

00:00:00.000 --> 00:00:10.920

Richards, Gwyn

I would respectfully ask that the presentations are limited to no more than 30 minutes. This is enable to enable the Members to ask any questions to your team.

00:00:11.690 --> 00:00:29.500

Richards, Gwyn

I'm on a housekeeping notes it would be helpful to my colleagues if in in aligning the transcript with the presentations that went when you were going through the presentation when he moved the slide. If he could just say next slide so there's an alignment there. So I think that's all from me, so please feel free to begin.

00:00:31.050 --> 00:00:33.700

Sir Michael Bear (Guest)

OK, thank you very much. It's Stuart. Do you want to?

00:00:34.470 --> 00:00:46.850

stuart (Guest)

Well, thank you very much for the opportunity to you offered just to talk to you. And I'm the President of the SNP congregation in London and.

00:00:46.910 --> 00:01:02.180

stuart (Guest)

Uhm, I'm very grateful to the people who you are going to hear speak tonight. It's afternoon at for the effort they put into it and I'll now have Sir Michael to carry on and I will come back at the very end. I get the last word.

00:01:04.010 --> 00:01:04.610

stuart (Guest)

To Michael.

00:01:04.060 --> 00:01:17.490

Sir Michael Bear (Guest)

Thank you, thank you very much as Stuart and and and could. I thank you to the planning and Transportation Committee for giving us the opportunity to meet with you to present our concerns about.

00:01:18.470 --> 00:01:23.270

Sir Michael Bear (Guest)

The devastating impact which would result from approving the 31 Bury St application.

00:01:24.130 --> 00:01:33.640

Sir Michael Bear (Guest)

And it takes a unique set of circumstances to get a bear out of hibernation, and this indeed is one of those unique circumstances.

00:01:34.810 --> 00:01:47.590

Sir Michael Bear (Guest)

The decision facing your committee tomorrow is crucially important and will have long lasting implications for the city and its role and reputation in respecting and protecting its heritage.

00:01:49.080 --> 00:01:53.450

Sir Michael Bear (Guest)

Our presentation today will be based on data, not emotion.

00:01:54.260 --> 00:01:57.330

Sir Michael Bear (Guest)

It will not be click see high tech and expensive.

00:01:57.930 --> 00:02:03.610

Sir Michael Bear (Guest)

Like that produced by the developer who's been able to outspend US small community budgets.

00:02:04.250 --> 00:02:06.090

Sir Michael Bear (Guest)

By over at 100 to one.

00:02:07.040 --> 00:02:12.620

Sir Michael Bear (Guest)

Nonetheless, we have today assembled world class experts in their fields to present our case.

00:02:13.810 --> 00:02:15.260

Sir Michael Bear (Guest)

So what is our case?

00:02:16.310 --> 00:02:29.090

Sir Michael Bear (Guest)

In essence, you have before you a planning officers report, which we believe is seriously flawed and draws conclusions from evidential studies which are quite frankly in our view, ROM.

00:02:30.220 --> 00:02:38.380

Sir Michael Bear (Guest)

Not only wrong, but as your own officers report accepts, the proposal is in fundamental breach of the city zone.

00:02:39.540 --> 00:02:40.760

Sir Michael Bear (Guest)

Development plan.

00:02:41.760 --> 00:02:45.650

Sir Michael Bear (Guest)

We operate on what is supposed to be a plan lead system.

00:02:46.560 --> 00:02:57.670

Sir Michael Bear (Guest)

Parliament has accorded a statutory presumption in favor of the local plan, yet you're being asked by the developer to approve a development which is in clear conflict with that class.

00:02:59.610 --> 00:03:11.130

Sir Michael Bear (Guest)

The planning listed building and Conservation Act of 1990 establish is that when considering whether to grant planning permission for development, which affects are listed building or it's setting.

00:03:11.820 --> 00:03:28.390

Sir Michael Bear (Guest)

The local planning authorities shall have special regard. That's special regard to the desirability of preserving the building, or its setting or any feature of special architectural or historic interest which had possesses, and that's in the 1990 clauses.

00:03:29.030 --> 00:03:38.800

Sir Michael Bear (Guest)

For reasons which would be which would be made clear that Beavers mark setting as well as its special architectural historic interest are distinctly at risk.

00:03:39.690 --> 00:03:56.220

Sir Michael Bear (Guest)

And that is why I myself, as a former member of your committee and a former Lord Mayor and a huge supporter of tall buildings in the city. Find myself in the unusual position of leading today's discussion on behalf of the objectors to the scheme.

00:03:57.360 --> 00:04:01.330

Sir Michael Bear (Guest)

The fact that the application site lies in the Eastern cluster.

00:04:03.570 --> 00:04:04.500

Sir Michael Bear (Guest)

To justify.

00:04:05.080 --> 00:04:08.680

Sir Michael Bear (Guest)

The unforgiving dominance of this proposal.

00:04:09.600 --> 00:04:13.770

Sir Michael Bear (Guest)

And this indeed appears to be the approach adopted by the applicant.

00:04:14.900 --> 00:04:27.620

Sir Michael Bear (Guest)

But in no sense can the planning policy position be regarded as a free pass to justify overwhelming Beavers marks. This greatly treasured place of worship.

