive and out of keeping with the building's original purpose. The construction of a twenty-storey tower above the concourse would harm the setting of the adjacent Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning 19th-century railway hotel in the City. The scheme would also damage the character of the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, which is defined by low- and mid-rise historic buildings. This contravenes the 2015 City Plan, which requires refusal of tall buildings in Conservation Areas and protected views, such as the St Paul's Heights Policy Area. In addition, the proposals would harm the setting of several other heritage assets, including many of the Grade I-listed Wren churches and St Botolph's Church. Once these views and contexts are lost, they cannot be restored. Beyond policy breaches, this application reflects a wider failure to value the historic built environment. Our architectural heritage is a cultural asset that gives meaning to place, memory, and identity. Erasing it in favour of oversized, generic development impoverishes the lives of future generations. The National Planning Policy Framework (paragraph 213) is clear:	PA	29-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Timewell	Alison	I object to this application which would cause substantial and unnecessary harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically I raise objections to: The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive and unnecessary new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. Paragraph 213 of the National Planning Policy Framework states : "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." The proposed application clearly does not qualify as 'exceptional'.	PA	29-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Lis	Tomasz	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. The development as presented is harmful to the station, it provides no obvious benefits to the area and it's based on false idea that the station is no longer fit for its purpose.	PA	29-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Spence	Susan	I can see no justification for the redevelopment of this building other than for profit. It will not enhance the passenger experience	PA	29-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Baker	Nicki	I strongly object to the planned alterations to Liverpool St station, as a regular commuter to London the building is beautiful and needs to stay untouched to continue to live as it is in its original design.	PA	29-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Harrison	Nick	To destroy any aspect of the historic building is unacceptable. It appears that greed and profit take precedence over quality and culture The station is already hemmed in by massive adjacent buildings - please see the reality of cramming another tall building in place of a gem of existing architecture	PA	29-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Banner	Kerry	I object to the proposals as believe the heritage harm to the listed station and the conservation area caused by the height and overbearing size and position of the tower is much greater than represented in the heritage pact statement.	PA	29-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Parrack	Linda	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to the substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. The National Planning Policy Framework paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional."	PA	29-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Ball	Vicky	The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. National Planning Policy Framework Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional."	PA	29-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Guyver	Christopher	This will cause irreversible damage to some of the capital's best Victorian architecture.	PA	29-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Painter	Philip	I object to this application as I believe it would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. Paragraph NPPF 213 of the National Planning Policy Framework states that "Substantial harm or loss of a) Grade II listed buildings ... should be exceptional." However, this application would result in harm to a Grade II listed station in requiring demolition of the roof of the concourse and its replacement with a new structure, which would also compromise the setting of the 19th century train shed, and this is my primary reason for my objection. Furthermore, I raise objections to the following points: - The insertion of multiple new retail units in the 19th century train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, which would cause significant harm to the special interest and significance of this Grade II listed heritage asset. - The negative impact on the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets, primarily to the hotel, which would be caused by the construction of a twenty-storey tower over the station concourse. - The substantial harm which would be caused by this scheme to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area by the addition of a tall building in an area which is characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This runs contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as conservation areas and the St Paul's Cathedral Heights area. Additionally, the scheme would impact upon the setting of a number of designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as St Botolph's and many of the City churches designed by Christopher Wren and which are now listed as Grade I.	PA	29-Jun-25	O
Page 296 25/00494/FULEIA	Broadley	John	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church.	PA	29-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Roche-Gordon	Kate	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. My objection is reference to the National Planning Policy Framework: Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." Specifically, I raise objections to: -The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. -The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. -The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. Please reconsider these plans for Liverpool Street station, that they be abandoned in preference of restoring and celebrating the existing Victorian engineering and architecture that we currently admire and cherish.	PA	29-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Peek	Jennifer	This station is part of our heritage. There are too many empty offices in London already. There is absolutely no need to spoil such a beautiful building and replace it with more ugly offices. People visit London to see these beautiful buildings and you are considering destroying it?	PA	29-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Tomlinson	Caron	Hello I am contacting you to say please do not put buildings on top of Liverpool Street Station. It would be ugly and an eyesore. You've changed or pulled down the old station where I live in Wickford Essex, it now an eyesore and had no historical character anymore so please do not do this to Liverpool Street station. Yours Sincerely Mrs Caron Tomlinson	PA	29-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Cassels	Robert	I object strongly to this appalling, inappropriate and unnecessary application which would substantially harm the existing significant architectural and functional features of Liverpool St station. The development is against the National Planning Policy Framework paragraph NPPF 213 which states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." The scheme would cause substantial harm to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area by imposing a tall building in an area characterised by low-and medium-scale buildings - in other words it is completely inappropriate to the area. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would affect the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches and nearby St Botolph's church. London is being wrecked by far too many high-rise developments, and it has become a free-for-all where almost anything is now approved regardless of sympathy with existing structures and communities. There is no regard to architectural beauty - this scheme is just a large cuboid block with no artistic merit. Building by building, older and beautiful sites in London are being destroyed and replaced with soul-less monstrosities that break the essential connection between people and their surroundings through excessive scale and ugly design.	PA	29-Jun-25	O
Page 298 25/00494/FULEIA	Donachie	Peta	I think that the architecture should be kept as it is, it is our history, when visiting the city the architecture is amazing, I am flabbergasted that someone thought that this should be a good idea. I include these objections also: as per the planning policy:- Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church.	PA	29-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Bottwood	Susan	I object to this application which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof of the concourse and its replacement with a new structure, which would also compromise the setting of the 19th century train shed. The insertion of large amounts of new retail units in the 19th century train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning 19th century hotel in the City - through the construction of a twenty-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low-and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches and nearby St Botolph's church. I also refer to the National Planning Policy Framework - Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." Please therefore accept my objection to the Plan.	PA	29-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Hardy	Emma	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to the proposed demolition of significant and important structures in the main fabric of Liverpool Street station. I object most strongly to the insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. I object to the resulting impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse.	PA	29-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Hydleman	Emma	The very nature of London and its architecture is being irrevocably altered and downgraded by Planning submissions such as this. If the station and its surrounds need work to upgrade, why not Facilitate this? What is the need for the dramatic change and re development of this site within its conservation area? Our London stations are Landmarks, great architectural feats of design And of interest worldwide. Is this not about another development, where the few benefit hugely financially, but our architectural heritage and world leading status as a city of historical importance, falls by the wayside? I object to the potential vandalism of yet another wonderful example of our history and industrial heritage.	PA	29-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Peek	gary	Should not be built on . Iconic station	PA	29-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Weaver	Lisa	I raise objection with the proposed planning application under the National Planning Policy Framework Paragraph NPPF 213 it states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." I object to this application therefore because it would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to:" The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. Our London heritage should be protected. This glass building is simply beautiful and SHOULD NOT BE DESTROYED. Regards Lisa Weaver	PA	29-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Hathaway	Rebecca Jane	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. Make sure to reference the National Planning Policy Framework in your objection, otherwise your objection may be dismissed: Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." The sheer audacity of Network Rail to try and force through such appalling vandalism of the heritage of London and to have the brazen attitude that money trumps history	PA	29-Jun-25	O
Page 301 25/00494/FULEIA	Howell	Gordon	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. Specifically, I object to substantial harm to the Grade II listed station through demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and it's replacement with a new structure which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. I object to the insertion of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing considerable harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II listed heritage asset. I object to the impact on the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II* listed hotel through the construction of a 20 storey tower over the station concourse. I object to the substantial harm that the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low and medium scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas. The scheme would also impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many Grade I listed Christopher Wren city churches and nearby St Botolph's Church. In making these objections I also refer to the National Planning Policy Framework in which Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional."	PA	29-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Howell	Gordon	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. Specifically, I object to substantial harm to the Grade II listed station through demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and it's replacement with a new structure which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. I object to the insertion of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing considerable harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II listed heritage asset. I object to the impact on the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II* listed hotel through the construction of a 20 storey tower over the station concourse. I object to the substantial harm that the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low and medium scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas. The scheme would also impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many Grade I listed Christopher Wren city churches and nearby St Botolph's Church. In making these objections I also refer to the National Planning Policy Framework in which Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional."	PA	29-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Forbes-Dawson	Jilli May	It is appalling that the whole nature of the area will be destroyed with a new development swallowing the grandeur of of the historical station and amenities.	PA	29-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Lennon	Paula	I object to this application which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to the substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low and medium scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I -listed Christopher Wren City churches and nearby St Botolph's Church. Paragraph NPPF 213 of the National Planning Policy Framework states "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) Grade II listed buildings or Grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional.	PA	29-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Rawlings	Lila	I'd like to object to this scheme which I see as not only harmful to the local environment but is also in direct opposition to the National Planning Policy Framework. In Paragraph NPPF 213 it states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." The planned structure will cause substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The area around the station has been hugely over developed an is now creating a canyon effect on the surrounding streets. No tree can grow as there is a diminishing of light. The envisaged developed will adversely effect the surrounding area and those who live and work there. It's a thoughtless and purely commercial plan that once again disregards people and communities.	PA	29-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Walsh	Jane	The proposed scheme ignores the character and historic importance of the victorian station buildings. The scale of the hotel/office building is unsympathetic to existing buildings which will be dominated and trivialised. The reshaping of the concourse undermines the effective functionality of the existing arrangement. This is barely an improvement on previous proposals which have been subject to protest and rejected. It is also UGLY!	PA	29-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	BASSI	RAJINDER	Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church.	PA	29-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Statham-Fletcher	Carole	I object to this application because it would cause definite harm to Liverpool Street Station which is a nationally important part of our built heritage. Paragraph NPPF 213 states "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional. The construction of a twenty-storey tower squatting over the station concourse, requiring the demolition and replacement of its roof, would be out of scale with the surrounding area and would completely dominate the Grade II* hotel. It is hard to imagine how anybody could have proposed something so ugly in the first place. Likewise, the proposed development of new retail units in the 19th century train sheds, including 2 elevated retail galleries, is all part of a grotesque overdevelopment in an area which does not need this type of construction. The proposal seems to have more in common with 1980 than 2025. It is noteworthy that the 2015 City Plan requires the refusal of planning permission in Conservation Areas. This development would damage the setting of many designated and undesignated buildings in the City and adjacent areas including St Botolph's Church and Wren's City Churches. This whole scheme looks like a monument to greed and it would be a shame if our generation were to be responsible for adding to the long list of architectural disasters inflicted on London since the end of the second world war.	PA	29-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Hawkins	Ian	I object to this application under the national planning framework paragraph NPPF 213 which states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional". This scheme is unnecessary, unneeded, and will result in significant damage to the existing historic station and its surroundings. Based on the policy this scheme cannot be warranted.	PA	29-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Blake	Mary	I object to this application which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof of the concourse and its replacement with a new structure, which would also compromise the setting of the 19th century train shed. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning 19th century hotel in the City - through the construction of a twenty-storey tower over the station concourse. In addition, I would like to state that I am a frequent visitor to London and have traveled through Liverpool Street Station many times. It is a wonder of 19th century architecture. I've spent much time simply admiring and studying the station itself and enjoyed the neighborhood around it. While I understand that progress is something that London sees regularly, noting that many parts have been demolished and replaced over the centuries that the city has been in existence, this particular plan is not sensitive to the protected nature of the station nor to the architecture of its surroundings. I know that Americans are not in good odor just now, but some of us value architecture and history and hope that our voices can be heard. Thank you for your consideration in this matter. Mary E Blake, New Haven, Indiana, USA	PA	29-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Brown	Rodolphus	As a regular user of Liverpool Street station, I strenuously object to this entirely unnecessary redevelopment. The City has no shortage of generic, soulless greenhouses; erecting another, which will come at great expense and likely require replacement before the end of the century, is quite unjustifiable.	PA	29-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Jessel	Suzanne	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the 19th Century train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II listed heritage asset. Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional.	PA	29-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Letterese	Anthony	Massive objections. It is a absolutely disgrace you would even considered damaging such an important and unique building in the name of what ... oh let me think, making more money!	PA	29-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Rodger	Michael	Absolutely ridiculous proposal. Although not currently local have been previously. I have always loved the feel of the concourse as you enter the station. There is something very comforting and welcoming about it as you enter Liverpool St. in its current form. It seems to welcome you with open arms as you enter any of its entrances currently. The concourse as it currently stands gives it a real bit of character and flavour and a sense of the scale of the history of the station. To lose this through this current planning application would be a real shame to all those current and future users of the station who would no longer be able to enjoy the historic nature of Liverpool St. in its current form. Keep Liverpool St. Station as it is please. It is currently a joy please don't ruin that by pushing through this planning application	PA	29-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Jones	Jo	I strongly object to this application. The need for some improvements to lifts, escalators and toilets does not in any way justify the harm caused to the listed station and adjacent hotel by building a colossal 20-storey office block right on top of it. It would badly impact the setting of the hotel, take away most of the glorious natural light in the station and completely destroy its ambience, and also harm the setting of the Bishopsgate Conservation area and views of St Paul's Cathedral. Paragraph 213 of the National Planning Policy Framework states that any harm to, or loss of, the significance of a designated heritage asset should require clear and convincing justification. Substantial harm to or loss of a designated heritage asset should be exceptional. This proposal does not come close to meeting that justification. It is vital that London retains its heritage. Network Rail claim that they cannot make the (relatively small) station improvements without the office block to pay for it - this is patently absurd. The amount of money already spent on this application would probably have been more than enough to pay for any necessary loos and lifts and upgrades that the station actually needs. It is also noticeable that virtually all the letters of support are single phrases or sentences, simply about loos or disabled access. They look as if they are gleaned from the 'consultation' in the station, which, like the Network Rail site, barely mentioned the vast office block. Is it legal to take these very limited comments and put them into the planning portal as support? Do any of these people even know that they are 'supporting' the building of a huge office block right on top of the station? There should be an enquiry.	PA	29-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Bullen	Michael	I profoundly object to this planning application and its associated listed building application. It will result on substantial harms to the sibbifoacme of this I profoundly object to this planning application and its associated listed building application. It will result on substantial harm to the significance of this important listed building. The scale of the proposed addition and the level of destruction to the historic fabric and character are wholly unacceptable. Any public benefits are hugely outweighed by the harm. There are no public benefits in terms of the conservation of the historic built environment.	PA	29-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Bullen	Michael	I profoundly object to this planning application and its associated listed building application. It will result on substantial harms to the sibbifoacme of this I profoundly object to this planning application and its associated listed building application. It will result on substantial harm to the significance of this important listed building. The scale of the proposed addition and the level of destruction to the historic fabric and character are wholly unacceptable. Any public benefits are hugely outweighed by the harm. There are no public benefits in terms of the conservation of the historic built environment.	PA	29-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Major	Edward	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The proposals would irreparably damage an imports at heritage building, and the designs are completely insensitive to the existing building. Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." I object to the proposal.	PA	29-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Joyce	Steve	I object to the redevelopment of Liverpool Street Stn. It is wholly unnecessary and will cause irreversible damage to the Station and its History. Yet more Office Blocks are not necessary in already overburdened and overcrowded area. Please decline permission for this 'development'.	PA	29-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	webb	robert	I wish to object to the proposed redevelopment of Liverpool Street Station. The scale of the proposed redevelopment dwarfs the Grade II listed hotel that sits at the heart of this station and all of the surrounding buildings in the area. Development on this scale is totally contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework 2015. A more sensitive low rise redevelopment would be more appropriate to this area. Most of the historic city of London has already been covered in high rise buildings of a mixed quality and I would like to oppose any further encroachment on this scale into the Bishopsgate and Spitalfields area.	PA	29-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Varley	Henrietta	I object strongly to this white elephant of a monstrosity, it will ruin the look of a listed building and seriously impact the area.	PA	29-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Elliott	Brent	I object to the proposal to demolish such a large proportion of the roof structure of the main concourse, which is one of the primary reasons for the building having been listed. I also object to the proposal to erect such a monstrous tower over the station, which would not only compromise the visual outline and appearance of the station from the exterior, but would be in itself a detrimental addition to the cityscape. The tower violates the 2015 City Plan, and should not have been allowed to come this far in the planning process before being rejected. I have previously commented adversely on an earlier iteration of the proposals for Liverpool Street Station, and all my previous objections are still valid.	PA	29-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Booth	Karen S	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. Make sure to reference the National Planning Policy Framework in your objection, otherwise your objection may be dismissed: Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional	PA	29-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Fletcher	Anna	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. It is extremely important especially for tourists, local and foreign, who come here to witness history. I hope you keep this in mind and retain heritage as there are other lands one can build on.	PA	29-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Walker	Jennie	I object to this proposal on lots of levels but what is the point of grade 2 listing if you can then get permission to destroy the reason it was listed. We only get one chance to save these parts of our history. There will be no going back. I have used this station many times and never had an issue. It's all about money as usual.	PA	29-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Tiller	Robert	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to- The substantial harm to this beautiful Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. Reference to the National Planning Policy Framework is to be made in this objection, Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." As a weekly user of this station I submit my objection to this terrible destruction and wanton loss of a period structure. R.Tiller. 29.06.25	PA	29-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Russell	Julia	I object because of the historical damage to British heritage	PA	29-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Beale	Lesley	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to causing harm to a Grade II listed building. Living in a Grade II listed building myself, it is something that should be preserved not altered in any way unless it's absolutely necessary. Such buildings, being of historical importance are subject to the National Planning Policy Framework - Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional. Not only would the changes proposed be in contravention to this policy but also impact the local area which has other heritage buildings present.	PA	29-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Scoggins	Clive	I object in the strongest possible terms to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: 1) The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. 2) The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. 3) The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. 4) The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. In this objection I reference the National Planning Policy Framework. Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional."	PA	29-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Leach	Majella	London is full of beautiful old Victorian buildings but also some very iconic modern buildings. But why destroy something that does not need fixing. These old buildings is what makes London such a great city, London does not need another modern building at the expense of a beautiful Victorian station.	PA	29-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Wilson	Carol	These buildings are our hertiage, their history and design is why we come to London. Architectural brilliant and unique design guves London its own identity. We risk loosing all this for what??? I will tell you: ugly straight lined concrete, glass and steel blocks of empty office space that wipe out history and culture. Please do not destroy these stunning buildings or the light or views they give which CNN makes arrival here such a joy.	PA	29-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Rawlins	Nicholas	I object to this application. This is the first time I have ever submitted such an objection. But I feel moved, as an ordinary citizen, as I believe that a majority of the public share my view, whether actively or subconsciously, that, piece by piece, we are losing the beauty from our cities. I believe the innate beauty of pre-war buildings like Liverpool Street cannot be replicated by the cost-driven approach of post-war development. London & Paris were almost unique, for cities of their size, in their historic architecture. Paris have chosen to preserve their city centre. But almost all of the historic architecture of the City of London has been irreversibly lost in the last 70 years. Victorian railway architecture is so admired that there are TV shows dedicated to it. Yet, one by one, the termini of London are being redeveloped, without public consent. Euston was fully demolished. Very little is left of Cannon Street. Fenchurch Street only retains its facade. Charing Cross, Blackfriars and London Bridge have lost much of their character. In 100 years there may be none of it left untouched for future generations to enjoy, and that is depressing. I realise these are all personal opinions but I believe they are shared by a majority of the public. One financial/tourist success story has been St Pancras, and that was achieved by retaining most of its historic structure. Leeds Station was redeveloped with a tower/block, similar to this proposal, and the result is not widely loved. It seems that developers win out every time. I find it painful that national assets are at the whim of private companies motivated by their own profits, whatever arguments they make about public benefit. I have been to Liverpool Street often and have never noticed it as being at capacity or in need of mutilation. And I feel that, if Grade II listing status offers no protection, then there is no point in having a heritage register. Sorry for my tone. I am passionate. Best wishes, Nick	PA	29-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Pearson	Tina	"I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to:" What are the key issues to cover in my objection? The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. I object in reference to the National Planning Policy Framework - Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional."	PA	29-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Hill	Christopher	I object on the grounds of the significant risk of irreversible damage to our national heritage and specifically to historically significant and aesthetically pleasing buildings which already fulfill a perfectly functional role for the station as it is. As a Londoner I would be deeply saddened to see this spoilt.	PA	30-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Woollam	Leila	Why would you destroy our heritage? I was born and brought up in London please leave our history alone	PA	30-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Hasler	Helen	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: -The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. -The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. -The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. -The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. With reference to the National Planning Policy Framework Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." By using people's complaints you have faked support for this abhorrent plan, this is London history and character you are ruining. How dare you.	PA	30-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Jarvis	Anna	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. I reference the National Planning Policy Framework in my objection. Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." I trust you'll hear my objection and take note. Thanks, Anna	PA	30-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Holmes	Lynn	I wish to object to the proposed changes to Liverpool Strret Station on the grounds that this will deeply affect another of our beautiful national heritage buildings. These buildings must be sympathetically preserved for future generations. It's part of our heritage and a credit to this country.	PA	30-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Budd	Jason	The demolition of this beautiful building would be an absolute travesty and total disregard for our heritage as a nation of brilliant Victorian engineers	PA	30-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Lethbridge	John	The City has been very successful keeping old buildings giving charter it has today.	PA	30-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Teald	Lotta	I object to this application. It would cause substantial harm to a nationally important heritage area. The National Planning Policy Framework states at para NPPF 213 "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." This proposed development violated that policy. In particular I object to: - the changed character of the neighborhood with the introduction of a building which is out of keeping with prevalent low buildings in the Bishopsgate conservation area which is consequential for residents of the area blocking out their light. This goes against the 2015 city plan which requires rejection of such tall buildings in inappropriate areas. - it would also impact on the setting of numerous other buildings in the area such as at Paul's cathedral heights area, the setting of other grade one listed churches and the character of the city as a whole - the development itself would destroy the character of the beautiful historical listed 19th century station. - London is lucky to be able to boast of such historically beautiful structures and settings which attracts people from all over the world. Such damage to our setting and infrastructure reduces the overall cultural value of the city and should be prevented.	PA	30-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Chaves	Jose	I used this station so many times when I studied Business Management at London School of Commerce. It is a glorious station and a heritage to the country. Demolishing part of it to build offices on top is outrageous.. I object this development.	PA	30-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Gregory	Linda	There are so many reasons why I object to any build above Liverpool street station 1 further impact on services traffic on an already overburdened infrastructure. 2 destroying railway structure heritage and impacting on the the natural.light to thd station. 3 the incredible overbearing ongoing interference of :the station business, the people's access to the station, the surrounding roads adjustment to accommodate elovering of building materials , machinery and personnel involved in what would be a long messy and ongoing nightmare for users and businesses in the area. 4 noise and air pollution during the proposes build. 5 furthr noise and air pollution from the build if we're to go ahead. 6 lack of data to determine why further build is deemed necessary (other than yo gain income to up keep station) in an already ovebuilt area already full of buildings/ offices. 7 the precedent to build and in turn ruin historical builds in ordervto finance upkeep is totally wrong and should not be encouraged or allowed now or in the future. Let us gave and continue to enjoy a great building.	PA	30-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Fletcher	Margaret	Why destroy a beautiful building that serves the public well, for office space that will lay empty in years to come , London has so many buildings now that lay empty that could be used, Don't destroy that beautiful building we need to keep our history not destroy it.	PA	30-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Nelson	Antonia	I strongly object to the ruination of such an iconic building. It is one of the most well centered railway buildings in London. And should be restored and not destroyed. The glass roof is the crown jewel and must be kept. There are plenty of unfinished and unused office spaces in the city therefore it is not a reasonable argument to say that office space is needed.	PA	30-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Tadman	Barry	I object to the partial demolition and inappropriate development of Liverpool St Station. This development will result in substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. I refer you to the National Planning Policy Framework Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional."	PA	30-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Tyler	Samantha	Our British heritage needs to be preserved and protected, no organisation, big or small should have the right to destroy that. Therefore I strongly object to this proposal.	PA	30-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Clayton	Lisa	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections because Liverpool Street station runs perfectly well as a rail station as it is. No need for more retail shops. The brightness of the ticket hall is refreshing and part of London's history. Please do not destroy	PA	30-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Syner	Chris	I object to this plan as it is totally out of keeping with the area and is merely a plan for rich people to get richer.	PA	30-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Hobson	Peter	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. My objection is referenced to the National Planning Policy Framework: Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Any harm to, or loss of, the significance of a designated heritage asset (from its alteration or destruction, or from development within its setting), should require clear and convincing justification. Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional."	PA	30-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Ettle	Keith	I object as it will cuase substantial harm to the Grade 2 Listed station and in pact on the station as it is. It will disturb the Conservation Area with such a tall building which is against the 2015 City Plan and be as tall as the old churches around so deminishing them.	PA	30-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	White	Simon	There is simply no need to destroy part of our Victorian history for yet another shapeless office block. London already has more office space than it can fill. Why destroy this functional and beautiful structure?	PA	30-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Topping	Crispin	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage asset. More specifically, I raise objections to: The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." As a chartered surveyor, with 43 years experience, mainly working in the City and the West End, I have serious doubts that the proposed, mainly Class E space, will be easy to let. I do not believe that it will add to the vitality of the area.	PA	30-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Murray	Caroline	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to the idea of increasing the number of shops, cafes, etc., the increasing height of the building, creation of an auditorium at Level 18 with ancillary terrace; creation of a public amenity terrace. All this will add to the crowding and confusion at the station, as well as destroying its historical and heritage areas. I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. Substantial harm to or loss of: (a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional.	PA	30-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Chaplin	Alison	Liverpool Street Station is a fine example of Victorian Architecture and should be treasured as such.	PA	30-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Forgione	Teresa	This development will irrevocably substantial damage the Grade II-listed station. Demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse will completely change the building and compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. This is effectively creating a shopping centre causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. It will harm the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. It's so monstrously huge it's absurd! The substantial harm the scheme to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, with such a tall, unsympathetic tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. Make sure to reference the National Planning Policy Framework in your objection, otherwise your objection may be dismissed: Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." This development will irrevocably substantial damage the Grade II-listed station. Demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse will completely change the building and compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. This is effectively creating a shopping centre causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. It will harm the setting o	PA	30-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Forgione	Teresa	This development will irrevocably substantial damage the Grade II-listed station. Demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse will completely change the building and compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. This is effectively creating a shopping centre causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. It will harm the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. It's so monstrously huge it's absurd! The substantial harm the scheme to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, with such a tall, unsympathetic tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. Make sure to reference the National Planning Policy Framework in your objection, otherwise your objection may be dismissed: Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." This development will irrevocably substantial damage the Grade II-listed station. Demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse will completely change the building and compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. This is effectively creating a shopping centre causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. It will harm the setting o	PA	30-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	HYMNS	JOHN	we must keep our heritage and not lose these valuable and beautiful buildings	PA	30-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Leman	Jill	I object to this planning application which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. I would like to draw your attention to National Planning policy Para NPPF 213 Liverpool Street Station and it's surroundings are a special landmark in the City - this plan is insensitive and we don't deserve this.	PA	30-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Streety	Susan	I object. The new addition will destroy the beauty of the original buildings and worse still bring darkness onto the streets below ,all high rise does also highrise creates wind tunnels,,especilly in the uk as this is a windy island, as well as the shadow on the streets below,making the city less walkable in semi. darkness for most of the day if not all on many streets i have walked on with tall buildings in the uk. I also think more office space is not needed in london as well as the potential extra traffic this development might cause.	PA	30-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Streety	Susan	I object. The new addition will destroy the beauty of the original buildings and worse still bring darkness onto the streets below ,all high rise does also highrise creates wind tunnels,,especilly in the uk as this is a windy island, as well as the shadow on the streets below,making the city less walkable in semi. darkness for most of the day if not all on many streets i have walked on with tall buildings in the uk. I also think more office space is not needed in london as well as the potential extra traffic this development might cause.	PA	30-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Lord	Flynn	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: - The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. - The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. - The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. - The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. Furthermore, National Planning Policy Framework paragraph 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional."	PA	30-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Elmes	Nick	I strongly object to the proposed plans to reconstruct Liverpool Street Station. As I step off the train from Hertfordshire it is lovely to see the light flooding through the Victorian Roof, but this will be lost if these plans go ahead. The substantial harm to the Grade II* listed hotel through a 16-storey vertical extension, cantilevered over the existing historic building, internal alterations to historic fabric to create new entrances to the station concourse, and the change of use from hotel to office use, resulting in the loss of last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City. Contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework which requires clear and convincing justification for any harm to a listed building and refusal of consent if a development will lead to substantial harm. Paragraph NPPF 200 states: "Any harm to, or loss of, the significance of a designated heritage asset (from its alteration or destruction, or from development within its setting) should require clear and convincing justification." I also bring to your attention potential harm to the Grade I listed St Paul's Cathedral by the massing and height of the proposed tower which would disrupt views protected under the London Views Management Framework. I also am concerned of the substantial harm to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low and medium scale buildings. Contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework which requires Local planning authorities to look for opportunities to enhance or better reveal significance of a Conservation area. I commuted in the late 80's during refurbishment works, the works did cause inconvenience, but resulted in the now well functioning station, with its large concourse, accessible toilets and escalators. The upheaval to commuters for these plans will be horrendous.	PA	30-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Hardy	Julia	The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. I would like to make reference to the National Planning Policy Framework in my objection: Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional."	PA	30-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Quayle	Jonathon		DC	30-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Russell-Brown	Jane	I object strongly to this appalling, inappropriate and unnecessary application which would substantially harm the existing significant architectural and functional features of Liverpool St station. The development is against the National Planning Policy Framework paragraph NPPF 213 which states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." The scheme would cause substantial harm to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area by imposing a tall building in an area characterised by low-and medium-scale buildings - in other words it is completely inappropriate to the area. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would affect the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches and nearby St Botolph's church. I object to this application which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More significantly, I raise objections to the proposed demolition of the roof of the concourse of this grade II listed station compromising the setting of the 19th century train shed and causing substantial harm. London is being wrecked by far too many high-rise developments, and it has become a free-for-all where almost anything is now approved regardless of sympathy with existing structures and communities. There is no regard to architectural beauty - this scheme is just a large cuboid block with no artistic merit. More office space is the last thing London needs ...surely a sympathetic scheme to improve the station in keeping with its history and architectural significance can be found.	PA	30-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Quayle	Jonathon		DC	30-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Booth	Fiona	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to the demolition of the existing roof structure, causing substantial harm to the Grade 11 listed station, the compromising of the setting of the surviving 19th century train shed with additional retail units and the harm to surrounding listed heritage assets, such as the 19th century hotel, should a 20- storey tower be built over the station concourse. The proposed scheme would cause substantial harm to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by imposing a tall building characterised by low and medium- height structures. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which required refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in appropriate areas. The proposed scheme would impact on numerous surrounding heritage assets in the City and beyond , for example many of the Grade 1 listed Wren churches and St Botolph's Church nearby. The proposed scheme violates, in my view, the National Planning Policy Framework which explicitly states (paragraph NPPF 213) : " substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade 11 listed buildings, or grade 11 registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional"	PA	30-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Elmes	Sue		DC	30-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Lincoln	Ben	First of all we should be preserving our heritage not destroying it. This is a Victorian master piece which allows loads of light to flood in, the beautiful ornate steel looks stunning, why would anyone want to loose this historical station and be crammed under electric lighting is beyond any belief. Also working on the city for well over 20 years There is absolutely no need for anymore office buildings there is huge decline of office space uptakes with many , including new or refurbis sitting empty. It would be a destruction of heritage and waste of time, disruption and I completely object to it. Regards	PA	30-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	West	Kate		DC	30-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Harrison	Timothy	I object to this application as would cause substantial irreparable harm to the significance of a nationally important heritage asset. National Planning Policy Framework, paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." The benefits of the proposed scheme do not satisfy this "exceptional" definition. There are already plenty of highrise buildings in the city and since lockdowns many are underused and with public appetite for WFH that is unlikely to change. As well as the station itself , the proposal would harm the Grade II* listed hotel and the Bishopsgate Conservation areas. NR's justification is that accessibility is poor and traffic is projected to increase. Well, accessibility can be fixed without building a 15 storey tower on top, and most of the projected traffic increase is via the crossrail lines, and users of that service don't tend to access the main concourse anyway. Recent press reports indicate that the business case is flaky and JLL Real Estated descibe it as a gamble. Please do not let Network Rail gamble with this truly unique heritage asset.	PA	30-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Passfield	Allie	If you are lucky enough to still be alive, but have mobility issues, lifts and escalators are nothing short of a lifeline to the world.	PA	30-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Jones	Eleanor		DC	30-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Neville	Maria	I've had a stroke so has lot more people we need lifts at stations.	PA	30-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Parry	Valerie	The older, disabled and unwell deserve a 21st century service.	PA	30-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Fulford	Anthony		DC	30-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Dickens	Rosemary	I strongly OBJECT to this application. It would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically I raise objections to *the substantial harm to the Grade 11 listed station *the impact to the surrounding area *the harm to the Grade 11 hotel *the harm to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area. I refer to the National Planning Policy Framework Para NPPF 213 _ substantial harm or loss of Grade 11 listed buildings or Grade 11 registered Parks or gardens should be exceptional. This area of London is unique. I have used Liverpool Street Station for many years, and know the surrounding area well. This application, if accepted, will cause great harm. For the attention of Tom Sleigh	PA	30-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Donachie	Peta		DC	30-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Szlesinger	Brenda		DC	30-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Porter	Molly		DC	30-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Dyson	Chris		DC	30-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Watson	Nigel		DC	30-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Lafferty	Julia		DC	30-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Eibl	Kirstin		DC	30-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Giuntini	Tina		DC	30-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Hunt	Enid	The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse.	PA	30-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Dunaway	Patrick	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church.	PA	30-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Champkin	David	Better facilities for disabled people.	PA	30-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Aouizerat	Mathias		DC	30-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Croasdale	Derek	I have found much difficulty negotiating stairs and lifts within Liverpool Street station. The lift there is antiquated Not fit for Purpose.	PA	30-Jun-25	S

25/00494/FULEIA	Bain	Carol	More support available for disabled people.	PA	30-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Elliott	Kevin	Ethical.	PA	30-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Barrett	James	It's about time Liverpool Street station got with the times and ensure they provide better facilities for the disabled community especially those of us in WHEELCHAIRS there has never been sufficient lift in the station and that need to change. Time to remember DISABLED people are as important as any able bodied person and we deserve to be treated with the same RESPECT.	PA	30-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Lines	Cheryl	My husband and I use Liverpool Street Station often to get to the London hospital that he is treated at. We both have mobility problems and the escalators are always packed out with people rushing up them. If the escalator by the main entrance is not working, we have to struggle to get to the escalator right the other side of the concourse. Lifts would make it a lot easier, especially if we are carrying things.	PA	30-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Holland	Jackie	I've been a regular commuter at LST for 30 years.	PA	30-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Tipping	Suzanne	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. National Planning Policy Framework, Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." I do not believe that there are exceptional circumstances that require redevelopment of this building, and our national heritage should be retained.	PA	30-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Phillips	Tara	Its outdated for the commuters.	PA	30-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Trouse	Jillian	Wheelchair users like my child need the same access as everyone else.	PA	30-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Agnew	Danielle	London Liverpool Street is one of London's busiest stations. It serves the Stansted Express and a large part of the South East. There is one tiny lift to get to the underground and 3 other floors. That's it! If you have heavy luggage or a pram you cannot even access the main toilets! People in wheelchairs, with prams as well as those travelling through this station with luggage deserve proper facilities.	PA	30-Jun-25	S

25/00494/FULEIA	Hart	Janine	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. Also, with reference to the National Planning Policy Framework, paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional."	PA	30-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	HM	Alison	Because I have a disability, and I'm also the mother of a toddler. Escalators aren't safe - we need more lifts please.	PA	30-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Radford	Paul	Always a queue when needing to use toilets.	PA	30-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	De Coene	Keith	As the current amount of lifts are not enough for the number of people using the station that needs them.	PA	30-Jun-25	S

25/00494/FULEIA	Harper	Patty	I strongly object to this application which will cause substantial harm to the significance of a important heritage asset and one of London's historic railway buildings. More specifically I raise objections to 1. The demolitions of the roof of the concourse which will harm the Grade 2 listed station and compromise the 19th century train shed. It will also block out alot of natural light. 2. The insertion of retail units on 2 stories in the historic train sheds will cause incredible harm to this grade 2 listed building. 3. The huge construction being proposed will be behind the last surviving continually functioning 19th century hotel in the City of London will create a devastating impact. 4. The proposed tall building is against the 2015 City plan which required the refusal of tall buildings in inappropriate areas such as Bishopsgate Conservation Area which is characterised by low and medium buildings. It would also impact adversely on the nearby heritage assets such as the C Wren Grade 1 listed City churches and nearby St Botolph's church. I am referencing the National Planning Policy Framework paragraph NPPF 213 which states "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings or grade II registered parks or gardens should be exceptional.	PA	30-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Nkululeko Mseleku	Samuel	Disabled.	PA	30-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Wilde	Jamie	These works seem in keeping with the form and function of the station whilst celebrating the existing architecture and releasing commercial and office space.	PA	30-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Dickson	Willa	[Toilets] Health reasons. Many people are still working with bladder and bowel issues.	PA	30-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Thurston	Josephine	We need more disabled toilets and seperate baby changing. 2 toilets is not enough especially when you consider each train can bring in lots of disabled people. 25% of the population has some form of disability. Toilets should include at least 10% for disabled people!	PA	30-Jun-25	S

25/00494/FULEIA	Austin	David	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of a nationally important and listed heritage asset. I raise specific objections to: - the substantial harm to the listed Grade II station by the demolition of the station roof structure which would compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. - new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of this listed Grade II heritage asset. - the impact to the setting of associated heritage assets and undoubted harm to the significance of the adjacent station hotel, listed Grade II* and the last functioning C19 hotel in the City, by the construction of a 20-storey office block tower over the station concourse. - causing substantial harm to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area noted for low- and medium-scale buildings, and contrary to the City of London Plan 2015, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. The scheme would also adversely impact the setting of many nearby heritage assets such as the Christopher Wren City churches, and St Botolph's church. - there is no rational or valid business case for the Over Development office blocks which would add 1 million (1,015,993) square feet to the current 140 million square feet of vacant office space in London, (data from CoStar Property Leasing). I note that the National Planning Policy Framework para 213 states: Any harm to, or loss of, the significance of a designated heritage asset (from its alteration or destruction, or from development within its setting), should require clear and convincing justification. This scheme does not meet any of the criteria stated above and planning should not be approved.	PA	30-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Fairweather	Karen	I live in Suffolk and often travel to London for pleasure on the train. Liverpool street station could certainly benefit from more toilets.	PA	30-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Levassort	Allan	More toilets must be made accessible for travellers, and free.	PA	30-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Chan	Tracey	To enable everyone to use the station easily.	PA	30-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Ayling	Alex	Please for the love of humanity yes let people have adequate facilities to relieve themselves in peace why are we begging for toilets.	PA	30-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Wiggins	Jan	To help disabled travellers.	PA	30-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Townsend	James	The station is very busy and often i have wait ages for an available toilets and many times have missed my train because I've had to wait so long.	PA	30-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Morrison	Elspeth	I travel through pretty much all London stations on a regular basis. Not so much Liverpool St these days as when I used to live in Dalston. But when I do.... I find it one of the most functional London stations. Great LIGHT, great FLOW. Yes... tweaks to be made in terms of some facilities but it is a glorious place and easy to get around. Do we really, really need another high building with sad architecture? Here is something absolutely glorious. And I will say it again...FUNCTIONAL! Are years of building works really going to make it work better. There are a couple of decent modern developments right by the station. Fine. Why tamper with the marvellous structure Liverpool St Station.... for profit? Whose profit? Whose improvement??? And I really object to those 'adverts' that have been put about making it look as if peoples opinion is being asked for. From Network Rail. Very underhand. Have complained to ASA. Please consider these objections seriously. It's not just about beauty and tradition, its' about maintaining something that works.	PA	30-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	CW (she/they)	Leanne	I'm disabled and it's very difficult getting around.	PA	30-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Steel	Mo	I have rheumatoid arthritis and need to use the one, tiny, lift at Liverpool Street station to access the Underground. Last Monday when I was there it wasn't working and there was chaos. It really is time to improve the disabled access at this very busy mainline station.	PA	30-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Mulcock	Andrew	Platform and station used to be bright and airy, now higher number and Elizabeth line feels like you're in a dungeon.	PA	30-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Storey	Eleanor	To improve the passenger experience and ensure the station is accessible and efficient for all users.	PA	30-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Buckley	Vincent	Make London the world city it is not some backward place.	PA	30-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Cocker	Elizabeth	I object to this application which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof of the concourse and its replacement with a new structure, which would also compromise the setting of the 19th century train shed. The insertion of large amounts of new retail units in the 19th century train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning 19th century hotel in the City - through the construction of a twenty-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low-and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches and nearby St Botolph's church. According to the National Planning Policy Framework; Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." This development is not needed and is completely out of character and unsympathetic to the this area. There are empty office buildings, as well as plenty hotels which are just as convenient to access. This is development for development's sake.	PA	30-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Orford	Barry	I strongly object to the proposed developments at Liverpool Street Station. These contravene the rules laid down in the National Planning Policy Framework Paragraph 213. The scheme displays utter insensitivity to the existing area and its Victorian buildings. The proposal to build a twenty storey tower block on the concourse almost beggars belief. It seems that architects and city planners are still trapped in the destructive mentality of the nineteen sixties, viewing everything through Bauhaus eyes and enslaved to the notions of the the mountebank Le Corbusier. I would have no problem with sympathetic development, but the scheme presented here is not that. It needs to be scrapped, and a new scheme devised which will honour and enhance the existing site and its buildings, rather than despising them.	PA	30-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Cezar	Robson	Dear Tom Sleigh, I am writing to object to planning application 25/00494/FULEIA. The proposed twenty-storey tower above Liverpool Street Station is completely out of keeping with its surroundings. It would do significant harm to listed buildings, including the station itself, the Great Eastern Hotel, and several other nearby heritage sites. The scheme ignores the character and history of the area. Its scale, height and commercial nature are wholly inappropriate- especially in a Conservation Area. I urge you to refuse this application. Yours sincerely, Robson Cezar	PA	30-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Airey	Jo	Liverpool Street station is one exceptionally beautiful piece of engineering which must be saved. It's light, bright and functional. Everytime I pass through there I marvel at the structure. It's a pleasant place to be. There are so many office blocks in the city lying empty esp since Covid. It would be a tragedy to see this building go. Deep pockets should be able to influence, coerce or railroad planners and governments into such catastrophic construction projects. Just how many members of the public actually know this is up for debate?? Please save Liverpool Street station.	PA	30-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Cammell	Jo	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. On the grounds of the National Planning Policy Framework, I specifically raise objections to the significant harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. In addition, the impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets and harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. I am a frequent user of this station.	PA	30-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Palmer-Hoffman	Jonathan	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to the gargantuan scale of the proposed works, which I believe will cause more harm to Liverpool Street Station than any benefit from escalator upgrades. The scale of the proposed massing also seems inappropriate for the neighbourhood and flagrantly excessive. Please reject this completely inappropriate proposal.	PA	30-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Teddy	Fiona	Any application for interference in the structure of these incredible buildings must be prevented. This is part of our architectural heritage. It is incomprehensible that Network Rail wishes to alter and damage it. These buildings are so precious. Network Rail should see this! Once they are gone that's it. Please turn down the applications and leave these extraordinary buildings as they are. Don't allow the big corporations to push the planners on this. Please let common sense prevail. Thank you.	PA	30-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Cooper	Sarah	I object to the planning application for this beautiful, historic and architecturally pleasing station to be 'enhanced' by an upper floor. The roof is spectacular and should be left alone. Not everything needs supposed 'enhancement' despite the ###s that this is clearly intended to bring in. Treasure our heritage - it erodes bit by bit if we don't object to these money-making enterprises with little to suggest that costs will be recouped, especially working under a glass roof in our current warming climate - I'd be off to another job !!	PA	30-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	STUBBS	HELEN	Dear Sirs , I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. Make sure to reference the National Planning Policy Framework in your objection, otherwise your objection may be dismissed: Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional."	PA	30-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Hackney	Katy	I strongly object to this planning application, as it will ruin a listed building and the entire surrounding area, which are of importance to London's history and the community. Many of the surrounding buildings are also Grade 2 listed. In the National Planning Policy Framework, Paragraph NPPF 213 states, "Substantial harm to or loss of A) grade 2 listed buildings or grade 2 reg. parks or gardens, should be exceptional." Please think before destroying what remains of London's history.	PA	30-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Gray	Josephine	This is purely a financial proposal and I object to losing this wonderful station as it is	PA	30-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Howard	Judith	I object to this application, which would harm the historic station and its environs. The proposed scheme involves far too much demolition of the existing listed building, and its replacement with structures which are totally unsympathetic and out of scale, both internally and externally. This sets a terrible precedent for the treatment of listed buildings. I object in principle to the over-building of listed buildings, which cannot fail to impact on historic structures and their settings. Externally the new structures ruin the skyline and dwarf adjacent buildings. They would harm the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by introducing a tall building into an area of lower-rise buildings. It is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in unsuitable locations. The National Planning Policy Framework, states in para. NPPF 213 "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings....should be exceptional". The overhang of the office building above the station entrances is visually oppressive - maybe it symbolises the forces of commercialism suppressing artistic and historical values! I question the need for 90,000 sq.km. of new office space in central London, when so many staff work from home. The scheme's financial viability is questionable, relying on an upturn in the economy which is highly unlikely. Losing the glass roof would make the concourse darker and require more artificial lighting, adding to the carbon footprint. New toilets, lifts, etc. are welcome, but Network Rail and Dept for Transport's Access for All programme has #millions still unspent, which surely could be used? NR has funded many similar accessibility improvements elsewhere. The Ads sent by Network Rail to my Facebook newsfeed until today 30 June had only a Support button, registering approval BEFORE seeing the scheme, which is a dirty trick! Many would not have signed if they had known. Those votes should be discounted.	PA	30-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Pasquali	Sarah	I object to this application which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: the substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof of the concourse and its replacement with a new structure, which would also compromise the setting of the 19th century train shed. The insertion of large amounts of new retail units in the 19th century train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning 19th century hotel in the City - through the construction of a twenty-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low-and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches and nearby St Botolph's church. The National Planning Policy Framework, otherwise your objection may be dismissed. Paragraph NPPF 213 states: Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional.	PA	30-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Francis-Gilbert	Christina	Request and plea to save historical buildings of London and environs, especially entrances and objection to any demolition of train buildings for new developments, in particular housing or retail. Please keep the train building intact in terms of its external and internal appearance, only maintaining with care building parts that may need upkeep. Sister lives in Earls Colne and parents in Crowborough so use route through London and Liverpool street.	PA	30-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	McManus	Matt	Often a queue for cubicles, and everyone is in a hurry for trains. I've had ulcerative colitis, and later bowel cancer, so this is usually very uncomfortable.	PA	30-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Phillips	Helen Louise	I would like to see more lifts at London Liverpool Street because it would ease passengers safety. I would like to see more lifts at London Liverpool Street because it would ease passengers safety.	PA	30-Jun-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Goode	Alexander	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: - The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. - The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. - The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. - The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. - The proposals are contradictory to the National Planning Policy Framework. NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional" and the proposals outlined are far from exceptional, arguably amount to overdevelopment of an area boasting historically sensitive heritage assets. I object to these proposals.	PA	30-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Chester	Ros	"I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to:" The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. Make sure to reference the National Planning Policy Framework in your objection, otherwise your objection may be dismissed: Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional."	PA	30-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Clewer	Carolyn	I object to this proposal. Unnecessary and damaging changes to a functional and beautiful historical station. Substantial and permanent harm will be done to the victorian roof and building. Multiple harmful acts removing existing structures are damaging and purely for financial gains as not needed. The tall structure will impact negatively on the environment and out of keeping with the established lower height buildings I am a local resident who objects to these unnecessary and harmful proposals. object to the destruction of 50 Liverpool.street This objection Refets to to Planning Policy Framework Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional."	PA	30-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Epstein	Merryl	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. I reference the National Planning Policy Framework in your objection, otherwise your objection may be dismissed: Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional."	PA	30-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Goode	Anthony	As a member of the public with an MSC in Conservation of the Historic Environment I consider the proposed plans for the redevelopment at Liverpool Street station inappropriate and unnecessary. I believe you could achieve as much with a more sympathetic and proportionate approach.	PA	30-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Manson	Beverlie	I object to the demise of yet another intrinsically London building!!! The soul of the city is being destroyed For what ????. Much needed affordable living I think not !! No it's yet another glass house which will remain empty because some billionaires want a tax loss Keep the uniqueness of London	PA	30-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Murphy	Louise	I strongly object to this proposal. It is totally inappropriate , destructive and causes unnecessary and damaging changes to a fully functional and beautiful historical station and local landmark. This proposal will impose substantial, totally avoidable and permanent harm to the victorian roof and building, permanently destroying beautiful Victorian listed features - significantly diminishing the architectural value and heritage of this area. The scheme involves multiple extremely harmful acts ,destruction of and denigration of a prized listed building. Removing culturally valuable existing structures purely for financial gain is both idiotic and morally wrong. The enormity of greed and obnoxiousness that this tall structure represents beggars belief. Not only is this scheme offensive in architectural terms but it is also totally inappropriate when considering the enormous scale of negative impact on the environment and planning policies designed to minimise this as well being totally out of keeping with the wider established lower height buildings I am a local resident who objects to these unnecessary and harmful proposals. object to the destruction of 50 Liverpool.street My objection Refers to to Planning Policy Framework Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional.". I implore you to wholeheartedly reject this proposal	PA	30-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Russell	Alan	Dear Chair of the Planning & Transport Committee I object to this proposal, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: 1. The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure, which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. 2. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. 3. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. 4. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. 5. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. As you will be aware paragraph 213 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) December 2024 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." Yours sincerely	PA	30-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Maddison	Tim	I object very strongly to this application, which would cause substantial harm to nationally important heritage assets and to the surrounding urban landscape. Specifically, I raise objections to: (1) The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the existing station's concourse roof structure and its replacement with a new structure. which would also impact negatively the setting of the surviving 19thC train sheds. (2) The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the integrity and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. (3) The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning 19thC hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. (4) The considerable harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. National Planning Policy Framework Paragraph 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." No conclusive case has been made for this level of harm to either be necessary or to justify overriding Paragraph 213's conditions. Necessary improvements could be funded sympathetically without causing so much harm.	PA	30-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Au	So-Shan	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: - The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. - The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. - The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. - The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional.	PA	30-Jun-25	O
Page 337 25/00494/FULEIA	Gardner	Andrew	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: - The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. - The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. - The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. - The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church.	PA	30-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Ansbro	Paul	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. The National Planning Policy Framework paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." which the plans for Liverpool station would incur.	PA	30-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Lightfoot	Martin	Liverpool Street station is the busiest station in the U.K It is there to make the journey for passengers as convenient and pleasant as possible. Taking the wonderful daylight over the concourse away by building a 20 Storey Office block above will not enhance the travel experience. In fact it will be more like entering an Eastern European Salt Mine. And what about the total disruption for passengers with the building work over a suggested 8 years- the station becoming a massive building foundation site. Yes , the improvements to disabled access and signage should be done , but this should have been done years ago in upgrading the station. You do not need to build a light destroying office block over the station to do this! . This will become totally disruptive (closing	PA	30-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Garside	Pam	This is a historic building with a long history. The new development will destroy it for people who have travelled via it for decades. Like St Pancras it could be redeveloped in a sympathetic way. From a personal point of view I gave travelled via the station from when I was a child. My father commuted to Lloyds of London, and the station represents a beloved scruffy old place. Please don't destroy its history .	PA	30-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Cosyns	Rachel	I cannot understand, and I understand lots of things.. I think there is one reason, money. It is not a reason, we have lost so much of our vernacular. Please value and our Victorian legacy.	PA	30-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Alvarez	Beverley	"I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to:" The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church	PA	30-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Sheppard	Thomas	I object. Please show some respect for this historic building	PA	30-Jun-25	O
Page 339 25/00494/FULEIA	David	Tayo	"I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to:" The unnecessary destruction of a currently standing and working structure, which will cause long-term debris, noise and chaotic traffic implications. Whilst, I do not live next to Liverpool Street Station, it's my closest mainline station. I use it frequently. I believe that this unnecessary redevelopment will cause, more disruptions to rail, roads land bus services in the area. The environmental impact will be immense and long-standing. Tower Hamlets and the City already have very high asthmatic rates. This will not help. Finally, I object because, despite whatever is said, there will be damage to a heritage station. For another hotel and eateries, in an area clogged full of new and half-empty developments. This is not for the benefit of the City, Tower Hamlets or local residents.	PA	30-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Kirkland	Michael	I strongly object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to Liverpool Street Station, a significant, nationally important heritage asset. Firstly, the application contravenes Paragraph NPPF 213 of The National Planning Policy Framework - "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." I also raise objections to: The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. On this basis I urge you to reject this application. Thank you.	PA	30-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Cassels	Rosie	This area is already built up enough and old / historic features of the station must be preserved. Constructions like this should be saved for sites where there are no existing buildings, let alone ones which contain old London character	PA	30-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Dean	Gareth	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. Given the recent fire at the Hotspur Press, likely due to the ongoing challenges to planning decisions and listing of significant industrial heritage, this scheme presents another significant, negative impact on 19th century industrial innovation and design. From an intangible heritage perspective, this station represents the staging point for journeys into and out of London, and it is in this capacity that I have fond memories of the station and would hate to see it lose its character through an insensitive and unnecessary development.	PA	30-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Moyse	Lorraine	I object to the plans as our heritage needs to be protected. I use Liverpool Street Station when I go into our London head office. It would be awful to see it lose its charm.	PA	30-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Cox	Jonathan	I object to this application on the grounds that it would cause substantial harm to nationally important heritage assets. In particular, I oppose the demolition of the roof structure of the existing concourse within the Grade II-listed Liverpool Street Station. Replacing it with a new structure would seriously damage the architectural integrity of the station and compromise the setting of the surviving 19th-century train shed-one of the last of its kind in central London. I also object to the proposed insertion of extensive new retail units, including two elevated retail galleries, within the historic train sheds. These would diminish the spatial quality of the station and erode its historical and architectural significance as a listed heritage asset. The 20-storey tower proposed above the station would have a detrimental effect on surrounding listed buildings, especially the Grade II*-listed Great Eastern Hotel. It would overpower the character of this rare example of a continuously operating 19th-century City hotel. The scheme would also cause major harm to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area. The height and scale of the proposed development are entirely at odds with the area's character of low- to mid-rise buildings, in clear conflict with the 2015 City Plan, which restricts tall buildings in conservation areas and sensitive view corridors, including those around St. Paul's Cathedral. It would also negatively affect the setting of several Grade I-listed Wren churches and nearby St Botolph's. Under Paragraph 213 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), "Substantial harm to or loss of... grade II listed buildings... should be exceptional." In this case, the harm to listed and conservation assets is not justified by any overriding public benefit and fails the test of exceptional justification under the NPPF. This application would irreversibly damage one of London's most significant Victorian railway stations. I urge the Committee to reject it.	PA	30-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Constable	Peter	The scale of the new development is totally out of character with the current building and it's setting and will also negatively impact on the whole area - as a freeman , supporter and user of the City of London feel the impact on the area would be highly detrimental and should not be supported	PA	30-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Lucken	Samantha	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. I would like to reference the National Planning Policy Framework in my objection: Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." Which this is not.	PA	30-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Farr	Nadia	As a City worker, I use Liverpool Street on nearly a daily basis and know the station and area well. I object to the application on the grounds of: 1) There being multiple empty offices and retail spaces in the area - additional units cannot possibly be justified. Even if they were, they would increase foot and vehicle traffic untenably on the already overflowing streets of Bishopsgate and Gracechurch St. 2) A lack of visible improvement in basic infrastructure and services in the area including: lack of public rest rooms, lack of night shelters / high rates of rough sleeping, poor street-cleanliness, poor pedestrianisation, lack of cycle paths, lack of street policing and anti social behavior. Investment in these items should be prioritised above any new office or retail developments. 3) The substantial harm it would cause to the significance of nationally important heritage asset, fundamentally going against NPPF 213. Further to point 3: - Demolition and replacement of Liverpool St Station Concourse and roof structure will cause substantial harm to the Grade II-listed building. - New retail units (including elevated galleries) will significantly damage the heritage value and special interest of the Grade II-listed structure. - Building a 20-storey tower will further clutter and homogenise the London skyline. It will specifically harm the setting and significance of the neighboring Grade II-listed Great Eastern Hotel (your only continuously operating 19th-century hotel). It will also impact other designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and surrounding areas. These include Sir Christopher Wren City churches and St Botolph's church. Building this tower is in direct contravention of the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas (i.e. those characterised by low and medium scale buildings). The Bishopsgate Conservation and St. Paul's Cathedral Heights are both such areas.	PA	30-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Pradillo	Rosa	I object to this application which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically , I raise objections to : -The substantial harm to the Grade II listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure, which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. -The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II listed heritage asset. -The impact to the setting of the surrounding listed heritage assets, in particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II listed hotel, the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City , through the construction of a 20 storey tower over the station concourse. -The substantial harm the scheme would cause to teh Bishopsgate Conservation Area by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low and medium scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedra Heights area. In addition , the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City, such as many of the Grade I listed Christopher Wren City churches and nearby St Botolph's church. Parragraph 213 of the National Planning Policy Framework states the following: "Substantial harm or loss of a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens , should be exceptional.	PA	30-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Andrews	Philippa	I object to this application which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically I raise objections to:1. The excessive height of the proposed building, totally out of scale to the current Victorian railway station and hotel. I understand that this is contrary to the 2015 City Plan requiring "the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas". This clearly includes the City Conservation areas and the St Paul's Cathedral Heights area. This includes many of the Grade 1 listed City churches and the nearby St Botolph's church.2. I draw your attention to the National Planning Policy framework. Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional.3. The Grade II listed station will be greatly harmed by the demolition of the roof of the concourse. The proposed replacement structure would compromise the look of the 19th century train shed.4. The scheme would also harm the Bishopsgate Conservation Area with such a tall building relative to the current low and medium scale buildings again contravening the 2010 city plan.5. The Developers' illustration is visually appalling equal to Prince Charles's 'carbuncle ' referring the the proposed National Gallery extension.	PA	30-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Windscheffel	Alex	I object to this application, which in my opinion as a professional historian of Victorian Britain would cause irreparable harm to a nationally and internationally important heritage asset. I raise objections on the specific grounds that: [i] The proposal is incompatible with the National Planning Policy Framework. Paragraph NPPF 213 states that "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." There is no 'clear and convincing justification' provided in these plans that could justify a decision to override the requirements of the NPPF. [ii] The proposed scheme would cause substantial harm to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall and over-scaled building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which mandates the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. The proposed scheme would impact negatively on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated global heritage assets in the City and beyond. [iii] The irreversible harm to the Grade II-listed station that will be caused by the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new and inappropriate, undistinguished structure. which would thereby compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. [iv] The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, will cause a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. [v] The substantial harm caused to surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II* listed Hotel, a structure of national heritage importance as well as of considerable historical significance.	PA	30-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Jones	Jonathan	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to:" - The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. - The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. - The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. - The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. I reference the National Planning Policy Framework and Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional	PA	30-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Andrews	David	I object to this application which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically I raise objections to:1. The excessive height of the proposed building, totally out of scale to the current Victorian railway station and hotel. I understand that this is contrary to the 2015 City Plan requiring "the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas". This clearly includes the City Conservation areas and the St Paul's Cathedral Heights area. This also includes many of the Grade 1 listed City churches and the nearby St Botolph's church.2. I draw your attention to the National Planning Policy framework. Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." This clearly addresses this ugly tall imposition on top of the station complex.3. The Grade II listed station will be greatly harmed by the demolition of the roof of the concourse. The proposed replacement structure would compromise the look of the 19th century train shed.4. The scheme would also harm the Bishopsgate Conservation Area with such a tall building relative to the current low and medium scale buildings, again contravening the 2010 City Plan.5. The Developers' illustration is visually appalling, equal to Prince Charles's 'carbuncle ' when he referred to the the proposed National Gallery extension. As a design professional I am horrified by this proposal "squashing" the current in scale Victorian gem - one of the worse of some awful trashy design proposals in the City. I live in the BARBICAN so I like decent modern architecture but not this wholly inappropriate scheme.	PA	30-Jun-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Williams	Sarah	As a keen historian and accredited City of London guide, I believe strongly in preserving and cherishing our heritage. In the 200th anniversary year of the birth of commercial railways, it seems extraordinary that you are planning to demolish part of Liverpool Street Station in the name of progress. Following Sir John Betjeman's laudable example, we must stand up for buildings that have no voice. From an environmental perspective, the last thing the City needs is more noise, pollution, dust, glass and steel. Please build your office blocks elsewhere. Or preferably, not at all.	PA	30-Jun-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Cooke	Alison	I object to this proposal. Unnecessary and damaging to a functional beautiful historic station. Substantial and permanent harm will be done to the Victorian roof and building. Multiple harmful acts removing existing structures are damaging, not needed and purely for financial gain. The tall structure will impact negatively on the environment and is out-of-keeping with lower height buildings. This objection refers to the Planning Policy Framework paragraph NPPF 213 which states 'substantial harm to or loss of a) Grade II listed buildings or Grade II listed parks or gardens should be exceptional'	PA	01-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Matheson Nowell	Beren	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections based on: - Paragraph NPPF 213, which states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." The application would significantly ruin the structure, setting and sense of place that Liverpool Street station currently has. - The City of London is increasingly being swallowed up by over-tall, unsympathetic buildings which seem to have no sympathy nor respect for the surrounding area. This application would be another. - We have already lost Broad Street station next door, let's not lose Liverpool Street (as it currently stands), too.	PA	01-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Eccles	C	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure, which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed.	PA	01-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Berner	David	I object to this proposal which would cause considerable harm to the station and the Bishopsgate Conservation area generally. The scheme is inappropriate and detrimental to the historic building. Our London termini are 'the cathedrals of their age' and should be cherished.	PA	01-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Hynes	Michael	I object to the proposed development. It is way too big. Its effect would be oppressive because of its sheer bulk when considered from streets around. It would weigh heavily on the spirit and mood of station users because of its light-occluding presence. The loss of listed, historic elements and details is not warranted. The grain of the cityscape would be coarsened aesthetically and degraded environmentally.	PA	01-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Mann	David	I object to the application to demolition of the grade II listed station as it will demolish the existing historic roof. I feel it is not about bringing the station into the 21st century as claimed by network rail but is purely a revenue generating exercise to create retail units and office blocks above the station. It is contrary to the 2015 city plan and will be harmful to numerous conservation areas in the local area. The National Planning Policy Framework NPPF 213 states substantial harm or loss to grade II listed buildings should be exceptional. There is no exceptional reason for doing this. It is all about money	PA	01-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Hanna	Alex	The proposed changes will significantly change and destroy the character and appearance of the existing structure, damaging the original architectural design	PA	01-Jul-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Stuart	Tessa	Substantial harm will be caused by this development to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches. The National Planning Policy Framework specifically discourages excessively tall buildings.	PA	01-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Denning	Lois	I object to the destruction of our heritage by building an unnecessary light blocking monstrosity on top of a much loved and important building that is Liverpool Street station - this is not nessessary and will blight the entire area - just who is going to benefit from this eyesore - only people who financially gain by allowing such a travesty Please stop this destruction of an important part of London s history	PA	01-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Jean	Theadora	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. Please also note the National Planning Policy Framework. Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." These plans do not justify the harm / loss.	PA	01-Jul-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	CHARMAN	Fiona	I object to this application, because it will cause harm to this wonderful nationally important heritage building which i have loved since a child. In particular, - The station is a working building and has already had considerable alterations to the place i remember as a child. The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. Thus is part of our heritage and needs to be preserved, not damaged. In the 1950's the wanton destruction of so many heritage buildings left standing after WW2 was terrible, and this represents a new era of demolition. This leads to poorly designed, monotonous building, fit only for short term tenancy, that will either be left to deteriorate or need further development in a matter of decades. These buildings have been there for over a century. - The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset is not needed. The area has improved already, and it will impact on nearby smaller, lovely retail areas. - The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage buildings. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. It will be a completely unnecessary development, harmful to the environment and not needed in an area where existing office buildings unoccupied, could be used. The more heritage buildings that are lost, the more our city loses its heart. - The station is within the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, and the imposition of yet another tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium	PA	01-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Palmer	Daisy	I OBJECT strongly to this Planning Application for Liverpool Street Station. Daisy Palmer	PA	01-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Millward	Jane	I implore you to Please leave this beautiful building as it is .	PA	01-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Sharon Reuben	Sharon	I object to the proposal in the strongest terms and do not believe it is necessary or justified. The architecture and nature of the building needs to be preserved and there is already a huge amount of office and retail space in the area; the proposal is cultural vandalism that must not be permitted.	PA	01-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Bentley	Susan		DC	01-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Fenby	Suzanne	Liverpool Street station is fine as it is! 'Updating' it would ruin a beautiful building, there is no need for any updates or alterations in this area of the city The character is established and building a tower would ruin it!. The train station is perfect as it is and the surrounding buildings should remain as they are. Travelling by train is a wonderful experience because of all the old architecture and history as you arrive at the beautiful Victorian railway stations is a pleasure altering the structures just ruins the magic. And destroys our history. In Manchester Victoria station has been modernised and it has totally destroyed ambience and character the building I want to cry when I walk through it now!. You can't keep doing this to our old historical buildings, it's vandalism	PA	01-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Anticoni	Paul		DC	01-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Kelly	Lynda		DC	01-Jul-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Armstrong	Catherine	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets and does not meet government policy. Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." More specifically, I raise objections to: 1/The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. 2/The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. 3/The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. 4/The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. 5/In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. I urge you to refuse this application which will be entirely detrimental on heritage grounds and would set a dangerous precedent for large developer schemes which contravene government policy.	PA	01-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	A D'Andrea	LM	I object to this plan. I use Liverpool Street Station regularly and feel the splendour of light pouring through the roof. It is not a disaster area but a good example of how human beings adapt and move through crowded areas effectively. There are already enough shops. Railway history is central to understanding London's history and LSS is a great example.	PA	01-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Mead	Galya	In today's chaotic world one should cherish and preserve whatever crumbs of Victorian or previous eras' heritage London is lucky to possess, still. I am not even starting on the potential damage to the anyway not-so-clockwork railway schedule. Do you really think the City needs yet one more high-rise monstrosity?? Really? Stop it! Leave our station alone. Please.	PA	01-Jul-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Norris	John	This application would cause substantial and irreversible harm to the a nationally important heritage asset. Specifically, I object to: The damage to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The negative impact on surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the the Grade II-listed hotel, which is the last continually functioning nineteenth century hotel in the City, through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial damage the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's Church. Paragraph 213 of the National Planning Policy Framework clearly and expressly states that "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) Grade II listed buildings, or Grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional".	PA	01-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Martin	Isabel	It's a beautiful, historic building that needs to be protected not destroyed!	PA	01-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Butcher	Rob	Busy station that is often overcrowded. Toilets are down a flight of stairs. Poor signposting to main road. Shops are often closed when I travel.	PA	01-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Goate	Debbie	As a mobility scooter user the lift is often broken meaning a long trip to the back if stound the station- not signed so hard to find just to then miss your train !!	PA	01-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Morrison	Maureen	I have mobility issues which make using stairs time consuming and painful, using a lift both stops my breathlessness and painful walking and would get me to my ultimate destination quicker.	PA	01-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Turnbull	Ali	Liverpool Street station is a struggle for anyone - but even harder when you have Parkinson's.	PA	01-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Benson	Daniel	I object to the proposals on the grounds that they are out of scale, overwhelm the surrounding lower-scaled buildings, impact negatively on the cityscape and cause adverse harm to the setting of the historic station, hotel and other nearby lower-scaled buildings buildings. Collectively these remaining building create a city-scape of scale and coherence. The proposed building is grossly out of scale and is neither exceptional nor of lasting merit.	PA	01-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Coffeen Jones	Kathleen	As a disabled passenger, I dread using the lift at Liverpool Strret Station from the train level to the street or to the underground. The Elizabeth line lift is good, but the other one is very small and inefficient. You push up, the lift arrives with an up arrow and suddenly you are in the underground instead of at street level.	PA	01-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Utting-Simon	Susan	It's really difficult to travel through Liverpool Street with luggage.	PA	01-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	King	Bryan	Have been using Liverpool St station as my way into the City for many years, don't think it has been changed for ages. Certainly the toilets need major changes and to be made more accessible.	PA	01-Jul-25	S

