

Comments for Planning Application 22/00203/LBC

Application Summary

Application Number: 22/00203/LBC

Address: Cripplegate House 1 Golden Lane London EC1Y 0RR

Proposal: Alteration and extension of the existing office building (Class Eg(i)) incorporating a local community/cultural space (Class Eg(i)/F2) at ground floor; to include additional floorspace through upward and infill extensions; altered and additional entrances; creation of office amenity terraces and plant enclosures; facade alterations including urban greening; new landscaping; and associated works.

Case Officer: Amy Williams

Customer Details

Name: Mr Richard Pitkethly

Address: 543 Ben Jonson House Barbican London

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Noise
- Other
- Residential Amenity
- Traffic or Highways

Comment: This development is far too high and too close to the Barbican, immediately next to and in sight-lines of residents' flats. The distance from the building is too close to avoid loss of privacy - the Barbican estate is designed throughout to allow privacy, whilst being part of a dense urban environment. There are too many roof terraces which exacerbate these privacy / disruption across the north-facing flats of Ben Jonson House / Breton House.

Any re-configuring of the underpass / ramp and its surroundings, if acceptable at all, should only be so to enhance the area. For example, a local artist might be engaged to produce something appropriate to the brutalist architecture and the conservations area generally and that will last - a genuine work of art. The ramp and its surroundings are magnificent and much-loved by residents and visitors. If short-cuts are made to this area, it will quickly attract the sort of issues that this application has cited as a problem. To be clear, I am not aware of any resident who has come across a problem of any sort here, including the ones cited by the developer. This is, to my mind, a case of searching for and finding problems where there aren't any.

DO NOT LAY A FINGER ON THE MAGNIFICENT RAMPS, THEMSELVES! My elderly mother who walks with a stick and some difficulty, who often visits us at the Barbican, delights in the

ramps, including their design. She uses them all the time and prefers them to the lifts. They represent her idea of an accessible building...

Comments for Planning Application 22/00203/LBC

Application Summary

Application Number: 22/00203/LBC

Address: Cripplegate House 1 Golden Lane London EC1Y 0RR

Proposal: Alteration and extension of the existing office building (Class Eg(i)) incorporating a local community/cultural space (Class Eg(i)/F2) at ground floor; to include additional floorspace through upward and infill extensions; altered and additional entrances; creation of office amenity terraces and plant enclosures; facade alterations including urban greening; new landscaping; and associated works.

Case Officer: Amy Williams

Customer Details

Name: Mrs Brenda Szlesinger

Address: Flat 112 Thomas More House Barbican London

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Noise
- Other
- Residential Amenity

Comment: I OBJECT to the application on the following grounds:

1. The proposed development will adversely affect the residential amenity of neighbours, by reason of noise and overlooking. Residents in neighbouring buildings will suffer a loss of privacy from overlooking and neighbouring homes will be overshadowed by the increased scale and scope of the development. The amenity terraces will be a source of noise and light pollution to local residents and visitors to the area. The area is a densely populated residential area popular with families. Their residential amenity will be negatively impacted by activities on the terraces.
2. The building is currently proportionate in height and scale with the surround buildings. Overdeveloping the site will have a negative visual impact from street level. It will detract from the open aspect of the area, giving rise to a sense of being walled in.
3. The building is adjacent to the Golden Lane and Barbican Estate Conservation Area. Given the recognised status of the area, development on neighbouring sites must not have a negative impact on the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. The proposed development will have a negative impact as its scale is not proportionate. The proposed development is overbearing, out of scale and out of character in terms of its appearance compared with existing development in the area.
4. 1 Golden Lane is adjacent to the Grade 11 Listed Barbican Estate. The proposed development

will have an adverse effect on the setting of the Barbican Estate. The Barbican Estate is a global icon and permitting inappropriate development such as that proposed is damaging to the City of London, London and the UK. The integrity of the Grade 11 listed estate must be safeguarded and this includes rejecting applications to modify neighbouring buildings in a way that detracts from their status.

I ask you to REJECT the application.

Brenda Szlesinger



Representing the interests of Barbican Residents

Barbican Association Planning Sub-Committee
c/o 343 Lauderdale Tower
Barbican
London EC2Y 8NA

The City Planning Officer
Department of Planning and Transportation
City of London
PO Box 270,
Guildhall
London EC2P 2EJ

26th April 2022

For the attention of Ms Amy Williams

Dear Ms Williams,

Objection to applications 22/00202/FULMAJ and 22/00203/LBC, 1 Golden Lane

We are writing on behalf of the Barbican Association, a Recognized Tenants' Association representing residents of the Barbican Estate, to **object** to the above application relating to the site at Cripplegate House, 1 Golden Lane London EC1Y 0RR on the grounds of significant loss of residential amenity, principally the loss of daylight and sunlight, overshadowing, overlooking and light pollution to many neighbouring properties.

Despite the voicing of numerous residents' concerns about the proposed increase in height and massing of the building during the consultation process, it is disappointing in the extreme that the applicant has chosen to leave the redevelopment plans completely unchanged despite the clear loss of residential amenity that this would cause.

The proposed increase both in height (of 24%) and mass (of 20%) of the site is not only patently disproportionate to the footprint of the existing building but is also damaging to the appearance and character of the historic listed frontage. The overdevelopment of the site will also have a detrimental impact on its setting by the Barbican and Golden Lane Conservation Area.

Unacceptable impact on levels of daylight and sunlight

The plans indicate that the existing extension of 9 storeys high 'will be extended to rise up to 12 storeys', resulting in a 24% increase in the height of the building from c55.3m AOD to c68.3m AOD. Whilst we accept that the height increases fluctuate across the building, this does not detract from the fact that these proposals are in clear contravention of Policy H3 of

the Draft Local Plan 2036 which states: *‘All development proposals should be designed to minimise overlooking and seek to protect the privacy, day lighting and sun lighting levels to adjacent residential accommodation’*.

We would also point out that this significant loss of light also clearly contravenes the Local Plan 2036 Policy D8 which states that *"development proposals will be required to demonstrate that the daylight and sunlight available to nearby dwellings and open spaces is not reduced noticeably to unacceptable levels.... Access to appropriate levels of daylight and sunlight is important for the mental health of workers and residents"*.

In this letter regard, we would remind that the CoL is a founding member of the City Mental Health Alliance and that lack of daylight has been clearly identified as detrimental to mental health.

As is seemingly always the case however, the applicant's Daylight, Sunlight and Overshadowing Report states that a total of 776 windows "will experience fully BRE compliant alterations" in relation to levels of daylight and sunlight received. We would argue that these measurements are somewhat disingenuous however and that affected residents are justified in believing that this is most definitely not the case. Indeed, looking specifically at the analyses for the two nearest residential blocks in the Barbican Estate to the proposed development we note that over 40% of the windows monitored in Ben Jonson House will lose between 10%-30% of their daylight. Some 20% of windows in Breton House will also lose between 10%-20% of their daylight. This can hardly be called inconsequential and will have a clear and obvious detrimental impact on the lives of the residents affected.

We are also concerned that Fortune Street Park will lose much of its sunlight, especially in the afternoons when many children from the nearby primary school go there to play when school is finished.

Terraces/overlooking

The significant element of outdoor amenity space proposed on the various levels clearly infers that there is great potential for noise and disturbance from these outside spaces which will impact on the quiet enjoyment of neighbouring residences.

Policy HS3 of the Draft Local Plan 2036 states that *‘The need to minimise overlooking and overshadowing of residential accommodation is a consideration in the design and layout of both new residential buildings and other developments’*. As that is the stated policy, then why have the developers of this site operated in clear contravention of this by proposing the construction of a number of external terraces on the building which overlook many residential flats and principally the bedrooms thereof? Having open terraces will bring a complete loss of privacy as well as additional noise and light pollution when the terraces are in use. The argument that by positioning these terraces above the adjacent buildings and using suitably placed greenery to deflect noise and encourage the terrace users to look away from the nearby

residential buildings is weak in the extreme. Noise and light also travel upwards and the proposed privacy screening will not be able to lessen this to any significant degree.

The developers' application states *'To further the obliqueness of views, planters are proposed to the edges of terraces with balustrades set within, severely restricting downwards views. This means that views from terraces are expected to be restricted to the distant skyline, or to within the terraces. The proposed seating is laid out to generally focus views internally'*. We would highlight the phrases "are expected" and "generally" which are hardly reassuring if you are a resident whose bedroom windows are within a stone's throw of one of these terraces. And who will be maintaining all of this planting to protect this "screening"? We see many instances of neglect of the "box ticking" greening of buildings and see a plethora of brown rather than green roofs and dead trees and plants rather than the lush green oases promised. Time restrictions on the use of any external terraces and strict regulations concerning the maintenance of all of the proposed greening screens must be enforced for any prospective occupier of the building.

Harm to heritage assets

Policy HE1: Managing Change to Heritage Assets states that in the alteration of existing buildings *'developers should have regard to the character of conservation areas and their settings. This includes the size and shape of historic building plots, existing street patterns and the alignment and the width of frontages...'*

Indeed, in possible recognition of this, the applicant's Planning Statement says *that 'the historic part of the building is also proposed to be generally preserved, with the alterations limited to the creation of step free accesses into the vestibules at ground floor.....'* n.b. Note again the use of the word "generally".

We would argue that this is not the case as not one but two entrance doors are planned for the listed eastern façade of the building. Surely the community room could be reached by a new door in e.g. Cripplegate Street rather than damage an historic façade and cause harm to an important heritage asset.

There may also be a heritage issue in the "public realm aspirations" as the attached images show various areas of cobble stones, which may date back some considerable time. We concur with the view that a full investigation be undertaken as to their provenance.

Waste collection

The plan for waste collection from the site is also fundamentally flawed and we are aware that you have already been alerted to this by Fred Rodgers, Chair of Breton House Group. We concur with his view that the current system of waste collection should be continued to avoid the issue of RCV drivers having to execute U-turns in Bridgewater Square when the Bridgewater Street junction with Golden Lane is closed (as will be proposed in the forthcoming public consultation). RCVs would be able to use the Golden Lane, Brackley Street, Viscount Street, Fann Street and Golden Lane route with no need for U-turns. We also share Mr Rodgers'

concerns about the location of rubbish bins which should surely be kept out of sight from all external areas as well as entrances.

Public realm landscaping proposals

We also object to the public realm landscaping proposals at the front of the building in Golden Lane which call not only for the removal of the Turkish hazel but also for the severe lopping of the elegant Tilia tree. Neither of these measures are necessary and would cause harm both to the current street scene and to air quality, not forgetting the aphids and pollinators which thrive on the latter's leaves and flowers. The argument that it would open up the façade is spurious in the extreme particularly since the nearest tree branch to the façade is at least 10 meters away. We would remind that Policy OS4 of the Draft Local Plan 2036 requires the City Corporation to seek *"to increase the number of trees and their overall canopy cover by"*, *inter alia* *"other than in exceptional circumstances, only permitting the removal of existing trees which are dead, dying or dangerous"*. We also believe that the idea of adding a bed at the foot of the Tilia tree is also spurious as nothing is likely to survive, let alone thrive, in this particular location.

Summary

For all of the reasons enunciated above, we **object** to the overdevelopment of the site's current footprint and the proposed unnecessary increase in height and mass which will cause considerable damage to residential amenity, principally in the form of loss of daylight and sunlight, overshadowing, overlooking and light pollution. We also object to the fact that a large part of the building is to be demolished which is not only against the City's stated sustainability objective of refurbishment wherever possible but will also cause two to three years of severe noise, disruption and pollution to the neighbouring area.

The building is currently proportionate in height and scale to its setting and its proposed overdevelopment will have a negative visual impact on the area. It appears totally incongruous that the City of London has recognised the importance of conserving this area of London by bestowing Conservation area status to the Barbican and Golden Lane Estate as recently as 2018 and yet it is to consider supporting ever larger, taller and bulkier buildings such as this in the immediate vicinity which will both detract from the Grade II and Grade II* listed architecture and cause unacceptable loss of light and privacy to many residents in the protected area itself.

We would remind that core strategic policy DE2 : New Development of the Draft Local Plan 2026 states that *'The design of all new development must ensure that: The bulk and massing of schemes are appropriate in relation to their surroundings and have due regard to the general scale, height, building lines, character, historic interest and significance, urban grain and materials of the locality and relate well to the character of the area,.....'* and that *'Development that would adversely affect the character, appearance or amenities of the buildings or area will be resisted'*.

We would therefore request that the City of London pays heed to its own planning policies and that the height and mass of 1 Golden Lane be left unchanged. We would also like to

remind that the developers of the nearby Denizen originally wanted that site to be two floors higher but the City of London insisted that it be no higher than 1 Golden Lane. It therefore surely follows that the City cannot now allow 1 Golden Lane to be higher than the Denizen.

Yours sincerely,

Jane Smith – Chair, Barbican Association Planning & Licensing Sub-Committee

Susan Cox – Deputy Chair, Barbican Association Planning & Licensing Sub-Committee



Representing the interests of Barbican Residents

Barbican Association Planning Sub-Committee
c/o 343 Lauderdale Tower
Barbican
London EC2Y 8NA

The City Planning Officer
Department of Planning and Transportation
City of London
PO Box 270,
Guildhall
London EC2P 2EJ

30th September 2022

For the attention of Ms Amy Williams

Dear Ms Williams,

Further objection to applications 22/00202/FULMAJ and 22/00203/LBC, 1 Golden Lane

We are writing on behalf of the Barbican Association, a Recognized Tenants' Association representing the 4000+ residents of the Barbican Estate, to **object** once again to the above applications relating to the site at Cripplegate House, 1 Golden Lane London EC1Y 0RR. Our concerns remain those that we expressed in our previous objection letter of 26th April which we have attached to avoid unnecessary repetition. Our objections are focussed primarily, but not exclusively, on the proposed building's disproportionate height and mass. This will not only cause **significant loss of residential amenity** in the form of loss of daylight and sunlight, overshadowing, overlooking and light pollution to the many neighbouring properties but the proposed over-development of the building is also totally out of scale in the predominantly residential surroundings, including an important and historic Conservation Area with Grade II and Grade II* listed status.