00:04:28.630 --> 00:04:42.700

Sir Michael Bear (Guest)

Quite the reverse, as if self evidently the position here significant harm would be caused to the synagogue and its setting affecting the provision of daylight and sunlight, which are experts will address in detail later.

00:04:43.920 --> 00:04:58.770

Sir Michael Bear (Guest)

Planning regulations have always been in perfect in judging the harm to adjacent buildings. This often ignores the very special nature of some buildings that like leave us marks, had a living, breathing, spiritual purpose.

00:04:59.480 --> 00:05:04.990

Sir Michael Bear (Guest)

And interpretation of the different nature is required of the data before you.

00:05:06.080 --> 00:05:07.560

Sir Michael Bear (Guest)

So our professional team.

00:05:08.630 --> 00:05:11.670

Sir Michael Bear (Guest)

Have three fundamental grounds.

00:05:12.290 --> 00:05:17.340

Sir Michael Bear (Guest)

For refusal for this planning application and they use our drafted for you.

00:05:19.270 --> 00:05:20.230

Sir Michael Bear (Guest)

The references.

00:05:21.060 --> 00:05:30.330

Sir Michael Bear (Guest)

For this refusal for these refusal detail, each policy convention contravention against your own city of london planning policies.

00:05:31.280 --> 00:05:35.780

Sir Michael Bear (Guest)

The London Plan policies and the National Planning policy framework.

00:05:36.730 --> 00:05:41.150

Sir Michael Bear (Guest)

We have arranged for you to have a copy of this information for your consideration.

00:05:42.160 --> 00:05:43.130

Sir Michael Bear (Guest)

Are we on that slide?

00:05:44.690 --> 00:05:46.600

Abigail Green

I'm worried that Maxine's frozen.

00:05:46.350 --> 00:05:47.720

Sir Michael Bear (Guest)

Right, ah.

00:05:49.720 --> 00:05:50.340

Sir Michael Bear (Guest)

Maxine.

00:05:58.960 --> 00:05:59.190

Sir Michael Bear (Guest)

I.

00:06:00.340 --> 00:06:04.430

Sir Michael Bear (Guest)

OK, I'll continue. But basically the.

00:06:04.480 --> 00:06:17.970

Sir Michael Bear (Guest)

There is a screenshot. I don't expect you to look at the detail of the three specific contraventions to statutory policy plans and frameworks which we've drafted for your attention.

00:06:19.190 --> 00:06:23.790

Sir Michael Bear (Guest)

And you will shortly be hearing from our experts, and this really does require a sharing the screen.

00:06:24.540 --> 00:06:30.560

Sir Michael Bear (Guest)

As to the unique use of the synagogue, it's important to the Community heritage and light.

00:06:32.010 --> 00:06:39.060

Sir Michael Bear (Guest)

And this really leads toward only one conclusion, and that is that the application should be refused outright.

00:06:40.120 --> 00:06:41.200

Sir Michael Bear (Guest)

In conclusion

00:06:41.900 --> 00:06:44.000

Sir Michael Bear (Guest)

you have in your hands the freedom.

00:06:44.710 --> 00:06:47.030

Sir Michael Bear (Guest)

In deciding the fate.

00:06:47.760 --> 00:06:50.040

Sir Michael Bear (Guest)

Of Bevis Marks synagogue.

00:06:50.900 --> 00:06:55.780

Sir Michael Bear (Guest)

Now we ask you to make your own independent judgment on these facts before you.

00:06:57.830 --> 00:07:07.400

Sir Michael Bear (Guest)

I will now pass over to our three speakers, who will introduce themselves and explain in detail the grounds for rejecting this application.

00:07:16.120 --> 00:07:18.750

Sir Michael Bear (Guest)

Some very important, could you stop the clock when 'cause this?

00:07:19.950 --> 00:07:21.630

Sir Michael Bear (Guest)

This this was a little bit unfair.

00:07:23.050 --> 00:07:23.400

Maxime (Guest)

Is.

00:07:23.600 --> 00:07:30.290

Richards, Gwyn

That's fine if you go over your half an hour, just that would mean less time for members to ask questions. But we're in your hands.

00:07:31.110 --> 00:07:31.780

Sir Michael Bear (Guest)

OK.

00:07:32.180 --> 00:07:35.270

Sir Michael Bear (Guest)

Uh, I I, we really don't have much choice there.

00:07:36.430 --> 00:07:38.440

Sir Michael Bear (Guest)

How how we doing uhm?

00:07:38.970 --> 00:07:49.620

Abigail Green

Well, maybe I'll start by introducing myself in the hopes that the PowerPoint will appear because it is really essential to substantiate what I'm saying, so I.

00:07:42.060 --> 00:07:42.430

Sir Michael Bear (Guest)

Yes.

00:07:48.930 --> 00:08:00.020

Alastair Moss

So sorry so sorry, interrupt we do. Actually I think Toni got the things I wonder whether Toni my email then through 'cause I think the deputy chairman. I've got them so we've just got some Mike was referring.

00:07:48.940 --> 00:07:49.400

Sir Michael Bear (Guest)

Thank you.