25/00494/FULEIA	Houle	Timothy	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. I make reference to the National Planning Policy Framework, that states in paragraph NPPF 213 "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional."	PA	01-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Dearing	John		DC	01-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Mullins	Sam		DC	01-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Murphy	Brian	I object to the development of Liverpool Street station and the development of office buildings ontop of the station. The Victorian station and roof should be retained.	PA	01-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Webb	Gavin		DC	01-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Rule	Nicholas		DC	01-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Bendixson OBE	Terence		DC	01-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Murphy	Charlie		DC	01-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Kearney	Jenny	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to loss of the historic building and change to the character of the area which is under threat from encroaching buildings.	PA	01-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Russell	Alan		DC	01-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Moretta	Susan		DC	01-Jul-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Kenton	James	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional."	PA	01-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	White	Charles	I strongly object to this monstrous proposed development surrounding Liverpool St Station .I will ruin a beautiful listed building and destroy the area	PA	01-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Coates	Stephen	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. The proposals are grotesquely over-scaled The National Planning Policy Framework paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." The scheme would cause substantial harm to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church.	PA	01-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Reuben	Shealagh	I object to this proposal and the damage it will do to this building.	PA	01-Jul-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Rose	Jackie	I object to this application which would cause substantial harm to the significance of a nationally important heritage asset. More specifically I raise objections to: *Substantial harm to or loss of a grade II listed building should be exceptional (NPPF 213); *The substantial harm to the grade II listed station through demolition of the roof of the concourse and its replacement with a new structure, which would also compromise the setting of the 19th century train shed; *The insertion of large amounts of new retail units in the 19th century train sheds, including the construction of two elected retail galleries causing a high level of harm to the special interest & significance of the grade II listed heritage asset; *The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm the significance of the grade II listed hotel (the last continually functioning 19th century hotel in the City) through construction of a 20 storey tower over the station concourse; *The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation area by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low & medium scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the grade I listed Christopher Wren City churches and nearby St Botolph's church; *Retail at other stations and developments seem pointless and underused - the demographic is changing and station goes purchase online.	PA	01-Jul-25	O
Page 355 25/00494/FULEIA	Cassels	Edward	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: - The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. - The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. - The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. - The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. - In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. - I reference the National Planning Policy Framework in this objection: Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." This is not an exceptional situation. It is a commercially exploitative one which occasions material disruption to vital heritage assets. Thank you.	PA	01-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	White	Charles	Unbelievably ugly proposed development...London does not need more office space .It does need however protection from over development.Network Rail should be ashamed of it's for even contemplating such a terrible design .	PA	01-Jul-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Ballance	Robin	I wish to object very strongly for this proposal to build above Liverpool Street Station. It is unnecessary and will blight the Victorian aesthetic. Knocking down train sheds is a crime and planning officers should hang their heads in shame for allowing this proposal the light of day. John Betjman would be turning in his grave	PA	01-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Hill	Timothy	This updated proposal will significantly damage the access of those travelling through this station to natural light, as well as major loss of historic structure in one of the most important stations in London.	PA	01-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Robbins	Joanne	I strongly object to the Liverpool Street station redevelopment. The station has enough toilets and amenities and does not need improving. The last thing London needs is another ugly, empty office building killing the natural light in the station and shading the surrounding areas. Absolutely not!	PA	01-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Keyworth	Liam	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. The proposal also goes against the National Planning Policy Framework. Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." Whereas these proposals are not and equate to profit for the investors at the loss of heritage for future generations.	PA	01-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Denbigh	David	I object to the loss of light and the loss of heritage	PA	01-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Buckton	Melvyn	There's no real reason other than profit to alter the existing station. Minor alterations provided reviewed are acceptable. The current proposal permanently ruins one of our great architectural structures	PA	01-Jul-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Grey	John	I object to this application for the following reasons: The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof of the concourse and its replacement with a new structure, which would also compromise the setting of the 19th century train shed. The insertion of large amounts of new retail units in the 19th century train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning 19th century hotel in the City - through the construction of a twenty-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low-and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches and nearby St Botolph's church. My objection is based on the National Policy Framing Network	PA	01-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	HJ	P	Shocking ignorance of architectural history. These plans risk the loss of a landmark. Total recognition and agreement with need to improve accessibility, but object to the scale of destruction involved in this proposed development.	PA	01-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Sheldon	April	I object to this application which would cause substantial harm to the significance of this nationally important heritage assets. More specifically I object to the harm to the Grade II listed station through demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse which would compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed and the harm that would be done to the last and continually functional C19 hotel in the City through the construction of a 20 storey tower over the station concourse. This project should be stopped in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework, Paragraph NPPF 213 which states: "Substantial harm to or loss of :a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional."	PA	01-Jul-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Davies	Lily Rose	I object to this application - particularly the 'over station development (office tower) - which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: - The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. - Building above the station would also restrict natural light within the station which would have an environmental Impact due to increased energy use (lighting). - The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. - The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. - The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional"	PA	01-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Bryars	Tim	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: the demolition of the roof structure and addition of a 20-storey tower, fundamentally altering this Grade II listed station, compromising the setting of the train shed and Grade II* listed hotel, and causing considerable harm to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, contrary to the policy on tall buildings set out in the 2015 City Plan. It is disgraceful that at risk is everything achieved by John Betjeman's landmark conservation campaign in the 1970s, and by the sensitive 1990s restoration project, which is explicitly part of the Grade II listing as an example of late 20th century approaches to conservation at their best. Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." These proposals directly contravene this policy - scrap them.	PA	01-Jul-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Walker	Carole	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. I refer to the National Planning Policy Framework, Paragraph NPPF 213 which states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." The concourse of Liverpool Street Station should be maintained as is for the benefit of future generations and not exploited for short term greed.	PA	01-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Kingsley-Filshie	Walter	I should like to state my unequivocal objection to the plans for Liverpool Street station, which would destroy a beautifully and tastefully built unique and historically-important piece of both local and national heritage. The demolition of the station roof and its replacement with a tower would go against both the City of London's 2015 conservation plan and the National Planning Policy Framework's efforts to preserve listed buildings (that, after all, being the purpose of placing a site onto the list). The proposed demolition of parts of the site would negatively impact the character of the local area, the ambience and environment of the station concourse itself, and would harm tourism and local businesses.	PA	01-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Kitchenside	Julie	I strongly object to the proposals for Liverpool Street Station. This beautiful and historic building should be left just as it is, for future generations to use and enjoy it. So many of our stunning Victorian architecture has been destroyed and it is vital that we don't lose more of our wonderful heritage to modern developments. Please listen to what people are saying!	PA	01-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Long	Will	I object to this proposal. The light and character of the station will be transformed for the worse.	PA	01-Jul-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Voller	Kay	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to the following: The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishops Gate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." London is ever evolving however it is so important that we protect these important and beautiful heritage sites before they are lost forever.	PA	01-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Silmon de Monerri	Pedro	The Victorian architecture of Liverpool Street Station is an invaluable asset of our social, industrial and transport heritage. The current plans are insensitive; they disregard the buildings' importance and the role it occupies in London, and Great Britain's history	PA	01-Jul-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Wilcox	Laurence	I have been brought to write to object to this application by a campaign from the Victorian society. I've read many of the comments that contain the very concise, rational and completely valid legal response and I would simple like to support this response (but will not repeat it). On the other hand, speaking from the point of view of an architect, there are some elements of this proposal that are quite beautiful. The principle of building above the spaces that are held in high esteem the example that comes to mind is Will Alsop and his Sharp Centre for Design, OCAD University, Toronto. The late master of bringing the people on the design journey with him, I feel as though the applicant could learn a thing or two from the approach that Alsop took to realise what can only really be described as insane architecture. Although the Glassworks, Birmingham project to build a high rise above a historic building was destroyed by public opinion, the project was architecturally brilliant. If pretending not to be insane. This proposal feels like it is trying to be a bit too normal, where it is clearly extraordinary. I would encourage the principle to be re-visited and perhaps for the public (me in this case) to be brought along for the ride.	PA	01-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Brown	Alan	To: Tom Sleigh, Chair of the Planning & Transport Committee I write to object to this application which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. I object to this new scheme - and with reference to the National Planning Policy Framework, Paragraph NPPF 213 that states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional...." for the following reasons: It does substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof of the concourse and its replacement with a new structure, which would also compromise the setting of the 19th century train shed. The new scheme inserts large amounts of new retail units in the 19th century train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The new scheme blocks natural light from the concourse which was always a characteristic feature of all Victorian railway stations. There is negative impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning 19th century hotel in the City- through the construction of a twenty-story tower over the station concourse. There is - in the new scheme - substantial harm to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterized by low-and medium-scale buildings. The new scheme is therefore exhibiting characteristics which are contrary to the 2015 City Plan which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond.	PA	01-Jul-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Bashford	James	Dear Mr Siegn, I object to this application, which would cause significant and irreversible harm to nationally important heritage assets. The demolition of the Grade II-listed concourse roof would permanently alter the station's character. Although of 20th-century origin, it is a high-quality structure that fits well within its historic setting. Its replacement lacks architectural merit and sensitivity to context, would be a blight on the streetscape and detract from the daily experience of millions of travellers. Inserting large retail units and elevated galleries into the 19th-century train sheds would severely compromise their historic openness and spatial clarity, causing substantial harm to the listed fabric as already seen at Victoria station. The proposed 20-storey tower would visually dominate nearby listed buildings, particularly the Grade II*-listed railway hotel - the last operating Victorian station hotel in the City. Its landmark status and historic value would be greatly diminished. The impact extends to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, where the prevailing scale is low to mid-rise. A tall building here is wholly out of keeping and directly conflicts with the City Plan 2015, which restricts tall buildings in Conservation Areas and the St Paul's Heights Policy Area. There would also be a wider cumulative effect on nearby heritage assets, including Wren's Grade I-listed churches and other historic buildings that depend on their townscape context and skyline prominence. Whilst much cited in this context, the loss of New York's original Penn Station offers a clear warning. "One entered the city like a god; one scuttles in now like a rat." The proposed changes would result in a similarly regrettable loss. Paragraph 213 of the NPPF requires that substantial harm to Grade II-listed buildings be exceptional. This application fails that test. ~~Urges the Committee to refuse the application.~~	PA	01-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Beddard	Donna	These buildings should be preserved for future generations to enjoy.	PA	01-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Orbach	Julian	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: the substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. /this is also contrary to national planning policy: NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional. The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed.	PA	01-Jul-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Wilson	Susan	"I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to:" What are the key issues to cover in my objection? The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional."	PA	01-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Napper	Helen	I object to the proposed development of Liverpool Street Station. This station is a beautiful part of our national history and should be maintained in its original and revered form for posterity . Not built on top of for the purposes of profit and greed	PA	01-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Johnson	Sophie	I object to this application which would cause substantial harm to the significance of this nationally important heritage asset. More specifically I object to the harm to the Grade II listed station through demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse which would compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed and the harm that would be done to the last and continually functional C19 hotel in the City through the construction of a 20 storey tower over the station concourse. We do not need more towers in this area for neither offices nor high end residential, many of which exist already and are not full. This project should be stopped in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework, Paragraph NPPF 213 which states: "Substantial harm to or loss of :a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional."	PA	01-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Ashley-Jones	Julie	I object to the proposed plans that will have a detrimental negative impact on the Grade II listed building. Whilst the concourse needs improving this should be done that is respectful to and in a manner that enhances the Victorian workman ship and the beautiful roof which is currently not shown to its best. We, in 2025 should be able to improve a building of national heritage importance to make it functional as well as aesthetically pleasing for future generations, and not ride roughshod in a selfish way that causes harm to our environment. The planned height of the build will not improve the area and will only serve to hide the beauty of the Victorian trainshed. I object to the plans and believe that the developers can be more creative in their ideas and protect our heritage whilst also considering the future.	PA	01-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Kuner	Lisa	Why destroy our iconic buildings it's what makes London unique	PA	01-Jul-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Whitfield	Alex	I object to this design due to the loss of character and light to one of the best public spaces in the city with no tangible improvement to the public's enjoyment of this space.	PA	01-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Beresford	Jenny	It would be a travesty to knock this place down & build a monstrosity. Beautiful Victorian engineering that needs to be forever preserved.	PA	01-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Mead	Galina	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to the damage of the historic complex and to the interruption of anyway chaotic day to day life of the very significant railway station.	PA	01-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Lidiard-Phillips	Melanie		DC	01-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Judge	Cynthia		DC	01-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Ball	Alec	The proposed plans will damage a beautiful grade II listed building and additional retail will detract from the aesthetics of the building and impede its primary focus of facilitating travel.	PA	01-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Bailey	Joan	Dear Mr Tom Sleigh I object to application 25/00494/FULEIA, to make significant and inappropriate changes to Liverpool Street Station. Bearing in mind paragraph NPPF 213 of the National Planning Policy Framework,, which states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional of Victorian architecture and if significant historical importance to the heritage of our Capital City. In particular, like many other objectives including the Victorian Society, I am concerned by the following: The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof of the concourse and its replacement with a new structure, which would also compromise the setting of the 19th century train shed. The insertion of large amounts of new retail units in the 19th century train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning 19th century hotel in the City - through the construction of a twenty-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low-and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches and nearby St Botolph's church. Thank you.	DC	01-Jul-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Mohun	Richard	"I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. In particular, I raise objections to: 1. The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station (the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure; which also compromises the setting of the surviving C19 train shed.) 2. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds which will cause a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. 3. The impact on the surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. 4. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. > This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. >In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. NB Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional."	PA	01-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Mead	Galya	In today's chaotic world one should cherish and preserve whatever crumbs of Victorian or previous eras' heritage London is lucky to possess, still. I am not even starting on the potential damage to the anyway not-so-clockwork railway schedule. Do you really think the City needs yet one more high-rise monstrosity?? Really? Stop it! Leave our station alone. Please.	PA	01-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	couchman	julia	I object because I think it would be tragic to remove the feeling of airiness that the light entering the building gives to this iconic railway station. I have also ticked the noise box and the traffic and highways box because carrying out the construction of this ugly addition to the lovely building would be a nightmare for anyone trying to live or work nearby for several years. We should take pride in our historic buildings not vandalise them.	PA	01-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Gibbons	Annette	Wanton destruction of a fine building and structure in favour of unnecessary rebuilding. Capitalism at its worse.	PA	01-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	The Flight Centre			DC	01-Jul-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Alder	Philippa	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional."	PA	01-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Howland-Bolton	Richard		DC	01-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Lebon	Sally		DC	01-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Jones	Emily	I object to Network Rail and Acme's plans for Liverpool Street Station. It would take away its charm, character and heritage. You won't be able to bring that back.	PA	01-Jul-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	BOWER	GARETH	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets and is inconsistent with the 2015 City Plan and the National Planning Policy Framework, paragraph NPPF 213 which states that "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional.". In particular, I object to the following: The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church	PA	01-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Sanson	Julien	I objectif. Need to preserve current building	PA	01-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Lund	Keeley	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: - The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. - The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. - The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. - The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. - In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional."	PA	01-Jul-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Proudman	Kate	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. I hereby reference National Planning Policy Framework Paragraph NPPF 213 which states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional."	PA	01-Jul-25	O
Page 368 25/00494/FULEIA	Webster	Martin	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: - The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. - The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. - The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. - The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. - Paragraph NPPF 213 of the National Planning Policy Framework states that "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional. This application is only exceptional in the gross overscale of the proposed development.	PA	01-Jul-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Mortensen	Brett	Good afternoon, This note is to voice my objection to the proposed redevelopment of Liverpool Street Station on the basis that it will cause "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens" (Paragraph National Planning Policy Framework 213) The demolition of the brick towers, 50 Liverpool Street and the loss of natural light throughout the station is not acceptable. Liverpool Street Station is one of the finest railway stations in London, natural light being central to its appeal. Renovations at Waterloo Station, and Kings Cross - St Pancras stations, were extensive, successful and retained heritage features and natural light. There is no reason to accept that Liverpool Street Station must be destroyed in order to accommodate future traffic. On a personal note, my default posture tends to be to permit and encourage development. But this project as it is currently proposed will result in a really tremendous station being totally downgraded. I acknowledge the need for something to be done to improve the station but this plan is just not acceptable.	PA	01-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Nash	Tanya	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. My objections are made in reference to the National Planning Policy Framework. Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to, or loss of: a) grade 11 listed buildings, or grade 11 registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." More specifically, I raise objections to: Substantial harm to the Grade 11-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure. The replacement structure will also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units in the C19 train sheds and the planned retail galleries. Again, they will harm the special interest and significance of Grade 11-listed heritage asset. These plans will also impact the surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade 11-listed hotel - the last functioning C19 hotel in the city of London - through the construction of a 20 story tower over the station concourse. That is a hideous idea. Substantial harm to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas such as Conservation Areas and the St Paul's Cathedral Height's area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets such as Grade 1-listed Christopher Wren City churches and nearby St Botolph's church.	PA	01-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Bloxham	Peter	I object to this application and the loss of the historic buildings and harm to the setting. Peter ARB RIBA chartered architect	PA	01-Jul-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Ball	Michael	The proposed development will do substantial damage to a grade II listed building and its setting and the proposals do not meet the criteria laid down in the NPPF Paragraph 213 which states that GII damage should be exceptional. Replacement of the concourse roof will compromise the remaining 19th century roof and the excess of retail is not only detrimental to the interior views but also to the functionality of the station, which is to facilitate travel. The new large building backdrop to the hotel severely compromises its setting and the new building itself contravenes conservation area requirements.	PA	01-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA Page 370	Harlow	Roger	I have a number of objections to Network Rail and Acme's plans for Liverpool Street Station. This application would cause substantial harm to a nationally important heritage asset. I fully concur with The 20th Century Society's and the Victorian Society's objections: 1. The destruction of the existing roof which would compromise the existing building and obstruct natural light. 2. Excessive new retail units which will overwhelm the existing architecture. 3. Harm to the existing surroundings which a huge development when most of the area is low and medium scale. 4. And I refer you to paragraph 213 of the National Planning Policy Framework: Any harm to, or loss of, the significance of a designated heritage asset (from its alteration or destruction, or from development within its setting), should require clear and convincing justification. Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional b) assets of the highest significance, notably scheduled monuments, protected wreck sites, registered battlefields, grade I and II* listed buildings, grade I and II* registered parks and gardens, and World Heritage Sites, should be wholly exceptional Regards Roger Harlow	PA	01-Jul-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Oliver	Jack	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional."	PA	01-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Richardson	Alexandra Mary	I think the scale of this development is not in keeping with the historical site. It is an enormous blot on the landscape and much too large for this area. The station can be remodelled in a way that enhances what is already there, while preserving the historical and unique features of the current station and train sheds. This is a prime location for development, but any construction should be carried out thoughtfully, with preservation in mind rather than desecration.	PA	01-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Dyke	Ursula	I object to this application as being a totally inappropriate and overbearing change within the Bishopsgate Conservation Area and the impact on the city's heritage buildings which we have now come to appreciate and to cherish for their character. The proposal is not sympathetic to the area and does not fit the National Planning Policy Framework (under Historic Environment) which states: "to ensure that heritage assets are conserved, and where appropriate enhanced, in a manner that is consistent with their significance" and "plans should set out a positive strategy for the conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment"	PA	01-Jul-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Bendall	James	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." I therefore raise objections to: * The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. * The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. * The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. * The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church.	PA	01-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Stock	Royden	I strongly object to these proposals in this application as someone that has used and enjoyed this station throughout my life. It would be a tragedy to lose the unique aspects of this site to the proposed development, and as I was closely involved with the previous works at St. Pancras and someone that lived fairly close for over 30 years I feel qualified to give this opinion. Demolishing so much of the Grade II listed building and concourse and then erecting yet another tower block on top of the site, causing a seriously negative impact to the Grade II* listed hotel is surely against the National Planning Policy Framework Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." I feel that this scheme would cause harm to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area and it would further damage an area that includes many of our finest churches and other important examples of architecture. Please treat this planning application with the contempt it deserves and save this area from more unwanted and unnecessary destruction of listed buildings.	PA	01-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Elliston	Charlotte	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church.	PA	01-Jul-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Bond	Melissa	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. I make reference to the National Planning Policy Framework - Paragraph NPPF 213 of which states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." Additionally I am a local resident and I object to the amount of disruption and noise that would be created by the inevitable ongoing building works. I am a lifelong user of Liv St Stn and it is currently stunning buildi	PA	01-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Collis	Lesley	The station is Grade II listed and of historical importance. The proposed changes are not sympathetic or in keeping with the existing building. Why not improve it without changing its character, or one of the other less iconic buildings.	PA	01-Jul-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Thorne	Robert	I strongly object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to Liverpool Street Station, No.50 Liverpool Street, the Andaz Hotel and the surrounding Conservation Areas. The application proposals fail to meet the tests set out in the National Planning Policy Framework regarding developments affecting heritage assets, and they cannot by any measure be described as sustainable development. I have been a regular user of the station for over 60 years. I can claim some specialist knowledge, having been part of the Greater London Council team which fought the proposals of 1976 to totally rebuild the station. As a result of that opposition there emerged the alternative proposal for a carefully-constituted remodelling of the station, as carried out in 1985-91. I wholly appreciate that there are aspects of that 1985-91 scheme which have proved inadequate, especially the lifts and escalators, and which should be upgraded. But the outstanding quality of that scheme is that it created a new main concourse, naturally lit and sensitively designed to respect the architecture and engineering of the original 1873-5 station. The applicants' Conservation Report confirms that outstanding quality (p.4). The destruction of that quality is profligate, harmful and unnecessary. As the application drawings demonstrate (especially drawing A-07-099), the proposed scheme will create a concourse dominated by retail outlets, obstructed by the stanchions supporting the office block above and only partly naturally lit. It fails to meet the NPPF tests (paras.213-215) in that the substantial harm it inflicts on the heritage assets is not justified by the minor public benefits claimed for it. The applicants have failed to supply evidence of any effort made to design a more modest, less wholly destructive scheme. In addition the proposals will cause substantial harm to the Grade 11* listed Andaz Hotel, which it will overwhelm, plus the overall environment of the Bishopsgate CA.	PA	01-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Peters	Nina	This Station functions very well as it is and the disruption caused by this proposal unnecessary and unwanted/unessarly. The station itself, plays an important part of retain London heritage and forms the gate way to the local heritage area.	PA	01-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Coy	Lucy	What a shame! Surely there's a better way to fund the station than destroying that beautiful iconic roof of Liverpool Street Station. It helps to create a welcome for people arriving from all over the world! I totally object as it's destroying our heritage.	PA	01-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Whitfield	Ann	Inappropriate overdevelopment of a classic building. A more sympathetic redevelopment retaining railway heritage is better The glass tower above has little architectural merit	PA	01-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Wignall	Katie	I object strongly to the plan for Liverpool Street Station. It's a destruction of a historically and architecturally important building and this development is totally out of proportion with existing structures and badly thought through. I specifically object to the damaging of the Grade II listed roof - something I often admire and encourage others to admire leading walking tours in the area. Th inclusion of a 20 storey tower looming over a listed 19th century hotel will also have a disastrous effect on the Bishopsgate conservation area and the viewing lines around Liverpool Street.	PA	01-Jul-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Cole	Penelope	I object to this application, which I believe would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. To cause substantial harm to or the loss of Grade II listed buildings or Grade II registered parks and/or gardens should be exceptional and this planned development to Liverpool Street station does not fall within the category of exceptional. I raise objections to the following: * The substantial harm to the Grade II listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing building, which would compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. *The insertion of extensive retail outlets within the C19 sheds which would cause harm to the special interest and significance of this Grade II listed heritage asset. *The harm to the Bishopsgate conservation area by introducing a tall building in an area characterised by low and medium scale buildings, which is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas.	PA	01-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Anderson	Julie	I object to this application which would cause substantial harm to a nationally important heritage asset. Specifically, I object to proposed demolition of the current roof structure and to the proposed new structure which would compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. Furthermore, the impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets would be entirely negative. The construction of a twenty storey tower over the station concourse would be an ugly, harmful blight on a national asset. The National Planning Policy Framework states that "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings , or grade II registered parks or gardens , should be exceptional." This proposed application would harm the Bishopsgate Conservation Area by introducing a tall building in a wholly inappropriate area. It would further impact the setting of nearby national treasures such as the Grade 1 listed Christopher wren churches. I should like to add that I see us all as guardians of our much-loved capital city. Future generations depend on us to think very carefully before we destroy national assets.	PA	01-Jul-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Pieczora	Marek	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: 1. The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving 19th century train shed. 2. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the 19th century train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. 3. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning 19th century hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. 4. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. In support of my objection I should like to bring to your attention the National Planning Policy Framework, and in particular Paragraph NPPF 213 which states: "...Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional..."	PA	01-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Murphy	Samuel	I am not generally in favour of the current plans, but do support a more modest regeneration, including additional retail and other spaces, but that keeps more (understandably not all) of the existing historical structure.	PA	01-Jul-25	R
25/00494/FULEIA	Albery	Stuart	Any alteration to Liverpool Street station i oppose to this beautiful architecture including impacting natural light on the concourse It's not bad layout as it is, therefore make no change!	PA	01-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	BRIANT	JULIAN	I oppose the plans to demolish a significant proportion of a listed building, including the entirety of the station concourse, which is recognised as being a key aspect of the significance of the building I oppose erecting a hulking tower block immediately on top of the station and the proposal to install a huge amount of new retail within the train sheds, the oldest and most important parts of the significant station building. The Bishopgate conservation area, City Plan 2015, NPPF and listed buildings status have all been ignored by this insensitive and out of scale proposed development.	PA	01-Jul-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Edmunds	Thomas	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station and the impact to the last continually functioning 19thc hotel in the city in specifically to replace it with a building outsized by the city plan's guidelines that demands refusal on these grounds. In addition the National Planning Policy Framework NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." This is clearly exception and in complete contradiction of this framework butchering the purposes of them being Grade II listed. The proposed benefits do not outweigh the damage of these proposals which are short term and will in the long term degrade the character of the city. These plans also will introduce a unusually tall building in the area, which has incalculable damage. Several studies have explored the impact of tall buildings on mental health, suggesting that they can contribute to increased stress, mental health difficulties, and a sense of oppression, I think this is obvious if you consider it personally. I am not prone to object usually, thank you for reading.	PA	01-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Mattox-Graham	Kelli	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. I object to the destruction of a national monument, and reference Paragraph NPPF 213 that states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." This is not exceptional- the last thing the city needs is another ugly modern tower ruining the beautiful historical city.	PA	01-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Gronnestad-Damur	Wendy	I object to the application as it will destroy the lovely and historic station concourse, add unnecessary retail and an unnecessary tower,, and interfere with the historic station hotel. Also, it will stick out like a sore thumb in the Bishopsgate Conservation area. Liverpool Street station is a gem and developers should not be given permission to destroy it. National Planning Policy Framework paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." That is exactly what will happen if this application is approved - substantial harm and loss.	PA	01-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Dowse	Liz	I object. This is not empathetic to historical Liverpool Street Station or its environment.	PA	01-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Mead	Jerry	I object to this inappropriate and quite unnecessary development. These days people work from home one of the reasons why so much of the City's office property stands empty. There is no justification for this plan.	PA	01-Jul-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Herbert	Simon	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections regarding ... Functionality: As a frequent user I vouch that the station's circulation areas and concourse are already fit for purpose, with great sightlines enabling easy navigation and an admirable lack of clutter. In effect by passing this planning application you would demote those pursuing the building's primary purpose, travel - forcing the paying public underground - while literally elevating the demands of speculative developers. I see no public benefit to the proposal. Aesthetics: By some miracle the 1980s / 1990s redevelopment resulted in a light-filled, lofty public space which enhanced travellers' journeys and respected Victorian invention. In stark contrast the proposed alternative would demolish built heritage of great value and submerge the public under an unwieldy office block which will starve them of daylight. Future-proofing: If you allow this kind of domination of overhead space in what is currently the public realm (in practice, if not technically in law) you'll invite a host of similar applications and introduce additional interests which would impair freedom in the future to make use of the site as a strategic logistical asset. Yours, Simon Herbert (Passenger on services into Liverpool Street station since 1964, resident of London since 1989 - and currently a home-owner in Tower Hamlets).	PA	01-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	tudor	Jane	I object to this application which would cause significant damage to nationally important heritage assets. Our victorian buildings are amazing and precious and we just seem hell bent on destroying our heritage and replacing them with ugly lazy alternatives.	PA	01-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Martin	Douglas	I object to the scale and design of the proposal that if built would obliterate the views and significance of loved buildings, namely the station itself, the adjoining hotel and St Botolph's Church. The lower scale and mass of the station and its immediate surrounds is a welcome island of more humane buildings in comparison to the soulless glass, concrete and steel slabs forming the rest of the City. The City is rapidly becoming an anodyne identikit business park like so many others around the world. We need to retain the significant fragments of London's character that remain.	PA	01-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Curtis	Nicola	The building needs to be preserved. This application destroys a heritage building and is inappropriate destruction of london heritage and massive over development.	PA	01-Jul-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Michel	Samantha	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: - The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. - The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. - The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. - The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. Lastly, I would like to draw your attention to Paragraph 213 of the National Planning Policy Framework, which states that "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: - The substantial harm	PA	01-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Brand	Briony	I object to this development. Rather than destroying, we should be celebrating and maintaining our beautiful Victorian heritage.	PA	01-Jul-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Michel	Samantha	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: - The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. - The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. - The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. - The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. Lastly, I would like to draw your attention to Paragraph 213 of the National Planning Policy Framework, which states that "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: - The substantial harm	PA	01-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Michel	Stephan	Having worked nearby and used Liverpool Street Station for many years, I strongly object to this development on aesthetic, heritage and functional grounds but fundamentally because the National Planning Policy Framework (Paragraph 213) states that "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." - I do not believe that the development will deliver a better/easier experience for commuters. - I do not feel that the loss of the listed roof and other listed parts of the station is warranted or necessary. - I do not believe that this location needs so much more office space. - I do not believe that the development enhances Liverpool Street - it dwarfs and diminishes its importance and it's beauty. - I believe that a development of this nature sets a dangerous precedent for other listed structures to be demolished without due care and consideration.	PA	01-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Wheeldon	Leanne	Object for the following reasons: 1. It is a listed building 2. It's loss would be a detriment to the overall historic environment / heritage of the area 3. Improvements to facilities can be made without complete destruction of the building. 4. Does not fit in with government guidelines for reduction of carbon emissions from the building industry. I use this station frequently. It is a beautiful, well designed and useable building.	PA	01-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Grainger	Hilary	The proposal is completely unacceptable. Given the architectural importance of this iconic building, the proposals are insensitive and unnecessary. I wholly endorse the views of the Victorian Society on this matter.	PA	01-Jul-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Billinghurst	Chris	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. The aesthetic of the proposed buildings would not enhance what already exists at Liverpool Street nor that of the surrounding area, the designs do not support a sustainable approach neither do they appear to encourage conservation. Bishopsgate is an area of great historic value and does not need another contemporary monolith, particularly when the requirement for physical office accommodation and shops is on the wane. I have been travelling to this station for several decades and it remains fit for purpose in the 21st century. There are plenty of other London terminals, Waterloo in particular, which require renovation far more urgently than Liverpool Street. It would therefore be absurd in the current economic climate to spend so much money where it does not need to be spent. The old saying about not fixing something which isn't broken is particularly apt.	PA	01-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Neill	Duncan	I am writing to object to the proposed redevelopment of Liverpool Street Station by Network Rail and Acme. The scheme poses a serious threat to nationally important heritage assets and should be rejected. The removal of the existing concourse roof of the Grade II-listed station would irreparably damage its historic fabric. Replacing it with an oversized modern roof would erase key architectural features and undermine the coherence of the surviving 19th-century train shed. The plans to insert large-scale retail units, including two elevated shopping galleries, would overwhelm the original design and significantly diminish the station's historic character. The proposed 20-storey tower over the concourse would severely compromise the setting of the adjacent Grade II*-listed former Great Eastern Hotel, the last functioning 19th-century railway hotel in the City. The massing and scale of the tower would dominate the hotel and disrupt its historical relationship with its surroundings. The proposal would also cause substantial harm to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, an area defined by historic low- to mid-rise buildings. A tall structure here contradicts the City of London's 2015 Local Plan, which discourages tall buildings in Conservation Areas and in protected view corridors, such as those relating to St Paul's Cathedral. The scheme would further harm the setting of numerous heritage sites, including several Grade I-listed Wren churches and nearby St Botolph's. These are not just heritage concerns, they reflect planning policy. Paragraph 213 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings... should be exceptional." The harm in this case is extensive and unjustified. More appropriate, conservation-led alternatives should be pursued. I urge you to reject this application to protect Liverpool Street Station's architectural legacy and the integrity of its historic surroundings.	PA	01-Jul-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Brown	Finn	I object to this application on the grounds that it significantly alters the spatial experience of the building user, the concourse will not be sufficiently lit from daylight and will be supplemented with artificial lighting. The partial demolition of the station and its associated buildings expends the building's embodied carbon. The new building on top of the station does not directly benefit the building users, there is not a successful precedent for this kind of architectural intervention in my opinion. There are many successful precedent for station improvements works across London that are sympathetic and retain a lot of the physical building fabric. This is crucial to its embodied carbon and contributing to the identity of the place and the people who depend on it. Station improvement works to improve accessibility must go ahead, but they must be sympathetic towards the existing fabric and consider the needs of the building users.	PA	01-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Palmer	Helen	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: The loss of an area of historical architectural interest. It is possible to develop stations without ripping out the natural light and Victorian architectural history, see St Pancras for reference. The environmental impact of rebuilding a perfectly good concourse. The negative impact on the Bishopsgate conservation area.	PA	01-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Dixon	Stuart	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to nationally important heritage assets. National Planning Policy Framework paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." I object for the following reasons: The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church.	PA	01-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Russell	Joanne	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to the modernisation of an asset which does not need modernisation or extension - building above it is solely for profit and will not enhance the facility. Build your units elsewhere. London Liverpool Street is a wonderful station, light, airy, interesting, which I enjoy regularly using. it has enough shops and kiosks, and definitely doesn't need 20 stories on top. Please don't ruin it.	PA	01-Jul-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	brittain	caroline	I object to the redevelopment for the following reasons The beautiful building that is Liverpool Street Station should be preserved as it is. The building on top of this beautiful building is completely unnecessary. The 21 storey office development seems to be against the current trend of reducing office space. It maybe commercially attractive but will dwarf this fine victorian building. Network Rail is a public sector arms length body of the department of transport and ultimately is owned by the public. It would be wise to remember this.	PA	01-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Linington	Michael	Surely there's a better way to 'develop' the station than to harm, damage and impose contemporary features on what is a listed and important 19th century building and one of the few remaining vestiges of the area's history. Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." As a regular user of the station, I also object to the transport disruption this will cause over a prolonged period of time for minimal gain to commuters.	PA	01-Jul-25	O
Page 383 25/00494/FULEIA	Day	Catherine	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifiically, I raise objections to the inappropriate nature of the plans given the location in an historic area full of interesting low and medium rise buildings e.g. the many Wren churches, contrary to the 2015 City Plan. As a regular visitor to this area there is plenty of empty office space that could offer retail opportunities, we don't want or need another St Pancras. We do not want or need yet more high rise developments adversely affecting this historic skyline and depriving residents, visitors and the whole environment of natural light to be replaced by dark windy corridors through a concrete jungle. This is a historic and uniquely distinctive area of London and any further development should be in keeping with that legacy and not detrimental to it. Network Rail and ACME can and should do better. In summary, the proposed development is contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework (Paragraph 213) which states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." Please reject this application	PA	01-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Scott-Brining	June	It is not appropriate to commercialise Liverpool Street Station by building offices or other structures above the current concourse. It is a magnificent building and the busiest station in London. It should be preserved in its current light filled space.	PA	01-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Hawkins	Libby	I strongly object to this plan that will destroy a hugely important building that is part of London's heritage. This wonderful structure will be lost to future generations. I use the station regularly and it is a fabulous example of Victorian railway architecture with its ornate ironwork, huge glass canopies and great brickwork. It will be a travesty if planning is given for this venture which will no doubt make a few people even richer than they already are. These buildings were created for everyone to enjoy, not for a few to destroy.	PA	01-Jul-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Joory	Kavita	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional."	PA	01-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Ball	Asli	The proposed development will do material damage to a Grade II listed building, its setting and heritage. The proposals fail to meet the criteria as per the NPPF Paragraph 213 which states that GII damage should be exceptional. Replacement of the concourse roof will compromise the remaining 19th century roof and the excess of retail is not only detrimental to the interior aesthetically but also to the functionality of the station, which is to facilitate travel. The new large building backdrop to the hotel severely compromises its setting and the new building itself contravenes conservation area requirements.	PA	01-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Smart	Harriet	I object to this application. This proposal, if allowed, will cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. Liverpool Street Station is a historic gateway to the City of London and this proposal seeks to irreversibly change both the station itself and its setting within the Bishopsgate Conservation Area. This proposal seeks to impose a 20 storey tower on top of the station concourse. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas. There will be substantial harm inflicted on the Grade II listed station, including the unnecessary demolition of the existing concourse roof. There will be also substantial harm done to the immediate setting, including the existing nineteenth century engine shed and the the Grade II*-listed hotel. Paragraph 213 of the National Planning Policy Framework states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." This proposal should be rejected on these grounds and the claimed benefits of the scheme do not outweigh the harms to irreplaceable, designated assets.	PA	01-Jul-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Palmer	Susan	I object to this because of the following reason. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset.	PA	01-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Benford	Polly	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to the substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse. I reference the National Planning Policy Framework: Paragraph NPPF 213 which states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." I am fond of Liverpool Street Station, having lived near it for many years, and I object to these plans.	PA	01-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Thomas	Lucy	Very significant harm/ demolition of a heritage asset without any public benefit, purely for the profit of the owner/developer.	PA	01-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Graham	Crystal	I object to the destruction of our glorious Heritage at Liverpool Street Station. I regularly use the station when travelling from Norfolk I find the light and airy persona to be uplifting. There is numerous buildings within London not yet rented and my question the need for another high-rise when others are available just to destroy our glorious railway history. Enough destruction was completed when the railways were privatised. I can't believe we want to destroy more. I'm concerned that a project of this nature will give years of chaos for anyone travelling to the station. The rail user and local inhabitants are not being considered, this is purely a money making activity Yours faithfully C Graham	PA	01-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Gamble	Angela	I object to the partial demolishing and inappropriate redevelopment of Liverpool Street Station as a listed building of importance and further object to the substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area	PA	01-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Davey	Laura	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to -The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. -The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. -The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. -The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. -The plans contravene the National Planning Policy Framework specifically Paragraph NPPF 213 which states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional."	PA	01-Jul-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	McGlenn	Mark	Planning Objection - Liverpool Street Station Redevelopment Proposal I object to the proposed redevelopment of Liverpool Street Station on the following grounds: 1. Substantial Harm to Listed Buildings - The demolition and replacement of the current concourse roof would cause substantial harm to the Grade II-listed Liverpool Street Station, damaging its historic integrity and visual coherence. The proposed commercial tower and concourse changes would negatively affect the setting of the surviving 19th-century train shed, a rare and significant structure. 2. Damage to Interior Character and Historic Fabric - The insertion of new elevated retail galleries within the Victorian train shed would obscure the original architecture, reduce natural light, and harm the station's special historic and architectural interest. These additions represent unnecessary commercial intrusion that compromises the station's historic value. 3. Harm to the Grade II-Listed Great Eastern Hotel - The tower would overshadow and dominate the setting of the Grade II-listed Great Eastern Hotel, the last operating 19th-century railway hotel in the City of London. This constitutes a major loss of visual and historical context and undermines the status of a nationally significant 4. Negative Impact on the Bishopsgate Conservation Area - The proposed tower is inappropriate in scale and directly conflicts with the 2015 City of London Local Plan, which states that tall buildings should not be permitted in conservation areas or in areas like the St Paul's Cathedral Heights zone. The proposal would disrupt the established scale of the area and damage the setting of numerous nearby listed buildings, including several Grade I-listed Wren church 5. Failure to Comply with National Planning Policy (NPPF) - Under Paragraph 213 of the National Planning Policy Framework, "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings... should be exceptional." This application results in clear substantial harm w	PA	01-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Gallagher	Joseph	Entirely unnecessary to demolish this historic station. An act of cultural vandalism.	PA	01-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Contreras-Brown	Miles	Demolition of existing concourse of historical significance and excessively tall offices will harm the area.	PA	01-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Porter	Christopher	I object because this is a site of architectural significance. London has a rich history of fabulous railway stations that are slowly being eroded by thoughtless and unnecessary 'modernisation'. This company employed by Network Rail have tried dirty tricks to persuade the public that it is in their best interest to wreck something beautiful to gain better access and shopping facilities. In truth the station is near perfect as it is. Commuters do not need stations to be shopping malls or worse be an office space. The worst trick is to block them comment on social media websites so the wider public can't see there is a downside and that they are being lied to. Please don't let this happen.	PA	01-Jul-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Braithwaite	Martin	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to:- The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. The National Planning Policy Framework paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." The proposed development could not be considered in anyway as exceptional.	PA	02-Jul-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Lee	Avril	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. As someone who worked in the neighbourhood for over 10 years and who now regularly visits, I am struck by the inappropriate mass and scale of this development. More specifically, I raise objections to: * The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. * The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. * The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. * The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. I refer you to the National Planning Policy Framework, Paragraph NPPF 213 which states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional - reject this proposal now.	PA	02-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Murkett	Shaun	The proposal constitutes gross over development above and around an existing building of architectural and cultural heritage, namely Liverpool Street station . The proposed design is lacklustre and feeble in comparison to the existing Victorian splendour of the station. There would appear to be insufficient evidence to support the need for more commercial office space in this area when there is already known to be lots of vacant office space to let locally and has been for a few years .	PA	02-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	wainwright	robert	I strongly object to this planning application. Why do we have to keep losing things of beauty for more boring office blocks and corporate greed. This should not be allowed to happen.	PA	02-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Bush	Amanda	The proposed massive block will have a disastrous impact on the surrounding area, dwarfing the older buildings and ruining the character of an older part of London which we should seek to preserve.	PA	02-Jul-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Ritchie	James	I object to this application which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: - the harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof of the concourse and its replacement with a new structure, which would compromise the setting of the 19th century train shed, and cause harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning 19th century hotel in the City. - the harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low-and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches and nearby St Botolph's church. - the scheme is also contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework, Paragraph NPPF 213 of which states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional."	PA	02-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Collard	David	The proposed development of Liverpool Street station is completely unacceptable and objectionable. The massive imposed block is ridiculously out of scale and inappropriate, and the developer's description of the so-called improvements for the public are entirely misleading.	PA	02-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Cooper	Matthew	I object to this application which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. Specifically: This is a grossly disproportionate scheme. Looming over the area and blocking light and views in all directions. The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof of the concourse and its replacement with a new structure, which would also compromise the setting of the 19th century train shed. The insertion of large amounts of new shopping units in the 19th century train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing great harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - which is the last continually functioning 19th century hotel in the City - through the construction of a twenty-storey tower over the station concourse. It is obvious that the scheme would cause substantial harm to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area by the imposition of an enormously tall building in an area characterised by low-and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches and nearby St Botolph's church. The National Planning Policy Framework, Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional."	PA	02-Jul-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Yelf	Thomas	Dear City of London Planning committee. I'm writing to Object the plan for the redevelopment of Liverpool Street Station. I regard Liverpool Street as a wonderful peace of Victorian architecture. Why should Network Rail destroy this to make room for an eyesore of a tower block. I feel that Liverpool Street should be listed with Grade 1 status. I don't wish to see another case like Euston, where heritage was destroyed. Why can't Network Rail should be ashamed, after the great job they have done at Kings Cross, where they embraced the Victorian architecture. In conclusion I hope that you take my suggestion seriously and look to get Liverpool Street listed. Regards Thomas Yelf	PA	02-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Eldridge	Julie	I object to the following: The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof of the concourse and its replacement with a new structure, which would also compromise the setting of the 19th century train shed. The insertion of large amounts of new retail units in the 19th century train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning 19th century hotel in the City - through the construction of a twenty-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low-and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches and nearby St Botolph's church. I reference the National Planning Policy Framework, Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional."	PA	02-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Macniven	Gordon	Far, far too large and out of character. Something more modest and becoming please!!	PA	02-Jul-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Lacey	Christina	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. The National Planning Policy Framework Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional."	PA	02-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Wood	Judith	The proposed alterations and new building will overpower the Station and do nothing to enhance the area.	PA	02-Jul-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Tapsell	Sally	I object to the proposed development at Liverpool Street Station on the following grounds. 1. The National Planning Policy Framework Paragraph 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." The scale of the new structure is completely out of scale with adjacent buildings. 2. The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof of the concourse and its replacement with a new structure, which would also compromise the setting of the 19th century train shed. 3. The insertion of large amounts of new retail units in the 19th century train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. 3. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning 19th century hotel in the City - through the construction of a twenty-storey tower over the station concourse. 5. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low-and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. 6. The scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches and nearby St Botolph's church.	PA	02-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Connolly	Victoria	I believe that the construction above the current station will blight the skyline and overshadow the surrounding area.	PA	02-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Charalampous	Sheree	Liverpool Street station played an important part of my life as I attended the Central Foundation school in the 1970's and I got the tube to there. It played an important role for the Kindertransport children and many more historical events and is still a very busy bustling station that has an image that should remain undisturbed and listed. The area is crammed with offices and over powering buildings and this development would have a major detrimental impact on the station, the environment and the public and people who live there . I strongly object.	PA	02-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Blowers	Andrew	This would be an eyesore to one of the last great pieces of railway architecture in the City of London. We already have many empty office buildings in the City. This is purely a vanity project and a cash grab by the developer.	PA	02-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	peacock	graeme	absolutely unnecessary distruction of a perfectly decent station with the move to more remote working we don't need more offices in a location thats already full of empty shops and offices we need homes, affordable homes. do your job, represent the people	PA	02-Jul-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Underhill	Moira Isabella	You must not dwarf and engulf one of London's most valuable buildings of great architectural and historical importance with yet another out of scale inappropriate overdominant bland block that will further destroy the character of a vital part of our British heritage. So much damage has already been done in this part London in the interests of profit over cultural heritage. It will add to global warming with its inevitable air conditioning and congestion bring thousands of workers into an already overdone transport systems. I wish to object strongly to this terrible damaging unnecessary application.	PA	02-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Warde	Margaret	Liverpool street needs more toilets, and more escalators. Its a very busy station	PA	02-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Wilks	Steve	Never enough toilets at stations	PA	02-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	D Chakraborty	Leena	It needs to be updated to accomodatw risings number of passengers	PA	02-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Williamson	Susan	I myself cannot access stairs more lift's would be better.	PA	02-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Parish	Alex	Liverpool Street should be transformed into a true through-station, enabling north-south services, similar to Thameslink, to reduce pressure on the tube and improve citywide connectivity. A modernised, better-connected Liverpool Street would benefit commuters from East Anglia and beyond.	PA	02-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Ainslie	Sarah	I object to this application which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, my objections are within the National Planning Policy Framework, Paragraph NPPF 213 which states: Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional. That there would be substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof of the concourse and then its replacement with a new structure. I am very concerned in the impact surroundings in the area including the listed heritage assets, not just in the vicinity but within the city as a whole. Particularly the harm to the Grade II*-listed hotel - which is the last functioning 19th century hotel in the City - because of the massive twenty-storey tower construction over the station concourse. This scheme of such a massive and tall building would cause great harm to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. I object to this application which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, my objections are within the National Planning Policy Framework, Paragraph NPPF 213 which states: Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional. That there would be substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof of the concourse and then its replacement with a new structure. I am very concerned in the impact surroundings in the area including the listed heritage assets, not just in the vicinity but within the city as a whole. Particularly the harm to the Grade II*-listed hotel - which is the last functioning 19th century hotel in	PA	02-Jul-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Younger	Melissa	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. I reference the National Planning Policy Framework Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." We do not need more shops at the cost of our heritage.	PA	02-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Ainslie	Sarah	I object to this application which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, my objections are within the National Planning Policy Framework, Paragraph NPPF 213 which states: Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional. That there would be substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof of the concourse and then its replacement with a new structure. I am very concerned in the impact surroundings in the area including the listed heritage assets, not just in the vicinity but within the city as a whole. Particularly the harm to the Grade II*-listed hotel - which is the last functioning 19th century hotel in the City - because of the massive twenty-storey tower construction over the station concourse. This scheme of such a massive and tall building would cause great harm to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. I object to this application which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, my objections are within the National Planning Policy Framework, Paragraph NPPF 213 which states: Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional. That there would be substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof of the concourse and then its replacement with a new structure. I am very concerned in the impact surroundings in the area including the listed heritage assets, not just in the vicinity but within the city as a whole. Particularly the harm to the Grade II*-listed hotel - which is the last functioning 19th century hotel in	PA	02-Jul-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Cameron	Julie	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to significantly important national heritage assets of the Victorian period. More specifically, my objections relate to; - the planned changes go against the National Planning Policy Framework; paragraph NPPF 213 states that substantial harm to or loss of Grade II listed buildings, or Grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional. - substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed; -insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. -The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel, which is the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City, through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. -The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church.	PA	02-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Leigh-Wood	Oliver	I object to this application which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. The substantial harm to the Grade 11-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure, which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade 11 listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of the surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade 11* - listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low and medium scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan. This proposal is contrary to NPPF 2024 which requires that great weight should be given to the conservation of heritage assets and proposals that do not preserve and look after the settings of such assets should be dismissed.	PA	02-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Moore	Naomi	Because climbing up and down from the toilets is very difficult for some people.	PA	02-Jul-25	S

25/00494/FULEIA	O'Connell	Caleb	I object to these dreadful plans because it would do enourmous damage to Liverpool Street Station and its hotel, whic hare nationally important buildings. The station is a masterpiece of Victorian engineering, which would be greatly harmed by the insertion of retail units into the concourse; the station is so beautiful exactly because of its great open ceiling. Many other railway stations in London already feel like shopping centres with a train attached. They are horrible to use. You must not allow yet another landmark piece of our capital's heritage to be carved up for profit. The enourmous towers proposed would have a huge negative effect not only on the hotel and the front of the station but also the surrounding conservation area and views of St. Paul's Cathedral. I would like to take this moment to point out that the 2015 City Plan requires the refusal of permission for tall buildings in these areas, so there really is no case to approve this proposal at all. This corner of the City is still very beautiful - it would be a terrible thing to trash yet another part of the city. Very few tourists will take pictures of this monstrosity, but as the station is now it provides a beautiful entrance to a beautiful city. The area is characterised by medium-height buildings and contains a lot of listed and unlisted attractive buildings which would be dwarfed by these proposals. This too is cause for the proposal to be thrown out: Paragraph NPPF 213 (of the National Planning Policy Framework) states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." The proposed designs are, to quote HRH The King, yet another "monstrous carbuncle on the face of a much-loved friend." It is appalling that theses designs are even being considered in our supposed enlightened age: to destroy such a beautiful station and the surrounding area for mere profit would be unforgivable.	PA	02-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Neill	Sue	It's a transport hub where hundreds of people pass through daily. Definitely in dire need of more facilities. It's just plain obvious and shouldn't need any persuasion to sensible planners!	PA	02-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Clisby	Jan	There are more disabled people who although mobile struggle with stairs and escalators, it will be easier and quicker to get people through the station.	PA	02-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Goodall	Sarah	Preserve not destroy,	PA	02-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Cooper	Lesley	I object because of: - The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof of the concourse and its replacement with a new structure, which would also compromise the setting of the 19th century train shed. - The insertion of large amounts of new retail units in the 19th century train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. - The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning 19th century hotel in the City - through the construction of a twenty-storey tower over the station concourse. - The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low-and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches and nearby St Botolph's church. I would also like to mention the National Planning Policy Framework, Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." There are already quite a few tall buildings that cause overshadowing to what it is a low rise part of the city.	PA	02-Jul-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Snapper	Gary	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. The National Planning Policy Framework (Paragraph NPPF 213) states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." This is an exceptionally important Grade II listed building and there is no exceptional need for causing such immense harm to such a historic and important building.	PA	02-Jul-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Hill	Finella	I object to this application which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. Paragraph NPPF 213 of the National Planning Policy Framework, states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." More specifically, I raise objections to: The very significant harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof of the concourse and its replacement with a new structure, which would also compromise the setting of the 19th century train shed. The insertion of new retail units in the 19th century train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, creating serious harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the Grade II listed Great Eastern hotel, the last continually functioning 19th century hotel in the City - through the construction of a twenty-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low-and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches and nearby St Botolph's church.	PA	02-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Brine	Paula	Lugging a suit case, a baby buggy plus children up stairs across a bridge and down the other side to exit the underground is not easy especially when you are the only adult and suffer from rheumatoid arthritis. I'm sure there are many others that struggle with stairs in general and would appreciate better access to the underground. Lugging a suit case, A baby buggy plus children up stairs across a bridge and down the other side to exit the underground is not easy especially when you are the only adult and suffer from rheumatoid arthritis. I'm sure there are many others that struggle with stairs in general and would appreciate better access to the underground	PA	02-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Brine	Paula	Lugging a suit case, a baby buggy plus children up stairs across a bridge and down the other side to exit the underground is not easy especially when you are the only adult and suffer from rheumatoid arthritis. I'm sure there are many others that struggle with stairs in general and would appreciate better access to the underground. Lugging a suit case, A baby buggy plus children up stairs across a bridge and down the other side to exit the underground is not easy especially when you are the only adult and suffer from rheumatoid arthritis. I'm sure there are many others that struggle with stairs in general and would appreciate better access to the underground	PA	02-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Rawling	Sue	As someone who works with a wheelchair user the more lifts the better. Also helpful for those with prams, heavy luggage or limited mobility.	PA	02-Jul-25	S

25/00494/FULEIA	Allen	Carole	More toilets needed as it is rare to visit without a long line of people waiting in the Ladies toilets.	PA	02-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Wright	Graham	I strongly object to the building of a tower block above the listed building that is Liverpool Street Station. This Victorian structure will be ruined and for future generations and I agree with many other London residents that the changes to the building will significantly detract from original design of the building and should not be allowed to proceed.	PA	02-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Ali	Sim	There are more public toilets needed in London! There are nowhere near enough especially as a person with health conditions that mean I need the toilet more often than normal.	PA	02-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Bond	Freddie	Destruction of the concourse at Liverpool Street station would be an act of architectural self harm. Where St Pancras and KX were renovated without destruction and change to the fabric of the original buildings, the same cannot be said for this development. Please, we have plenty of steel and glass boxes in and around the city, adding yet another won't improve anyone's future vision for our architectural heritage. The supposed plans are a short term solution. The current building, built by hard labour and Victorian character, deserves a future that won't turn green with moss or excrete more heat and energy. The plans show just how dire our architectural future looks. In a city now dominated by what we would call "University Accommodation Style," Liverpool St station does not need to join the areas "renewed" by this plain, frustrating and soulless building designs utilised country wide. For a station that sits on the iconic Monopoly board, to have it bastardised in this way would be a great shame. The Victorian ironwork is some of the best still in existence. If you want to teach children about Joseph Paxton's Great Exhibition, a way to bring the long gone building to the forefront of the imagination, would be to view this stations stunning concourse. Please, review your plans and designs and remember, that when it's gone, it is gone forever. I hope that the future of this concourse will not be one of pictures and minds eye memories. Many thanks for reading. Freddie. YV/YG	PA	02-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Shaw	James Thomas	I object to this application which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to the substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof of the concourse and its replacement with a new structure, which would also compromise the setting of the 19th century train shed, the insertion of large amounts of new retail units in the 19th century train sheds, impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning 19th century hotel in the City, the substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low-and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches and nearby St Botolph's church.	PA	02-Jul-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Wood	Jane	Building of historic value are listed for a reason. The category of listing reflects the sensitivity, uniqueness and significance of the building in its historic form. As the resident of a listed building myself, I am very aware of the constraints and responsibilities of owning such properties. I can't put a plastic gutter instead of a cast iron one on my small house, or change the paint colour; far less plonk a giant shopping centre on top of it. This station is Grade II* listed to protect it from changes that would harm its structure, significance and context. The proposal threatens all those aspects, and this should be an easy refusal as it's exactly this kind of inappropriate redevelopment that the listings system is designed to repel. This should clearly be weighed as representing the higher end of significant harm to heritage value in the planning balance. I trust the planning officer will exercise their planning judgement accordingly and make that advice clear to the committee. Otherwise we may as well scrap the system of listed buildings completely. If this can't be protected, what can? Building of historic value are listed for a reason. The category of listing reflects the sensitivity, uniqueness and significance of the building in its historic form. As the resident of a listed building myself, I am very aware of the constraints and responsibilities of owning such properties. I can't put a plastic gutter instead of a cast iron one on my small house, or change the paint colour; far less plonk a giant office block on top of it. This station is Grade II* listed to protect it from changes that would harm its structure, significance and context. The proposal threatens all those aspects, and this should be an easy refusal as it's exactly this kind of inappropriate development that the listings system is designed to repel. This should clearly be weighed as representing the higher end of significant harm to heritage value in the planning balance. I trust the plan	PA	02-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Holmes	Ann	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. The National Planning Policy Framework, paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional and this proposal does not satisfy that criteria.	PA	02-Jul-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Quinn	Anthony	I strongly object to this development at Liverpool St station. It does irreparable damage to a significant and beautiful Victorian station, part of our national heritage. It would also compromise the surrounding buildings, blocking the light and vastly overshadowing the environs. There is absolutely no excuse for this building apart from its potential to make a small number of investors a lot of money. It is a grim and objectionable blight on the City and cannot be excused in any circumstances. I would also like to quote from the National Planning Policy Framework, Paragraph NPPF 213, which states: 'Substantial harm to or loss of a) Grade II listed buildings, or Grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional'. I therefore ask you to reject this planning application forthwith. Yours, Anthony Quinn	PA	02-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Scott	David	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: 1. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. 2. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. These objections are supported by the National Planning Policy Framework Paragraph 213 which states: Any harm to, or loss of, the significance of a designated heritage asset (from its alteration or destruction, or from development within its setting), should require clear and convincing justification. Substantial harm to or loss of: (a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional;	PA	02-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Pittard	Alan	I object to this application which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: The high rise buildings which will have a negative impact on the Bishopsgate Conservation Area by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low-and medium-scale buildings. The plan would destroy the heritage of the station and hotel and the replacement of the concourse area would have a negative impact on the 19th century train shed. I would like to draw attention to the National Planning Policy Framework Paragraph NPPF 213 it states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional."	PA	02-Jul-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Ledger	Peter	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. The National Planning Policy Framework, Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional."The current proposals completely ignore this requirement. I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: - The substantial harm to	PA	02-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Figueiredo	Ana	It is already a busy area and with such a building there will be a load more people. It will cast a shadow on the streets making it a dark area. More people and more the vehicles because of the building is too much noise. We need to keep the history of what is left of Liverpool Street	PA	02-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Beevers	David	I Object to this application because it would severely compromise nationally important listed buildings and heritage assets. In particular, I raise objections to the demolition of the roof of the station concourse. This would negatively affect the 19th century train shed. I object too to the insertion of new retail units within the Victorian train shed, specifically two raised retail galleries which would harm the special interest of the Grade 2 train shed. The application has a negative impact on surrounding listed buildings, particularly the Grade 2* hotel through the oversized 20 storey tower over the concourse. The proposal will harm the Bishopsgate Conservation Area by the negative impact of a very tall building in a low and middle rise area. The overscaled tower is contrary to the 2015 City Plan for tall buildings. The application is contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework para NPPF213 which states that only in exceptional circumstances should substantial harm or loss be caused to Grade 2 listed buildings, parks or gardens.	PA	02-Jul-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Hendry	Kirk	For the attention of Tom Siegn, Chair of the Planning & Transport Committee. Regarding Planning Application 25/00494/FULEIA I object to this application which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: - The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof of the concourse and its replacement with a new structure, which would also compromise the setting of the 19th century train shed. - The insertion of large amounts of new retail units in the 19th century train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. - The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning 19th century hotel in the City - through the construction of a twenty-storey tower over the station concourse. - The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low-and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches and nearby St Botolph's church. I also point to the National Planning Policy Framework, Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." Yours sincerely,	PA	02-Jul-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Bellenberg	Nicholas	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. Also, the National Planning Policy Framework Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional."	PA	02-Jul-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	James	Jane	To: Tom Sleigh, Chair of the Planning & Transport Committee and quote Planning Application 25/00494/FULEIA. I am writing to object to the above application which I believe will be detrimental to Liverpool Street Station, a local, national and international heritage asset; it will also compromise existing listed buildings in the area around it. The Station's architectural integrity will be damaged by the demolition of the roof of the concourse and its replacement with a new structure that also compromises the setting of the 19th century train shed. The integrity of the 19th century train sheds will be further compromised by the introduction of large numbers of retail units and two elevated retail galleries. Surrounding heritage assets, such as the the last continually functioning 19th century hotel (Grade II listed), will be impacted by the construction work and building of a 20 storey tower. Connect this with the 2015 City Plan that requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas - in Conservation Areas and the St Paul's Cathedral Heights area. This is also in the midst of the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, an area of low to medium scale buildings. The disruption to traffic and pedestrian flow and train passengers during this project will be substantial. Any residents in the area will have to live through this significant disruption. It will also raise noise levels significantly during construction and introduce more building construction pollution to the area. This is now a beautiful, light and airy building that sits appropriately in its surroundings. If this development is allowed to happen in its current form then it will allow 'creeping' inappropriate development in the heritage area around Liverpool Street Station. Thank you for your consideration of my heartfelt objection.	PA	02-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Elgie	Colin	The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof of the concourse and its replacement with a new structure, which would also compromise the setting of the 19th century train shed. The insertion of large amounts of new retail units in the 19th century train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning 19th century hotel in the City - through the construction of a twenty-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low-and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches and nearby St Botolph's church. Be sure to reference the National Planning Policy Framework, otherwise your objection may be dismissed. Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional."	PA	02-Jul-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	O'Connell	Helen	I object to this application, as it causes substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. It would be visually intrusive and impact negatively on the surrounding buildings and Bishopsgate conservation area. Designs of this type become dated quickly and costly to maintain. More specifically, I raise objections to the impact on the adjacent Grade II* listed hotel which is the last continually functioning 19th century hotel in the city of London. The proposed construction is totally disproportionate to its surround. The 2015 city plan specifically prohibits the construction of tall buildings in inappropriate areas such as conservation areas. Paragraph NPPF213 states that substantial harm or loss of grade II listed buildings should be exceptional. This is not.	PA	02-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Vermaak	Lisa	I object to the proposal to build office space on Liverpool Street station on heritage grounds as well as false claims of the concourse being not fit for purpose despite it being clearly fit and this being an irrelevant solution.	PA	02-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Strong	Malcolm	As someone who used to use Liverpool Street Station regularly and still goes to that part of the City I object to this application which would cause significant harm to one of the best London stations. This has not happened to other London stations of architectural merit such as Paddington, St. Pancras and King's Cross. This application would require demolition of the roof structure and its replacement with an over-large building (including a 20 story tower) in an area (the Bishopsgate Conservation Area) which at the present has only low or medium scale buildings contrary to the 2015 City Plan. I understand that the National Planning Policy Framework paragraph NPPF 213 states: 'Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed Buildings, or grade II registered parks and gardens, should be exceptional'. The station itself is Grade II listed as is the C19 hotel. I trust that this misguided and unnecessary application will not be allowed to proceed.	PA	02-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Holl-Allen	Roseanna	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional."	PA	02-Jul-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Champ	Hamish	I have lived in London all my life and worked in the City of London for a significant part of that. Liverpool Street station is a 19th century architectural gem, Grade II-listed, and worth preserving as is. Acme's plan - which would cause substantial harm to the building through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure, and compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed - is wholly inappropriate, not just to the building itself, but to the surrounding area. I am not against development, but I am against inappropriate development which eviscerates a building of such importance to a city like London. If the proposed scheme were to be given the go-ahead its value to the Square Mile and beyond will be lost. And as the Victorian Society (VS) spells out, the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings would be contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. The scheme would also impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, including many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. The proposed scheme also appears to contravene the National Planning Policy Framework, particularly paragraph 213, which says: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." Acme says its plans will provide better facilities for those using the station. This is a ruse, designed to lull people into thinking that a 20-storey office scheme spreading along Liverpool Street, plus some ad-hoc retail units, will improve their lot. This is simply not the case. I object to the proposed development, and urge the planning authorities to do the same.	PA	02-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Grosch	David	This is the most vile, unsympathetic developement of Liverpool Street Station and despoils the environs of this Victorian masterpiece. The proposed structure takes no account of this and shadows... dominates the surrounding historical footprint that shows us and future generations London's evolution via it's buildings. This glass 'thing' looks to have been modelled on the dystopian nightmare of the 'Blade Runner' (film) set... it completely envelopes the station, clashed with its Victorian intricates and grandeur, thereby removing so much of the area's architectural heritage and lineage. As a regular user of the station for half a century (58yrs) it further perpetuates the commercialisation of the station which presently sacrifices the fast efficient movement of travellers for the retail footfall that they seemingly provide. The station concourse is utterly chaotic at peak times, so much so one wonders about the safety aspects of evacuating these vast numbers of people if there was an emergency situation. Have the Developers forgotten 7/7 this monstrous carbuncle would be a prime target, all that glass is weaponised and then becomes shrapnel?	PA	02-Jul-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	McCallum	Andrew	I wish to object to this application on the following grounds. The trainshed roof at Liverpool Street is one of the finest in London and no part of it should be demolished. It is nationally significant and the late 20th century additions to the 19th century original are a superb example of blending in reconstruction, rather than destruction, as part of a redevelopment. This should set an example for future changes to the station rather than be destroyed. The proposed over site development is out of scale and would ruin the aesthetic of the station, hotel and surrounding area particularly as these are Listed buildings and within the Bishopsgate Conservation Area. There are other locations nearby available should more office space be required in this part of London in the future. Certainly the station does need improvements to accessibility and wayfinding especially concerning access between the concourse and the Underground lines and more escalators and lifts are needed but the proposed plans are grossly excessive. The concourse and access improvements can be achieved without causing such harm. In the National Planning Policy Framework, Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) Grade II listed buildings, or Grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." This guidance should be respected. I am not related to your Case Officer.	PA	02-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	NeSmith	Jo		DC	02-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Smith	Rob		DC	02-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Ohm	Greg	As an older person with persistent bladder control it's very important to have access and available public toilets that are clean, convenient, and accessible.	PA	02-Jul-25	S

25/00494/FULEIA	DUNK	GUY	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. The National Planning Policy Framework Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional."	PA	02-Jul-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Brooks	Michael	I object to this application, which intends to cause substantial harm to significant, nationally important heritage assets. Specifically: -The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station, through the demolition of existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure, compromising the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. This contravenes National Planning Policy Framework Paragraph NPPF 213, "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." -The insertion of extensive new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. -The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the city's last continually functioning C19 hotel - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the concourse. -The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by adding a tall building in an area denoted by low/medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, requiring the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. I am deeply concerned to hear comments such as those in my own emphatic objection to the previous plans praising only the intent within the scheme to improve access for disabled passengers have somehow been construed as approval. I offer no such approval. Long overdue upgrades to disabled access do not require a 20-storey tower block. Yours Sincerely,	PA	02-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Trudgett	Patricia	The toilets need to be more accessible. If you have a suitcase and you are elderly and travelling alone, there is no way you can get down the WCs.	PA	02-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Keeble	Nicholas	I most vehemently object to this application, which would cause irreparable harm to Liverpool Street Station, and adjoining nationally important heritage assets, in addition to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area. The proposals are clearly contrary to adopted policy, and in particular Paragraph 213 of the National Planning Policy Framework, and I urge Councillors to reject them.	PA	02-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Hool	Alison	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to nationally important heritage assets.	PA	02-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Skene	Callum	We have to prioritise heritage over constant greed for redevelopment	PA	02-Jul-25	O