It is most regrettable that the applicant has decided to largely ignore the very real issues raised by the 200+ objections lodged to date against this application, in particular those concerning the proposed site's inappropriate location, height and massing. Indeed, the overall reduction in the height of the building is less than a metre lower than the original design and the consequent loss of residential amenity to neighbouring residential properties is totally unacceptable.

In brief, our objections remain:

- **Unacceptable loss of light and overshadowing** which, despite the accompanying documentation stating that compliance with BRE guidelines has been met, is in clear contravention both of Policy H3 and of Policy D8 of the Draft Local Plan 2036.

- **Noise and overlooking from terraces** – in clear contravention of Policy HS3 of the Draft Local Plan 2036
- **Overdevelopment of the site**; disproportionate height and scale to its setting - in clear contravention of core strategic Policy DE2 of the Draft Local Plan 2036
- **Harm to heritage assets** - damage/intervention to listed façade – in clear contravention of Policy HE1 of the Draft Local Plan 2036
- **Unsatisfactory refuse arrangements** – in clear contravention to Policy DM16.5 of the Local Plan and Policy VT2 of the Draft City Plan 2036 (as even admitted by the applicant!)
- **Unsatisfactory servicing arrangements** - on street, instead of internal – in clear contravention of Policy VT2 of the Draft Local Plan 2036
- **Unsatisfactory public realm landscaping** proposals with very little change made to the original proposals
- **No overarching public or local community benefit** to justify the adverse effects of this proposed development

As previously stated, we would urge the City of London to pay heed to and follows its own planning policies and request in the strongest possible terms that this application be refused.

Yours sincerely,

Jane Smith – Chair, Barbican Association Planning & Licensing Sub-Committee
 Susan Cox – Deputy Chair, Barbican Association Planning & Licensing Sub-Committee

From: [PLN -](#)
To: [Comments](#)
Subject: Objection to Planning Application 22/00203/LBC
Date: 21 April 2022 12:58:15

THIS IS AN EXTERNAL EMAIL

Letter of Objection

RE Cripplegate House, 1 Golden Lane, London EC1Y 0RR
Ref: 22/00203/LBC

1. The extensive reports, analysis and design are of a high calibre; however the focus is on the proposal itself and barely takes into account the huge impact on its neighbours. The conclusion of the planning report suggests; *"In summary, it is considered that the Proposed Development represents an exemplary form of sustainable development"*. Furthermore the Design and Access Statement concludes; *"The proposal complies with required policy and responds to its context in a sensitive and meaningful way."* However the most sensitive and low carbon approach would be to do many of the improvements to the 1980/s building without having to add 4.5 additional stories. Therefore, the question is how to evaluate the requirement for extra floor space as noted in the Planning Statement: *"A sustainable contribution to increasing office floorspace within the City of London in response to identified need, resulting in an increase in internal floorspace of circa 19.8% (2,588sqm) and net lettable floorspace of circa 11.6% (1,117sqm)"*.
2. In stating the following, the commercial imperative is referenced as the driver: *"In its current state the building cannot attract new tenants and the proposal will refurbish the building in a sustainable way, providing much needed contemporary workspace in the City of London."* (from Whole life-cycle carbon assessment report). It goes on to state that; *"The proposed development includes ...well designed extensions at roof level, including several roof terraces, to optimise the provision of office space on the site."* The financial requirement to maximise financial return over-rides the need to respect the local context. Furthermore the evocation of the nearby newly completed Denizen Building as a positive precedent is a problematic reference as this was also rejected by the local community but pushed through planning. It is therefore not possible to agree with the TVIHA when it states: *"The design of this element will complement that of the Denizen and the surrounding post-war buildings, many of which are listed."* The cumulative impact of this as well as the new residential tower on Golden Lane, by the same architect, must be taken into account.
3. This objection suggests that the site is overdeveloped and does not enhance the listed part of the building which has already been compromised and is described as a 'façade' and a 'remainder'. However, to the passer by as well as many local residents the qualities of the listed façade are unique and special. The extension therefore reinforces the sense in which it is only a veneer and therefore not a true listed structure resulting in a proposal where it is dominated by the proposed form.
4. The Barbican and Golden Lane Area Strategy (2015) states in objective 3,.2 that: *"Future developments should preserve the existing qualities and values of the area, including the*

historic environment.” When considering the Townscape, Visual Impact and Heritage Assessment (‘TVIHA’), it is clear that the visual impact on the Barbican and Golden Lane Estate is significant. It is therefore extremely misleading to refer to the *‘The enhanced elevations of the extension’* as three stories of brand new construction. Referring to at the submitted drawings (proposed East Elevation) it is clearly 4 stories plus a plant room above. The height is now 50.52m and equals that of Great Arthur House, a tower block, on Golden Lane (ref Section AA).

5. When considering the conclusion of the DAS 6.9: “*Where visible, the Proposed Development will enhance views*”, it is clear that aspects of the design and streetscape are an improvement on the current building. However, this comes at a high price, which is the over development of the site where the four and a half additional stories greatly impact on the urban setting, resident’s amenity and the listed buildings.

The City of London Planning Authority should therefore not grant planning permission to the scheme in its current form.

Yours,

James Soane

**96 Breton House
Barbican
London EC2Y 8PQ**

Comments for Planning Application 22/00203/LBC

Application Summary

Application Number: 22/00203/LBC

Address: Cripplegate House 1 Golden Lane London EC1Y 0RR

Proposal: Alteration and extension of the existing office building (Class Eg(i)) incorporating a local community/cultural space (Class Eg(i)/F2) at ground floor; to include additional floorspace through upward and infill extensions; altered and additional entrances; creation of office amenity terraces and plant enclosures; facade alterations including urban greening; new landscaping; and associated works.

Case Officer: Amy Williams

Customer Details

Name: Ms Wendy Spurry

Address: Flat 344 Ben Jonson House LONDON

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Other

Comment: I would like to register my objection to the plans submitted for the redevelopment of the 1 Golden Lane Building. I agree that the building needs to be redeveloped, but the size of the new extensions to the roof and the sides of the building is far too large and will severely impact the light and view from my flat. The plans that residents have seen are very worrying and there does not need to be such an addition to the building. The 'listed' part of the façade is overwhelmed by the new extensions. I also object to the idea of 'greening' and planting the outside of the building as this has been a signal failure in other buildings around the city and leads to a highly unsightly view when the plants are left to die.

Comments for Planning Application 22/00203/LBC

Application Summary

Application Number: 22/00203/LBC

Address: Cripplegate House 1 Golden Lane London EC1Y 0RR

Proposal: Alteration and extension of the existing office building (Class Eg(i)) incorporating a local community/cultural space (Class Eg(i)/F2) at ground floor; to include additional floorspace through upward and infill extensions; altered and additional entrances; creation of office amenity terraces and plant enclosures; facade alterations including urban greening; new landscaping; and associated works.

Case Officer: Amy Williams

Customer Details

Name: Mrs Gaila Leahy

Address: 520 Ben Jonson House Barbican London

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Other

Comment: Firstly, I object to the cynical use of 'green' and 'community'.

- Demolition is the most un-green option for refurbishment. Planting greenery is not trade-off.
- Community space is not required. This development itself is an affront to the community.
- The present height of 1 Goldne Lane is the recognised standard for the immediate area, as The Denizen was not allowed to exceed that height.
- I further object to the south wall being built even closer to Ben Jonson House and being finished in cladding rather than brick.
- In short, this proposed development is too tall, too wide, and too ugly.

Comments for Planning Application 22/00203/LBC

Application Summary

Application Number: 22/00203/LBC

Address: Cripplegate House 1 Golden Lane London EC1Y 0RR

Proposal: Alteration and extension of the existing office building (Class Eg(i)) incorporating a local community/cultural space (Class Eg(i)/F2) at ground floor; to include additional floorspace through upward and infill extensions; altered and additional entrances; creation of office amenity terraces and plant enclosures; facade alterations including urban greening; new landscaping; and associated works.

Case Officer: Amy Williams

Customer Details

Name: Mrs Gaila Leahy

Address: 520 Ben Jonson House Barbican London

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Other

Comment: I posted my objections in March to the massive size and appearance of the planned redevelopment.

I wish to further add that a 'green wall' of planting will never work on the south-facing wall of the building, which will be like an oven in the summer.

When I spoke to the architect Trent Sneddon at the most recent exhibition, he had no idea how this would be maintained.

This is yet another bogus attempt to present the project as green.

From: [REDACTED]
To: [PLN - Comments](#)
Subject: 1 Golden Lane 22/00202/FULMAJ and 22/00203/LBC
Date: 30 September 2022 10:42:05

THIS IS AN EXTERNAL EMAIL

FAO the COL Planing Committee:

I previously objected to 22/00202/FULMAJ and 22/00203/LBC. Having seen the revised plans, they do nothing to substantially change my thoughts on the proposal.

The totally disproportionate bulk and inappropriate finish remain.

Therefore, I repeat my objections and request that both applications are refused.

The developer has I believe behaved in a vexatious manner in submitting these revised plans.

Sincerely,
Gaila Leahy
520 Ben Jonson House
EC2Y 8NH

Comments for Planning Application 22/00203/LBC

Application Summary

Application Number: 22/00203/LBC

Address: Cripplegate House 1 Golden Lane London EC1Y 0RR

Proposal: Alteration and extension of the existing office building (Class Eg(i)) incorporating a local community/cultural space (Class Eg(i)/F2) at ground floor; to include additional floorspace through upward and infill extensions; altered and additional entrances; creation of office amenity terraces and plant enclosures; facade alterations including urban greening; new landscaping; and associated works.

Case Officer: Amy Williams

Customer Details

Name: Mrs Nadine Forster

Address: FLAT 516, BEN JONSON HOUSE, BARBICAN BARBICAN LONDON

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Noise
- Residential Amenity
- Traffic or Highways

Comment: My kitchen is opposite 1 Golden Lane, so is one of my bedrooms. At the moment there is enough natural light coming through the windows. I'm really worried that this would change with a possible height and width extension of No. 1 Golden Lane.

I am also worried that there would be noise disturbance by people using the planned roof terraces.

Also I read that the existing ramp that a lot of parcel delivery people use to get to the podium from street level at 1 Golden Lane would be removed. That is another point that worries me. How will I get my fresh supermarket deliveries?

Comments for Planning Application 22/00203/LBC

Application Summary

Application Number: 22/00203/LBC

Address: Cripplegate House 1 Golden Lane London EC1Y 0RR

Proposal: Alteration and extension of the existing office building (Class Eg(i)) incorporating a local community/cultural space (Class Eg(i)/F2) at ground floor; to include additional floorspace through upward and infill extensions; altered and additional entrances; creation of office amenity terraces and plant enclosures; facade alterations including urban greening; new landscaping; and associated works.

Case Officer: Amy Williams

Customer Details

Name: Mr James Stothard

Address: 25 Breton House Bury London

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Other

Comment: No too all illuminated signage. There is nothing of a similar nature in the vicinity - very out of keeping.

No to balconies. This is not a residential development. Office balconies are noisy as used by multiple people & reduce privacy of residents - in this case overlooking them.

Comments for Planning Application 22/00203/LBC

Application Summary

Application Number: 22/00203/LBC

Address: Cripplegate House 1 Golden Lane London EC1Y 0RR

Proposal: Alteration and extension of the existing office building (Class Eg(i)) incorporating a local community/cultural space (Class Eg(i)/F2) at ground floor; to include additional floorspace through upward and infill extensions; altered and additional entrances; creation of office amenity terraces and plant enclosures; facade alterations including urban greening; new landscaping; and associated works.

Case Officer: Amy Williams

Customer Details

Name: Dr Jane Bickerton

Address: 207 Ben Jonson House Barbican London

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Noise

Comment: These plans add 4 new storeys to the building which I consider rebuild.

Open areas on top

Or round the building will cause noise.

Comments for Planning Application 22/00203/LBC

Application Summary

Application Number: 22/00203/LBC

Address: Cripplegate House 1 Golden Lane London EC1Y 0RR

Proposal: Alteration and extension of the existing office building (Class Eg(i)) incorporating a local community/cultural space (Class Eg(i)/F2) at ground floor; to include additional floorspace through upward and infill extensions; altered and additional entrances; creation of office amenity terraces and plant enclosures; facade alterations including urban greening; new landscaping; and associated works.

Case Officer: Amy Williams

Customer Details

Name: Dr Jane Bickerton

Address: 207 Ben Jonson House Barbican London

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Noise
- Other
- Residential Amenity
- Traffic or Highways

Comment: I would like to make my objections to the planning submission for 1 Golden Lane for the following reasons.

Alteration and extension of the existing office building (Class Eg(i)) i;

I am concerned that the new architectural design is not in keeping with the listed aspects of the building.

I am concerned about the possibility of 24 hour working in the building and the impact of this on the local community, personal safety, light and noise pollution.

I am concerned about the quality and standard of the work and design

To include additional floorspace through upward and infill extensions.

I am concerned about decreased air space between the Highwalk and Golden Lane from level two and above where level two of the building is of equal height to the existing Barbican Highwalk.

I am concerned about Increased noise and light pollution.

Creation of office amenity terraces and plant enclosures:

I am concerned about the addition of four storeys with external space which will impact adversely

on noise levels and natural light which I experience from my property.

Incorporating a local community/cultural space (Class Eg(i)/F2) at ground floor

I am concerned about additional and altered entrances adding to noise and light pollution as well as vehicular pollution

Facade alterations including urban greening; new landscaping; and associated works.

I am concerned about the impact of the building design on birds, flora and fauna in the area

I am concerned about the continued maintenance of new landscaping

Altered and additional entrances;

I am concerned about the location of rubbish bins which should be kept out of sight from all external areas as well as entrances

I am concerned about additional and altered entrances adding to noise pollution

In summary I object to the development unless these issues can be resolved to the satisfaction of all residents in the neighbourhood.