00:07:59.590 --> 00:08:05.920

Bright, Toni

Sorry I missed a hold on hold Alastair. Hold on just a second. I've got the presentation.

00:08:08.260 --> 00:08:11.190

Bright, Toni

So hold on just a second while I.

00:08:12.500 --> 00:08:13.850

Bright, Toni
Find.

00:08:16.510 --> 00:08:17.460

Bright, Toni
Find it.

00:08:20.070 --> 00:08:26.410

Doug Barrow
We've all been circulated this. I'm all Members have actually got a copy by email at this presentation.

00:08:26.750 --> 00:08:28.480

Sir Michael Bear (Guest)
OK thanks Sir.

00:08:28.100 --> 00:08:31.490

Abigail Green
OK, that's not my bit of its, but I'll just proceed.

00:08:28.730 --> 00:08:35.820

Bright, Toni
This is this is this is this. This is the three. This is the three grounds for approval, right?

00:08:37.110 --> 00:08:39.940

Sir Michael Bear (Guest)
For for no, not for approval, for rejection.

00:08:39.930 --> 00:08:44.190

Bright, Toni
Sorry, objection, sorry no sorry, sorry, sorry. Three grounds for objection.

00:08:44.430 --> 00:08:46.000

Sir Michael Bear (Guest)
Yeah or refusal rather yeah.

00:08:48.390 --> 00:09:18.080

Abigail Green
Well, I think I'll just continue and hope that at some point my screen, my my slides will become available. So I speak. I'm Abigail green. I'm an international expert on Jewish history with the extensive experience working with national and international heritage organizations like Historic England, the National Trust, and the European Association for the Preservation and Promotion of Jewish Culture and Heritage. I'm a professor at Oxford and I also speak in a personal capacity.

00:09:18.440 --> 00:09:24.150

Abigail Green
My family have worshipped in this synagogue since it was built and still do and I was married in it.

00:09:24.970 --> 00:09:33.920

Abigail Green
So you're asked to consider the impact of this proposal on this grade, one listed building and it's setting. That is to say, it's curtilage.

00:09:35.070 --> 00:09:40.140

Abigail Green

The principle of curtilage listing is established by law that Slide 4.

00:09:41.950 --> 00:09:53.180

Abigail Green

And for this reason, both the City of London local Plan 2015 and the London Plan 2021 underlined the importance of setting as we can see next slide.

00:09:54.380 --> 00:10:08.010

Abigail Green

Notes the use the next slide is cityoflondon policies. Note the use of words like sustain and respect in these policies. So what does it mean to sustain and respect a Grade 1 heritage assets?

00:10:08.880 --> 00:10:26.520

Abigail Green

Next slide, these are the principles Historic England recommend you should apply and I want to draw your attention to principle, for which highlights the connection between places and their values with the site of powerful religious significance like Beavis marks. This is the key.

00:10:27.170 --> 00:10:36.160

Abigail Green

Historic England defined the importance of heritage assets through four key heritage values. All apply in this case. Next slide.

00:10:37.390 --> 00:11:00.610

Abigail Green

Beavis Marks has aesthetic value. It has evidential value as a perfectly preserved early 18th century synagogue in a setting that records the courtyard in which it was built. But it's real value is historical and communal, and that value lies in the unique fact of its continuous use. Over centuries, people and place over time. Next slide.

00:11:01.370 --> 00:11:28.240

Abigail Green

The point is that for this site, historic and communal value can't be this entangled all over Europe. There are beautiful synagogues which are empty shells because the Jews were either killed or left. They have historic value, not communal value. This synagogue is a living community. It's unique in the way that British Jewish history is unique because it didn't experience the rupture of the Holocaust.

00:11:28.990 --> 00:11:54.500

Abigail Green

The planning officers report and what it says about Bevis Marks demonstrates a limited understanding of the historic and communal value of this building and its setting. Because while some consideration is given to architectural and historical value, no consideration is given to communal value or what London supplementary planning guidance described in 2014 as character and context.

00:11:55.230 --> 00:12:21.030

Abigail Green

So it's clear from the strength of the response from the Jewish community that the proposal does

not reflect an attempt to manage the site in a way that respects its character, or sustains the values of those who use it. Next slide. It ignores principle for too much attention, is paid to the visitors view aesthetic appreciation, visual experience, and the technical capacity to read and leader service.

00:12:21.670 --> 00:12:44.130

Abigail Green

New mention is made of spiritual experience in which light plays such a fundamental role, or Revis is actually at the heart of the use and historical significance of the building. No attention is paid to the holistic experience of a community at prayer or the role of the courtyard as a social space in sustaining that communal experience.

00:12:44.850 --> 00:12:54.780

Abigail Green

So these things may be intangible, but intangible. Heritage is a very important consideration when considering historical and communal value. Next slide.

00:12:55.640 --> 00:13:17.400

Abigail Green

So this is how the UNESCO convention defines intangible heritage and in the city you may want to think about the role respecting minority heritage plays in enhancing social cohesion and social inclusion. Next, slide the planning officers report refers to the social and communal benefits of this proposal as significant.