Page 41

25/00494/FULEIA	walker	frances	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. I would refer you to paragraph 213 of the National Planning Policy Framework which states that "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." More specifically, I raise objections to: The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset.	PA	02-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Newby	Sarah	This is a beautiful station with historical and cultural value. This should be preserved and cherished for future generations. Nothing with craftsmanship like this will ever be built again. Let's do the right thing and treasure it and not give into corporate greed	PA	02-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Crane	Caroline	I wish to object to the application for proposed development at Liverpool Street Station. The proposal would cause a great deal of harm to what is a G2 listed building, one of London's heritage assets in a Conservation area that needs to retain features that make it what it is. The proposals for this hideously large building will dwarf the existing properties and will do irreparable damage to the existing historical buildings here including the G2* listed hotel and the surrounding Bishopsgate area. Surely this is contrary to the 2015 City Plan and I would also refer you to the National Planning Policy Framework Paragraph 213. Upgrading the stations facilities and retail spaces can be done without harming the architectural integrity of this unique building.	PA	02-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	ELY	Anne	The proposed Tower is far too tall and will have a detrimental effect on the area.	PA	02-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Mattinson	Jameela		DC	02-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	khatun	sabiya	we do.not need more tower blocks.	PA	02-Jul-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Hayton	Daniel	The Greater London Industrial Archaeology Society (GLIAS; Charity No1113162, Company Number 5664689) writes in objection to the above application for the Liverpool Station Development. We are of the opinion that, in light of the removal of Broad Street and the existing dramatic changes to the urban landscape of the surrounding area, that a further development of such a size would be overpowering. This is contrary to existing planning policies both the National Planning Policy Framework (para. 213) and the local Bishopsgate Conservation area, along with the City Plan, 2015. The retention of original detail and proportions within the station itself, although already compromised in modernisation, is important to illustrate the craftsmanship and overall design in contemporary practices. The Grade II-listed station would be severely damaged by the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse the proposed replacement. The additional galleries detract from the overall effect of the original building. GLIAS has been encouraging research and publication on the industries and built environment of London since 1969. The regular publications include a two-monthly Newsletter and "London's Industrial Archaeology", our annual journal of articles by members and other interested parties. The Society has also made representations to authorities and developers on applications and designs for developments.	PA	02-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Harrison	Kelly	I strongly object to this application under the National Planning Policy Framework. As you are aware, paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional. I believe that the proposed application would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. In a city where we have lost so much of our history to soulless faceless development, I urge you to be on the right side of history for this decision. Aspire to deliver the result of St Pancras Station when Betjeman led the charge to save it, not Euston Station...!!! I raise objections to: The eyesore that is being proposed in the Bishopsgate Conservation Area. I believe it will cause significant harm both to the area and nearby Grade I listed churches. And is also contrary to your 2015 City Plan. The harm to the grade II station and 19th Century train sheds. by demolishing the roof structure. Addition of many more retail units not needed in this already beautiful station served by more than sufficient retail units. The detrimental impact on the Grade II listed hotel - The last continually functioning 19th Century Hotel in the City.	PA	02-Jul-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	whitehouse	george	To: Tom Sleigh, Chair of the Planning & Transport Committee and quote Planning Application 25/00494/FULEIA I object to this application, which will cause unnecessary and profound harm to nationally important heritage buildings. I object especially to the demolition of the roof structure of Liverpool street station, to the harm that will be caused to the bishops gate conservation area by the insertion of an incredibly tall building that goes completely against the existing built fabric, in the aforementioned conservation area in both form and material. this scheme would have wide reaching impact across the city, including the grade 1 listed wren city churches and nearby st boltoph's church. the insertion of numerous insensitive retail units will obscure or destroy the special interest and the significance of this grade II listed building. it will cause harm to the significance of the grade II* listed railway hotel, the last continually operational 19th century hotel in the city through the construction of a massive 20 story building on the station concourse which will strip it of natural light. this plans refusal is required as per the 2015 city plan which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas, as applies in this case as per Paragraph NPPF 213: Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional. It is not for the reasons i have stated, it will negate and detract from numerous nationally important listed structures, both within its own conservation area and the city beyond. thank you for taking note of my objection.	PA	02-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Birch	Steve	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to; The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. The National Planning Policy Framework paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional."	PA	02-Jul-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	fawdry	catherine	I object to this application which contravenes the National Planning and Policy Framework, particularly paragraph 213 which states that "substantial harm or loss of a) grade 11 listed buildings, or grade 11 registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional. This development will cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important assets. In particular it will - The development will cause harm to the Grade 11 listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse with a new structure which would also compromise the setting of the C19 train shed. The retail units would cause a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade 11 listed heritage assets There would be negative impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets, particularly the C19 hotel which is the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City The proposed tower is too tall and would dwarf surrounding buildings and it is contrary to the 2015 City Plan which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas such as in Conservation Areas and the St Paul's Cathedral Heights area. London is loved the world over for it's Victorian Architecture. Please respect this heritage and do not grant permission for these changes which will obliterate the character of this beautiful station.	PA	02-Jul-25	O
Page 414 25/00494/FULEIA	Percy	Pamela	I object to this application which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: 1) The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low-and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches and nearby St Botolph's church. Paragraph of the National Planning Policy Framework 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." 2) The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof of the concourse and its replacement with a new structure, which would also compromise the setting of the 19th century train shed. 3) The insertion of large amounts of new retail units in the 19th century train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning 19th century hotel in the City - through the construction of a twenty-storey tower over the station concourse.	PA	02-Jul-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Kirby	Trudie	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: The Planning Policy Framework - Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church.	PA	02-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Cruise OBrien	Rita	The new development will be totally out of character of the beautiful Victorian station and will block natural light into the station. It is totally unnecessary and simply reflects the greed of City developers. Not another one!	PA	02-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	O'Brien, Jr.	David	Liverpool Street Station is one of the architectural glories of my favorite city. This alteration would be aesthetically disastrous. I have been a regular London visitor for over 50 years, and every visit seems to reveal another structural blight on the city. Saving Liverpool Street Station is a step in the right direction in halting these sweeping changes that have done irreversible damage to the Big Smoke.	PA	02-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	fawdry	mary	I stongly object to this application and I believe it contravenes the National Planning Policy Framework which in paragraph 213 states that - Substantial harm to or loss of a) grade 11 listed buildings, or grade 11 registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional. This development will dwarf the original Grade 11 listed station. It's scale and damage is too much and the character of Liverpool Station will be lost forever. It will cause irreparable damage to the station and the surrounding area. The tower is too overpowering and it would contravene the 2015 City Plan which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas such as in Conservation Areas and the St Pauls Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as the Grade 1 listed Christopher Wren City Churches and nearby St Botolph's Church. Please do not let this development go ahead. It will ruin the station and the surrounding area and contravenes the rules that are already in place to protect the unique and historic character of the station and its surrounds.	PA	02-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Kember	Findlay	I object to this application which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to the character of the area which embodies a specific period of British social and economic history. Findlay Kember	PA	02-Jul-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Harries	Glyn	I object to this gross greedy destructive development. Specifically I object to: - The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof of the concourse and its replacement with a new structure, which would also compromise the setting of the 19th century train shed. - The insertion of large amounts of new retail units in the 19th century train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. - The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning 19th century hotel in the City - through the construction of a twenty-storey tower over the station concourse. - The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low-and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. - In addition that the scheme impacts on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches and nearby St Botolph's church. It is clear this development breache the NPPF 213 stating: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." And I make a specific complaint about the developers' adverts, to which I nearly replied, www.asa.org.uk, as they are grossly misleading. Supporting more toilets and better handicapped access at the station should not be taken as support for this dreadful scheme. Mr Glyn Harries A regular user of Liverpool St Station for 40 years.	PA	02-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Pocock	Stephen	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. The National Planning Policy Framework Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional."	PA	02-Jul-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Lee	Rowland	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed, the rear of the hotel, and the memorials affixed thereto. I also object to the negative impact which the development would have to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. I object also to the substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. Paragraph 213 of the National Planning Policy Framework states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." The current proposals would certainly result in substantial harm to several heritage assets.	PA	02-Jul-25	O
Page 417 25/00494/FULEIA	Pocock	Stephen	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. The National Planning Policy Framework Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." The present C19 station roof is beautiful and makes using the station a pleasure rather than merely functional. It should remain as it is. Toilets and lifts can be installed without wholesale destruction of good architecture.	PA	02-Jul-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Ford	Justin	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of its existing concourse roof and replacement with a structure of an entirely different form. This undermines the station's historic character, its relationship with the surviving 19th-century train shed, and erases legibility of its architectural evolution. As per NPPF paragraph 213, such harm should be exceptional and is not justified here. The insertion of retail units and elevated galleries within the 19th-century train sheds, which would intrude on the open spatial quality of the listed interior, disrupt historic views, and introduce materials and commercial clutter incompatible with the station's architectural language. NPPF paragraph 200 requires clear and convincing justification for such harm, which is lacking. The adverse impact on the setting of the Grade II-listed hotel*, a rare and continually operating 19th-century railway hotel. The proposed 20-storey tower above the station would visually overpower and diminish its historic prominence, contrary to NPPF paragraph 206 and 214. Substantial harm to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, where the scale and massing of the tower contradict local policy and the 2015 City Plan, which discourages tall buildings in historic areas. The scheme undermines the area's established character and continuity. Cumulative harm to nearby heritage assets, including numerous Grade I-listed Wren churches and St Botolph's Church, which would be visually diminished by the proposal. This scheme fails to meet national and local policy requirements and should be refused.	PA	02-Jul-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Rhys Wakefield	Alex	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: - The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. - The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. - The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. - The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. In making my objection, I refer further to the National Planning Policy Framework, whose Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional.	PA	02-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Preston	Christopher	To much of our heritage has been destroyed in the name of profit! All this is a purely for profit exercise with little to no value for the travelling public. Stop trying to extract a profit from rail network and focus on improving services!!! There is no issue at this station apart from people are seeing #signs.	PA	02-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Woodger	John	London was not built like other cities such as New York on a wide road grid system. London cannot tolerate excessive heights and spread of tower blocks with such limited ground space for traffic of people and vehicles. If this office block is just another foreign investment and will remain empty, how do you justify its construction at the expense of human quality of life? Thankfully the Bevis Marks synagogue nearby was saved from total obliteration of natural light and probable damage to the historic building. Do you have no respect for the population of London and its history and culture?	PA	02-Jul-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Schofield	Abby	ity, Postcode] [Email Address] [Date] Planning Department [Local Authority Name] [Planning Department Address] [City, Postcode] RE: Objection to Planning Application for Redevelopment of the Grade II-listed Station and Surrounding Area Dear Sir/Madam, I am writing to formally object to the proposed redevelopment of the Grade II-listed station and its surrounding area, on the grounds of the significant harm it would cause to designated heritage assets and the wider historic environment. The scheme involves the demolition of the existing station concourse roof, which would result in substantial harm to the architectural and historic interest of the Grade II-listed station. The replacement structure would compromise the setting and character of the surviving 19th-century train shed. Moreover, the insertion of extensive retail units-including the construction of two elevated retail galleries-within the historic train sheds would cause an unacceptably high level of harm to the special interest of the listed station interior. The proposal also includes the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse, which would seriously affect the setting of surrounding listed buildings, particularly the Grade II*-listed hotel-the last continually operating 19th-century railway hotel in the City. The scale and massing of the tower would overwhelm this historic structure and erode its significance. Additionally, the proposed tall building would cause substantial harm to the Ricksengate Conservation Area, which is defined	PA	02-Jul-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Hornsey	Philip	I object to this application, which would cause substantial and irreversible harm to nationally important heritage assets and create a precedent whereby any listed building can be built on top of, greatly undermining the character and heritage of the City of London. More specifically, I raise objections to: - Substantial and irreversible harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure, which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. - The demolition of entrances, surrounding features and buildings (such as those on the Southern entrance) which, although not listed, have merit and were designed to be sympathetic to the overall character and heritage of the station. - The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. - The general substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. - The impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. I note that Paragraph NPPF 213 of the National Planning Policy Framework states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." This application fundamentally undermines the framework and for this reason alone should be rejected.	PA	02-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	askey	hazel	Another shocking example of overdevelopment and greed in our corrupt UK society. A beautiful architectural heritage will be totally ruined by another block of 'luxury' apartments.	PA	02-Jul-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Knight	Sonia	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to a beautiful, nationally important heritage asset. 1 This is the London station I arrive at. When, in the late eighties, it was restored & the beautiful ironwork was painted, it was a joy to look around in the new light filtering through the cleaned glass of the roof & feel proud of our heritage. It is unthinkable that this roof structure should be demolished & this would destroy the essence of the Grade II-listed station. 2 Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." The impressive Great Eastern hotel is one such, & would be dwarfed & diminished by this development. 3 This giant development would be detrimental to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas. 4 There are numerous heritage assets in the surrounding area, including Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church, & their setting would be further compromised by an ill-fitting & disproportionate development. 5 The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, would cause a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. You don't see this level of ruination visited upon Milan Central station or the Paris Gare du Nord, both of which I spent some time admiring while changing trains last month.	PA	02-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Mulvenna	Ruth	I am completely against the plans for Liverpool Station. This is a complete over development of a historic building. I fear profit is coming before common sense & sensitivity to the historic nature of the site. The plans are hugely out of proportion & will dwarf the existing building. Too much over development, let architecture breathe. I strongly object.	PA	02-Jul-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Garland	Caroline	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. Make sure to reference the National Planning Policy Framework in your objection, otherwise your objection may be dismissed: Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional."	PA	02-Jul-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Devitt	Niall	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to to the substantial permanent damage that will be done to a unique Grade II listed nineteenth century train shed through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new ersatz structure. Cod heritage to disguise true vandalism. The need to provide retail outlets has overruled ALL other considerations. The physical separation of the train shed from the similarly Grade II listed hotel is in particular outrageous, effecting the whole of the Broadgate Conservation area. The imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings is extraordinary. I directly quote in support for my submission from the Victorian Society re height of proposed structure: 'This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church.' What were they thinking, especially as a heritage foundational document 'National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) Paragraph 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional.. This is not, especially given the numerous empty office buildings within walking distance of the proposed re-development. A very turn of the century idea, clearly no one has factored in working from home and Teams. In the 200 year of the railway, with NR doing much to claim how much it cares about the past, this is appalling and shames both NR and the Corporation of London.	PA	02-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Wiedemann	Margaret	I object to the proposal on aesthetic, conservation and historical grounds. The planners admit it's an operationally-led proposal, and in the opinion of a range of conservation bodies it takes no account of Paragraph NPPF 213 which states that "substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." Liverpool Street Station is a fine example of London's Victorian architectural heritage, and the surrounding developments on Bishopstage should be kept within the same scale and a complementary design. The station has important historical significance as a shelter in the Blitz and also the station where Kindertransport children were received. My relation by marriage Hella Levi, aged 101, remembers arriving there from Germany in 1939. Something of that historic atmosphere on the concourse can still be experienced by travellers and is at risk of destruction by the retail expansion envisaged in the new plans.	PA	02-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Devereux	Anastasia	I don't understand why a historical building is allowed to be altered in this way just to ruin it? The plans and rendors are misleading - you want to demolish part of a listed building just for a capital gain.	PA	02-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	K Bird	Lisa	I use the station regularly and the queue for the ladies toilets goes up the stairs and onto the concourse	PA	02-Jul-25	S

25/00494/FULEIA	Mahony	Richard	I am writing to object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. I have had the great privilege of traveling to London frequently in the course of my professional life, and it was my home for several very happy years. Liverpool Street Station is a valued heritage asset, and I believe the proposed development should be rejected. To be specific, I raise objections to: - The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof of the concourse and its replacement with a new structure, which would also compromise the setting of the 19th century train shed. - The insertion of large amounts of new retail units in the 19th century train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. - The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning 19th century hotel in the City - through the construction of a twenty-storey tower over the station concourse. Moreover, I believe the proposed development is contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework. Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." For these reasons, I urge the Committee to reject the proposal.	PA	02-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Garciga	Alberto	I object to the modification of this beautiful Victorian building in a conservation area. The revised plans will still cause the decimation of the character and beauty of this important and historical transport hub. We do not require yet more office space that will remain empty and more retail space to replicate the same shops that exist everywhere else. Open your eyes and look at all the empty shops that already exist in the City along Bow Lane and the abysmal New Change (a retail graveyard). Be brave and , courageous and deny this planning application. Thank you, Alberto Garciga	PA	02-Jul-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Dickson	Josephine	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. I refer to the National Planning Policy Framework. Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional.	PA	02-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Kendall	Ian	I object to this redevelopment of Liverpool Street station which will result in the loss of the beautiful iron work and also loss of natural light in the station	PA	02-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Pitkin	Sue	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional."	PA	02-Jul-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Knight	Beth	I object to Planning Application 25/00494/FULEIA for Liverpool Street Station, primarily due to its significant environmental harm. The scheme involves extensive demolition of historic station structures, generating substantial construction waste and embodied carbon-contradicting the UK's climate targets and the City's sustainability commitments. Building a 20-storey office tower above the station will further increase carbon emissions and resource use, when the existing infrastructure remains fit for purpose. The proposed massing will reduce natural light and alter airflow, negatively impacting the urban microclimate and worsening air quality for commuters and residents. Increased commercial space will bring more deliveries and traffic, further exacerbating local pollution and congestion. Despite claims of added greenery, the scheme results in a net loss of meaningful open space and provides minimal new green infrastructure, threatening local biodiversity and the historic urban landscape. This proposal sets a dangerous precedent for unsustainable, large-scale commercial development at the expense of heritage and environmental responsibility. It contradicts the National Planning Policy Framework and the City of London Local Plan, both of which call for sustainable development and protection of historic assets. The public benefits claimed do not outweigh the environmental and heritage harm. I urge the City of London to refuse this application.	PA	02-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Reid	August	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: 1) The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. 2) The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. 3) The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. 4) The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. I wish to draw your attention to the National Planning Policy Framework: Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." Thank you for considering my views.	PA	02-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Ferrari	Mark	I object to this monstrosity being built alongside something so iconic and beautiful	PA	02-Jul-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Foskett	Philippa	We need to preserve our heritage and beautiful Victorian buildings. We don't need more empty offices! Leave Liverpool Street Station alone. Thoroughly object in the highest regard to any future planning applications to Liverpool Street Station	PA	02-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Davies	Alistair	The destruction of such a beautiful and important part of our heritage is willfull. Listed building status is appropriate and as such these plans proposed do NOT protect the history of this amazing station. By aliens restore it but I object to its destruction	PA	02-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Giles	Amanda	I strongly object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. The National Planning Policy Framework Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." More specifically, I raise objections to: The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church.	PA	02-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Dixon	Jane	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. This will cause substantial harm to a Grade II listed station. This scheme is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas. The National Planning Policy Framework Paragraph 213 states "Substantial harm to or loss of a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional".	PA	02-Jul-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Gore	David	I object against the redevelopment of London Liverpool Street Station, because it will ruin the historical look of 19th century building.. Also as an amateur transport historian, it will ruin the look and feel of the station for future generations.. Also London has TOO many glass buildings and we don't need another one... .	PA	02-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Pringle	Max	To Whom It May Concern, I am writing to register my formal objection to the proposed redevelopment of Liverpool Street Station, which involves the construction of large-scale, high-rise towers over and around this historic site. This objection is made on the grounds of heritage preservation, architectural integrity, and the broader cultural consequences of unchecked overdevelopment. 1. Heritage at Risk Liverpool Street Station is not just a functional transport hub-it is a living part of London's history. Opened in 1874 and partially rebuilt after World War II and again in the 1980s, the station exemplifies the evolution of London's infrastructure and urban life. It stands as a testament to Victorian engineering and is closely associated with significant historical events, including the Kindertransport rescue efforts during the Second World War. The station's current facade, train sheds, and elements of the Great Eastern Hotel (now Andaz London) reflect a distinctive blend of Victorian Gothic and Edwardian architecture. These heritage features are not incidental; they are integral to the station's character and civic identity. The proposed development threatens to overpower and diminish these elements. The introduction of massive, glass-clad high-rises over the Grade II listed station and the Grade II* listed hotel constitutes a gross insensitivity to the architectural fabric of the area. It fundamentally alters the skyline and the context in which the station has stood for over a century. 2. Loss of Identity and Urban Character This project represents yet another instance of London's historic spaces being sacrificed for corporate gain under the guise of "modernisation." If approved, the development will contribute to an increasingly monotonous cityscape, where soulless high-rises replace sites of cultural memory and urban distinctiveness. London risks becoming a city of nowhere-a landscape of generic glass towers indistinguishable from those in Dubai, Frankf	PA	02-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Ray	Janette	Substantial harm to the wonderful Liverpool Street Station and its immediate setting is inevitable if the proposed development proceeds. The NPPF states heritage of this calibre should not be substantially harmed by development. To build such an huge structure partly on top of this important historical terminus adversely affects the streetscape nearby in addition to the station. Also this development appears to include far more retail space than is required in the vicinity. The huge waste of finite resources which will come about as a consequence of demolition of existing structures and their replacement is against all conservation policies to restore and reuse.	PA	02-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Joned	Joanna	This is a shocking and shameful. I appreciate things need updating but not to this extend it'll be a monstrosity that will be regretted ! The British public would like to keep it historical with enhancements to and not a rebuild. London train stations are unique keep it that way but not the way you want .	PA	02-Jul-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Farmiloe	Dawn	I use Liverpool st station regularly, I wish to make my objection to the redevelopment of this beautiful station you will cause the loss of a wonderful station and the years of construction is not only excessive but will disrupt local residents and services please rethink and cancel these proposals . This building is beautiful and the surrounding buildings will be spoiled all for a out of place new building. The community and county are experiencing financial hardship at present so why put more pressure on all to make a building that looks out of place and we will lose another part of our heritage. I beg you to dismiss this application lets keep our individual London skyline and keep our community together and not spend money on redevelopment of a lovely light filled station that I use weekly to visit my family in essex the layout of Liverpool st station is easy to you for my elderly family not confusing to navigate like other London station's have become. Please listen to my comments a born and bread Londoner that feels we need to look after our historic city.	PA	02-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Clegg	Debbie	I object wholeheartedly to the plans to partially demolish and inappropriately redevelop Liverpool Street Station. Considering the amount of empty already established buildings that could be converted into more appropriatework spaces, I as a caring member of the public and a protector of our national iconic places and historic heritage - known far and wide across the globe, have reason to believe that this development will cause nothing but uproar, upset and chaos, that alone yhe impact on surroundings with construction vehicles for example. Please reconsider leaving this space well and truly to restoration and upkeep only. I appreciate your time and consideration. I and many UK folk, hope to have generation's following behind our lifetimes and respecting our heritage for many years to come. With sincere respect and hope. D clegg	PA	02-Jul-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Price	Richard	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically: - the proposal reduces public amenity, substantially reducing natural light to the railway station concourse and platforms through a combination of overbuilding and blocking of light by the large office block. This will significantly worsen the daily travelling experience of tens of thousands of people each day. - It damages/demolishes the historic architectural fabric of the station, Grade II listed, particularly in the concourse and adjoining historic buildings, notably the demolition of 50 Liverpool Street. This is completely at odds with the National Planning Policy Framework: para NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." - it proposes to remove parts of the exceptional Victorian trainshed, and a significant Victorian building at the front of the station - 50 Liverpool Street, restored in the 1985-1992 project to reverse wartime damage. It destroys other parts of the successful additions by Nick Derbyshire and British Rail, carefully designed to retain the character of the station during the 1989s remodeling Contrasting this proposal with that of the 1980s underlines how crass the current proposal is, with no serious consideration of heritage or public realm. - It does real damage to the character and integrity of the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, the overbearing office building would affect sight lines to many City churches, and is out of proportion for the Bishopsgate area. - Network Rail overstates existing space constraints. It is possible to augment circulation by rearranging retail, making better use of the existing concourses in and around the trainshed. There is no need to demolish large parts of the historic fabric of the buildings and trainshed to achieve this. Please reject this proposal outright.	PA	02-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	smith	helen	Surely it is important to preserve links with our historical heritage for generations to come? Paragraph National Planning Policy Framework 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." and I do not feel that the benefits would justify the exceptional loss. I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to - The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. - The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. - The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. - The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church.	PA	02-Jul-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Skinner	Rebecca	I object on grounds of damage to heritage. The station is a national asset used by thousands. The plans will destroy it, not protect it.	PA	02-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Hill	Alex	"I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: The material loss of a Grade 2 listed public building. Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church	PA	02-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Waugh	Geoff	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. As Paragraph NPPF 213 of the National Planning Policy Framework states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." And the proposals are not exceptional in any form. As a regular user of the station as a commuter and traveller since the 1970s I have seen the station change but nothing warrants as unnecessary and radical alteration as the ones suggested.	PA	02-Jul-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	M Brown	Karen	I find it absolutely unbelievable that such a beautiful, historic building is under threat and I object strongly. The current version of the station is beautiful, respectful of the heritage and very importantly works well. I frequently use it at rush hour. The current plans strike me as willingly destructive. The vast amount of money would be far better spent on something less beautiful and historic that actually needs improvement. Please don't go ahead and destroy our heritage for profit.	PA	02-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Twitchen	Jonas	I object to this application. Reasonable changes can be made to the station without destroying its historic character and ruining the atmosphere of the local area by building on top of it. Please preserve this heritage and let the station be the station, rather than part of a spurious development.	PA	02-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	hogge	adam	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. Specifically, National Planning Policy Framework NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." I don't think a new office building reducing light to Liverpool St station and a bunch of retail qualify	PA	02-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Mann	Catherine	I object to these demolitions, alterations and the building of a huge tower at Liverpool St station. The station works perfectly right now and is in no need to major alterations.. What is described is a blatant destruction of a working station for no other reason than corporate greed. These proposed alterations are not for the good of travelling public who will be massively inconvenienced. The plan would also destroy historical buildings and this inexplicably vulgar idea of a top would also create shadows and compete nastily with historic buildings in the area. I wholly object.	PA	02-Jul-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Prescott	Andrew	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. The proposals seem contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework para 213 which states that 'Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional'. More specifically, I raise objections to: - The substantial harm that would be caused by the demolition of the roof structure of the existing roof concourse and its replacement with a new structure - The unnecessary insertion of an excessive number of retail units and galleries, which are more appropriate to a Chinese shopping mall than a grade II listed heritage asset which is a valuable testimony to Britain's industrial and cultural heritage - The harm caused to the grade II* listed hotel which is in itself an important testimony to the social and associational life of Victorian and Edwardian London - The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. To allow this application would mark a further stage in the destruction of the historic character of London for very little additional gain.	PA	02-Jul-25	O
Page 434 25/00494/FULEIA	Liivet	Alexander	I object due to the damage this will cause to a listed building and the negative impact it will have on an important public building. Previously a regular user of Liverpool Street station and still an occasional visitor, I find the station functions well and is an attractive environment. It is a superb example of a Victorian building that has been sensitively modernised and enhanced for modern times. At present, Liverpool Street station is an asset to the City, with its light and airy spaces giving a real sense of arrival and a great first impression to visitors and newcomers. It is unthinkable that the City would support swapping this for a gloomy, constrained and unwelcoming arrival point. In particular, I have been driven to object as it is clear the developers have used aggressive marketing tactics to solicit "support" from the public on a dubious basis. I have encountered many of their adverts online which imply that improvements to items such as lifts, platform access and other facilities can only be achieved if the proposed redevelopment is improved. This is misleading and will doubtlessly lead to an over-representation of "supporters" in consultation responses, as many will have been led to believe they are supporting passenger achievements without having been made aware of the downsides of the plan.	PA	02-Jul-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Ross	Cathy	I object strongly to this application. The scheme and associated demolition of the roof will cause substantial harm to the station, one of the most significant of the City's Grade II listed heritage assets. This contravenes the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework - there are no 'exceptional circumstances' to justify such harm. As a City resident I also strongly object to the impact on the station's immediate surroundings, the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, St Botolph's church and the Grade II* hotel. A tower of this size will be visually intrusive and diminish considerably the character and sense of history that the area currently communicates. The City's history is uniquely extraordinary and once it becomes invisible, through loss of historic buildings, it will be lost to all. Liverpool Street station is a key site in the story of the City's relationship with its neighbouring districts to the north and east. Burying the current evocative and much-loved station building beneath a glass tower seems to me to convey an unhelpful sense that today's City no longer values this relationship.	PA	02-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Oates	Martin	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. Make sure to reference the National Planning Policy Framework in your objection, otherwise your objection may be dismissed: Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional."	PA	02-Jul-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Hewlett	Michael	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to yet another diminution of our national heritage and a further reduction in the historical and visibly attractive area of the surrounding area, pushing it further toward 'just brick lane' and a veritable ghetto. This is a beautiful example of its era. A place where light comes on the busiest terminal in London. What do you think people see at the start / end of a hard working day? A ceiling with yet another gross glass monstrosity over it? As a Grade II listed building there is an onus to preserve the character and wellbeing of the site, the plans of which just reek of dereliction. I quote: " Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional.". There is nothing exceptional about the plans except commerce and the further erosion of our heritage, as if that is of little consequence these days, and one that we would greatly regret. I've been of thrips to the U.S where they get glassy eyed and fawning over a 150 year old church. Stop this crass destruction of our heritage.	PA	02-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Baker	Susanne	This is cultural heritage that should not be destroyed. Let's preserve our beautiful buildings, not destroy them.	PA	02-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Tether	Karen	It wouldn't happen in Venice would it! Protect our English Heritage, and our wonderful architecture, too much has already been lost!	PA	02-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Blanchard	Fiona	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to the following plans: Demolition of roof of existing station. The substantial harm to the Grade 2 listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure which would also compromise the setting of the surviving 19th century train shed. This would contravene the National Planning Policy Framework. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the 19th century train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. This would contravene the National Planning Policy Framework as it would not conserve or enhance the historic environment. The plans to build a tower block on top of the concourse would cause harm to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the Grade II* listed Great Eastern Hotel (now the Andaz Hotel) - the last continually functioning 19th century hotel in the City - through the construction of this tower over the station concourse. This would contravene the National Planning Policy Framework as it would not conserve or enhance the historic environment. The scheme would cause harm and damage to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's.	PA	02-Jul-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Hadfield	Neil	A plea to oppose the destruction of an. Architectural treasure to be replaced by a soulless new block to serve only to line the pockets of already wealthy developers.	PA	02-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Dixon	Christine	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: 1) The substantial harm to the Grade II listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. 2) The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II listed heritage asset. 3) The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II* listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20 storey tower over the station concourse. 4) The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low and medium scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St. Botolph's church. In closing, I refer to the National Planning Policy Framework, paragraph NPPF 213 of which states "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) Grade II listed buildings, or Grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional.	PA	02-Jul-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Valdemarca	Julia	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. This project would also cause enormous delays and difficulties for TFL, commuters, and tourists alike for an unnecessary addition to the station. Not everything needs to become an office and this beautiful station already serves enough of a purpose for our wonderful city. More specifically, I raise objections to: The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional."	PA	02-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Williamson	David	Firstly there's no need to build over other buildings. This opens the gates to more historic sites being in jeopardy. This can potentially go wrong and destroy this building and then will be class as condemned ans would be levelled . The foundations to dig down into the train platform, tube platforms is unsound. Plus all the development work will disrupt way too much which counters any play public transport "issues" that we don't see need fixing	PA	02-Jul-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Blanchard	Fiona	I object to the plans which would harm and damage the existing station and its surrounding conservation area. The plans contravene the government's National Planning Policy Framework as the proposals do not conserve our unique and priceless historic environment. I object to the following in particular: The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure which would damage the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets would harm the Grade II* listed former Great Eastern Hotel (now the Andaz) - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low and medium-scale buildings contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. The scheme would impact the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren churches. In addition, the noise, dust, pollution and extra traffic entailed by the building works would seriously impact residents living nearby. There is no need for these plans. We must preserve and maintain our beautiful historic stations at all costs for future generations.	PA	02-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Williamson	Andrew	Firstly there's no need to build over other buildings. This opens the gates to more historic sites being in jeopardy. This can potentially go wrong and will be condemned and would be levelled to make way for the development. The foundations to dig down into the train/tube platforms is unsound. Plus all the development work will disrupt way too much which counters any public transport "issues" that we don't see need fixing. This is corrupt cash grab.	PA	02-Jul-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Simonsen	Astrid	As a frequent visitor to London for work, my office is on Elizabeth street and also Liverpool Street, I worry that the proposed changes will ruin not only the aesthetic of the area for residents and people working there but also kill the infrastructure provision for businesses and residents. There is more to the station building than just a home for the rail services and TFL... this is an historic building a beautiful building. It provides a place and a living for people who work there, live there, have small business for hospitality and leisure services. To remove the aesthetic and build more office space will make the space unappealing, less used, the I pissy on the existing businesses will be fatal in some cases and will degrade opportunities for new business owners and providers. A space in London is valuable but not just for the purpose of revenue. A space in an historic city, our capital city, world renowned city especially in this district needs to retain historical architecture where it is sensible to do so. This building is a small but immensely beautiful statement of what British architecture has done for the world. The light, detail, and sense of peace and beauty should never be sacrificed purely for corporate profit. Please reconsider.	PA	02-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Lancashire	Janet	"I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. I also refer you to the National Planning Policy Framework Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." Our historical heritage is fragile and once lost is lost for ever. We have lost so much in wars and in the name of progress let us preserve this integral part of our Great City of London for our future generations. Remember all that we have lost, churches, schools, great public buildings, etc and save this historic landmark today so that people will treasure it tomorrow and for generations to come	PA	02-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Bayley	Sarah	I object to this application as it would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets.	PA	02-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Batrick	Naomi	The idea of tearing down this station is ridiculous	PA	02-Jul-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Howatson	Andrew	Firstly there's no need to build over other buildings. This opens the gates to more historic sites being in jeopardy. This can potentially go wrong and will be classed as condemned and would be levelled to make way for the development anyway. The foundations to dig down into the train/tube platforms is unsound. Plus all the development work will disrupt way too much which counters any public transport "issues" that we don't see need fixing. Constant over heating in the stations This is corrupt cash grab.	PA	02-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Manley	Jane	I object to the proposals for the redevelopment of Liverpool Street Station. It is one of the most remarkable examples of Victorian engineering and should be preserved. We need to celebrate these spaces and not lose them. I have been using Liverpool Street Station for over 40 years. These plans will completely destroy its heritage.	PA	02-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Bailey	Leon	As a local resident and regular user of Liverpool Street Station, I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: 1. The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. 2. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. 3. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. 4. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. As Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." This scheme clearly controvenes this; the loss as a result would be catastrophic.	PA	02-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Hornsby	Kelly	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. Liverpool Street does not need another office block and the destruction of a beautiful concourse	PA	02-Jul-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Ludford	Sarah	I object to this application which would cause substantial harm to nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to this hugely destructive and indeed vandalistic scheme because it would demolish a large part of this magnificent, historic and much-loved listed Victorian Liverpool Street station - which was saved from demolition in the 1970s after a massive campaign effort - ruin the rest of this heritage asset by imposing on it an ugly overbearing 20-storey tower block, harm the important 19th century train sheds by cramming new retail units into them via 2 elevated galleries and damage the neighbouring listed hotel which is the City's last functioning 19th-century hotel. The scheme would cause great harm not only to the station and the neighbouring listed hotel but also, through its height and bulk, to the surrounding low- and medium-height Bishopsgate conservation area and to numerous heritage assets in the City including Grade 1 listed Wren churches. This is all contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework which in Paragraph 213 says that substantial harm to or loss of Grade 11 listed buildings, or Grade 11 registered parks or gardens should be exceptional.	PA	02-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Wright	Christopher	object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to damage to the station building which is grade two listed and the surrounding Bishopsgates conservation area will be impacted and my objection is in line with the national planning policy framework as the current station building is listed.	PA	02-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Morison	Patricia	I object to this application which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically I raise objection to the proposed roof structure replacing the fine existing one. The 19th-century train sheds will be adversely impacted. I object to the new retail units and to the two galleries. Paragraph NPPF213 of the National Planning Policy framework is contravened by this inappropriate scheme which will cause great harm to, or demolish Grade 2 Heritage assets. In this area of low to medium buildings, this monstrously big scheme will dwarf the 19c hotel. It will blight hugely important and well-loved churches like St Botolphs, and others in the wider City area.	PA	02-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Herbert	David	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections: The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. I make particular reference to the National Planning Policy Framework, which, in Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional."	PA	02-Jul-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Festa	Nicola	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to - number of retail units - loss of glass ceiling damage to a grade II listed building	PA	02-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Hamlyn	Peter	As a frequent traveller to and from Liverpool Street Station I strongly object to this application. I consider that this will cause substantial harm to a national heritage asset. It will also compromise the existing listed buildings in the neighbourhood and in particular the Great Eastern Hotel. The beauty of the station will be damaged by the demolition of the roof of the concourse and the 19th century train sheds by the introduction of the retail units and galleries. The proposal appears to be contrary to the City Plan and the Bishopsgate Conservation Area.	PA	02-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Knight	Graham	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: The roof structure of the existing building is one of it's delights. It should not be lightly tossed away just in order to provide more office space - which would, in any case be better provided somewhere other than London. Providing extra retail space in what is supposed to be a transport hub is a very poor reason for the development. There is surely no national need for more food outlets and shoe shops. I would be more sympathetic if the intention was to provide more facilities for passengers, such as seats and free toilets.	PA	02-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Brooks	Stuart	I oppose this application because it would significantly harm nationally important heritage assets. Specifically, I am concerned about the loss of natural light, which would diminish the significance of the 1992 trainshed and damage the overall character of the station. Additionally, there is already an oversupply of office space in the City, and current occupancy rates are unsatisfactory.	PA	02-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Chambers	Michael	I strongly object to this development. It is completely out of character to the Victorian Station which Sir John Benjamin fought to save in the previous century. Under the proposed plans the natural light is being sucked away with a tasteless office block being built over it making all those below feel claustrophobic and as someone who is autistic this would cause me great distress. For superb examples of how to make a classic station look tasteful and welcoming look no further than at St Pancras International which showcases the stunning victorian architecture. The sympathetic alterations of the early 1990s such as the concourse and frontage are perfectly executed and need little alterations.	PA	02-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Mier	Rebecca	London is known for its rich historic buildings, there are enough We Work style office spaces for businesses to use in London so demolishing this building with its rich history would not in any way offer office space, especially with most people still operating a hybrid model.	PA	02-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Buirski	Joseph	Liverpool Street station is such a beautiful structure, particularly the roof trusses, it would be a travesty to demolish any of it. The National Planning Policy Framework, paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." Surely there are enough tall buildings in the area, save this beautiful example of victorian architecture.	PA	02-Jul-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Adams	Robert	This development will result in destroying the ambience of a valuable cultural heritage site, we have lost too many beautiful buildings and environs of the past to willful destruction. This will cause substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. The National Planning Policy Framework Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional."	PA	02-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Roberts	Nina	I object to this proposed development. This is a listed building and should be preserved. The character of the station will be fundamentally altered. The preservation of the building is of greater value than that of additional office blocks which are unnecessary. Further there will be significant disruption in the area and to existing services which should be taken into account.	PA	02-Jul-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Pelissier	Sophie	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: -The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. -The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. -The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. -Paragraph NPPF 213 of the National Planning Policy Framework states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." The reasons for the development as outlined by National Rail are certainly not exceptional and do not justify irrevocable damage to the architectural integrity and character of one London distinctive Victorian railways.	PA	02-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Preston	Adam	As a worker in the City of London, I strongly object to the proposed construction of a 20-storey office block over Liverpool Street Station. This development would irreparably damage one of the city's most historically significant and architecturally iconic transport hubs. Liverpool Street is not just a station-it's a heritage landmark that reflects the character and history of London. Replacing it with a towering commercial block undermines our cultural identity, erodes public space, and prioritizes corporate expansion over community value and historical preservation. There is a pressing need for modern development to respect and integrate with our city's heritage, not erase it.	PA	02-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Clare	Beverley	There is seriously no real justification to destroy the heritage of such a lovely, important and meaningful historical landmark other than profit and greed. There is nothing wrong with Liverpool Street station at all as it is. I use that station more or less all the time on my very frequent visits to the capital. There is no risk to the public in its current state and should therefore be left alone. Manchester has just lost one of its most important historical mills and you get bet the greedy developers were behind its demise. This destruction of buildings of historical importance for profit has to stop. Buildings of such importance should be preserved to serve as a historical reminder of what has been before, and helps retain a uniqueness allowing us to stand out from other countries and cities who seem to have adopted the rather bland blueprint of glass/steel/bronze structures.	PA	02-Jul-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Salvatore	Carla	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: - the substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed, - the insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset, - the impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets, - the substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings (contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area), - the impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. (Ref: National Planning Policy Framework / Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional.")	PA	02-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Ziola	Monika	I object to the proposal as it would cause the substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure, which would also compromise the setting of the surviving 19th-century train shed.	PA	02-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Fleming	Kate	Objection to the Proposed Development of London Liverpool Street Station I strongly object to the proposed development of London Liverpool Street station. This historic building is not only an architectural gem but also a vital part of the city's heritage. The proposed plans risk irreparably damaging its unique character and erasing a piece of London's cultural identity. Moreover, the development threatens to cause significant and prolonged disruption to commuters, with little clear benefit. The short-term chaos and long-term alteration of a landmark station are not justified by the speculative commercial gains. London must balance progress with preservation-this proposal fails to do so.	PA	02-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Metis	Marisa	I object to this development on grande II listed building. Like to ref Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." I also think this will be a target for potential terrorist attacks.	PA	02-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Hobbins	Amanda	I object to this proposal due to the expense, disruption and disfigurement of the current structure that is not only functional but also one of our countries most beautiful architecture.	PA	02-Jul-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	baynes	colin	There's no need to create any further chaos to this structure. The only improvements for Liverpool St as a Railway Station and transport hub should be that of actual public transport service and the improvement of customer services. This isn't an opportunity or a viable destination for ambitious developers. Liverpool St is a vitally important transport link for millions of travellers both local and those from much further afield. Leave it alone.	PA	02-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Lewis	Margaret	I do think it is appropriate to put such an enormous, ugly "glass box" of an office at Liverpool Station. An excellent job has been done at St Pancreas and KX . Why can the update of the station not fit sympathetically with the area? Margaret Lewis	PA	02-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Edwards	Holly	I object to the planning proposal that is not sympathetic to or acknowledges the rich history of the beautiful victoian architecture. I strongly object to the introduction of an imposing high rise structure when there are already countless other spaces in the vicinity that are underutilised.	PA	02-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Wong	Taylor	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church.	PA	02-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Green	K	I understand the need for improvement, updating access points but not at the cost of damaging victorian historical relevance. It is a great monumental piece of architectural design and should not by any means have any building put on top. The beautiful conservation area of victorian buildings which desperately require preserving! It will decimate the location if any building is undertaken. Damage from.. movement, upheaval to local businesses etc. I'm sure the modern glass metal tower scrappers won't be standing or survive in 50 years, let alone 100 yrs!! Leave historical beautiful architecture alone! Issues with Netwok Rail are down to bad management and nefarious, PR practices! The size of the concorse and amount of shops is totally sufficient! Space isn't down to the cost of our heritage of buildings! A 20 storey rubbish building put on top of a beautiful station is ludicrous! Keep our British history! Keep our beautiful architectural history! Stop building for building sake! These changes will not improve the rail services at Liverpool Street Station!	PA	02-Jul-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Datson	Freda	Beautiful building will look ugly with all the changes. No light and no history.	PA	02-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Humber Lopez	Elena	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. The National Planning Policy Framework, Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." As a regular user of the station the need for the proposed development cannot, in anyway, be considered 'exceptional' or even necessary.	PA	02-Jul-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Collett	Martin	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. I raise objections to demolition of the existing structure, destruction of a beautiful Victorian station, shoe-horning of too many retail developments, and the loss of amenity. More specifically I raise objections to : The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. I note that National Planning Policy Framework Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." I believe the application is not in accordance with the framework	PA	02-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Baker	John	I strongly object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections regarding the impact of this proposal on the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets - in particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*listed hotel - the last continually functioning 19th century hotel in the City - through the proposed construction of this twenty-storey monstrosity of a tower looming over the current station concourse. This would seriously degrade the visual appearance of this important building, and make a complete mockery of the Bishopsgate conservation area's whole intent and purpose, as it would also impact negatively on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the locale, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches and nearby St Botolph's church. Paragraph 213 of the National Planning Policy Framework states that "Substantial harm to, or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." And there is nothing about this egregious scheme that can warrant the imposition of such harm to a wonderful part of my neighbourhood.	PA	03-Jul-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Targett	Anna	I object to these plans which will fundamentally change the nature of this beautiful, light and airy space above the concourse. Office space and developers greed are fuelling this change. It is not in the public interest. Our heritage and the light into this stunning and precious space in the overcrowded and high rise City of London must be preserved.	PA	03-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Warans	Valerie	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to the substantial harm to the Grade II listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. Also to the insertion of new retail units within the station. A new gallery of high-end shops have recently been added in the station concourse- these are nearly always empty and we don't need any more fast food outlets. This scheme would also harm the Grade II listed hotel, the last functioning C19 hotel in the City through the construction of a 20-storey hotel above it. The scheme would also cause harm to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas. In this respect I make reference to the National Planning Policy Framework, viz Paragrapg NPPF 213 states "Substantial harm to or loss of a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional". To reiterate, I OBJECT to this scheme by greedy property developers who are in effect trying to develop the "air" above Liverpool Street Station.	PA	03-Jul-25	O
Page 450 25/00494/FULEIA	Alexander	Vicky	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of this nationally important heritage asset. As per the National Planning Policy Framework, paragraph 213 refers to - "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." Therefore as the station is Grade II listed, I object to the below : Demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed - this causes substantial harm. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, - this causes substantial harm to it's heritage. Impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets - this causes substantial harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. There will also be substantial harm caused to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church.	PA	03-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Fairbrother	Una	I object to the redevelopment plans to Liverpool Street station as proposed since they interfere with the character and feel of the station and do not respect its Victorian heritage	PA	03-Jul-25	R

25/00494/FULEIA	Gick	Rachel	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: - The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving nineteenth-century (C19) train shed. - Insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. - The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II -listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. I feel that the above do not accord with the National Planning Policy Framework Paragraph NPPF 213: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." Further, the substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. Note: I (recently) visited St Pancras Station and was impressed that changes have *not* been to the detriment of its historical character. Why can't this approach be followed?	PA	03-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Brinsmead	Dany	The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's the National Planning Policy Framework: Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional."	PA	03-Jul-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Palombo	Stuart	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's. Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." And finally, London currently has an excess of office space, empty floors and under utilised buildings - therefore, there is no exceptional need.	PA	03-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Hewlett	Tracey	Save our historic buildings	PA	03-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Gaiger	Lucy	Keep the original station , I travel there daily and it works well and has character. History should not just be erased and replaced with poor quality monolithic buildings endlessly turning London into a faceless city.	PA	03-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Barnett	Naomi	I object due to the change of how this beautiful building will no longer be the same. It does not need more toilets as the guise for the change. Toilets on the trains and plenty in the station.	PA	03-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Algar	Martin	Leave this building as it is. You're messing with a historical building. Think of the Monopoly board.... famous train stations. Loads of toilets and toilets on the trains to use.	PA	03-Jul-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Mahabir	Sheerin	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. The demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement structure would compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed and damage a grade II listed building. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, will cause a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. It will have a huge impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The scheme would cause substantial harm to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. In the National Planning Policy Framework Paragraph 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." and it is for these substantial reasons I totally object to the proposed redevelopment .	PA	03-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Shelley	Joanne	I object to the proposed development of this building on the grounds that it will detrimentally impact the grade 2 listed building which is stunning, particularly in its natural lighting, and additionally in respect of the disruption it will cause to train users like me who regularly use Liverpool St station.	PA	03-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Tolan	Jayne	Please don't change the station.	PA	03-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Clarke	Martin	I object to the redevelopment of Liverpool st station. The proposed demolition of the 1980s concourse and entrances would be a huge heritage loss. The proposed 20 story tower will block out the light and destroy what is currently a bright open and thoughtfully designed space, the new access and escalators that are needed could be done without demolition of a grade 2 listed building. The station as it stands is a well used and much loved space, it has become a well recognised and architecturally significant building which should be preserved rather than destroyed. I do not believe the new tower and concourse are improvements to Liverpool street station, the proposed design is over blown and out of scale with the grade 1 listed hotel and will block vast amounts of natural light from commuters using the station.	PA	03-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Dennis	Hugh	It will change the character of the area for good. Liverpool Street is the best model of a classic Victorian railway station- its use of iron and glass without parallel anywhere else in London. Enclosed in this huge glass box will 'dinkysie' it and change for ever its appearance as a working Victorian station. Building this glass box is also a waste of scarce energy and resources when they are needed for other more important works elsewhere. The disruption over years will also be more than just inconvenient.	PA	03-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Draper	Lucy	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to the damage to a Grade II listed building for no reason other than commercial purposes. We should protect these buildings in London that are really rare rather than destroy them.	PA	03-Jul-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Jackson	Adrian	This proposed development is unnecessary and completely out of proportion to existing surroundings buildings and current proposed other developments. It removes all daylight from what is already a dark railway concourse and provides little benefit to either local residents or commuters.	PA	03-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Bayliff	Tristan	I object to this application that would irreparably damage a nationally important heritage asset.	PA	03-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Crick	Clare	I absolutely condemn the plan to change in anyway the Concourse at Liverpool Street Station. This a very efficient space which i have used for 78 years - it's beautiful Victorian structure must NOT be altered.	PA	03-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Purdey	Diane	I object to the proposal. The loss of our heritage will be damaging to the structure. It should be left intact. Far too many beautiful historic buildings are being tampered with. It should be a lasting legacy for years to come. It was built to last. Modern structures won't fit with the beauty of the building. To do such a thing is sacrilege. It is a iconic structure and it will be ruined forever if planning goes ahead. I understand London has to move with the times but if we keep allowing this. There will be no more historic buildings to admire in generations to come. Leave it be.	PA	03-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Berner	Elizabeth	I object to this proposal which is over development of the site and will cause considerable harm to the Bishopsgate conservation area. It is greedy, inappropriate and unsympathetic to the historic fabric of the station, one of London's finest Victorian railway termini.	PA	03-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Ferguson	Alice	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. With reference the National Planning Policy Framework: Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." I'm Londoner and a regular user of Liverpool Street Station; my family live in Norwich. The planned wanton destruction of our city's heritage is both upsetting and disgraceful. These plans need to be withdrawn without delay. I stron	PA	03-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Butcher	Isla	Preservation of historical site	PA	03-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Bartler	Cornswell	This is absolutely abhorrent, demolishing the own history of my towns station is disgraceful, whilst other countries protect heritage sites I've seen these buildings be destroyed. This should stop immediately as this building is ENGLANDS heritage. If you want to build a modern contemporary station build it somewhere else! Do not build it on the little heritage we have left, Victorian buildings are demolished frequently without judgement and this is truely appalling, the government should recognise that destroying heritage sites is not a progressive and suitable option	PA	03-Jul-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Hepple	Jane	It is of the upmost importance to maintain and respect and restore any remaining antique architectural buildings left in Great Britain - we have enough modern carbuncle's to hurt the eyes and the soul. Our past should be appreciated treasured and respected, not decimated.	PA	03-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Fickling-Smith	Kelly	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. The National Planning Framework Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." More specifically, I raise objections to: * The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. * The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. * The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. * The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. I am a regular traveller and former commuter from London to London Liverpool Street and I object to this application in the strongest possible terms.	PA	03-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Dean	Peter	Impact on the historical outlook of the city of London.	PA	03-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Barber	John	I strongly object to the demolition of Liverpool Street Station due to its deep historical importance. As one of London's most iconic Victorian-era transport hubs, it stands as a testament to the city's rich architectural and industrial heritage. Destroying such a structure would erase a tangible link to our past, particularly when so much of London's historical fabric has already been lost to modernisation. We must preserve what remains of our collective history. Ontop of this its iron framed roofs and architectural structure CANNOT be replaced. It is strictly unique to the station and once lost it cannot be brought back as the original, destroying history that in itself has brought London a beautiful building which cannot be replaced with a modern easily designed structure in its placd	PA	03-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	raval	Purnima	The development will cause substantial harm and damage to a beautiful Grade II listed building. We must do our utmost to preserve and conserve our Heritage buildings for future generations. I take a keen interest of heritage buildings in the UK , especially those in London having lived here for 50years. Visit regularly City of London , steeped in history with immense pride .	PA	03-Jul-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Hall	Rachel	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure, which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. National Planning Policy Framework: Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." It is appalling planning such as this is being considered. Our heritage is important and not something to be thrown away or damaged willfully. If this planning goes through, time will not look back kindly on you who passed it.	PA	03-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Parker	Patricia	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: This is a historical heritage that needs preserving.	PA	03-Jul-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Smeeton	Toby	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." The proposed development will indeed cause substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church.	PA	03-Jul-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Perry	Johann	I strongly object to the proposed plans to demolish part of the historically and culturally significant Liverpool Street Station and to construct a modern tower above it. This development represents a grave threat to one of London's most important pieces of Victorian architectural heritage and would set a dangerous precedent for the future treatment of our historic sites. Liverpool Street Station is far more than a functional transport hub-it is a living testament to the city's rich industrial past, a physical reminder of the Victorian era's architectural ambition, engineering prowess, and civic pride. It has served generations of Londoners, played a vital role in both World Wars, and stands as a gateway to the city for millions. It also has deep emotional and cultural significance as a site of remembrance, notably the Kindertransport memorial honouring child refugees fleeing Nazi Germany. The proposal to construct a high-rise tower over the station not only disrespects the character and scale of the surrounding heritage environment, but it also physically and visually overwhelms this historic site. The modern glass and steel structure would dwarf the original Victorian architecture, erasing its contextual integrity and overshadowing nearby listed buildings including the Andaz Hotel (formerly the Great Eastern Hotel). Development and progress must not come at the cost of cultural erasure. We can and must find ways to adapt and enhance our infrastructure without demolishing what makes our city unique and meaningful. Once a building of this historical importance is destroyed or irreparably altered, it is lost forever. No glass tower, however lucrative, can replace that. London's character is defined by its layered history. Preserving landmarks like Liverpool Street Station is not about resisting progress-it is about ensuring that our future includes our past. I urge planners and decision-makers to reject this proposal and seek alternative approaches that protect	PA	03-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Gilham	Toby	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church.	PA	03-Jul-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Wyatt	Tristram	Generous spaces for pedestrians are what make cities great, and that goes for transport hubs like Liverpool St	PA	03-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Boenke	Joan	Providing changes and improvements that are much needed.	PA	03-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Paula Lock	Claire	I often want too visit london more but the escultors are too mich for me	PA	03-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Holloway	Thomas	The station needs more toilets.	PA	03-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Walsh	Fiona	I object to this application which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically ii raise objections to 1) the substantial harm to the Grade 11 listedstation thro the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. 20 the insertion os several new retail units within the C19 train sheds including the construction of 2 elevated retail galleries causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the grade 11 * listed heritage asset. 3) The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. 4) The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. 5)Make sure to reference the National Planning Policy Framework in your objection, otherwise your objection may be dismissed: Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional."	PA	03-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Bickerstaffe	Jackie	I object to the plans to redevelop Liverpool street station, London. This is a wonderful historic Victorian monument to engineering of another area. It has the most beautiful roof. This must be preserved for the nation. The concourse still works perfectly well, much better than the service of trains using it. Here in Liverpool, our amazing Lime Street station has not been subjected to corporate vandalism and is consequently an iconic and much used city landmark. It is preserved as testament to a time when engineering skills merged seamlessly with beauty in the construction industry. Such buildings are our heritage and as such deserve to be protected from schemes whose only objective seems to be financial gain. London planning department you are better than this! Please turn down these destructive plans. Jackie Bickerstaffe Scouse mum.	PA	03-Jul-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Charrington	Harry	I object to this application. I believe it will cause significant damage to an internationally recognised, and locally loved, heritage asset. I believe all the changes run contrary to the spirit and letter of the National Planning Policy Framework, NPPF, paragraph 213: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." Specifically, I object to: 1 The extreme level of damage and alteration to the Grade II-listed station caused by: Demolition of the roof of the station concourse. Insertion of a new structure which compromises the surviving 19thC train shed. Insertion of two-storey elevated retail galleries in the 19thC train shed. 2 Impact on the visual amenity of the immediate environment, in particular the Grade II*-listed hotel caused by the proposed 20-storey tower above the station concourse. Impact on the visual amenity of the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, through the construction of the massive new buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. Finally, I have travelled through Liverpool Street station for over 50-years, and it forms a vivid part of my intangible heritage - as it does for many in my family and others I know. The right to the city belongs to us all, not only those with means.	PA	03-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Clarke	Rosemary	I object strongly to this inappropriate and unnecessary application which would substantially harm the existing significant architectural and functional features of Liverpool St station. The development is against the National Planning Policy Framework paragraph NPPF 213 which states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." The scheme would cause substantial harm to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area by imposing a tall building in an area characterised by low-and medium-scale buildings - in other words it is completely inappropriate to the area. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would affect the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches and nearby St Botolph's church.	PA	03-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Ferguson	Jacqueline	I object to this planning application which would cause substantial harm to the significance of national heritage assets. More specifically I raise objections to the demolition of the roof structure and the substantial harm to the grade 2 listed buildings as referenced in paragraph NPPF 213 of the NATIONAL PLANNING POLICY FRAMEWORK	PA	03-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Rodwell	Michael	I object to these proposals as they will damage buildings of national importance. We have to protect our key heritage sites and this proposal is catastrophic in this regard.	PA	03-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	McLynn	Lewis	The building should be restored to its original architectural and historical identity. Any new additions should be slight and delicate, only to enhance the existing architecture of the station.	PA	03-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	ROGERS	JONATHAN	I strongly object to this plan.	PA	03-Jul-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Kenningham-Brown	Sue	Dear Mr Sleigh I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. I object to the plans to 'develop' Liverpool Street Station under the National Planning Policy Framework where paragraph NPPF 213 states: 'substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade 11 listed buildings, or grade 11 registered park or gardens , should be exceptional'. The demolition of the roof structure would be sacrilege to the architecture and history of Liverpool Street station removing one of its most beautiful and defining features. This type of quality structure will never be built again and still works perfectly at the station. The desire to remove this Grade II listed structure is not born of functionality but to gain money and profit. As a regular user of Liverpool Street Station it would not assist or improve my use of the station. It would appear reading the proposal that the objective is to create a space where as many retail units as possible can be crammed in, on the assumption this will make as much money as possible. Retail outlets are frequently left empty due to overcapacity & high rents and at a train station there are not the waiting times for transport that apply at airports so not enough retail footfall to sustain them. The removal of this grade II listed asset would be for nothing but the harm would be irreparable. In addition to this removal of history and architecture there would be a huge impact on the grade II hotel still operating. The 20 storey tower proposed for office space would be overwhelming for the hotel and against the Bishopsgate conservation area and against the 2015 City Plan. There is plenty of unused office space in the area and no requirement for more when companies are reducing costs and increasing working from home. This 20 storey tower denigrates the significance and beauty of these heritage sites such as St Botolphs church. The hotel is trying to maintain a listed building structure	PA	03-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Sun	Josie	The objections from a heritage perspective simply don't stand - the proposals only remove sections of the 1980s renovation whilst retaining the 1875 trainshed roof and other Victorian features. On the other hand, the proposals would fix the many problems the station currently faces (and getting worse in the future): crowding, delays, poor toilet facilities, disastrous accessibility, sense of arrival, retail offer etc etc. The case for change is strong and this is a rare opportunity to get the funding and transformation the station desperately needs.	PA	03-Jul-25	S

25/00494/FULEIA	Maxwell-Timmins	Zoe	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. Specifically I object on the basis that: - it will cause substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. - the insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, will cause a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. - the construction of a 20 storey tower will significantly impact the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City. - the tall tower in the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, which is characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings would be contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas. Given the above, this scheme therefore goes against the National Planning Policy Framework. Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional. It should be refused.	PA	03-Jul-25	O
Page 462 25/00494/FULEIA	HERBERT	Richard	I object to this application. It would cause substantial harm to a very important heritage asset. Paragraph 213 of the National Planning Policy Framework states that "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." In particular, my objections are: Liverpool Street station is Grade II-listed and the demolition of the roof of the concourse and its replacement with a new structure would cause substantial harm to the site and its environment. Putting in large numbers of new shops etc and retail galleries in the 19th century train sheds will cause much harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. There will be a major impact on the setting of surrounding listed buildings, in particular harm to the significance of the Grade II* listed hotel through the construction of a 20 storey tower over the station concourse. There would be substantial harm to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area with such a ghastly structure . The 2015 City Plan requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area.	PA	03-Jul-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Ingelow	Claire	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. Make sure to reference the National Planning Policy Framework in your objection, otherwise your objection may be dismissed: Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional."	PA	03-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Cartwright	Alison	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets as set out in the National Planning Policy Framework - Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional. More specifically, I raise objections to: The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church.	PA	03-Jul-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Bignell	David	"I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to:- The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. The National Planning Policy Framework Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." The proposed development by Network Rail would cause exceptional harm and the loss of a major part of Liverpool St Station and the surrounding area, the plans are wholly inappropriate, ill thought out and unacceptable and I urge the complete reject	PA	03-Jul-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Gray	Paul	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. All of the above are contrary to National Planning Policy Framework Paragraph 213 which states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional."	PA	03-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Cheeseman	Paul	Their campaign has gathered objections and called them support. They block comments on their Instagram posts. Thru have manipulated the questions they ask to get their desired answer. All of this is abuse of the planning process. Why does the city need more office space - WFH means there is lots vacant already	PA	03-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Moran	Rosie	I object to this application on the following grounds: - It would substantially harm the significance of this nationally important heritage asset. - It represents a clear instance of 'over - development'. - The surrounding buildings are mostly 'low - rise' and would be disproportionately overshadowed by the proposed twenty storey edifice. - It would undermine and traduce views of iconic 'Wren' churches and the nearby St Botolph's, these within current sightlines. -It will erode the architectural character of the extant station interior.	PA	03-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Twist	Judy	This is a busy thorough fare already, the building as it is , is part of London heritage, and would spoil the area, it would also create more congestion around the area, which is very busy at the best of times. Keep the external building as it is and update the insides but do not build on top of it. This would be an eyesore to the original beautiful building	PA	03-Jul-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Stones	Rosemary	I object to this application which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. Specifically, I am concerned that this application runs counter to the National Planning Policy Framework which states in paragraph NPPF 213: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." I also object to the substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas. The scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade 1-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church.	PA	03-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Amies	Mark	Any destruction of the original building would be a mistake. It will rob the City of London of one of its great public buildings. The proposed new building would be at odds with the character of the existing station buildings. It shows complete contempt for existing built environment, and displays the open greed of developers. The City of London and its Corporation should listen to the voices of those who care about it, not the demands of developers and architects who serve only themselves, not the public. If the Corporation agrees to this proposal then it will reflect very badly on them , as far as public perception is concerned.	PA	03-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Johnson	Ian	I am writing to object to the above application which I believe will be detrimental to Liverpool Street Station, a local, national and international heritage asset; it will also compromise existing listed buildings in the area around it. The Station's architectural integrity will be damaged by the demolition of the roof of the concourse and its replacement with a new structure that also compromises the setting of the 19th century train shed. Surrounding heritage assets, such as the the last continually functioning 19th century hotel (Grade II listed), will be impacted by the construction work and building of a 20 storey tower. Connect this with the 2015 City Plan that requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas - in Conservation Areas and the St Paul's Cathedral Heights area. This is also in the midst of the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, an area of low to medium scale buildings. The disruption to traffic and pedestrian flow and train passengers during this project will be substantial. Any residents in the area will have to live through this significant disruption. It will also raise noise levels significantly during construction and introduce more building construction pollution to the area. This is now a beautiful, light and airy building that sits appropriately in its surroundings. If this development is allowed to happen in its current form then it will allow 'creeping' inappropriate development in the heritage area around Liverpool Street Station.	PA	03-Jul-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Turnbull	Hannah	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: * The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. * The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. * The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. * The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. This is not in keeping with: Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." It's a beautiful station, my absolute favourite in London -and our local station too. Please don't ruin it!!!!	PA	03-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Betts	Katharine	I object to the proposed changes on the grounds that they will damage part of London's architectural heritage without justification. The proposed development would destroy the historic entrance and deprive passengers of natural light, with the building of yet another huge tower block above the station. It is extremely unclear what problems would be solved by this development.	PA	03-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	OConnor	Marie	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. The station / building is beautiful and should be repaired or preserved to keep the history of it alive to be enjoyed.	PA	03-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Althorpe	Mike	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to the needless destruction of one of the most fit-for-purpose, legible and loved station concourses in London. It is one of the city's greatest public spaces and its erasure will be a loss for the square mile and everyone who uses it. The case for the scheme is phoney and I object to the way in which the proponent Network Rail has falsified the case for it. I also object for the substantial damage the project will have in wider urban heritage views and the precedent it sets for needless/willful and opportunistic destruction of perfectly usable and well-loved buildings.	PA	03-Jul-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Bazeley	Chas	I object to the revised plans on the following grounds: 1) The interfaces between the pastiche Gothic entrance arches, the modern glass structure above, and the existing Victorian hotel building have not been resolved and are visually offensive to, and out of scale with, the existing Grade 2* building in contravention to paragraph 213 of the National Planning Policy Framework. 2) Both the proposed use of reflective bricks in the entrance arches, and the poor pastiche design of the concourse roof structure will give the station a cheap and plastic appearance that will detract from the craftsmanship evident in the adjoining hotel and train shed and reflect poorly on visitors' perception of our respect for our heritage. 3) The overall height of the proposed building, whilst marginally reduced compared to the earlier application, is still overbearing in scale to the Grade 2* hotel.	PA	03-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	ravenscroft	Alan	Hello Kieran - As a Londoner I strongly object to these plans. This station is a historical site - a classic Victorian public building. These plans would destroy its character. I don't believe that we need more shops and offices in the city. + I hoped the age of ugly towers had gone with Boris Johnson. The National Planning Policy Framework (Para NPPF 213) states "Substantial harm to or loss of a) grade 11 listed buildings, or grade two parks or gardens, should be exceptional". I don't think there are any valid reasons to claim this is an exception to the laudable policy of preserving Grade 11 buildings. What makes London such a popular city? Buildings like Liverpool Street, Marylebone and St Pancras. Don't let's be the generation that destroyed its history and beauty for a quick buck.	PA	03-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Hogg	Alison	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: 1. The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. 2. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. 3. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. 4. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. NOTE: National Planning Policy Framework, Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional."	PA	03-Jul-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Brandon	Rodney	I object to this application which would cause substantial damage to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically I raise objections to; demolition of the wonderful Grade II listed roof structure of the existing concourse and its replacement with a new structure which would also compromise the setting of the surviving 19th century train shed. This roof is one of the wonders of the station. I also object to the unnecessary insertion of new retail units within the 19th century train shed including the equally unnecessary construction of two elevated retail galleries causing harm to the general appearance of this station. Additional retail units are not required in the station. I object to the construction of a 20 storey tower over the station concourse which will completely ruin the setting of the adjacent Grade II listed 19th century hotel, it is an abomination to build such a structure on top of this heritage station. I object to the unnecessary insertion of a high rise building in this inappropriate area, the building is simply a speculative venture for gain at the expense of a wonderful Victorian setting which has been preserved and maintained for many years. I refer to the National Policy Framework, paragraph NPPF 213; substantial harm to or loss of; a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens should be exceptional. EXCEPTIONAL, such changes are not merited in this case and I object to this plan.	PA	03-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Ross	Diana	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to:" The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." I love this station as it is, the Victorian detailing and the scale it is. So much of the city of London has been ruined already with ill considered tall building architecture.	PA	03-Jul-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Pether	David	I object to this application, which proposes an inappropriate treatment for a nationally-important listed heritage asset. Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, ... should be exceptional." The application proposes the following substantial harms to the C19 train shed and adjacent buildings: 1. The demolition of the existing concourse roof structure, one of the building's most striking and important historic features. 2. The insertion of additional modern retail galleries, breaking up the space of the concourse and train shed, thus disrupting the special architectural interest of the overall design. 3. Addition of an overbearing 20-storey tower, dwarfing the grade II* listed hotel. For these reasons the application should be rejected. The scheme is also contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of applications for tall buildings in conservation areas characterised by low and medium-rise buildings. The scheme would have exactly such a negative impact on the Bishopsgate Conservation Area. This application should be refused. Modern enhancements were successfully introduced at St Pancras and Kings Cross Stations, preserving their heritage features and scale. This proposal lacks the imagination and ingenuity of those schemes and would destroy the heritage value of Liverpool Street Station.	PA	03-Jul-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	bowden	rebecca	"I object to this application which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to:" 1.The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof of the concourse and its replacement with a new structure, which would also compromise the setting of the 19th century train shed. 2.The insertion of large amounts of new retail units in the 19th century train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. 3.The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning 19th century hotel in the City - through the construction of a twenty-storey tower over the station concourse. 4.The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low-and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches and nearby St Botolph's church. 5.Pls refer to the National Planning Policy Framework, Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." The whole character of the area will change. . Other cities manage to keep their heritage areas intact for everyone to enjoy. Greedy developers seem to enjoy destroying ours with ugly, un-necessary buildings. . Once lost, this can NEVER be r	PA	03-Jul-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Berrecloth-Bale	Emma	Dear Sirs/Madam, I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. I refer to the National Planning Policy Framework Paragraph NPPF 213 which states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional. Yours faithfully Emma Berrecloth-Bale	PA	03-Jul-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Hunnisett	Philip	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. According top the National Planning Policy Framework Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional."	PA	03-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Rodwell	Karen	This Victorian station is an outstanding beautiful building, of historical significance it would be a crime to obliterate this! I object to another piece of history being destroyed! There is plenty of other crappy buildings to build over!	PA	03-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Walters	Sarah	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to the substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional."	PA	03-Jul-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Schaffer	Jane	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. I believe that Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." And therefore the objection should be taken seriously.	PA	03-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Alexander	Jake	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to the demolition of the iconic entrances on Liverpool Street and Bishopsgate, and particularly the demolition of the neo-gothic Victorian building housing a McDonald's. The fact that this building was reconstructed in the C20 does not detract from the fact that it forms an elegant and harmonious architectural composition with its neighbour, a Grade II*-listed hotel which the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City of London (the National Planning Policy Framework states: "Substantial harm to or loss of [...] grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional."). Access improvements sought by Network Rail can easily be achieved without demolition of these buildings and construction of large towers which would cause significant harm to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, as well as blocking natural light from the station concourse and compromising the majestic Victorian train shed, and causing years of disruption for passengers at a time when the City is just beginning to recover from the ravaging effects of the Covid-19 pandemic.	PA	03-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Wilson	Nick	My objection regards the loss of existing structure and light. I'm sure improvements are needed especially for the users of the station (they are to be encouraged to use the station for sure), and redevelopment has to be viable but the current plans are just too much, too intrusive ... too everything frankly. As regard 'light' Marylebone and Waterloo are the best stations in London so please insist on some sort of replication of what they have achieved to date.	PA	03-Jul-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Krizanovich	Karen	"I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: 1) The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. 2) The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. 3) The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. 4) The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. I refer to the National Planning Policy Framework herewith: Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional."	PA	03-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Hill	Rosemary	I object strongly to the current proposal for a 19-storey tower block over the Grade II listed Liverpool Station. It is a great heritage asset and this development would be out of scale, destroying the character of the station and also of the nearby historic hotel, which is listed Grade II*!! These plans conflict with the 2015 City plan, intended to safeguard London's skyline, and with the provision of the NPPI that 'Substantial harm to or loss of... grade II listed buildings...should be exceptional'. There is no reason to make an exception in this case. As the redevelopment of Liverpool Street in the last century made clear it is possible to update, to maximise retail potential and passenger flow while preserving the character of a much-loved historic building. Liverpool Street contributes to the character of an area where the churches of Christopher Wren and the medieval St Botolph's blend London's past and present, adding to the quality of life for residents and for the much greater number of workers, commuters, tourists and travellers who pass through each day. These plans are crude and greedy. London and Liverpool Street deserve better.	PA	03-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Jordan	Philippa	I object strongly to the plans to partially demolish and alter the existing Victorian structure of Liverpool Street Station. I have been a user of Liverpool Street station all my life as a child travelling through and now frequently as an adult. Liverpool Street Station is my local mainline station. The recent renovations show the beautiful structure and roof supports it cheers me to see them each time I use the station. I object to demolishing the beautiful roofs and columns for the sake of a large office building. We need to cherish and enjoy this beautiful Victorian building. With this development of yet another soulless office building you are destroying our history and gambling that it will make money. I urge the planning committee to reject these plans.	PA	03-Jul-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Dinsdale	Anne	I regularly use Liverpool Street Station and find it an attractive historical and functional space. It is light and pleasant as it is and all the unnecessary work described in the planning application will change the character and ambiance of the whole area. It will not sufficiently improve any of the existing amenities and appears to be purely designed to provide more expensive office space (There is already a surfeit in the area and working from home is causing yet more vacancies in inner London.) and make a large profit for the developers at the expense of the local residents and users of the area.	PA	03-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Pauw	Nina	I object to this change of building on heritage grounds. Greater consideration is required to create a more considered building.	PA	03-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Freeman	Matt	I OBJECT to this application because it will cause irreversible harm to our heritage and environment:Loss of historic fabricThe plan removes significant parts of the Victorian concourse roof and introduces new internal structures, severely damaging the character of the Grade'II listed station.Overdevelopment of the Grade'II* Great Eastern HotelA 16-20 storey tower is proposed to cantilever over the hotel, cutting through historic interiors and converting spaces from hotel to offices-threatening the building's historic integrity.Impact on the Conservation AreaThe proposed tower is out'of'scale with the surrounding low' and mid'rise Bishopsgate area, undermining its historic character and ambience.Intrusion into protected viewsThe height and bulk of the development would disrupt important sightlines, including views of St'Paul's Cathedral.Dangerous precedentApproval could set a precedent that allows modern structures to intrude on or build through listed heritage buildings.Fails national planning standardsCurrent planning policy requires "clear and convincing justification" for harm to designated heritage assets. This proposal does not meet that criterion, and the public benefits offered do not outweigh the damage.Unnecessary and prematurePassenger forecasts are based on outdated data. Recent transport improvements, such as the Elizabeth Line, and shifts in commuter habits have not been fully considered, making the scale of redevelopment excessive.ConclusionWhile modernising the station may be needed, it should not come at the cost of historic loss. I urge the Committee to reject this plan-or insist on a major redesign that:Fully retains the Victorian concourse roof and train shedRemoves or drastically reduces the tower over the hotelRespects the scale of Bishopsgate and preserves protected viewsMeets the required justification standard under planning policy.	PA	03-Jul-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Anderson	Kathleen	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. National Planning Policy Framework states Paragraph NPPF 213 : "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." I strongly object, I use this station regularly and to lose its history would be wrong.	PA	03-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Liese	Christine	I strongly object to the application no. 25/00494/FULEIA. This plan will cause major and irreversible harm to the significance of this nationally important Victorian heritage asset. In doing so, I refer to Paragraph NPPF 213 which states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." This plan is NOT based on any exceptional circumstance that would justify the loss and harm it will cause Liverpool Station, an exquisite example of ambitious London Victorian architecture. It is a shameful plan and disregards the quality of the building and the historic significance of it's surrounding area: A. Substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse. Its replacement with a new structure will compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. B. Extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries cause major harm to the significance of this Grade II-listed heritage asset. C. The impact to surrounding listed heritage assets: Especially, harm to the Grade II*-listed former Great Eastern hotel through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. Shameful. D. The massive harm the plan causes to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by a brutally tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is totally in breach of the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme impacts on the setting of countless heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of our Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and St Botolph's church where John Keats, our great Romantic poet was baptised. Please refuse this unsympathetic application. I strongly object	PA	03-Jul-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Liese	Christine	I strongly object to the application no. 25/00494/FULEIA. This plan will cause major and irreversible harm to the significance of this nationally important Victorian heritage asset. In doing so, I refer to Paragraph NPPF 213 which states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." This plan is NOT based on any exceptional circumstance that would justify the loss and harm it will cause Liverpool Station, an exquisite example of ambitious London Victorian architecture. It is a shameful plan and disregards the quality of the building and the historic significance of it's surrounding area: A. Substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse. Its replacement with a new structure will compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. B. Extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries cause major harm to the significance of this Grade II-listed heritage asset. C. The impact to surrounding listed heritage assets: Especially, harm to the Grade II*-listed former Great Eastern hotel through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. Shameful. D. The massive harm the plan causes to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by a brutally tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is totally in breach of the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme impacts on the setting of countless heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of our Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and St Botolph's church where John Keats, our great Romantic poet was baptised. Please refuse this unsympathetic application. I strongly object	PA	03-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Wood	Jane	Building of historic value are listed for a reason. The category of listing reflects the sensitivity, uniqueness and significance of the building in its historic form. As the resident of a listed building myself, I am very aware of the constraints and responsibilities of owning such properties. I can't put a plastic gutter instead of a cast iron one on my small house, or change the paint colour; far less plonk a giant shopping centre on top of it. This station is Grade II* listed to protect it from changes that would harm its structure, significance and context. The proposal threatens all those aspects, and this should be an easy refusal as it's exactly this kind of inappropriate redevelopment that the listings system is designed to repel. This should clearly be weighed as representing the higher end of significant harm to heritage value in the planning balance. I trust the planning officer will exercise their planning judgement accordingly and make that advice clear to the committee. Otherwise we may as well scrap the system of listed buildings completely. If this can't be protected, what can? Building of historic value are listed for a reason. The category of listing reflects the sensitivity, uniqueness and significance of the building in its historic form. As the resident of a listed building myself, I am very aware of the constraints and responsibilities of owning such properties. I can't put a plastic gutter instead of a cast iron one on my small house, or change the paint colour; far less plonk a giant office block on top of it. This station is Grade II* listed to protect it from changes that would harm its structure, significance and context. The proposal threatens all those aspects, and this should be an easy refusal as it's exactly this kind of inappropriate development that the listings system is designed to repel. This should clearly be weighed as representing the higher end of significant harm to heritage value in the planning balance. I trust the plan	PA	03-Jul-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Baxter	Christina	Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." This development will absolutely change and impact massively on the buildings and the whole area. This must not be allowed. The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. Christina Baxter	PA	03-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Ipaktchi	Iradj	i object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to the harm risked to the surrounding community. We are already ignored and made to feel like second-class citizens in our own neighborhoods, especially in council flats. We live with constant noise and construction schemes while our local businesses are being shut down and priced out to be replaced with absolutely soulless projects. I've already seen this neighborhood be sanitized of any sort of local character and it's only going to get worse with a Liv Street Station project. Please, for once, think of the people who live here instead of the high earning City works. I know we are not plentiful but we still matter.	PA	03-Jul-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Potkins	Gillian	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. No more new retail units are required in this area. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional.	PA	03-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Herridge	Jennifer	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. The National Planning Policy Framework Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional."	PA	03-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Reardon	Lisa	Too big. Too much. Over developed	PA	03-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Webb	Julieann	Because older and disabled people cannot manage the stairs or escalators.	PA	03-Jul-25	S