Comments for Planning Application 22/00203/LBC

Application Summary

Application Number: 22/00203/LBC

Address: Cripplegate House 1 Golden Lane London EC1Y 0RR

Proposal: Alteration and extension of the existing office building (Class Eg(i)) incorporating a local community/cultural space (Class Eg(i)/F2) at ground floor; to include additional floorspace through upward and infill extensions (+2485sqm GIA uplift); altered and additional entrances; creation of office amenity terraces and plant enclosures; facade alterations including urban greening; new landscaping; and associated works [RECONSULTATION DUE TO REVISED DESIGN AND LANDSCAPING PROPOSALS]. |cr|

Case Officer: Amy Williams

Customer Details

Name: Dr jane bickerton

Address: 207 Ben Jonson House London

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Noise
- Other
- Residential Amenity
- Traffic or Highways

Comment:

My earlier objections to the building application still stand.

This new design makes a mockery of enhancing the details of a Grade II listed building and reduces the original work to disjointed fragments of construction. The present building supports and highlights the original elements of the earlier listed building where the new planning application eliminates any conversation with the earlier building elements.

Comments for Planning Application 22/00203/LBC

Application Summary

Application Number: 22/00203/LBC

Address: Cripplegate House 1 Golden Lane London EC1Y 0RR

Proposal: Alteration and extension of the existing office building (Class Eg(i)) incorporating a local community/cultural space (Class Eg(i)/F2) at ground floor; to include additional floorspace through upward and infill extensions; altered and additional entrances; creation of office amenity terraces and plant enclosures; facade alterations including urban greening; new landscaping; and associated works.

Case Officer: Amy Williams

Customer Details

Name: Mrs Joan Crighton

Address: FLAT 562, BEN JONSON HOUSE BARBICAN LONDON

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Noise
- Other

Comment: The proposed development ruins the skyline and is too dominant.

The development is already causing noise disturbance to local residents,

Comments for Planning Application 22/00203/LBC

Application Summary

Application Number: 22/00203/LBC

Address: Cripplegate House 1 Golden Lane London EC1Y 0RR

Proposal: Alteration and extension of the existing office building (Class Eg(i)) incorporating a local community/cultural space (Class Eg(i)/F2) at ground floor; to include additional floorspace through upward and infill extensions; altered and additional entrances; creation of office amenity terraces and plant enclosures; facade alterations including urban greening; new landscaping; and associated works.

Case Officer: Amy Williams

Customer Details

Name: Ms Margareta Kern

Address: 37 Breton House, Barbican, London EC2Y 8DQ

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Noise
- Other
- Residential Amenity

Comment: I strongly object to the proposed development by the Castleforge Partners (part 1):

Despite numerous conversations and 'consultations' with Castleforge Partners in which myself and other residents made clear our concerns about the proposed height and massing of the building and its adverse impact on our lives, the developer continued to pursue the plans regardless.

The proposed extension upwards of four-five floors is completely disproportionate to the current building. It will destroy the character of the listed frontage, as well as have an adverse affect on the character and heritage of the Barbican.

- The extension will reduce the sunlight and the daylight, as well as cause a loss of privacy and light pollution. The children in the nearby primary school will lose their afternoon sunlight and daylight. I see so much sky from my flat, especially above the roofs of the listed part of the building
- all this will be lost forever.

I also strongly object to the proposed terraces on the floor 8, 10 and 12. Unlike what's said in the proposal, these terraces will overlook the residents bedrooms, including my own. Level 8 terrace, in particular, is barely higher than the level of my bedroom in Breton House, not to mention the

bedrooms in Ben Johnson. Having open terraces will mean a complete loss of privacy as well as additional noise when terraces are in use, or when they are being maintained. Positioning them (barely) above the adjacent buildings as is being argued in the application will not help, instead, it will heighten the sense of being looked on from above, while at the same time not being able to see who is looking.

The Denizen development had to keep their roof height in line with that of 1 Golden Lane. Surely, it would be unfair if the same standards were not upheld for this proposal?

Comments for Planning Application 22/00203/LBC

Application Summary

Application Number: 22/00203/LBC

Address: Cripplegate House 1 Golden Lane London EC1Y 0RR

Proposal: Alteration and extension of the existing office building (Class Eg(i)) incorporating a local community/cultural space (Class Eg(i)/F2) at ground floor; to include additional floorspace through upward and infill extensions; altered and additional entrances; creation of office amenity terraces and plant enclosures; facade alterations including urban greening; new landscaping; and associated works.

Case Officer: Amy Williams

Customer Details

Name: Ms Margareta Kern

Address: 37 Breton House, Barbican, London EC2Y 8DQ

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Noise
- Other
- Residential Amenity

Comment: I strongly object to the proposed development by the Castleforge Partners (part 2/continued from the previous objection entry):

I am very concerned to see in the landscape plan that the cobble stones which could date from 19c. or even earlier will be removed. [interesting to note that the landscape plans are addressed to 1 Golden Lane freeholder, Avasha Ltd, registered in the Isle of Man, as well as the Seychelles].

I object to the plans to place the rubbish bins on the south side of Cripplegate Street, which will require them to be wheeled some distance across the street causing unnecessary noise and smell nuisance. Previously all waste was collected from Brackley Street.

The site has already started causing noise nuisance - it has been unbearable to work from home since the 'soft strip' started, and this is currently taking place on the south side of Cripplegate Street.

A large part of the building will be demolished - this is not sustainable nor is it 'green'. It will cause two-three years of severe noise disruption and pollution to the neighbourhood.

And, finally, I object to the cynical language used by the Castleforge Partners to attempt to mask their profit motive with greenery and sustainability, questionable assertions about the needs of office workers, and a 'community space' for which there is no need and which will not ameliorate the damage caused by this overdevelopment. At a moment when there are so many empty office blocks in the square mile and elsewhere, and when our working practices are changing, allowing such a disproportionately large project to go ahead will set a rather worrying (and disappointing) precedent. The roofline ought to be kept in line with the Barbican and the Denizen development, who had to keep their height in line with 1 Golden Lane.

From: [REDACTED]
To: [PLN - Comments](#)
Subject: 1 Golden Lane - 22/00202/FULMAJ and 22/00203/LBC - OBJECTION
Date: 29 September 2022 18:08:33

THIS IS AN EXTERNAL EMAIL

Hello,

I would like to object to the revised plans for both 22/00202/FULMAJ and 22/00203/LBC. I have seen both of the revised plans, and am quite disappointed by the meager changes which have done nothing to substantially change my opinion on the proposal. My earlier objection is repeated and I ask that the application be refused.

Additionally, I would like to seek clarification from the planning department regarding the communication with the applicant and its representatives, as I would like to understand how this communication led to such minor revisions that do not address the majority of concerns raised by the comments?

I hope that a FoI request will not be necessary.

Thank you.

Kind regards, Margareta Kern
37 Breton House, Barbican, London EC2Y 8DQ

Comments for Planning Application 22/00203/LBC

Application Summary

Application Number: 22/00203/LBC

Address: Cripplegate House 1 Golden Lane London EC1Y 0RR

Proposal: Alteration and extension of the existing office building (Class Eg(i)) incorporating a local community/cultural space (Class Eg(i)/F2) at ground floor; to include additional floorspace through upward and infill extensions; altered and additional entrances; creation of office amenity terraces and plant enclosures; facade alterations including urban greening; new landscaping; and associated works.

Case Officer: Amy Williams

Customer Details

Name: Mrs Diana Lamb

Address: 236 Ben Jonson House Barbican London

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Noise
- Other

Comment:

We live in the middle of the Ben Jonson House block in the Barbican, and our bedroom and dining room directly overlook Golden Lane and the building at Number 1.

We are extremely concerned after reading the plans for the proposed development, on a number of points as follows:

The proposed increase of just under 70 feet to the height of the building, together with the extension at the front middle section from the second floor upwards, will significantly reduce the level of light coming into our home. This development is so close to our home that the reduction in light will be disastrous for us.

The addition of roof terraces on which people will gather will create additional noise and disturbance when used - and Golden Lane does amplify sound when there is noise at the moment, so this is a real concern to both our rest and enjoyment of our property

Yet more bicycle racks and refuse containers in front of Ben Jonson will create further eyesore and disturbance.

The proposed development is not appropriate for a residential area, where it will reduce light, create noise disturbance, and degrade the scene to a point where our enjoyment of our home is

reduced and the market value of our home will inevitably be reduced.

In addition, this moves away from the sympathetic previous developments which preserved the outside history of the building, which used to be a theatre

Please, please decline the proposed development on the basis that this will negatively impact residents in a number of ways. Internal development while preserving the exterior is the only acceptable option, and the proposed development is a disaster for both residents and also for the city to preserve our (rare) historical buildings.

From: [Williams, Amy](#)
To: [P.N. - Comments](#)
Subject: 1 Golden Lane objection
Date: 25 April 2022 11:40:15
Attachments: [image1.png](#)
[image001.png](#)

From: Matthew Rees
Sent: 21 April 2022 19:12
To: Williams, Amy <Amy.Williams@cityoflondon.gov.uk>
Subject: Save trees

THIS IS AN EXTERNAL EMAIL

Dear Ms Williams,
I endorse the message on Twitter below. You should not allow builders to decimate mature trees. All such trees must be protected and saved.

19:09 ↗



Tweet



FOCG

@FCityGardens



Save Golden Lane Street Trees!
The developer of 1 Golden Lane plans to heavily prune the beautiful Silver Lime and remove another street tree. Please object to this by emailing the planning officer

amy.williams@cityoflondon.gov.uk
or via the City website tinyurl.com/5n8ra349



5 Monkwell Square

Matthew

Comments for Planning Application 22/00203/LBC

Application Summary

Application Number: 22/00203/LBC

Address: Cripplegate House 1 Golden Lane London EC1Y 0RR

Proposal: Alteration and extension of the existing office building (Class Eg(i)) incorporating a local community/cultural space (Class Eg(i)/F2) at ground floor; to include additional floorspace through upward and infill extensions; altered and additional entrances; creation of office amenity terraces and plant enclosures; facade alterations including urban greening; new landscaping; and associated works.

Case Officer: Amy Williams

Customer Details

Name: Mr Edward Wardell-Yerburgh

Address: Flat 517 Ben Jonson House, Barbican Barbican London

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Other

Comment: I am a resident in Ben Jonson and I object to the proposal on the grounds that it will uglify a currently beautiful building. The proposed additions are ugly and soulless without any redeeming ornament.

In addition, I object to the token offering of a "community space" which will go unused.

I would support this development if the redesign improved the building's beauty, rather than destroyed it.

Comments for Planning Application 22/00203/LBC

Application Summary

Application Number: 22/00203/LBC

Address: Cripplegate House 1 Golden Lane London EC1Y 0RR

Proposal: Alteration and extension of the existing office building (Class Eg(i)) incorporating a local community/cultural space (Class Eg(i)/F2) at ground floor; to include additional floorspace through upward and infill extensions; altered and additional entrances; creation of office amenity terraces and plant enclosures; facade alterations including urban greening; new landscaping; and associated works.

Case Officer: Amy Williams

Customer Details

Name: Mr Terry Lamb

Address: 236 Ben Jonson House Barbican London

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Other

Comment: Dear Sir/Madam

I write to object to the proposed cutting back of the large tree in front of the No. 1 Golden Lane development.

Following on from the planned development itself, this proposal to cut back the tree simply adds insult to injury. As a resident whose dining room and bedroom directly overlooks this area, the tree really makes a positive contribution to our daily enjoyment of life.

It is a lovely tree, very much the "star" of the Golden Lane area, that adds a welcome and much-needed bit of beauty to an otherwise barren and brutalistic urban environment. There doesn't appear to be any conceivable functional requirement to mutilate this magnificent tree. The planned cutting back amounts to little more than developers' vandalism (presumably to allow them to get a better photo of the front of their development for marketing purposes). It shows no consideration to the people who actually live their lives in the Barbican (city) environment.

Prince Charles yesterday commented on the need to replenish trees for future generations and for our depleted landscapes and townscapes." He is right - we should do our utmost to protect the existing mature trees which have taken so very many years to grow. And that includes protection of this superb, healthy, mature tree in front of the Cripplegate building at No. 1 Golden Lane.

Please leave the tree alone!!!!

Comments for Planning Application 22/00203/LBC

Application Summary

Application Number: 22/00203/LBC

Address: Cripplegate House 1 Golden Lane London EC1Y 0RR

Proposal: Alteration and extension of the existing office building (Class Eg(i)) incorporating a local community/cultural space (Class Eg(i)/F2) at ground floor; to include additional floorspace through upward and infill extensions; altered and additional entrances; creation of office amenity terraces and plant enclosures; facade alterations including urban greening; new landscaping; and associated works.

Case Officer: Amy Williams

Customer Details

Name: Ms Marika May

Address: 528 Ben Jonson House London

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Noise
- Other
- Residential Amenity

Comment: I object to the proposed building extension to 1 Golden Lane. So far the noise level for just removal has been quite disruptive and harmful - it's been a nuisance, especially as I work from home.

Second, I am concerned about the restriction to sunlight I will get from the additional floors. It will not only block sunlight but also block the view - and additionally will also have light pollution from these buildings, which faces directly into my bedroom.

Third I am also concerned about the lack of privacy the additional floors and windows will create. Having such a large commercial space overlooking what is supposed to be a quiet neighbourhood/house is a shame and will also change what the Barbican is about.

From: [REDACTED]
To: [PLN - Comments](#)
Subject: Re-objecting to 1 Golden Lane Plans
Date: 30 September 2022 09:41:54

THIS IS AN EXTERNAL EMAIL

Hello,

I have previously objected to the proposed plans for 22/00202/FULMAJ and 22/00203/LBC. Having seen the proposed changes, I would like to re-submit objections for both.