00:13:18.080 --> 00:13:48.440

Abigail Green

No mention is made of the damage that will be done to Community relations and social cohesion by the failure to treat the most important site in Britain for the Jewish community in a way that is consistent with the values of that Community or respects its attachment to it. And here I draw your attention to the public sector equality duty to foster good relations between those who share a relevant protected characteristic and those who do not. That duty has plainly been ignored.

00:13:48.490 --> 00:13:50.580

Abigail Green

There's no reference to it in the report.

00:13:51.240 --> 00:13:53.170

Abigail Green

So why does be bismarcks matter?

00:13:54.050 --> 00:14:24.230

Abigail Green

In their report, historic England next slide have focused on the Tower of London World Heritage Site, but in terms of Jewish heritage, this is also a World Heritage site. It's the oldest continuing functioning synagogue in Europe. It preserves a unique liturgy. It lies at the heart of the global Safar ***** Diaspora. And that's why this development has generated news coverage in New York and Israel, and objections from Jewish.

00:14:24.290 --> 00:14:26.990

Abigail Green

Groups in the US and Continental Europe.

00:14:27.590 --> 00:14:36.210

Abigail Green

As a British under Jewish historian, I would say in fact that the tower is the more parochial, less internationally resonance site.

00:14:37.580 --> 00:15:00.000

Abigail Green

Now I'm going to talk about national heritage next slide, so I think the Jewish Museum submission captures the significance of this very well. It's the single most important historic site for British Jews in the heart of the city, close to the Bank of England and the Mansion House, and it speaks to their history since the return of Jews to England's under Oliver Cromwell next slide.

00:15:00.710 --> 00:15:31.060

Abigail Green

As the only non Christian religious site in the city, Beavis marks packs a huge symbolic punch. It speaks at the diversity of the city over centuries to the vital role British Jews have played in the city's evolution as a global financial and commercial center and to the Rover. City played as the platform from which British Jews asserted their claim to equal rights as non Christians in this country, paving the way for Hindus, Muslims, Sikhs and other minorities.

00:15:31.660 --> 00:15:48.990

Abigail Green

The city has an extraordinary Jewish heritage, of which Bevis Marks is now the prime symbol. This heritage was valued in the 19th century when non Jews campaign to save it. It was valued in the 1970s. You should have the courage to show you still value that heritage today, Steven.

00:15:54.470 --> 00:15:54.850

Cannon-Brookes, Stephen

Thank you.

00:15:54.780 --> 00:15:55.100

Sir Michael Bear (Guest)

Thanks.

00:15:59.550 --> 00:16:29.800

Cannon-Brookes, Stephen

I'm grateful for the opportunity to address this meeting and share with committee members that review made by my colleague, Doctor John, Mud, elevation myself. My name is Stephen, Canon Brookside, an associate professor in the Institute of Environmental Design and Engineering, UCL. My colleague John Model Lurch, was recently professor of building daylight modeling at Loughborough University, is responsible for key advances in daylight simulation, and was the UK principle expert in the formation of current European Day lighting standards.

00:16:29.850 --> 00:16:30.550

Cannon-Brookes, Stephen

For buildings.

00:16:31.990 --> 00:16:40.550

Cannon-Brookes, Stephen

Uh, before starting, Please note I've used my own photographs to try and convey actual lighting conditions within and around the synagogue.

00:16:42.340 --> 00:16:43.370

Cannon-Brookes, Stephen
Next slide, please.

00:16:44.610 --> 00:16:47.920

Cannon-Brookes, Stephen
Today the Beavers Marks Synagogue is at risk.

00:16:49.270 --> 00:17:19.200

Cannon-Brookes, Stephen
Synagogue was consciously designed as a day. Let building with large windows on all four sides. Unlike in Christian churches, members of the congregation have always expected enough daylight to read by during services. Blockers for books have provided under receipt and these have been used in the same way for over 300 years. As Professor Green has noted, daylight is not purely functional. It is also a spiritual part of worship. It is fundamental to the buildings.

00:17:19.260 --> 00:17:26.060

Cannon-Brookes, Stephen
Design and use, and by extension the sustainability of the congregation. Next slide.

00:17:28.090 --> 00:17:43.790

Cannon-Brookes, Stephen
From the 18th century, the surrounding courtyard, on four sides and Henige Lane on the 4th, has protected the daylight reaching the windows, the synagogue. The effectiveness of this, Carter has gradually declined. It's the height of the surrounding perimeter. Buildings increased.

00:17:44.660 --> 00:18:14.570

Cannon-Brookes, Stephen
PA's concern for the synagogue, daylight availability availability is Elliot, evident in the cutbacks on 33 Creechurch and Valiant House. This extends to the use of pale materials for surrounding walls to assist the reflection of sunlight and skylight into the synagogue, as noted in last month. Building Research Establishment report commissioned by the City of London planning to pumped. Recently, such concerns appeared have been ignored, heard for more distant buildings.

00:18:14.630 --> 00:18:20.320

Cannon-Brookes, Stephen
You substantial height well nevertheless have us have similarly detrimental shading effects.