25/00494/FULEIA	Lethbridge	Lucy	Liverpool Street Station is a grade-2-listed nationally important heritage asset and I object to this application on the grounds that it would do substantial damage to the station, its context and surrounding Victorian buildings. 19th century station buildings tell an important story of the city and its history. They should not be squeezed and dwarfed by enormous modern functionalist structures. The demolition of the roof would cause damage to the structure and compromise the setting of the surviving 19th century train shed. The setting of the 19th century station hotel, the last continually functioning Victorian hotel in London, would be destroyed by the proposed twenty storey structure above it. The Bishopsgate conservation area would be substantially damaged by the proposed building - the height of which is contrary to the 2015 City Plan which refuses planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas such as Bishopsgate and St Pauls. A project of this magnitude would have significant impact on the settings of buildings far afield, including many Wren churches and St Botolph's. I refer to the National Planning Policy Framework Para 213 which states: Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." Yours, Lucy Lethbridge	PA	03-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Howell	Vivienne	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: Ruining a Grade II listed building, a building which is currently serving the local and wider community. Adding in retail units. No one needs more access to buy rubbish they don't actually need, or more cheap, processed food. Network Rail need to manage their business better, not ruin our heritage buildings for a quick buck today.	PA	03-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Casado	John	I object to this application which would cause substantial harm to the significance of this nationally important heritage assets. More specifically I object to the harm to the Grade II listed station through demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse which would compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed and the harm that would be done to the last and continually functional C19 hotel in the City through the construction of a 20 storey tower over the station concourse. This project should be stopped in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework, Paragraph NPPF 213 which states: "Substantial harm to or loss of :a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional."	PA	03-Jul-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Deacon	Nick	I was a long term commuter into Liverpool St and lived through the upheaval of the last redevelopment. The resultant terminus is a key link into the city and beyond. The station is spacious and enjoys natural light through its original iconic roof design. Construction of yet more speculative office space in this part of London will add nothing to amenity or quality of life to the many residents in the area and the host of people who, like I used to, flow through the terminus in our daily grind. Please don't let greed destroy even more of our heritage when there is no need or demand.	PA	03-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	O'Hare	stephen	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: 1. Harm to Grade II-listed Liverpool Street Station The proposal would result in the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse, a key element of the Grade II-listed station. Replacing it with a new structure would cause substantial harm to the special interest and significance of the heritage asset and would also compromise the setting of the surviving nineteenth-century train shed, undermining the historic character and integrity of the station. 2. Insertion of Extensive Retail Units in the C19 Train Sheds The plan to insert extensive new retail units, including two elevated retail galleries, within the nineteenth-century train sheds would cause a high level of harm to the special interest of the Grade II-listed station. Such an intervention would erode the historic fabric and spatial qualities that define the station's heritage value. 3. Impact on Surrounding Listed Heritage Assets The construction of a 20-storey tower above the station concourse would cause substantial harm to the setting and significance of surrounding heritage assets, particularly the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning nineteenth-century hotel in the City. The tower would dominate and overshadow these historic buildings, resulting in irreversible harm to their character and setting. 4. Harm to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area The proposal would introduce a tall building into the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which specifically requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, including Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. The scheme would also harm the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets.	PA	03-Jul-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Marks	Richard	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: 1. The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. 2. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. 3. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. 4. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. 5, The destruction of a key part of Britain's transport heritage without any consideration of its value to the historic landscape or the ongoing protection of heritage assets. The station building is a prime example of British railway architecture which shows how architectural style was used as a foundation for the creation of a marketing brand by Victorian industry. The building MUST be preserved and interpreted correctly.	PA	03-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Flanders	Judith	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to historically important assets. In particular under the remit of the National Planning Policy Framework Paragraph NPPF 213, which states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." This is directly at odds with the plan for a tall building within the Bishopsgate Conservation Area and contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in conservation areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. Furthermore, there is substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, will cause a high level of harm to this Grade II-listed heritage asset. There will be deleterious impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets, in particular, to the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse.	PA	03-Jul-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Todorov-Smyth	Andrew	I use this station everyday and the fact is it works perfectly fine. The whole station is bright and open, placing another building in an already congested area will destroy the overall look of the station and surrounding architecture. I already pay a small fortune to travel through this station and do not agree with the disruption it will cause to 100'000's of people simply got greed and profit. There is no need for this building at all, office occupancy is no where near 90% and yet more buildings are being constructed.	PA	03-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	MACKAY	James	The proposed replacement of the 1990 concourse and the construction over it of a massive block dominating the Great Eastern Hotel both damage the significance of the Listed Building and damage the character of the Bishopsgate Conservation Area. The application should be rejected, and the applicant asked to releran how a very large office development could be integrated with the historic assets as was done a generation ago. The argument that the application should be approved so as to improve passenger facilities at the station is spurious: that could be achieved by some of many other potential changes. JM	PA	03-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Knightswood	Symon	re: objection to planning application reference number: 25/00494/FULEIA. I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: - The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. - The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. - The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. - The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. With respect to this objection, I refer to the National Planning Policy Framework as being relevant and in particular Paragraph NPPF 213 which states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." which clearly applies to the planning application.	PA	03-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Gilbert	Paul	I strongly object to the proposed development at Liverpool street Station. It will destroy the architectural integrity of a Victorian masterpiece. It should be left just as it is.	PA	03-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Nicholls	Allie	The station is lovely with natural light and there are more than enough empty flats around Shoreditch as it is that are sold as investment that lay empty.	PA	03-Jul-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Vincent	Bekki	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. I object with reference to the National Planning Policy Framework. Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional. More specifically, I raise objections to: The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church.	PA	03-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Cole	Alexandra	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." particularly substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. w AND the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. Please note the substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church.	PA	03-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Church	Clare	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically I raise objections to: the substantial harm to the Grade II listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure, which would also compromise the setting of the surviving 19th Century train shed: The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the 19th century train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II listed hotel - the last continually functioning 19th century hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20 storey tower over the station concourse. Paragraph NPPF 213 of the National Planning Policy Framework states that substantial harm to or loss of buildings should be exceptional.	PA	03-Jul-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Sood	Saurabb	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional."	PA	03-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Pert	Jacqueline	I object to this application (Ref: 25/00494/FULEIA) which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. . so much of the old City of London as already been lost that the destruction of parts of Liverpool St. Station would further degrade our cultural heritage. Future generations will not thank us! . the demolition of the existing roof structure and the subsequent replacement would compromise the 19th century train sheds and destroy the superb glass roof; a priceless example of Victorian design. . the 20 storey tower over the station would be "as a carbuncle on the face of a much loved building" - this is the last Victorian hotel that has been in continuous use since its inception and would be diminished by this tower of glass and steel. It, also, contravenes the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas (the Bishopsgate Conservation Area; St Paul's Cathedral Heights area). The National Planning Policy Framework - paragraph 213 states, "substantial harm or loss of a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." This scheme would also have a huge impact on the Wren churches in the area and St. Botolph's church. . we do not need more retail businesses that would compromise the 19th century train sheds. This is a major transportation hub to Greater London, Eastern England and the continent; not a shopping mall! In conclusion, I wish to repeat my strong objects to this plan (25/00494/FULEIA). Modernisation is part of a city's growth, granted, but prudence and care must be maintained to protect our historical heritage; the heart and soul of the City. Can we afford to have such a cavalier approach to one of London's historically rich areas, in one of the world's greatest cities. Thank you for your consideration of my objections. Jacqueline Pert	PA	03-Jul-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Brown	Clarissa	I object to this application which will cause substantial harm to nationally important heritage assets in particular I object to the substantial harm to the grade II listed station as a result of the demolition of the roof and the replacement of a new structure. The significant new retail units and the two elevated retail galleries will cause significant harm to the grade II listed Heritage site. In particular I object to the construction of a 20 storey tower over the station concourse which will cause irreparable harm to the grade II listed hotel. The whole Bishopsgate conservation area will be devastated by these new dominant features overpowering the present low/medium height buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan and in my view breaches the National planning policy framework.	PA	03-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	El Khoury	Jeanine	Geezzzz why do you always have to get rid of something that works well looks good and has served a purpose for so long just to line your very deep personal pockets and egos of "look what we built!".why oh why do you think the new concrete and glass bland drab thoughtless and uninspiring monoliths thst 200years from now will be either falling to bits or even gone are more pleasing to the people who live and work in London than buildings with style personality and colour. Why is it always the bottom line that obseanly counts over the comfort and lives of those who live there. Are you even sure the structure foundations and tunnels under it all will take the weight of a high building or are you going to simple destroy everything about this iconic station? Why do all city's look the same wherever in the world it's so boring and dismal! Search your inner person and think hard about destroying so much character London is already just a concrete jungle a sacrifice to the almighty god money	PA	03-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	McCausland	Sam	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to the fact that the station is lovely as it is and doesn't need more soulless office/retail space	PA	03-Jul-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Toh	Zi Ken	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. The demolition of the existing station concourse, which is itself a fine and thoughtful example of a sympathetic addition to a heritage asset, and its replacement with a highly unsympathetic structure would severely compromise the setting of this heritage asset, and cause substantial harm to it. This application is therefore contrary to the principles set out in the NPPF, paragraph 213. The extensive and excessive insertions within the 19th century train sheds, including the elevated retail galleries, compromise the setting of this listed heritage asset, harming the special interest of this gem of 19th century engineering and design. The design shows a high level of disregard to the architectural qualities of the listed heritage asset, and do nothing to improve its setting or special interest. The proposed high-rise addition, with its wall-like design, similarly disregards the context of the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, causing substantial harm in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. It is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas. Furthermore, its scale, massing and design would negatively impact the setting of nearby designated and undesignated heritage assets, such as the Grade-I listed churches by Sir Christopher Wren, and the Grade-II* listed station hotel in the immediate vicinity. The loss of daylight in the station is also undesirable - even the renderings show the Listed hotel dwarfed and in dark shadow, contrasting negatively with the light-filled station we have today. We have to thank heroes like Betjeman for saving Liverpool Street Station from the destruction intended by British Railways in the 1970s, and saved them from inflicting another Euston on London. I hope that you will not let Network Rail undo that good work.	PA	03-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Darby	Penelope	Until recently I lived and worked in the Liverpool St area and have used this station all my life. I am still using it now. There are some developments nearby that have been a bit more sympathetic to the Victorian architecture around the Bishopsgate area but this is like a giant greenhouse has landed on top of a pleasing building. Like others have said, we do not need more empty office space and this proposed monstrosity is without any architectural merit at all. Certainly the toilets need to be more conveniently sited and a ticket office with people who can be easily seen would be an improvement. It beggars belief that there is a possibility that this ill conceived scheme could possibly be granted permission to proceed. I object most strongly to it's being realised.	PA	03-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Chappell	Paul	My prime objection to this application as written is that it does not comply with the National Planning Framework, specifically para NPPF 213 which states "Substantial harm or loss of ... grade II listed buildings...should be exceptional." It would seem that passenger traffic through Liverpool Street station will continue to increase significantly and that innovative improvements will be required to handle the additional traffic. I would consider that these traffic needs could be regarded as exceptional in the context of the NPPF if justified, with minimal impact upon grade II listed infrastructure. However, I cannot accept that the provision of retail and office areas is in any way exceptional in this part of London, and therefore believe that the application must be rejected. In particular, I believe that the demolition and replacement of the existing station concourse roof would cause substantial harm to the grade II listed station, whilst the new retail units	PA	03-Jul-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Morris	celeste	I think it is a true shame to be trying to build over historic buildings, create more inflation in prices for people that live in the area and also create even more CO2 gasses adding to the environment!! Why do we need to keep developing buildings that are only helping the rich!	PA	03-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Marchant	Aaron	I object to this application on the grounds that it would cause significant and irreversible harm to nationally important heritage assets and their settings: 1. Harm to the Grade II-Listed Station The proposed demolition of the historic concourse roof and the insertion of new retail units would result in the loss of original 19th-century fabric and fundamentally alter the character of the station. Such interventions would undermine the architectural and historic significance of this listed building. 2. Impact on Surrounding Heritage Assets The construction of a twenty-storey tower would dominate the skyline, overshadowing the adjacent Grade II*-listed hotel and detracting from the setting of several nearby listed buildings, including Grade I-listed churches. The scale and massing of the tower are wholly inappropriate in this sensitive context and would cause substantial harm to the historic environment. 3. Damage to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area The Bishopsgate Conservation Area is characterised by its lower-rise, historic buildings. Introducing a tall building of this nature would be entirely at odds with the established character and appearance of the area, contrary to the aims of the City Plan and conservation policies. The proposal would erode the special qualities that justify the area's designation. 4. Non-Compliance with the NPPF The National Planning Policy Framework makes clear that substantial harm to listed buildings and conservation areas should be exceptional and only permitted where it is clearly justified. In this case, the public benefits do not outweigh the significant harm that would be caused. For these reasons, I urge the refusal of this application.	PA	03-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Jackson	Stephen	I write as Chairman of The Betjeman Society and register mine and the Society's strenuous objections to the scheme as submitted because of the substantial harm it would do to the historic station and its setting, and to the surrounding Conservation Area. We accept it is important to create better facilities for disabled passengers (something Network Rail should have carried out years ago) but this does not warrant the wholesale destruction of the site as proposed. The suggested office block which obliterates the setting remains a potential eyesore with no architectural merit and little evidence that it is needed in an area with an over supply of office space. Why not give the station the same sympathetic treatment as the highly successful St Pancras development and balance heritage needs with genuine amenity needs. This application is so out of step with the post covid world and the cost is an affront to travellers who would sooner their train was on time than spend in expensive shopping areas.	PA	03-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Metcalfe	Matthew	I object out of fear of a detriment to the character of the area and the loss of cultural heritage. The Victorian roofing of the station is beautiful and ought to be preserved. Moreover, the surrounding area will be blocked from the sun by the development, in turn harming their local environment. The multiple stories part of the development are not necessary and should be blocked because they do more harm to the station itself, as well as the surrounding area	PA	03-Jul-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Pannett	Kate	To whom it may concern, I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. I draw your attention to the National Planning Policy Framework - Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." Yours faithfully, Kate Pannett	PA	03-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Baxter	Antony	I object to this proposal to redevelop Liverpool Street Station as it would result in significant harm to the environment of the area in which it is situated as well as to the building itself. The station was the subject of a comprehensive redevelopment scheme only some 35 years ago, a well thought out scheme which has resulted in Grade II listing of the original structure being extended. It appears that much of the recent additions contributing to this would be demolished. In particular the over-station development is quite out of keeping with that area of London, would dwarf the Great Eastern Hotel and block light onto the concourse, resulting effectively in an underground station. It is claimed that this proposal is necessary to be able to cope with the expected increase in passenger numbers, estimates varying from 50% to 100% increase. However, there is no explanation of how the railway is expected to cope with this number of passengers: there are two main lines out of Liverpool Street Station, both heavily used with little, if any, spare capacity with competing demands between passenger and freight trains and between slow short-distance suburban trains and fast longer distance services. It would be highly unlikely that this kind of increase in passenger numbers could take place rendering this aspect quite unnecessary. Furthermore, the function of the building is as a railway station, facilitating passenger travel into and out of London, not as a shopping centre or as a "destination in its own right". When I travel by train, my needs for retail establishments are limited to a bookstall and possibly a refreshment facility, not a comprehensive shopping centre. In general there is no need to linger on the concourse, being able to board a train immediately.	PA	03-Jul-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Vincent	Daniel	I object to this application, which would cause substantial, irreparable and unnecessary harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: 1) The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving 19th century train shed. 2) The insertion of extensive numbers of new retail units within the 19th century train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. 3) The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel, which is the last continually functioning 19th century hotel in the City, through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. 4) The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. I would like to point out that the National Planning Policy Framework states the following: NPPF Paragraph 213: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional."	PA	03-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Boyce	Anthony	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to a nationally important heritage asset. More specifically, I raise objections based on: The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church.	PA	03-Jul-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Sears	Colin	I object to this scheme for the following reasons: - it diminishes the public realm by cutting out natural light to the station concourse - the loss of historic fabric - the negative affect on adjacent Listed buildings - the relatively minor station improvements do not warrant or justify such an overbearing scheme Thank you.	PA	03-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Fawdry	Corey	I object to this application because it will cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important assets in the station itself and the surrounding area. I believe the plans to develop the station contravene the National Planning and Policy Framework, in particular paragraph 213 which makes it clear that any development should only be carried out in exceptional circumstances. From a young age I have been interested in trains and travel. Liverpool Street is an amazing example of Victorian architecture and it should be saved as close to it's original form as possible. The tower will dwarf the station and surrounding area and it will cause damage to the look and atmosphere of the station. Similarly the retail units will be overbearing and damage the station. I think the surrounding area also needs to be considered as there are many nationally important buildings nearby and they need to be protected too. I and my family are strongly against this plan and I hope a more sympathetic option will be found.	PA	03-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Baynham	Melissa	"I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to ruining the architecture of the building, we love coming to Liverpool where there are many beautiful looking buildings, I love the "oldey worldy" of Liverpool, a nod to times gone by, there really is no need to spoil this station with a monstrous building, build somewhere else, who needs offices when people are working from home !	PA	03-Jul-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Lawrence	David	Dear Chair, Planning application reference number: 25/00494/FULEIA I write to you as a historic building professional and railway architecture specialist published consultant and author. With reference to National Planning Policy Framework Paragraph NPPF 213 which states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional", I object to application 25/00494/FULEIA, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: - The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station caused by the proposed demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. - The high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset caused by the insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries. - Through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse, the adverse impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets and in particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel. - The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church.	PA	03-Jul-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	JOKIC	FLAVIA	Attention Tom Sleight, Planning Committee Chair, I strongly object to this application which would cause significant harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. These assets are listed for good reason. You will be aware of paragraph 213 of the NPPF which states that substantial harm or loss of grade II listed buildings should be exceptional. Once such assets are demolished or destroyed, they cannot be replaced leaving irreparable damage to the fabric of the local area, social history and community. The tower would be incredibly intrusive both in height and mass and negatively impact the surrounding Bishopsgate conservation area. The construction is massively disproportionate to the local urban realm and would entail the loss of both the structural and architectural integrity of a classic Victorian era station. The C19 train shed would also be severely compromised. The proposed development would directly impact the grade II listed functioning C19 hotel and impose itself aggressively on an area characterised by low to medium height buildings. During construction, the disruption to local businesses, residents and station users would be fairly intolerable. For what gain? Another anonymous tower that would severely detract from the urban grain and overwhelm precious heritage assets. Please urgently consider the multiple objections to this case.	PA	03-Jul-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Smith	Georgina	For the attention of Tom Siegn, Chair of the Planning & Transport Committee. Planning Application 25/00494/FULEIA I object to this application which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: - The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof of the concourse and its replacement with a new structure, which would also compromise the setting of the 19th century train shed. - The insertion of large amounts of new retail units in the 19th century train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. - The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning 19th century hotel in the City - through the construction of a twenty-storey tower over the station concourse. - The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low-and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches and nearby St Botolph's church. I point to the NPPF, Paragraph 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." I absolutely agree with making the station more accessible and how this can be achieved through bold concepts, however, this proposal is disproportionate.	PA	03-Jul-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Perry	Leigh	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. In addition, I refer to the National Planning Policy Framework; Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional.". This application is NOT exceptional.	PA	03-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Fletcher	Gaby	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. It is a beautiful space & of national importance.	PA	03-Jul-25	O
Page 496 25/00494/FULEIA	Perry	Aaron	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. In addition, I refer to the National Planning Policy Framework; Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional.". This application is NOT exceptional.	PA	03-Jul-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Constable	Gary	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." Does the committee want the distinction of ruining Great Railway Architecture? Used in the same breath as the demolishing of the Euston Arch, which is still talked about today. We only have the iconic St Pancras Station today because of objections to the desecration of Railway Architecture.	PA	03-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Pittock	Catherine	I object to this monstrosity of a plan to build yet another office block at the expense of the grade 2 listing buildings and train shed through the destruction of the roof and impact on the Bishopsgate conservation area. As a daily commuter through the station i am fully aware that station is fit for its current purpose it does not require extra escalators as you can already access all floors of the concourse. Neither does the station require more retail units when there are long term empty units at the station already following the Bishopsgate remodel. London does not require another office block many still stand empty following covid and as a commuter i do not want endless years of disruption to my journeys every day. I do however enjoy marvelling at the beauty of station and its roof and too lose that heritage and beauty would be a travesty. This entire plan is in conflict with the national planning policy framework paragraph 213 "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." And should be rejected outright	PA	03-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	MacKenzie Pereira	Sophia	This plan will destroy both a beautiful building as well as the surrounding area.	PA	03-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Stow	Edward	It is a shame to let good architecture in London be replaced by modern glass and concrete blocks. The style and design won't be retained and is of historic significance. If you could tell me the new building would like like St Pancras then maybe it would be okay, but it'll just be glass and concrete with no sense of grandure.	PA	03-Jul-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Tolcher	Edward	Liverpool Street Station Planning application reference number: 25/00494/FULEIA I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. In particular I have following issues with the proposal: 1. This is an important building of more than special interest and the proposal would result in substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. 2. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. 3. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. 4. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. I note the National Planning Policy Framework, paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." This is not exceptional.	PA	03-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Delves	Peter	I object to the revised plans for the development of Liverpool Street station. This will greatly and irreparably damage the appearance of this magnificent Victorian building. We should be cherishing not harming this wonderful structure. Of course the City needs to be constantly evolving, it always has done and will continue to do so over the coming centuries. But we owe it to future generations to be sensitive and thoughtful in the changes we make, and not repeat some of the mistakes of the past.	PA	03-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Denton-Cardew	Benjamin	I object to the redevelopment of Liverpool Street Station in that the station urban realm as it currently sits, and has done since the Victorian age simply 'works' and this proposal to shamelessly 'plonk' a tower block on top of the beautiful hotel, and demolish parts of the original canopy are harmful. I strongly believe that all of the 1980s additions to the urban realm, including the building that presently houses McDonalds; are an asset, and their loss would be insurmountable in damage to the wider area.	PA	03-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Summers	Victor	I wish to object to the proposed changes which will destroy historic parts of the Station.	PA	03-Jul-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	hill	des	I object to the development, as described and illustrated on the following grounds -- 1) The development has a serious impact on the settings of the listed hotel and the train shed. Planning legislation, and the National Planning Policy Framework, exist to protect such listed buildings, and their settings. There can be no legitimate reason to compromise the setting of such buildings accordingly. 2) The drawings are misleading. The elevation clearly indicates a relationship between the respective heights of the existing and proposed. The 2 point perspective has been distorted (willfully ?) to distort the actual relationship between old and new. The new building should appear larger, in relation to the hotel, than is shown, from that viewpoint. The diminution of scale and 'wide-angle' distortion has an incorrect scale, not appropriate to the viewpoint. In any case I believe that even with a closer viewpoint, and with a perspective effect nearer to that shown, that the relative heights of the new building should be higher than indicated. 3) The perspective of the concourse is misleading, giving the appearance of large amounts of natural light, where none will exist. The loss of daylight to the concourse will seriously compromise the experience of traveler and commuter.	PA	03-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Haines	Alison	I object to: The demolition of the historic roof structure The inappropriate addition of retail units and galleries The 20-storey tower that will damage the setting of listed buildings This application conflicts with paragraph 213 of the National Planning Policy Framework, which states that substantial harm to grade II listed buildings must be exceptional.	PA	03-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Osborne	Jenni	"I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets"	PA	03-Jul-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Tye-Walker	jennifer	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: 1. Substantial Harm to the Grade II-listed Station The proposed demolition of the existing station concourse roof and its replacement with a new structure would result in a significant loss of historic fabric and architectural character. This intervention would not only undermine the integrity of the Grade II-listed station but would also severely compromise the setting of the surviving 19th-century train shed, a key component of the station's historic and architectural value. 2. Inappropriate Retail Insertion within Historic Fabric The introduction of a substantial volume of new retail space, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries within the 19th-century train sheds, would cause a high level of harm to the special architectural and historic interest of this Grade II-listed heritage asset. These intrusive additions would obscure key sightlines and detract from the station's open, historically significant spatial character. 3. Harm to the Setting of Adjacent Listed Buildings, Including a Grade II-listed Hotel* The proposed 20-storey tower rising directly above the station concourse would dominate and visually overshadow the adjacent Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continuously operating 19th-century railway hotel in the City. This development would erode the setting and significance of this nationally important building, which depends on its relationship with the scale and historic context of the station. 4. Detrimental Impact on the Bishopsgate Conservation Area The introduction of a tall building in this location would fundamentally alter the established character of the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, which is defined by a consistent scale of low- to medium-rise historic buildings. This is explicitly contrary to the City of London's 2015 City Plan, which stipulates that	PA	03-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Omori	Rachel	I think it would be a travesty to alter this historic building. There are so many new buildings around yet the station retains its charm and history. Please don't turn it into another non-descript structure that loses all historical beauty and significance.	PA	03-Jul-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Jordan	Janice	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional."	PA	03-Jul-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Hall	Joanne	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance or nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: - The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. - The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. - The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. - The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church.	PA	03-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Savory	Fiona	I object to the proposed redevelopment of Liverpool Street Station. It operates satisfactorily as a transport hub and in this area we do not need yet more years of rebuilding disruption and noise. It is an extremely busy area and redevelopment will cause years of inconvenience to many commuters and local residents.	PA	03-Jul-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Dornan	Pete	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. Make sure to reference the National Planning Policy Framework in your objection, otherwise your objection may be dismissed: Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional."	PA	03-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	davies-james	karen	I object to the plans application. I do not wish the demolition of the liverpool street station in London. I think the plans should be changed so that there is no more demolition to the building. Instead, I think it should be preserved. I do not consider this application to be improvement. Unfortunately, once gone it cannot be rebuild. It should be unspoilt and there should be more consideration of these things as London is being spoiled in general, leave it unspoilt	PA	03-Jul-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Shackleton	James	I object to the proposed development on several grounds, particularly its potential harm to listed heritage assets and the surrounding conservation area. The demolition of the Grade II-listed station concourse roof and its replacement with a new structure would cause substantial harm to the station's historical fabric and affect the setting of the C19 train shed. The NPPF (Paragraph 213) clearly states that substantial harm to Grade II-listed buildings should be exceptional, which this proposal fails to demonstrate. Inserting extensive retail units, including two elevated galleries, within the C19 train sheds would also damage the special interest and integrity of the Grade II-listed asset. The modern additions would disrupt the historic character of the train sheds, diminishing their significance. The construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse would harm the setting of the Grade II*-listed hotel, the last functioning C19 hotel in the city, and overshadow its historical value. The scheme would also cause substantial harm to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area by introducing a tall building into an area characterized by low- and medium-rise structures. This conflicts with the City Plan's policy against tall buildings in Conservation Areas. Furthermore, the proposal would negatively affect the setting of several Grade I-listed churches, including Wren's City churches and St. Botolph's. In conclusion, this development would cause irreversible harm to key heritage assets and the historic environment, violating both the NPPF and City Plan policies. I strongly urge the refusal of this proposal.	PA	03-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Maier	Karyn	I frequently use Liverpool St Station and it's one of my favourites in London. Why? Because it's clean, spacious, easy to walk through from train to tube or taxi or the street. It's rarely overcrowded, the concourse feels open and safe. Plus it's a remarkable historical building that remains absolutely fit for purpose. The thought of wasting millions of tax payers money on a project that is simply unwarranted fills me with despair. Just please leave it as it is	PA	03-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Blackstock	Hilary	I object to this planning application as the station is Grade11 listed and the proposed high office block is totally out of keeping with the surrounding area and will over shadow the station concourse.	PA	03-Jul-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Rickson	S	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance important heritage assest. I raise objection to: Harm to the Grade 2 listed station through the demolition of the roof structure to the exisiting station concours and its replacement with a new structure. Would also comprmise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. Insertion of extensive amounts of retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of 2 elevated retail galleries - causing significant harm and significance of the Grade 2 heritage asset. Impace of the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular harm to the significance of the Grade 2 - listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City through construction of 20 storey tower over station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation are, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low/medium scale buildings. Contrary to the 2015 City Plan which required refusal of planning permission for tall buildings. To protect buildings such as many of the Grade 1 listed Christopher Wren City churches and nearby St Botolphs church. Paragraph NPPF 213 states 'Substantial harm to or loss of a) grade 2 listed buildings, or grade 2 registered parks or gardens should be exceptional. The corporation of London is already destroying the City. Please protect the history and heritage that we have, what people come to see in London. We seem to be ashamed of our history whereas other countries value theres. We see great tower blocks as 'progress' whereas they are making the City soulless and just like anywhere else. For a City that promotes 'history and heritage' in their tourist literature we seem determined to destroy the very thing we want people to visit.	PA	03-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Packard	John	I object to the building above Liverpool St Station as it will have a negative impact on an important railway terminus and historic piece of Victorian engineering. The removal of the iconic towered facade would have an effect on the historic street view and the light in the station shed will be impacted greatly despite the architects renders therefore radically altering the space. Any design proposal for expansion should take a more considered view to maintaining what is currently there for generations to come. This design if it goes ahead will be as regretful as the demolition of the old Euston Station.	PA	03-Jul-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Fletcher	Hayden	I object to this application as it would cause substantial harm to the significance and architectural quality of nationally important heritage assets at Liverpool Street railway station and No. 50 Liverpool Street. Paragraph 213 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) states that: "Substantial harm to, or loss of, a) Grade II-listed buildings, or Grade II-registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." The substantial harm posed to Liverpool Street station and its surroundings by this application should be avoided at all costs; the station is Grade II listed for its architectural and historic interest as a major Victorian railway terminus. The demolition and replacement of the station roof poses substantial harm to the architecture of the Grade II-listed station and its visual amenity. The inclusion of large numbers of new retail units within the original train shed, including two elevated 'galleries', poses substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station. The proposed 20-storey tower over the station concourse compromises the Grade II-listed station's setting and visual amenity, as well as that of the neighbouring Grade II-listed hotel at No. 40 Liverpool Street, which is especially significant as it is the last continually operating C19 hotel in the City of London. The proposed 20-storey tower also causes substantial harm to the wider Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by imposing its scale on a townscape composed mainly of low- and mid-rise buildings. Such a harm contravenes the 2015 City Plan which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in City Conservation Areas. This part of the application would also cause unacceptable harm to the visual amenity of other local heritage assets, including various churches in the City, designed by Sir Christopher Wren and listed at Grade I.	PA	03-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Moody	Joanne	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: - The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. -The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. -The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. I make these objections with reference to the National Planning Policy Framework. Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional."	PA	03-Jul-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Willenbrock	Zoe	I vehemently object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to:" What are the key issues to cover in my objection? The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construct I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: 1. The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. 2. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. 4. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. 5. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of	PA	03-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Clapham	Phoebe	As a long-term and very frequent user of Liverpool St station and the surrounding area, I object to this proposal, which would cause significant harm to historic listed buildings. Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." This proposal would undoubtedly cause substantial harm to Liverpool St station and the surrounding area. The trainshed itself would be damaged and the whole station, adjacent grade 2 listed hotel and surrounding area would suffer from the erection of a 20-story tower in an area with a very successful mix of low and medium height. Building an inappropriate tower here would be contrary to the 2015 City Plan. Unlike much of the eastern side of the City, which has been irreparably damaged by the insensitive construction of towers which overshadow (if they have not destroyed) the historic streetscape, this area of Bishopsgate and Liverpool St have been carefully modernised while retaining key heritage buildings. It would be incredibly sad to see this area of the City wrecked by insensitive and unnecessary commercial development.	PA	03-Jul-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Pinfold	Colin	Mr Sleigh, I wish to register my objection to the plans to significantly alter this valuable, complex, and impressive building. The plans are detrimental to a conservation area and would destroy the historical impact of the site. We have a duty to conserve such rare and meaningful buildings which add so much to the quality of our built environment. The plans submitted are wholly inappropriate.	PA	03-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Oddy	James	I strongly object to the proposed redevelopment of Liverpool Street Station due to the substantial harm it would cause to heritage assets, in direct conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and the City of London's Local Plan. The demolition of the station concourse roof would irreversibly damage the historic fabric of this nationally important structure and compromise the setting of the Grade II-listed 19th-century train shed. Inserting extensive retail development, including two elevated galleries within the train sheds, would further erode its special architectural and historic interest. The proposal also harms the setting of the Grade II*-listed Great Eastern Hotel-the last continuously operating 19th-century railway hotel in the City-through the construction of a 20-storey tower that would dominate and diminish its character. Significant damage would also be done to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, where tall buildings are explicitly discouraged by the 2015 Local Plan. The proposal is completely at odds with the area's low- to mid-rise built form and would disrupt the historic townscape. The wider impact on numerous listed and unlisted heritage assets, including Wren's City churches and St Botolph's, is also deeply concerning. Paragraph 213 of the NPPF states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings... should be exceptional." The level of harm posed by this scheme is not only substantial but unjustified, with no overriding public benefit to warrant such loss. I urge the planning authority to refuse this application.	PA	03-Jul-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Willenbrock	Zoe	I vehemently object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to:" What are the key issues to cover in my objection? The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construct I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: 1. The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. 2. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. 4. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. 5. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of	PA	03-Jul-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Brown	Emily	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to What are the key issues to cover in my objection? The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. Make sure to reference the National Planning Policy Framework in your objection, otherwise your objection may be dismissed: Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional."	PA	03-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	thomson	norman	I object to this application on the basis that it will cause extreme harm to the Grade 11 listed station and the surrounding nationally important assets. I am worried about the impact the scale of this development will have especially as most of the surrounding area is medium height. The proposed tower will dwarf the older buildings and I am worried about the impact this development will have on Christopher Wren churches in the area as well as other significant buildings. It is my understanding that under the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) that developments should only be permitted in exceptional circumstances. This development contravenes paragraph 213 of the NPPF. Please save Liverpool Street Station and it's beautiful Victorian Architecture. I would also like to highlight the importance of the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City which this development will destroy. Improvements can be made sympathetically and in scale to old buildings. This proposed development will dwarf the station and surrounding area and destroy the unique character of the Liverpool STreet Station.	PA	03-Jul-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Lock	Charles	I object to this application because it would cause substantial harm to the nationally important Grade 2 heritage site of Liverpool Street Station. Paragraph NPPF 213 protects against "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings". There is at least one Grade I church nearby, and this also needs to be safeguarded. The redevelopment of Liverpool Street Station in the 1990s was one of the great civic triumphs of London planning in recent years. It met with widespread approval among residents and businesses in the community, and among railway passengers. I have lived in Copenhagen for thirty years and I follow closely projects in planning and urban development. Seen from Copenhagen, Liverpool Street Station has been a triumph for London and has set an example for other cities. It should be treasured!	PA	03-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA Page 511	Hallums	Hayley	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. I raise these objections with reference to Paragraph NPPF 213 of the National Planning Policy Framework which states Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional."	PA	03-Jul-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Bridges	Jeffrey	My objection is based on my knowledge of the area and my concern at the potential destruction of an important part of our railway heritage. I object strongly to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important assets. To be more specific, I am most concerned at the substantial harm to the Grade II Listed station, through the demolition of the historic roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. This would also compromise the setting of of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including construction of two elevated retail galleries. This would cause high level harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II Listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. May I draw attention to the National Planning Policy Framework. Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional."	PA	03-Jul-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Holden	Susie	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: - The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure, which would also compromise the setting of the surviving 19th-century train shed; - The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the 19th-century train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset; - The impact to the setting of surrounding heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II* listed Great Eastern Hotel (now Andaz London Liverpool Street) through the construction of a tall tower block directly on top of the station concourse. - The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. With reference to the National Planning Policy Framework, paragraph 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional. I therefore urge the planning committee to refuse this application. Yours faithfully Susie Holden	PA	03-Jul-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Rider	Kenneth	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. I raise objections to: The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. The demolition of the historic roof structure, the inappropriate addition of retail units and galleries and the 20-storey tower will damage the setting of listed buildings and hence will cause substantial harm to Grade 11 listed buildings. This conflicts with Paragraph NPPF 213 which states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional."	PA	03-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Blake	Roger	Railfuture is Britain's leading longest-established national independent voluntary organisation campaigning for a better railway across a bigger network for passenger and freight users. Our primary interest is securing benefits for users of the station and the railway it serves. We acknowledge that the existing station needs upgrading in various respects, and it would be preferable for those user benefits to be secured through, for example, an acceptable commercial development rather than through the certainty of fare rises or the uncertainty of central government funding, probably the only alternatives. We do not however take the view that any commercial development is acceptable just because it avoids a need for fare rises or central government funding, and do not offer a view on what does or does not constitute an acceptable commercial development in terms of for example heritage or cityscape impacts. As an organisation representing some of the existing users of the station, and desirous of attracting both current non-users now and newcomers in the future, some examples of station improvements to be secured, cited by the proposer and with which we agree, include and as described in your 'Application details': ~ "introduction of new lifts, escalators and stairs and service spine at basement" - especially beneficial for London Underground users ~ "insertion of new ticket gates" ~ "creation of new station entrances from Hope Square and Bishopsgate Square" - and including greater visibility for the station's Bishopsgate entrance ~ "creation of new upper concourses and associated new public access from Exchange Square including new walkways" ~ "provision of cycle parking and associated access ramp." It is also important that the station remains open during construction works, and that the hotel's external facades and the Victorian train sheds are retained, along with other familiar features, in order to secure user satisfaction and wider public acceptability.	PA	03-Jul-25	R

25/00494/FULEIA	Bucknall	Nicholas	Out of scale. Of detriment to the existing historic character. Unsightly and overbearing. Too much glass. Over development. Disturbance and over crowding. Critical location of national importance should not be so drastically changed. Contribute to congestion. Need is not justified.	PA	03-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Adams	Natasha	Disruptive	PA	03-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Birrell	Georgie	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to:" The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional."	PA	03-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Potter	Janelle	I object to this, on the grounds that it would substantially harm nationally important heritage assets. More specifically: a) the harm caused to the Grade II-listed station by the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse, and its replacement with a new one that would also compromise the setting of the surviving nineteenth-century train shed; b) the installation of extensive numbers of new retail units inside the nineteenth-century train sheds, including construction of two elevated retail galleries, which would involve a high degree of damage to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset; c) the impact upon the setting of surrounding, listed heritage assets; in particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually-functioning nineteenth-century hotel in the city - through construction of a colossal, incongruous, twenty-storey tower over the station concourse; d) the substantial harm the project would constitute to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area by introducing such a tall structure in an area characterised by low- and medium-rise buildings, contrary to the 2015 City Plan which requires the refusal of permission for buildings in inappropriate areas such as Conservation Areas and the St Paul's Cathedral Heights area. Additionally, the project would adversely impact upon numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's Church; e) paragraph NPPF 213 of The National Policy Planning Framework states that: 'Substantial harm to Grade II-listed buildings, or Grade II-listed parks or gardens, should be exceptional.' There are no 'exceptional' grounds and no justification for this damage to and destruction of a valuable heritage asset.	PA	03-Jul-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Handford	Clare	I object in the strongest terms to this application, which will cause irreparable harm to Liverpool Street station and surrounding area. Specifically, I object to : - The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure in the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure, which would also compromise the surviving C19 train shed. - The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing irreparable harm to the special interest & significance of this Grade II-listed heritage asset. - The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City and much lived by Londoners - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. - The substantial harm the scheme will cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby (and much loved) St Botolph's church. Paragraph NPPF 213 of the National Planning Policy Framework states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." I live only ten minutes from Liverpool Street Station and know and love it well. Please reject this inappropriate and damaging application.	PA	03-Jul-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Rounce	Kate	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. I refer to the National Planning Policy Framework, Paragraph NPPF 213 which states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." More specifically, I raise objections for the following reasons: - The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. - The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. - The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. - The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church.	PA	03-Jul-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Pilcher	Steve	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. I understand that the proposals are contrary to the guidance contained in Paragraph 213 of the National Planning Policy Framework which states that : "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional. The previous redevelopment of the station approx 30 years ago, has been a great success. This proposal would totally ruin what was previously achieved.	PA	03-Jul-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	chambers	iain	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. Specifically, I object to: The significant harm to the Grade II-listed station from the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse, and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. I would also refer you to the National Planning Policy Framework in which Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional.	PA	03-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Poulter	Gregg	Too much of our heritage has already been destroyed , save this stunning heritage.	PA	03-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Bigalke	Eva	The plans destroy a beautiful and airy important heritage building without providing unquestionable advantages. The retail concept is garish and not in line with the building's purpose. The plan create substantial overdevelopment in that area which is not in line with the National Planning Framwork Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional."	PA	03-Jul-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Sapunaru	Andreea	I object to Planning Application 25/00494/FULEIA for Liverpool Street Station, primarily due to its significant environmental harm. The scheme involves extensive demolition of historic station structures, generating substantial construction waste and embodied carbon-contradicting the UK's climate targets and the City's sustainability commitments. Building a 20-storey office tower above the station will further increase carbon emissions and resource use, when the existing infrastructure remains fit for purpose. The proposed massing will reduce natural light and alter airflow, negatively impacting the urban microclimate and worsening air quality for commuters and residents. Increased commercial space will bring more deliveries and traffic, further exacerbating local pollution and congestion. Despite claims of added greenery, the scheme results in a net loss of meaningful open space and provides minimal new green infrastructure, threatening local biodiversity and the historic urban landscape. This proposal sets a dangerous precedent for unsustainable, large-scale commercial development at the expense of heritage and environmental responsibility. It contradicts the National Planning Policy Framework and the City of London Local Plan, both of which call for sustainable development and protection of historic assets. The public benefits claimed do not outweigh the environmental and heritage harm. I urge the City of London to refuse this application.	PA	03-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Garside	Mariota	I OBJECT to this application on the ground it will cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. I believe this proposal will result in breaching NPPF 213 which states that "substantial harm to or loss of: grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be EXCEPTIONAL." Specifically I raise objections to: 1 The demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse & its replacement with a new structure which will compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed; 2 The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units in the C19 train sheds including 2 elevated retail galleries which will cause significant harm to the special interest & significance of the Grade II listed heritage asset; 3 The damaging impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets especially to the significance of the last functioning C19 hotel in the City (which is listed Grade II*) if the 20 storey high tower is built over the station concourse; 4 The extremely harmful impact on an area of low and medium scale buildings in the Bishopsgate Conservation Area of erecting a 20 storey tall building in it. This is CONTRARY to the 2015 City Plan which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas including Conservation Areas. Such a tall building will also have a negative impact on the many other heritage assets in the City eg Grade I listed Wren Churches. 5 This proposal will destroy one of the glories of 19C architecture in London which is used and enjoyed by millions of passengers from all over the world. The demolition and construction works will significantly disrupt travel for vast numbers of passengers as well as commercial activities in this area. Please refuse planning permission.	PA	03-Jul-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Warburton	Holly	I object to this application which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof of the concourse. The design is not in accordance with The National Planning Policy Framework paragraph 213. I have lived in the area of Liverpool Station for 37 years since 1988 . Firstly in Shoreditch High Street and then at my current address since 1991. I frequent Liverpool Street Station regularly . I remember when the Queen opened Broadgate in 1991 . The Broadgate development was designed in sympathy with The original Liverpool Station using quality stone and materials and became a central architectural focus to our community. The proposed scheme is contrary to the 2015 City Plan which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. The scheme would cause substantial harm to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area and to local residents and visitors . Liverpool Street Station is an example of wonderful Victorian Architectural and is part of our heritage that must be preserved so it can continue to be enjoyed and celebrated as part of our heritage .	PA	04-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Mohler	Janet	I object to the proposed alterations to the beautiful Liverpool Street Station: Why? Why would the developers ignore the historical character and details that make this building so appealing? Their plan seems to be to crush this structure under the generic sort of modern building like those that are currently filling London. Why? It adds nothing to the functionality of the current station and seeks instead to increase the number of persons using this space. They have no consideration of the function of this station, which is transportation. There are numerous spaces for business and commerce already existing in the area. Are they seeking to eliminate the existing businesses for their selfish reasons, to deny that the current tenants of the area are a useful community? Their proposal is preposterous and would greatly damage the beauty and character of the area. I hope that the planners reject this travesty and instead consider sensitive improvements for this station, that would preserve the work of the past and bring it along to the future without destroying it's essential character.	PA	04-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Leffler	Tim	I object to this whole process of eradicating another iconic and historic heritage site in London based solely on the commercial value of its location. Network Rail have already destroyed so much, they have spent millions (which would now be wasted money) in refurbishing the building complex and it is disingenuous and fraudulent to make claims the Mr Rhys Jones briefly outlined. Planning should be there to protect such locations and I think you would be eradicating future generations heritage if you permit this application to proceed. There are already so many empty unimportant (historically) buildings that could be redeveloped and Network Rail selling "the family silver" because of high land value in its inherited location - they did not purchase it for investment- is abhorrent	PA	04-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	SOROKINA	Inessa	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. While it is highly important to upgrade the area and increase its accessibility and energy efficiency it is as important to save London's heritage that is the core of its attractiveness and legacy.	PA	04-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Johans	Thomas	I object to the demolition of the Victorian station. There are ways to update the station without destroying our architectural heritage.	PA	04-Jul-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Megroz	Grace	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. I walked through Liverpool Street station and worked in the City on an almost daily basis for 8 years past and believe the proposal does not respect the needs or unique character of the area. A 20-storey tower over the station concourse is inappropriate and unnecessary. I highlight the National Planning Policy Framework (Paragraph NPPF 213) states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." More specifically, I raise objections to: The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure (compromising the setting of the surviving C19 train shed). The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. The scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church.	PA	04-Jul-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	McKevitt	Wendy	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. The National Planning Policy Framework Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional."	PA	04-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	large	Denise	I along with many commuters use Liverpool Street station in London. The proposed assassination of what is being built will absolutely ruin this magnificent building. Please consider this rather than destroying what is part of our heritage & can not be recovered. This will not improve the station.	PA	04-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Leeson	Tiffany	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. Please note the National Planning Policy Framework : Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." Yours sincerely, Tiffany Leeson	PA	04-Jul-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Griffiths	Rosemary	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. I believe this will cause substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. I object also to extensive amounts of new retail units and galleries within the C19 train sheds, which I believe will affect a significant Grade II-listed heritage asset.. it will also impact the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets and the Bishops Gate Conservation area and In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The area is characterised by low and medium height buildings and the street scene would be rubbed by the imposition of a modern tall building. Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." This plan is not.	PA	04-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Campbell	James	I Object strongly to the application as it is in clear breach of both national and local planning regulation and guidelines and would be a significant detriment to the historic street scene in the City.	PA	04-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Brown	Vicky	I object to this application which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. I believe this breaches National Planning Policy Framework, Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." This is not exceptional. It diminishes and overshadows the historic station and hotel and there is already enormous amounts of office space in the city which is underutilised. It is ugly, out of keeping with the existing buildings and disproportionately tall, impacting the light in the surrounding area.	PA	04-Jul-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Constantine	Rose	I object to this application on the grounds that it would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. - The National Planning Policy Framework paragraph NPPF 213 states that substantial harm to or loss of grade II listed buildings or grade II registered parks or gardens should be exceptional. The current proposal does not provide sufficient justifications for such exceptions to be made for this application. - The 215 City Plan requires refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas. The Bishopsgate Conservation Area is a textbook example of an inappropriate area because it consists mostly of low and medium height buildings. The current proposal would also cause substantial harm to the wider surrounding area, including many listed and unlisted heritage assets. - In particular, the proposed 20 storey tower would have a very significant negative impact on the magnificent grade II* listed hotel immediately overshadowed by it - In Liverpool Station itself, the demolition and replacement of the roof would cause substantial harm to the grade II listed building and the surviving train shed - The elevated retail galleries would also cause substantial harm to the special interest and significance of the grade II listed train sheds The damage to the environment of the construction work should also be considered: the UN report "Building materials and the climate" (2023) estimates that construction accounts for 37% of greenhouse gas world wide. Construction also produces a significant amount of water pollution, air pollution, noise pollution and landfill waste.	PA	04-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Gilmore	Ingrid	I object to seeing a Grade II-listed station being demolished through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station its replacement with a new structure. There must be away to preserve this and remodel without demolishing it. The shed and the hotel (which is still functioning) are grade 11 listed heritage asset which are special interest and woven into the history of London. The scheme will also impact the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets and the substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings is devastating. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. The National Planning Policy Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional."	PA	04-Jul-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Hopper	Paul	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: - The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. - The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. - The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. - The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. - It is also contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework, which states at Paragraph 213, "Any harm to, or loss of, the significance of a designated heritage asset (from its alteration or destruction, or from development within its setting), should require clear and convincing justification. Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional."	PA	04-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Lamcer	Graham	to make it more accessible	PA	04-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Morrison	Jackie	People always need toilets and free and accessible toilets	PA	04-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	.	Kate	so many people and not enough lifts! The escalators are so full, you cannot take a suitcase on them. Many disabled and able bodies prefer lifts too	PA	04-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Palmer	Gillian	Cos theres always room for improvement!	PA	04-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	McCabe	Julie	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to the substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. I also refer to the National Planning Policy Framework. Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional.	PA	04-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Richardon	David	better access is essential	PA	04-Jul-25	S

25/00494/FULEIA	Parker	Jake	I travelled to london special occasion no toilets available on the train up on arrival thete was a long quebfor stinky facility i complained and was told if i travelled long distances that was why people wore tena lady never been so furious or insulted i can tell you	PA	04-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Chapman	Alex	Need to be kept modern	PA	04-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Cameron	Stephanie	Not appropriate in the area and will block too much light. Eyesore. Preserve the heritage of Liverpool St station.	PA	04-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Shahbazian	Steve	RE: planning application 25/00494/FULEIA I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to the sheer ugliness of the development and the wanton vandalism to a much-loved station. Everywhere we go in London, we are assailed by characterless new developments built in the last 15 years, while buildings that give pleasure to many are pulled down or defaced. As someone who has lived in London for almost fifty years, to see the deliberate destruction of the built environment has been heartbreaking. We have to be grateful that British Rail at least saw the value in saving (most of) Liverpool Street in the late 1980s instead of destroying it as per its original plans (see YouTube video https://youtu.be/yM-ATtyWJzo). Even then, much of the main station building, the original Southend platforms and Broad Street station was lost. To plonk what looks like the Borg Cube from Star Trek right on top of what's left would be worse then a crime. It would be sheer idiocy.	PA	04-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Roscow	Charlotte	I object to this most recent proposal of the redevelopment of Liverpool Street Station. It is a public building and a private company should not have sole authority over changes made. More importantly it is a Heritage building supported by The Victorian Society who are leading this protest against such brutal and life long changes to a building set in the heart of London. To all intents and purposes this is a vanity project that is being tendered to make money using the building as a resource. The station belongs to the people of London and it is essential and proper that it remains untouched except for essential repairs/maintenance and remain there for future generations to enjoy the beauty of the original design. I speak as someone born a Londoner, and my school days were spent passing through this station every day on my way to school and also accessing the East Anglian area.	PA	04-Jul-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Campion	Chris	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to the substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. The loss of the light, bright and open concourse space would be a detriment to the users of the station. The 1980s development replicating the victorian aesthetic has stronger architectural merit and should be retained	PA	04-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Rosen	Wendy	I have worked around Liverpool Street for 40 years and still do (currently beside Spitalfields). This proposal will be unsightly - UGLY in fact - and doesn't seem necessary. Yet another ugly building taking over from our dwindling historic beauty that we can never get back ... but we CAN try to keep it at the level we have reached. Please please don't put this one through	PA	04-Jul-25	O
Page 528 25/00494/FULEIA	Knipe	Marianne	I object to this outrageous application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. National Planning Policy Framework Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional."	PA	04-Jul-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Guy	Stephen	I object to this application on the basis of: 1. The substantial and irreparable harm it will cause to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. 2. The serious impact on neighbouring businesses who have chosen and invested significantly to be located in The City, Specifically; This plan shows absolutely no regard for its nearest neighbours. It will seriously occlude light & outlook from the south and west sides of 135 Bishopsgate - into which I was responsible for selecting as a new headquarters and moving 1500 staff from across London. We would not have chosen to move to The City of London had this plan been known. The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. The National Planning Policy Framework, paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." This is not exceptional. It is totally unnecessary.	PA	04-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	McFarlane	Carmen	Why would you wish to DEFACE, SPOIL such a splendid architectural building like this. Why do you feel need to fix what's not broken just for greed. Why you feel need to put up overpriced building on top of such beauty. These high rise offices are ugly and will NEVER last the time this building has been here. Leave Liverpool Street station/ building alone... please.	PA	04-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Poole	Lorraine	I object to the demolition of this beautiful piece of history on the grounds that it should be used as a public amenity and preserved for its beauty	PA	04-Jul-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Blythman	Laura	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. The National Planning Policy Framework (Paragraph NPPF 213) states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." This is an exceptionally important Grade II listed building and there is no exceptional need for causing such immense harm to such a historic and important building.	PA	04-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	King	Hannah	I object to the planning application in the strongest possible terms. To butcher Liverpool Street Station is vandalism of the grossest kind, and all for a speculative venture! The recent upgrades to King's Cross, St Pancras and Paddington all demonstrate that upgrading facilities can be done sensitively and in-keeping with listed building status, while also delivering what the public require. If this plan to destroy Liverpool Street goes ahead, it will show that greed overpowers all and that nothing has been learnt since the infamous destruction of Euston last century. In a time where demand for office and retail space is collapsing, this proposed destruction of a beautiful space is even more disgusting.	PA	04-Jul-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	COLE	Alison	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. I have been using the station all my adult life - it's beautiful and every time I walk through the station I look up and appreciate it. I would be devastated if it were lost. More specifically, I raise objections to: The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church.	PA	04-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Armstrong	Naomi	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. I have been using this beautiful and timeless station for much of my adult life. Every time I walk through the station I look up and appreciate it. I would be devastated if it were lost. More specifically, I raise objections to: The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. The Heights policy has been in place since 1938. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church.	PA	04-Jul-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Johnston	Desmond	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional	PA	04-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Monk	Daniel	This is a deeply worrying proposal. It shows an extraordinary disregard and lack of care about heritage and the environment. Both issues that the Corporation attests to care about. It is a hugely significant part of Victorian London, which will be decimated by this proposal. As we face heat waves and the Corporation commits to taking climate change seriously, renovation and care will have far less negative impact. This is a plea for the Corporation to demonstrate its commitments are not just hot air!	PA	04-Jul-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Panter	Laura	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. Make sure to reference the National Planning Policy Framework in your objection, otherwise your objection may be dismissed: Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional	PA	04-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Brown	Andrew	I object to this application which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to the impact of the proposed development to the feel of the area. The proposed development is out of keeping and will detract from the heritage assets. I am generally supportive of development in the City but this is in the wrong place and not suitable.	PA	04-Jul-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Holroyd	Jennifer	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to:" The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The construction of two elevated retail galleries within the C19 train sheds, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. In making the above points, I reference the National Planning Policy Framework in your objection, Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional."	PA	04-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Campbell	Emily	Destruction of important architecture from 19th & 20th centuries that contributes greatly to variegated massing of style and scale in the area and constitutes visible history of railway engineering.	PA	04-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Gillman	John	I object to this application which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: The substantial harm to the Grade II listed station and the Grade II listed hotel The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low-and medium-scale buildings. Specifically I refer to National Planning Policy Framework in which Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional."	PA	04-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Davies	Catherine	This planned work is immoral and hideous. Greedy developers decimating our cultural heritage. Capitalism gone mad. Leave Liverpool Street alone!	PA	04-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	McLees-Johnson	Alexandra	As a frequent user of Liverpool Street station and a local resident, I could not object more strongly or vehemently to the proposed plans to transform Liverpool Street station's stunning Victorian railway building to a modern day monstrosity.	PA	04-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Paterson	Michael	> I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: The fundamental change in style, character and structure to an historic Grade II listed station and Grade II* listed hotel. >Importantly, the harm that this scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a very tall building. This flies in the face of the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas such is this one, hence threatening the sight lines to St Paul's Cathedral and other local and important heritage structures.	PA	04-Jul-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Stone	Andrew	I object to this application. The proposed demolition of a significant part of the Grade II and II* Liverpool Street station will cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. If approved it would undermine the value of the national listing process and demonstrate the City's disregard for a critical component of London's 19th century architecture and wider infrastructural heritage. The significant damage the proposal will do to the architecture of the City of London and specifically to the composition of a collection of key buildings in the history of railways is substantial. The success of the careful and considered restoration and refurbishment of the station would be undermined. The scale of the proposed building will significantly impact on key City churches and other important architectural sites and the wider public realm in the area. The Bishopsgate Conservation Area is a vital transition in the scale of the centre of London and the richness and diversity of that will be compromised. The proposal's bulk, and blandness, will directly impact the lower scaled buildings to the North of the station. The proposed design is of especially poor. The drawings are actively non-descript, consciously diminishing the building's impact through the lack of detail, using light line weight to disguise its mass and the typical 'let's put a tree on top and pretend it's a garden' distraction. This is not good enough and I cannot imagine would be considered as an exceptional contribution of the architectural standing of the City. This is what must be demonstrated if the proposal is meet the requirement of Paragraph NPPF 213: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." I cannot see how this proposal can meet that requirement or how the City of London and its planning committee could justify their support.	PA	04-Jul-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Bates	John	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. I reference the National Planning Policy Framework: Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." John Bates	PA	04-Jul-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Olenick	Jacob	I support this application. I urge the committee in particular to disregard the brain-dead "I've got mine, you get nothing" campaign from the Victorian Society, who have been wasting obscene amounts of money on legal fees and social media advertising. This application has everything anyone could conceivably want. (1) Beautiful and historically significant buildings are preserved, despite the challenges of age. (2) NO taxpayer or farepayer money will be needed to pay for the improvements (something you can't say about the spurious and prima facie stupid obstruction campaign!) (3) The new Liverpool Station design will be MORE architecturally sympathetic with its surroundings than the current one! Just look at it! (4) The station will be larger and less cramped, with more space, more ticket barriers, less crowding, less queueing, and better access for the disabled. (5) CRUCIALLY, the construction of new offices above the building will support jobs and grow the local economy after decades of suffocation at the hands of the blockers, naysayers, and whining babies who pile into these sorts of applications, because they have nothing better to do than yell "no" at the slightest hint of change. "Wah wah i can see an office from the street!" Pardon? Aren't you like 60? Grow up! By the way, you can see that most of these objections are copy-pasted or paraphrased from the Victorian Society's website. What an embarrassment. See for yourself here: https://www.victoriansociety.org.uk/national-news/how-to-object-to-the-harmful-plans-to-partially-demolish-and-inappropriately-redevelop-liverpool-street-station/ Sometimes things change. Sometimes, they even improve! I look forward to seeing these long overdue improvements to Liverpool Street station. Maybe, just for once, something good can actually HAPPEN, instead of merely being talked about.	PA	04-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Howson	Vanessa	I object to the extreme modification of Liverpool Street station's structure, a protected building of historical importance, the disruption to passengers and the impact it will have on the conservation area around it. As Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." There is no exceptional need for these modifications. Kind regards, Vanessa Howson	PA	04-Jul-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Eisenberg	Andrew	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. Make sure to reference the National Planning Policy Framework in your objection, otherwise your objection may be dismissed: Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional.	PA	04-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Montgomery	Elizabeth	A great transformation. Great improvement to Liverpool Station for everyone's benefit. The station has suffered for decades from under investment.	PA	04-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Urquhart	Caitline	About time it was updated. Definitely needs more step free access. Design looks Amazing!	PA	04-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Urquhart	Daniel	It's well past its sell by date and needs to be brought into the 21 century	PA	04-Jul-25	S

25/00494/FULEIA	Dix	Jane	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of one of our nationally important heritage assets, Liverpool Street Station. I refer to the National Planning Policy Framework, which covers historic buildings such as this station. More specifically, I raise objections to the destruction of a beautiful and fully functioning Victorian station. It's a pleasure to use, both in peak and off-peak times. The development of a high rise building, superimposed on the existing site is totally inappropriate. It would have significant negative effect on the surrounding buildings, the hotel, and local area, and it is contrary to the 2015 City Plan. Furthermore, the inclusion of more modern retail space is unnecessary - the retail space currently available is delightful in its inclusion within the building, and has considerable charm. Modern retail space would destroy this atmosphere. There is plenty of retail space already available in the local area. Surely we have learnt about the value of keeping in tact, and continuing to use, such spaces of past eras - I refer to the tragic loss of Euston Station, and the successful development of Kings Cross Station. Liverpool Street Station is a pleasure to use, AS IT IS. And it is a pleasure to see it from the various angles possible in the surrounding district, from other buildings, and from the street, in its current form. I object to the development proposal.	PA	04-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	McLachlan	Kirsty	No reason not to.	PA	04-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Parker	Shirely	Women's loos are always busy with a queue usually way out the door. And that's when they all work!	PA	04-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Davies	Sylvia	To help people who need to make connections in quick time	PA	04-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	McGivern	Lewis	Having been the main entry-point into London for me when commuting into the city from Colchester (my home town), and now living a 10 minute walk away from this station having moved to London >4 years ago, I would like to see the site preserved in the beautiful Victorian design and state that it is currently as I believe it to be a beautiful heritage site for many, and for historical purposes. I would very much like for this plan to be appropriately reviewed and reconsidered as I very much object to the plan to redevelop Liverpool Street Station, not only for the aforementioned and sentimental reasons, but for retaining the essence that differentiates our capital to so many others, which is the unique architectural landscape of the very old, with the new. I believe that altering this landmark and site will damage this important characteristic. Thank you. Yours faithfully, Lewis McGivern	PA	04-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Potts	Katherine	The proposal presented will be damaging to the Victorian station features-particularly the roof. The scale of the building above the existing station is out of proportion and will spoil the stations historic features.	PA	04-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Armstrong	Elizabeth	It will boost the economy and provide placemaking in the city	PA	04-Jul-25	S

25/00494/FULEIA	Tomkins	Deborah	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: The loss of natural light, which is a huge benefit to passengers. Natural light is preferable to artificial light on grounds of safety and also carbon emissions. The disruption to a major station concourse that works extremely well (it was my local London station for many years). It never feels crowded and is easily accessible. The sustainable harm to a grade 2 listed structure through new developments including retail units situated in 19th century engine shed, and the adverse impact on the remaining 19th century engine shed, plus the construction of a 20-storey tower block. A 20-storey modern tower block is out-of-keeping with the surrounding area, and will be seen from several miles away. There are adverse impacts to the surrounding heritage buildings including the last continuously operating 19th century hotel. There would be substantial harm to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings, which is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. The scheme would also impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. National Planning Policy Framework, Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." Liverpool Street Station is efficient and pleasant to use. The proposed developments will not improve the passenger experience, but will be detrimental.	PA	04-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Wicks	Polly	Access to toilets when and where you need them is a game changer, particularly for disabled people, the elderly and children.	PA	04-Jul-25	S