Thank you,

--

Marika May

Comments for Planning Application 22/00203/LBC

Application Summary

Application Number: 22/00203/LBC

Address: Cripplegate House 1 Golden Lane London EC1Y 0RR

Proposal: Alteration and extension of the existing office building (Class Eg(i)) incorporating a local community/cultural space (Class Eg(i)/F2) at ground floor; to include additional floorspace through upward and infill extensions; altered and additional entrances; creation of office amenity terraces and plant enclosures; facade alterations including urban greening; new landscaping; and associated works.

Case Officer: Amy Williams

Customer Details

Name: Dr Nicholas Deakin

Address: Flat 372, Lauderdale Tower, Barbican Barbican London

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of the Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Noise
- Other
- Residential Amenity

Comment: Whilst some of this development is welcome (and the refurbishment/upgrade of the listed facade and some of the rear office building), the 3 top storeys totally overwhelm the listed building and will dominate even the Barbican Podium/Garden which is a II* listed Park and Garden. It seems the latter context has been totally forgotten - and the interplay between terraces and the Podium/Gardens. This is disappointing.

I strongly oppose to the open terraces given the use and noise in a very residential area. Being open will damage the setting/interaction with the listed Barbican garden. Any privacy screening will just increase the noise potential and encourage more careless use of such facilities; whilst any restrictions on use will likely - in the long term - prove unenforceable or be subject to further applications.

For those in the adjacent (listed) blocks, the increased scale and mass of the building will inevitably create a loss of residential amenity, principally in the form of light pollution, overshadowing and loss of daylight and sunlight and noise pollution.

Comments for Planning Application 22/00203/LBC

Application Summary

Application Number: 22/00203/LBC

Address: Cripplegate House 1 Golden Lane London EC1Y 0RR

Proposal: Alteration and extension of the existing office building (Class Eg(i)) incorporating a local community/cultural space (Class Eg(i)/F2) at ground floor; to include additional floorspace through upward and infill extensions; altered and additional entrances; creation of office amenity terraces and plant enclosures; facade alterations including urban greening; new landscaping; and associated works.

Case Officer: Amy Williams

Customer Details

Name: Mr David Murray

Address: 7 Breton House Barbican London

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Noise
- Other

Comment: This over development is enormous and unnecessary. It will block light from Breton by the addition of yet more floors, it will cause noise disturbance in a solidly residential area from the unnecessary rooftop outdoor areas, the supposed community spaces are not needed or wanted. And more subjectively, the sheer bulk of it is ugly in an area directly adjacent to two prized estates. If the developer can't make the building work on the current scale they shouldn't have bought the building. These proposals are simply too big, too domineering and too ugly to be agreed and come at the cost to quality of life, privacy and loss of light to residents all around. I therefore strongly object to the proposals.

From: [REDACTED]
To: [PLN - Comments](#)
Cc: [Williams, Amy](#)
Subject: Comment on the Application for 1 Golden Lane (22/00203/LBC)
Date: 12 April 2022 09:34:46

THIS IS AN EXTERNAL EMAIL

Dear Planning Committee,

I was not able to use the planning website to submit my comment, so I would be grateful if you will accept it via email.

Adrian Tanovic
Flat 153 Shakespeare Tower
Barbican, London EC2Y 8DR

Category: Objection

===== Comment follows =====

The proposed height of this redevelopment is *far* beyond the profile of the existing building, and will negatively affect all of the surrounding estate (both Barbican and Golden Lane), resulting in a poorer quality of life for hundreds of residents.

This proposal merits special scrutiny by the Committee since the redeveloped building -- if constructed at the height planned -- would overlook and dominate a critically central position in the densely-populated Barbican and Golden Lane estates, bounded as it is in all four directions by the Barbican and Golden Lane Conservation Area, and thus forming part of the curtilage of this Area.

From the submitted plans, it can be estimated that the top of the proposed roof infrastructure (including lift overruns, etc) will come level with about the 15th or 16th floor of Shakespeare Tower, with the attendant noise from open terraces and rooftop plant such as air-conditioning radiating far higher even than that.

The developer has claimed that the project cannot be economically viable with fewer floors, but this is disingenuous: they purchased the building at a cost which reflected its current profile and current capacity -- it can therefore be no unreasonable burden on them to be constrained to work within those parameters, especially if expanding those parameters is to the detriment of local residents.

The quiet enjoyment of air, space, and light far outweighs any public realm 'enhancements' like a community activity room in the redeveloped building, or tree planting in the very limited space around the building at street level.

In summary, I object to the proposal and humbly urge you to reject it prima facie.

Comments for Planning Application 22/00203/LBC

Application Summary

Application Number: 22/00203/LBC

Address: Cripplegate House 1 Golden Lane London EC1Y 0RR

Proposal: Alteration and extension of the existing office building (Class Eg(i)) incorporating a local community/cultural space (Class Eg(i)/F2) at ground floor; to include additional floorspace through upward and infill extensions; altered and additional entrances; creation of office amenity terraces and plant enclosures; facade alterations including urban greening; new landscaping; and associated works.

Case Officer: Amy Williams

Customer Details

Name: Ms Mary Gilchrist

Address: 21 Shakespeare Tower London

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Noise
- Other
- Residential Amenity
- Traffic or Highways

Comment: I object to the planning applications 22/00202/FULMAJ and 22/00203/LBC for the proposed development of Cripplegate House on the following grounds:

Significant adverse impact on the architectural and heritage character of the area, specifically: The mass and height of the proposed development damages the architectural integrity of the listed Barbican and Golden Lane estates and the heritage of the Barbican and Golden Lane Conservation Area. In addition, the existing east façade of the Cripplegate Library, which is historic and listed, would be dwarfed and overwhelmed by the mass and height of the proposed development.

Significant loss of amenity, specifically:

Loss of daylight and sunlight to surrounding residential buildings, the nearby primary school and the nearby park.

Overshadowing and overlooking - the additional storeys for the proposed upward extension would dominate the surrounding residential buildings; the proposed open terraces would overlook the surrounding residential buildings.

Noise and disturbance - 1) there will be considerable noise and disturbance during development

with adverse impact on surrounding residential buildings and the school; 2) continuing noise and disturbance to surrounding residential buildings particularly from the proposed set-up for refuse collection which appears to involve bins being taken along the street to an open bin holding area and 3) continuing noise and disturbance to surrounding residential buildings from the new terraces.

Increased traffic - Brackley Street and Viscount Street - particularly due to the servicing /refuse collection set-up.

Adverse impact of landscaping proposals - I strongly object to the proposal to raise the crown of the linden tree and to remove the Turkish hazel tree. Both are beautiful mature trees, which contribute enormously to the streetscape and green environment and it would be vandalism to reduce or remove them (the butchery of the tree in front of the Denizen building was shocking).

Light pollution (from artificial lighting) to many neighbouring properties.

From: [REDACTED]
To: [PLN - Comments](#)
Subject: 22/00202/FULMAJ and 22/00203/LBC
Date: 30 September 2022 12:02:37

THIS IS AN EXTERNAL EMAIL

Dear Planning Team

I have seen the revised plans for 1 Golden Lane under the above references.

I objected to the previous versions of these plans.

The changes now proposed do nothing to change my opinion of the plans. Hence, I reiterate my objections and request that the applications be refused.

Please confirm receipt of my objections.

Mary Gilchrist
21 Shakespeare Tower, London EC2Y 8DR
[REDACTED]

From: [Williams, Amy](#)
To: [PLN - Comments](#)
Subject: Objection FW: 22/00202/FULMAJ and 22/00203/LBC - 1 Golden Lane
Date: 04 April 2022 17:25:00

-----Original Message-----

From: Frederick Rodgers <
Sent: 01 April 2022 10:10
Subject: 22/00203/FULMAJ and 22/00203/LBC - 1 Golden Lane

THIS IS AN EXTERNAL EMAIL

Dear Ms Williams,

Although we have had significant contact with representatives of Castleforge Partners, including a director, its architects and PR agents, the first indication of the proposals for waste storage and removal I'm aware of is in Velocity Transport Planning Ltd's Operational Waste Management Strategy. I would like to know how the Strategy avoided adverse scrutiny in pre-application meetings.

The availability of notes and minutes of all pre-application meetings is something I hope will soon be addressed by City Corporation. In the meantime, the Strategy references City Corporation's Community Facilities Manager and I trust this is only in respect of measurement of quantities of waste, as this is the very person in Cleansing Services who would respond to consultation on the Strategy.

Of course, waste disposal has been an issue at CoLPAI and at the Denizen, where dp9 were also involved. At the latter, between City Corporation's responsible officers and the architects, no provision was made for a dropped kerb outside the bin storage area. As a result the refuse collection operatives are required to wheel bins further along the Brackley Street footway than the supposed ten metre limit or simply drop the bins off the newly installed kerb.

What is proposed in the Strategy is totally unacceptable. Residents in The Cobalt Building, Bridgewater House, Ben Jonson House and even Breton House are suddenly expected to endure the noise from the movement of several bins over significant distances twice daily and also the noise and odours from the daily - for up to three hours or more - storage of bins on the south side of Cripplegate Street. Then there is the noise of the bins being emptied into RCVs.

Up until UBS vacated the building, all waste was collected in Brackley Street. Whilst this involved a lot of noise, waste was removed directly from the building into RCVs etc. There is no reason why this system can't be continued. It would also have the advantage of avoiding RCV drivers having to execute U-turns in Bridgewater Square when the Bridgewater Street junction with Golden Lane is closed, as will be proposed in the forthcoming public consultation. RCVs would be able to use the Golden Lane, Brackley Street, Viscount Street, Fann Street and Golden Lane route with no need for U-turns.

I appreciate that you are consulting with Cleansing Services on the Strategy but this seems likely to be a waste of time and resources. A complete rethink, as above, is necessary.

Best regards,

Fred Rodgers

Chair, Breton House Group
100 Breton House
Barbican
London
EC2Y 8PQ
UK

1 Golden Lane EC1Y 0RS
22/00202/FULMAJ and 22/00203/LBC

The following are additional comments on the proposal submitted by Avasha Limited (the Applicant) under the two above application numbers.

Whilst acknowledging the willingness of the Applicant to consult and having attended a number of consultations, both virtual and in person, the proposal remains unacceptable as regards both massing and height. As a result of the consultations, it seems some mutually beneficial changes are possible, through the discharge of conditions. These changes include:

1. Interventions in the eastern façade

Providing a level access from Cripplegate Street – matching the proposed level access from Brackley Street – would enable the existing eastern façade to be left untouched. This would also be a financial saving for the Applicant, as well as probably only involving Listed Building Consent for the change.

2. Public Realm

Presumably, all elements of the proposal relating to the Public Realm will subject to condition and, ultimately, to a section 278 Agreement. Changes must include:

- Retaining the Turkish hazel tree and not touching the linden tree;
- Retaining the existing planters; and
- Reusing the cobble stones.

3. Refuse bin storage

It seems from the last consultation that the method of refuse bin storage and holding in the proposal is to comply with Local Plan policy. The policy, apparently, requires refuse bins that can't be held internally for refuse collection be held in an external holding area.

I was unable to ascertain how many refuse bins would be needed as the Velocity representative was unable to say. From memory, not many bins were wheeled out during UBS's occupancy but there was also on-street shredding and regular replacement of equipment. As a result, Brackley Street was always quite busy. Whatever the fate of the proposal, it would be hoped that the building's occupants will be required to ensure the minimal daily production of refuse in accordance Local Plan policy.

The proposal includes a refuse bin storage area in the basement, with the full bins being carried up to street level on a lift and then pushed 20/30 metres to a bin holding area on the southern side of Cripplegate Street for refuse collection. The bins' return journey to the building could be over three hours later.

I have already objected to this part of the proposal separately. Since the bins have to be moved from the basement for refuse collection, why can't refuse be collected from the point where the bins are pushed into Viscount Street?

As pointed out, the junction of Bridgewater Street with Beech Street will be closed permanently sooner rather than later. Then, any non-emergency vehicle travelling south along Viscount Street, Cripplegate Street and Bridgewater Street from Brackley Street will have to be turned around before departing the area.

RCVs normally have a crew, so one member could act as a marshal and guide a reversing vehicle. This means the RCVs could turn right into Viscount Street from Brackley Street and then reverse down Viscount Street for the few metres to where the bins are removed from the building. The short distance means less nuisance from reversing alarms and avoids the need to the external refuse bin holding area.

There is no quiet way of wheeling and emptying refuse bins but not having an external holding area means the bins wouldn't be left outside either before or after the refuse has been collected. However, this proposal would need consultation with the residents in and around Viscount Street.

4. Urban Greening

Local Plan policies relating to urban greening and the UGF are another problem. This results in the need for the Applicant to comply with policy through a box-ticking exercise. This benefits no one, except perhaps landscape gardeners and nurseries.

The Applicant is obviously box-ticking as, if it had any concern for urban greening and biodiversity enhancement, there is much that it could have done during its eight years of ownership. Admittedly, whilst UBS was the tenant, the planting both within and without the Public Realm was well maintained.

UBS even responded to the introduction of the Mayor of London's Low Emissions Neighbourhood with air quality planting. However, since UBS vacated, although the City Gardens team, with its limited resources, has carried out some maintenance in the Public Realm planters, there has been no new planting for over two years in any of the planters.

Now, seeking planning permission, the Applicant is simply making self-serving proposals. However, it would be far more effective, all round, if, instead, the Applicant were to invest in enhancing the adjoining Public Realm. The Barbican Podium, Fortune Street Park - on the other side of Golden Lane - and, whilst not "public", Golden Lane Estate and Golden Lane Campus are obvious areas requiring investment in biodiversity.

The Applicant's proposals re urban greening involve a significant investment, as well as ever increasing maintenance costs, where or not the latter may be paid by the building's occupants. Through the diversion of a discounted initial capital investment

along with the regular maintenance costs, the Public Realm could benefit significantly.

As policy is followed haphazardly, mostly against the interests of residents, urban greening is one area where a more bullish approach could be taken. Doing so would benefit almost everyone.