00:18:20.890 --> 00:18:40.950

Cannon-Brookes, Stephen
The current proposals will further diminish the daylight provision to the synagogue. Today's challenge is how to realistically determine it, determine the magnitude of the daylight injury in terms of its actual effect on the use of the building by the Congregation of the synagogue. Next slide.

00:18:43.210 --> 00:19:13.500

Cannon-Brookes, Stephen
Current VRE derived guidelines provide a standard geometrical technique to assess the degree sky visible from a window. This allows determination of the degree of change resulting from further obstructions. The technique is widely employed to protect the interests of domestic interiors and offices, but rarely the needs of historic buildings with such specific concerns as fevers marks daylight impact reports for 31, Bury St and other developments.

00:19:13.800 --> 00:19:40.870

Cannon-Brookes, Stephen

Tech knowledge, their additions to the skyline will deliver further incremental reductions to what they claim are already limited levels of daylight within the synagogue. Their case, however, rests on questionable logic, having decided apriori on the basis of the incomplete analysis that daylight is already insufficient, they conclude that any further incremental reductions are negligible.

00:19:42.320 --> 00:19:59.870

Cannon-Brookes, Stephen

While questioning some of the technical details, the Breg report does not address the fundamental issue of the lack of realism in these routinely used assessment methods, which crucially do not quantify the contribution, either direct or reflected sunlight.

00:20:00.820 --> 00:20:12.350

Cannon-Brookes, Stephen

It does, however, bring attention to this deficiency by concluding that if all the proposed schemes are implemented, there would be major injury to sunlight reaching the synagogues windows.

00:20:13.500 --> 00:20:24.370

Cannon-Brookes, Stephen

May I repeat this according to these results? The internal day lighting will be almost unaffected. Accumulative sunlight reduction is counted a major injury.

00:20:25.800 --> 00:20:55.690

Cannon-Brookes, Stephen

This office contradiction is the product of the acknowledged fundamental limitations in the standard internal daylight calculations used in planning. The methodology excludes all contributions of sunlight on an overcast sky. Light in the prediction of daylight levels, most egregiously for the synagogue congregation. That presentation presented assessment exclude the all important contribution of reflected daylight under realistic de Son.

00:20:55.760 --> 00:20:56.870

Cannon-Brookes, Stephen

And sky conditions.

00:20:57.740 --> 00:21:11.050

Cannon-Brookes, Stephen

These weaknesses in prediction methodology allow the developers consultants to substantially under represent the true scale of the injury. This Linux daylighting next slide, please.

00:21:13.010 --> 00:21:15.200

Cannon-Brookes, Stephen

Stand in the middle of the synagogue and look up.

00:21:16.090 --> 00:21:23.620

Cannon-Brookes, Stephen

You cannot see the sky and the lights you receiving is almost entirely reflected from the surrounding buildings.

00:21:24.970 --> 00:21:31.070

Cannon-Brookes, Stephen

Recognition this is key to comprehending the sensitivity of this issue now and in the future.

00:21:32.000 --> 00:21:52.190

Cannon-Brookes, Stephen

Presence of daylight and the synagogue is largely a gift from its neighbors and not due to access to the sky as state in the Bury methodology on a fair day, the interior is made bright by sunlight and skylight reflected from the surrounding walls. Compared this to a dull overcast day.

00:21:52.780 --> 00:22:02.650

Cannon-Brookes, Stephen

When the interior becomes subdued and the congregation is that threshold of being able to read their sacred texts, clearly a tipping point has already been reached.

00:22:03.660 --> 00:22:24.450

Cannon-Brookes, Stephen

Developments, especially the South that reduce it light from afflicted sunlight and broken cloud cover, will extend the proportion of the year when daylight levels drop below the threshold of sufficiency. This will have a direct impact on our congregations ability to read by available light and properly communicate during services.

00:22:25.060 --> 00:22:25.990

Cannon-Brookes, Stephen

Next slide, please.

00:22:27.430 --> 00:22:53.220

Cannon-Brookes, Stephen

In summary, none of the techniques currently used in planning realistically present the consequences of further obstructing the sky around the synagogue. Sun path diagrams show reductions in potential errors, notably to a mere one hour in Midsummer, but not the effect of blocking reflected light from surrounding buildings, and in particular, the impact of shading by substantial developments to the South of the synagogue.

00:22:54.180 --> 00:22:54.730

Cannon-Brookes, Stephen

Next slide.

00:22:56.650 --> 00:23:28.000

Cannon-Brookes, Stephen

Overcast sky analysis by definition, misses these contributions altogether. Given the nurse substantial dependence on reflected light from the surrounding buildings, any assessment day lighting within the synagogue must include the reflective contribution of both sunlight and non overcast skylight to accurately represent both existing conditions and proposed changes. But daylight assessments submitted with the current development proposals failed to include sunlight.

00:23:28.060 --> 00:23:36.550

Cannon-Brookes, Stephen

Contribution rendering the findings incomplete and leading to severe underestimation of negative impact on the synagogue.

00:23:37.330 --> 00:23:57.960

Cannon-Brookes, Stephen

Apply to a grade one listed building that is a living synagogue. These daylight assessment methods

are being used outside of their domain of applicability and cannot therefore revealed the true extent in the reduction of functional daylight to what the users of this unique space will be expecting.