25/00494/FULEIA	Scott	Mr Andrew	I object to this development on the grounds that it is an unnecessary and destructive "development". The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure, which would also compromise the setting of the surviving 19th-century train shed; The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the 19th-century train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset; The impact to the setting of surrounding heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed Great Eastern Hotel (now Andaz London Liverpool Street) - the last continually functioning 19th-century hotel in the City - through the construction of a tall tower block directly on top of the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. This is unnecessary due to the huge amount of architectural harm to our history and the fact that London has a huge amount of office space currently sitting empty rendering this needless. Yours sincerely Mr Andrew Scott	PA	04-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Major	Julia	It's so important as there are many people who have mobility issues who need to use lifts. As someone who visits London regularly with people who have disabilities I need to use facilities such as lifts & the one at the station is so outdated & had a nasty experience recently when it kept juddering on its way down & felt very unsafe.	PA	04-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Todman	Lesley	They are so well used, it's anyone's first experience of our beautiful City. Liverpool Street is such a great station, vibrant and busy. Our toilets need to be a nice place to visit.	PA	04-Jul-25	S

25/00494/FULEIA	Triscott	Molly	I object to this application which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: 1. The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof of the concourse and its replacement with a new structure, which would also compromise the setting of the 19th century train shed. The insertion of large amounts of new retail units in the 19th century train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. 2. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning 19th century hotel in the City - through the construction of a twenty-storey tower over the station concourse. 3. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low-and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area*. 4. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches and nearby St Botolph's church. All of which are grounds for refusal to build under the National Planning Policy Framework, paragraph NPPF 213: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional.	PA	04-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Bunting	T	Because it's so hard for wheelchair users to be able to use the lifts especially if they're out of order.	PA	04-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Morris	Maureen	as an elderly person i often use the ladies toilet at Liverpool st station.....another one in a nearer location would be good.	PA	04-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Meadway	Joe	The current station has always struck me as oddly boxed off and interrupted by the white conservatory-type buildings along the first floor - they block off the view of the roof, are quite ugly, and having been in few of the shops & cafes seem quite awkward to fit out and use. The plans seem to offer a much more open concourse, and celebrate the space inside the station.	PA	04-Jul-25	S

25/00494/FULEIA	Jenks	Gillian	The proposed application should it be approved, is the destruction of one of London's historic landmark buildings and does nothing to improve the city of London and the majestic architecture that our capital city showcases to the rest of the world. Why developers think it is acceptable to change our landscapes and for no real gain to society, with many office blocks empty as the world has moved to a digital society is beyond comprehension. The proposal for shops cafes and restaurants is just not necessary. I have owned my own shops and cafes and I know just how hard this is and I do not see that more are needed when others nearby are struggling. It sounds and looks a monstrosity, which has no useful or unique purpose, is detrimental to our historic city and would not be used to full capacity as there is no demand for what it proposes to offer. Please, please, please stop this application and the wanted destruction of our beautiful city as it when it is done it cannot be reversed and only regretted.	PA	04-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Von Braemer	Heidi	A building as old and of such historic worth should not be made to compete with a modern totally inappropriate looking building as suggested by the submitted plans. Too many buildings of historical and/or beloved by the public are being undermined/destroyed.	PA	04-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	McLean	Ian	simply the right thing	PA	04-Jul-25	S

25/00494/FULEIA	Mundy	Annabelle	As a former resident of Boundary Circus in Shoreditch, and frequent user of LSS, I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. It is a complete over-development of a sensitive and historically important site. More specifically, I raise objections to: The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. Please note that Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." Yours faithfully, Annabelle Mundy	PA	04-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Goodwin	David	Toilets are a vital public convenience in name and function. Many trains have few/inadequate toilets, Elizabeth Line -two hours Shenfield to Heathrow - inexplicably have none. Imagine travelling on holiday with young children!	PA	04-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Yau	Wilson	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: - loss and damage to the Grade II-listed station because of the demolition of the existing roof structure. - new retail units which will detract from the character of the station and add more traffic to a crowded station and adversely affect existing retail in the area. - harm to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area through the inappropriate proposal for tall buildings in a medium to low rise area. - in the National Planning Policy Framework, Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." This application will substantially harm grade II listed buildings for no gain and should not be allowed to be made an exception based on the points raised above.	PA	04-Jul-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Silver	John	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically , I raise objections to: 1. The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station by the replacement of the existing roof structure over the station concourse with a new structure that would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed 2. The addition of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds including two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage assets 3. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - by building a 20-storey tower above the station concourse. 4. The substantial harm the development would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation area , by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low - and medium scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would have a detrimental impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. My objection is made with reference to the National Planning Policy Framework. Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional."	PA	04-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Malone	Rowenna	I object to the proposals because of the harm to the heritage assets, which is such that the proposals do not comply with the NPPF especially paragraph 213. There will be substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, will also cause a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets is a concern. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The scheme would cause harm to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. As paragraph 202 of the NPPF states, our heritage assets are "an irreplaceable resource" and great weight should be given to their conservation. As both a professional heritage consultant and a passenger regularly travelling through Liverpool Street station to East Anglia over the last 11 years, I am appalled by the prospect of such harm to one of the capital's finest Victorian railway stations and to this part of the historic City.	PA	04-Jul-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Baldry	Alastair	I object to the proposed alterations to Liverpool Street Station. There is no need to enhance the beautiful station that is already there. The plans are purely unnecessary greed and if not and are about required new space, have you considered Milton Keynes?	PA	04-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Larkin	Christopher	I strongly object to the current proposals. All period features of the existing station on site must be preserved.	PA	04-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Grisdale	Jane	I object to this application because substantial harm will be caused to a nationally important Grade II listed station, in particular the demolition of the roof structure to build a monumental structure, compromising the setting and causing significant harm to the 19th century train shed. It will also impact the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets, including the Grade II*-listed hotel, through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The Bishopsgate Conservation Area would also be substantially affected which is against the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. The National Planning Policy Framework states that 'Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional'. In my view, improved facilities in the station do not need to be funded by this enormous office block - Network Rail owns enough land that could be sold to fund the improvements.	PA	04-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Dunnett	James	This proposal would cause substantial harm to Grade II-listed Liverpool St Station and to the Grade II*-listed East Midlands Hotel and to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area. Consent should be refused. I am an architect with many published articles to my name about the Modern City and Modern Architecture, and I was formerly Chair of DOCOMOMO-UK the international conservation organisation for Modern Architecture and urbanism. The aim of the great Modern architects and urbanists of the twentieth century was to ensure access to 'light, space, greenery' to all, even in the heart of the city, which they believed modern construction technology made possible. It is an objective to which the City of London should aspire. This proposal will work directly against it by imposing an overbearing mass that will take light and space away from its site and surroundings both by blocking the station concourse glazed roof and by overshadowing. This is not a suitable site for a development of this kind due to the substantial harm that will unavoidably be caused to listed buildings and conservation area.	PA	04-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Makhonko	Olesia	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to building project that will last 8 years and most significantly impact rail of overground services from the station. Now I live on a Weaver line and it is only way I can get to work via Liverpool Street station. I worry that due to disruption to overground services I will need to sell my house in Highams park or resigned from my very secure job, where I have been for many years. This greedy project undoubtedly will have a significant negative impact on many people for years and potential will has devastating impact people's lives.	PA	04-Jul-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Cameron	Andrew	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, and with reference to the National Planning Policy Framework (inc NPPF 213), I raise objections to: - The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure, which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. - The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. - The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. - The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. - More generally, if the development were permitted it would show that the very notion of a conservation area and of a protected heritage asset within one (and the democratic underpinning for that designation) are essentially without substance. Elected councillors on behalf of the public they serve should have nothing to do with such schemes.	PA	04-Jul-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Postins	Lisa	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to... The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. Make sure to reference the National Planning Policy Framework in your objection, otherwise your objection may be dismissed: Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." Please do not destroy something that is irreplaceable you will not be able to undo the damage. I have no doubt whatever you build on top will not be as beautiful or la	PA	04-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Sullivan	Tracy	"I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to:" The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. Make sure to reference the National Planning Policy Framework in your objection, otherwise your objection may be dismissed: Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional."	PA	04-Jul-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Paice	Adam	I object in the strongest way. Why must you continue to destroy the wonderful country we inherited from history? My reasons include: The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." Please preserve our history and don't destroy it for the sake of short term cash.	PA	04-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Blackwell	Lee	I object to the redevelopment as a regular user of this station. I honestly can't see how the suggested changes benefit anyone other than the developer. It is a beautiful station with good access. It does become crowded at peak times but this is something you see at all the other stations across London so this is not an issue for construction. Please do not lose what makes London special in a quest for what you call improvement and also the tactics of asking people if they want better lifts/more toilets without highlighting the full set of changes is deeply suspect.	PA	04-Jul-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Mitchell	Colin	I object to this application which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: . The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof of the concourse and its replacement with a new structure, which would also compromise the setting of the 19th century train shed. The insertion of large amounts of new retail units in the 19th century train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning 19th century hotel in the City - through the construction of a twenty-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low-and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches and nearby St Botolph's church. The National Planning Policy Framework, Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." In my view there is no exceptional reason for this development. .	PA	04-Jul-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Carrette	Susan	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: * The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. * The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. * The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. * The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. In addition I would remind you that the National Planning Policy Framework itself is clear that such developments should only be in very exceptional circumstances and not automatic or the norm. Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional."	PA	04-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Caronna	Alice	I oppose the project. Don't think it's a suitable proposal and would cause enormous disruption	PA	04-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Searle	Holly	I object to the plans to build this proposed building. I object because its construction will not add any improvements, it will cause irreversible damage and hard to the heritage of this building. The proposal to remodel the surrounding property is not conducive to the current market trend of the failing high street consumerism. I urge you to abolish these intension and conserve the history of the building and its heritage.	PA	04-Jul-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Gadd	Condell	I object. Reference Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional. I have been a regular commuter into London from Suffolk and have always been an admirer of this beautiful, light and airy station: to make the changes proposed would be a travesty. I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church.	PA	04-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Russell	James	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: The demolition and covering of the Concourse Roof with a tower block. This will remove the natural lighting in the station making it much darker and destroying the beautiful look of the station. The addition of extensive additional retail units within the station causing harm to the Grade II building The addition of a 20 Storey office building right next to the Grade II listed hotel (Andaz) with a large structure so close to this building as well as the station itself. The proposed scheme would result in substantial harm to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area through the introduction of a tall building that is fundamentally at odds with the area's established character of low- and medium-rise structures. This directly contravenes the City of London's 2015 City Plan, which explicitly calls for the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate locations-including within Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights Policy Area-where they would detract from heritage significance. As a user of Liverpool Street Station I find it very disappointing that the custodians (Network Rail) want to decimate the beautiful station in such a way. We do not want another Euston station here (Dark and not welcoming, which Liverpool Steet Station is neither).	PA	04-Jul-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Pearce	Ben	As the former Historic Buildings Officer for LB Tower Hamlets and the East End, I am writing in personal capacity to object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of this nationally important heritage asset. More specifically, I raise objections to substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last ongoing C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. This grossly over-developed and unnecessary scheme (there are many unlet empty offices nearby) would cause substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building, also contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which should see the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated heritage assets in the City, Tower Hamlets and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. The National Planning Policy Framework (pp NPPF 213) states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." As a result, this scheme must be scrapped.	PA	04-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Upcraft	Philip	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically I raise objections to: - The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. - The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. - Thr impact to the setting of listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. - The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St. Botolph's church.	PA	04-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Cox	Andrew	I object to this application on the grounds that it will cause irreparable damage to a building that is historic, attractive and - despite previous redevelopment - still very impressive. The proposed development is out of keeping and will damage and diminish what is already there. Liverpool Street Station is light, bright, and a pleasure to use - this work is unnecessary.	PA	04-Jul-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Kefford	Paul	I wish to OBJECT to this application for demolitions and alterations in and around Liverpool Street Station. I write in a personal capacity but for transparency declare I am a former Trustee of a national amenity society, Historic Buildings and Places. I consider the proposals would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets contrary Paragraph NPPF 213 where "substantial harm to or loss of (a) grade II listed buildings... should be exceptional. The test for exceptionality has not been met. More specifically, I object to: The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which inter alia would also compromise the setting of the surviving 19C train shed. The proposed alterations and insertions within these train sheds causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The erosion of the sense of place and the impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets, in particular, the substantial harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. The proposed tall building is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area.	PA	04-Jul-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Pooley	Matthew	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional. More specifically, I raise objections to: The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church.	PA	04-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Hulme	David	I object to the destruction of a historic building for monetary gains. The disruption to the rail network is unacceptable you say you need more money but give away millions to shareholders in the sold off portions of the rail network and build vanity projects wasting billions on them, yet can't pay for upkeep of a major rail hub.	PA	04-Jul-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Dunham	Lynda	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. With particular reference to the National Planning Policy Framework Paragraph NPPF 213 which states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." More specifically, I raise objections to: * The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. * The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. * The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. * The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. I strongly object to these plans, which would not only block precious light but also desecrate this beautiful building - a cherished piece of our architectural and cultural heritage.	PA	04-Jul-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Basham	Alan	I am writing to object to planning application for Liverpool Street Station 25/00494/FULEIA This inappropriate plan would do immense harm to the culturally and historically significant listed assets of the railway station, train shed, hotel, the surrounding conservation area and the area and views at large. Liverpool Street railway station is Grade II listed. These plans would cause enormous damage to the station, the concourse and the nineteenth century train sheds through the demolition of the existing roof and the addition of many retail units. These actions would cause irreparable loss of culturally significant heritage assets. The hotel, a Grade II* asset and the last continuously occupied nineteenth century hotel in London, would be severely compromised in setting by the enormous proposed tower. This tower would impact not only on the Grade II station and shed, the Grade II* hotel but also on the surrounding area and the heritage of this unique streetscape. The Bishopsgate Conservation Area is characterised by low and medium height buildings. The enormity of this inappropriate scheme is in direct contradiction of the 2015 City Plan, a plan which requires refusal of tall buildings in inappropriate areas. Numerous cultural and heritage assets such as St Botolph's Church and various Christopher Wren churches would also be impacted. These plans are not in line with the National Planning Policy Framework which states in paragraph 213: "Substantial harm to or loss of Grade II listed buildings, or Grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." Whenever I've been to Liverpool Street Station and the surrounding area I've known where I am, it feels different, not just a concrete and glass box that could be anything, anywhere. A beautiful, unique area would be destroyed by the wanton vandalism of a generic block unceremoniously dumped onto a nineteenth century masterpiece. We must protect and cherish our nationally important historic assets.	PA	04-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Reid	Allyson	Significant impact on conservation area, and commuters into an already busy regional railway station. Daily impact on people, while focusing on profit is appalling. Thousand of people use this important link between work and home and major works at the station will be highly detrimental to the well being of commuters	PA	04-Jul-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Derouineau	Marion	I object to this planning application, as per the National Planning Policy Framework, Paragraph NPPF 213 which states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." I object specifically to: The plans to demolish the roof structure of the existing station concourse to replace with a new structure. The current roof is a beautiful heritage that should be preserved. The addition of new retail units including the addition of two elevated retail galleries, which would compromise the special interest of the Grade II listed heritage asset. The station and its adjoining shopping centre already offer a lot of retail options, including the nearby area of Spitalfields. We do not need more retail spaces. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. And as a resident of East London who visits the station and its area weekly, I would find that the addition of another tall and imposing building replacing the open sky above the station to be gruelling. The beauty and attraction of the Liverpool Street area resides precisely in its blend of old and new.	PA	04-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Waterston	Kirstie	Dear sirs, I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: The harm caused to a grade II listed station concourse, therefore diminishing the heritage of the structure. This would also cause harm to the grade II* listed hotel. This office building seems entirely unnecessary, I don't understand why the developer feels it necessary to compromise a historic structure. We are terrible at celebrating and cherishing built heritage in this country. These kinds of office blocks can be thrown up anywhere, but stations like Liverpool Street will never be built again. We should be protecting our beautiful old buildings from our diminishing stock of railway heritage whose lifespan has already far outweighed modern buildings. Please do the right thing and value heritage value over monetary value.	PA	04-Jul-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Perry	Anne	I HUGELY object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. I specifically raise objections to the significant harm that this building project would cause to the Grade-II listed structure, including the amount of natural light it receives (Grand Central Station in NYC having lost all its light in the 1950s and 60s for this reason). I also object because of the substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. Paragraph 213 of the National Planning Policy Framework states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." The changes proposed here are in direct contravention of the NPPF. It is incumbent upon the City of London to protect our city and our national heritage.	PA	04-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Collins	John	I strongly support this proposal. It will bring much needed capacity to Britain's busiest railway station and enable the railway to grow and serve the wider regional and national economy. The proposed approach sensibly capitalises on opportunities to generate third party funding for this scheme, reducing the call on taxpayer resources to ensure its successful delivery. The City of London is an international economic hub - not a museum - and must evolve and grow as it adapts to an increasingly challenging economic climate. Investing in the City's busiest rail station is essential to secure its future.	PA	04-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Shearer	Ann	I write as someone who uses Liverpool Street Station very frequently. This proposal seems to me sheer vandalism . The unnceccary destruction of the 1991 award-winning concourse, harm to the Grade 11 listed hotel (the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the city); the overpowering of the entire station area - so busy and crowded and needing all the calm it can get - by yet one more giant tower; the substantial harm to the Bishopsgate Conserviation area by the erection of that tower. And for what? Yet more crowded office space to the detriment of those who work and live in the area? Yet more opportunities to shop and drink coffee in an area that already has quite enough of them? Please- strike a blow for sane living, making the city as spacious and attractive as it can be, and reject this relentless pursuit of gain and greed. The National Planning Policy Framework, par.NPPF 213:states:' Substantial harm to or loss of:a) GRTade 11 listed buildings, or grade 11 registered parks of gardenbs, should be exceptional'. There is nothing ' exceptional' in this application that jusifies its acceptancer. Please refuse it.	PA	04-Jul-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Weller	Tim	The proposal significantly threatens the heritage and amenity asset of this building which has previously been spared by overwhelming public support for its preservation. The architectural, aesthetic and purely practical components of the current building threatened by the loss of important period features, historic relics, internal height and natural light - at the expense of unnecessary commercial and retail opportunity. Whilst the practical requirement for internal height in the original building is no longer a contemporary need, reduced headroom as proposed introduces a closed-in and claustrophobic dimension to users of the space. This negative impact is enhanced by proposed dramatic loss of natural light ingress to the concourse by construction of a tower above it. The tower itself will cast a shadow across the overglazed platform area reducing light levels particularly to certain platforms which already suffer low natural illumination. The application is silent about forward provision for historic relics not reused in the proposed design. With respect to those which are, the re-location of some items is at best imprecise. For those to whom these items have meaning beyond their mere presence, re-location is of significance. The destruction of 50 Liverpool Street, with its fine architectural forms, to make way for the development is nothing short of abhorrent. Decision-makers should be minded of the salvation of this building from WW1 attack, and then saving from British Rail's proposal to develop the site. Sir John Betjeman and Sir Spike Milligan campaigned to garner huge public support to preserve the building and trigger its listed status as a railway and architecturally significant structure. The impact of demolition of the building simply traumatises the existing complementary trinity of rail shed, concourse and Great Eastern Hotel. A truly awful legacy for developers, Londoners, visitors and commuters if approved; an historical disaster.	PA	04-Jul-25	O
Page 560 25/00494/FULEIA	White	Sally	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to the substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional."	PA	04-Jul-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Dinsmore	Sarah	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to irreplaceable heritage assets: the Grade II Listed Liverpool Street Station, Grade II* listed Great Eastern Hotel and the Bishopsgate Conservation Area. More specifically, I object to: - The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed Liverpool Street Station which would be caused by the construction of a 97m/19 storey speculative office building over the station concourse. - Substantial harm to the interior of the station by the demolition of the roof structure of the concourse and its replacement with a new structure compromising the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. - Substantial harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II listed 19th C train sheds by insertion of two elevated galleries providing accommodation for multiple chain retail units. - The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets; specifically, the construction of a 97 m/19 storey speculative office block over the station concourse which would overwhelm the adjacent Grade II*listed Great Eastern Hotel and cause substantial harm to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area in which it sits. - The damaging impact the scheme would have on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets - in particular the Grade II* listed Church of St Botolph Without Bishopsgate. - The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) paragraph 213 states: "Any harm to, or loss of, the significance of a designated heritage asset (from its alteration or destruction, or from development within its setting), should require clear and convincing justification. Substantial harm to or loss of: (a) grade II listed building should be exceptional (b)assets of the highest significance - including grade II* listed buildings - should be wholly exceptional. The application provides no such justification.	PA	04-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Sawkill	Peter	I object to the proposal partly because of the effect it would have on a listed building but also because of the effect on the surroundings, especially the Great Eastern Hotel. The excuse that the station is inadequate in its present form has no real merit. Indeed the reasons behind the proposal seem to be financial gain for a few, not public good.	PA	04-Jul-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Wilson	Clare	To whom it may concern; I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. And will also probably be a complete pain for my already tiresome commute. More specifically, I raise objections to the following issues: - The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. - The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. - The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. - The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. With reference the National Planning Policy Framework, Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." I'm sure improvements can be made, but more sensitive to the stations heritage. Kind regards, C Wilson	PA	04-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Sanz	Debbie	It's our British heritage I object to this application, as it causes substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. It would be visually intrusive and impact negatively on the surrounding buildings and Bishopsgate conservation area. Designs of this type become dated quickly and costly to maintain. More specifically, I raise objections to the impact on the adjacent Grade II* listed hotel which is the last continually functioning 19th century hotel in the city of London. The proposed construction is totally disproportionate to its surround. The 2015 city plan specifically prohibits the construction of tall buildings in inappropriate areas such as conservation areas. Paragraph NPPF213 states that substantial harm or loss of grade II listed buildings should be exceptional. This is not.	PA	04-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Blore	Katie	Disruption and negative impact on historical site	PA	04-Jul-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Barber	Samantha	I Object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. I believe that the proposals fall foul of the National Planning Policy Framework, specifically Paragraph NPPF 213 which states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional."	PA	04-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Christodoulou	Christina	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. I highlight paragraph NPPF 213 which states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." More specifically, raise objections to the demolition of the roof structure which is quite beautiful and airy. I also object to the proposed addition of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. We have enough tall generic architecturally poor buildings in central London without the need for more.	PA	04-Jul-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Daffern	Adrian	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to the loss/modification to a building constructed when the railway proprietors took pride in providing imposing and interesting buildings through which their passengers could be transferred to cabs etc. in comfort protected from the elements. I note that Sir John Betjeman was part a group who successfully stopped redevelopment of this station some years ago. Have the arguments changed? Will you demolish Brunel's Paddington? I think not! I lived and worked in west London before retirement for 40 years. I noted how much of interesting and attractive architecture has been lost. I believe Network Rail might spend their time in relacing dodgy points and signals, redesigning overhead catenaries which even when new seem fall down and which seem to cause most train delays these days.	PA	04-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Girdwood	Allan	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church.	PA	04-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Sealy	Stephen	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally-important heritage assets, especially the substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station and its replacement with a new structure which would also compromiose the setting of the surviving 19th-century train shed.	PA	04-Jul-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Moore	Richard	I object to this application, which would substantially harm the significance of important heritage assets in London. In particular, I raise objections to: - harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure - compromise of the setting of the surviving train shed - impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets, in particular the Great Eastern Hotel - substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas. Reference to the National Planning Policy Framework, paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional."	PA	04-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Mott	Nick	I object to this application. I believe this would cause substantial harm to nationally important heritage sites. I have the following concerns: 1. there would be substantial impact on the surrounding listed sites. In particular if the construction of a 20 storey tower is permitted, there would be significant harm to the adjacent 19th century Great Eastern Hotel. 2. The station (a listed building) itself would suffer substantial harm because of the demolition of the roof structure of the station concourse and its replacement by a new roof structure. It would also compromise the setting of the 19th century shed. 3. there would be substantial harm caused to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area. The current area is largely comprised of low / medium rise buildings. Planting a 20 storey tower in this area would totally destroy this and would act as a precedent to further such inappropriate development. There are enough such tall buildings further along Bishopsgate. Please let's restrict them to that area. The scheme would be contrary to the 2015 City Plan which requires refusal for tall buildings in inappropriate areas. The Bishopsgate Conservation Area is one such area. 4. I have lived and worked in London all my life and use Liverpool St regularly. It is an old friend. The 1980 development was proportionate and fitting. Permitting this totally disproportionate development would be a betrayal of a great heritage asset: a modern station set within a heritage envelope. Please do not allow this to happen. Once gone, it's gone forever. 5. My objections are made by reference to para 213 of the National Planning Policy Guidance which requires substantial harm to grade II listed buildings to be exceptional. This is not an exceptional case.	PA	04-Jul-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Houlton	Jayne	I object to this application which will cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets, it will also compromise existing listed buildings in the area around it Paragraph NPPF 213 states "substantial loss: a grade 11 listed buildings or grade 11 registered parks and gardens should be exceptional " so therefore the reasoning is that this is not	PA	04-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Deards	John	I object to this application since it would cause substantial harm to the significance of a nationally important heritage asset. Specifically the demolition of the roof structure of the existing concourse which would damage a Grade II listed building The harm it would do to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area The work is contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework	PA	04-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Bueno de Mesquita	Nicholas	I object to the proposed development of Liverpool Street Station on the following grounds -detrimental effect on a fine listed Victorian railway station. The record suggests that sensitive development can ensure the functioning of old stations - examples include King's Cross and St Pancras.. This development is destructive in the shameful tradition Euston -the detrimental impact is on both exterior , where the older building will be dominated by new development, and on the concourse, which will be substantially altered.	PA	04-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	de Boissieu	Anne-Camille	Hi, I object to this application which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to the height, mass and style of the proposed development . Liverpool Street is such a historical landmark and it would be a shame to see it covered.	PA	04-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	de Boissieu	Jean-Sebastien	Dear Madam, dear Sir, I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important national assets. More specifically I raise objection to: - It would harm a grade II listed building and alter it quite significantly in a disruptive and disproportionate way. As per the National Planning Policy Framework clearly states on Paragraph NPPF 213 : "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." - It would alter the harmony of the conservation area and I don't feel such a tall development would respect the philosophy and be appropriate in this area, already suffocating between tall buildings. Best regards, JSB	PA	04-Jul-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	SULLIVAN	MARK	Liverpool Street station is an attractive London terminus which is easy to use and has a light and bright concourse, with natural light. I pass through occasionally. The major work undertaken by British Rail Network SouthEast in the 1990s conserved the station's historic character which making it suitable for the 21st century, and was highly successful. Liverpool Street and its surroundings are one of the most walkable parts of the City and are pleasant to be in. This ambience would be lost with a high office block over the listed structure and the loss of natural light. The concourse is not congested and does not need changing. Passenger flow through the station is lower than before 2022 when the Elizabeth Line was opened. The Shenfield (GE Main line) suburban service no longer uses Liverpool Street (except for a few peak-hour trains). And many users of some other lines, who formerly passed through Liverpool St, now instead change between those services and the Eliz Line at Stratford.	PA	04-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Dalton	James	I wish to object to Liverpool Street Station planning application 25/00494/FULEIA. These plans are inappropriate in size and scope and would do enormous damage to the listed station, train sheds and the associated hotel and area. The station is a wonderful light and airy place, with natural light streaming in through the C19th train sheds. One feels a sense of space and relaxation that is unique in a London terminus. The proposal would rob station users of this setting and feeling. The monolithic tower block would cause enormous harm to the grade II* hotel and surrounding conservation area. The grade II station is a fine example of C19th aesthetic as is the grade II* hotel. They are suited to their surroundings. The Bishopsgate Conservation Area would be severely impacted by this incongruous scheme as would surrounding heritage assets such as St Botolph's Church and many Christopher Wren churches. These listed buildings would be significantly compromised in setting. I implore you to refuse this application. It would cause immense harm to listed assets and culturally significant buildings in a sensitive conservation area. It does not meet the National Planning Policy Framework (paragraph 213) or the 2015 City Plan. We cannot allow our heritage assets to be destroyed like this. Thank you for your time and consideration.	PA	04-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Tulunay	Harun	This is a historical area which has been heart of the community. These changes will erase the soul of the neighbourhood. I strongly object as someone who is living here and using Liverpool Street regularly. Liverpool street should be kept as it is.	PA	04-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Mott	Caroline	The historical building should be maintained for the future. There is no need to make a bigger concourse.	PA	04-Jul-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Burel	Violaine	I object to this application which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: . The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof of the concourse and its replacement with a new structure, which would also compromise the setting of the 19th century train shed. The insertion of large amounts of new retail units in the 19th century train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning 19th century hotel in the City - through the construction of a twenty-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low-and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches and nearby St Botolph's church. I want to refer you to the National Planning Policy Framework, Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional."	PA	04-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Shepherd	Alison	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. This is a railway station, a listed building; the prime purpose for any development should be to improve and enhance the railway station in the interests of passengers, also respecting the integrity of the building. The application is for a parasitical development which does not respect the listed building, and in which the railway interests are secondary and seem poorly thought out.	PA	04-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Farrington	Helena	Rail disruptions and chaos, noise,	PA	04-Jul-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Woodhead	Catherine	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. To reference the National Planning Policy Framework: Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." This isn't!! And from an environmental perspective we don't need more tall buildings trapping the pollution in this area. I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important h	PA	04-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Alexander	Jacqui	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of a nationally important heritage asset and also compromise existing listed buildings around it, in the middle of a Conservation Area. The station's architectural integrity will be dwarfed outside by this glass behemoth towering over it, and also be damaged inside by the demolition of the roof and its replacement. The integrity of the 19th century train sheds will be further compromised by the introduction of large numbers of retail units and elevated retail galleries. The 'gothic' arch entryway is hideous in the extreme and looks ridiculous. There is enough office space in and around this area without having to build above a heritage rail station. Surrounding heritage assets, such as the last continually functioning 19th century hotel (Grade II listed), will be impacted by the construction work and building of a 20 storey tower. Connect this with the 2015 City Plan that requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas - in Conservation Areas and the St Paul's Cathedral Heights area. This is also in the midst of the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, an area of low to medium scale buildings. The disruption to traffic and pedestrian flow and train passengers during this project will be substantial. Any residents in the area will have to live through this significant disruption. It will also raise noise levels significantly during construction (which will obviously affect those offices already in the area who won't be too pleased) and introduce more building construction pollution to the area. This is currently a beautiful, light and airy building that sits appropriately in its surroundings. If this development is allowed to happen in its current form then it will allow 'creeping' inappropriate development in the heritage area around Liverpool Street Station. Paragraph NPPF 213 of the National Planning Policy Framework states: "Substantial harm to o	PA	04-Jul-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Woods	Martin	As a regular traveller into Liverpool Street Station, a City Churchwarden, a Freeman of the City of London and serving on numerous City based committees, together with a concern for the preservation of the City's history and development, I strongly object to the present proposals which I consider would destroy the current character of the whole building and its surrounding area. In short, it represents an unwelcome over development of an important listed building which will do nothing to improve the environment for both those arriving by train, and also those walking on foot to the station. I would hope that the proposals, as they currently are, will be completely scrapped.	PA	04-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Clements	Marie	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." The station's historic architecture is valued by national and international visitors and users. Spitalfields shops and their trade may well be affected by new retail at Liverpool St station: By way of transparency I work for a national amenity society. Signed Marie Clements	PA	04-Jul-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Wills	Magnus	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. I would refer to National Planning Policy Framework Paragraph NPPF 213 which states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the d	PA	04-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Selwyn	Alan	This grossly disproportionate and disrespectful piece of trash in the name of architecture is an abomination. It destroys the sensitively restored listed station and neighbouring buildings with something so out of scale and character as to defy words. To destroy our environment for speculative profit without any merit or return for the public turns London into a ghastly morgue. It must be refused or else the developers will try other crass interventions - maybe a skywards extension over St Paul's?	PA	04-Jul-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Wills	Magnus	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. I would refer to National Planning Policy Framework Paragraph NPPF 213 which states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the d	PA	04-Jul-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Clements	Jennifer	Dear Sir/Madam, I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: - The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. - The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. - The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. Please note Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." Our industrial heritage is important.	PA	04-Jul-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Clements	John	Dear Mr Sleigh and Committee Members, I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: 1) The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. 2) The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. 3) The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. 4) Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." Our Railway heritage is crucial to the history of this country. Please refuse this planning application. Thank you.	PA	04-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Auclair	Philippe	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to a nationally important heritage asset. There is no justification to what would amount to the destruction of a unique Grade II listed London landmark, starting with its roof and its concourse. Improving accessibility to the station is possible without wrecking the site and the surrounding Conservation Area as the proposal would do. As is stated in Paragraph 213 of the National Planning Policy Framework, "substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional.". It is unjustifiable in this case.	PA	04-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Bricker	Celyn	I object to this development on account of its destruction of the existing Victorian architecture, and also on account of the dubious method by which letters of support have been gathered. As a resident who frequently uses the station I object to both the many years of disruption and destruction of a valuable part of our Victorian heritage, to be replaced by office blocks that will need replacing in a few decades.	PA	04-Jul-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Fournet	Emilie	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: The demolition of the station's historic roof structure, which would result in the loss of a defining architectural element of the Grade II-listed Liverpool Street Station. Its replacement with a new, incompatible structure would not only diminish the integrity of the original design but also undermine the character of the station as a whole. The insertion of elevated retail galleries within the 19th-century train sheds, which would significantly alter the visual and spatial experience of the historic interior. The extent and scale of these new commercial elements would erode the special interest and architectural coherence of this protected structure. The proposed 20-storey tower over the station concourse, which would severely compromise the setting of the adjacent Grade II*-listed former Great Eastern Hotel - the last continuously functioning 19th-century hotel in the City. This tower would dominate the heritage skyline and distort the historic urban context of the area. The detrimental impact on the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, which is characterised by its low- to medium-scale development and historic fabric. A tall building of this scale is wholly inappropriate here and directly conflicts with the policies set out in the City of London's 2015 City Plan. Moreover, the development would intrude upon key views and the settings of multiple heritage assets, including Grade I-listed churches by Christopher Wren and nearby St Botolph's. In accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), I draw your attention to Paragraph 213, which states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." This proposal clearly entails substantial harm to Grade II and Grade II*-listed buildings and fails to meet the "exc	PA	04-Jul-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Auclair	Sarah	I strongly object to this application and consider it would cause significant harm to a nationally important building. Liverpool Street Station is a main gateway to London from both within the UK and with direct links to Stansted Airport, is the first place that many overseas visitors will arrive into London. Any alteration will greatly harm this magnificent building and the surrounding conservation area. The demolition of the roof structure of the the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure would cause substantial harm to the Grade 11 listed station and would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. Liverpool Street Station has many original features of special architectural interest and these would be greatly harmed by the insertion of extensive amounts of high level retail galleries. There would be significant harmful impact to the surrounding listed heritage assets, namely the Grade 11 listed hotel, of historic importance through the construction of a 20 storey tower over the station concourse and cause significant loss of natural daylight within the station itself. The imposition of such a tall building would cause substantial harm to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area which is characterised by low to medium scale buildings. This is country to the 2015 City Plan which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in conservation areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. There are many heritage assets in the City and beyond whose setting would be negatively impacted by a tall building destroying the skyline. The proposal is in contradiction to the National Planning Policy Framework. Paragraph NPPF 213 which states : "substantial harm to or loss of a grade 11 listed buildings, or grade 11 registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional"	PA	04-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Robins	David	I object to this application. Liverpool Street station is part of the national heritage, my heritage. Network Rail must leave the listed building alone and respect its setting. The requirements of national policy, as set out in NPPF paras. 202 to 221, are not met.	PA	04-Jul-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Hatton-Gore	Robin	I wish to OBJECT to the: City of London: Application Reference: 25/00494/FULEIA. The Proposal will irrevocably harm a cherished London landmark for no defensible purpose. It will pile on top of this important fully functioning, historic building, casting a dismal prospect of its everyday travellers. It will grossly overshadow the neighbourhood which contains historically significant and beautiful buildings and businesses that deserve better consideration, casting them into an overbearing gloom. The character of the train sheds and station interior will be chronically undermined with poorly judged retail infilling. The Bishopsgate Conservation Area will be further damaged by excessive, ill-considered development. The historic Station and its former integral and listed Station Hotel will be further disjointed. The iconic views of the City's sacred architecture - such as the Wren churches - will be damaged needlessly. The design being proposed is ugly and crass. The City of London's planning department are custodians of a precious resource, a built environment of historic, world renowned. They need to protect it from such mindless cashing in. This thriving area will face a decade of disruption. I urge the planning committee to reject this abject development proposal.	PA	04-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Moyse	Kathy	I use LST on a regular basis. It is a beautiful building and totally fit for purpose as it is!	PA	04-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Price	Janie	I object on the grounds of building conservation. As a Specialist Conservation Architect I have rarely come across a scene that so vehemently disrespects the host building. It completely flies in the face of conservation principles and would destroy a significant heritage asset and its setting. As a local resident and long-time regular visitor to the station and passer-by through to Spitalfields, this proposal would ruin the experience. It would be gross over development of the site and an eyesore from afar. I would go along with further comments made by the Victorian Society and SAVE in strong objection to this scheme.	PA	04-Jul-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Peacock	Richard	To whom it may concern, London Liverpool Street is my local station. I use it dozens of times per month. I travel from Hackney Downs Station to attend many events in the city of London, including numerous weekly attendances at Mary Moorfields Catholic Church in Eldon Street (five minutes walking distance from Liverpool Street Station), to go to the Bishopsgate Institute where I've studied Mandarin and go to the library many times per month, to volunteer at Artizan Street library, and to transit to the Elizabeth Line and London Underground. I consider it to be the best station in London, retaining both old charm and efficient use, including my regular use of Broadgate Circle for dining and cafes. I am aghast that it could be ripped apart and ruined. Have we learned nothing from how all stations have been treated in London? Is the destruction of Euston, on the one hand, and the preservation and sensitive redevelopment of Kings Cross and Saint Pancras, on the other hand, not lessons enough? Must sell proper developers destroy rather than create and preserve? Is life measured only in pounds, shillings and pence? The station has served me since I was a young man, moving to London in 1990. Now, as I approach retirement, I implore you not to ruin a beautiful old station with ugly and shortsighted greed.	PA	04-Jul-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Bone	Nathan	to whom it may concern, I strongly object to the demolition of this structure. London is known for its wide architectural diversity and this wonderful example of Victorian design is simply something to be marvelled and cherished! To replace it with a 'modern' solution risks losing part of our diversity and risks us losing something spectacular for the future generations come. While I work in construction and understand commercial needs - and appreciate sometimes it is probably easier to demolish than to refurbish; to simply sweep away our past highlights a lack of responsibility on behalf of the building owners not to have looked after it appropriately over many years. They are guilty of abusing the legacy it was handed and guilty of neglecting the needs of the building over many decades. Having past through the station many times over the years I have always been charmed by its faded splendour but left impressed that a structure that is well over 100 years old still manages to blend form / structure and function in one solid design. It surprises me that this structure is escaping any form of listed protection and feels it urgently requires 'listed' status to safeguard its survival. Until then I call upon yourselves to review the planning application with scrutiny and ensure you understand what London, the UK; along with current and future generations stand to lose if this application is approved. Therefore, knowing what is at stake I strongly oppose this application in favour of retaining the current structure along with encouraging the building owners to restore and renovate the building fabric.	PA	04-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	O'Sullivan	James	A grotesque development ruining a historical building all in the name of some greedy developers. The way the campaign for it has been run also has been very misleading to the public and the development above the station is really awful. History must be preserved and the station must be saved - we will look back on this in 40 years like we do now about Euston or Charing Cross/Fenchurch Street. Stations ruined by redevelopment of buildings above	PA	04-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Davey	Katherine	I object to this ugly and unnecessary application which will ruin a beautiful station and take natural light away from the concourse. Access for the disabled can and should be facilitated without the need for a hideous office block on top of the station. Both the Victorian and 1980s parts of the stations are beautiful and work well together. This application and the previous one have been disingenuously presented, instructive and ugly facades have been withheld from the public and the old application has been deliberately left live to give the impression that objections to the Herzog building suffice and will still be counted. The figures for crowding have been massaged to include those who change between underground lines and do not go near the concourse. Disabled access needs urgent attention, can be effected without the office block and with removal of a few shops at minimal expense. All station users, including those requiring disability access, will be massively inconvenienced by a decade of disruption to their journeys with no public benefit at the end. A miserable, sunless concourse and the tokenism of yet another sky garden. The City of London has no regard for the history or heritage of its buildings or the pleasure that residents and workers have for the same.	PA	04-Jul-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Butler	Samantha	Commuting can be hellish at the best of times, especially when there are delays. What makes it bearable is the natural light and beautiful architecture of this station. Do not turn it into the awful Euston. Natural light is important and there are too many vacant profit-centric buildings in the city already. People don't visit London for the glass blocks. They visit for the history and architecture.	PA	04-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Horsia	Claudiu	For the attention of Tom Sleight, Chair of the Planning & Transport Committee. Regarding Planning Application 25/00494/FULEIA I am writing to register my strong objection to the proposed redevelopment of Liverpool Street Station, which I believe would cause significant and irreversible harm to nationally important heritage assets. In particular, I object to the following aspects of the scheme: - The demolition of the existing roof structure over the station concourse, a key feature of the Grade II-listed station, and its replacement with a new structure that would also undermine the visual integrity and historic setting of the surviving 19th-century train shed. - The insertion of extensive retail units within the 19th-century train sheds, including two large, elevated retail galleries. These additions would erode the architectural character and special historic interest of the listed station interior. - The impact on the setting of nearby listed buildings, most notably the Grade II*-listed Great Eastern Hotel - the last continuously operating 19th-century railway hotel in the City. The proposal to construct a 20-storey tower above the station concourse would overwhelm this building and diminish its prominence and historical context. - The damage to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, an area defined by a fine urban grain and predominantly low- to mid-rise buildings. The scale and form of the proposed tower is wholly inappropriate in this setting and directly contravenes the 2015 City Plan, which advises against tall buildings in conservation areas and in protected view corridors, such as those affecting St Paul's Cathedral. - The broader impact on the historic environment, including the setting of numerous designated and non-designated heritage assets across the City and beyond - such as several Grade I-listed Christopher Wren churches and the nearby St Botolph's Church. - Furthermore, the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF, paragraph 213) makes clear that:	PA	04-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Mendelblat	Andrew	I'm opposed to the design. In place of the airy station which is attractive for visitors and with natural light in keeping with the station's Victorian heritage, the construction of an overshadowing office building will be ugly and will make the station a gloomy place. It will not be a good advertisement to people arriving in the city from abroad.	PA	04-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Mendelblat	Michael	I object to the structure. Overbuilding is a mistake. The proposed structure detracts from the historic buildings and causes harm to the historic structure under the National Planning Policy Framework due to loss of natural lighting and compromising the 19th century overall roofs by removing a structure carefully designed to be in keeping with them.	PA	04-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Hughes	Em	I object to the proposals suggested - this building needs to be preserved for future generations it is a beautiful structure of huge value - stop destroying beautiful buildings.	PA	04-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Rodgers	Fred	Is there any reason why the submitted tree assessment methodology statement should relate to Victoria Embankment and not Liverpool Street Station? https://www.planning2.cityoflondon.gov.uk/online-applications/files/4803C88268DCBB18D796B8D9EED1994E/pdf/25_00494_FULEIA-LIVSS.01_LIVERPOOL_STREET_STATION_HERITAGE_IMPACT_ASSESSMENT_MARCH_2025_PT_3_1_-1635728.pdf	PA	04-Jul-25	R

25/00494/FULEIA	Terry	Richard	I travel through the station very regularly. The station concourse is a great space. It is sometimes busy but always works, so why compromise its function and delight for this over-sized new development?	PA	04-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Velluet	Paul	ROAD, ST MARGARET'S, TWICKENHAM, T.W.1. 1.R.E. 1. I write in an independent capacity as a Freeman of the City of London; as a chartered architect with over forty years' experience specialising in the conservation, alteration and extension of listed and other historic buildings and in the design and development of new buildings and spaces in historic areas; working in both private practice and the public sector, including serving as English Heritage's Regional Architect for London between 1991 and 2004, and in past years as a member of the RIBA's Planning and National Awards Groups. 2. I have carefully studied relevant parts of the extensive material submitted on behalf of Network Rail Infrastructure Ltd. in support of the current applications for Planning Permission and Listed Building Consent, including the drawings and illustrative information, and, in particular, Newmark Gerald Eve's Town Planning Statement; ACME Architects' Design and Access Statement; Donald Insall Associates' Heritage Impact Statement; Donald Insall Associates' Chapter 8 - Built Heritage in Volume 1 of the Environmental Statement and Donald Insall Associates' Townscape, Visual and Built Heritage Impact Assessment in Volume 2 of the Environmental Statement. I have long been familiar with the listed Station, the adjacent, grade II* listed Great Eastern Hotel (now branded The Andaz Hotel), the Bishopsgate Conservation Area and adjacent parts of the City, Islington, Hackney and Tower Hamlets. 3. Having now carefully considered the submitted material, I conclude that the project, by virtue of the height, bulk and massing of a key part of the development and the design and extent of the proposed alterations to the listed Station, is fundamentally misconceived in architectural, urban design and conservation terms and, if approved and implemented, will result in substantial and unjustified harm to the special architectural and historic interest, significance and setting of the listed Station; to th	PA	04-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Stern	Sonja	Desttroying architecturally important property- last thing London needs is another empty architectural blight on its landscape	PA	05-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Haynes	J	Unnecessary and appalling destruction of a fine Victorian restoration. Major disruption to travel on roads adjacent and trains from the station by long term works. Inconvenience to those living and working nearby with long term phased plans which will stretch far into the future. There are far more important infrastructure and running issues to fix before spending billions on this proposal.	PA	05-Jul-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Reading	Kate	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. The National Planning Policy Framework 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." Yours sincerely, K reading	PA	05-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Oliver	Seline	It's obvious to people who care about buildings, heritage, natural light, how devastating this pointless plan is. The public have a right to say no. It's just as much their station. A station I've commuted to in over 40 years. You've already attempted to ruin it. Taking out independent shops and now eateries this station should be left alone now. Look at Glasgow Central and that's beautiful. London want to destroy. Sickening, stupid and no doubt money is behind it.	PA	05-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Younger	Clare	I object to this development which would cause substantial harm to a significant historical asset in relation to Paragraph NPPF 213 which states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." It is out of scale, oversized, and inappropriate and would spoil a beautifully restored building. This would better be built elsewhere to spread business opportunities out across the country. Encourage greedy lazy developers to make use of existing buildings and brownfield sites to reduce the carbon footprint.	PA	05-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Blackburn	Richard	I object to the suggested redevelopment of Liverpool Street station. The scheme negatively impacts a classic victorian London station by swallowing it in a modern office block. There is no need to sabotage our history like this. Liverpool St station is perfectly functional as it is, and real beauty. Please do not go ahead with this planned work.	PA	05-Jul-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Pevreall	Eileen	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." And this most certainly is not . I am extremely disappointed in the city's ability to think about the residents of the city as they continuously seek profit over our heritage and quality of life for residents and the public.	PA	05-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Scott	Kirsten	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. The National Planning Policy Framework, Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." Liverpool Street Station works well, is a beautiful building and must be protected from these terrible plans.	PA	05-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Pollock	Andrea	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to the unnecessary stripping away of valuable heritage that needs to be preserved for future generations. The proposals are not in keeping with the current buildings and would dwarf the beauty and elegance of this building. The plans to improve need to put the building at the heart of any development and swallow it up.i strongly object.	PA	05-Jul-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Dixon	Joanna	This area has been a constant construction zone since I moved here. Bit by bit, every trace of history and culture is being destroyed, replaced by generic, unattractive high-rises that loom over everything and block out natural light at street level. The environment has become so harsh that no wildlife can survive here. The sound of construction and machinery fills the air every time I open my window- it's unbearable. The thought that Liverpool Street Station is at risk is truly heartbreaking. We should preserve our historic architecture and instead prioritize creating green spaces in this concrete-dominated landscape.	PA		05-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Williams	Hilary	British Railway Architecture is extremely important in the development of architecture as a whole. There are few exemplary examples remaining- of which Liverpool St Station is one. The natural light and glazed roof creates a sense of arrival of the city just outside waiting. The scale of the building proposed also distorts the whole street scape. I oppose this development.	PA		05-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Williams	Joanne	This would cause substantial harm to the significance of a nationally important heritage site. More specifically, I raise objections to: - Substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station - The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - Substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan	PA		05-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Cochrane	Fergus	Ridiculous Size of this ugly carbuncle* in this historic area . * what does the Monarch think ???	PA		05-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Kennedy	Christian	I object to the loss of natural light and architectural merit of the station.	PA		05-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Evans	Carole	"I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. The station is a beautiful station and concourse, no need to add another monstrosity of an office block to the London skyline, this is a Grade II listed building for a reason and should be preserved.	PA		05-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Cooke	Adam	This application would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. The proposed tower block would wrap around the grade 2* listed Great Eastern Hotel causing substantial to it and its setting, contrary to NPPF 213. Furthermore, the proposed demolition of the roof structure of the award-winning concourse would be a great loss and mean that the concourse would be buried under a tower block rather than bathed in sunlight. The construction itself and thereafter the huge increase in visitors (both occupants of the tower block plus those visiting the increased retail space) would be noisy; and the volume of traffic would increase significantly in what is already a very busy part of the City.	PA		05-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Kaiser	Christina	The proposed development is inappropriate in terms of scale and relation to the existing building. It will be compromised immensely. I travel through Liverpool Street station frequently and it is a special Victorian building. One of few spaces left with air and natural light. The proposed development is neither necessary nor in any way keeping with the existing scale nor will it provide any benefit to the public. Liverpool Street station is more than anything a public building. Clearly consultation is not genuinely taken into account the negative impact, nor has it genuinely taken into account public views. Once done, the damage will be irreversible.	PA		05-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Brighton	David	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. The alterations to this station in the 1980s were proportionate and gave an improved concourse which is still adequate. The station still holds its Victorian splendour while being functional. The new proposals with destroy the essence of the station and its surroundings which I believe go against the National Planning Policy Framework. The city has many new splendid buildings going up. It is a shame to destroy the city's major rail station just to squeeze another unneeded office.	PA		05-Jul-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	McLees	Beverley	I object to this application which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically I raise objections to the demolition of the roof structure of the existing concourse which is grade 11 listed . The impact of the surrounding listed heritage assets, particularly the Gd 11 listed hotel , through the construction of a 29 storey tower over the station concourse . Have you lost your minds ! You should be protecting this glorious structure .	PA	05-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Guscin	Paul	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed	PA	05-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Moyle	Tristan	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets.	PA	05-Jul-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Elliot	Timothy	I object to this application. Network Rail is pursuing an application that does harm to the environment of which they are stewards with a development that would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. This proposal would do substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. Breaks in volume at focal points like this station are necessary and protected. The scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. The National Planning Policy Framework Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional" this development is overly commercially driven to the detriment of the public realm.	PA	05-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Barrington	Barbara	You make me very sad to think of how your decision to alter the face of London one way or another - is reducing a wonderful city - with these ghastly concrete blocks for even more throngs to come to the City making it into an even more overcrowded and completely unrecognisable landscape. The faceless square blocks of office buildings and apartment blocks are totally taking away Character and Charm from a once historical, laden with atmospheric charm and heavy with stories, area. Do for goodness sake preserve our beautiful and much loved and visited Capital to some semblance of history, the past, true buildings, atmosphere and heavy with stories and memories alone. I feel very sorry for the generations who inherit this modernised nightmare. Thank you for reading.	PA	05-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Miles Humphries	Julia	Destruction of a beautiful building. It will be a blot on the landscape.	PA	05-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Girling	Bailey	As a regular user of the Liverpool Street station, I firmly object to the proposed plans to "improve" the station. This station is a historic landmark and has been wonderfully preserved for many years. To destroy it now in favour of the proposals given would be absolutely shameful.	PA	05-Jul-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Harrison	Fred	I object to these plans because they will seriously harm the Grade II listed station and Grade II* listed hotel by burying them under an enormous monstrosity of a building. The thought of that happening to Kings Cross or St Pancras is unimaginable - so why Liverpool Street? Paragraph 213 of the National Planning Policy Framework states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." This proposed development is certainly not exceptional, in fact it is shameful vandalism	PA	05-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Cherry	Deborah	I object to this application on the grounds that the proposal will cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. 1. substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station and the setting of the Victorian train shed. 2. There will be harm beyond the station and sheds to the associated Grade II*-listed hotel through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse an destruction of their original scale of relation 4. The 2015 City Plan requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas 5. The height and volume of the proposed scheme will impact the setting and enjoyment of numerous heritage assets eg Wren's City churches. 6. NPPF, 2012, & updated s. 16 , p202 designates heritage assets an irreplaceable resource, to be conserved in an appropriate manner so that they can be enjoyed by existing and future generations" This scheme fails to protect the heritage assets concerned and public enjoyment of them. 7. The National Planning Policy Framework, 2012, s.16, p213 rules that"Any harm to, or loss of, the significance of a designated heritage asset (from its alteration or destruction, or from development within its setting), should require clear and convincing justification" And in p. 214 "Where a proposed development will lead to substantial harm to (or total loss of significance of) a designated heritage asset, local planning authorities should refuse consent, unless it can be demonstrated that the substantial harm or total loss is necessary to achieve substantial public benefits that outweigh that harm or loss, ..." There are few significant substantial public benefits to the proposal that could justify or outweigh the significant harm intended or otherwise to the heritage assets and their setting, and spatially related heritage assets and the damage to present and future generations enjoyment of them.	PA	05-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Cooper	Christopher	object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections on the grounds of the substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. This would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The National Planning Policy Framework Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." In addition to this, the area features many important historic features, causing significant harm to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, and being contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area.	PA	05-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Keating	Caroline	Destruction of heritage	PA	06-Jul-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Adams	Kathryn	The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse.	PA	06-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA Page 588	Catchpool	Hannah	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: - The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. - The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. - The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. - The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional."	PA	06-Jul-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Waddilove	Mark	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. The main reasons for my objection is The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. I also bring your attention to Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional.	PA	06-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Baggott	Helen	This structure is hugely important to the area and its history. That cannot be underestimated. Ripping out history in the name of progress is shameful.	PA	06-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Adams	Toby	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to:"	PA	06-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Adams	Tracey	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to:"	PA	06-Jul-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Carson	Rose	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. In making this objection I reference the National Planning Policy Framework, Paragraph NPPF 213 of which states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional."	PA	06-Jul-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Carson	Philip	Here's an easy cut and paste to put into the Comments section: I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. In making this objection I reference the National Planning Policy Framework, Paragraph NPPF 213 of which states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional.	PA	06-Jul-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Fitzpatrick	Margaret	Here's an easy cut and paste to put into the Comments section: I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. In making this objection I reference the National Planning Policy Framework, Paragraph NPPF 213 of which states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional.	PA	06-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Duffin	James	The current Victorian building and roof are unique London stations and allow for fantastic natural light into the station concourse. Demolished and replaced by a tower block would destroy this space and turn it into a dank and inhospitable space like the central New York stations. Also demolition would make a mockery of the listing of this structure.	PA	06-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Frank	Vanessa	It's clear this development is unwanted by the general public on the basis it is not in keeping with the historical, architectural character of the original building. It meets none of the councils key targets and increases environmental impact of the building exponentially. Further more London councils need to listen to the general public or you will develop spaces which just turn people off and fail commercially. Commerce	PA	06-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Lynch	Keita	The building provides the most fit for purpose concourse of any station in London. These changes are absurd. Destroying the Victorian building is erasing london's history; what brings joy to people living here and attracts tourism from across the world.	PA	06-Jul-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Leefe	Ben	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. I reference the National Planning Policy Framework: Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional. This is not exceptional it is based purely on money making / profit and greed - there is no need for this development	PA	06-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Malcolm	Vicki	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. I love the historic architecture in the station and this should absolutely not be compromised or demolished. Also please keep the natural light in the station via the beautiful roof.	PA	06-Jul-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Fitzpatrick	James	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. In making this objection I reference the National Planning Policy Framework, Paragraph NPPF 213 of which states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional.	PA	06-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Todorov-Smyth	Ivaylo	An objection must be raised against the proposed Liverpool Street Station development due to its profound negative impacts on heritage, natural light, and urban character. While acknowledging the need for increased capacity (forecasted to exceed 200 million annual passengers), the current scheme, despite being a revised version, remains fundamentally flawed. The plans involve constructing a significant office block (a 97m, 19-storey tower) over the existing station concourse, necessitating the demolition of parts of the Grade II-listed 1980s extension. This will irreparably sever the architectural harmony of the 1870s trainshed from its later additions, destroying the meticulously designed heritage and losing the essential natural light that currently floods the "cathedral-like" concourse. Heritage groups like SAVE Britain's Heritage and the Victorian Society fiercely oppose this, arguing it would render the station "unrecognisable" and compromise the "picturesque silhouette and proper grandeur" of the Grade II*-listed Great Eastern Hotel. While Network Rail asserts the office component is crucial for funding station improvements like accessibility upgrades (more lifts, escalators, and concourse space), alternatives to such destructive over-station development have not been sufficiently explored. Sacrificing irreplaceable historic fabric and significant views, including protected vistas of St Paul's Cathedral, for speculative office space is an unacceptable trade-off. The scheme's sheer bulk would also severely damage the Bishopsgate Conservation Area. The proposed development prioritises commercial gain over the station's unique character and the public's access to light and heritage. A truly "world-class" transport hub should enhance, not diminish, its historic context.	PA	06-Jul-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Chisnall	Peter	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: the substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional."	PA	06-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	A Lister	Jonathan	I object to the proposed redevelopment of Liverpool Street Station. All of the Victorian structure should be retained and restored. Yours Sincerely, Jonathan Lister	PA	06-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Coyle	Iain	It is completely unnecessary and will lead to the destruction of a beautiful building for pure profiteering.	PA	06-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Wallis	Clare	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. As a regular commuter, the station is perfectly fit for purpose, has an appropriate number of retailers and importantly retains its grade II listed features. Another tower block is not required in the city.	PA	07-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Read	Elizabeth	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. PLEASE USE MONEY WISELY THIS IS A SHOCKINGLY BAD PROPOSAL TO USE MONEY FOR SOMETHING THAT'S NOT NEEDED THE STATION WORKS PERFECTLY WELL. I will fight this development to the end. No one wants it, preserve history - less rubbish shops, glass and steel architecture booooo!	PA	07-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Price	Claire	I object to this application which would caused substantial harm to the historic national asset. This will impact the surrounding area and shake away the historic look of the area in general. To demolish the roof from its original state and put shops in will take away it unique look and historic attraction and going back in time feel to the building which is unspoilt by time. I come from a Small town which has lost a lot of its older buildings nd the look isn't good, whin I come to London and Liverpool st station I am in ore of its historic look and feel happy we have it. This is only a money making scheme and not in the national interest for our heritage. Best regards Claire	PA	07-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Newton	John		DC	07-Jul-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Brookes	William	"I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. This is with reference to the National Planning Policy Framework paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." More specifically, I raise objections to: The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church.	PA	07-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Williams-Jones	Elaine	Disabled people who want to use the station get pushed to the back! More lifts would help them to get out safely and quickly!	PA	07-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Bright	Rupert	Important that this key piece of infrastructure is kept up-to-date.	PA	07-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Stark	Helen	My main transport hub within London and so very keen to see Liverpool Street become an iconic and exciting hub for East London.	PA	07-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Ritchie	Frances	Liverpool Street station is outdated, crowded, and difficult to navigate. I am so excited about the prospect of an improved station experience, and for the station to be more accessible to people with limited mobility - the people who need trains and transit access the most.	PA	07-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Brown	Pendrick	LST is tired, the facilities are awful, the Wi-Fi is awful, the shops are poor...	PA	07-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Andrew	Davina	The station needs to be modernised to cope with increased capacity. It leaks when it rains and the flow of passengers is a nightmare during peak times!	PA	07-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	D'Arcy	James	Huge improvement to the station.	PA	07-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Stukins	Mia	Need to future proof the station, increase accessibility and improve customer experience.	PA	07-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Davies	Diane	The station is claustrophobic and closed in currently, very dated against our other London terminals, the flow of people traffic is dangerous at times.	PA	07-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Jolley	Carly	We are directly connected to Liverpool Street and it is time for it to be modernised.	PA	07-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Talks	Robert	London Liverpool Street would really benefit from redevelopment.	PA	07-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Ruddick	Nicholas	It needs improved passenger flow, capacity, and retail.	PA	07-Jul-25	S

25/00494/FULEIA	Kelly	Stephen	I use every day and upgrade would be great.	PA	07-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Sowden	Fraser	Will improve the station.	PA	07-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	McCombes	Steph	I think this will make the station feel less busy by opening up the natural space of the building.	PA	07-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Beazley	Alexandra	I object to this application because it would cause major harm to a nationally important heritage asset. The demolition of the partial roof structure of the grade two listed station and the massive and over-development of the proposed structure on top of the new roof are totally inappropriate to the built environment of the station itself and the surrounding area.	PA	07-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Knox	Beverley	"I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to the substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church.	PA	07-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Hobbs	Kieran	I think the station enhancements and improvements are absolutely critical to the ongoing evolution of the city, and ensuring the best experience for travellers and visitors. I am supportive of the concept of Network Rail seeking to create value from their landholdings to cross subsidise such enhancements. I think the vision and design will result in huge improvements to the usability of Liverpool Street station.	PA	07-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Sheldon	Sam	Much needed improvements.	PA	07-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Pike	Edward	It's currently overcrowded and drab, and needs to go ahead - the new design looks amazing.	PA	07-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Hussain	Bilal	Seems nicer.	PA	07-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Jeffrey	Anne Marie	To make it more safe.	PA	07-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Salter	Allen	I've always felt that better use could have been made of the station footprint. I'm full in favour of the proposed development.	PA	07-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Adair	Barry	Use the station all the time and it is in dire need of a facelift.	PA	07-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Davies	Lesley	The current toilets are not enough for the amount of people using them.	PA	07-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Francis	Lisa	Looks brighter and more open. Hopefully it will make it easier and faster to access trains.	PA	07-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Ray-Marples	George	This country should change its planning laws to make redeveloping and progress easier, this is part of that drive.	PA	07-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Shepherd	Sue	Very long queues at the Ladies - you can miss your train.	PA	07-Jul-25	S

25/00494/FULEIA	Pearson	Andy	Absolutely love the mix of old and new, so typical of modern day London. The new entrances look fantastic and will give a real sense of arrival. It's not at all obvious from the street at the moment that you are right next to a large railway terminus. As the carer for someone with mobility issues I'm really glad about the focus on improving accessibility. It feels like the new design will really link the station back in to the area. As a lover of historic buildings the best thing for me though is the way the redevelopment respects the remaining Victorian parts of the station. I particularly love the the way the removal of the shops will open up views of the magnificent train shed from the lower concourse and the proposed balconies running along the side. I think that this design really celebrates the stunning original architecture.	PA	07-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Kubiak	Jaroslav	Because it desperately need improvement, with respect for historical structure.	PA	07-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Pearson	Charlie	It will create an unforgettable entrance.	PA	07-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Mayes	Colin	Easier access for wheelchair users.	PA	07-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Wade	Amina	More seats and toilets at Liverpool Street.	PA	07-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Bullard	Belinda		DC	07-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Franks	Jaqui	Sadly I have a phobia of escalators so lifts and stairs are the only option for me.	PA	07-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Williamson	Jean	I am 80 waiting for a double hip replacement and stairs are almost impossible.	PA	07-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Harley	June	More facilities for wheelchair users and disabled.	PA	07-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Davies	Voirrey	I commute daily and the station is tired and not fit for purpose. The new changes look excellent and will make everything much smoother.	PA	07-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Sanders	Andrew		DC	07-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Neesam	Darren	The station is crowded, looks rundown and lacks a modern look. It needs more and newer facilities.	PA	07-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Brown	Nigel		DC	07-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Rutland	Lisa	I object to the destruction of heritage. This is a beautiful station building that should be preserved for future generations. Let London be. Once it's gone, it's gone.	PA	07-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Canty	Shelly	I object to the proposed development at Liverpool St Station London. This is a listed Victorian building that functions perfectly well. We do not need more high rise offices in this area.	PA	07-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Sadler	Hilary		DC	07-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Callister	Wendy		DC	07-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	McMurtrie	Kenneth		DC	07-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	White	Tony	I am a regular user of LS Station and having ascended from the Elizabeth line find the concourse a very pleasant and social place, it feels safer than the streets outside and I am encouraged to spend money inside the station.	PA	07-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Hook	Elizabeth	I object to any form of demolition of any part of Liverpool Street Station this beautiful 19th Century building MUST BE LEFT AS IT IS . NO it doesnt need a 20 storey office block above it either that would be Sacrilege. I OBJECT I OBJECT I OBJECT	PA	07-Jul-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Murphy	Patrick	This seems an obvious example of overdevelopment in this instance. You have an area with an inordinate amount of office space/retail and entertainment space/facilities in very close proximity. I personally can envision no rational explanation for adding to an already overcrowded area, with more of the same. I had heard, a few years previously, that CoL police were constantly overwhelmed by the sheer volume of people leaving bars/restaurants etc in the late evenings. Since that time, the number of venues has significantly increased, which I can only assume, has increased the number of instances requiring police attendance. To consider adding another such venue to this seems foolhardy. Along with this, you're also planning to demolish a historic site, which shows the historical significance of railways in the development of our city, whilst presumably replacing it with yet another glass box. All this will understandably take years to complete, so I imagine in the interim, services in and out of Liverpool Street station will be severely disrupted. Like Kings Cross, the disruption to road traffic would be horrendous, and given Bishopsgate is a major thoroughfare through the city, its closure would have a massive impact on the local area, and the limited number of alternate routes. How are people expected to get to and from work, for, probably upwards of two to three years? This seems like a very ill conceived plan, which would do nothing to improve the city's infrastructure, but would create an enormous amount of disruption and congestion in the area, and to users of the station, with absolutely minimal benefit to the city environment. There are many offices in the city that are underused or empty. Alongside the many new buildings that have been developed very recently. It seems there is no shortage of space, and therefore I cannot understand the rationale behind this endeavour, which would destroy a beloved piece of the city's historical legacy.	PA	07-Jul-25	O
Page 599 25/00494/FULEIA	Gilbert	Ian	I object to this application because of the harm it will cause to the listed station. The National Planning Policy Framework paragraph 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church.	PA	07-Jul-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Keet-Mayers	Justine	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. The National Planning Policy Framework Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional."	PA	07-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Provansal	Anabel	It needs to be better layout for the amount of people that move through Liverpool street. This looks like it will cater for that.	PA	07-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Rawlinson	John	I ride a mobility scooter to give me independence. With more access on trains I can be more independent.	PA	07-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Peek	Susan	Because there's never enough public toilets in London.	PA	07-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Brennan	John	[Toilets] To make journeys more comfortable and to stop people urinating in the wrong places.	PA	07-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Hughes	Martin	1. Substantial Harm to Heritage Assets and Character: - Demolition of the Concourse Roof and Impact on the 19th Century Train Shed: The current plans involve demolishing the existing 20th-century concourse roof, which was specifically listed as Grade II in 2022 due to its architectural and historic significance. Replacing it with a new structure, especially one designed to accommodate a tall office block, would severely compromise the "cathedral-like" feel and natural light of the concourse and detrimentally affect the setting of the older 19th-century train sheds. - Impact on the Grade II-Listed Great Eastern Hotel:* The proposed 97m (19-storey) office tower would be built directly over the station concourse and would dramatically overwhelm the adjacent Grade II*-listed Great Eastern Hotel. This constitutes "substantial harm" to a highly significant heritage asset, undermining its special historic and architectural significance. - Harm to Conservation Areas: The imposition of a tall building in an area characterized by low- and medium-scale buildings, particularly within the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, is contrary to the City Plan which discourages tall buildings in such sensitive areas. It would also negatively impact the New Broad Street conservation area. - Impact on Wider Heritage Assets and Views: The scheme could affect the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets, including Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches and nearby St Botolph's church. Concerns have also been raised about the impact on protected views of St Paul's Cathedral. 2. Inappropriateness of Speculative Office Development: - Disproportionate Scale to Funding Justification: Network Rail states that the office block is necessary to fund station upgrades and accessibility improvements. However, objectors argue there's no evidence that alternative, less destructive funding models or development sites have been fully considered.	PA	07-Jul-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Shute	Jane	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. Paragraph 213 of the National Planning Policy Framework states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." Do not ruin this beautiful building!	PA	07-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Aston	Elizabeth	It's a fantastic example of a historic building being utilised for a modern purpose. It's such a lovely building in the heart of the city. I discovered it for the first time earlier this year when I was in London for a conference. I was completely bowled over by it. It must be saved!	PA	07-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Zammit	Ben	It is a fantastic repertatation of victorian workman's ship	PA	07-Jul-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Morse	Greg	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. I refer to the National Planning Policy Framework, of which Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." With this in mind, more specifically, I raise objections to the following: The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 trainshed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church.	PA	07-Jul-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Darlison	Mari	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: - The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. - The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. - The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. - The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church.	PA	07-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Kukwa	Danielle	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: - The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. - The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. Both of these run directly contrary to paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional. - The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church.	PA	07-Jul-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Hudson	Mark	I object to the proposed development on the grounds that it is visually and culturally damaging to a historically significant area of London. The Liverpool Street area is much loved by the public, specifically for its historic character and links to and echoes of Britain's industrial past that are evident in Liverpool Street Station, which would be partially demolished in the proposed plan. The proposed development would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets, including large numbers of Grade II listed buildings and architectural features, and the settings of Grade I listed buildings. This runs contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework. Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." The imposition of a tall building immediately adjacent to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings runs counter to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area.	PA	07-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Gall	John	I strongly object to these proposals. I use this station frequently travelling from Stoke Newington and am always thrilled at its elegance. It functions perfectly well with good clear flow of people around the station. The public spaces work well. The beautiful architecture should not be undermined in any way and the lovely natural light that pours in must not be diminished. There are absolutely no grounds for any change other than the absolute greed of developers. I oppose this pointless, destructive, potential act of cultural vandalism in the strongest terms possible.	PA	07-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Gall	John	I strongly object to these proposals. I use this station frequently travelling from Stoke Newington and am always thrilled at its elegance. It functions perfectly well with good clear flow of people around the station. The public spaces work well. The beautiful architecture should not be undermined in any way and the lovely natural light that pours in must not be diminished. There are absolutely no grounds for any change other than the absolute greed of developers. I oppose this pointless, destructive, potential act of cultural vandalism in the strongest terms possible.	PA	07-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Pryor-Jones	Angela		DC	08-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Westwood	Marianne	I find that using two crutches I feel really unsafe on escalators. More lifts would make it so much better for disabled and senior citizens users.	PA	08-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Salmon	Teraza	Stops tourist congestion.	PA	08-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Morris	Pat	We have to wait a long time to get a free lift as the current one to street level is so busy.	PA	08-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Davies	Veronica	Every time I visit Liverpool St Station there are long queues for the toilet especially the women's. This needs to change.	PA	08-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	King	Frank	Its a great station with lovely coffee outlets. Toilets are essential.	PA	08-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Smith	Christine	Working near Liverpool Street station, we need more lifts, takes too long to exit the station plus too many steps for people with walking difficulties and the older generation generally.	PA	08-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Barnett	Joan	The stairs you go down to get to the toilets are no good for older or disabled people.	PA	08-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Freer	David	Supporter of good architecture!	PA	08-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Porter	Edward Joseph	[Accessibility] Not being as agile as I was; age does have some disadvantages.	PA	08-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Loughnane	Darren	I object on the grounds substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage site that is the station. More specifically, I raise objections to the fact its a classic station in London and believe Network Rails money is better spent elsewhere.	PA	08-Jul-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Walters	Anthony	I object to this application due to the significant and unnecessary harm to heritage assets and the setting of those assets- namely Liverpool Street station, the great eastern/ Andaz hotel and bishops gate conservation area. This I believe contravenes the principal of the national planning policy framework (Paragraph NPPF 213.) I do not believe that the proported benefits of the scheme outweigh the harm that will be done to these assets and therefore warrant this being treated as an exceptional circumstance. Specifically, improvements the station facilities in relation to accessibility or improved facilities could be achieved without this excessive development.	PA	08-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Jenkins	John	It's a major bottleneck in the station having a major impact on pedestrian through flow	PA	08-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Best	Michael	3 St John's Road Lowestoft	PA	08-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Geisser	Helen		DC	08-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Bonzi	Candia		DC	08-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Moore	Charles	Do not let this amazing architecture and space be destroyed. I use this station often and there has never been a problem with it or its facilities. This application is being made purely for the money makers to make more and not in the public interest or to preserve our important heritage.	PA	08-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Ward	Margo	Everyone who is unable to walk needs a lift.	PA	08-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Fielding	Clare	This is a stunning scheme for the improvement of my home station. I wholeheartedly support.	PA	08-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Wiseman	Amy	As a disabled person getting around London tube stations in general is a problem. You need more disabled access so we have the freedom to move around London just like everyone else.	PA	08-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Russell	Barbara	To make the station more accessible	PA	08-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Wheelldon	Chris	More lifts and more toilets please, to make the station properly accessible for disabled people.	PA	08-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Readings	Shannon	I object to this application on the grounds that the plans submitted will totally change a historic monument. This is not sympathetic to the building in any form and should not be passed on these grounds.	PA	08-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Bailey	Susan	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to- The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches. Finally I would like to reference the National Planning Policy Framework in my objection. Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional."	PA	08-Jul-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Milnes	Lori	This station is perfect as it is. Do not ruin it in the name of profit. Look to Grand Central Terminal in New York City as an example of preservation perfection. It was once at risk like Liverpool Street station but was saved at the last minute and it is now a jewel in the crown of NYC.	PA	08-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Wilkins	Liz	I strongly object to the proposed redevelopment of Liverpool Street station, which would cause substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station and surrounding historic environment. As a regular visitor to the station - I work nearby at Old Street - I value its unique architecture and historic character. The demolition of the concourse roof and insertion of extensive retail units, including two elevated galleries, would severely compromise the 19th-century train sheds and the station's special interest and significance. This isn't sensitive regeneration - it's irreversible loss. The proposed 20-storey tower would overwhelm the setting of the Grade II*-listed hotel, the last continually operating 19th-century hotel in the City. It would also disrupt the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, which is characterised by its human scale and rich historic fabric. The scheme directly contradicts the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of tall buildings in inappropriate locations, including Conservation Areas and the St Paul's Heights Zone. Wider harm would be caused to the setting of multiple designated and undesignated heritage assets across the City, including several Grade I-listed Wren churches and nearby St Botolph's Church. Under Paragraph 213 of the National Planning Policy Framework, "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings... should be exceptional." This proposal does not meet that standard. Liverpool Street Station is more than a transport hub - it's part of London's historic and cultural identity. I urge the planning authority to refuse this application.	PA	08-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Lewis	Sharon	The beauty of London's past diminishes as every planning application that is agreed, takes away a bit of what makes our beautiful capital, beautiful. Once this building is redeveloped it's lost, never to resurface. Enough is enough, leave our heritage for our yet to be aware, generation. Please	PA	08-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Young	Lynne	I object to this application as it would cause substantial harm	PA	09-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Christie	Robyn		DC	09-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Cheesman	Branda	because i have arithus and struggle with stairs	PA	09-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Wyatt	Debbie	Liverpool Street is the gateway way to London from The Coastal East Counties and has a great need for basic functional facilities such as toilets where so many Public Toilets are being shut down where are the growing population supposed to actually go ?	PA	09-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Gravett	Julie	more accessible for people who cannot use escalators	PA	09-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Wright	Bryony		DC	09-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Rayner	Annie	To ease congestion	PA	09-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Jennungs	Sarah	I want more toilets please but also a down escalator, I'm 70 and getting my suitcase down the stairs is becoming dangerous. Very poor facilities give the number of people passing through the station	PA	09-Jul-25	S