The above are changes that could and should be accepted by the Applicant and City Corporation, although I can't speak for the other residents, even following the necessary consultation. However, those changes apart, there remains the height and massing of the proposed 24 metre extension and its accompanying roof terraces, all of which is unacceptable for the actual affect on our residential amenity.

Loss of sunlight is always assessed on policy, despite it being based on BRE guidelines. Those guidelines are time of the day specific and ignore the loss of amenity caused by the loss of sunlight at other times of the day. On the western side of Breton House, the Denizen, which added five sunlight reducing storeys, means we lose evening sunlight from around six pm onwards. The proposal would mean that, apart from a brief period when the sun crosses Brackley Street, the loss of sunlight will now be continuous from around four pm.



Photo taken at five pm today

Of course, the whole western façade of our flat is glazed, so we rely on sunlight for heating. As we lose sunlight, we automatically lose heat, something that seems to be beyond BRE's guidelines. City Corporation's Climate Action Strategy, for what it's worth, is supposed to be reducing Scope 1 and 2 carbon emissions to zero by 2027. Forcing our unnecessary increased use of electricity hardly seems to be an appropriate way of achieving the target.

As far as I'm concerned, the changes outlined above, in isolation, would make the proposals acceptable. However, until the proposed upward extension is significantly reduced, along

with the proposed roof terraces, my objection to the proposal will remain, as will my request that planning permission be refused.

25 April 2022

Fred Rodgers

100 Breton House
EC2Y 8PQ

Comments for Planning Application 22/00203/LBC

Application Summary

Application Number: 22/00203/LBC

Address: Cripplegate House 1 Golden Lane London EC1Y 0RR

Proposal: Alteration and extension of the existing office building (Class Eg(i)) incorporating a local community/cultural space (Class Eg(i)/F2) at ground floor; to include additional floorspace through upward and infill extensions; altered and additional entrances; creation of office amenity terraces and plant enclosures; facade alterations including urban greening; new landscaping; and associated works.

Case Officer: Amy Williams

Customer Details

Name: Ms Julia Hamilton

Address: 255 Ben Jonson House Barbican

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Other

Comment: I object to the proposed development of No. 1 Golden Lane.

Too tall - loss of light

Being brought forward to front - also reducing light

Roof terraces - will be noisy and disturbing.

Ramp to basement to be brought to road level. Additional bike racks and bins - contributing to more noise and disturbance.

I really object to this.

Thank you

Julia Hamilton

Comments for Planning Application 22/00203/LBC

Application Summary

Application Number: 22/00203/LBC

Address: Cripplegate House 1 Golden Lane London EC1Y 0RR

Proposal: Alteration and extension of the existing office building (Class Eg(i)) incorporating a local community/cultural space (Class Eg(i)/F2) at ground floor; to include additional floorspace through upward and infill extensions; altered and additional entrances; creation of office amenity terraces and plant enclosures; facade alterations including urban greening; new landscaping; and associated works.

Case Officer: Amy Williams

Customer Details

Name: Ms Kathrin Speidel

Address: 88 Defoe House Barbican London

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Other

Comment: I object to the plans.

In front of 1 Golden Lane stands a beautifully matured lime tree like a landmark. It took more than 30 years to grow to its majestic size. It actually is a very rare specimen in the City giving food and space to all kind of wildlife.

How can it be that in 2022 it is even being considered to prune such a nice street tree? In a time when we learnt after the pandemic how important nature and trees are for our mental health and when we know that we need to give space to nature and biodiversity also in cities to stop climate change.

Just a bit further on in front of the new Denizen block a street tree was pruned and now looks sad and injured.

Furthermore the plan is to replace the Turkish hazel next to the lime tree as well as an Elder tree on the South side reaching the ramp of the Barbican. Both are well matured trees. I do not see the point in replacing them when newly planted street trees need so much maintenance and take so much time to be established.

The planners worry that the trees are "creating a very dark shaded public realm space beneath, which will only get worse over time". The trees create a pleasant cool microclimate which will be greatly appreciated in the hot summers to come. It is always very nice coming out of the grey grimy (due to traffic) Beech street tunnel onto Golden Lane to be greeted by the freshness, colour and good smell of the Lime tree and Turkish hazel.

Leave street trees alone! Give them Tree Preservation Orders!

Otherwise the plans of Cripplegate house look like it will become quite a monstrosity. I hope there will be enough light for all the office workers inside. The extra very darkly coloured floors on top will make the appearance of the facade look awkward.

The trees on the other hand beautify and adorn the facade as well as creating a pleasurable entrance area to the building. (If bicycle racks are seen as clutter, they could be located underneath the ramp possibly.)

Comments for Planning Application 22/00203/LBC

Application Summary

Application Number: 22/00203/LBC

Address: Cripplegate House 1 Golden Lane London EC1Y 0RR

Proposal: Alteration and extension of the existing office building (Class Eg(i)) incorporating a local community/cultural space (Class Eg(i)/F2) at ground floor; to include additional floorspace through upward and infill extensions; altered and additional entrances; creation of office amenity terraces and plant enclosures; facade alterations including urban greening; new landscaping; and associated works.

Case Officer: Amy Williams

Customer Details

Name: Mr Julian Vickery

Address: 341 Ben Jonson House Barbican London

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Other

Comment: It is next to the Barbican and Golden Lane two of the most important residential pieces of architecture of the 20th C. This is overdevelopment by adding 3 floors it is attacking these estates and it has no architectural integrity or significance of its own it should be subservient to these masterly pieces of architecture

After Bernard Morgan House I hope you can set higher standards of planning and architecture on this interesting area

Comments for Planning Application 22/00203/LBC

Application Summary

Application Number: 22/00203/LBC

Address: Cripplegate House 1 Golden Lane London EC1Y 0RR

Proposal: Alteration and extension of the existing office building (Class Eg(i)) incorporating a local community/cultural space (Class Eg(i)/F2) at ground floor; to include additional floorspace through upward and infill extensions; altered and additional entrances; creation of office amenity terraces and plant enclosures; facade alterations including urban greening; new landscaping; and associated works.

Case Officer: Amy Williams

Customer Details

Name: Dr Andrew Higgott

Address: 540 Ben Jonson House Barbican London

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: I strongly object to the design as it stands, the upward extension of the building would severely impact on the light and amenity of a large number of occupiers of existing residential properties. I also object to proposed open terraces for similar reasons, despite questionable assurances about screening of these terraces. I think residents' Interests, in what is otherwise largely a residential area, should be paramount. I also think the proposed 'community' space on the ground floor is a 'sop' to residents and is not really needed in this case.

Comments for Planning Application 22/00203/LBC

Application Summary

Application Number: 22/00203/LBC

Address: Cripplegate House 1 Golden Lane London EC1Y 0RR

Proposal: Alteration and extension of the existing office building (Class Eg(i)) incorporating a local community/cultural space (Class Eg(i)/F2) at ground floor; to include additional floorspace through upward and infill extensions; altered and additional entrances; creation of office amenity terraces and plant enclosures; facade alterations including urban greening; new landscaping; and associated works.

Case Officer: Amy Williams

Customer Details

Name: Ms Kaitlin Dave

Address: 528 Ben Jonson House London

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of the Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Noise
- Other

Comment: This is not a refurbishment. It will cause extreme disruption, noise, and loss of light and privacy for neighbours and is unacceptable. Please don't do this!

From: [REDACTED]
To: [PLN - Comments](#)
Subject: Re-objecting to 1 Golden Lane Plans
Date: 30 September 2022 09:40:16

THIS IS AN EXTERNAL EMAIL

Hello,

I have previously objected to the proposed plans for 22/00202/FULMAJ and 22/00203/LBC. Having seen the proposed changes, I would like to re-submit objections for both.

Thank you,

Kaitlin D'Avella

Comments for Planning Application 22/00203/LBC

Application Summary

Application Number: 22/00203/LBC

Address: Cripplegate House 1 Golden Lane London EC1Y 0RR

Proposal: Alteration and extension of the existing office building (Class Eg(i)) incorporating a local community/cultural space (Class Eg(i)/F2) at ground floor; to include additional floorspace through upward and infill extensions; altered and additional entrances; creation of office amenity terraces and plant enclosures; facade alterations including urban greening; new landscaping; and associated works.

Case Officer: Amy Williams

Customer Details

Name: Mr Andrew Rowe

Address: 518 Ben Jonson House Barbican London

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Noise
- Other
- Residential Amenity
- Traffic or Highways

Comment: 1. Heritage

The proposal will dwarf the historic frontage of the Cripplegate Institute. The existing structure is in my view already out of proportion and overwhelms the historic structure. The massively increased size of the new structure will make this even worse.

2. Size out of proportion to surrounding buildings

The proposal is significantly higher than the existing structure and all the buildings in the area. This is out of keeping.

It should be noted that the building is surrounded on 3 sides by residential property.

3. Loss of amenity - view/light

Below is the current view from my flat. Clearly the proposals for a huge 14 metre increase in the height of the building will block out all the direct view of the sky and with it much of the light into my flat. This will cause a considerable loss of amenity. This will be much more so for flats lower in the building. The decrease in light will be exacerbated by the proposal to bring the south side of the building closer to Ben Jonson House.

4. Loss of amenity - increased noise and pollution

The current arrangement of the building allows refuse, bicycle storage etc to be below ground level minimising the noise and pollution impact on surrounding residents. The proposals appear to

take no account of the affect on residents as space is increased and building services moved into the open air.

The propsed roof terraces will also lead to an increase in noise to the many residents on 3 sides of the building.

5. Loss of amenity - privacy

The proposed roof terraces will cause an enormous loss of privacy to many residents as they look directly into our large windows, the full width of the flats.

6. Lack of engagement

While the developers held an online meeting with residents, there were no accurate drawings presented so residents were unable to see the extent of the issues above.

Comments for Planning Application 22/00203/LBC

Application Summary

Application Number: 22/00203/LBC

Address: Cripplegate House 1 Golden Lane London EC1Y 0RR

Proposal: Alteration and extension of the existing office building (Class Eg(i)) incorporating a local community/cultural space (Class Eg(i)/F2) at ground floor; to include additional floorspace through upward and infill extensions; altered and additional entrances; creation of office amenity terraces and plant enclosures; facade alterations including urban greening; new landscaping; and associated works.

Case Officer: Amy Williams

Customer Details

Name: Dr Sarah Hudson On behalf of Friends of City Gardens

Address: Flat 192, Shakespeare Tower Barbican London

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Other

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Other

Comment: I am the volunteer biodiversity lead for Friends of City Gardens. We have consulted our 180+ members and this objection to the removal and pruning of the public realm trees is supported by our membership. Our members are local residents from the City and Islington, City workers and volunteers from city businesses.

We object to the interventions in the public realm at the front of 1 Golden Lane. The silver lime tree should not be touched at all. It is a healthy and well proportioned mature tree that provides important mitigation of poor air quality (limes are particularly good at this). The tree provides shade and habitat for birds to forage. In particular the small local population of red listed house sparrows that rely on insects to feed young during the nesting season. It also provides a hugely important source of nectar for pollinators. Limes are often shocked after any degree of pruning and do not flower again for many years. There is no case to touch this tree in any way.

The hazel tree which developers wish to remove should also be left untouched. It is not impacting the growth of the lime tree and provides additional and welcome forage and cover.

FoCG would like to take over the maintenance of the existing planting in beds to create a biodiverse and sustainable and aesthetically pleasing public space. The developers proposal to change the planting and planters is not sustainable. The City gardens team will be left with a high maintenance and expensive planting scheme long after the building is sold on.

The developer clearly has only short term objectives for these public realm interventions. Nature, the public and the City gardens team will be left with the consequences for many years to come.

Comments for Planning Application 22/00203/LBC

Application Summary

Application Number: 22/00203/LBC

Address: Cripplegate House 1 Golden Lane London EC1Y 0RR

Proposal: Alteration and extension of the existing office building (Class Eg(i)) incorporating a local community/cultural space (Class Eg(i)/F2) at ground floor; to include additional floorspace through upward and infill extensions; altered and additional entrances; creation of office amenity terraces and plant enclosures; facade alterations including urban greening; new landscaping; and associated works.

Case Officer: Amy Williams

Customer Details

Name: Mr Marcus Kern

Address: 37 Breton House, Barbican, London EC2Y 8DQ

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Residential Amenity

Comment: I object to applications 22/00202/FULMAJ and 22/00203/LBC regarding the redevelopment of 1 Golden Lane London EC1Y 0RR. As a neighbour I am objecting because of the significant loss of my residential amenity, principal loss of daylight and sunlight, overshadowing, overlooking and light pollution at my home.

The collection of views by the applicant earlier this year was a complete farce, as none of the given feedback has changed the redevelopment proposal submitted in this application.

The proposed increase of the height of the building by a quarter and the mass by a fifth is out of keeping with the eave's lines of the neighbouring buildings and disproportionate to the Grade II listed building of the former Cripplegate Institute. The result will be a disfigured mess of hideous disproportions between the historic building and a bulked-for-profit backside.

This application should also be refused because it is violating the City of London's own core strategic policy DE2 for the Draft Local Plan 2026 because the proposed redevelopment adversely affects the character, appearance or amenities of the neighbouring buildings and the surrounding area.

From:
To: [PLN - Comments](#)
Subject: Planning Comment for 22/00202/FULMAJ and 22/00203/LBC
Date: 03 October 2022 13:23:48
Attachments:

Dear Planning Department,

I previously objected to 22/00202/FULMAJ and 22/00203/LBC. Having seen the revised plans, they do nothing to substantially change my thoughts on the proposal. Therefore, I repeat my objections and request that both applications are refused.

Please confirm receipt.