00:24:00.300 --> 00:24:11.430

Cannon-Brookes, Stephen

Accordingly, the Committee has not yet been provided with the quality of the information it requires in order to make an informed decision on this historic case.

00:24:12.820 --> 00:24:13.330

Cannon-Brookes, Stephen

Thank you.

00:24:15.210 --> 00:24:27.640

Sir Michael Bear (Guest)

Thank you very much, Steve. And I think we need to move swiftly onto a shallow and and and then I think we're gonna run over. But so be it. That's less time for members. OK, Rabbi Shalom.

00:24:28.120 --> 00:24:58.880

Rabbi Shalom Morris

Thank you, we've asked for this meeting for the opportunity to speak plainly with you today, so I apologize in advance to the Chief Planning Officer. It is our contention that the officers report is strikingly misleading, likely due to profound misunderstanding of the nature of the synagogue. It is therefore intent to clarify the truth, so you can make an independent, informed, and educated decision and not just follow the lead of a deeply flawed report you just heard from world experts.

00:24:58.960 --> 00:25:16.930

Rabbi Shalom Morris

In heritage and light and the reasons why the Tower 31 Bury St is simply unacceptable in planning terms as the rabbi about this marks, I'm now going to share with you several additional points about the synagogue in Judaism that you must understand to reach a fully informed conclusion.

00:25:18.200 --> 00:25:48.920

Rabbi Shalom Morris

From 1290 to 1656, Jews were not permitted to live in England. Indeed, even when Jews were given the nod by Oliver Cromwell that they could return, it was never official. For this reason, they were forced to keep a low profile. This explains why Bevis Marks Synagogue was built in a private courtyard. Something historians referred to as private worship, as opposed to the public worship of churches or synagogues on main thoroughfares. This is the reason that until this day.

00:25:48.980 --> 00:26:03.290

Rabbi Shalom Morris

When one enters the courtyard, Bevis marks from off the main road. One feels as though they have left the City of London and entered another world. If not the 18th century and and entered another world. If not the 18th century itself.

00:26:04.330 --> 00:26:34.480

Rabbi Shalom Morris

It is this historic character which is threatened most directly by the tower at 31 Bury St. While London is famous for its mix of new and old's. The setting of Bevis Marks is not the same. It is meant to be secluded and separate. If a 48 Storey tower looms over it and sets the backdrop to it, this is

historic character and setting will have been destroyed. It is only through the preservation of this original setting. The one is most able to understand.

00:26:34.540 --> 00:26:51.990

Rabbi Shalom Morris

And experience the history and nature, Bevis Marks and the life of Jews in the 18th century London. For those of you who came to the site visit, I believe you understand what I mean. This is what local plans intend to protect when they call for the protection of heritage sites and their settings.

00:26:53.140 --> 00:27:23.110

Rabbi Shalom Morris

Oddly, the officers report claims quote the proposed building would replace some clear sky with slender massing. This is patently untrue, unless one is standing very close to the synagogue and arching your next straight up. However, when looking towards the synagogue when just entering the courtyard, the entire mass of the building will be in full view and overpower the space the applicant has tried the same trick in their fly view video that you may have seen.

00:27:23.310 --> 00:27:54.800

Rabbi Shalom Morris

Showing the backdrop of 31 Bury St from a vantage point which is extremely close to the synagogue itself, making it seem that only a narrow portion of the building would be visible while in truth the entire southern side of the synagogue will be overshadowed by 31 Bury St. Even more crucially, the Clearview skies around Bevis Marks Synagogue are also important for religious reasons, as Judaism requires views of the sky for the performance of its rituals. It is upon seeing three stars and the Saturday night Sky.

00:27:54.880 --> 00:28:07.700

Rabbi Shalom Morris

Did you know that the Sabbath has concluded? Additionally, each month only want to witness the Crescent of the newly emerging moon and the early night sky that they can thank God for the new Hebrew month?

00:28:08.330 --> 00:28:41.280

Rabbi Shalom Morris

And according to the Biblical Book of Daniel, A Jew is supposed to see the sky when they pray to be reminded of having all of these points were made in the community impact study that we submitted. And yet the planning report didn't even address them, despite the legislative requirement for you to conduct a Community impact study. In fact, you should have seen a letter just today from Doctor Joseph Spitzer. It might have seemed a bit strange, but in it he explains the current synagogue light levels are just barely enough to conduct Jewish religious circumcision safely.

00:28:41.750 --> 00:29:12.460

Rabbi Shalom Morris

This is something of grave concern to us as per their light loss would prevent the Jews of Bevis Marks Synagogue from carrying out one of Judaism's most sacred duties. This is what we mean when we say that approval means the closing of the synagogue. It isn't hyperbole or theatrics. If we can no longer carry out our rituals as required, Bevis Marks, Synagogue ceases to function as a living place of worship, but becomes a museum a relic of the past. This is an infringement on our religious rights.

00:29:12.750 --> 00:29:14.560

Rabbi Shalom Morris

He protected religious minority.