25/00494/FULEIA	Jones	Leah	I have mobility needs. I need lifts as i cannot manage stairs and escalators are dangerous for me,	PA	09-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	.	Tracey	Because currently the toilets are disgusting	PA	09-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Burke	Julia	Thisxstaion isbinaccessible to the disabled, elderly & any one with a buggy or pram WHAT PRUCE EQUAL OPPORTUNITIES?	PA	09-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Gould	Gay		DC	09-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Barsley	Tegwen	To be disability friendly.	PA	09-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Wilson	Jaqueline	To bring equality and true accessibility for disabled people	PA	09-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	G	Sandra	It will feel safer and less hectic, often it is like trying to run through a wall just make your train on time.	PA	09-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Cockley	Lynne	Its a over congested major network station	PA	09-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Wedgwood	Simon		DC	09-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Tucker	Sally	It keeps the beautiful high ceiling and feeling of space while making room for more passenger footfall	PA	09-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Khalid	Hasin	Make travel easier	PA	09-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Mirrington Black	Alison	Many people have ibs and other, stomach complaints plus going down stairs or escalators with suitcases is difficult. Please put more loos at ground level.	PA	09-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Davis	Hilary	Disabled persons toilet relies on finding someone to open the door and are inadequately fitted out and cramped for the user	PA	09-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Eade	Daniel	Liverpool Street is full. An upgrade is much needed.	PA	09-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Hazzard	Kieran	Architecturally and historically destructive. Hugely disruptive for commuters. Little useful improvement to station facilities beyond increased retail space.	PA	09-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Young	Lucy	I strongly object to the demolition and destruction of this important Victorian railway heritage site. This station and its concourse is of historic significance and any improvement works should be in line with preservation and restoration.	PA	09-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Armstrong	Bill		DC	09-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Cooper	Catherine	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: damage to the Grade II listed building - in particular the roof; damage to the train sheds and damage to the Bishops Gate conservation area. I believe these plans are in contravention of the National Policy Planning Framework, paragraph 213.	PA	09-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Howarth	Janette & Philip		DC	09-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Broughton	Lynne		DC	09-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Burch	Lizebeth And Don		DC	09-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Hill	Michael		DC	09-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Eastoe	Jude		DC	09-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Cooper	Sarah Jean		DC	09-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Milford	Valerie	I object to this application The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. Plus the commuter disturbance which we have already had years and years of	PA	09-Jul-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Modeste	Arlene	For the busiest of stations the facilities are woeful and more well/maintained toilets are needed. I work off Bishopsgate and am disabled with a chronic condition that requires diuretics. As soon as trains are delayed I'm plunged into worry about how long it'll be before I have access to a bathroom. If there were more toilets at Liverpool st station it would take that stress away and my commute would be so much easier.	PA	09-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Griffiths	Louise	We cannot live without nature. Solar panels can be put on elsewhere, on the top of industrial buildings, car parks, roofs, there place is not on our beautiful valuable countryside, this is not a better alternative green energy solution as it destroys the countryside and a historic site. If this goes ahead, our future generations will question this crazy decision	PA	09-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Kenningham-Brown	Sue		DC	09-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Osgood	Katja	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. The National Framework Policy Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional."	PA	09-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Symonds	Paula	The disabled toilets are a disgrace	PA	09-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Bramley	Kathy	Good access is hugely important to people who need it and better for equity and for everyone!	PA	09-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Endacott	Sarah	I object to the proposed changes to Liverpool St Station because this beautiful building should remain intact. Its part of London's heritage. The office space unoccupied in London is high so there is no reason why this amazing structure should knocked down and changed. What purpose would this serve? And to create more food/takeaway units is just ludicrous! Litter is already an absolute travesty in London let alone creating more avenues for this to increase. London does not need more cafes/fast food units! Please stop this!	PA	09-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Harling	Poppy	To make life easier for disabled wheelchair users.	PA	09-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Winship	Lindy	More lifts for disabled.	PA	09-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Tarr	Rachel	The Liverpool Street Station is a historical building that should be protected and is functioning well. I haven't experienced any problems in the many times I have been through the station.	PA	09-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Devaney	Van	This is unacceptable. The building is a national treasure, and must be preserved in its originality. Try building in another country or at sea perhaps. Thanks but no thanks. Goodbye. We'll close the door because we also want to keep that intact.	PA	10-Jul-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Every	Lorna	Absolutely no reason on God's earth to destroy this iconic and beautiful building just to create more office space. There are plenty of office blocks in London, lying empty and unused, there is no need for one to be constructed at this particular site. If it's a case of (supposedly) raising funds for improvements to the station, there are plenty of other ways to raise the funds needed that don't require the destruction of a perfectly good and usable space, which also happens to be an outstandingly beautiful piece of architecture.	PA	10-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Curtis	Sarah	As a disabled traveller getting around stations can be really difficult. Make London more accessible	PA	10-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Bloggs	Joe	I just think it needs to happen	PA	10-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Cala	Santi	Cause it's so chaotic all the time specially at rush hour that is begging for an upgrade	PA	10-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Hedley-Friar	Daniel	Liverpool Street has such a rich history and is the gateway to so many people into London. It's a station we should all be proud of and a jewel in the City of London. The proposed plans are artistic, modern and beautiful.	PA	10-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Sue	Soozy	[Toilets] Because the current ones absolutely stink of urine and need some ventilation	PA	10-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Lawrence	Yvonne	it would be good to have more toilet facilities for travelers. Making their journey more comfortable	PA	10-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Johnson	Merle	I cannot travel to Liverpool Street from Colchester due to the lack of mobility facilities. I have to travel from Colchester to Stratford then connect with an underground station. It would be great if these issues were addressed. Thank you.	PA	10-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Parkin	Linda	I'm disabled with very limited mobility, currently I can't get the train into London. We need the space and accessibility!	PA	10-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Stewart	Vicky		DC	10-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Aldred	Michael	Need more open area space Liverpool St is too compact. Need more open area space Liverpool St is too compact. Need more open area space Liverpool St is too compact.	PA	10-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Aldred	Michael	Need more open area space Liverpool St is too compact. Need more open area space Liverpool St is too compact. Need more open area space Liverpool St is too compact.	PA	10-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Owen	Maggie		DC	10-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Tatam	Luke		DC	10-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Aldred	Michael	Need more open area space Liverpool St is too compact. Need more open area space Liverpool St is too compact. Need more open area space Liverpool St is too compact.	PA	10-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Summerville	Dave	My wife is didabled and often uded stirs with great difficulty as lifts are so scarve and oor and too small	PA	10-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Wyatt	Sue	more accessable toilets would be good. As far i can tell the only toilets are downstairs. if there are other ones there isnt clear signs.	PA	10-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Pell	Jeanette	need more lifts for disabled people	PA	10-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Nasri	Karina	To make commuters life bit easier	PA	10-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Mastracci	Jon	Critical to upgrade station due to amount of footfall and growth predicted	PA	10-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Starr	Julie	Need more toilets	PA	10-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	.	Karen	Always queues, difficult to access with luggage or if you have mobility issues.	PA	10-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Hewitt	Maureen	It would be great to have it updated. I love that station	PA	10-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Jane Lambdon	Heather	Because I use crutches so I need lifts	PA	10-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Brown	Jackum	I am a pensioner with mobility issues. 99% of my journeys are via Liverpool Street and I dread having to use the facilities there. Too crowded, too often bashed into by others.	PA	10-Jul-25	S

25/00494/FULEIA	Bates	Sallie	It will be very pleasant as a commuter to have a nice and light spacious to enable movement around this station after years of overcrowding and dull lighting. The extra space and facilities will also make it easier for my disabled relatives to use the railway. Additionally extra retail and office space should hopefully make them a station good value for money	PA	10-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Yaxley	Varunie	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. This is inline with the National Planning Policy Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional."	PA	10-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Tosh	Nafisa	More toilets at LSS please!!	PA	10-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Kalman	Danny	a big improvement including for the Kinder transport monument	PA	10-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Hewlett	Ashley	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets.	PA	10-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	PROSSER	Paul	It would be a crime to remove such a beautiful building to replace it with an unnecessary costly new development	PA	11-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Black	Julie	Im a wheelchair user and havent been into city for years as never know one if stations have lifts and two if theyre working	PA	11-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	.	Simona	Access to a toilet is a basic human need and should not be contingent on whether someone is a paying customer. Restricting toilet access based on consumer status reinforces social inequalities and can lead to unnecessary distress, particularly for vulnerable individuals such as children, the elderly, those with medical conditions, or people experiencing homelessness. Everyone deserves the dignity of being able to use a toilet without fear of embarrassment, judgement, or being turned away due to financial limitations. Ensuring free and equitable access to public toilets is a fundamental step towards creating a more inclusive and compassionate society.	PA	11-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Ward	Denise	I would like to see more toilets in the station because it will be more convenient.	PA	11-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Sturge	Roger	I avoid Liverpool Street because i am dependent on strp free access. Elizabethine statikn is hslf waybto Moorgate and the Westbound Circle line platform is inaccessible.	PA	11-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	O'Brien	Lilly	im a wheelchair user and theres not enough lifts and they often breakdown	PA	11-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	.	SB	No there are enough, add toilets to other stations please	PA	11-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Jobsonhyde	Jonathan	Because you need them	PA	11-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Bird	Aoife	I travel to Stansted and lits at Liverpool Street would make a huge difference!	PA	11-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Frost	Harry	These plans are urgently needed	PA	11-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Brown	Lesley	Liverpool street is one of the most difficult stations to access if you are disabled!!	PA	11-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Moulton	Julia	There isn't enough toilets especially for elderly travellers	PA	11-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	James	Andrew	The station is a nightmare to navigate in a wheelchair because it's so old.	PA	11-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Johnson	Helen	Please make more toilets for the public	PA	11-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Radulescu	Alexandru	Faster commute	PA	11-Jul-25	S

25/00494/FULEIA	Sinclair	Karen	The toilets are very difficult for anybody with mobility issues to access. Also the toilets get very busy and queues build up. There are often toilets out of action.	PA	11-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Larsen	Dirk	Because we TRULY need more public toilets at Liverpool Street Station.	PA	11-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Mulder	Vincent	The current Liverpool Street Station does not make for great marketing - it feels very outdated and congested	PA	11-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Newman-Schultz	Daniel	I use the station often and its in dire need of tlc. Its so busy and crowded.	PA	11-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Brown	Angus	More space, better crowd control. Need police officers always in the station.	PA	11-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Hirst	Barbara	Regular Passenger - needs to be updated. It's very crowded and needs a complete revamp.	PA	11-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Mellow	Carol	When you arrive at the station it seems very depressing!	PA	11-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Walker	Jay	Liverpool street station NEEDS to be upgraded, updated and brought inline with current needs of passengers and also "visitors", its not just a station.	PA	11-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Hewes	Stephen	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. I also object to Network Rail's behaviour where they are seeking support on Instagram to increase provision of public toilets without giving the full facts of their plans, or enabling others to do so.	PA	11-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Meadowcroft	Christopher A	I object because this appears to be nothing more than an attempt to destroy architectural heritage enjoyed by many, purely for the financial benefit of a few developers. The so called improvements to facilities for travellers could be achieved without vandalising the existing building.	PA	11-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	bown	richard	I object to the destruction of our railway heritage. I travel to Liverpool street several times a week for work and it is a light, bright and welcoming station full of uniquely british heritage. These plans will make it a blight and ruin the station.	PA	11-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Hayes	Karen	Needless and unnecessary destruction of an architecturally important and beautiful as it is historic building.	PA	11-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Voysey	Ann	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The National Planning Policy Framework Paragraph 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." I don't believe the building of shops and offices to be a good reason to cause harm to a Grade II listed building.	PA	12-Jul-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Videv	Lorra	Behold, the twenty storey office block that Network Rail wants to plonk on top of Liverpool St Station. Note the height of Grade II*-listed Great Eastern Hotel in front and observe that this pile is more than twice the height. No amount of terraces with greenery can conceal the bulk of this monster which will block out daylight from the concourse. Many readers wrote objecting to the first version of this scheme but now there is this new version all those objections have been discarded. *If you want to stop this new offence, please write a new objection before 4th July.* You may have seen adverts on social media encouraging people to support improving access and toilets at Liverpool St Station, which lead through to an online form to register support for the new development. Yet it is Network Rail's responsibility to provide proper access and toilets, and these adverts barely mention the twenty-storey block they want to build. Unfortunately, the developers have garnered 613 messages of support against 180 objections so far, which is why your objection is imperative. Please forward this post, and encourage your friends and family to object too.	PA	12-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Martin	Frances	Damage of historic building and disruption of use of the station	PA	12-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Mansfield	Timothy	Objection on the grounds that quality of travel for the resident and tourist will be greatly reduced. There is a cost to this quality reduction. Quality of light and space. Humans are a product of our environment, if this is reduced so is our wellbeing and productivity.	PA	13-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Green	Donna	I object to this application. One of the many pleasures of the city of London is the stunning historical buildings, including all the railway terminuses. To build an office block on top of this fantastic area would be a travesty in my opinion.. to lose the beautiful light filled atrium of this terminus would be a huge loss	PA	13-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	O'Brien	Mary	Liverpool street station is a landmark in London and is great as it is. Putting office blocks above it will ruin land landmark. I also don't believe London needs any more offices or building works in the area.	PA	13-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Norton	Sam	I have travelled into London via Liverpool Street for over 30 years. I am keen to protect the beautiful, historic and characterful space.	PA	13-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Clarke	Alison	I object to you destroying the heritage of this building for now reason other than financial gain. I have used this station for 30 years and it does not need to lose all the light for the sake of an office block on top. Also the corrupt consultants you are engaging with are YET AGAIN misleading the public.	PA	14-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Langrish	John	We can't continue to demolish beautiful structures and buildings and replace them with awful concrete and glass structures.	PA	14-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Porter	Molly		DC	14-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Leonard	Alice	I commute into London Liverpool Street for work and pleasure, and I would love to see this station get the same treatment as other London terminals. It's a beautiful building and station, and it's been neglected with an old layout and design. Hopefully the new look and feel and layout will help improve everyone's journeys in and out of Liverpool Street.	PA	14-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Evans	Michael	Liv. St. station is long overdue an update! Compared to other busy London station it has fallen far behind.	PA	14-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Jefford	Isobel	Because I regularly pass through. I am 79 and i have a heavy suitcase.	PA	14-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Garnett Mumford	Lynn	For inclusion	PA	14-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Leslie	Siobhan	More lifts. More accessible toilets that are free to use	PA	14-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Wesson	Angela	I have limited mobility and without a lift i am unable to travel to see my family	PA	14-Jul-25	S

25/00494/FULEIA	Bunn	Pauline	Pram user	PA	14-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Blackshaw	Melvyn	yes we need more lifts in Liverpool Street Station	PA	14-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Porter	Lynn	More lifts, and better access for disabled users like myself.	PA	14-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Eli Chamberlain	Elaine	Because an additional lift, or lifts are desperately needed. Mothers with pushchairs or disabled people with scooters often dont fit into the lifts whose weight limit is quite low, especially when you consider those carrying luggage.	PA	14-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Mchenzie	Samira	To make the station more accessible for all	PA	14-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Cox	Linda	I don't use the station very often, but I do think people who have difficulties climbing stairs should be taken into consideration. Notices would be good about being patient with people who have lesser mobility, because there is a lot of pushing and shoving..	PA	14-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Jones	Elsie	To make it more accessible for disabled people.	PA	14-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Kaushik	Kav	it's a nightmare trying to find public toilets in london as someone with ulcerative colitis	PA	14-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Hyde	Janice	It is so difficult fir elderly disabked and oarents to sccess platforms	PA	14-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Rita Peters	Lorraine	I struggle on stairs and escalators and with heavy suitcases, buggys etc more lifts are needed for amount of people using them	PA	14-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Potter	Elaine	Dreadful access for disabled	PA	14-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Daish	Rich	I get fed up of being jostled as I move around and look at the notices of arrivals and departures. Too many people now use this station and more space would make it a more pleasurable experience and myself and my friend would be more 'up' for coming to London	PA	14-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Skelton	James	I object to this development as it appears it would lead to the destruction of the historic interior of Liverpool Street station. This should be protected and cherished and not turned into another bland modern building. Please do not destroy history!	PA	14-Jul-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Locker	Jean	I wish to OBJECT to the: City of London: Application Reference: 25/00494/FULEIA. The Proposal will irrevocably harm a cherished London landmark for no defensible purpose. It will over-shadow the historic well used station plus numerous historic buildings in the area. At the moment there is natural light cast through the Victorian glass roof which will be lost by the proposed glass tower which will constantly overcast the light for those travelling. It will grossly overshadow the neighbourhood which contains historically significant and beautiful buildings and businesses that deserve better consideration, casting them into an overbearing gloom. The character of the train sheds and station interior will be chronically undermined with poorly judged retail infilling. There is adequate retail at present. The Bishopsgate Conservation Area will be further damaged by excessive, ill-considered development. The historic Station and its former integral and listed Station Hotel will be further disjointed. The iconic views of the City's sacred architecture - such as the Wren churches - will be damaged needlessly. The design being proposed is ugly and unwelcoming. The City of London's planning department are custodians of a precious resource, a built environment of historic, world renowned. They need to protect it from such mindless exploitation for no end. This increased office space is unnecessary and will be damaging to the whole area. This thriving area will face a decade of disruption. I urge the planning committee to reject this abject development proposal.	PA	14-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Boyd	Katherine	I strongly object to this development as the plan removes heritage constructions and appears to be overdevelopment in an already over-populated area for buildings. The design will remove many historical features and the proposal does not seem to enhance the travel experience. Another issue is the loss of independent retailers, who add so much to the experience of the station, i.e. offering food and services that make people come to the station other than just using the travel facilities. In order to cover the cost of such development the proposed food / drink offerings would have to be generic companies. The development should support existing retailers and incorporate them in the scheme.	PA	14-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Miles	Deborah	I object . Don't replace historical buildings with modern monstrosities	PA	14-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Morgan	Andrew	Greed	PA	15-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Noon	Jennifer	Liverpool Street station is a fantastic example of historical functionality. Altering the station to make room for more office space that will lie empty as people continue to work from home the majority of the week is just insulting and thoughtless.	PA	15-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Herring	William	More disabled Toilets always appreciated, speaking as a Disabled Person.	PA	15-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Cerasale	Amanda	for safety reasons	PA	15-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Morton	Jane	The current lift is not suitable for disabled with wheelchairs, luggage and carers assistance	PA	15-Jul-25	S

25/00494/FULEIA	Ann Shaw	Layla	As its sooo difficult doing stairs if you are on crutches w/chair etc and especially if youve not long between train times	PA	15-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Lea	Samantha	it is inaccessible for most people who genuinely need the lift	PA	15-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Smith	Gladys	Improve facilities	PA	15-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Holt	Patricia	step free access from the tube to the concourse is long overdue. it is a disgrace that such a busy mainline station doesn't have this facility.	PA	15-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Dennis	Garrard	Respect the historical importance and gravitas of the original but enhance, place make with modern yet contextual contemporary interventions. I fully support the proposals as they are truly beautiful yet sympathetic to.	PA	15-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Ashton	Bridgette		DC	15-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Leong	Corina	Liverpool Pool Street Station is a busy station serving tourists who visit the local markets and tourists attractions. The station is a busy hub for passengers travelling to airports, a link between Hackney, Enfield etc and the City for instance where passengers rely on trains to get to work and leisure activities. The concourse at the station has many food and shopping outlets but no toilets. Clean, adequate supply of toilets are a basic human need.	PA	15-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Crouan	Katharine	Need loos that are accessible without steps involved.	PA	15-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Morrison	Jonathan		DC	15-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Jenner	Virginia	I am disabled using a mobility scooter and I'm afraid of travelling on trains because I'm never sure I can access moving by myself.	PA	15-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Baxter	Heather	I object to the proposed plans to build an office block above Liverpool Street Station and the destruction of an historic building.	PA	15-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Turnball	Derek	I'm tired going into a main concourse and it being packed with people & falling over bags	PA	15-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Martin	Tom	We need to give businesses and people in London every chance to succeed. Fit for purpose transport is a critical part of that	PA	15-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Riordan	Joanne		DC	15-Jul-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Pitt	Oliver	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: 1. Substantial Harm to Grade II-Listed Station The proposed demolition of the roof structure and its replacement would irreversibly damage the architectural integrity of this Grade II-listed building while compromising the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. 2. Inappropriate Commercial Insertion The insertion of extensive retail units within the C19 train sheds, including two elevated retail galleries, would cause high-level harm to the special interest and significance of this Grade II-listed heritage asset. 3. Impact on Grade II-Listed Hotel* The 20-storey tower over the station concourse would cause significant harm to the setting of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City. 4. Harm to Bishopsgate Conservation Area The scheme would cause substantial harm through imposing a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings, contrary to the 2015 City Plan which requires refusal of tall buildings in Conservation Areas. The development would also impact numerous heritage assets including Grade I-listed Christopher Wren churches and St Botolph's church. 5. NPPF Conflict This application fails to meet NPPF requirements. Paragraph 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." The applicant has failed to demonstrate exceptional circumstances justifying substantial harm to multiple Grade II-listed assets. This inappropriate development would cause substantial harm to designated heritage assets without exceptional justification required by national planning policy. I urge refusal on heritage grounds, diminishing of light and character of the space.	PA	15-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Varley	Henrietta		DC	15-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Bitmead	Diane	Getting to the underground stations are really difficult if you are less mobile or have luggage.	PA	15-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Jenkinson	Simon	More space to move around.	PA	15-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Wilson	Stuart	I lived in the vicinity for 3 years. Please make it more wonderful.	PA	15-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Hathaway	Rebecca		DC	15-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Henry Hart	George		DC	15-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	O'Brien	Gilbert		DC	15-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Lunn	Roger		DC	15-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Geisha	Marion	No access to central line . I had to try to climb the stairs which caused me pain and upset	PA	15-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Cavendish	Hayden	I'm a regular at Liverpool Street. It's always packed - a constant flow of commuters and tourists. For a station of such significance, it really ought to offer a better experience. Stations are often the first and last touch point that people have with London. It's important that we leave a positive impression if we want to keep attracting business and tourism to our great city.	PA	15-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Ransom	Sally	I am now afraid to use escalators and I find stairs difficult too. I would travel to London more on the train if I knew there were lifts at Liverpool Street Station	PA	15-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Odwyer Myers	Julie	Being disable woul make it easy for me.	PA	15-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Hicks	Jeanette	make travelling eaier for disabled people	PA	15-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Gander	Karren	There is an ageing population , in London ,as elsewhere... unfortunately, that means more likelihood of mobility issues. Escalators are ok for many, but they are not safe for wheelchair, pushchair, or pram users, and even some luggage.	PA	15-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Gordon-Head	Anette	Lifts are required to enable disabled passengers to travel.	PA	15-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Gravener	Sarah-Jane		DC	15-Jul-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Courtman	Karina	I want shops toilets and trains to be accessible	PA	15-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Ojeda	Leticia	Liverpool Street it is a very busy area, as well as the station. I totally agree with the improvement, like more toilets available for people there and the image of a great tube/train station according of a great city as London	PA	15-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Andrews	Jennifer	As a frequent user of this station, I object to this application largely under the National Planning Policy Framework, since it would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. I object to the significant harm caused to this Grade II listed station with the demolition and replacement of its roof structure - the new structure replacing it which would make a nonsense of the setting of the 19C train sheds. I see damage and no value in inserting new shops and elevated shop sections in those sheds. I also see architectural harm to the setting of the existing Grade II listed hotel with a tower of some 20 stories over the station concourse. That tower makes an attractive low and medium level housingscape a nonsense, and of the Bishopsgate Conservation Area in general, contrary to the 2015 City Plan. I currently arrive at Liverpool Street with pleasure (and even as an elderly person, am not gasping for more loos). I don't want to be arriving or leaving from a tower which is a landmark for all the wrong reasons.	PA	15-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Tallis	Zoe	I object to this application. It would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. In particular: 1 demolition of the roof of the station concourse would compromise the setting of the C19 train shed. 2 incorporating substantial numbers of new shops would significantly harm the nobility and integrity of this fine building. 3 the impact overall to the surrounding heritage buildings, especially the last remaining C19 hotel, of the building of a 20 storey tower over the concourse would be extremely harmful and create an eyesore. 4 it would make a mockery of the intentions of the Bishopsgate Conservation Area contrary to the 2015 city plan and set a precedent for further inappropriate development, contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework. This station building is beautiful and unique. As is the surrounding area. It should not be compromised by an incongruous, massive tower and the destruction of the existing roof would be an act of philistinism.	PA	15-Jul-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Chappell	Andrew	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional."	PA	15-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Coote	Elaine	Helps the disabled.	PA	15-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Monaghan	Jane	I've been using this station for 50 years and I do think it needs more accessible access points. As I get older I have arthritis on both knees as a frequent user of Liverpool Street station. It would help me and hopefully others to get about.	PA	15-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Ricketts	Shirley	I am 78, travelled to Liverpool St since 1962. I was 15. Now need independence. Lifts, toilets. Escalators accessible.	PA	15-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Carr	Linda	Easier access for elderly, disabled, children in prams, luggage.	PA	15-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Coombes	Kevin	Better access for the disabled is important.	PA	15-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Burrell	Angela	More lifts please.	PA	15-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Mcclure	Irene	Help people with limited mobility and relieve congestion.	PA	15-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Shilton	Mary	When accessing the underground its not possible to access the central line if you're unable to use the escalators. I have issues with balance and dizziness which makes it impossible to use the fast moving escalators. More lifts would make visiting London from East Anglia so much more enjoyable.	PA	15-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Smith	Maggie	I'm over 70 and not entitled to use disabled toilet (1?) at ground level and with a heavy suitcase it's almost impossible to bump downstairs to the ladies as it only has escalator coming out! Very tiring with arthritis and lack of easily accessible toilets urgent now. I'm getting older every time I visit my southern based children and this lack of toilets is not acceptable.	PA	15-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Rees	Emma Catherine	It would be so important to change the station so it reflects the change in society but can still hold the history of the past.	PA	15-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Kuhr	Natasha	Long queues for toilets and they are so heavily used it's hard to keep them clean.	PA	15-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Smith	Ellie	I really struggled to get down the stairs to the toilets in the station with my hand luggage. I think having more accessible toilets for everyone would make the station a much better space for travellers.	PA	15-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Baker	Valerie	There is a lack of public toilets in London generally.	PA	15-Jul-25	S

25/00494/FULEIA	Dewhurst	Adam	Existing station is tired and not fit for purposes, and offers poor arrival experience for visitors first visiting the City. New plans solve this	PA	16-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Nibbs McQuilen	Patricia	Current access to the basement lavatories is discriminatory - all lavatories should be on the main concourse - As soon as a shop unit becomes available it must be redesignated for lavatories - all cubicles must have sinks, some with changing tables - all doors must be wide enough for wheelchair users - genderless cubicles means everyone is accommodated	PA	16-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Baker	Christine	Because myself and my husband are senior citizens and need to use the toilet quickly when we either arrive at the station or just get off the train. The steps at LS are steep down to the toilets also.	PA	16-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Brizhatyuk	Dmitry	The station is indeed overcrowded and looks dated. This is an esthetically pleasing project that brings the station up to the modern standards	PA	16-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Cable	Katrina	Because travel with a back issue and bags on an escalator is no fun at any age. The ones you have are not fit for purpose. This adds anxiety and un-necessary pressure to travellers.	PA	16-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Francis	Graham	So we can get home without a lot of hassle.	PA	16-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Howard	Judith		DC	16-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Willis	Sue		DC	16-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Sheppard	Julia		DC	16-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Bray	Sandra		DC	16-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Kean	Hilda		DC	16-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Hemmings	Christopher		DC	16-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Redelli	Maria		DC	16-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Kindred	Bob		DC	16-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Stanley	Ron		DC	16-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Andrews	Meg		DC	16-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	P Norris	John		DC	16-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Ashman	Richard		DC	16-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Jones	David		DC	16-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Lafferty	Julia		DC	16-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Hill	Jim		DC	16-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Saunders	Huw		DC	16-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Goodridge	Paul		DC	16-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Thomas	Catherine		DC	16-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Artemis	Sophie		DC	16-Jul-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Mawson-Taylor	Alex	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to; 1, The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. 2, The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. 3, The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. 4, The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. 5, The president that such permission would set in respect of other nationally important heritage assets. If planning were to be permitted in this case, which other buildings could then become at risk of demolition. Please bear in mind the National Planning Policy Framework Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional.	PA	16-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Douglas	Gaile	Why change something so beautiful that is working anyway. Great Britain at its best.! Iconic station which needs to remain traditional	PA	16-Jul-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Anderson	Elizabeth	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. I am proud of my link with the City, and very disappointed at how the City may treat such heritage. More specifically, I raise objections to: The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure, which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." This is not a scheme that will enhance the area, rather it out of keeping and will destroy a landmark.	PA	16-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Grassett	Emily	Redeveloping Liverpool Street would benefit the entire city and should be done.	PA	17-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Overington	Rick	I use the station weekly to commute. It's a wild west at peak times. Chaos at the worst times.	PA	17-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Mason	Michael	I feel like public infrastructure like this - especially in east London - is sorely missed. The proposed solution is beautiful, true to its cultural history, and modern / sustainable in its longevity.	PA	17-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Deakin	Hilary	The station is spacious light and airy. Definitely needs the natural light through its glazed roof. Do not destroy this historic building.	PA	17-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	O'leary	Nicala		DC	17-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	McCosh	Malika		DC	17-Jul-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Baylis	Sarah	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets, contravenes the National Planning Policy Framework regarding listed buildings. and would result in the undermining of views of iconic Wren churches and the further loss of beauty in our fragile world. I raise objections to: The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church.	PA	18-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Upsher	James	This is another horrible proposal that has been presented to the public in a duplicitous manner by the applicant, including a misleading social media advertising campaign. The legacy of the 1990s redevelopment is a good one, and should be respected, as its listed status protects. The minor changes at Liverpool Street that are desired to improve accessibility are possible without major works, that will destroy that legacy and cause years of disruption. The area around the station has been compressively developed and building on top of this small parcel is not sustainable or desirable.	PA	18-Jul-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Coles	Samantha	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to the substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional."	PA	18-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Kalkhoven	P	I object to this submission as this proposal would have a significant detrimental effect on the listed building that Liverpool Street station rightly is. Its overwhelming massing negatively affects the setting of the listed station building and blocks daylight into the important public concourse area below.	PA	18-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Hunwick	Neal	I object to this proposal as I have used Liverpool St Station for nearly 30 years and have always marvelled at its Victorian architecture and engineering, it's delicate beauty can not and should not be lost. It is light, bright and airy and it's magnificent space should not be eroded for greed. Develop the goods yards along Bethnal Green Road and leave the Station intact.	PA	19-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Brasier	Ken	As it will destroy our Victorian architectural heritage.	PA	19-Jul-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	SINDALL	DAVID	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. I am proud of my link with the City, and very disappointed at how the City may treat such heritage. More specifically, I raise objections to: The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure, which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." This is not a scheme that will enhance the area, rather it out of keeping and will destroy a landmark.	PA	19-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Hills	Beverley	Unnecessary destruction of a heritage Grade 2 listed roof to accommodate Network rails own profit margins is unethical and avaricious. Network rail should look to its own mismanagement of the concourse, that is what its 'supporting letters' are really about. I highly object to my city's heritage buildings being ripped apart.	PA	21-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Williams	Alan		DC	21-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Hodge	Jamie	The station needs capacity.	PA	21-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Donovan	Dave	Update to Liverpool St station well overdue.	PA	21-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Paton	Rory	Liverpool Street Station is one of the key gateway transport hubs for the City of London. If the business district is to evolve positively, its crucial that the infrastructure keeps pace. This ambitious redevelopment positions the station for the future to help support that growth.	PA	21-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Burling	Vicky		DC	21-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Lewis	Catherine	This is a beautifully restored station and a vital gateway to East Anglia. It should not have any further development or disruption. It's beautiful as it is. The roof must be preserved.	PA	22-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Evans-Pughe	Anthony	Because it is long overdue	PA	22-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Kett	Kirsteen	To mych congestion, not enough toilets on ground level.	PA	22-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Yi	Swan	its always so overcrowded and not a really pleasant space to be in	PA	22-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Durbin	Patricia	It's chaos	PA	22-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Morales	Felipe	It will transform the city and journey of thousands	PA	22-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Sapora	Silvia	I often go by Liverpool Street and it always seems really crowded and while other stations in London feel quite "grand" (Paddington is my favourite, but King's Cross and Marylebone are also beautiful) Liverpool Street is just a very utilitarian space	PA	22-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Williams	Lyn		DC	22-Jul-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Lee	Martin	I use the station frequently and it is overcrowded and concerning for personal safety. It is very difficult to get platform access when there are thousands of people milling around and they prevent access to our platform.	PA	22-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Davies	Richard	My main line station for trips from Norwich! I also teach Design and Technology and find the railways and infrastructure very interesting. I try to impart this in to my pupils. Any possible school related content, trips or grants would be fantastic. My main line station for trips from Norwich! I also teach Design and Technology and find the railways and infrastructure very interesting. I try to impart this in to my pupils. Any possible school related content, trips or grants would be fantastic.	PA	22-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Phillips	Helen Louise	I would like to see more lifts at London Liverpool Street because it would ease passengers safety. I would like to see more lifts at London Liverpool Street because it would ease passengers safety.	PA	22-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Rodgers	Fred		DC	22-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Letherland	John	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to the following points: * The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. * The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. * The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II* listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. * The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church I also note that the National Planning Policy Framework Paragraph NPPF 213 states that: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." The proposals in this application are far from exceptional and the application should be refused.	PA	22-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Williams-Jones	Elaine	Disabled people who want to use the station get pushed to the back! More lifts would help them to get out safely and quickly!	PA	22-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Herring	William	More disabled toilets always appreciated, speaking as a Disabled Person.	PA	22-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Rowley	Olive	Disabled toilets had a long queue of able people to use it as other toilets broken. I could not wait. Nearly had an accident.	PA	22-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Wilson	Natalie	It's the station that's for the East that connects me to London.	PA	22-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Meyrick	Gwendoline	To make commuting a less stressful experience.	PA	22-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Parkes C	Timothy		DC	22-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Rey-Burns	Paul	This is a terrible idea, please preserve this wonderful building.	PA	22-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Wignall	Katharine		DC	23-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Wilson	Susan		DC	23-Jul-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Millard	Antony		DC	23-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	McCarthy	Kevin		DC	23-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Edwards	Jessica	Hub station that feels like passing transit. Lifts not fit for purpose.	PA	23-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Anderson	Joshua	The station is tired, old, hard to navigate, forced to use it however the historic architecture isn't able to be appreciated because of the horrific ability to navigate wait for trains. No one wants to be in the station and I commute here everyday. Huge opportunity.	PA	23-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Harinton	Xai	Up to date and current approach to travel but still nodding to the past heritage.	PA	23-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	James Vičar	Lubo?	More capacity, up to date and refiner (yet respectful) approach to a refurbishment.	PA	23-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Dewick	Paul	Liverpool Street is so busy it feels unsafe.	PA	23-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Barker	Gav	The station needs an update not just aesthetically but also to improve customer flows now and into the future.	PA	23-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Bailey	Joanne		DC	23-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Cameron	Sophie		DC	23-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Wilson	Andrew		DC	23-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Douglas-Menzies	Arrabella		DC	23-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Weaver	Alan		DC	23-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Sparks	Michael	I object to the change to the original building and concourse being changed and amended and completely overshadowed by by a huge office building. As an architect the concept of the proposal and the design is one of the worst I have seen. In terms of need there is absolutely no need of more offices in London and with the future use of AI the need will be depressed even further.	PA	23-Jul-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Hamlen	Karen	To: Tom Sleigh, Chair of the Planning & Transport Committee Re: Planning Application 25/00494/FULEIA I object to this application which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to the following points: - Demolition of the Grade II-listed station concourse roof and its replacement with a new structure would result in substantial harm to the listed building itself and compromise the setting of the adjacent 19th-century train shed. - Insertion of extensive new retail units within the 19th-century train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, would significantly undermine the special architectural and historic interest of the Grade II-listed station. - Adverse impact on the setting of surrounding listed buildings, particularly the Grade II*-listed hotel-the last continually operating 19th-century hotel in the City-through the proposed construction of a twenty-storey tower above the station concourse. - Substantial harm to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, caused by the introduction of a tall building in an area defined by low- and medium-rise structures. This directly contravenes the 2015 City Plan, which stipulates that planning permission for tall buildings should be refused in inappropriate locations, including Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. - Wider heritage impacts, including detrimental effects on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets across the City and beyond, such as the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren churches and nearby St Botolph's church. In accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), this application fails to meet the requirements set out in Paragraph 213, which states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." The level of harm proposed is not justified and cannot be consider	PA	25-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Reynolds	Stacey	This is an amazing structure which should be preserved. I use the station most days and it works well.	PA	25-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Kenneth	Lilian	I strongly to the object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I am really concerned qt the overall beutal change to auch a magnificent grade II listed structure It will change the dundamentalala od the area, impact ita history andimpact the glory of the design and Thw surrounding area ... And doe what More shopa more xommercial facilities more coffee shops - there are plenty around - why more !!! Throughout my lifetime it has been the central hub of my life - work and career, beginning of lifes journeys and adventures. The station supports so many every hour and every day and we all are in awe od its beauty and stature. There is no doubt that this proposal has purely financial motives - let us retain the beauty and the history. So much has been destroyed- the essence of London being destroyed and thia landmark should not be developed !!!!!	PA	25-Jul-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	crampton	Teresa crampton	Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." The proposed development is not required and cannot be justified as exceptional and must be refused. Preservation of the heritage, setting and use of the current sites listed structures is essential to maintaining the essence of the city. The existing roof structure provides an airy light attractive public place which would no longer exist if the proposed scheme is permitted. High-rise buildings should not be permitted in the area as they would bring long term detriment by overshadowing historical features and listed buildings. The city does not need this type of development in this location. I object to the proposed development.	PA	26-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Haynes	Rob	This station should be a listed building (if it isn't already) and needs to be left untouched. All around are glass and steel monstrosities and the area does not need any more. Save our heritage.	PA	26-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Fieldsend	Jonathan	Look, things change, things move on, life gets better. Time for progress. Ignore the Victorians.	PA	28-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	McArdle	Michael	It's a busy station and the layout isn't used to its full potential at the moment. The waiting areas and entrances/exits definitely need improvement to make the area more accessible and nicer.	PA	28-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Brett	Fin	Ease congestion, enhance the building	PA	28-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Garlick	Kate	Dangerous over crowding and struggling to get on your train due to the crowds	PA	28-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Borg Jones	Ruben	i believe that the architecture and current foundations of Liverpool Street are well overdue update and that, from the drastic increase of passengers from the new crossrail update means that there should be much more funding and renovations in Liverpool Street station.	PA	28-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Hearne	Charlotte	I think redevelopment of Liverpool Street is key to it being able to service the enormous number of people that pass through it every year. I would love to see a new Liverpool Street where people aren't crammed in like sardines.	PA	28-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Barlow	Andrea	Easier flow at rush hour.	PA	28-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Stephenson	Jonathan	This station is the key entrance to the city.	PA	28-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Ringsell	Anita	We need space to move. The disabled need lifts to live their lives.	PA	28-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Swims	Helen	Its important for everyone including disabled, elderly as well as those people with prams and pushchairs.	PA	28-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Candler	Margaret	Reduce the congestion.	PA	28-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Lozeau	Chris	Needs modernising. Needs modernising.	PA	28-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Kyle	Alex	I work at LST (London Liverpool Street) and I think this upgrade will be very beneficial.	PA	28-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Lockwood	Laura	Overcrowded station.	PA	28-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Parker	Simon	Needs to happen as the station is massively overcrowded during rush hour.	PA	28-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Metcalfe	Emma	My husband has mobility problems, but he doesn't want to queue up for the one tiny lift which only holds three people. We need more lifts, please!	PA	28-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Doyle	Kathy		DC	28-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Walker	Barbara	I am disabled and elderly and rely on lifts, they don't take you to the underground platform. One often breaks down so you have to walk around to what is also a service lift which smells unpleasant. The main lift is small.	PA	28-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Lowe	Tim		DC	28-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Lucas	Gary	Work for Greater Anglia as a Driver. Station is far too congested and not easy to maneuver around. New plans look good, much brighter and offer far more accessibility and space.	PA	28-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Vowles-Sheridan	Stephen	Agree! It needs a massive upgrade with restructuring to improve space and waiting, seats.	PA	28-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Mason	Daniel		DC	28-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Simonson	Danielle	More working lifts needed. Im on crutches and with help can go up on escalators but not down.	PA	28-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Simonson	Danielle	More working lifts needed. Im on crutches and with help can go up on escalators but not down.	PA	28-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Langworthy	Richard	Disabled access is important!	PA	28-Jul-25	S

25/00494/FULEIA	Southcott	Peter And Margaret		DC	28-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Mahrouei	Edris	London is a constantly growing and evolving city. With more people moving here and an increasing number commuting in for work every day, it's essential that our infrastructure grows with us. While we take great pride in preserving our heritage, we also need to make room for progress. Renovating Liverpool Street Station is not about erasing the past, it's about preparing for the future. A modernised station with improved accessibility, expanded platforms, and better facilities will help manage the growing demand and create a smoother, more efficient experience for everyone. It's time we matched the pace of the world around us and invested in an infrastructure that reflects the needs of today's London.	PA	28-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Mahrouei	Edris	London is a constantly growing and evolving city. With more people moving here and an increasing number commuting in for work every day, it's essential that our infrastructure grows with us. While we take great pride in preserving our heritage, we also need to make room for progress. Renovating Liverpool Street Station is not about erasing the past, it's about preparing for the future. A modernised station with improved accessibility, expanded platforms, and better facilities will help manage the growing demand and create a smoother, more efficient experience for everyone. It's time we matched the pace of the world around us and invested in an infrastructure that reflects the needs of today's London.	PA	28-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Lark	Becka	[Lifts] Because it's safer and I'm frightened of going down escalators.	PA	28-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Cassels	Sally		DC	28-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Petherick	Ann		DC	28-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Wood	Philip		DC	28-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Watkinson	David		DC	28-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Chan	Chun Sun		DC	28-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Bronkhurst	Judith		DC	28-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Harrison	Julia		DC	28-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Gurl	Peter		DC	28-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	De Jasay	Lucinda		DC	28-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Campbell	Nigel		DC	28-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Neale	Francis		DC	28-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Smith-Rawnsley	Sheila		DC	28-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Hill	Timothy		DC	28-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Candler	Margaret	Reduce the congestion.	PA	28-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Lozeau	Chris	Needs modernising. Needs modernising.	PA	28-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Swan	Christine		DC	28-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Orbell	Martin J		DC	28-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Rigge	Simon		DC	28-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Simpson	Elizabeth		DC	28-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Curtis	David		DC	28-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Gowans	James		DC	28-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Hutchinson	Procter		DC	28-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Scott	Mary		DC	28-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Keating	Michael		DC	28-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Mortimer	Rosemary		DC	28-Jul-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Brodey	Lyn		DC	28-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	McCarthy	Rachel		DC	28-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Barlow	James		DC	28-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Harries	Glyn		DC	28-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Maguire	Karen		DC	28-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Hendry	Kirk		DC	28-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Begum	Labbeka		DC	28-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Maidment	Barry		DC	28-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Plumb	Stephanie		DC	28-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Smith	Helen		DC	28-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Lethbridge	Lucy		DC	28-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Moojen	Alex		DC	28-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Holroyd	Jennifer		DC	28-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Hunt	Peter		DC	28-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Dixon	John		DC	28-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Hunter	Michelle		DC	28-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Reading	David		DC	28-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Cooper	Gillian	I object to this application which would cause substantial harm to significant and nationally important heritage assets. I raise objections to the wanton destruction of a heritage site. We know from destruction of other heritage buildings in the past, how we can regret such destruction and cannot get back the architecture which is more beautiful and more valued than modern buildings. I object to: The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. The application is contraryThe National Planning Policy Framework which states "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should not occur.	PA	28-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Lee	Bev	More lifts everywhere on the Underground would help people like my husband with some walking ability but not a lot of energy due to being in heart failure.	PA	28-Jul-25	S

25/00494/FULEIA	Warner	Laura	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: 1) The dereliction in duty to preserve that heritage for future generations and to realise the importance of celebrating London's past as an integral part of celebrating its present. 2) Too often now there is a move instead to obliterate London's history in the name of some futuristic vision - often a vision designed and dictated by those who have no personal ties to the place - but this move misunderstands the nature of humans who will always care for what they have a tie to. If you want people to care about London don't then sever those ties but instead cherish them. Liverpool Street Station, its history, architecture, its presence in so many books and films, is one of those ties.	PA	29-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Bitton	Joy	Yes we need more lifts at Liverpool station to make it more accessible.	PA	29-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	James	Sarah	As a disabled person who finds stairs extremely diifAs a disabled person find stairs difficult especially how many there is. It would be great to have more lifts that are not tucked away in corners	PA	29-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Stone	Andrew		DC	29-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Tyler	Eva		DC	29-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Carter	Sharon		DC	29-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Mirza	Hamza	London and its major stations need to be transformed as more then just station but destinations to put london back on the map get the economy going	PA	29-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Lacey	Christina		DC	29-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Hudson	Mark		DC	29-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Leigh-Wood	Oliver	I object to this application which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets.The substantial harm to the Grade 11-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and it replacement with a new structure, which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed.The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade 11 listed heritage asset.The impact to the setting of the surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade11* - listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse.The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low and medium scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan.This proposal is contrary to NPPF 2024 which requires that great weight should be given to the conservation of heritage assets and proposals that do not preserve and look after the settings of such assets should be dismissed.	DC	29-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Lawrence	David		DC	29-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Thomas	Jane		DC	29-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Kennedy	Rhoda		DC	29-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Kosanovic	Georgina		DC	29-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Roe Burrows	Valarie		DC	29-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Newby	Sarah		DC	29-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Fine	David		DC	29-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Lambe	Fiona-Jane		DC	29-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Madsen	Sarah		DC	29-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Rhys Jones	Griff		DC	29-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Lock	Charles		DC	29-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Marden	Valerie		DC	29-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Almau	Luis		DC	29-Jul-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Kelly	Derek		DC	29-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Hardy	Matthew		DC	29-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Perry	Alfred		DC	29-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Rhys Jones	Jo		DC	29-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Spiteri	Joseph	I am 24/7 carer for my partly disabled friend and need more lifts and specially if you have luggage. We need more lifts in many more stations	PA	29-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Molehusband	Reginald	It will make for a more pleasant and definitely more efficient train service.	PA	29-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Donkor	Amma	To make it more comfortable to navigate for commuters in rush hour and tourists. It will be especially for the disabled, mobility impaired and those with young children/buggies.	PA	29-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Allen-Sheperd	Sue	I prefer to go by train, I have tried hard for over 15 years, but with luggage it is impossible. Some toilets are down step narrow staircases, I can't cross my legs for that long on a journey. Paddington is a bit better now, but it is a very long walk, I am getting too old to walk that far with luggage. Liverpool Street is still a nightmare travelling to Paddington. I have to rely on other passengers help me lift my suitcase up the steps. I am now 75 and have suffered long covid for over 5 years. 15 years ago I burst blood vessels the whole length on my underarm, heaving a suitcase on my journey to Exmouth to go and get my very elderly mother out of hospital.	PA	29-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Chan	Wengkwan	Need to make the interchanges more accessible for all people to cut down their time in finding the entrances and separating the arrivals and departure traffics from passers by for local workers.	PA	29-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Weaving	Mary		DC	29-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Althorpe	Mike		DC	30-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Rawson	Trevor		DC	30-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Collyer	Daniel		DC	30-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Georgiou	Marios		DC	30-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Winman	Sarah		DC	30-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Whittredge	Emily		DC	30-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Judge	Noah		DC	30-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Green	Jenny	There aren't enough lift from the booking hall to the platform level for people with baby buggies and cases	PA	30-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Thomas	Ann	I want this to happen because I cant get my rollator on the escalators so I cant travel to London on the train anymore - Im sure there are thousands like m	PA	30-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Christine Sawyer	Sue	To allow disabled people access.	PA	30-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Brooks	Hilary	More disabled access!	PA	30-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Reid	Linda	inclusive for disabled and elderly	PA	30-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Farrow	Gail	The lack of lifts and escalators at London's busiest station is completely ridiculous and very inconvenient. I'm constantly hearing tourists speak negatively about it...it's an embarrassment	PA	30-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Jenkins	Richard		DC	30-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Wilson	Gabrielle		DC	30-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Hewitt	Rosemarie		DC	30-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Loughnane	Darren		DC	30-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Dalton	James		DC	30-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Sharpe	Phillis		DC	30-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Terry	Francis		DC	30-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Wunderman	Charles		DC	30-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Parkes	Wendy P		DC	30-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Marquet-Brooks	Clemence		DC	30-Jul-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Brace	Geoffrey & Jennifer		DC	30-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Booth	Chris	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets and the substantial harm to the surrounding listed assets of the hotel through the construction of a 20 storey building on top of it. The current station is an outstanding station that functions well currently. If it is purely over-crowding that is the issue then this could be resolved without the need to destroy a vital heritage asset.	PA	30-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Simons	Hilary	It's vital, especially for the disabled!	PA	30-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Smith	Gary	Fantastic iconic station should be renovated for the future.	PA	30-Jul-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Roberts	Teresa Anne	"I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to:" The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional.	PA	31-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Lemmer	Azaluddin	The architectural design destroys the old Victorian style and does not contribute to society. There are enough offices in London. The office on top the station does not reflect the City of London and ruins the skyline.	PA	31-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Powell	Bertie	I object this proposal.	PA	31-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Ridge	Tom		DC	31-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Coyle	Sharon		DC	31-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Kow	Susanna		DC	31-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Ward	John And Carol		DC	31-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Kopke	OP		DC	31-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Harris	Tony		DC	31-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Seale	Stephen		DC	31-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Hatton-Gore	Robin T.		DC	31-Jul-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Quinton	Laura	This beautiful station is fit for purpose and is light and airy. It is like a cathedral of travel and by blocking the light and selling it out for commercial profit you will likely deter people from wanting to use public transport and destroy another piece of London's history. Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." and this work would cause substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, would cause a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. In particular, the work would cause harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church.	PA	31-Jul-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Macaulay	Judith	As a now elderly person, unable to walk without severe pain, I need to be able to get from level to level by the shortest route possible, and the least number of steps. I am usually needing to wheel my heavy, bulky bag, and using lifts is essential.	PA	01-Aug-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Taylor	Tracey	I travel to London via Liverpool Street frequently. It will be a better place if the plans are started asap.	PA	01-Aug-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Snell	Suzie	To help disabled and young families with extra luggage navigate the station easier. Ease congestion on the concourse.	PA	01-Aug-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Woodstock	Sue	For many travellers to London, it's their entry point from 2 airports - it's an embarrassment that its so dreary.	PA	01-Aug-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Goodings	Rod	For ease of movement for the elderly and infirm.	PA	01-Aug-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Morrison	Zak	The station needs to change currently, whilst I understand the need to preserve history they are not artifacts. The fact of the matter is the people who use this station day to day don't care, we just want it to work and be a pleasant enough experience. Accessibility at Liverpool needs improvement now whats the point in making it look nice if it's still a struggle to use for those who are vulnerable. I think the plans not only look great but will make the station more pleasant.	PA	01-Aug-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Hunt	Tanya	Because more needs to be done to help disabled/ elderly/ injured peoples access whilst keeping the building beautiful and in one piece.	PA	01-Aug-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Small	Rob		DC	01-Aug-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Garratt	Mary		DC	01-Aug-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Atkinson	Mark		DC	01-Aug-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Walters	John L		DC	01-Aug-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Collingridge	Andrew		DC	01-Aug-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Weaver	Madeleine		DC	01-Aug-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Heppenstall	Nicky		DC	01-Aug-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Potter-Merrigan	Gillian		DC	01-Aug-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Pereira	Jane		DC	01-Aug-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Aldgate Connect BID			DC	01-Aug-25	R
25/00494/FULEIA	Eastern City BID			DC	01-Aug-25	R

25/00494/FULEIA	Heppell	Sharon		DC	01-Aug-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Williams	Julia		DC	01-Aug-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Lambe	Patrick		DC	01-Aug-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Napier	Christopher		DC	01-Aug-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Napier	Jill		DC	01-Aug-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Elmes	Kirsten		DC	01-Aug-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Methven	Charlie		DC	01-Aug-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Macdonald	Angus		DC	01-Aug-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Read	Jane		DC	01-Aug-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Harris	Tanya		DC	01-Aug-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Kosanovic	Georgina		DC	01-Aug-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Booth	Matt	I believe it is the kind of world class architecture that we need.	PA	01-Aug-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Fermor	Geraldine	I have mobility issues and am unable to use stairs.	PA	01-Aug-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Barat-Clarke	Rachael	Even when I was young and fit, a suitcase was a nightmare at Liverpool Street station. Just getting from the underground is horrible. If you need a toilet, 20 plus steps with rucksack and heavy case is impossible. It is so 19th century.	PA	01-Aug-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Spence	Sue	I object to this planning application. The proposed development will destroy a beautiful part of our history and replace it with yet another faceless office block. I have never seen the station concourse overcrowded, it does not lack amenities. I feel the development is an excuse to yet again make yet more money at the expense of our heritage. It will be shameful if permission is granted	PA	03-Aug-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Hart	Alison	I strongly object to the plan to build a tower on top of the station. This development will be to the severe detriment of the grade 2 listed station building and is in contravention of the National Planning Policy Framework. Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." The existing station concourse is in keeping with the surrounding building and I have never experienced it as dangerous due to overcrowding. Please reconsider these plans as they would mean we'd lose the entire character of this station.	PA	03-Aug-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Ford	Catherine	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. I refer to the National Planning Policy Framework Paragraph NPPF 213 which states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional."	PA	03-Aug-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Higgins	Tricia	As a wheelchair user, i have experienced problems when the main lift on the concourse is out of order. i know there's another lift behind platform 10, but a lot of people don't. In addition, there can be massive queues when large numbers of people with heavy luggage try to use the main lift	PA	04-Aug-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Hewitt	Di	Struggle with the steps especially with cases	PA	04-Aug-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Morrish	Sue	current lifts are tiny, in an out of the way location and there are too few.	PA	04-Aug-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Flood	Janet	I find stairs difficult	PA	04-Aug-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Ludlow	Karon	For People who find stairs difficult	PA	04-Aug-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Martyn	Sandy	I have mobility issues and can't use escalators a lift would be essential for me to use.	PA	04-Aug-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Phile	Carol	I am wheelchair bound so I cant go anywhere if selfish people fill up the few lifts.	PA	04-Aug-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Maunder	Andrew	I use this station daily and support the scheme for the following reasons: - the station needs a major upgrade to cope with current and future passagner demand - providing the quality is maintained, it presents a stunning design and a great addition to the city of London - the design is thoughtful and celebrates what remains of the historic fabric of the building and its surroundings	PA	04-Aug-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Crofts	Charlotte		DC	04-Aug-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Argent	Clare		DC	04-Aug-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Black	Audrey & Andrew		DC	04-Aug-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Firth	Tanya		DC	04-Aug-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Cheyney	Julie		DC	04-Aug-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Arthur	Gordon		DC	04-Aug-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Newman	Aileen	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to the harm that would be caused through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. This would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. I object to the building of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of the elevated retail galleries. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church.	PA	05-Aug-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Vernon	Richard		DC	05-Aug-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Bridle	Peta Ruth		DC	05-Aug-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Grellier	Frances		DC	05-Aug-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Howell	Jean		DC	05-Aug-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Wells	Catharine		DC	05-Aug-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Green	Jeremy		DC	05-Aug-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Shilaw	Ali		DC	05-Aug-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Dickinson	Theo		DC	05-Aug-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	(OBO Hyatt International LLC)	Lichfields		DC	05-Aug-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Bromelow	Kimberley		DC	05-Aug-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Gerard	Meaghan		DC	05-Aug-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Wagner	Erica		DC	05-Aug-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Bigger	Loraine		DC	05-Aug-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Thompson	Terrence		DC	05-Aug-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Hughes	Margaret		DC	05-Aug-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Walker	Benjamin		DC	05-Aug-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Hawes	Robin	I use the station frequently and although I love it now, since the previous rebuilding, I know that it needs further improvements.	PA	05-Aug-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Ranger	Jonathan		DC	05-Aug-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Arding	Kate		DC	05-Aug-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Coombs	Nathaniel		DC	05-Aug-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Zuckerman	Paul S		DC	05-Aug-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Kirkpatrick	Neville		DC	05-Aug-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Lane	Sarah		DC	05-Aug-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Bunning	Samantha		DC	05-Aug-25	R
25/00494/FULEIA	Kay	Susan		DC	05-Aug-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Barnes	Aaron	I object to the appallingly excessive plans submitted for Liverpool Street Station. Grounds to object are many and varied, but primarily 1) the damage done to the existing building including the concourse and roof, 2) the external damage to the Bishopsgate conservation area at ground and storied levels, 3) the lack of suitable amenity and excessive provision of offices, 4) impact on the character and appearance of the station, street and area.	PA	05-Aug-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Chance	Veronique		DC	05-Aug-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	King	Laura	Network Rail should be ashamed of this proposal. There is ample space in Gracechurch Street for new office space (and plenty of unused buildings too) for their plans. Liverpool Street has never been overcrowded; even pre-pandemic. This office space is simply not needed with many people now working from home. Liverpool Street is one of the rare pleasant stations in London, with a stunning roof and architecture. Please don't turn a light and open station into a dark and dingy space. This feels all about profit, but our history should be preserved and respected. If you want to improve the station then improve the stairs and escalators up to Bishopsgate as that's the only area that ever gets busy.	PA	06-Aug-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Gregory	Emma	To protect the historical building. It would be a huge mistake to go forward with this plan	PA	07-Aug-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Marshman	Guy	Looks amazing, great for area.	PA	07-Aug-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Gafaro	Filippo	Liverpool Street Station is too busy for its current layout. The split level concourse with a couple of escalators going down is not for the current passenger volume.	PA	07-Aug-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Williams	Stuart	Yes please.	PA	07-Aug-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Dillingham	Harry	Get started ASAP! Massive improvement on the previous plans by Herzog & de Meuron. For too long this country has been held back by people that don't want to see anything change. We must get Britain innovating and building again - this is a step in the right direction! Don't listen to the NIMBYs.	PA	07-Aug-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Doljanin	Edward	We need a proper gateway for London.	PA	07-Aug-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Whiting	Genny	Increase improvement of accessibility to London's beautiful cultural landmarks. I have mobility issues and so do millions of other train users. It would facilitate increased tourism financial income.	PA	07-Aug-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Seagroatt	Tracy	Disabled Mum and friends cannot access beautiful London!	PA	07-Aug-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Darke	Nancy	So that I can easily travel to the centre with my wheelchair.	PA	07-Aug-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Adair	Anthony	Make Liverpool St better.	PA	07-Aug-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Short	Alan	More lifts for disabled at Liverpool St and on the Tube.	PA	07-Aug-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Fallon	Rosalyn	I am 71 (not elderly), of restricted height, with an arthritic hand and can not lift much weight. I struggle on stairs and escalators!	PA	07-Aug-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Pettitt	Fiona		DC	07-Aug-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Strutton	Elaine	I object to having an office block above the concourse. Do not ruin the station! It's a beautiful station.	PA	07-Aug-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	City of London Conservation Area Advisory Committee			DC	07-Aug-25	R
25/00494/FULEIA	Hazelwood-Horner	Lewis	I particularly object the partial demolition and proposed plan of alterations of over-station development reaching a maximum height of 97.67m aswell as also object the build of private office terraces. The current roof offers a superb amount of light through and new planning should be proposed for a restoration of the roof.	PA	08-Aug-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Barber	Michael	I strongly object to the partial demolition of the historically and architecturally important station. We should not be knocking down the vanishingly small number of important historical landmarks in the area just to accommodate more pointless office space. The towers you propose to demolish are a well known landmark in the area and once they're gone they're never coming back. The proposed building sitting on top of Liverpool street is also massively out of proportion. You shouldn't be building anything on top of this listed building. The greed evident in these plans is quite unbelievable, and i'm very surprised this is coming from network rail of all people. Not every building in London has to be a shopping mall. LEAVE IT ALONE.	PA	09-Aug-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Froom	Jane	I object to this application as this station and concourse is full of natural light and needs to be restored as a beautiful example of the City of London heritage. Can we have one building that is not high rise and bland. Please	PA	09-Aug-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Collier	Richard	Dear Mr Sleigh, I am writing to formally object to the current planning application for the redevelopment of Liverpool Street Station. The proposal would cause substantial and unacceptable harm to both the Grade II-listed station and its surrounding historic environment. My concerns are as follows: 1. Harm to the Grade II-listed station The demolition of the existing station concourse roof and its replacement with a modern structure would irreversibly damage the historic fabric and compromise the setting of the surviving 19th-century train shed. 2. Loss of historic character through excessive retail insertion The proposed insertion of large amounts of new retail space, including two elevated retail galleries within the original train sheds, would erode the architectural integrity, special interest, and heritage significance of this important building. 3. Impact on surrounding heritage assets The Grade II*-listed Liverpool Street Hotel - the last continually operating 19th-century hotel in the City - would suffer harm to its setting from the construction of a 20-storey tower above the station concourse. This intrusive addition would dominate and detract from the hotel's historic character. 4. Damage to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area The introduction of a tall building into an area defined by low- and medium-rise structures would undermine the historic townscape, contrary to the City of London's 2015 Local Plan, which prohibits tall buildings in inappropriate locations such as Conservation Areas and the St Paul's Cathedral Heights policy area. The scheme would also adversely affect the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets, including many Grade I-listed Christopher Wren churches and nearby St Botolph's church. 5. Conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework Paragraph 213 of the NPPF states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." The leve	PA	10-Aug-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Jones	Nicola	I object to the planned development of Liverpool Street station as it is an inappropriate use of information which should be addressing poor management NOT replacing a beautiful historical building with ghastly new builds.	PA	10-Aug-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Hammerton	Ian	The concourse and the whole of Liverpool Street Station do not need the proposed redevelopment of the extensive office block on the top of it. It would severely detract from the aesthetics and charm of this effective and functional concourse.	PA	10-Aug-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Dobbs	Jeremy	"I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional."	PA	10-Aug-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Waterman	Liz	Arriving at Liverpool St with large luggage is a challenge! Long waits for the lift.	PA	10-Aug-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Towler	Yvette	I'm disabled and I need lifts to be able to get around.	PA	10-Aug-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Mezughi	Fadwa	I am writing to express my full support for the proposed redevelopment of the site, While the current structure holds a listed status, it is important to acknowledge that the parts being proposed for demolition are not original and do not meaningfully contribute to the authentic historical fabric of the area. In contrast, the new design offers an inspiring and beautiful addition to the city - one that reflects the energy, diversity, and evolving needs of Londoners today. As our city continues to grow, so too must our spaces. We must be willing to adapt and build for the people who live and work here, ensuring our urban landscape remains functional, inclusive, and visionary. Preserving our heritage remains important, but it should not come at the cost of progress or people's wellbeing. When the structure in question lacks true historical integrity, we must prioritise thoughtful development that enhances the city for future generations.	PA	10-Aug-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Tuckwell	Natalie	It takes ages to get the lift, and often quite a few tries as different groups want to use it: those with buggies, lots of luggage, bikes, or those with mobility problems.	PA	10-Aug-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Hasler	Shirley	I'm a 70 year old, with arthritis, travelling alone, and cannot carry luggage up steps. I can hardly get myself up steps....	PA	10-Aug-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Chilvers Park	Rachel	Liverpool Street area, is one of the most vital areas of city of London, the place where people arrive. It should be in keeping with the amount of upgrade in the area.	PA	10-Aug-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Priestley	Fran	To help those with limited mobility and loads of luggage of course!	PA	10-Aug-25	S