Best regards,

Marcus Kern
37 Breton House
Barbican
EC2Y 8DQ
London

From: [Williams, Amy](#)
To: [PLN - Comments](#)
Subject: FW: 1 Golden Lane Proposal "22/00202/FULMAJ"
Date: 05 May 2022 14:28:03
Attachments: [image001.png](#)

From: Nigel Smith [REDACTED]
Sent: 04 May 2022 07:54
To: Williams, Amy <Amy.Williams@cityoflondon.gov.uk>
Subject: 1 Golden Lane Proposal "22/00202/FULMAJ"

THIS IS AN EXTERNAL EMAIL

Dear Amy Williams

I wish to object to the above proposal for the following reasons

The proposed development is 'sandwiched' between both the Barbican and the Golden Lane Estate both being Statutory Listed of Architectural importance and are in designated Conservation Areas

The City of London has a duty to protect these special characteristics
Due consideration should be given to these very special and exceptional circumstances

The proposal does not protect such areas but indeed will cause significant harm. This is contrary to the City of London's responsibilities

The architectural design of the proposal is incongruous in the extreme and harms the protected architectural characteristics of both the listed Barbican Estate and the listed Golden Lane Estate

It is an ugly, overdeveloped and inappropriate design

It is unwarranted overdevelopment

Its construction would result in a significant loss of sunlight and sky view for Barbican & Golden Lane residents

There will be increased traffic due to servicing / refuse collection causing environmental harm (and quality of life) to adjacent residential units

Unpleasant change to the architectural/historical heritage of the area giving rise to an unfortunate precedent for inflicting further harm on adjacent listed residential estates and established Conservation Areas

Further harm by the proposed removal and extreme pruning of two historic trees on south-east corner of Golden Lane Estate

I urge you to give proper consideration to the above arguments and reject this application

Thank you

Yours sincerely

Nigel Smith

Nigel Smith
Chartered Surveyor & Chartered Architect
MSc Dip(Arch) FRICS RIBA
56 Basterfield House
Golden Lane Estate
London
EC1Y 0TR

[Redacted]
[Redacted]

Comments for Planning Application 22/00203/LBC

Application Summary

Application Number: 22/00203/LBC

Address: Cripplegate House 1 Golden Lane London EC1Y 0RR

Proposal: Alteration and extension of the existing office building (Class Eg(i)) incorporating a local community/cultural space (Class Eg(i)/F2) at ground floor; to include additional floorspace through upward and infill extensions; altered and additional entrances; creation of office amenity terraces and plant enclosures; facade alterations including urban greening; new landscaping; and associated works.

Case Officer: Amy Williams

Customer Details

Name: Mr Matthew Keating

Address: 507 Ben Jonson House London

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Noise
- Other

Comment: This proposed development will prove detrimental to surrounding properties. Regardless of the noise and disruption caused by construction, the proposed development would rob neighbouring residents and pupils and staff at Golden Lane Campus of sunlight. It would also impinge on privacy as well as greatly increasing traffic and pollution, which is appalling and on Beech Street is at illegal levels.

Comments for Planning Application 22/00203/LBC

Application Summary

Application Number: 22/00203/LBC

Address: Cripplegate House 1 Golden Lane London EC1Y 0RR

Proposal: Alteration and extension of the existing office building (Class Eg(i)) incorporating a local community/cultural space (Class Eg(i)/F2) at ground floor; to include additional floorspace through upward and infill extensions; altered and additional entrances; creation of office amenity terraces and plant enclosures; facade alterations including urban greening; new landscaping; and associated works.

Case Officer: Amy Williams

Customer Details

Name: Mr Bruce Badger

Address: Flat 338, Ben Jonson House Barbican London

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Noise
- Other
- Residential Amenity

Comment: The proposed building is huge, much larger than the existing structure. If approved, the proposal would benefit the applicant and other members of the property industry to the significant detriment of the local community. The building should be returned to the roofline of the original Cripplegate Institute, or perhaps as a compromise it could extend to the current roofline and volume. Anything larger would loom over the surrounding properties overshadowing them and unreasonably reducing visual amenity.

The proposed structure is not sympathetic with the surrounding conservation area, nor the listed front facade, rather it is a crude move to maximise the rental value for the applicant through increased bulk and externalisation of services. It is unreasonable that the fine words expressed when establishing the conservation area are brushed aside for the convenience of the applicant at the expense of the conservation area. The application should be rejected on these grounds alone.

Outdoor terraces would inevitably lead to noise and disturbance resulting from use. The primary purpose of such terraces is for social gathering which means noise. Being able to offer terraces to potential tenants is clearly a money spinner for the landlord, but will be torture for residents of adjacent residential blocks. It is unreasonable to grant permission for terraces for enrichment of the applicant at such a significant cost/impact to the existing surrounding community.

A member of the planning committee with any direct or indirect interest in this specific application should of course recuse themselves. Also, any member who has a direct or indirect interest in any matter which has come before the committee for which they had to recuse themselves but which was supported by members with an interest in this application should also recuse themselves. i.e. any hint of "you scratch my back and I'll scratch and I'll scratch yours" must be eliminated.

Begum, Shupi

From: Bruce Badger <bwbadger@gmail.com>
Sent: 26 September 2022 20:43
To: PLN - Comments
Subject: Objections to 22/00202/FULMAJ and 22/00203/LBC.

THIS IS AN EXTERNAL EMAIL

Re 22/00202/FULMAJ and 22/00203/LBC (1 Golden Lane redevelopment resubmitted application)

My original objections to the application stand. The changes in this latest submission are insignificant, the mass of the proposed building is still absurd in context and seems to brush aside Local Plan Policy considerations on a whim.

City officers must try harder to explain their support for projects like this. Are there good reasons for supporting this application? If so, what exactly are they? How are the imagined benefits and harms measured and balanced?

Despite the increased recognition of the value of the established trees in the area, I fear that we'll have a repeat of the "rebalancing" of the tree in front of the Denizen building which simply had all the branches on the side of the building stripped off. When I asked the officers responsible for the care of trees why they had not objected to this they claimed to have been unaware. If the trees around this new proposed development are worth keeping there should be no pruning merely to accommodate the new development ... the new development should be designed to allow enough space for the trees (as **should** have happened with the Denizen) ... and please make the officers responsible for the trees aware of this application.

Sincerely,
Bruce Badger
338 Ben Jonson House
Barbican
EC2Y 8NQ

Comments for Planning Application 22/00203/LBC

Application Summary

Application Number: 22/00203/LBC

Address: Cripplegate House 1 Golden Lane London EC1Y 0RR

Proposal: Alteration and extension of the existing office building (Class Eg(i)) incorporating a local community/cultural space (Class Eg(i)/F2) at ground floor; to include additional floorspace through upward and infill extensions; altered and additional entrances; creation of office amenity terraces and plant enclosures; facade alterations including urban greening; new landscaping; and associated works.

Case Officer: Amy Williams

Customer Details

Name: Mr Shawn Mach

Address: 220 Ben Jonson House Barbican London

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Noise
- Other
- Residential Amenity

Comment: I object to applications 22/00202/FULMAJ and 22/00203/LBC relating to the proposed development of Cripplegate House.

The increased mass and height of the new development will result in significant loss of amenity, specifically (i) Loss of daylight and sunlight, including to surrounding residential buildings; and (ii) Overshadowing and overlooking.

While the current building is proportionate in height and scale with the surrounding buildings, the addition of four additional storeys will cause a substantial loss of daylight and sunlight to surrounding residential buildings, the nearby primary school and the nearby park, as well as increased light pollution. The additional storeys would dominate the surrounding residential buildings, with the floor to ceiling windows allowing for intrusion into residents' privacy, and the proposed open terraces would overlook the surrounding residential buildings resulting in loss in privacy and noise pollution. The proposed development would also narrow the space between it and Ben Jonson House.

The development will also have a significant adverse impact on the architectural and heritage character of the area. The mass and height of the proposed development damage the

architectural integrity of the listed Barbican and Golden Lane estates and the heritage of the Barbican and Golden Lane Conservation Area, and appear to be in direct contravention of the draft Local Plan 2036 with respect to residential amenity, loss of sunlight and daylight, overlooking and public realm. The existing east facade of the Cripplegate Library, which is historic and listed, would also be dwarfed and overwhelmed by the mass and height of the proposed development.

In addition, I echo the views of the Friends of City Gardens and others in relation to their objections to the interventions in the public realm at the front of 1 Golden Lane, including in relation to the silver lime tree and the hazel tree.

Comments for Planning Application 22/00203/LBC

Application Summary

Application Number: 22/00203/LBC

Address: Cripplegate House 1 Golden Lane London EC1Y 0RR

Proposal: Alteration and extension of the existing office building (Class Eg(i)) incorporating a local community/cultural space (Class Eg(i)/F2) at ground floor; to include additional floorspace through upward and infill extensions (+2485sqm GIA uplift); altered and additional entrances; creation of office amenity terraces and plant enclosures; facade alterations including urban greening; new landscaping; and associated works [RECONSULTATION DUE TO REVISED DESIGN AND LANDSCAPING PROPOSALS]. |cr|

Case Officer: Amy Williams

Customer Details

Name: Mr Shawn Mach

Address: 220 Ben Jonson House Barbican London

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Noise
- Other
- Residential Amenity

Comment: I previously objected to 22/00202/FULMAJ and 22/00203/LBC.

Having seen the revised plans, they do nothing to substantially change my thoughts on the proposal.

Therefore, I repeat my objections and request that both applications are refused.

The increased mass and height of the development continue to result in significant loss of amenity, specifically (i) Loss of daylight and sunlight, including to surrounding residential buildings; and (ii) Overshadowing and overlooking.

While the current building is proportionate in height and scale with the surrounding buildings, the addition of the extra storeys will cause a substantial loss of daylight and sunlight to surrounding residential buildings, the nearby primary school and the nearby park, as well as increased light pollution. The additional storeys will dominate the surrounding residential buildings, with the floor to ceiling windows allowing for intrusion into residents' privacy, and the proposed open terraces overlooking the surrounding residential buildings resulting in loss in privacy and noise pollution.

The proposed development would also narrow the space between it and Ben Jonson House.

The development will also have a significant adverse impact on the architectural and heritage character of the area. The mass and height of the proposed development damage the architectural integrity of the listed Barbican and Golden Lane estates and the heritage of the Barbican and Golden Lane Conservation Area, and appear to be in direct contravention of the draft Local Plan 2036 with respect to residential amenity, loss of sunlight and daylight, overlooking and public realm. The existing east facade of the Cripplegate Library, which is historic and listed, would also be dwarfed and overwhelmed by the mass and height of the proposed development.

Comments for Planning Application 22/00203/LBC

Application Summary

Application Number: 22/00203/LBC

Address: Cripplegate House 1 Golden Lane London EC1Y 0RR

Proposal: Alteration and extension of the existing office building (Class Eg(i)) incorporating a local community/cultural space (Class Eg(i)/F2) at ground floor; to include additional floorspace through upward and infill extensions; altered and additional entrances; creation of office amenity terraces and plant enclosures; facade alterations including urban greening; new landscaping; and associated works.

Case Officer: Amy Williams

Customer Details

Name: Dr Christopher Newton

Address: 204 Ben Jonson House Barbican London

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Noise
- Other

Comment: We object on the following grounds:

BURDENSOME HEIGHT: The current view from our bedroom window is about 75% view of 1 Golden Lane existing brick façade, and 25% sky. The increased height of 20.4 m takes the height of 1 Golden Lane from 48 m to 68m. This will give us a view with no sky at all. Being hemmed in like this is psychologically abhorrent. There should be no height increase. A reduction in height would be preferred. It is noted by myself and others that the permitted height of "The Denizon" was limited by the current height of 1 Golden Lane. This height should not now be exceeded. The Barbican estate is being hugely dominated by developments in all directions around it which is reducing its attractiveness as a place to live. It is time to stop such developments of ever increasing height within 100m of the Barbican estate.

UGLY ELEVATION CHANGES: The plan is to "infill" the current recess on the south side of 1 Golden Lane (removing the attractive "cupola" feature within this recess) and bring forward this part of the façade on the south side towards Ben Jonson House, crowding the flats and presenting an architecturally meritless prison façade of a wall to the occupiers of the flats. The current indented building line should be retained.

UNSYMPATHETIC CHANGES TO BUILDING MATERIALS: There are no artists' impressions within the documents, but I understand the current red brick façade (which blends in with the old Cripplegate library building material) is to be removed and replaced by some sort of "cladding". This seems architecturally lazy, unsympathetic to the Library, and far uglier to have as a view from

Ben Jonson House.

NOISY OPEN TERRACES. The only thing that absorbs sound is mass. Greenery will have no effect on current Barbican residents being able to quietly enjoy their properties, as is their legal right. These terraces should be abandoned.

LACK OF CLARITY OF OWNERSHIP: who is the beneficial owner of 1 Golden Lane and is it an offshore operation?

Comments for Planning Application 22/00203/LBC

Application Summary

Application Number: 22/00203/LBC

Address: Cripplegate House 1 Golden Lane London EC1Y 0RR

Proposal: Alteration and extension of the existing office building (Class Eg(i)) incorporating a local community/cultural space (Class Eg(i)/F2) at ground floor; to include additional floorspace through upward and infill extensions; altered and additional entrances; creation of office amenity terraces and plant enclosures; facade alterations including urban greening; new landscaping; and associated works.

Case Officer: Amy Williams

Customer Details

Name: Ms Sarah Hudson

Address: FLAT 192 SHAKESPEARE TOWER London

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Other

Comment: I object to the proposed public realm landscaping proposals at the front of the building in Golden Lane. The Tilia street tree should not be pruned at all nor should the Corylus be removed. Hidden away in the documents is the proposal to raise the crown of the Tilia to 5 m. This could mean about 50% of the canopy would be removed - all for a short term marketing ploy on behalf of the developer to 'open up' the facade. The nearest tree branch to the facade is more than 10 m away and the facade is not obscured. This tree is elegant, beautifully shaped; a real asset to the street scene, providing shade, carbon capture and air quality benefits. Its scented flowers are a valuable resource for pollinators. The shock of 'pruning' may prevent it flowering for years to come - a huge loss of forage for local bees. And there is no need to touch it in any way.