00:29:15.580 --> 00:29:37.850

Rabbi Shalom Morris

With the officers report does say on page 140 is that quote the impact on daylight to the interior of the synagogue will not compromise their religious user activities therein. Unquote I ask you then what specialists advice? Have the officers received to support that assertion? This goes against the assessment of the Chief Rabbi. The Board of Deputies and the local worshipping community.

00:29:38.510 --> 00:30:08.680

Rabbi Shalom Morris

What I can tell you is that the daily lived experience of worshippers at Bevis, including myself, is that when light reflects off the surrounding buildings, it illuminates the interior creating brightness, beauty and spirituality, and it becomes easier to read our prayer books and carry out our faith. If we become overshadowed. This will be harmed, creating a situation of perpetual cloud cover and gloom. The planning report profoundly misses the point about the role and impact of light in a religious space.

00:30:08.990 --> 00:30:17.980

Rabbi Shalom Morris

Consenting to this building would rob us of that, and that is unacceptable harm to a Community that is worshipped in this space, unfettered for over 300 years.

00:30:18.030 --> 00:30:49.520

Rabbi Shalom Morris

Yes indeed, the independent DRA light study concluded that cumulative effects of the already approved buildings, and though is if you have to be contented, would be major adverse. You must understand that 31 Berry St then cannot be evaluated on its own terms as one Cree church to the synagogue. East has already been built 100 Len Hall to the synagogue. South has already been approved, 31 Berry St in the middle of them, then is commute cumulative impact already? It is no longer possible to consider it.

00:30:49.560 --> 00:31:06.330

Rabbi Shalom Morris

On its own it's approval would it's approval would be permitting the major adverse cumulative impact to be a common reality according to historic England, past harm is not a justification for further harm. Quite the opposite. This would be death by 1000 cuts.

00:31:07.390 --> 00:31:09.320

Rabbi Shalom Morris

Allow me to conclude then by saying.

00:31:10.250 --> 00:31:42.510

Rabbi Shalom Morris

That there has been a lot of talk about minor, adverse, moderate, major, etc. What is clear and everyone agrees is that approval of 31 Bury St means consenting to harm costed Bevis Marks. Synagogue. Now the argument to cause such harm hinges on the position. The greater public benefit is caused for BI approval. So let me ask what is the public benefit that would permit you causing

harm to British juries? Most sacred religious sites because they will allow community groups to use the bottom floors of their building.

00:31:43.010 --> 00:31:44.580

Rabbi Shalom Morris

That's clearly a fig leaf.

00:31:45.480 --> 00:32:06.700

Rabbi Shalom Morris

And a transparent one at that. They could build a 15 story building and still make the 1st floor public. It is no justification whatsoever to build a 50 story one and there is certainly no justification to cause harm to a pre existing historic community to Createspace for the possible one day random use of some outside community group.

00:32:07.570 --> 00:32:27.180

Rabbi Shalom Morris

So let's be honest here, this decision ultimately comes down to how much you value Bevis marks. Synagogue, This is why there was such outrage coming from the public, both Jews and non Jews alike. What the right decision is here is playing for nearly everyone to see, except for perhaps you're planning officer.

00:32:27.810 --> 00:32:37.140

Rabbi Shalom Morris

This is why such decisions are not made by planning officers, but by public servants. Because you are meant to see the bigger picture and having broader perspective.

00:32:38.030 --> 00:33:02.330

Rabbi Shalom Morris

This is not an assault on tall buildings, the eastern cluster, or even on tall buildings in the area. Bevis Marks, but against ones to our South and southeast that will cause serious detriment to our historic faith community where there for asking you to do the right thing and preserve one of the most important living Jewish sites in the world by not consenting to a tower that would so clearly cause harm to it. Thank you.

00:33:03.310 --> 00:33:09.500

Sir Michael Bear (Guest)

Thank you, thank you very much. Shalom and Stewart were a little bit over time. Do you want to?

00:33:09.110 --> 00:33:10.290

stuart (Guest)

I should be very quick.

00:33:10.550 --> 00:33:10.980

Sir Michael Bear (Guest)

OK.

00:33:10.840 --> 00:33:28.170

stuart (Guest)

Uh, thank you. You've heard a lot about the synagogue history today. I'm going to very quickly show you something about the Corporation's history, and this is a report of the city architect and Planning Officer 19th of June 1978.

00:33:29.050 --> 00:33:35.640

stuart (Guest)

And it concerns the building that is currently on 33 Creechurch and you recommend that.

00:33:36.680 --> 00:34:06.470

stuart (Guest)

Committee recommended the granting of it with conditions and if you read quickly this, but it's been highlighted the points which were raised in these letters mainly concerned the possible infringement of day lighting. The revised drawing shows that the 4th floor is to be set back from the edge of the building. An oven. The Henry David Henige Lane frontage, opposite number 2 and the synagogue and the plant room will have a sloped.

00:34:06.770 --> 00:34:22.660

stuart (Guest)

Mansard roof these measurements with in fact slightly improved the existing situation that the synagogue. So I ask you what's changed? Sunlight hasn't changed. The synagogue hasn't changed, but you are going to.

00:34:23.970 --> 00:34:27.390

stuart (Guest)

Sorry, can we get back to that? One of the building quickly please.