25/00494/FULEIA	Liddle	Andrew Peter	The station is out of date, difficult to access with limited space in the main foyer.	PA	10-Aug-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Bower	Janet	Currently challenging for anyone with mobility issues and/or heavy luggage!	PA	10-Aug-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Boyce	Corinne	We are in our 80s and regularly use Liverpool Street station. We use the only lift available which is often very busy. Improvements to the lift system would benefit not only the old but young families with buggies and disabled people in wheelchairs.	PA	10-Aug-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Hodgkins	Rosalind	Lifts from and down to platforms I have to ask someone to take my suitcase down both flights of stairs.	PA	10-Aug-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Nash	Brenda	More access for people with disabilities.	PA	10-Aug-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Price	Diana	Easy access for disabled, those with children and push chairs and tourists with luggage obviously!!	PA	10-Aug-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Lemanski	Mark		DC	11-Aug-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Howes	Tessa		DC	11-Aug-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Kulothungan	Barathan	The plans looks beautiful and will bring this wonderful station into the future. I'm so glad this design doesn't brush form away with mindless modernism. It looks great and I can't wait to see it come to fruition! Thanks!	PA	11-Aug-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	MacGregor	Craig	Liverpool St for being now the busiest train station in the UK seems like a shambles, the entrance onto Bishopsgate Road is a nightmare and would be nice to an open view onto the platforms, unlike the current retail setup. Opening it up onto Exchange Square is a good access point.	PA	11-Aug-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Hayes	Chris	More sympathetic to the original architecture and a design that is more timeless and will age far better than the original futuristic white aesthetic the previous design used.	PA	11-Aug-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Jarvis	Gary		DC	11-Aug-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Velluet	Paul		DC	11-Aug-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Rawlins	Nicholas	I object to this application. This is the first time I have ever submitted such an objection. But I feel moved, as an ordinary citizen, as I believe that a majority of the public share my view, whether actively or subconsciously, that, piece by piece, we are losing the beauty from our cities. I believe the innate beauty of pre-war buildings like Liverpool Street cannot be replicated by the cost-driven approach of post-war development. London & Paris were almost unique, for cities of their size, in their historic architecture. Paris have chosen to preserve their city centre. But almost all of the historic architecture of the City of London has been irreversibly lost in the last 70 years. Victorian railway architecture is so admired that there are TV shows dedicated to it. Yet, one by one, the termini of London are being redeveloped, without public consent. Euston was fully demolished. Very little is left of Cannon Street. Fenchurch Street only retains its facade. Charing Cross, Blackfriars and London Bridge have lost much of their character. In 100 years there may be none of it left untouched for future generations to enjoy, and that is depressing. I realise these are all personal opinions but I believe they are shared by a majority of the public. One financial/tourist success story has been St Pancras, and that was achieved by retaining most of its historic structure. Leeds Station was redeveloped with a tower/block, similar to this proposal, and the result is not widely loved. It seems that developers win out every time. I find it painful that national assets are at the whim of private companies motivated by their own profits, whatever arguments they make about public benefit. I have been to Liverpool Street often and have never noticed it as being at capacity or in need of mutilation. And I feel that, if Grade II listing status offers no protection, then there is no point in having a heritage register. Sorry for my tone. I am passionate. Best wishes, Nick	DC	11-Aug-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Jarmain	Andrew		DC	11-Aug-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Ridley	Philip		DC	11-Aug-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Zarri	Julie	We need to preserve our history not destroy it. There are multiple empty buildings/shops that can be redeveloped. Money is NOT everything in this world and I can only see this as financial greed	PA	12-Aug-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Anonymous			DC	12-Aug-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Boonham	Sara	Overwhelming need for upgrade to the station which the provision of Grade A office space above will provide coupled with the creation of a new place in the heart of the city.	PA	12-Aug-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Dorrell	Susan	I think the plans are an improvement.	PA	12-Aug-25	S

25/00494/FULEIA	Evans	Gareth		DC	12-Aug-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Edwards	Martin	The station is a cluttered mess at the moment. Love the openness of the new plans and the vaulted brickwork is stunning.	PA	12-Aug-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Simons	Freddie	Seems like a great and needed plan with nice new architecture and its good it will not cost the taxpayer from the new building on top.	PA	12-Aug-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Thorp	Freddie	It looks amazing!	PA	12-Aug-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Gabalis	Algis	As architect and commuter, I see opportunities to make London as UK gateway as more presentable for the world. This is our first impression and face to the world.	PA	12-Aug-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Pearce	Peter	Station is dated and needs revitalization. Designs are nice.	PA	12-Aug-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Williams	Lauren	Objection to the proposed partial demolition and redevelopment of Liverpool Street Station I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: Loss of historic fabric and architectural integrity Liverpool Street Station is one of the most historically significant railway termini in the UK, incorporating elements designed by Great Eastern Railway architect Edward Wilson and later reconfigured sympathetically by Charles Peckover and others. The proposed demolition of original Victorian and Edwardian structures would result in the irreversible loss of historic fabric, eroding the architectural integrity and authenticity of the station. Harm to the character and setting of a listed building Liverpool Street Station and the adjoining Grade II* listed Great Eastern Hotel (now the Andaz Hotel) form a unified historic grouping. The proposed over-scaled and intrusive new structures would dominate and overshadow the station and hotel, harming their setting, which is a key part of their heritage significance. National planning policy requires great weight to be given to the conservation of designated heritage assets, and this scheme fails to meet that standard. Failure to meet national and local heritage policy requirements The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) makes clear that harm to heritage assets must be clearly justified and outweighed by public benefits. The applicant has not demonstrated that such benefits exist at a level sufficient to justify the substantial harm caused. Similarly, the City of London's own Local Plan requires development to preserve and enhance heritage assets-yet this scheme would have the opposite effect. Inappropriate scale, massing, and design The proposed redevelopment is wholly out of scale with the historic station and surrounding conservation area. Its bulk, height, and contemporary materials would create an incongruous	PA	12-Aug-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Lammas	Perry	Objection to the proposed partial demolition and redevelopment of Liverpool Street Station I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: Loss of historic fabric and architectural integrity Liverpool Street Station is one of the most historically significant railway termini in the UK, incorporating elements designed by Great Eastern Railway architect Edward Wilson and later reconfigured sympathetically by Charles Peccover and others. The proposed demolition of original Victorian and Edwardian structures would result in the irreversible loss of historic fabric, eroding the architectural integrity and authenticity of the station. Harm to the character and setting of a listed building Liverpool Street Station and the adjoining Grade II* listed Great Eastern Hotel (now the Andaz Hotel) form a unified historic grouping. The proposed over-scaled and intrusive new structures would dominate and overshadow the station and hotel, harming their setting, which is a key part of their heritage significance. National planning policy requires great weight to be given to the conservation of designated heritage assets, and this scheme fails to meet that standard. Failure to meet national and local heritage policy requirements The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) makes clear that harm to heritage assets must be clearly justified and outweighed by public benefits. The applicant has not demonstrated that such benefits exist at a level sufficient to justify the substantial harm caused. Similarly, the City of London's own Local Plan requires development to preserve and enhance heritage assets-yet this scheme would have the opposite effect. Inappropriate scale, massing, and design The proposed redevelopment is wholly out of scale with the historic station and surrounding conservation area. Its bulk, height, and contemporary materials would create an incongruous	PA	12-Aug-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	O'Connell	Peter		DC	13-Aug-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Phillips	Katie	This is a positive investment in the city and will make the train station much better.	PA	13-Aug-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Houghton	Lucy	The station is long overdue for development to ease congestion and create better access to transport.	PA	13-Aug-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Graves	Mark	Regular traveller going East, definitely needs an upgrade that includes some quiet areas to hold calls or just to meet.	PA	13-Aug-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Weaver	Owen	The reconfiguration of Liverpool Street Station to provide additional capacity is required to allow for current and future passengers as the number of users increases as London's population continues to grow.	PA	13-Aug-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Auguste	Deborah	I agree that we should make it an (enjoyable) destination in itself.	PA	13-Aug-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Wissler	Kai	The proposed plans are a stunning upgrade to the current London Liverpool Street station. They perfectly integrate into the area while providing much-needed improvements in capacity, space, and aesthetics. I fully support this move and hope it can be realised as close to the current renderings as possible.	PA	13-Aug-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Martinez	Linda	I object to the plans to redevelop beautiful Liverpool St. It is an architectural treasure and should be preserved. It would be a crime to demolish the roof and put lots of offices in its place. London is losing its character and becoming an ugly highrise desert, bland and forbidding. We need beauty in our lives. Please leave Liverpool Street alone, it is fine as it is. Thank you.	PA	13-Aug-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Briody	Chantel	I would like to travel more with my electric wheelchair. I am disabled since birth.	PA	14-Aug-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Dansey	Sam	It's about time that Liverpool Street station was regenerated to bring it up to standard with the other London gateways.	PA	14-Aug-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Black	Nick	I strongly object to the proposal. The station is one of the few surviving elements of the what was a rich architectural heritage in this area. It is one of the finest examples of 19th century railway architecture and has been sensitively restored in recent years to the joy of many people.	PA	14-Aug-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Stone	Jamie	I travel through Liverpool Street 3 days a week and the plans looks amazing at the current iteration. The overcrowding has gotten worse since COVID and if they would help to alleviate this while also making the station a much nicer place to wait in for the train, I'm all for it.	PA	15-Aug-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Spencer	Thomas	It's clearly a massive upgrade, I use Liverpool Street at least once a week and I would be really proud to have this station a part of London.	PA	15-Aug-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Tether	Angie	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: 1. The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. 2. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. 3. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. 4. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. 5. I refer to Paragraph NPPF 213 which states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional.	PA	18-Aug-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Dolamore	Peter	I object to the development in question due to my wish to see Liverpool Street Station's architecture, its views and its surroundings preserved for future generations.	PA	19-Aug-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Udall	Ross J		DC	19-Aug-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Cook	Christopher		DC	19-Aug-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Pilling	Anthony		DC	19-Aug-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Salmon	Nicolet	I object to this grade 2 Victorian roof being demolished either partly or whole. This is our heritage and it's a beautiful structure the likes of which we will never see or enjoy again. It needs preserving. Please have the network offices elsewhere. There are empty buildings nearby Regards Nicolet Salmon	PA	19-Aug-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Johnston	A		DC	19-Aug-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Burch	Don And Lizebeth		DC	19-Aug-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Arminio	Patrick	The station is always super busy and it's hard to navigate.	PA	20-Aug-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Wakeman	Lindsay		DC	20-Aug-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Lamb	Hetty	Absolutely horrified to hear of this planning application. Leave Liverpool street well alone. Nothing wrong with it as is. I have used it for years and love the place.	PA	20-Aug-25	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Verster	Eric	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to:" What are the key issues to cover in my objection? The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional."	PA	20-Aug-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Woodward	Christopher	I object to this application for the substantial damage to the historic structure of the station itself, and to the impact on the setting of the Grade II listed building; in each case at odds with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF2113). I also object to the impact of a new building of such bulk on the Bishopsgate Conservation Area.	PA	20-Aug-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Morgan	Gareth	This is another example of an Architectural gem, like many stations of this era. Why must an architecturally significant building be lost in the name of more office developments? There are plenty of dormant/empty office spaces across london and Beyond there is no need to ruin such a great piece of architecture for more offices. I strongly object to this plan. The concourse isn't the problem, the trains are! Always too small, always overcrowded and in need of more stock.	PA	21-Aug-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Meakin	Mary	I have used Liverpool Street Station as a commuter over many years. The idea that Network Rail wish to build on top of the existing structure fills me with absolute horror. The current station is full of light and the concourse is a much better space for people waiting for trains than other stations like Kings Cross, Fenchurch Street, Victoria and Waterloo. The plans represent a disastrous misuse of Network Rail's power. It will be a tragedy if this goes through and lead to enormous disruption for commuters over a long period with no improvement for them at the end.	PA	25-Aug-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Wilkins	Guy	This plan seems to be far less invasive and damaging than the previous plan. It respects the historic fabric of the station and introduces a new areas which are rich in detail but in a contemporary design. They seem to blend well to create a building that is not bland but richly distinctive.	PA	26-Aug-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Weston	James	I use and have used Liverpool Street station for many years. It is an iconic main station in London and is in desperate need of renewal, and deserves to be celebrated. The new proposed designs look incredible. Truly architecture that it would be a joy to experience on my commute. I can see it would really celebrate the "meeting point" nature of Liverpool Street station too, with wide open areas to access shops, restaurants and bars. I hope to see it come to life!	PA	26-Aug-25	S

25/00494/FULEIA	Goh	Yian	If you're not moving forward, you are moving backwards. The station is not fit for purpose and additional development is part of the reality of the cost to redevelop the train station. There is no such thing as a free lunch.	PA	26-Aug-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Jamieson	Francis C		DC	27-Aug-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Taylor	Andrew		DC	27-Aug-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Wentworth	Ian Timothy		DC	27-Aug-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Crumack	Neil Geoff	Liverpool Street is a beautiful Victorian station and plonking a gazillion square foot office development on top of it would severely diminish its stature. All in the name of greed - disgraceful.	PA	28-Aug-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Osler	Tim	I object to the planning application for the redevelopment of Liverpool Street Station, which should be preserved in its current form as a legacy piece of architecture.	PA	01-Sep-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Tyler	David	Because it's an old iconic station, it's a bit run down so needs a tidy up, as some of the old features are very nice. It also needs a bit of modernising. I work there as a train driver & it's sad to see that it's got dirty & not been maintained like it should over the years.	PA	01-Sep-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Kirkman	James		DC	01-Sep-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Yates	David		DC	01-Sep-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Denison	Kieron		DC	01-Sep-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Whitley	Sue		DC	02-Sep-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Elson	Peter J		DC	02-Sep-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Dyson	Will		DC	02-Sep-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Jackson	Simeon		DC	02-Sep-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Bryant	Peregrine		DC	08-Sep-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Segnit	Nat		DC	09-Sep-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Hill	Jane		DC	09-Sep-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Budd	Richard		DC	10-Sep-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Venner	Peter		DC	10-Sep-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Scott	Celia		DC	10-Sep-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Power	Jacqueline		DC	10-Sep-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Clarke	Chris		DC	10-Sep-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Anderson	Ian		DC	16-Sep-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Anthony	Ross		DC	22-Sep-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Holden	Rebecca		DC	02-Oct-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Gorai	Saurav	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to the idea of removing public space for private corporations	PA	06-Oct-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Nathaniel	Krishan		DC	29-Oct-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	London Property Alliance			DC	11-Nov-25	S

25/00494/FULEIA	Kalkhoven	Paul	I object to this oversized development which will severely damage the integrity of this Grade 2 station and its surroundings, particularly the loss of daylight on the concourse. The improvements of public amenity do not justify the overall negative impact that the immense bulk of this building will have on this important public building. I object to this proposal because of the negative and destructive impact this development will have on the public and semi-public domain. The architectural quality of this design does not reflect the importance of Liverpool Street station as the UK's busiest station and therefore as a major national public space, in particular because of the following aspects: - The loss of daylight in the concourse area - the over-scaled and bulky development over the station - its negative impact on the setting of the listed buildings	PA	11-Dec-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Collett	Martin		DC	11-Dec-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Burton	Geoff		DC	16-Dec-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Greene	Michael P		DC	19-Dec-25	
25/00494/FULEIA	Morris	John W		DC	19-Dec-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Davies	Robert H.		DC	19-Dec-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Oddy	James		DC	19-Dec-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Barracrough	Richard		DC	19-Dec-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Bickerstaffe	Jacqueline		DC	19-Dec-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Lancer	Philip		DC	19-Dec-25	R
25/00494/FULEIA	Hodgkins	Rosalind		DC	19-Dec-25	R
25/00494/FULEIA	Davies	D		DC	19-Dec-25	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Williams	Alexander	I object in the strongest possible terms. This construction is extremely detrimental to a historic building and the sensitive 1990s additions. It will create a totally uninviting space and as a cynical ploy by the developer to create new office space with flimsy justifications around station upgrades. All these upgrades could easily be completed via other means. There will be years of construction disruption which will have a detrimental effect for users of the station and for the whole of the city of London economy. The new design not only will create a worse station, it will look out of place in the surrounding area. The huge bulk is in no way concealed by the CGI images with Tolkien greenery attached to terraces. The city of London must reject this application in full.	PA	29-Dec-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Stein	Jonathan	As a relatively recent visitor to Liverpool Street Station I object to the planned 'Phased development comprising partial demolition and alterations'. The plans shown are entirely unsympathetic to this fine historic structure; I would ask that any proposals for redevelopment consider previous examples of more appropriate treatments of the nation's Victorian legacy.	PA	31-Dec-25	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Dyson	Paul		DC	02-Jan-26	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Richardson	Pauline	I vehemently object to the proposed redevelopment of Liverpool Street Station. Not only will it destroy the characteristics of not one, but two grade II listed buildings, it will also affect the conservation of the area. The National Planning Policy Framework states: Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional."	PA	04-Jan-26	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Dunnett	James		DC	05-Jan-26	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Medhurst	Glenna		DC	05-Jan-26	R
25/00494/FULEIA	Sheppard	Thomas		DC	05-Jan-26	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Anonymous			DC	05-Jan-26	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Ridley	Philip		DC	05-Jan-26	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Gander	Terry		DC	05-Jan-26	R
25/00494/FULEIA	Higginson	Tom		DC	05-Jan-26	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Moran	Rosie		DC	05-Jan-26	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Parker	Nicholas		DC	06-Jan-26	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Parkes	Timothy C		DC	12-Jan-26	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Singer	Hugh	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: - Impact on listed buildings and the Bishopsgate conservation area: the revised proposal will have a significant impact, through the demolition of existing grade II listed buildings (including the 1980s extensions to the trainshed and the building known as the 'McDonalds building'), impact on existing grade II* listed buildings (such as light levels in the 1870s trainshed and the setting of the former Great Eastern Hotel). There is precedent for applications such as this to be rejected due to their impact on light levels, such as the recent decision on 31 Bury Street, due to the impact on Bevis Marks Synagogue. - Impact on traffic and pollution: the site is extremely constrained and congested, and I do not believe sufficient consideration has been taken in the application to mitigate the impact of construction noise, pollution and congestion in this area. As a cyclist who regularly cycles down the A10, this will significantly impact me and there are insufficient mitigations in place. - Carbon impact of construction and net-zero commitments: the application has taken insufficient consideration of alternative options, such as restoration of the existing building rather than demolition. The demolition and construction will release significant amounts of embedded carbon into the atmosphere, and insufficient consideration has been taken into how this project impacts the City of London's own Climate Action Strategy and the UK's wider net-zero goals.	PA	17-Jan-26	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Vowles-Sheridan	Stephen	When I do use Liverpool Street Station, it is a bit of a struggle to get in and out during busy times. If they're going to increase the barriers to allow people onto the trains, that would make a big difference because at the moment you wait for the number to come up and then it's a bit of a bundle to try and get in there. Everything else sounds like it'd be a good improvement on what's there at the moment.	PA	19-Jan-26	S
25/00494/FULEIA	McGlinchey	Kevin	They've actually got accessibility needs covered in those plans, which is really, really good. I used to be married to a disabled lady, so I know how hard it can be getting around London. As an occasional walking stick user, having to walk from one end to the other for the toilet, you don't always have the energy. So more toilets throughout the station, regular and accessible toilets. Better disability awareness and training for all the staff right across the board would make a big difference.	PA	19-Jan-26	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Hanley	Edward	I think the design looks very elegant, and I agree with putting offices on top of the station - rather space effective.	PA	19-Jan-26	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Mitchell	Dylan	The project is a significant improvement on the existing station, bringing it up to a world class standard. The associated office building development is to an equally high standard.	PA	19-Jan-26	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Swanson	Tom	I use Liverpool Street station every day. It could be so more efficient, modern and fulfill its potential. I am fully supportive of this transformation.	PA	19-Jan-26	S

25/00494/FULEIA	Bright	Rupert	The redevelopment suggestions of London Liverpool Street Station are sensible, and if it is to be functional and works, then that's the most important thing. What they suggest in terms of having more barriers, opening it up and making it more accessible is all important. Keeping the history of the building is also important.	PA	19-Jan-26	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Sheldrake	Ron	New plans look to be a great improvement to the station.	PA	19-Jan-26	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Ray-Marples	George	The redevelopment of London Liverpool Street Station is a great idea. What I love most about London is the mix of the old and the new, and this development reflects that. I think that's a great idea. I'm honestly sick of developments in the UK getting blocked by people complaining about every small change. I want to support things that actually get done. I also like that it's going to be expanded, and for me, any works that improve services are good in my book.	PA	19-Jan-26	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Abrey	Dan	Liverpool Street is Britain's busiest railway station, and I think a rebuild would improve the station environment and make it better for customers.	PA	19-Jan-26	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Ridgers	Alexander	It needs upgrading for the future.	PA	19-Jan-26	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Rose	David	The development seems to work towards improving access and that's my major priority and I'm supporting it principally on that factor alone. If the redevelopment of the concourse area and the rest of the site is going to improve step free access, then I support.	PA	19-Jan-26	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Pittie	Ludovic	Much needed transformation, an exciting project that's working hard to embrace its heritage and make the station fit for purpose for the needs of its current and future users.	PA	19-Jan-26	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Snell	Damon	Parts of Liverpool Street Station really need updating. Some of the shops, especially on the upper concourse, look really awful and tired. The east side of the station, from the 80s, also looks old and worn out. I love the station, especially the beautiful Victorian side, and I think it's important that too is preserved.	PA	19-Jan-26	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Barton	James	I've seen the pictures of the redevelopment and it looks amazing. When you look at some of the transformations that have happened in other places like London Bridge, it's absolutely changed the whole destination of the place. I think bringing all the arches back and the use of the historic brickwork made a big difference. There's so much opportunity at somewhere like Liverpool Street to make it a destination in and of itself, especially given the existing buildings and what can be done there. It's about taking something forward and making it better for everyone.	PA	19-Jan-26	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Reed	Jason	I'm strongly in support of the Liverpool Street development. I think I saw some of the pictures and it's going to be quite something when it's done. I'm glad to see a lot of work and effort going into this.	PA	19-Jan-26	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Ambrose	Rachel	I usually go to Liverpool Street station to visit the museums in London. It's not accessible at all; there are too many steps, and the tube station platform is too far away for me, as I'm partially disabled. There's not enough seating when you're waiting for trains, the toilets are very run down and not accessible enough. I hope this redevelopment will work out so I won't have to worry about the steps so much. It all sounds very good. More escalators, less steps, step-free access and lifts, that kind of thing. It'd definitely be brilliant to have a restaurant of some type there.	PA	19-Jan-26	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Swan	T	Once again it's disappointing to see so many NIMBY objectors and those that don't want to see change. Do they not understand that it is only viable through intensification. Network Rail / The taxpayer don't have the funds to upgrade this. If we want this country to get out of its slump we need developments like this. The benefits it will bring far outway it's "look" which is totally subjective (jobs, consumers, efficiencies, modernisation). Or do we just leave it as it is and watch this country fall further behind the world.	PA	19-Jan-26	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Hunt	Rosie	I think this would be a great improvement, both in terms of handling the volume of people and making the station more accessible. I know someone involved in the development who explained the plans to me, and I agree with the ideas. I wouldn't object to the new office buildings, especially if the Victorian parts are kept. I know some people are protesting, but I believe the new buildings are a small price to pay for such useful improvements.	PA	19-Jan-26	S

25/00494/FULEIA	Joyce	Beverley	I think this is long overdue and it would be a much more pleasant experience for me using the station several times a week if it was modern, clean, and had facilities I could use before and after work. I'm totally in support of all of the changes. More people are using scooters, bikes, etc, and if you don't keep up with change, you're just going to end up with another outdated platform. Also, I'd definitely use a better variety of shops if they were there which would be useful before and after work.	PA	19-Jan-26	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Brown	Pendrick	I think this all sounds good. The current WC facilities in particular are horrendous, and a problem for the people who use them, so any update would be welcome, especially for the ladies. We're also in a commercial work area so we do need the office space too.	PA	20-Jan-26	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Jones	Adam	I think the station just looks a bit tired compared to other big stations and could do with a bit of TLC. As a commuter and paying customer, better accessibility and being able to move around more easily would be really positive. The idea of having more lifts and escalators is great and I think it's really good that private investment will fund the work rather than taxpayer money.	PA	20-Jan-26	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Athwal	Anika	I think it's really important that the facilities do get upgraded, and extra ticket barriers are especially needed when you're in a rush. The station is so chaotic and busy, and even getting to the underground feels like such a narrow area compared to other stations. I've got two young children, so with buggies it's quite difficult to navigate around London and I'm quite particular about which stations we go to because of the tube accessibilities. Hopefully, if things do improve, then it'll be a lot easier for those with accessible needs to get around.	PA	20-Jan-26	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Liu	Helen	I think it can only be a positive thing. It would help drive more people like me who visit the shops. I'm looking forward to when it finally finishes and it will be aesthetically pleasing as well. I'd like to see bigger and better shops there, especially more clothing shops. I think it would definitely help make things a lot more linear and maybe people could be a bit more independent.	PA	20-Jan-26	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Graves	Mark	I support the redevelopment of Liverpool Street Station because I agree that improvements and allowing people to flow more easily is important. The station is tired and has been the same for quite a long time, so I can see that redevelopment would be worthwhile. As a regular user, anything to improve the journey and actually being able to use spaces rather than just passing through would be useful for me.	PA	20-Jan-26	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Kelly	Stephen	I support the development for the improvements to the concourse. I walk across there every morning and it gets quite congested, especially in the evening. Even the barriers can get queues because of the number of people, and I've seen escalators closed for the night when trying to come back. It just shows there's too many people and the station is not big enough. I think having more room for shops and coffee places is always good in stations too.	PA	20-Jan-26	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Toscani	Adam	I support the development because I think it will be a positive change for the station whilst maintaining its character. There's also hardly anywhere to eat there so it could do with a few more facilities for eating.	PA	20-Jan-26	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Donnelly	Alex	I am a regular commuter to Liverpool Street Station. The station is old and outdated and not fit for purpose, so making things more user-friendly would be really good. The shops are okay but some are inaccessible - it's a nightmare. I've seen the changes that they've made at London Bridge and think that should be repeated elsewhere. I work in construction, so developments like this are always a positive for the industry.	PA	20-Jan-26	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Purwanto	Alex	Going to Liverpool Street Station now is oftentimes a very overwhelming experience. It's a change that is very much needed. I've seen some of the development plans and illustrations and I'm all for them. The station deserves some excitement and some upgrading, so I was quite pleased to learn about the changes being proposed and I really, really hope they get implemented.	PA	20-Jan-26	S

25/00494/FULEIA	Groat	William	As an occasional pram user, I've noticed how difficult it can be for people using wheelchairs or carrying bags to move between the concourse and the underground. The station does need a change. There's a specific pinch point that really highlights how dated the layout is, and I assume improvements like that will be addressed using modern architectural design. I also think it's great that professional architects are using best practice to make sure the station works better. The Victorian ironwork is a monument and it will be preserved, which is really important. There's a shortage of prime office space in the nearby radius so I know that we've got to keep building quality office space if we want London to remain competitive.	PA	20-Jan-26	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Stoneman	Antonia	As a wheelchair user, better accessibility is the main thing I really cared about with these plans. I use Liverpool Street to travel and visit family. I'm really glad to hear there will be more lifts as currently if one lift breaks down, you're stuck. The queues for lifts are really long, it takes me up to 30 minutes to get from the Elizabeth Line to the mainline station. The lifts are tiny and the access level to the upstairs main concourse is so narrow that you have to reverse back to let other people out of the lift, but then the doors close and by that time the lift is gone. Better accessibility would make life easier as a wheelchair user - the current level of accessibility is completely unsuitable.	PA	20-Jan-26	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Donnison	Matthew	A bigger concourse would be beneficial. King's Cross is a good example of what a good station looks like, and if they're looking to build something like that, that would be welcomed. Also, if it's relatively cost neutral to the public and funded by the developer, then it's a positive.	PA	20-Jan-26	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Boachie	Christian	I think when the station gets too congested, the current escalators are not enough. Every time I go there, that's something I keep asking myself - why are they not even considering increasing the amount? If they could expand the concourse it would be extremely helpful. The presence of staff is also really key. It's a very busy place and people, especially tourists, find it difficult to get around.	PA	20-Jan-26	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Watson	Stephen	Good design.	PA	20-Jan-26	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Strohm	Nigel	Looks great, keeping the old looks with modern technology.	PA	20-Jan-26	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Snow	Jan	Having seen St Pancras and Kings Cross transformation it will be great to see L Street too. The Broadgate development has been fantastic so can L Street be too.	PA	20-Jan-26	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Sithole	Mary	To improve capacity, grow businesses and creation of jobs.	PA	20-Jan-26	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Shaw	Philip	It's a great and much needed improvement!	PA	20-Jan-26	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Scofield	Nathan	This is incredibly needed, and the proposed plans create a fantastic blend of the contemporary challenges of accessibility coupled with the need for careful and considerate preservation and display of heritage assets.	PA	20-Jan-26	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Roome	Alison	At present the station is old and not very welcoming. We use it quite a bit and upgrading would be beneficial.	PA	20-Jan-26	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Poon	Qi Ian	Sympathetic to the area.	PA	20-Jan-26	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Payne	Freddie	We need redevelopment everywhere.	PA	20-Jan-26	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Moar	Lewis	I think the proposed new station and adjoining offices look great. I work nearby and think that this would be an asset for central London.	PA	20-Jan-26	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Golding	Lucy	I am a regular user of Liverpool Street and it needs this transformation to remain functional. I really like the design and its incorporation of Victorian architecture.	PA	20-Jan-26	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Herriott	Mark	Liverpool Street needs an upgrade.	PA	20-Jan-26	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Edwards	Nick	Long overdue.	PA	20-Jan-26	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Jeffrey	Anne-Marie	Many people commute from Southend to Liverpool Street station. It is a very popular station to a lot of destinations and needs a re-vamp.	PA	20-Jan-26	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Johnson	Liam	The current station is outdated and during the busiest times difficult to navigate due to crowding. The new plans providing more concourse capacity and more escalators will help speed up passengers entering and exiting the station. Also plans to increase the number of elevators will provide a more convenient and seamless travel experience for people with accessibility restrictions.	PA	20-Jan-26	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Holmes	Christopher	This will be a superb renovation in the heart of London.	PA	20-Jan-26	S

25/00494/FULEIA	Boundy	Caryl	I am a frequent visitor to the station. It is a vital hub and is clearly getting busier. Good work has been done there in the past and this proposal is going to make it even better. I very much look forward to these changes.	PA	20-Jan-26	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Ansell	Oliver	Such a transformative upgrade to the existing station infrastructure, particularly in relation in to accessibility and capacity is significantly overdue. The most recent series of proposals developed by Network Rail and their designers, demonstrate a renewed focus on these most critical aspects of the passenger journey. By expanding the concourse and accentuating the station's existing heritage features the station design will amplify intuitive wayfinding to more easily guide customers from street level into the concourse. As a regular user of the station, I strongly support the current design in enabling the major capacity and facilities upgrade required at this station. It would be beneficial for this scheme to be progressed as quickly as is reasonably practicable to realise customer benefit.	PA	20-Jan-26	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Kelly	Stuart	Ensure The City has a major, modern station to match its world class status.	PA	20-Jan-26	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Curtis	Chris	Liverpool Street gets quite crowded. Anything that can help add more circulation space and improve access for those who are less mobile must be a good thing.	PA	20-Jan-26	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Finlay	Brigid	I used to work here between 1986-1988 & I have fond memories of the station even before its modernisation. We need to bring it into the 21st century & cater for the travellers that will be more inclined to use this station.	PA	20-Jan-26	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Barnes	Sam	The current station is overcrowded and ugly. The redesigns look clean and light and a better space overall.	PA	20-Jan-26	S
25/00494/FULEIA	Rose	Sue	A shame to lose a beautiful building	PA	20-Jan-26	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Pastakia	Reena	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to the impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. I also object to the substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. I reference Paragraph NPPF 213 which states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional.".	PA	20-Jan-26	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Temple	Mark	Wanton destruction of a piece of significant heritage architecture of national importance	PA	20-Jan-26	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Hunnisett	Phil	The whole area around the Liverpool Street Station is turning into a 'Mini Manhattan' it is truly awful to see 30 storey buildings erected with no thought to the consequences, I support the updates to the station concourses and look and feel internally but strongly object to building on top of the Victorian station, the artists impression of the look is crazy and completely out of step with the current station	PA	20-Jan-26	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Caiger	Tom	Building this on top of one of London's most iconic railway station is an affront to it's history, architecture and the significance it plays on a daily basis to connect the rest of the UK to London. Building grotesque homogenous glass towers on top of this station will not benefit anyone apart from the people who want to erase the character and history of the station... And of course the people who will financially gain from this going ahead. While I agree the main INTERIOR of the station could do with a refresh and reconstruction. That does not warrant building vile glass towers on the historic roof. People would be up in arms if the same thing were to happen to London Paddington. And so, Liverpool Street station is no exception.	PA	20-Jan-26	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Adams	Jill	Liverpool St Staion is a building of historic importance and beaauty and is an important part of the surrounding landscape in that part of London.	PA	20-Jan-26	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Read	Daniel	Just leave the station alone. There's apparently no need for this "development" and tampering with a historic building to doubtlessly make it as "modern" (and soulless) as everything else just isn't good.	PA	20-Jan-26	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Quinton	Penelope	I live locally and cycle through this part of the city to work and I object to this planning application because there is already too much construction ongoing in the City of London and the trucks and cranes already cause too much disruption and danger in the city streets. The National Planning Policy Framework in paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station at Liverpool Street Station through the demolition of the roof structure over the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure also compromises the surviving C19 train shed. The proposal for extensive new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, will cause a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset that is Liverpool Street Station. Further: the impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church.	PA	20-Jan-26	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Freiesleben	Lawrence	My objection is from the heritage angle. All too many of the important buildings of the past in the country nationwide are destroyed without sufficient thought. This is perhaps especially true of London, with property values and commercial pressure at its most extreme. All too much change generally is carried out without thought and with little actual benefit - "inadvertent snakes foiling our ladders."	PA	20-Jan-26	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Goldberg	Sally	I object to this application on the grounds that it would result in substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. Paragraph 213 of the National Planning Policy Framework states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) Grade II listed buildings, or Grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." This development proposal is not exceptional, and is harmful for the reasons below: 1. The proposal would cause substantial harm to the Grade II listed station through the demolition of the existing station concourse roof and its replacement with a new structure. This intervention would also harm and compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train sheds. 2. The introduction of extensive new retail development within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, would cause a high level of harm to the special architectural and historic interest and overall significance of the Grade II listed heritage asset. 3. The proposal would adversely affect the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, it would harm the significance of the Grade II* listed hotel, the last continuously operating C19 hotel in the City, through the construction of a 20-storey tower above the station concourse. 4. The scheme would result in substantial harm to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area by introducing a tall building into an area characterised by low- and medium-scale development. This approach conflicts with the 2015 City Plan, which requires planning permission to be refused for tall buildings in inappropriate locations, including Conservation Areas and the St Paul's Cathedral Heights area. 5. In addition, the development would adversely affect the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets within the City and beyond, including several Grade I listed City churches by Christopher Wren and the nearby church of St Botolph	PA	20-Jan-26	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Deliss	Leopold	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to the proposals as they clearly run against the National Planning Policy Framework, and further more: The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure, which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church.	PA	20-Jan-26	O
Page 655 25/00494/FULEIA	Law	Sophie	To the Chair of the Planning & Transport Committee: Mr Tom Sleigh, I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. I would like to underline that Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." Thank you for considering my objection. Yours faithfully, Sophie Law	PA	20-Jan-26	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Blair	Peter	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to:- The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed.- The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset.- The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse.- The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. With reference to the National Planning Policy Framework:- Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." This is a Grade II Victorian structure. Cannot see how the construction of a 20-storey office block through and on top of the station respects the national importance of this site in any way. I object strongly against th	PA	20-Jan-26	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Ridler	Katharine	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station from the demolition of the roof of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. This would also compromise the setting of the surviving 19th-century train shed. The insertion of far too many new retail units in the 19th-century train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing great harm to the special interest and significance of this Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact on the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets, especially harm to the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning 19th-century hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area by imposing a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which REQUIRES the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. National Planning Policy Framework paragraph NPPF 213 states: 'Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional.' Please refuse permission to this inappropriate application. I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to: nationally important heritage assets. Specifically, I object to the harm to the Grade II-listed station by the demolition of the roof structure of the existing concourse and its replaceme	PA	20-Jan-26	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Merry	Isobel	I am a lover of Victorian and Edwardian architecture, and Liverpool Street station is a beautiful example of Victorian design and architecture. Functional and beautiful. There are enough ugly modern buildings in London and all of our other cities. Cherish the beauty of this building don't let it be ruined in the mistaken belief that this would somehow be progress. I use Liverpool Street station regularly, do I feel that my voice should be listened to!	PA	20-Jan-26	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Howe	Penelope	It's far more environmentally sustainable to adapt: not to demolish and rebuild. The John McAslan plans show how unnecessary Network Rail's proposed destructive plans are; Network Rail's plans are also unnecessarily expensive.	PA	20-Jan-26	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Paterson	Rachael	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: - The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. - The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. - The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. - The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. - In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. - I also believes this contravenes paragraph NPPF 213 in the National Planning Policy Framework: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional."	PA	20-Jan-26	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Patterson	Helen	Do not wish to see yet another cultural historic building destroyed. Enough, keep England English	PA	20-Jan-26	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Poplawski	Rosalia	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional."	PA	20-Jan-26	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Murray-Jones	Allan	this is an abomination by way of attack on London's heritage, One of the things that make London special is the way that heritage is preserved. As a Londoner I feel threatened by building projects like this. London will be less attractive to residents and businesses if we lose too much heritage. I believe that this proposal is indeed too much.	PA	20-Jan-26	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Wellings	Martin	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to nationally important heritage assets in the Bishopsgate Conservation Area and the City. More specifically, I raise objection to the substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure, which would also compromise the setting of the surviving nineteenth-century train shed. Furthermore, I raise objection to the substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan. The scheme seems to contravene the National Planning Policy Framework, in particular paragraph NPPF 213, which states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional."	PA	20-Jan-26	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Childs	Rachael	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to the substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed.	PA	20-Jan-26	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Overhill	Jane	London Liverpool Street station is an iconic building which cannot accommodate these changes without fundamentally damaging the stature of this building. All too often buildings of historic significance, such as this, are destroyed by ill forged planning. Please don't let this building fall victim to that.	PA	20-Jan-26	O
25/00494/FULEIA	McGregor	Glennis	I object to this application on the grounds that it would result in substantial harm to the significance of designated heritage assets, and that such harm is neither justified nor outweighed by public benefits. The proposal fails to preserve the special architectural and historic interest of listed buildings, their settings, and the character and appearance of the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, contrary to national and local planning policy. Key grounds of objection: The demolition of the existing station concourse roof and its replacement with a new structure would cause substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station, fundamentally altering its historic fabric and compromising the setting and legibility of the surviving nineteenth-century train shed. The insertion of extensive new retail units within the nineteenth-century train sheds, including two elevated retail galleries, would cause a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset, overwhelming its historic character and scale. The proposal would cause harm to the setting of nearby listed buildings, in particular the Grade II-listed hotel*, the last continuously operating nineteenth-century hotel in the City. The proposed 20-storey tower above the station concourse would be visually dominant and would significantly diminish the asset's heritage significance. The development would result in substantial harm to the character and appearance of the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, introducing a tall building into an area characterised by low- and medium-scale historic development. This conflicts with the City of London Local Plan (2015), which seeks to resist tall buildings in inappropriate locations, including Conservation Areas and the St Paul's Cathedral Heights area. The scheme would also cause cumulative harm to the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets, including Grade I-listed City churches by Christopher Wren and nearby St Botolph'	PA	20-Jan-26	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Wrigley	Mark	I think the plan is nothing short of vandalism of a part of London history and architecture.	PA	20-Jan-26	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Denison-Kurg	Geraint	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of a nationally important heritage asset. More specifically, I raise objections to the substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. I also object to the impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm to the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church.	PA	20-Jan-26	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Graham hunt	Rosalind	It's too big and tall.thanks yours ever Rosalind Graham hunt Sw17 7hj 07399 166748 postgraduate diploma in chaplaincy Surrey 2003 06	PA	20-Jan-26	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Brough	Rob	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. The key issues relating to my objection are as follows: The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. Furthermore, the national planning policy framework, paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional."	PA	20-Jan-26	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Otterwell	Sue	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: - The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. - The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. - In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional."	PA	20-Jan-26	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Young	Michael	Its just a most unattractive building presented for short term profit in an area of great historical interest in the City of London. It diminishes a building of stature and of great interest that means much to so many millions that have travelled through it. Do we really need more Bistros, offices? On the whole the former are finding business tough and the latter are losing costs as people work on the go or from home. The design frankly is second rate, who draped some climbers over the side, the stylish architect or the would be owners. Dear oh dear!	PA	20-Jan-26	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Harrison	Richard	This development will destroy the historic setting of Liverpool Street Station, replacing they present cityscape with a huge and ugly block with little aesthetic or architectural value.	PA	20-Jan-26	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Byrne	Lindsey	Please do not demolish this station please make improvements to the existing station the historic importance is important to Liverpool and the Uk	PA	20-Jan-26	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Goodall	John	I object to this proposal. It is over-scaled, intrusive and destructive both of this station, an important historic and Listed Building in its own right, as well as its setting, including the Bishopsgate Conservation Area. Paragraph NPPF 213 states that 'Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional.' The proposals simply do not justify an exception be made in this case and seek to justify excessive and aggressive development in terms of functional need. It is perfectly possible to update this busy station in ways that are more sympathetic to its historic character.	PA	20-Jan-26	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Lewis	Gary	Here's a concise, portal-ready objection version (under 300 words) that retains the key policy and heritage grounds while fitting the City of London's online submission format. I object to application 25/00494/FULEIA for the redevelopment of Liverpool Street Station. The proposals would cause substantial harm to nationally important heritage assets, contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and the City of London Local Plan. The scheme would severely damage the Grade II-listed Liverpool Street Station through the demolition of its 19th-century roof structure and the insertion of new retail galleries and concourse alterations that would obscure and diminish the architectural and historic significance of the building. It would also harm the Grade II-listed Great Eastern Hotel*, the last surviving Victorian railway hotel in the City, by placing a 20-storey tower directly above it. This would destroy its visual prominence, damage its setting, and interrupt the historic relationship between station and hotel. The proposed tower represents overdevelopment that conflicts with the character and scale of the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, introducing a dominant mass that breaches the City's own policies restricting tall buildings in conservation zones and the St Paul's Heights area. The scheme would also undermine the setting of nearby listed buildings, including St Botolph's and several Wren churches, affecting key heritage views across the City. It fails NPPF paragraph 213, which states that substantial harm to or loss of Grade II-listed assets should be exceptional. Finally, the demolition of sound historic structures contradicts the London Plan's sustainability and embodied carbon policies, disregarding viable conservation-led alternatives. For these reasons, this proposal fails to meet national, regional, and local policy tests and should be refused.	PA	20-Jan-26	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Scott	John	I object in the strongest terms to the proposals for Liverpool Street station, which will greatly harm the important and sensitive work carried out in the late 20th century as well as harming the connectivity, setting and ensemble of the historic train shed and the Great Eastern Hotel. The proposals go far beyond any scope of improving the transport links and functions of the station as a transport hub and are presented without convincing evidence for necessity. The architecture of the proposal is over scaled and insensitive, itself harming the heritage assets it will dominate.	PA	20-Jan-26	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Thwaites	Roy	I object to the proposed redevelopment of Liverpool Street station as per the planning application currently put forward. My thoughts are the plans are inappropriate for such an historical landmark and doesn't give sufficient consideration to the heritage which should be preserved and incorporated into any relevant planning submission	PA	20-Jan-26	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Linnard	David	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets.	PA	20-Jan-26	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Cross	Anthony	I object to this application on the grounds that this grand Grade 11 listed station will suffer enormously There is a cheaper and better alternative. Once our heritage has gone it can never be replaced, something National Rail shows no concern whatsoever. Please consider these facts.	PA	20-Jan-26	O