The argument to remove the Turkish hazel is also spurious. The tree is not interfering with the growth of the Tilia. The developer again wants a short term opening up of the entrance and the ability to reconfigure the planters. The idea of adding a bed beneath the Tilia is ludicrous - nothing will survive and the City Gardens team, who will be expected to maintain this unsustainable planting, will be saddled with expensive maintenance that is doomed to failure.

There should be no interference by the developer in the public realm here at all. These plans are short term and unfeasible. Long after the developer has sold on the building, residents, occupiers and passers by will have to bear the aesthetic and financial cost of these ill considered and inappropriate proposals. A volunteer community group, Friends of City Gardens are keen to take over maintenance of the existing planters in Golden Lane and to create a sustainable and biodiverse planting scheme. They should be encouraged to do so.

Comments for Planning Application 22/00203/LBC

Application Summary

Application Number: 22/00203/LBC

Address: Cripplegate House 1 Golden Lane London EC1Y 0RR

Proposal: Alteration and extension of the existing office building (Class Eg(i)) incorporating a local community/cultural space (Class Eg(i)/F2) at ground floor; to include additional floorspace through upward and infill extensions; altered and additional entrances; creation of office amenity terraces and plant enclosures; facade alterations including urban greening; new landscaping; and associated works.

Case Officer: Amy Williams

Customer Details

Name: Ms Margot Barrow

Address: 48, Breton House Barbican London

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Other

Comment: The main objections are on the grounds of light deprivation and imposition of extended height - even exceeding the Denizen building adjacent. The roofline will impose and dominate the skyline.

I am concerned about light deprivation I believe we have a right to light and the extended height will deprive flats in Breton house and Ben Johnson house of daylight.

The architects' proposals for upper levels are excessively imposing. The extended rectangular windows dominate as do the blocks of white surround. The present grey roof recedes whereas white will impose and dominate the original facade.

The original extension clad in grey lead has windows of similar area to those on lower floors. The upper levels repeat the arched ones in the front elevation in harmony with the originals. There is a cohesion giving the facade a French Louis XV style. In these plans there has been no consideration for the listed character of the front of the building.

Comments for Planning Application 22/00203/LBC

Application Summary

Application Number: 22/00203/LBC

Address: Cripplegate House 1 Golden Lane London EC1Y 0RR

Proposal: Alteration and extension of the existing office building (Class Eg(i)) incorporating a local community/cultural space (Class Eg(i)/F2) at ground floor; to include additional floorspace through upward and infill extensions; altered and additional entrances; creation of office amenity terraces and plant enclosures; facade alterations including urban greening; new landscaping; and associated works.

Case Officer: Amy Williams

Customer Details

Name: Ms Anne Corbett

Address: 11 Basterfield House Golden lane London

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of the Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Noise
- Other

Comment: I am a resident of the Golden Lane Estate and an elected member for the Cripplegate ward. I am lodging an objection as a resident.

I am concerned about this development on several counts.

Firstly, the consultation was not fairly conducted with an over-emphasis on a small benefit to the local community in the form of one room on the ground floor. I attended one of the sessions in the Golden Lane Community Centre where I observed and experienced the strategy of the consultants which was to minimize and deflect objections rather than listen to concerns. I was not convinced that my views were acknowledged or correctly recorded.

Secondly, I am concerned about the loss of light to residential blocks: blocks which have already lost light because of the development of the adjacent block of flats (formerly Bernard Morgan House).

Thirdly, I object to the height and scale of the building which destroys the original design as well as affecting the daily lives of residents in adjacent homes.

Fourthly, I object to the scale of the development and the impact on our daily lives in because of noise and air pollution during the building process. In the last four years we have lived with two major building developments on Golden Lane which has had a direct impact on our lives in terms of our mental and physical health.

Fifth, I object to the alteration of trees on the pavement - one of the trees currently provides a beautiful canopy and roosting for birds as well as a benefit to the air quality.

In conclusion, I strongly object to yet another office development in the City of London where there is ample spare and unused office space following the pandemic and changing work patterns. It seems that the requirements of property developers come before the needs of the people who live here.

From: [Williams, Amy](#)
To: [PLN - Comments](#)
Subject: FW: Objections
Date: 25 April 2022 11:46:44
Attachments: [image001.png](#)

From: Samantha Logan
Sent: 22 April 2022 09:44
To: Williams, Amy <Amy.Williams@cityoflondon.gov.uk>
Subject: Objections

THIS IS AN EXTERNAL EMAIL

Dear Amy,

Objection Re Golden Lane Trees,

Application Ref. 22/00203/LBC & 22/00202/FULMAJ

I would like to strongly object to the proposal to raise the crown of the Silver Lime tree to five metres. This is a healthy tree that is of great nectar source for our pollinators and may not flower for years after any damage to the tree.

Best wishes,

Samantha Logan
519 Bunyan Court
Barbican

Comments for Planning Application 22/00203/LBC

Application Summary

Application Number: 22/00203/LBC

Address: Cripplegate House 1 Golden Lane London EC1Y 0RR

Proposal: Alteration and extension of the existing office building (Class Eg(i)) incorporating a local community/cultural space (Class Eg(i)/F2) at ground floor; to include additional floorspace through upward and infill extensions; altered and additional entrances; creation of office amenity terraces and plant enclosures; facade alterations including urban greening; new landscaping; and associated works.|cr|

Case Officer: Amy Williams

Customer Details

Name: Ms Alison Lamb

Address: 220 Ben Jonson House, Barbican Barbican London

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Noise
- Other
- Residential Amenity

Comment:I object to applications 22/00202/FULMAJ and 22/00203/LBC relating to the proposed development of Cripplegate House.

The increased mass and height of the new development will result in significant loss of amenity, specifically (i) Loss of daylight and sunlight, including to surrounding residential buildings; and (ii) Overshadowing and overlooking.

While the current building is proportionate in height and scale with the surrounding buildings, the addition of four additional storeys will cause a substantial loss of daylight and sunlight to surrounding residential buildings, the nearby primary school and the nearby park, as well as increased light pollution. The additional storeys would dominate the surrounding residential buildings, with the floor to ceiling windows allowing for intrusion into residents' privacy, and the proposed open terraces would overlook the surrounding residential buildings resulting in loss of privacy and noise pollution. The proposed development would also narrow the space between it and Ben Jonson House.

The development will also have a significant adverse impact on the architectural and heritage character of the area. The mass and height of the proposed development damage the

architectural integrity of the listed Barbican and Golden Lane estates and the heritage of the Barbican and Golden Lane Conservation Area, and appear to be in direct contravention of the draft Local Plan 2036 with respect to residential amenity, loss of sunlight and daylight, overlooking and public realm. The existing east facade of the Cripplegate Library, which is historic and listed, would also be dwarfed and overwhelmed by the mass and height of the proposed development.

In addition, I echo the views of the Friends of City Gardens and others in relation to their objections to the interventions in the public realm at the front of 1 Golden Lane, including in relation to the silver lime tree and the hazel tree.

Comments for Planning Application 22/00203/LBC

Application Summary

Application Number: 22/00203/LBC

Address: Cripplegate House 1 Golden Lane London EC1Y 0RR

Proposal: Alteration and extension of the existing office building (Class Eg(i)) incorporating a local community/cultural space (Class Eg(i)/F2) at ground floor; to include additional floorspace through upward and infill extensions; altered and additional entrances; creation of office amenity terraces and plant enclosures; facade alterations including urban greening; new landscaping; and associated works.

Case Officer: Amy Williams

Customer Details

Name: Miss Rachel Mortimer

Address: 143 Thomas More House London

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Residential Amenity

Comment: I OBJECT

The proposed redevelopment adversely affects the character, appearance and amenities of the neighbouring buildings and the surrounding area.

It will result in a significant loss of sunlight and sky view for both Barbican and Golden Lane residents. In addition, the proposed removal/pruning of two historic trees on south-east corner of Golden Lane Estate further reduces amenity in an hour lacking meaningful public greenery

Comments for Planning Application 22/00203/LBC

Application Summary

Application Number: 22/00203/LBC

Address: Cripplegate House 1 Golden Lane London EC1Y 0RR

Proposal: Alteration and extension of the existing office building (Class Eg(i)) incorporating a local community/cultural space (Class Eg(i)/F2) at ground floor; to include additional floorspace through upward and infill extensions; altered and additional entrances; creation of office amenity terraces and plant enclosures; facade alterations including urban greening; new landscaping; and associated works.

Case Officer: Amy Williams

Customer Details

Name: Mr Charles Bell

Address: Flat 143 Thomas More House London

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of the Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Residential Amenity

Comment: This would involve cutting down a tree which lends a lot to the local area. There are few enough trees in the central city, which are important for bird life, cleaning the air and providing shade in hot weather. It would be a shame to lose it in the name of an extension to a building.

Comments for Planning Application 22/00203/LBC

Application Summary

Application Number: 22/00203/LBC

Address: Cripplegate House 1 Golden Lane London EC1Y 0RR

Proposal: Alteration and extension of the existing office building (Class Eg(i)) incorporating a local community/cultural space (Class Eg(i)/F2) at ground floor; to include additional floorspace through upward and infill extensions; altered and additional entrances; creation of office amenity terraces and plant enclosures; facade alterations including urban greening; new landscaping; and associated works.

Case Officer: Amy Williams

Customer Details

Name: Mr Justin Hancock

Address: Flat 74, John Trundle Court, Barbican, Barbican Barbican London

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Noise
- Other
- Residential Amenity

Comment: I strongly oppose this development. The proposed addition of 4 storeys is an unnecessary blight on those that live in neighbouring blocks in Breton and Ben Johnson House. We've already had months of building and upheaval at that end of Golden Lane with the Denizen. Also the removal of the gorgeous trees, home to finches and sparrows, would be a dreadful shame.

From: [PLN - Comments](#)
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: FW: No 1 Golden Lane tree
Date: 24 May 2022 11:38:00

From: john vaughan
Sent: 23 May 2022 11:27
To: Williams, Amy <Amy.Williams@cityoflondon.gov.uk>
Subject: No 1 Golden Lane tree

THIS IS AN EXTERNAL EMAIL

Dear Ms Williams,

It has just come to my attention that the tree in front of no 1 Golden Lane is due for destruction.

I am mortified that a beautiful healthy tree that gives great pleasure to residents and city workers is going to be destroyed in order to enhance the entrance of number 1 Golden Lane - despite the fact the tree has been there for many years.

Not content with taking away light from my apartment it would seem I am to be deprived of the pleasure of a tree that I have watched grow over the years and have taken delight in observing seasonal changes.

The intention to remove the tree is, in my opinion, an act of vandalism and I would very much appreciate your views on this matter

Thank you

John Vaughan

From: [Williams, Amy](#)
To: [PLN - Comments](#)
Subject: FW: Objection to cutting back tree at No.1 Golden Lane
Date: 05 May 2022 14:27:42
Attachments: [image001.png](#)

From: Diana Lamb [REDACTED]
Sent: 05 May 2022 00:36
To: Williams, Amy <Amy.Williams@cityoflondon.gov.uk>
Subject: Objection to cutting back tree at No.1 Golden Lane

THIS IS AN EXTERNAL EMAIL

Dear Ms Williams

I write to object to the proposed cutting back of the large tree in front of the No. 1 Golden Lane development.

Following on from the planned development itself, this proposal to cut back the tree simply adds insult to injury. As a resident whose dining room and bedroom directly overlooks this area, the tree really makes a positive contribution to our daily enjoyment of life.

It is a lovely tree, very much the "star" of the Golden Lane area, that adds a welcome and much-needed bit of beauty to an otherwise barren and brutalistic urban environment. There doesn't appear to be any conceivable functional requirement to mutilate this magnificent tree. The planned cutting back amounts to little more than developers'

vandalism (presumably to allow them to get a better photo of the front of their development for marketing purposes). It shows no consideration to the people who actually live their lives in the Barbican (city) environment.

A few days ago, Prince Charles commented on the need to "replenish trees for future generations and for our depleted landscapes and townscapes." He is right - we should do our utmost to protect the existing mature trees which have taken so very many years to grow. And that includes protection of this superb, healthy, mature tree in front of the Cripplegate building at No. 1 Golden Lane.

Please leave the tree alone!!!!

Many thanks

Diana Lamb
236 Ben Jonson House.

Comments for Planning Application 22/00203/LBC

Application Summary

Application Number: 22/00203/LBC

Address: Cripplegate House 1 Golden Lane London EC1Y 0RR

Proposal: Alteration and extension of the existing office building (Class Eg(i)) incorporating a local community/cultural space (Class Eg(i)/F2) at ground floor; to include additional floorspace through upward and infill extensions; altered and additional entrances; creation of office amenity terraces and plant enclosures; facade alterations including urban greening; new landscaping; and associated works.

Case Officer: Amy Williams

Customer Details

Name: Mr Nigel Smith

Address: 56 Basterfield House Golden lane estate London

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Other

Comment: I wish to object to the above proposal for the following reasons

The proposed development is 'sandwiched' between both the Barbican and the Golden Lane Estate both being Statutory Listed of Architectural importance and are in designated Conservation Areas

The City of London has a duty to protect these special characteristics

Due consideration should be given to these very special and exceptional circumstances

The proposal does not protect such areas but indeed will cause significant harm. This is contrary to the City of London's responsibilities

The architectural design of the proposal is incongruous in the extreme and harms the protected architectural characteristics of both the listed Barbican Estate and the listed Golden Lane Estate

It is an ugly, overdeveloped and inappropriate design

It is unwarranted overdevelopment

Its construction would result in a significant loss of sunlight and sky view for Barbican & Golden Lane residents

There will be increased traffic due to servicing / refuse collection causing environmental harm (and quality of life) to adjacent residential units

Unpleasant change to the architectural/historical heritage of the area giving rise to an unfortunate precedent for inflicting further harm on adjacent ILsted residential estates and established Conservation Areas

Further harm by the proposed removal and extreme pruning of two historic trees on south-east corner of Golden Lane Estate

I urge you to give proper consideration to the above arguments and reject this application

Nigel Smith

Chartered Surveyor & Chartered Architect

MSc Dip(Arch) FRICS RIBA

Comments for Planning Application 22/00203/LBC

Application Summary

Application Number: 22/00203/LBC

Address: Cripplegate House 1 Golden Lane London EC1Y 0RR

Proposal: Alteration and extension of the existing office building (Class Eg(i)) incorporating a local community/cultural space (Class Eg(i)/F2) at ground floor; to include additional floorspace through upward and infill extensions; altered and additional entrances; creation of office amenity terraces and plant enclosures; facade alterations including urban greening; new landscaping; and associated works.