00:34:31.950 --> 00:34:42.010

stuart (Guest)

Yeah, that's an aerial view of the current building that 33 Creechurch which has got a slope and a cut out to preserve the light.

00:34:42.830 --> 00:34:46.870

stuart (Guest)

Being reflected into the synagogue so.

00:34:47.880 --> 00:34:51.260

stuart (Guest)

What's changed is your attitude to our synagogue.

00:34:52.090 --> 00:34:53.630

stuart (Guest)

Because your predecessors.

00:34:54.220 --> 00:34:57.650

stuart (Guest)

Protected it and we ask you to do the same.

00:34:58.610 --> 00:34:59.130

stuart (Guest)

Thank you.

00:34:59.540 --> 00:35:23.430

Sir Michael Bear (Guest)

Thank you very much. Do the the the application is 31 Bury St but the principles that Stuart has mentioned are the ones that we that that that we are so keen for you to to understand. OK if you

just hang on to that slide this is the one that you couldn't see when I was making my presentation you will have a copy of this which are the reasons for refusal that our professional team had drafted.

00:35:24.020 --> 00:35:43.030

Sir Michael Bear (Guest)

Uhm, uh, to give you chapter and verse on each clause that is in contravention in the London plan, the City of London local plan and the National Planning framework. So that's our presentation over at Gwyn, over to your Members. Now we're 5 minutes over, but you have plenty of time to ask your questions. Thank you very much.

00:35:51.560 --> 00:35:53.270

Sir Michael Bear (Guest)

Do any Members have questions?

00:35:54.900 --> 00:35:58.280

Sir Michael Bear (Guest)

Who is chairing, uh, do you want me to take questions or?

00:35:59.040 --> 00:35:59.740

Sir Michael Bear (Guest)

Ask the question.

00:36:00.320 --> 00:36:03.160

Richards, Gwyn

I'm waiting for any Members who may have questions too.

00:36:00.790 --> 00:36:01.040

Sir Michael Bear (Guest)

Like

00:36:02.870 --> 00:36:06.640

Sir Michael Bear (Guest)

uh, OK, yeah. Thank you Glenn date they understand that, uh, it's Henry yeah.

00:36:04.250 --> 00:36:04.830

Richards, Gwyn

Like this?

00:36:05.670 --> 00:36:05.910

stuart (Guest)

So.

00:36:09.970 --> 00:36:11.820

Pollard, Henry

Thank you Michael. Henry Pollard.

00:36:11.900 --> 00:36:14.520

Pollard, Henry

Yeah, I'm am I right in saying that?

00:36:15.790 --> 00:36:23.340

Pollard, Henry

This the this if the building was a similar height to the existing building, there would be no problem with that building being built.

00:36:24.650 --> 00:36:53.800

Sir Michael Bear (Guest)

I I mean that is correct. I mean we are where we are. There's the synagogue has lived with the with the height and massing that's there at the moment, and I think that that is normally under planning guidance. There should be alternatives which the planning officer would would would go through with the developer in order to come up with the right height and massing. I don't believe that's taken place. I think the the the adherence to the tall building policy has missed that step.

00:36:54.350 --> 00:36:55.710

Sir Michael Bear (Guest)

But in order to your question, yes.

00:36:57.280 --> 00:36:57.650

Pollard, Henry

Yep.

00:37:04.870 --> 00:37:22.390

Sir Michael Bear (Guest)

But we obviously did a really good presentation. Questions, which is fine. I mean we we you know we, we spent a lot of time trying to second guess what the questions were being would be and have come up with this presentation. So so Gwyn, if there aren't any questions, we quite happy to rest on.

00:37:23.040 --> 00:37:32.890

Sir Michael Bear (Guest)

The evidence that we presented to you and and and and move on to tomorrow, which is a hugely important.

00:37:32.940 --> 00:37:34.950

Sir Michael Bear (Guest)

UHM committee meeting.

00:37:35.930 --> 00:37:39.300

Sir Michael Bear (Guest)

And do any of my colleagues have anything to say?

00:37:40.040 --> 00:37:43.520

Sir Michael Bear (Guest)

Yep, OK Gwyn. I think we are. We are where we are rather than.

00:37:44.170 --> 00:37:47.470

Richards, Gwyn

Thank you very much and thank you for being prompt. Thank you.

00:37:47.780 --> 00:37:51.240

Sir Michael Bear (Guest)

That's alright, OK, do we get points for that? Do we get points for them? I like pointed.

00:37:52.260 --> 00:37:57.270

Sir Michael Bear (Guest)

Great, thank you very much and could again. I thank you for the opportunity to allow us to put our case.

00:37:57.600 --> 00:37:58.230

stuart (Guest)

Thank you.

00:37:58.230 --> 00:37:58.650

Sir Michael Bear (Guest)

OK.

00:37:58.260 --> 00:37:59.240

Rabbi Shalom Morris

I guess.

00:37:58.710 --> 00:37:59.250

Abigail Green

Thank you.

00:37:59.360 --> 00:38:03.880

Sir Michael Bear (Guest)

Thank you, thank you very much. OK, we're gonna we're gonna go off now. Thank you bye.