25/00494/FULEIA	de Ruano	Antti	Architectural heritage loss	PA	20-Jan-26	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Smith	David L	I agree with the comments of Historic England and the Victorian Society. This is gross overdevelopmnt and unsuited to a Grade II listed building of great importance to the travelling public.	PA	20-Jan-26	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Brocklebank	Gary	The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. Make sure to reference the National Planning Policy Framework in your objection, otherwise your objection may be dismissed: Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, inclu	PA	20-Jan-26	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Swingler	Charlotte	I wish to object to the proposed redevelopment of LSS. While investment in accessibility and passenger capacity is important, the current scheme would cause unacceptable and irreversible harm to one of London's most significant Victorian stations. The construction of a large tower above the concourse would destroy or severely damage key historic features, including the listed Victorian train shed roof, and would overshadow the adjacent Grade II* Great Eastern Hotel. The loss of natural light and the overwhelming visual impact of the tower would fundamentally alter the station's character and its conservation area setting. These effects conflict with statutory duties under the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, which require the preservation of listed structures and their historic context. The proposals also appear inconsistent with the National Planning Policy Framework, which requires great weight to be given to conserving heritage assets. Substantial harm must be justified by exceptional public benefit, yet there is no clear evidence that less destructive alternatives have been properly considered. Local City of London planning policies likewise require development to respect the scale, setting, and significance of heritage assets, which this proposal does not. Environmental concerns further strengthen the objection. Blocking natural light would reduce the station's environmental quality and the demolition or damage to historic structures would generate unnecessary carbon emissions and waste, contradicting sustainable planning aims. Financial justification for the tower remains weak. Heritage groups have repeatedly noted that no adequate assessment has been provided to show the need for such a large commercial development to fund station improvements. The scheme appears speculative, especially given partner withdrawals in earlier iterations. There is also extremely strong public opposition, reflecting widespread concern regarding the plan	PA	20-Jan-26	O
Page 663 25/00494/FULEIA	Hamer	Victoria	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to the substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. There would be harm as detailed in Paragraph NPPF 213: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." John McAslan has demonstrated that Network Rail's justification is baseless. Alternative approaches: Would not entail demolition of a large section of the station Would not entail the construction of a 20-storey office block through and on top of the station.	PA	20-Jan-26	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Foster	Shirley	I object to National Rail and Acme's plans for Liverpool Street Station, in line with the National Planning Policy Framework for guidance on harm to to a Grade 11 listed building. The impact on the building itself will be considerable, especially the demolition of the roof structure and replacement with a visually harmful new structure. The impact on the surrounding listed heritage assets will be considerable, and once effected, will be irreversible The whole of the Bishopgate Conservation Area will be deleteriously affected by the height of the proposed building, quite out of scale with the neighbouring environment. There are viable alternatives to this scheme which would do far less damage and still achieve the desired result.	PA	20-Jan-26	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Moores	Sarah	The proposed development destroys the current historic and architectural significance of the present building. Please protect it rather than destroy it.	PA	20-Jan-26	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Burch	Lizebeth	This idea is APPALLING. It will forever damage an irreplaceable landmark piece of architectural history, which is working extremely well as a public transport link. There is no need for this travesty, which will in addition be hideous as currently planned. There are already countless examples in the City and surrounding area of enormous tower blocks which are empty or nearly so, post-Covid. Please DO NOT APPROVE any part of these proposed changes.	PA	20-Jan-26	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Rios	June	Our history needs to be preserved.	PA	20-Jan-26	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Green	Nicholas	This is an iconic building, a unique and loved part of the fabric and history of London. It should not be partially demolished. Rather it should be protected. Those of the sites around it which are not historic can be redeveloped, but the historic ones must be left. They can be renovated and modern interiors remodelled but the original fabric must be preserved. As part of the unique history of London it makes no sense to replace with a modern alternative just to line the pockets of developers. So for residential amenity - for those who live in the area and on London generally and use the station and for those visiting London and bringing valuable commercial benefits to London, these proposals are wrong and should be rejected. Member of the public and Past ward member. This will destroy the character and soul of the station and the area. It is architectural vandalism of the sort John Betchamin prevented at St Pancras and we are all glad he succeeded there as we see how wonderful it is today. Network Rail's justification for rejecting a far preferable alternative is baseless, and that there are alternative approaches that would: Cost significantly less Cause years' less disruption to station users Would not entail demolition of a large section of the station building Would not entail the construction of a 20-storey office block through and on top of the station On every ground this is the wrong approach to developing this site. It is a part of the nations heritage not for networking rail to destroy with the poorly conceived, venal, shoddy and vandalistic approach proposed. It should and must be rejected.	PA	20-Jan-26	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Puddifer	Martin	London needs more buildings like Liverpool St Station, not soulless glass boxes that'll be gone in 50 years, much like the pebbledash high rises that plagued UK cities until they, too, were pulled down.	PA	20-Jan-26	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Blaufuss	Elizabeth	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to the following, as related to: Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." **The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. **The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. Follow the rules that have already been decided upon! This design is a travesty and will ruin the history and beauty of the building and the area. There are better ways to update the building. Please have some respect and figure it out. Thank you! Elizabeth Blaufuss	PA	20-Jan-26	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Beckett	Diana	This project is totally out of keeping with the Victorian architecture. Much too big and will completely drown the current listed buildings of historic interest.	PA	20-Jan-26	O
25/00494/FULEIA	harris	penelope	I am an architectural historian and strongly object to the changes proposed. Liverpool Street Station is a valuable heritage site which MUST be preserved as such and not treated as a commercial commodity of little consequence.	PA	20-Jan-26	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Santi	Remo	I strongly object to this application, which would cause significant damage and harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: - The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. - The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. - The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. - The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. Furthermore, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. With reference to the National Planning Policy Framework: - Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional."	PA	20-Jan-26	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Anglin	Howard	John McAslan has demonstrated that Network Rail's justification for the current eyesore of a plan is baseless, and that there are alternative approaches that would: Cost significantly less Cause years' less disruption to station users Would not entail demolition of a large section of the station building Would not entail the construction of a 20-storey office block through and on top of the station. I object to the desecration of a landmark physical building and the further transformation of the human-scale of the city into a Canary Wharf-style forest of steel and glass office towers. That was the point of Canary Wharf. London should follow the example of Paris and have a dedicated modern commercial district that does not swallow its beautiful heritage. The historic old City is quickly becoming an unrecognisable, soulless and placeless international-style district. There are a thousand such commercial districts in the world, from Shanghai and KL to Manhattan, but only one City of London. Let the City remain the City.	PA	20-Jan-26	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Burfield	Catherine Elizabeth	I object in the strongest possible terms to the plan that could cause substantial harm to the loss of a wonderful Grade 2 Listed Building and I refer to paragraph NPPF-213. Historical building are of importance to all of us and once lost, they are lost forever. I there for ask for reconsideration. Many thanks.	PA	20-Jan-26	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Vessey	Richard	I object to this application, having read much about what is intended, and the unimaginable damage that will be caused to a very significant London station. The disastrous demolition of pretty well all of the original Euston station should make it even more important to protect the context of Liverpool Street station. The construction of the tower seems particularly inappropriate and contrary the 2015 City Plan which bans such structures. It has been shown that there are better options, taking less construction time, causing less chaos in the area, effecting the settings of neighbouring buildings less, particularly the hotel. The National Planning Policy Framework states in paragraph NPPF 213 that "substantial harm to or loss of Grade II listed buildings, or Grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional". It is quite apparent that the project as presently designed is neither necessary, appropriate or attractive. Please reject this application and encourage the plans to be reconsidered for a future application. With thanks Richard Vessey	PA	20-Jan-26	O
25/00494/FULEIA	WENN	DOUGLAS LAURENCE	Whilst I no longer live in London I still take interest in history, architecture and heritage. Hence the need for this objection. Has the applicant no shame? My objection based on the following alternative: In recent months, John McAslan has demonstrated that Network Rail's justification is baseless, and that there are alternative approaches that would: Cost significantly less Cause years' less disruption to station users Would not entail demolition of a large section of the station building Would not entail the construction of a 20-storey office block through and on top of the station Please reconsider. Thankyou. Douglas Wenn	PA	20-Jan-26	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Johnson	Matthew	I strongly object to this planning application as it would cause substantial harm to nationally important heritage assets, contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and the City of London 2015 Plan. The proposal to demolish the existing station concourse roof and insert extensive retail units, including two elevated galleries, would severely compromise the Grade II-listed station and 19th-century train shed. The construction of a 20-storey tower above the concourse would harm the setting of the Grade II*-listed hotel, the last continually operating 19th-century hotel in the City, and would materially detract from the character of the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, which is traditionally low- to medium-rise. Additional impacts would affect multiple Grade I-listed Christopher Wren churches and nearby St Botolph's Church, diminishing their historic context. Paragraph 213 of the NPPF states that "substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings... should be exceptional." The proposed scheme clearly constitutes substantial harm with no public benefit sufficient to outweigh it. For these reasons, I urge the City to refuse this application to protect the architectural and historic significance of these irreplaceable assets.	PA	20-Jan-26	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Edmond	David	Another unsightly invasion of an historic quarter in the City of London by a cynical developer with designs of tawdry vulgarity. This is not NEEDED	PA	20-Jan-26	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Berry	Sue	Ill conceived and unnecessary alteration to a truly magnificent edifice.	PA	20-Jan-26	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Hext	Clare	Please re-think this plan to destroy a part of our architectural heritage, this forms a huge part of our historical fabric within this capital city of culture. To destroy part of the site would not only destroy it's unique aesthetic in the city but the history of place that has been at the heart of the people, past and present who have worked, lived and used the station over it's life since 1874. We must preserve this important site and work together towards a plan that is both cost effective without the need to loose such a jewel of design forever.	PA	20-Jan-26	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Jackson	Anita	In this country we are extremely careless with our cultural heritage, particularly our architectural heritage. When there are opportunities to make money, it is all too common for fine old buildings to be mutilated or completely demolished. Liverpool Street Station is just the latest to face severe degradation at the behest of commercial interests. This should not be happening. Sadly, we have no official body that has oversight of the whole of London's architectural heritage - a body that would protect irreplaceable buildings, have power to ensure that new-build projects fit sympathetically into the built environment around them, and also oversee the river frontage and the London skyline. Once lost, heritage CANNOT be replaced and it is not only Londoners, but also tourists and visitors who will be extremely disappointed to find that the distinctive and varied character of old London has given way to generic, large new buildings with limited lifespan, erected to maximise commercial space and minimise construction costs. Liverpool Street Station should be protected.	PA	20-Jan-26	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Murray	John	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. Make sure to reference the National Planning Policy Framework in your objection, otherwise your objection may be dismissed: Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to:	PA	20-Jan-26	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Wolfe	Gillian	Disregarding a heritage building in London is shameful. Tourists and Londoners want to view the beauty of brilliant past technical buildings. It is the issue that Liverpool Street Station is not in good order as it is but it does not need this mountain of modernity on top. It requires a different plan that can add space but should make viewing the original building the priority.	PA	20-Jan-26	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Edgar	Joseph	Soon, at this rate of modern development, any building over 50 years old will cease to exist ! Any that do survive will take on the status of monuments such as Stonehenge !!	PA	20-Jan-26	O
25/00494/FULEIA	WENTWORTH	IAN	I strongly object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important and loved heritage and transport assets. The significance of the entire building and particularly the train shed are of such importance visually and aesthetically that the high value of the buildings historically is apt to be overlooked. The destruction of any major part of this ensemble would be irreparable and a yet further diminution of the international regard for the architecture of the city of London.	PA	20-Jan-26	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Walby	Susan	Thus historically important building should be restored and treasured to enhance its magnificence. The structure should be maintained and celebrated as a sound and solid part the City. Diminishing its splendour with inappropriate and less substantial add-ons must be resisted. I object to this application on grounds of irretrievable and substantial harm it will cause to the fabric and status of this nationally important heritage building and its environment. I raise objections to the harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. The National Planning Policy Framework clearly states in paragraph NPPF 213: Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or	PA	20-Jan-26	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Thomson	Dawn	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to:" (and add some of the key issues listed below) The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. Make sure to reference the National Planning Policy Framework in your objection, otherwise your objection may be dismissed: Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional."	PA	20-Jan-26	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Hoge	Corinne	As an architectural historian I object to this project. Many countries manage to protect their heritage whilst adapting to 21st century life. Why is it that Britain has so little respect for historical buildings? I urge the City of London to stop Network Rail's current planning process and force them to consider other alternatives which seek to protect and enhance Liverpool Street Station.	PA	20-Jan-26	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Cheng	P	We need to preserve the beautiful architecture and don't need another shopping mall.	PA	20-Jan-26	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Brettell	Jim	This application is completely out of scale for this important historical site and will cut much daylight, be hugely detrimental to an important historical and listed building and be massively out of scale.	PA	20-Jan-26	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Hathaway	Rebecca Jane	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. Make sure to reference the National Planning Policy Framework in your objection, otherwise your objection may be dismissed: Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." The sheer audacity of Network Rail to try and force through such appalling vandalism of the heritage of London and to have the brazen attitude that money trumps history	PA	20-Jan-26	O
25/00494/FULEIA	STEINITZ	CARL	I am Professor Emeritus of the Graduate School of Design, Harvard University and also Honorary Professor at UCL. My degrees are in urban design. Simply stated, this is a terrible design for a city that values its history and the quality of its urban design. Carl Steinitz	PA	20-Jan-26	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Ashton	Norman	We should preserve our architectural gems for future generations- my understanding is that it is possible to both achieve what the developer wants and preserve the architectural environment.	PA	20-Jan-26	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Kemp	Julie	Why would anyone want to add this monstrosity to, and partially demolish, such a beautiful building.	PA	20-Jan-26	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Tuely	Miles	I think that the extent of these proposals is wholly inappropriate and will do huge damage to this wonderful collection of buildings which I know well having used this station over many years.	PA	20-Jan-26	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Henshaw	Catherine	I object to the current proposal of Network Rail to redevelop Liverpool Street station. You just need to look at the shambles of HS2 to see the devastation and phenomenal waste of public funds that ensues when profit is put above nature, historical significance and community. A 20 storey building is not in keeping with the surrounding building and would open the floodgates to further high rises. This is in contradiction of the 2015 city plan. A beautiful historic building will be undermined and defaced forever with potential destabilisation of the parts that remain. As I'm sure you are aware the National Planning Policy Framework, Paragraph NPPF 213, states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional. There are few buildings so grand and spectacular of this age in London, or indeed around the world. Obviously St Pancras comes to mind and maybe the work to be undertaken should be more in keeping with the development and modernisation there.	PA	20-Jan-26	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Bingham	Catherine	I object to this planning application due to the complete disregard of Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." Please dismiss this application as this building is of key importance so should not be harmed.	PA	20-Jan-26	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Gunning	Adrian	An appalling destruction of Liverpool Street station concourse. I object to an historic building being treated like this and to no advantage to the commuter and running of trains at the terminus. The proposed office block on the top is an eyesore and could be designed in a far better way on top of the train sheds without a metal and glass collection of boxes with plants coming out of them. It is unrealistic and has no relation to the Victorian train shed. whom it may concern, As a new owner of a Victorian house with an interest in preserving Victorian and older buildings such as Liverpool street station, which are considered important to our nation heritage, I object to this application. Specifically, I object to the harm to the special interest and significant Grade II-listed station by: A planning to demolish the existing station concourse roof structure and replace it with a new structure which would compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. B inserting extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including constructing two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. C this building is part of the whole area and the impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets must be taken into account. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower (!) over the station concourse. D The effect this scheme would have to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, only 10 years old, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. E In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. Most importantly Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." Thank you	PA	20-Jan-26	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Sayer	Wendy		PA	20-Jan-26	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Dunkley	Sam	Dear Cllr Sleight I object to this proposal because of the substantial harm It would cause to nationally significant heritage assets in a conservation area. A 20 storey office block built through and over the historic station is completely over the top, and unacceptable I first used this station in the 1970s, & would be distressed to see it smothered by an enormous tower. The proposal is an extreme over development which would wreck this important conservation area, near a Heritage City church The alternative McCaslan plans look a much more appropriate & sympathetic treatment of this historic site. They would also be cheaper, causing much less disruption to users of the station, by reducing the amount of demolition. I respectfully request that you reject the current proposal, and direct the site owners to the Alternative plans	PA	20-Jan-26	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Sasaki-Renzullo	Mika	It is important to keep one of the most historical and important stations within the UK preserved as it was before	PA	20-Jan-26	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Wilkie	Martin	This proposal is totally out of all proportion to the existing Victorian structures and show no logic other than to maximise returns.	PA	20-Jan-26	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Hembling	Barry	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: * The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. * The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. * The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. * The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. * In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's. National Planning Policy Framework, para NPPF 213 states: 'Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional'. For the reasons set out above, there is no justification to depart from these obligations is respect of this proposed scheme. It must be refused. Yours faithfully Barry J Hembling	PA	20-Jan-26	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Hill	Sarah	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to knocking down part of the existing building. The drawing that I have seen of the proposed finished site are not pleasing to the eye and are a blight on the character of the original station. I would have thought that a building this tall would be in contravention of the 2015 City Plan.	PA	20-Jan-26	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Rice	Stephen	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically I object to: 1. The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station caused by the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. 2. The impact the scheme would have on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. 3. The significant harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. I would draw your attention to paragraph NPPF (National Planning Policy Framework) 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." I do not believe there is any reason to consider this scheme as an exception but rather dismissed immediately or we run the risk of losing yet more of our heritage. Respectfully, Stephen Rice	PA	20-Jan-26	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Kell	John	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: - the substantial harm that would be caused to the Grade II listed train shed, which under the National Planning Policy Framework needs to be justified on an exceptional basis, which has not been done here - the substantial harm that would be caused to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, which under the 2015 City Plan should not be the site for new tall buildings - the substantial harm that would be caused to the significance of the Grade II* listed station hotel.	PA	20-Jan-26	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Thomson	Matthew	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. Make sure to reference the National Planning Policy Framework in your objection, otherwise your objection may be dismissed: Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional.	PA	20-Jan-26	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Davis	Andrew	It will destroy a wonderful Victorian railway station and cover it with another London architectural carbuncle As a livery-man and freeman of the City of London I see this as nothing less than the destruction of the city heritage for greed	PA	20-Jan-26	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Godwin	Joe	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. Specifically, I object to: The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. Furthermore, the National Planning Policy Framework, Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional."	PA	20-Jan-26	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Stevens	Carol	Too many iconic buildings are being ruined in the name of progress, this seems to be one of them.	PA	20-Jan-26	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Tedham	Stuart	I object to this very harmful and ill thought plan to both partially demolish and inappropriately redevelop Liverpool Street Station. I feel the plans are way out of all proportion and will negatively affect what heritage survives from this appalling destruction. In time this redevelopment would date very quickly and the needless destruction caused would later be heavily regretted.	PA	20-Jan-26	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Fookes	Michael	I object to this application on the following grounds: - The development would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. - Such a tall building would cause substantial harm to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area which is characterised by low to medium scale buildings. - Tall buildings in Conservation Areas are contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which demands the refusal of planning permission for such proposals. - The demolition of the concourse roof would cause substantial damage to the Grade II listed station. - The proposed replacement structure would compromise and detract from the character and setting of the historic 19th century train shed. - The introduction of excessive amounts of new retail units within the 19th century train sheds, upper retail galleries, would cause a high degree of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II listed heritage asset. - The construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse would severely impact on the setting and special significance of surrounding listed heritage assets which include the Grade II* listed 19th century hotel. - The scheme would impact on the skyline and setting of many other heritage assets in the City and beyond, including Grade I churches. - The proposal is contrary to National Planning Policy Framework paragraph 213.	PA	20-Jan-26	O
Page 677 25/00494/FULEIA	Bradbury	Oliver	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure, which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19th train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19th train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19th hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. Please therefore adhere to the National Planning Policy Framework and in particular Paragraph NPPF 213 which states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional."	PA	20-Jan-26	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Woollam	Leila	Destruction of historical architecture	PA	20-Jan-26	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Wood	Sylvia	This is going to generate noise and pollution which will adversely affect health of residents and visitors.	PA	21-Jan-26	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Bundy	Michael	This proposal is an abomination	PA	21-Jan-26	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Wroblewska	Karolina	I don't believe this is the right proposal for this historic building	PA	21-Jan-26	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Johnson	Matthew		DC	21-Jan-26	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Smith	Hilary A		DC	21-Jan-26	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Hall-Flavin	Jef	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important Grade II listed heritage assets. The proposed 20-storey tower over the Liverpool Street station concourse is not only grossly out of scale. As designed, it would forever harm existing roof structures in the train shed, do harm to the Grade II listed hotel, and alter the setting of the Bishopsgate conservation area, among other irreparable damage. The National Planning Policy Framework is clear in Paragraph NPPF 213, stating: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." For this reason it is inconceivable as to how this proposal can be approved under current planning policies. I strongly object.	PA	21-Jan-26	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Feaviour	Alexander		DC	21-Jan-26	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Lyon	flora	"I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area.	PA	21-Jan-26	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Golay-Evans	Jeanne		DC	21-Jan-26	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Elliott	Brent	I object to the proposal to demolish such a large proportion of the roof structure of the main concourse, which is one of the primary reasons for the building having been listed. I also object to the proposal to erect such a monstrous tower over the station, which would not only compromise the visual outline and appearance of the station from the exterior, but would be in itself a detrimental addition to the cityscape. The tower violates the 2015 City Plan, and should not have been allowed to come this far in the planning process before being rejected. I have previously commented adversely on an earlier iteration of the proposals for Liverpool Street Station, and all my previous objections are still valid.	PA	21-Jan-26	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Woods	Malcolm	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of Grade II listed heritage buildings. The proposed 20-storey tower over the Liverpool Street station concourse is not only out of scale. As designed, it would harm existing roof structures in the train shed, do harm to the Grade II listed hotel, and alter the setting of the Bishopsgate conservation area, among other irreparable damage. The National Planning Policy Framework is clear in Paragraph NPPF 213, stating: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." For this reason, this proposal cannot be approved under current planning policies.	PA	21-Jan-26	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Ashworth	Mike	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to the substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed along with the insertion of excessive development of retail units within the C19 train shed that again would cause substantial harm to the special interest & significance of the Listed asset. The proposed scheme also impacts the setting & interest of adjacent Conservation Areas and other heritage assets. Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." I feel that this scheme does not meet that rightly high bar. Whilst recognising that stations do need to evolve to meet operational requirements I feel that schemes with less or no impact could and should be considered and that the Committee reject this damaging & inappropriate application to what is widely regarded as one of the great London railway termini & one that previous developments have done much to respect and enhance the station and its heritage assets.	PA	21-Jan-26	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Head	Jonathan	This unnecessary development is nothing short of corporate vandalism. Damage to the 19 century grade 1 & 2 listed buildings would be immense and irreversible. There would be high levels of disruption caused to the travelling public trying to use the station, to both commute and travel for leisure , which in case no one has noticed is the purpose of Liverpool Street station. Substantial disruption to the surrounding area during construction You go to a railway station for the purpose of a journey not to go shopping. There is a surplus of office space now with working from home, etc and the growth of AI will reduce many office type jobs. Breaches National Planning Policy Framework, Paragraph NPPF 213.	PA	21-Jan-26	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Hall	Bernard	I am horrified at the possible vandalism proposed for this valuable (beyond monetary) part of London's railway heritage.	PA	21-Jan-26	O
25/00494/FULEIA	O'Sullivan	Julie	Your proposal will destroy the wonderful and important historic qualities of this landmark station, that is a great asset to the City of London. A modern day equivalent to 'the Euston Arch' destruction and how we all regret that event. Look how the efforts of John Betjeman saved the heritage of St Pancras Station and Hotel for future generations to enjoy and wonder at and please reflect how close it came to being lost.	PA	21-Jan-26	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Fiddeman	Joyce	Now in my 70s I grew up with a family in north london and seeing this area, and nowadays dismayed by many historic landmarks such as the Monument surrounded and dwarfed by modern highrise buildings. Liverpool Street Station and surrounding area seems the last surviving buildings with a clear view and not isolated islands of old London. Enough is enough, developers are still building all over London, and fed up with finding myself walking along historic roads but surrounded by tall buildings with empty shops/offices and blocking out sunlight also the design causing wind tunnels. In the process how many small shops and businesses are going to be lost, replaced by more coffee shops for high rents. Liverpool Street station is part of the historic heart of east London leading to St Pauls and which would to be changed for ever. Please do not allow this development, it is certainly not for the benefit of local community.	PA	21-Jan-26	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Seedhouse	Richard	I'm again the spoiling historic building and setting a dangerous president for listed buildings. the overcrowding problem isn't due to the existing building its the rail companies don't run the trains on the time.	PA	21-Jan-26	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Price	Dennis	I object to this application.which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: changes that would seriously harm the existing surviving 19th century train shed. This is a delightful station much appreciated by those of us who use it regularly. It is open to daylight and the only part of a miserable nature is the east end platforms updated relatively recently. It is a train shed used by many people and is a pleasure to experience compared with many stations that have been severely altered and have lost any feeling of arrival in a significant City. Considering the setting of the station itself in the Billingsgate Conservation area to add such an overwhelming and dominate building destroys any sense of the city as it currently stands. An area of relatively low buildings which are a delight to walk around. It runs contrary to the city's own 2015 City Plan which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas in such Conservation areas. The scheme would impact the setting of numerous designated heritage assets in the city and beyond, such as many Grade 1 listed Wren churches and the 3 wonderful St Botolph's Church and Aldgate School. Please think again and reject this scheme. It is to be noted that in the National Planning Policy Framework 213 states Substantial harm to or loss of :a) grade 11 listed building ,or grade 11 registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional. This is not exceptional just a carbuncle or a much loved building and area.	PA	21-Jan-26	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Moorhouse	Paula	I object to this application as it would great harm to the existing buildings and surroundings. Specifically it will damage and alter the significance of a Grade 2 listed building. This is in contravention of the National Policy Framework which states in paragraph 213 : substantial harm or loss of a) grade 2 listed buildings or grade 2 registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional. It will cause harm to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan.	PA	21-Jan-26	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Backe-Hansen	Melanie	I object to the proposed plans for Liverpool Street Station. I strongly object. The impact and destruction of the heritage assets, not only for the Grade II listed station itself, but for surrounding buildings, train shed, Grade II listed hotel, nearby churches, and the whole Bishopgate conservation area. It is distressing and maddening that this plan is proposed with so much destruction to the station and surrounding buildings, particularly as it has been presented by many heritage groups that the increased space needed for the station can be achieved without such extensive harm (and at a lower cost). Again, I strongly object to the plans for Liverpool Steet Station. It clearly causes substantial harm or loss to the grade II listed buildings - which directly breaks the National Planning Policy Framework where it states in paragraph 213 that applications should not cause "substantial harm to or loss of a grade II listed building".	PA	21-Jan-26	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Turner	Roger	Hideous and completely out of scale with the existing station. Why make the rape of London even worse?	PA	21-Jan-26	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Papachristos	Helen		DC	21-Jan-26	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Dore	Sally	I have a long-standing interest in the history, topography and architecture of London. Although the City is predisposed to development, and has been throughout its history, we should now be focusing on preservation, not only because the historical assets of the City are diminishing rapidly (and making it a less attractive place to visit), but also for environmental and sustainability reasons. I object to this proposal because it would be damaging to an important historic building and site, and because less damaging alternatives are available for this development, as has been demonstrated. In damaging the building and setting of a major heritage site, it would diminish the whole area and make it less attractive to visitors.	PA	21-Jan-26	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Bucknall	Camilla	Loss of Significance to a major heritage site with unique london history. Over development. Glass and generally poor design. Features that have already proven to fail/fall out of favour.	PA	21-Jan-26	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Foggo	Andrew	I object to this application which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: * The substantial harm to the Grade II listed station *The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets - the Grade II* listed hotel *The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area *The insertion of extensive new retail units within the C19 train sheds.	PA	21-Jan-26	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Kenyon	Kate		DC	21-Jan-26	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Young	Stan		DC	21-Jan-26	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Foggo	Andrew	I object to this application which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: * The substantial harm to the Grade II listed station *The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets - the Grade II* listed hotel *The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area *The insertion of extensive new retail units within the C19 train sheds. Sincerely, Andrew Foggo	PA	21-Jan-26	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Vicinus	Martha	As the former Editor of the premier academic journal, Victorian Studies, and a lifetime advocate for Victorian architecture, I find it difficult to understand plans to damage one of the most beautiful rail stations in Britain. London's East End has become an important residential area, attracting young people and tourists; Liverpool Street Station is an excellent-and beautiful-center for both shopping and transportation. To destroy yet another rail station, one which has been part of the fabric of the area for over 150 years, is an expensive destruction of the neighborhood's historic environment. Over the years I have repeatedly led American students to Liverpool Street station to show them the incomparable skill and beauty of Victorian rail stations, nestled in a neighborhood that has survived and thrived for centuries. Please honor this historic site.	PA	21-Jan-26	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Robinson	Elizabeth	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to the insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset, and the impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church.	PA	21-Jan-26	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Moore	Natasha	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: - The damage that would be caused to the Grade-II listed building - The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area - The damage that would be done to the setting of heritage assets surrounding the station Moreover, Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional."	PA	21-Jan-26	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Walder	Tim	I object to the proposals on heritage grounds. In my view the proposals cause substantial harm to the significance of Liverpool Street Station because: 1) The 1985 to 1992 elements, listed only recently, are almost wholly demolished. This is a large and significant proportion of the listed building. 2) The concourse will be narrower and much darker and this is a loss of the light and spatial qualities noted in the listing description. 3) The insertion of the bomb proof box into the 1875 train shed is harmful in terms of both fabric and appearance. 4) The proposed entrances are wholly uncharacteristic of the listed building and the conservation area and are probably unbuildable in this form. 5) The proposed retail units harm the fabric and block views of the side walls of the 1875 shed. 6) The proposed overstation office development is physically and visually dominerer and will overwhelm and subsume what is left of the listed building, as well as harming its setting and the character and appearance of the conservation area. The proposals also cause a high level of harm to the Great Eastern Hotel through harm to its setting: this elegant building will be backdropped and visually overwhelmed by the proposed offices. The proposed office building is too tall and massive for this context and this results in harm to the conservation area and nearby assets including other conservation areas and listed buildings. The City should pause this scheme and think again. As SAVE have shown, this is not the only viable option for this site. The City should not be responsible for the unnecessary loss of the elegant and much loved 1985 to 1992 work, which is the best of its type in the UK. This scheme reeks of another era when major London rail termini were routinely marked for demolition. Does the City want to create another Euston? Tim Walder Former Principal Conservation Officer to the Greater London Authority, writing in a personal capacity.	PA	21-Jan-26	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Chambers	Michael	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church.	PA	21-Jan-26	O
Page 684 25/00494/FULEIA	Emanuel	Robert	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to the substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. There is no need for new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries which will cause a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. There will also be an impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. I object to the substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. I refer to the National Planning Policy Framework Paragraph NPPF 213 of which states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." and I object to this application. I have had the pleasure of commuting to Liverpool Street station for many years and I strongly object to this application which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. I raise objection	PA	21-Jan-26	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Balcomb	Sean	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to the substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure, which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed, and the impact on the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II listed hotel, the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the city, through the construction of a 20-story tower over the station concourse.	PA	22-Jan-26	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Hawkins	Jeff	Liverpool Street station is iconic , throughout the world. It is in an area, that still remains sympathetic to its Victorian past. Yes there are new skyscrapers....but they are rightly separate. The careful redevelopment of the station, in the 1980s, was done with sympathy and a high level of craftsmanship. The station still has that grand Victorian feel. The proposed redevelopment would be a ghastly act of vandalism. It is out of scale to the station and surrounding area. It is not it keeping. It is using harsh , unsympathetic materials. It Actually looks cheap and Nasty.... everything the original Liverpool Street station is not. The original Victorian station , and the brickwork of the 1980s is a celebration of the craftsmanship of working class tradesmen, particularly the brickwork. The proposed redevelopment, is an insult to craftsmanship. Anyone can build a skyscraper if they have enough nuts and bolts. Not many people can build Flemish bond brickwork, with Victorian weather pointing and beautiful terra cotta details. Trust me, I've seen the tourists stand and stare in ore at this beautiful building. The station is also the gateway to Victorian spittlefields, and so needs to retain it's look and identity. We need tourists, and they love this building, the way it looks NOW. No other country would carry out this act of vandalism on such an iconic building and surroundings. I oppose this dreadful development because It's ugly and detrimental to the Victorian era I takes great character and charm away....and adds nothing It's totally out of scale and far too dominating for it's surroundings I think it will effect tourism It is destroying local history There are now to many skyscrapers in this area It's plain ugly and elitist	PA	22-Jan-26	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Gnisci	Jacopo	I am writing to formally oppose this application on the grounds that it would cause profound damage to the integrity of heritage assets of national importance. My specific concerns are as follows: Alterations to the Grade II Listed Station: The proposed demolition of the existing concourse roof and its replacement with a modern structure would significantly degrade the station's architectural character. This move would also negatively affect the setting of the surviving 19th-century train shed. Intrusive Retail Development: The plan to install extensive retail units and elevated galleries within the Victorian train sheds represents a high level of harm to the asset's "special interest." Impact on the Grade II Listed Hotel:* The construction of a 20-storey tower above the concourse would irreparably damage the setting of this unique, continually functioning 19th-century hotel. Conflict with the 2015 City Plan: A tower of this magnitude is entirely out of character for the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, which is defined by low-to-medium-rise buildings. This proposal directly contradicts the 2015 City Plan, which mandates the refusal of tall buildings in inappropriate locations, including Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights protection zone. Wider Heritage Context: The development would mar the setting of numerous surrounding assets, including several Grade I-listed Christopher Wren churches and St Botolph's. Under Paragraph 213 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), it is stated that "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." This application fails to meet that "exceptional" threshold and should be refused.	PA	22-Jan-26	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Schell	Adam		DC	22-Jan-26	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Broad	Tony		DC	22-Jan-26	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Sayer	Wendy		DC	22-Jan-26	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Newson	John		DC	22-Jan-26	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Backhouse	Roger		DC	22-Jan-26	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Featherstone	Malcolm	I object to these proposals because they are totally unsympathetic to what is an economic building. I spent many years both working in, and traveling through, Liverpool Street Station, alongside countless others, and it became an important part of our lives. To destroy it, to disrespect it, in this way is a big blow to our collective cultural heritage. I have seen much modernisation of the station over the past few decades, and whilst I may not have particularly liked them, they left the grandeur of the station essentially intact in a way that these plans will not.	PA	22-Jan-26	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Mayou	Richard	I object most strongly to these proposals which would do irreparable harm to buildings of high historic and architectural importance. The proposed loss of historic structures and the erection of overbearing new building would mean the loss of an outstanding public amenity. The proposals do not conform with the National Planning guidance, I strongly object to these proposals: - Destruction of important, historic and attractive station buildings - The site and size of the tower block - The cost and disturbance when it has been shown that a much better alternative is possible	PA	22-Jan-26	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Curtis	Gary	I wish to formally object to the proposed redevelopment of Liverpool Street Station. This iconic station is not only a vital transport hub but also a treasured piece of British architectural heritage. The scale and design of the proposed changes are entirely inappropriate and would irreversibly harm its historic character. While I appreciate the need for upgraded facilities, there are far more sensitive approaches that could modernize the station without eroding its unique architectural identity. Liverpool Street Station stands as a rare gem amid an overdeveloped area, and the continual loss of character in this part of London is a matter of serious public concern. I urge the relevant authorities to reconsider this proposal and prioritize preservation alongside improvement, ensuring the station's historic significance is respected for future generations.	PA	22-Jan-26	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Hulme	Aly	This is a beautiful historic building and should be protected and preserved	PA	22-Jan-26	O
25/00494/FULEIA	McCracken	Sarah	I object to every part of this application. It is environmentally damaging, destroys the area around the station, is overbearing of original Victorian architecture and is not wanted or needed. The city has already encroached on this historic part of London, there is no need to have further high rise office buildings in an area already crushed by the weight of them. What we need is a working station and space to move around. By squashing in this new building and destroying important parts of the original station the proposed development is setting a dangerous precedent. The noise, years of work and upheaval just isn't worth it.	PA	22-Jan-26	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Johnson	Angela	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area.	PA	22-Jan-26	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Critchlow	Anthony	I find the proposals degrading to the original design.	PA	22-Jan-26	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Pitchford MRTPI (Rtd)	Frederick John	As a regular user of Liverpool Street Station, I object to the proposed development as set out in the application 25/00494, in particular for its impact on the Grade II listed station concourse - the part of the building seen by most passengers, whether arriving by train, from the street or from the Underground. This would cause substantial harm to the existing heritage structures which still perform their original function while delighting the travelling public with their architecture and engineering. In addition, the proposed office development would cause substantial harm to the setting of the Grade II* listed former Great Eastern Hotel, dominating it with incongruent architecture. Both of these would be contrary to the NPPF. The justification of these changes appears to be largely based on the need to accommodate forecast increases in passengers. Subjectively, as a user, I do not feel that the station is over-crowded and, while access to the main Underground concourse should be improved, especially for disabled passengers, these concerns are clearly not of a scale to warrant the wanton destruction and damage to heritage buildings now proposed. Looking in more detail at the evidence prepared by NR to justify the anticipated increase in passenger throughput, the existing figures are still substantially below the peak reached in 2019, notwithstanding the one-off growth created by the opening of the Elizabeth Line. The 2019 level of use was clearly accommodated in the existing station. There is no evidence that the higher levels of growth, suggesting an exceedance of 2019 levels only in some decades time, is founded in wider examination of commuting patterns or development trends in the catchment area of the Great Eastern lines. In conclusion, I would contend that the substantial harm which would be caused to the listed station concourse and hotel is not justified by the flimsy projections of passenger growth set out by NR as part of this application.	PA	22-Jan-26	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Stanford	Leigh	I have been a user of Liverpool Street Station throughout my working life. Using the Chingford to Liverpool Street route or Ponders End to Liverpool Street route on an almost daily basis. I strongly object to these plans on heritage and sustainability grounds. The plans as they stand will cause years of disruption to Liverpool Street Station users for basic upgrades.	PA	22-Jan-26	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Clayton	Barry James	Traditional Building	PA	22-Jan-26	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Bilyan	Mariya	I find it outrageous that for financial profit you are eager to destroy history! The place that commemorates arrival of thousands of Jewish children who escaped Nazi persecution should not be transformed into a flashy modern spectacle of the grotesque that undermines the site's historical dignity.	PA	22-Jan-26	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Evans	Margaret	I think this would be an inappropriate and disfiguring development causing years of disruption for rail travellers. In my view the unusual and distinctive appearance of this station would be negatively impacted on by the proposed high-rise building which as an idea seems mainly driven by considerations of profit regardless of the visual cost.	PA	22-Jan-26	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Stark	Sarah	If approved this proposal would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. I therefore urge the Corporation to reject it. If this proposal were approved, there would be substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving nineteenth-century train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, would result in a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. There would be a negative impact on the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning nineteenth-century hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The proposed scheme would cause substantial harm to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, through the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in conservation areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. I urge the Corporation to have regard to the National Planning Policy Framework, specifically para 213 which states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." This unique historic terminus should not be degraded by an exception to heritage planning policy.	PA	22-Jan-26	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Allen	Julie	I object to the proposed development affecting Liverpool Street Station. For over 64 years I have arrived at Liverpool Street Station on countless occasions. Throughout that time it has remained a place of exceptional architectural quality and civic importance. Its monumental columns, historic fabric, carefully considered proportions and distinctive Art Deco lighting give it a character and dignity that are increasingly rare in modern transport buildings. Liverpool Street Station is not simply a functional interchange; it is a heritage asset of significant architectural, historical and social value. Its original features are integral to its identity and make a vital contribution to London's historic townscape. These elements are not decorative, but fundamental to the station's significance and sense of place. While I recognise the need for transport infrastructure to adapt and expand, this must be achieved in a way that conserves and respects the station's historic character. Development should not involve the loss, removal or dilution of original architectural features, nor their replacement with generic modern alternatives, as this would result in permanent and unnecessary harm to heritage value. National and local planning policy places a clear duty on decision-makers to preserve and, where possible, enhance heritage assets and their settings. Any harm must be clearly justified, unavoidable, and demonstrably outweighed by substantial public benefits. In this case, it has not been shown that the proposed harm to Liverpool Street Station's historic fabric is necessary or justified. The public interest strongly favours the sensitive conservation and adaptation of historic buildings. Liverpool Street Station is widely valued as a landmark of London's architectural and cultural heritage. Once lost, historic features cannot be meaningfully replaced, and their destruction would irreversibly diminish the character of the city. Historic buildings are held in trust b	PA	22-Jan-26	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Pringle	Max	to whom it may concern, I am writing to register my formal objection to the proposed redevelopment of Liverpool Street Station, which involves the construction of large-scale, high-rise towers over and around this historic site. This objection is made on the grounds of heritage preservation, architectural integrity, and the broader cultural consequences of unchecked overdevelopment. 1. Heritage at Risk Liverpool Street Station is not just a functional transport hub-it is a living part of London's history. Opened in 1874 and partially rebuilt after World War II and again in the 1980s, the station exemplifies the evolution of London's infrastructure and urban life. It stands as a testament to Victorian engineering and is closely associated with significant historical events, including the Kindertransport rescue efforts during the Second World War. The station's current facade, train sheds, and elements of the Great Eastern Hotel (now Andaz London) reflect a distinctive blend of Victorian Gothic and Edwardian architecture. These heritage features are not incidental; they are integral to the station's character and civic identity. The proposed development threatens to overpower and diminish these elements. The introduction of massive, glass-clad high-rises over the Grade II listed station and the Grade II* listed hotel constitutes a gross insensitivity to the architectural fabric of the area. It fundamentally alters the skyline and the context in which the station has stood for over a century. 2. Loss of Identity and Urban Character This project represents yet another instance of London's historic spaces being sacrificed for corporate gain under the guise of "modernisation." If approved, the development will contribute to an increasingly monotonous cityscape, where soulless high-rises replace sites of cultural memory and urban distinctiveness. London risks becoming a city of nowhere-a landscape of generic buildings.	PA	22-Jan-26	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Hibberd	Jonathan	Not appropriate or necessary development with respect to both the original Victorian structure and the later sympathetic Victorian-style additions. Other more sympathetic adaptations are possible, on a more sensible scale and avoiding years of disruption. Important to protect what little Victorian architecture remains in the area.	PA	22-Jan-26	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Millington	B	In my opinion too many historical buildings have already been lost.	PA	23-Jan-26	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Hill	Marilyn	Its a lovely designed building stop changing London can there be another station built somewhere else to take the volume of comuters?	PA	23-Jan-26	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Galer	Dawn	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional.	PA	23-Jan-26	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Young	Sarah	I object to this plan due to the damage to the Victorian station and also to the disruption to travellers like myself coming into London on this line	PA	23-Jan-26	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Stewart	Regind	I Object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. I reference the National Planning Policy Framework, 213 which states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." Yours sincerely,	PA	23-Jan-26	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Stewart	Vicky	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. Referencing The National Planning Policy Framework Paragraph NPPF 213 - I believe this application, if passed, will do "substantial harm to grade II listed buildings"	PA	23-Jan-26	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Rifkin	Adrian	This is a stunning architectural relic and a beautiful space. It is heavily used and enjoyed. I lived in Middlesex Street for 20 years and can understand the unutterable disruption this will bring to thousands of residents as well as to visitors to Spitalfields. Shocking. Stupid and short-sighted.	PA	23-Jan-26	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Robertson	William	This building is of significant historical value and importance and should be retained as part of our heritage. It is not an appropriate or necessary development with respect to both the original Victorian structure and the later sympathetic Victorian-style additions. Other more sympathetic adaptations are possible, on a more sensible scale and avoiding years of disruption. It is HUGELY Important to protect what little Victorian architecture remains in the area.. AND IN London generally.	PA	23-Jan-26	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Z	N	It would be a pity to demolish such a beautiful building if we think of London historical architecture . Thank you	PA	23-Jan-26	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Aslet	Clive	I write as a Visiting Professor of Architecture at the University of Cambridge and the author of over 30 books on largely architectural subjects. Having examined the ACME proposal, I believe that it is overscale, would badly impact the existing architecture of Liverpool Street Station and would irreparably damage a conservation area. One of the joys of Liverpool Street Station is the sense of airiness and light, achieved by Nick Derbyshire remodelling opened in 1991. This would be significantly compromised by the proposed scheme. Whereas the Derbyshire remodelling was outstanding sympathetic to the traditional of railway architecture and Liverpool Street in particular, the ACME scheme does not show the same sensitivity. In particular it would destroy the Victorian character of the entrance to the station, where Derbyshire's inspired towers and the rebuilt (in facsimile) 50 Liverpool Street are joined by an attractive collection of Victorian commercial buildings -- creating a sense of harmony and human scale. John McAslan and Partners, with their huge experience of station architecture and reputation for imaginative solutions to inserting new architecture into historic environments, have prepared an alternative to the ACME scheme which is far more suitable. 1. It is better environmentally because it requires no demolition and is generally a much lighter structure. 2. It complements the historic character of Liverpool Street station, leaving the concourse lit with natural light. 3. it will not cause so much disruption while being built. 4. While providing less office space it is more financially viable because it will be so much cheaper to build. With this alternative in view, I strongly believe that the ACME sheme should be refused.	PA	23-Jan-26	O
Page 695 25/00494/FULEIA	Kent	Duncan	I object to the application as it would cause significant harm to nationally important heritage assets and adversely impact the setting of Liverpool Street Station within the Bishopsgate conservation area. The current station layout is award winning for its sensitivity to the Victorian train shed and preserving the heritage character of the station as a whole; this will be wholly lost if the current proposals were implemented. The visual and architectural and engineering continuity of the station will be lost and the legibility of the setting of the Victorian train shed greatly impaired, harming its heritage character and setting. This will be greatly amplified by creation of additional retail units, including at an elevated level, interrupting clear sight lines and cluttering the space within the station, further obscuring and impairing the historic architectural and engineered elements. There will be knock on impacts to the setting of the adjacent listed hotel - the last continuously operating Victorian hotel in the City of London - and its legibility as a historic feature within the station concourse. Outside of the concourse the imposition of large tower blocks onto the concourse area and wider station setting will dwarf the existing Victorian street scape and destroy the remaining 19th century character that is still present within the wider Bishopsgate area, including its relationship with Finsbury Square, St Botolphs, Bishopsgate and the Spitalfields area, all protected heritage assets. This application seeks to maximise profit from the asset value of the land on which the station sits without regard to the station as a crucial heritage asset that represents a rare survivor of a London rail terminus of the first rate. It is unnecessary and the award winning current design should be preserved as an exemplar of sensitive redevelopment and not lost to insensitive overdevelopment of the type it's example so eloquently stands against.	PA	23-Jan-26	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Miller	Lindsay	The proposal of the Liverpool street station development is abhorrent. Liverpool street station is distinct with so much character and history. The proposed development would leave it looking like any other city building in the world.	PA	23-Jan-26	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Minister	Margaret	I use Liverpool St station often and have done throughout my life - I commuted to it as a young woman. Although earlier alterations drastically reduced the ambience by building over platforms the exiting cathedral roof is a wonderful example of the Victorian city and should remain including its surroundings, the city has enough impersonal glass buildings.	PA	23-Jan-26	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Clarkson	Paul	This just be rejected as it's a disgrace that this has been allowed to even be mentioned.	PA	23-Jan-26	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Plank	Courtney	I am a tour guide and draw visitors' attention to the skill and wonder of 19 th century engineers as visible at Liverpool Street station. Do not destroy this light filled station!	PA	23-Jan-26	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Earl	Pamela	Dear Sir/Mme, We are fast losing so much of our historic fabric. This threat is egregious. I can't believe this is actually being attempted. So much of London has been lost in this not-so-new century. There is no excuse or need to destroy this. It already has shops and cafes. I used Liverpool Street station for several years on a near daily basis. Believe me when I say it can and does handle millions of people during the rush hour and throughout the day and night. I do hope y'all have pride in your wonderful and unique historic fabric and reject this monstrous planning application. Thank you for reading. Kind regards, Pamela - Historic Conservation researcher	PA	23-Jan-26	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Davis	Penny	Objection to Partial Demolition and Remodelling of Liverpool Street Station I object to the proposed partial demolition and remodelling of Liverpool Street Station on the grounds that it would cause unjustified harm to a Grade II* listed heritage asset, contrary to national, London, and Historic England policy and guidance. Liverpool Street Station is of exceptional architectural and historic significance. The proposal would result in the loss of historic fabric and a fundamental erosion of the station's architectural coherence and legibility. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) requires that: "Great weight should be given to the asset's conservation (and the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be)." (NPPF, para. 199) Any harm must be clearly and convincingly justified: "Any harm to, or loss of, the significance of a designated heritage asset... should require clear and convincing justification." (NPPF, para. 200) Such justification has not been demonstrated. Less harmful, conservation-led alternatives capable of delivering capacity improvements have not been adequately explored. The proposal also conflicts with the London Plan (2021): "Development proposals affecting heritage assets and their settings should conserve their significance." (Policy HC1) Historic England guidance reinforces this position. Conservation Principles (2008) states that: "The historic environment is a non-renewable resource and should be conserved for the benefit of present and future generations." Historic England's Advice Note 2: Managing Significance in Decision-Taking (2015) emphasises that harm should be avoided through design and that loss of historic fabric should be a last resort. The claimed public benefits do not clearly outweigh the harm identified, as required by NPPF paragraph 202, particularly where those benefits could be achieved through alternative schemes with significantly less impact on the heritage asset. For these reasons, the proposal fai	PA	23-Jan-26	O
25/00494/FULEIA	White	Henriette	The alternative proposal seems more suited on all levels and cheaper	PA	23-Jan-26	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Greenfield	Deborah	I write to object vehemently to the proposed plan that would incur massive expense, disruption and destruction to a valuable part of London's built heritage. An alternate plan by JMP manages to pay for the new lifts, escalators and toilets with a much smaller office building that would require no demolition of the existing station. https://www.savebritainsheritage.org/news/a-new-vision-for-liverpool-street-station-unveiled-by-john-mcaslan-partners	PA	23-Jan-26	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Hiley	Adam	please block the proposal to destroy the character of Liverpool Street Station	PA	23-Jan-26	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Greaves	Phil	This scheme will ruin beyond recognition a key part of the nation's railway heritage. As the country that gave the world railways, Liverpool Street Station belongs to the whole of Great Britain, not just London. The demoliton of such significant features of the station is irreversible and such architectural finesse cannot be replaced. This station and its associated structures can be re-purposed without unnecessary demolition.	PA	23-Jan-26	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Brunner	Helen	Awful plan to ruin this beautiful cathedral station	PA	23-Jan-26	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Latto	Richard	For historical and aesthetic grounds i object to this proposal.	PA	23-Jan-26	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Cook	Alan	I object to the above development in Liverpool station. Also ongoing disruption to commuters and national rail customers for a very long time.	PA	23-Jan-26	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Hagan	Conor	This redesign is barely a change on the original, glossy computer images can't hide the fact that this is pure developer and landowner greed - why is design such an afterthought?! People don't travel to glass and steel cities, they want culture and part of that is architectural. Approving this in the current condition is the wrong decision	PA	23-Jan-26	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Dawson	Edward	The historic fabric of the magnificent station building should be kept and restored where needed. It is part of the vital character of Liverpool Street Station and also has touristic value for the foreseeable future.	PA	23-Jan-26	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Bartlett	Deborah	Indefensible and unnecessary loss of architectural heritage.	PA	23-Jan-26	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Hill	Jane	I object to the Network Rail plans and would urge the City of London Planning Committee to consider instead the alternative proposals put forward by SAVE and the Victorian Society which keeps the classic architecture and enhances the dtation without causing major distuption to the entire area.	PA	23-Jan-26	O
25/00494/FULEIA	BRADY	RICHARD	Please respect our glorious Victorian buildings, we have lost enough already.	PA	23-Jan-26	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Vevers	MARK	The development is not appropriate.	PA	23-Jan-26	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Atherton	Thomas	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More s specifically, I raise objections to: - The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. - The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. - The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area.	PA	23-Jan-26	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Osmon	David	It is simply not right that a wonderful, historic London building that is a significant part of the City of London's heritage should be threatened. Liverpool Street Station is a building that brings joy and uplifts everyone who passes through it whereas the proposed replacement would entail a diminished experience. The proposed scheme is a form of vandalism. It is particularly disgraceful that, I gather, the whole scheme has been developed simply in order to make money to cover a shortfall in Network Rail's pension fund. It is particularly obvious that the proposed scheme should not be approved when an alternative has been developed by John McAslan and Partners (JMP) that is innovative and elegant and involves almost no demolition, destruction or disruption. It would also avoid the huge amount of extra carbon emissions inherent in the proposed scheme.	PA	23-Jan-26	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Allen	Michael James	what is it with the greed and ego in this country. That councils and politicians are perfectly happy to destroy what it is that makes our cities and towns special. Our heritage, architecture and the landscape which has been sympathetically built. This proposal is a joke, an eye sore and is not putting the building first. There are alternatives that must also be considered before this one is rushed though with what looks like no scrutiny. Such as ideas from John McAlslan + Partners.	PA	23-Jan-26	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Beckingham	Carolyn	It would be a great pity to lose the light-filled concourse and I object in the strongest possible terms.	PA	23-Jan-26	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Powers	Alan	Liverpool Street Station is one of the best mainline stations in London in terms of individual design features and the comfortable way in which it fits into the scale of the City with its two frontages, and its characterful mixture of materials and styles. The makeover of the 1980s/90s made it more efficient for users than several other main stations, as well as being revolutionary at the time in its light-filled spaces. The replication of the iron and glass roof was unusual at the time and the forerunner of some later sensitive and undogmatic alterations to buildings. The proposals will sweep away or obscure the merits of this scheme with little advantage for the public and a detriment to the historical interest and townscape quality. The alternative proposed by John McAslan is clever and unobtrusive, as was his addition to Kings Cross, and offers the benefits without the damaging effects of the proposals in this application.	PA	23-Jan-26	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Brown	Virginia	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. Substantial harm would be caused to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, would cause a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. There would be a detrimental impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The scheme would cause substantial harm to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. I believe this application contravenes paragraph NPPF 213 in the National Planning Policy Framework: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional."	PA	23-Jan-26	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Burrows	Adrian	Demolishing the whole concourse and major construction, work that would require rolling closures for years, is wrong when there is a smaller more sympathetic design allowing the station to still continue operation whilst work is undertaken.	PA	23-Jan-26	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Copping	John	Excessive and unnecessary disturbance to the historic fabric	PA	23-Jan-26	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Page	Malcolm	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: 1. The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. 2. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. 3. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. 4. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. 5. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. 6. The plans are contrary to The National Planning Policy Framework Paragraph which 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." The Architects John McAslan & Partners have demonstrated an alternative approach to improving this station that would far quicker to erect and involve virtually no demolition or disruption to train services.	PA	23-Jan-26	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Mayo	Nancy	I object to this thoughtless scheme which involves bunging up a tower block. The alternative vision by JMP would enhance this listed railway station and its setting and is far more sympathetic. Instead of constructing an ugly tower block, as proposed by Network Rail, a vaulted office building with a public garden would be added. The JMP vision is for a low-carbon design and a high-quality sustainable facade, avoiding the need for internal columns or demolition of the platform roofs. Moreover, the JMP design would remove the unsightly retail mezzanine, declutter the concourse (thereby easing passenger movement) and open up historic views along the trainshed.	PA	23-Jan-26	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Wade	Christopher	This will look horrible	PA	23-Jan-26	O
25/00494/FULEIA	taylor	cicely	Waste of money	PA	23-Jan-26	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Hillier	Richard	Liverpool Street Station is a beautiful heritage building and views of it need to be preserved for posterity. Any plans for buildings to tower over it world significantly damage the environment. The building of the new offices and shops destroyed forever the atmosphere of platforms 13 to 18. It would be a disaster to loose any more if the structure of the old engine sheds.	PA	23-Jan-26	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Harwood	Gillian	The proposed overlarge scheme in unworthy of The City of London. I use this lovely station to visit Norwich and would hate it to be darkened with construction columns holding up a concrete ceiling. I do not think it right to consider demolishing heritage buildings. Other London stations have now become modernised icons. The City and the railway company should be thinking of the future and taking this opportunity to build something so much better and more sustainable and more beautiful.	PA	23-Jan-26	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Campbell-Thomas	Gordon	I totally oppose this planning application. It is reminiscent of the proposed PA that was meant for St Pancras all those years ago, and like that application, totally unnecessary. There are alternatives that meet the requirements of the planners without destroying this architectural gem. I firmly believe that if this application is approved, it would be a retrograde step on a number of fronts, environmentally, economically and architecturally It would be a travesty. There is an alternative. Please, please, please think again. Please keep me updated	PA	23-Jan-26	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Clutterbuck	Janis	"I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings.	PA	23-Jan-26	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Taylor	Dave	Gross overdevelopment: Totally unnecessary.	PA	23-Jan-26	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Casson	Dinah	This is an over-elaborate, over-expensive scheme that will profoundly damage the character and identity of Liverpool Street Station. There is an alternative scheme by John McAslan which achieves most of the ambitions of this scheme but causing less damage. We know that ANY form of demolition is undesirable from an environmental point of view. We are realising, late in the day, that our heritage is precious, that the particular quality of this part of London is just hanging on and it shouldn't be destroyed. It is easy to be hoodwinked into thinking that unless it is wholesale makeover, nothing will work. But it will and it does if adjustments are made with care, creativity and sensitivity. Say NO to this please.	PA	23-Jan-26	O
25/00494/FULEIA	McAlpine	Lady	Stop trashing our Heritage! Our original Railway Stations are part of Britain's GREAT Industrial, Engineering & Transport Heritage. We taught other countries to conserve their heritage and now we simply destroy ours. I have here stunning gauged brickwork Demi-lunes that my husband saved the last time there was an attack on Liverpool Street. If only he were here now to save the rest of the station from rapacious tasteless developers with no understanding of the value of history. Pity their children... and ours.. Judy, Lady McAlpine: President, National Transport Trust, Trustee, Railway Heritage Trust. Etc...	PA	23-Jan-26	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Groenheim	Gary	This plan is way too large for the site, massing out of proportion. This proposal must be rejected.	PA	23-Jan-26	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Stewart	Frances	This is an ill-thought-out project to destroy an important historic building, while other more sympathetic options are available which would retain the light-filled station concourse. Please reconsider.	PA	23-Jan-26	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Maybank	Euan	i object to this grotesque and highly damaging scheme. if built, these proposals will irrevocably damage not only the physical structure of this one off , highly significant part of our international industrial heritage but it will destroy the setting of the building and that of its historic neighbours on liverpool street. it is an utter outrage and a total failure of our planning system this disgustingly wasteful project is being considered at all for such a significant site. with regards Euan Maybank Bermondsey	PA	23-Jan-26	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Howe	Ian Howe	I strongly object to this proposal on the grounds of the loss of structure of a national heritage asset. Liverpool Street station needs to be preserved as it is. It cannot meet the same fate as Euston. The damage caused to the wider conservation area will also be colossal. Ref: National Planning policy Paragraph NPPF 213: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." There are ugly parts of London for this monstrosity to be built and should not be built to cause damage and destruction of such an important and iconic London landmark. Yours sincerely, Ian Howe	PA	24-Jan-26	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Sampson	Henry	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance or nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure which would also compromise the setting of the surviving 19th century train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the 19th century train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II listed hotel - the last continually functioning 19th century hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. The National Planning Policy Framework in your objection, paragraph NPPF 213, states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." This development is not appropriate.	PA	24-Jan-26	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Holme	Richard	Disgraceful new development out of scale to current station and destroying the historic concourse.	PA	24-Jan-26	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Comish	Michael	A better solution is to preserve the buildings and devise a less grandiose solution.	PA	24-Jan-26	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Pearce	Kathryn	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed.	PA	24-Jan-26	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Wolfe	Kenneth	The loss of heritage and historical inheritance. The station and all that it illustrates of the British culture and that part of London represents a perspective that will be lost. It is an attribute to engineering brilliance in former times that will also be lost; the engineering of the rolling stock continues to progress and the station itself is there as a reminder of ingenuity and invention. The architecture innovations that continue must surely not erase but surely enhance where there is a need to show more clearly how. Engineering and design had improved and will continue especially will it be vivid when the station's building is restored where necessary as a vivid reminder of the brilliance we have restored rather than dismantled and obscured.	PA	24-Jan-26	O

25/00494/FULEIA	McGarrity	Kerry	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to the substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the beautiful glass roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. Also to the unnecessary extensive amounts of new retail units within the train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. Also The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the inappropriate scale of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. Lastly, the National Planning Policy Framework Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional."	PA	24-Jan-26	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Hartwell	Colin	I strongly object to the mutilation of a building of national importance for no reason other than financial gain for those involved in it's destruction. I have been using this station for 40 years and never tire of admiring it's beauty, scale and continued functionality. The claim that it requires change due to overcrowding is ridiculous and deceptive. Passenger numbers are down and passage through the station is easier now, even in peak periods, than it has ever been. This cannot be used as an excuse to destroy a heritage building for naked commercial gain. Have the backbone to tell the speculators involved to take their 'venture capital' to other more deprived areas where destruction of our collective history is not an essential part of their profit making. It won't be as profitable but they're wealth should not come at our loss.	PA	24-Jan-26	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Chamberlin	Stella	My husband and I object to Network Rail's current plans for this iconic London Station, and much prefer JMP's alternative and far more suitable plans, for environmental and many more reasons. Why would you even consider Network Rail's plans when it will cause so much unnecessary disruption to the travelling public and create such an eyesore?! My husband and I object to Network Rail's current plans for this iconic London Station, and much prefer JMP's alternative and far more suitable plans, for environmental and many more reasons. Why would you even consider Network Rail's plans when it will cause so much unnecessary disruption to the travelling public and create such an eyesore?!	PA	24-Jan-26	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Chamberlin	Stella	My husband and I object to Network Rail's current plans for this iconic London Station, and much prefer JMP's alternative and far more suitable plans, for environmental and many more reasons. Why would you even consider Network Rail's plans when it will cause so much unnecessary disruption to the travelling public and create such an eyesore?! My husband and I object to Network Rail's current plans for this iconic London Station, and much prefer JMP's alternative and far more suitable plans, for environmental and many more reasons. Why would you even consider Network Rail's plans when it will cause so much unnecessary disruption to the travelling public and create such an eyesore?!	PA	24-Jan-26	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Proctor	Karen	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. - o The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. - o The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. - o The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. - o The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. - o In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. - o Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." - o Scheme would remove the taxi rank from London's business mainline station without adequate provision as TfL restricted our ability to Bishopsgate and Network Rail have removed access for disabled passengers from Harwick Lane.	PA	24-Jan-26	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Rowbotham Fyffe	Amelia	I object to this proposal due to its excessive scale/ height and level of commercial overdevelopment at Liverpool Street. The proposal involves substantial demolition and alteration of the fabric of this historic station, which is harming the architectural and heritage significance of one of London's most important stations / my local large transport hub. It prioritises commercial gain over the station's civic / transport function, and will significantly increase congestion and disruption for local residents. This also fails to demonstrate how it will improve the station environment or surrounding public area in any real way for those who live around it. I believe this just reflects a wider and deeply concerning trend of prioritising commercial gain over the protection of historic buildings in the UK. The unnecessary loss of the historic features at Liverpool Street Station represents an irreversible erosion of our country's heritage... one that is becoming too commonplace. Once demolished or fundamentally altered, these buildings and structures cannot be replaced or recreated in any meaningful way in this day and age unfortunately. The role of government and planning authorities should be to safeguard nationally significant heritage assets for future generations (I am young, in my 20s, the historic features of the country are eroding), not to facilitate their incremental destruction in pursuit of short-term commercial returns on offices and shops etc. Development must be genuinely necessary, and in this case the scale of over-development is neither justified nor respectful of the station's historic significance. I live here and walk through this building every day... this is not necessary at all and comes from sheer greed. We need to wide our historic building protection laws before it is too late.	PA	24-Jan-26	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Polglase	Laura	This is an old scheme which does not address the issues of 2026. It is expensive and wasteful in embodied carbon. It does considerable harm to the listed buildings and to the conservation area around them. There is much better plan suggested by Tom McAslan which should be considered. The NPPF states that harm to listed buildings should only be accepted in exceptional circumstances. There are none here and the harm can be avoided by consideration of alternative proposals with significantly less interventions.	PA	24-Jan-26	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Kennett	Helen	Liverpool Street Station is an iconic London building which is unrivalled throughout the world. Any alterations would destroy its character and iconic status. It would be a much greater loss than the destruction of Euston Station was in the pursuit of modernising a station. There is no logical reason to tear the heart out of the building and totally wreck it in the process. The remains would then be but a pitiful reminder of this unique building.	PA	24-Jan-26	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Lloyd	Peter	The submitted scheme is overwhelming. There is a much better proposal by John McAslan & Partners	PA	24-Jan-26	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Mitchell	Jan	Great Britain's railways changed the world and the glorious stations of that era showcased that exceptional achievement. Their designs were elegant and architectural wonders in their own right. They are places where people can see working history and marvel at the skills on show. That should be honoured. The proposed design is a plebian edifice whose design looks like something from a dystopian computer game. Can the City of London truly think that PlayStation architecture is an appropriate add on? Glass and metal is currently everywhere and hardly shouts grace and elegance. It has no uniqueness. It's hardly inspiring to see yet another steroidal greenhouse. No one would dump a shard onto the back of Hampton Court. But that foul up is what is proposed here. Does the City of London consider this a fitting legacy to put its name to? Tourists come to see beauty and history. Let's hope their memories won't be of ghastly mistakes where they ask "who on earth allowed that!?" Please think again.	PA	24-Jan-26	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Reynolds	Colin	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure, which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. The National Planning Policy Framework Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional."	PA	24-Jan-26	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Mayer	Freddie	I object to the plans for Liverpool Street station because they will alter the building from its current form and destroy the historic fabric of the building through partial demolition and the proposed building work. Historic buildings should be preserved as they are. They should not be altered from their current form. The City of London has already allowed the destruction of so many historic buildings through projects like the Justice Quarter. This vandalism of our built environment must stop! Please do not allow these plans. Please follow the advice of the Victorian Society in how to adapt the building.	PA	24-Jan-26	O
25/00494/FULEIA	LeGrove	John	Liverpool Street railway station is a building of great significance and aesthetic value in the City of London. Network Rail's proposals would desecrate it. The proposed development would make the station vastly less attractive to use, and mar the surroundings and the view of other significant buildings, such as St Paul's Cathedral.	PA	24-Jan-26	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Morgan	Colin	So much of what makes London special is disappearing with bland office developments taking the place of buildings that contribute to well-being by their historicity and architectural interest.	PA	24-Jan-26	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Freeman	Sheila	Liverpool Street Station is one of London's finest Victorian buildings. Like St Pancras and Kings Cross stations it is loved by all who know it. All it seems except developers who see a bonanza not a treasured building. The City of London was full of some of the most interesting, beautiful and expensive Victorian and Edwardian buildings - in addition of course to older buildings. But planners have allowed developers to run rough shod through it - like bulls in a China shop. They have stolen what belongs to us all and replaced it with monuments to themselves. The new buildings, love them or loathe them, replace our history with international glass, steel and concrete. Liverpool street station was saved once from destruction and in the process smartened up. That was all that was needed or wanted. A new office building will bring even more people into the tiny area that is the city and put even more pressure on infrastructure. With so many working from home or on 4 day weeks, new offices are not needed or wanted. Broad Street, which was next door, was demolished years ago. But had it been kept it would have taken some pressure off Liverpool Street. But similar short sightedness and lack of care led to its loss. The so-called past is present and can inspire and aid the future - if we just love and care for it.	PA	24-Jan-26	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Ferguson	Alice	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. With reference the National Planning Policy Framework: Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." I'm Londoner and a regular user of Liverpool Street Station; my family live in Norwich. The planned wanton destruction of our city's heritage is both upsetting and disgraceful. These plans need to be withdrawn without delay. I stron	PA	24-Jan-26	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Orchard	Caroline	There is no need to create such chaos & disruption to all travellers, residents & users of that area, & build a monstrosity which will ultimately benefit a few, & create more noise & pollution, when there is a very good alternative plan which also retains a significant part of London history.	PA	24-Jan-26	O
25/00494/FULEIA	English	Geoffrey	I object to the proposal to "redevelop" Liverpool Street Station by the proposal to erect a 20 storey office block over the concourse. 1. This is a building of considerable architectural significance which will be functionally destroyed by the proposed structure. 2. There are viable alternatives to the proposal which will sympathetically redevelop the site. 3. The proposal will blight the lives of all of the people using the station for an unspecified length of time - think proposed time x 4. 4. The proposed tower block, if constructed, might only offset a portion of the redevelopment costs - given the track record of public infrastructure improvements in the UK and their continual overrun this should properly be viewed as wildly optimistic. In actuality, as Network Rail is a nationalised organisation, the inevitable cost overrun will fall on the public purse. 5. There are alternative schemes proposing considerably reduced disruption which must be considered as an alternative to this white elephant. This scheme will involve rolling closures of significant parts of the site for years, if not decades. 6. Given that Network Rail claim to be engaging with the public - i.e. the actual users of the station, those people whose daily lives will be most disrupted, advertisement of the proposals, with a realistic outline of the scale and time of construction has not been adequately or honestly advertised. 7. Is there an actual requirement for additional office accommodation in the City, given that there is already a surplus of available office space and the certainty that the future will, due to streamlined working practices, including the development of AI, actually see a reduced footfall in the City.	PA	24-Jan-26	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Simmons	John	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. Paragraph 213 of the National Planning Policy Framework states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." I have specific objections to:- a) The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station by the demolition of the roof of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. This will would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. b) The insertion of extensive new retail units in the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries. This will cause a high level of harm to the Grade II-listed heritage asset. c) The impact on the setting of the surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II* listed hotel (the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City) by the proposal to construct a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. d) The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area.	PA	24-Jan-26	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Schmitz	Sarah	To whom it may concern, I wish to strongly object to the proposed plans for Liverpool Street Station. The plans would cause significant harm to the historic structures, as well as those adjacent. The historic value of the station will be completely diminished, and the aesthetic massively impacted.	PA	25-Jan-26	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Knight	Roger	While I can see the need to upgrade Liverpool Street Station, I can see no reason to maximise profits and cause the sort of disruption that is clearly involved. Liverpool Street Station has a long history, is the busiest in London and is a pleasant terminus. There is an alternative, viable modernisation scheme, not the Network blunderbus approach. The peer amongst London stations is St Pancras. Modernisation did not change its character. The present scheme is being dictated by ambitious modernist architects. Stand up for your heritage and think of the passengers, not the developer's shareholders.	PA	25-Jan-26	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Litterick	Rhiannon	I object because these proposals are a travesty that would ruin a critical landmark of our cultural heritage and cause myriad disruption for commuters and local area users for years to come.	PA	25-Jan-26	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Bogle	Paul Wakefield	I strongly object to Network Rail's planning proposal in relation to Liverpool Street Station on the grounds that: 1. The disruption that will be caused to the millions of users of the station during the demolition and construction phases 2. The permanent loss loss of historic concourse space and buildings at Liverpool Street station which I have been using regularly over the last 40 years 3. The availability of alternative proposals which achieve the objectives of the proposal namely increased office space in the vicinity without destroying the historic site.	PA	25-Jan-26	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Wassell	Mark	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: 1) The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. 2) The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. 3) The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional."	PA	25-Jan-26	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Yildirim-Bogle	Gulay	I commute into Liverpool Street from Essex fo work. Not only do I pay through the nose to commute to work where I am fleeced, I will now be facing years of disruption, which will be delayed for months even years. I will also be facing various traffic issues trying to visit my elderly parents and family living in Hoxton/haggerston. I strongly object to this project which will my life a misery for years and years!	PA	25-Jan-26	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Ward	Karen	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to a nationally important heritage assets in Liverpool Street Station. I raise objections to: 1. The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and replacement with a new structure. 2. This would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed with extensive new retail units within the C19 train sheds, causing untold harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. 3. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. 4. Substantial harm would also be caused to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church.	PA	25-Jan-26	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Cornish	Tom	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to - - The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed - The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse - The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area In the National Planning Policy Framework, paragraph 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." This application is clearly in opposition to this and should be rejected.	PA	25-Jan-26	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Lane	Robert	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to the loss of the train shed roof, and contravention 2015 City Plan	PA	25-Jan-26	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Swerdlow	Alan	25/00494/FULEIA Access to trains from Woodbridge to London was an important factor in moving to EastAnglia when I retired from a career in Liverpool. It was always a great joy to arrive at Liverpool Street station. The original proposals for the major development, despite being by a distinguished firm of architects seemed to completely ignore all aspects of the historical station design. The new proposals seem a far better solution. I'm unable to comment on the costs, but the idea of a tall building over the station was not a good idea even if it had rental potential. Alan Swerdlow MBE.	PA	25-Jan-26	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Fitch	Alison	I am writing to object to Network Rail's proposals for the redevelopment of Liverpool Street Station, scheduled for consideration on 10 February, on heritage and conservation grounds. Liverpool Street Station is a building of exceptional historic and architectural significance. Its concourse, flooded with natural light and designed as a generous civic space, is a rare survivor of post-war railway architecture and an integral part of the station's character and public value. The proposed demolition of this concourse, and its replacement with an overbearing 19-storey commercial tower, would cause irreversible harm to this important heritage asset. As heritage campaigners including Griff Rhys Jones have rightly argued, these proposals represent a destructive and unnecessary approach. Crucially, there is an alternative scheme that would deliver the required station upgrades and capacity improvements without demolishing the historic concourse and without imposing a tower of this scale. The existence of such an option makes the level of harm proposed by the current scheme unjustifiable. Liverpool Street Station is not merely a development site but a place of collective memory, civic pride, and architectural quality. The planning system exists to balance growth with stewardship, and in this case the balance has not been met. The loss of historic fabric, daylight, and spatial generosity cannot be mitigated once removed. I urge the Committee to refuse consent for the current proposals and to require a redesign that protects the station's historic character while meeting operational needs. There is still time to choose a solution that respects Liverpool Street Station's heritage and safeguards it for future generations. Yours sincerely,	PA	25-Jan-26	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Seez	Nina	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: - The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure, which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. - The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. - The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. - Paragraph 213 of the National Policy Framework states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." Not only all the above, I understand there is an alternative, viable proposal which I believe should be considered, see https://www.savebritainsheritage.org/news/a-new-vision-for-liverpool-street-station-unveiled-by-john-mcaslan-partners	PA	26-Jan-26	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Thomas	Mary	Please keep this iconic station as it is and find a better way to improve it!	PA	26-Jan-26	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Bridgewater	Emma	The present hall of this station is elegant and full of natural light; it is also full of personal histories, associations and ghosts. Moreover it is the beloved and familiar gateway to East Anglia for me and for millions of others- our histories are bound up with the building as it is. This human patination is invisible but powerful and if you sweep it away you belittle and alienate us in the capital city we live so much.	PA	26-Jan-26	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Bayer	Patricia	I question the need for more office space as the majority of people I know now work primarily from home. This is yet another proposed major redevelopment which once again impacts on this important historic Station stop destroying British Heritage! The disruption caused to rail passengers and the extra traffic causing the usual chaos for road users and pedestrians alike must be given serious consideration.	PA	26-Jan-26	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Bogle	Sarah	I object on grounds of over-development, impact on heritage and listed buildings and over-looking. The scale of this development is excessive. An alternative should be explored.	PA	26-Jan-26	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Ashton	Jessica	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. In particular I object to: - o The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. - o The insertion of extensive new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. - o The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. - o The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. - o In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. - o Paragraph 213 of the NPPF indicates that "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be wholly exceptional." The exceptions set out at Paragraph 214 clearly do not apply as evidenced by the fact that the station is in use as well as an alternative proposal which avoids the harm, therefore in accordance with NPPF guidance in Paragraph 214, the local planning authority should refuse consent.	PA	26-Jan-26	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Thomas	Martin	I object to the application. The demolition and building works will create many years of unnecessary and avoidable disruption for passengers using the busiest station in the country, whilst delivering little if any passenger benefit. The needs of passengers should always be the priority for station developments. I understand that alternative plans are available that minimise disruption, whilst avoiding the environmentally harmful demolition of a perfectly usable (and in some cases, historic) building.	PA	26-Jan-26	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Dinmore	Ian		DC	26-Jan-26	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Bayliss	Paul	I wish to object to this scheme. The station and hotel would be engulfed by the development and the railway architecture lost for ever. The Liverpool Street station is an important part of the Conservation area and Grade 2 listed. It is vitally important to protect and conserve the station and the C19 hotel built to serve travellers, a function which it still fulfills.	DC	26-Jan-26	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Curtis	Brigid		DC	26-Jan-26	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Cox	James	I object to the proposals as they would destroy the station and be visually monstrous This building needs sensitive handling and this is definitely not what is being proposed You only have to look at what has been achieved with imagination and style at St Pancras and Kings Cross, to see that this is a grossly insensitive and unattractive proposal	PA	26-Jan-26	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Hopwood	Nicola	The excessive destruction of heritage fabric and an important landmark of railway history resulting from the above proposal should be opposed, to say nothing of the disruption to commuters and leisure passengers from the east of England. The more respectful and less disruptive proposal made by John McAslan and Partners shows that a more sensible approach is possible and should be adopted.	PA	26-Jan-26	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Olenick	Jacob	These plans look great, I hope they can go ahead as quickly as possible. The archways look really cool, and honestly the station could use a makeover (it's one of the UK's most used stations, but certainly not one of its nicest). Personally, I think the above-station development is a little aesthetically bland (couldn't the building get some of that sweeping masonry that the station is getting?). But overall, a welcome improvement.	PA	26-Jan-26	S
25/00494/FULEIA	GREENWOOD	Jeremy	I first used Liverpool Street Station in 1946 at the age of seven - I was joining my family who had moved to Suffolk. Since then I have used it regularly and more frequently since I moved to Suffolk permanently in 1991. I was dismayed when Network Rail's proposal for a major re-development were published which include a 20-storey tower. My objections are to the destruction of significant parts of the original buildings, the major building works to support the tower and the considerable disruption to passengers during a potentially extended construction period. I have now read John McAslan & Partners proposal for a more sympathetic solution to Network Rail's requirements. Not only would it retain existing buildings, but the additional work is in keeping with the spirit of the original design with a contemporary twist. It is clear that construction would be far less disruptive than the design put forward by Network Rail. This new proposal has so much to commend it in both practical and aesthetic aspects that I hope that the City of London's Planning Committee will accept it in preference to the Network Rail proposal.	PA	26-Jan-26	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Alexander	Angela	In the past, many buildings have been demolished or changed in ways which we now regret. The current proposal for Liverpool Street Station would fall into that category. It does not recognise the current buildings with any sympathy. A more sympathetic proposal is that from McAslan, which still recognises the needs of the busiest station in London, but also recognises the users need for the aesthetic beauty.	PA	26-Jan-26	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Bolton	Thomas	I would like to object to the proposals on the basis of their heritage and townscape impact, and design quality. I believe the proposed development is very overbearing, out of scale with the existing station and its context on Bishopsgate, and very damaging to the station. It will require the demolition of high quality heritage buildings, and the destruction of the station's glass roof which brings much-needed light into the concourse and platforms. The replacement lacks character, looking like a building which could be anywhere, and fails to respond to the distinctive built environment in the surrounding area. The proposed replacement building is also dominated by glass to an extent that begs significant questions about the sustainability of the design, especially the energy needed to prevent it from overheating. The proposals would render a much-loved station unrecognisable, and strip it of its architectural quality and long-established place in the neighbourhood. The planning application should be rejected.	PA	26-Jan-26	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Morris	Shelagh	I object to this application, because it would cause substantial harm to the Grade II listed station due to the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse. Replacing this with a new structure would also adversely affect the surviving C19 train shed. The construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse would also cause harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel. The whole scheme has the potential to cause harm to or loss of Grade II listed buildings, in contravention of the National Planning Policy Framework.	PA	26-Jan-26	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Beevers	David	I object to this application which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. In particular, I object to: The great harm to a grade 2 station through roof demolition and replacement. This would compromise the setting of the train shed. New retail units within the 19th century train shed will harm a grade 2 building. A 20 storey tower over the concourse will gravely harm the grade 2* 19th century hotel. Tall buildings will harm the Bishopsgate conservation area. I refer to para 213 of the NPPF: 'Substantial harm to or loss of grade 2 listed buildings or parks should be exceptional.	PA	26-Jan-26	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Munro	James	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of a nationally important heritage asset. More specifically, I raise objections to: The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. I reference the National Planning Policy Framework in my objection, specifically Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional."	PA	26-Jan-26	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Kearney	Jenny	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to harm to the Grade II-listed station and the Bishopsgate Conservation Area. This should be protected as stated in the National Planning Policy Framework, of which Paragraph NPPF 213 states: Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional.	PA	26-Jan-26	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Collins	Theresa	Heritage Destruction: I object to the proposed which will cause substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station and the demolition of its 1990s-built concourse roof. Scale and Character: I object to the 97m, 20-storey tower which is a "grossly disproportionate" structure that would overpower the surrounding Victorian townscape and the Bishopsgate Conservation Area. Impact on Listed Assets: I object to the negative effect on the setting of the adjacent Grade II*-listed former Great Eastern Hotel and views of St Paul's Cathedral. Over-commercialization: I Object to the creation of extensive new retail, including elevated, high-level walkways, which diminish the historic train shed's character. Environmental & Construction Concerns: I object to the carbon impact of the construction and the long-term disruption to commuters. Sustainability of Need: There is no evidence to support whether the massive scale of the redevelopment is truly necessary to achieve the promised accessibility and capacity improvements.	PA	26-Jan-26	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Schofield	Matthew	I object to this development. Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." These plans indeed cause substantial harm to listed buildings. They will devastate a Grade II* listed hotel, the Grade II listed station and the Bishopsgate Conservation Area. The planned new structures do not have the qualities needed for such a sensitive area and are overbearing and jarring companions to neighbouring buildings. They will dominate and detract from the City of London as a whole and upset the setting of many listed buildings, including Grade I listed churches. The planned structures make me feel sad and disappointed, whereas the current station and hotel make me feel uplifted and positive in their charming design.	PA	26-Jan-26	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Kane	Rae	I'm a born and bred Londoner, this site has much sentimental value to me. Although I now live outside of London I travel through this station and the area often and to see this obscenely expensive, disrespectful, disruptive, and ugly monstrosity being proposed is very disturbing and I'm hugely disappointed that it's even got this far in the planning process. Everything about this plan is a simple NO from the very beginning. To deface a building that has stood the test of time and is beautiful in exchange for this short term vanity project is abhorrent. This plan must be rejected. The better proposed improvements at much less cost and inconvenience which would retain the building pretty much in its entirety should be given the go ahead instead. Not this awful, awful decimation, not now, not ever!	PA	26-Jan-26	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Chahine	Ali	This seems to be a disruption to a historic station, which has only be recently restored, and seems to guarantee disruption, and further effect the fabric on the inside and outside of the station. This will likely cause further traffic on the ring road, only recently released from the Cross Rail works. It will also likely cause disruption. Having worked in the building trade, from the documents I have seen, they seem unrealistic, and seem to restrict the concourse for an amount of time, that further interventions will likely be required in future. I am some what surprised that they are only accepting support, and probably point to an unsustainable, and poorly planned building strategy, which are always late.	PA	26-Jan-26	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Shap	Danielle	Please leave our history alone. We need to preserver our beautiful London.	PA	26-Jan-26	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Baker	Fiona	Alternative upgrades coulc bd achieved wiyout such disruption, cost and destruction	PA	26-Jan-26	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Kosanovic	Georgina	I object to this application, which would cause substantial and permanent harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. Liverpool Station is Grade II listed and its hotel, the last 19th century hotel in the City which has functioned continuously since its opening, is Grade II*listed. The plans associated with this application would cause significant harm to both, thereby going against the National Planning Policy Framework, Paragraph NPPF 213, which states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." This substantial harm would be caused by the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse, the insertion of new retail units inside the 19th century train sheds, the impact to the setting of the historic hotel by the building of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse, and the imposition of a tall building in the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, currently characterised by low- and medium-scale structures. This last type of significant harm goes directly against the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas; Conservation Areas are mentioned as being one of these areas. The scheme would also impact the setting of Grade I-listed Wren churches and also St Botolph's Church nearby. Once more, I strongly object to these plans by Network Rail and Acme being given approval. Thank you.	PA	26-Jan-26	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Blake	David	I object to this application. The proposal would cause severe impairment to important national heritage and diminishes great character and charm. It is out of scale and too dominating for it's surroundings. Please seek an alternative.	PA	26-Jan-26	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Flynn	James	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional."	PA	26-Jan-26	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Wimble	Simon	The proposal is a complete over development and totally unnecessary. Although some elements of the current building are not original, it does not discount the merit of these later additions. Many of the improvements could be made successfully without such a large overbuilding. I also saw the means used to trick people into supporting the plans and thought it was a disgrace to let our democratic processes be taken advantage of in such a shameless way.	PA	26-Jan-26	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Cunningham	Suzanne	"I object to this application, which would cause harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. It is a grade 2 listed building and all around us we see brutalist and post modern architecture that breeds unhappiness and feelings of isolation. We have so few things left that are a reminder our society once cared about things other than consumerism and a race to bulldoze the past. There is no consideration for the effect this will have on the public.	PA	26-Jan-26	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Terpet	Carolyn	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional."	PA	26-Jan-26	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Read	Elizabeth	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to the following. I object on the grounds of lack of necessity, absence of clear public benefit, and the significant impact on everyday users of the station. I am a regular commuter into London via Liverpool Street Station and use it daily. Based on this direct experience, Liverpool Street is a well-functioning and efficient station that already manages very large passenger numbers effectively and safely. It does not require redevelopment in order to operate successfully. The proposed works would cause prolonged disruption, inconvenience, and uncertainty for commuters for an immeasurable length of time. This would result in avoidable stress, lost time, and additional effort for thousands of people who rely on the station daily for work and essential travel, without delivering a proportionate or necessary benefit. I do not believe that money or resources should be spent on redeveloping a station that is already operational and effective. Instead, the rail industry should prioritise improving the reliability, capacity, and quality of its services for passengers, rather than undertaking disruptive and unnecessary redevelopment of a working transport hub. When considered alongside the harm to heritage assets, the lack of demonstrable need and the negative impact on daily commuters clearly outweigh any claimed benefits. The application should therefore be refused.	PA	27-Jan-26	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Hoskin	Max	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: I further object on the basis that this proposal seeks to fix something that is not broken. As a regular commuter using Liverpool Street Station, I can confirm that the station functions effectively and manages high passenger numbers well. It operates as a successful and efficient transport hub and does not require redevelopment in order to meet the needs of its users. The proposed works would cause substantial and prolonged disruption to commuters for an immeasurable period of time. This disruption is not justified, particularly where there is no clear operational need for redevelopment. The scale of inconvenience, uncertainty, and lost time for everyday users would far outweigh any claimed benefits. It also appears that this scheme is driven primarily by commercial gain for private developers, rather than by the needs of passengers or the public interest. Such an approach risks prioritising profit over functionality, accessibility, and the lived experience of those who rely on the station daily. Furthermore, the proposals fail to adequately respect and preserve the historic character, heritage value, and cultural significance of Liverpool Street Station. Maintaining the station's historic fabric and identity is paramount, and these qualities should not be compromised by unnecessary redevelopment. For these reasons, the proposal represents an unjustified intervention that would cause harm, disruption, and loss of heritage value, and it should therefore be refused.	PA	27-Jan-26	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Halsted	A	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional."	PA	27-Jan-26	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Coldwell	Katya	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving C19 train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the C19 train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning C19 hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. The substantial harm the scheme would cause to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by the imposition of a tall building in an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. This is contrary to the 2015 City Plan, which requires the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St. Paul's Cathedral Heights area. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church. Make sure to reference the National Planning Policy Framework in your objection, otherwise your objection may be dismissed: Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional."	PA	27-Jan-26	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Gould	Ian	Grade 1 listed buildings should be given the highest protection especially in the City of London. The current proposal seems out of scale and destructive. Read Sir John Betjamen and Sir Simon Jenkins to see what makes this station so special.	PA	27-Jan-26	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Eslava Saucedo	Pilar	I object to this application because it represents an unsustainable, short-term proposal that would cause serious harm to designated heritage assets, while creating major disruption and an unjustifiable waste of resources. The scheme would cause substantial harm to the Grade II listed station through the demolition of the existing concourse roof and its replacement with a new structure. This would adversely affect the surviving nineteenth-century train shed and undermine the historic character and architectural integrity of the station. The construction of a 20-storey tower above the concourse would also harm the setting and significance of the Grade II* listed hotel, overwhelming its historic scale and presence. The proposal is fundamentally flawed from a sustainability perspective. The new structure is understood to have a limited lifespan of around 30 years, after which major replacement or redevelopment would be required. This short design life contradicts sustainable development principles and would result in excessive embodied carbon, material waste and unnecessary environmental impact. Demolishing and rebuilding on this scale for such a limited period cannot be justified. In addition, the scale and duration of construction would cause prolonged disruption to transport services, local businesses and station users, with little evidence of long-term public benefit. Given the extensive costs involved, the scheme represents a disproportionate and illogical use of funds. The proposal therefore has the potential to cause harm to, or loss of, Grade II and Grade II* listed buildings, in clear contravention of the National Planning Policy Framework.	PA	27-Jan-26	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Barry	Mary	This is not a sustainable development and is completely unnecessary.	PA	27-Jan-26	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Toh	Zi Ken		DC	27-Jan-26	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Mortimer	Neil		DC	27-Jan-26	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Marshall	Lachlan		DC	27-Jan-26	O
25/00494/FULEIA	John McAslan + Partners			DC	27-Jan-26	R
25/00494/FULEIA	cantell	timothy	The scheme would cause substantial harm to the listed station, adversely affect the surviving C19 train shed and cause harm to the significance of the listed hotel. It is hard to see public benefit that would carry greater weight than these impacts. It is curious that neither heritage nor townscape are offered on the website as reasons for objection when they should be fundamental to consideration of this scheme. The alternative by SAVE and John McAslan and Partners should be investigated before this pl app is resolved.	PA	27-Jan-26	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Harker	Timothy	I object to this application, which would cause substantial harm to the significance of nationally important heritage assets. More specifically, I raise objections to: Contravention of the National Planning Policy Framework with regard to the development of a heritage asset. The substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station through the demolition of the roof structure of the existing station concourse and its replacement with a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving 19th century train shed. The insertion of extensive amounts of new retail units within the 19th century train sheds, including the construction of two elevated retail galleries, causing a high level of harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed heritage asset. The impact to the setting of surrounding listed heritage assets. In particular, harm to the significance of the Grade II*-listed hotel - the last continually functioning 19th century hotel in the City - through the construction of a 20-storey tower over the station concourse. In addition, the scheme would impact on the setting of numerous designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed Christopher Wren City churches, and nearby St Botolph's church.	PA	27-Jan-26	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Northey	Nita	Keeping our English heritage alive	PA	27-Jan-26	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Brack	Hannah		DC	27-Jan-26	O
25/00494/FULEIA	London And Middlesex Archaeological Society			DC	27-Jan-26	O
25/00494/FULEIA	London And Middlesex Archaeological Society			DC	27-Jan-26	O

25/00494/FULEIA	Smith	Thomas	This remains a very bad scheme. The disruption caused to the City's busiest station (and in recent years the country's) would be vast creating chaos for those like myself who have to travel around the vicinity of the station for work. The loss of light and air from the station represents a considerable danger, while these "air rights" developments have been done at smaller termini the sheer scale of this project would irreparably damage the station. At present Liverpool Street is a reasonable compromise between the original station and an ideal design (the original was always very difficult for passengers). The nature of the station buried in a cutting means that it Must have light from above and this cannot be artificial. No one who has used Fenchurch Street or Charing Cross would call the platforms of those stations pleasant. This scheme would ruin the airy nature of the station which we currently enjoy. Why should commuters and tourists be greeted by a dank pit at every station? London is already thickly forested with towers which are partially empty. If this was a scheme to alleviate the hideous homelessness which is wrecking London's social cohesion, the "ugly but necessary" argument would carry some weight. As it is this scheme is for the loss of amenity of a railway station used by a huge swathe of England. The entrance to London should be bright and welcoming. For a building that will cause years of inconvenience and then sit empty. I do most sincerely hope the Corporation sees sense on this.	PA	27-Jan-26	O
25/00494/FULEIA	Bradley	Simon	I object to this application, which be extremely destructive to the fabric and context of nationally and internationally significant heritage assets. The especially damaging provisions include: Substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station, by demolishing the roof structure of the existing concourse in favour of a new structure. which would also compromise the setting of the surviving Victorian train shed. The insertion of substantial structures for new retail units within the historic train sheds, including the construction of two elevated shopping galleries, which would cause serious harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II-listed complex. The impact to the wider setting of listed heritage assets, notably the Grade II*-listed hotel, which would be compromised by the proposed construction of a 20-storey office tower over the station concourse. Substantial harm would also be caused to the Bishopsgate Conservation Area, by imposing a tall building on an area characterised by low- and medium-scale buildings. Such an insertion would contravene the 2015 City Plan, which directs the refusal of planning permission for tall buildings in inappropriate areas, such as in Conservation Areas and the St Paul's Cathedral Heights area. The scheme would also have a negative impact on the setting of other designated and undesignated heritage assets in the City and beyond, such as many of the Grade I-listed City churches, and St Botolph Bishopsgate church to the south. The National Planning Policy Framework provides clear direction on the correct response to this proposal. Specifically, Paragraph NPPF 213 states: "Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional." I object to this application, which would be substantially harmful to the fabric and significance of nationally important heritage assets. The proposed harms include: 1 Substantial harm to the Grade II-listed station b	PA	27-Jan-26	O

25/00494/FULEIA	ford	graham	Liverpool St Station is a unique historic monument as well as a fully functioning station, that I and millions of others have visited hundreds or thousands of times. It should be protected for, and enjoyed by, those who have to travel through it on their way into and out of London. Graham Ford	PA	27-Jan-26	O