Case Officer: Amy Williams

Customer Details

Name: Mr Julian Burgess

Address: 208 Bryer Court Barbican London

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Other

Comment: I don't think the front should be altered and the extra floors are too high.

Comments for Planning Application 22/00203/LBC

Application Summary

Application Number: 22/00203/LBC

Address: Cripplegate House 1 Golden Lane London EC1Y 0RR

Proposal: Alteration and extension of the existing office building (Class Eg(i)) incorporating a local community/cultural space (Class Eg(i)/F2) at ground floor; to include additional floorspace through upward and infill extensions; altered and additional entrances; creation of office amenity terraces and plant enclosures; facade alterations including urban greening; new landscaping; and associated works.

Case Officer: Amy Williams

Customer Details

Name: Mr Jacques Parry

Address: 110 Breton House Barbican London

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Noise
- Other
- Residential Amenity
- Traffic or Highways

Comment: I live directly opposite the site and I object to the application on the grounds set out in the Barbican Association's letter of 26 April. In particular, the proposed increase in height would block much of what little sky is still visible from my flat since the erection of the Denizen. The proposed changes to the listed frontage, and the destruction/mutilation of the trees in front, would be sheer vandalism.

Begum, Shupi

From: Jacques Parry [REDACTED]
Sent: 26 September 2022 16:26
To: PLN - Comments
Subject: Re: Representation Acknowledgement (22/00203/LBC)

THIS IS AN EXTERNAL EMAIL

Dear Ms Williams,

Thank you for your letter. Please treat my original objections as applying equally to the revised application.

Thank you.

Jacques Parry

> On 26 Sep 2022, at 12:37, <PLNComments@cityoflondon.gov.uk> <PLNComments@cityoflondon.gov.uk> wrote:

>

> Dear Sir/Madam

>

> Please see attached acknowledgement of your representation made on planning application 22/00203/LBC (Cripplegate House 1 Golden Lane London EC1Y 0RR).

>

> Kind Regards

>

> Planning Administration

> Environment Department

> City of London

> THIS E-MAIL AND ANY ATTACHED FILES ARE CONFIDENTIAL AND MAY BE LEGALLY PRIVILEGED. If you are not the addressee, any disclosure, reproduction, copying, distribution or other dissemination or use of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you have received this transmission in error please notify the sender immediately and then delete this e-mail. Opinions, advice or facts included in this message are given without any warranties or intention to enter into a contractual relationship with the City of London unless specifically indicated otherwise by agreement, letter or facsimile signed by a City of London authorised signatory. Any part of this e-mail which is purely personal in nature is not authorised by the City of London. All e-mail through the City of London's gateway is potentially the subject of monitoring. All liability for errors and viruses is excluded. Please note that in so far as the City of London falls within the scope of the Freedom of Information Act 2000 or the Environmental Information Regulations 2004, it may need to disclose this e-mail. Website:

<https://gbr01.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.cityoflondon.gov.uk%2F&data=05%7C01%7CPLNComments%40cityoflondon.gov.uk%7C36db5c5d43d24bbd7c8708da9fd37e11%7C9fe658cdb3cd405685193222ffa96be8%7C0%7C0%7C637998027949221448%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWljojMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzliLCJBTiI6Ik1haWwiLCJXVCI6Mn0%3D%7C1000%7C%7C%7C&sdata=NhlZt276tnUnuWCgRfKI%2Bvp26TPMPrbwqLv2gZ%2FRriY%3D&reserved=0>

> <ufm10_Neighbour_Acknowledgement_Email.pdf>

Comments for Planning Application 22/00203/LBC

Application Summary

Application Number: 22/00203/LBC

Address: Cripplegate House 1 Golden Lane London EC1Y 0RR

Proposal: Alteration and extension of the existing office building (Class Eg(i)) incorporating a local community/cultural space (Class Eg(i)/F2) at ground floor; to include additional floorspace through upward and infill extensions; altered and additional entrances; creation of office amenity terraces and plant enclosures; facade alterations including urban greening; new landscaping; and associated works.

Case Officer: Amy Williams

Customer Details

Name: Mr Paul Singh

Address: 40 Breton House Barbican London

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of the Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Other
- Residential Amenity

Comment: The proposed redevelopment adversely affects the character, appearance and amenities of the neighbouring buildings and the surrounding area.

It will result in a significant loss of sunlight and sky view for both Barbican and Golden Lane residents. In addition, the proposed removal/pruning of two historic trees on south-east corner of Golden Lane Estate adds insult to this injury.

From the proposals, I do not see a genuine and relevant public benefit and benefit to the local community to justify the adverse effects caused by the redevelopment. I therefore question the effectiveness of the consultation process in getting to the bottom of what the area actually needs.

Comments for Planning Application 22/00203/LBC

Application Summary

Application Number: 22/00203/LBC

Address: Cripplegate House 1 Golden Lane London EC1Y 0RR

Proposal: Alteration and extension of the existing office building (Class Eg(i)) incorporating a local community/cultural space (Class Eg(i)/F2) at ground floor; to include additional floorspace through upward and infill extensions; altered and additional entrances; creation of office amenity terraces and plant enclosures; facade alterations including urban greening; new landscaping; and associated works.

Case Officer: Amy Williams

Customer Details

Name: Mrs Alison Hope

Address: 107 Breton House Barbican London

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Noise
- Other
- Residential Amenity

Comment: I would like to object:

The height and bulk of the building will cause loss of light and amenity

The terraces will cause disturbance, overlooking and loss of privacy - some of these terraces are a literal stone's throw from peoples' bedroom windows

The proposal isn't even a good reflection of the council's own planning policies

It makes a mockery of the existing listed elements of the building

Proposals for rubbish collections and provision of services will have unacceptable levels of noise

It's a purely speculative proposal. There is no real evidence that there is a need for this type of office space in this location. That's pretty shocking considering what residents are being asked to sacrifice in terms of their amenity

There is limited green space in the City as it is, so please leave the existing trees alone!!

Fortune Street park, which serves many local children and is the entrance to the nearby school will suffer loss of light.

From: [Williams, Amy](#)
To: [PLN - Comments](#)
Subject: FW: 1 Golden Lane
Date: 05 May 2022 13:35:59

-----Original Message-----

From: Michael Callow [REDACTED]
Sent: 05 May 2022 13:35
To: Williams, Amy <Amy.Williams@cityoflondon.gov.uk>
Subject: 1 Golden Lane

THIS IS AN EXTERNAL EMAIL

As a local resident I would like to express my dismay and object to the size of this proposed development. It is truly shocking in light of the surrounding residential developments.

The design appears to pay no respect to both the facade of the cripplegate building or the surrounding grade II listed Barbican.

Regards
Michael Callow
161Lauderdale Tower

Sent from my iPhone

From: [REDACTED]
To: [PLN - Comments: Williams, Amy](#)
Subject: 1 Golden Lane, EC2Y8AH (22/00202/FULMAJ and 22/00202/LBC)
Date: 05 May 2022 14:09:25

THIS IS AN EXTERNAL EMAIL

Dear Sir or Madam,

I would like to object to the existing plans for development of Cripplegate House, 1 Golden Lane, EC2Y8AH (22/00202/FULMAJ and 22/00202/LBC) on the following bases:

- 1. Privacy (terraces):** The application states that the proposed terraces have been placed above neighbouring buildings. However, from the images provided of the floorplan, the proposed South Elevation and photographs provided in the Townscape, Visual Impact and Heritage Assessment it appears that the terrace on the 8th floor south elevation will face into homes in Ben Jonson House (bedrooms, kitchens, dining rooms (often used as homeworking areas)). While the location of the 8th floor terrace is not clear from the plan "Long section BB", which shows the face of the development into Ben Jonson House before the terrace starts, it is clear from that plan that the 8th floor of the proposed development faces into Ben Jonson House, and is not above it. The direct overlook can (just) be understood from the images on page 10 of the Landscape Statement (with the southern part of the terrace seen on page 21). From this, the proposed 8th floor terrace appears to face into my home, and into the homes above and around my flat leading to a significant loss of privacy. The 10th floor terrace would also overlook Ben Jonson House in a way which makes it difficult to understand how the privacy of residents can be preserved. I do not have any confidence that the measures proposed, including 'greening', would be successful in preventing individuals on the terrace from (quite naturally) looking out and down into adjoining homes; there is no planning condition which can prevent people looking around as they stand outside. Further, 1 Golden Lane is surrounded by public outdoor space which can be used by the tenants, including Fortune Street park (directly opposite), the public areas of the Barbican and Charterhouse Square. It is therefore unclear why the proposed terraces, with associated loss of privacy for residents and noise nuisance (as below), are considered either appropriate or necessary. The strong objection of local stakeholders to the inclusion of outdoor terraces in this development was made clear during the consultation period.
- 2. Noise (terraces):** The proposed terraces would lead to an increase in noise directly opposite residential properties in a wholly residential area. Other than temporary construction noise, the surrounding area is generally quiet with only a little background noise. This can be seen from the noise survey. The proposed terraces would, inevitably, be used for socialising which would lead to noise nuisance to the surrounding properties (in addition to the concerns in relation to privacy set out above). I do not believe that a planning condition would be an acceptable control given the proximity of the proposed terraces to the kitchens, dining rooms and bedrooms of adjacent homes, which are used by residents throughout the day.
- 3. Privacy (glazing):** The replacement glazing proposed for the west end of the redevelopment appears wider and longer than the existing glazing, leading to a loss of privacy for homes into which the windows face. This is recognised by the developers themselves in their plan for encouraging cycling which refers to "*significant passive surveillance*" from lower floor windows onto Cripplegate Street. From the drawing provided it is not clear that the 'green veil' proposed for the centre of the building will extend to the west end of the building.

4. **Sunlight:** I believe the proposed development would reduce sunlight to my home, in particular my kitchen / homeworking area, although I cannot tell in what degree because it is impossible to tell from the report provided to which flat the reductions in sunlight calculated apply. I also note that the sunlight reading was taken at midday and in relation to direct sunlight, when the majority of sunlight blocked by the new development to properties to the east would, in fact, be enjoyed towards the afternoon and evening.
5. **Environment and listed buildings:** 1 Golden Lane is a listed building and the addition made to it, while maybe not as fashionable now, is listed and, at least in mass and materials, relatively sympathetic to the preserved building. The increased mass of the proposed development dominates the original facade of the building. Further, 1 Golden Lane sits next to the Barbican and Golden Lane Estate, both of which are listed and of great architectural significance. The proposed development should be considered in the context of the preservation of these listed estates, including avoiding the estates being placed in a 'canyon' of larger, dominating buildings. No clear explanation is given in the Visual Impact Heritage Assessment as to why it is believed that the extension will "*enhance the setting of the Barbican RPGSHI*" when from a number of the pictures provided the extended mass of the development appears to loom over the Barbican and surrounding areas. I also object to any aggressive pruning of the lime tree and hazel tree on Golden Lane, which gives significant amenity to the large number of local residents who enjoy a view of it and the passing community in general.
6. **Waste management:** The current proposals for waste management involve both full and empty bins being dragged along Viscount Street and into a newly built temporary bin store on Cripplegate Street on a daily basis. This will, again, cause noise nuisance for local residents and businesses together with the more general loss of amenity associated with a bin store being built directly below a number of homes.

On the basis of the above I ask that you reject this proposal.

Yours faithfully,

E Deas
307 Ben Jonson House, EC2Y 8NQ

From: [REDACTED]
To: [PLN - Comments; Williams, Amy](#)
Subject: Re: 1 Golden Lane, EC2Y8AH (22/00202/FULMAJ and 22/00202/LBC)
Date: 04 October 2022 23:33:42

THIS IS AN EXTERNAL EMAIL

Dear Sir or Madam,

I previously objected to 22/00202/FULMAJ and 22/00202/LB as below. The revised plans do not meaningfully address these objections, which are therefore repeated. I request that the applications be refused.

Yours faithfully,

E Deas
307 Ben Jonson House

Dear Sir or Madam,

I would like to object to the existing plans for development of Cripplegate House, 1 Golden Lane, EC2Y8AH (22/00202/FULMAJ and 22/00202/LBC) on the following bases:

- **Privacy (terraces):** The application states that the proposed terraces have been placed above neighbouring buildings. However, from the images provided of the floorplan, the proposed South Elevation and photographs provided in the Townscape, Visual Impact and Heritage Assessment it appears that the terrace on the 8th floor south elevation will face into homes in Ben Jonson House (bedrooms, kitchens, dining rooms (often used as homeworking areas)). While the location of the 8th floor terrace is not clear from the plan "Long section BB", which shows the face of the development into Ben Jonson House before the terrace starts, it is clear from that plan that the 8th floor of the proposed development faces into Ben Jonson House, and is not above it. The direct overlook can (just) be understood from the images on page 10 of the Landscape Statement (with the southern part of the terrace seen on page 21). From this, the proposed 8th floor terrace appears to face into my home, and into the homes above and around my flat leading to a significant loss of privacy. The 10th floor terrace would also overlook Ben Jonson House in a way which makes it difficult to understand how the privacy of residents can be preserved. I do not have any confidence that the measures proposed, including 'greening', would be successful in preventing individuals on the terrace from (quite naturally) looking out and down into adjoining homes; there is no planning condition which can prevent people looking around as they stand outside. Further, 1 Golden Lane is surrounded by public outdoor space which can be used by the tenants, including Fortune Street park (directly opposite), the public areas of the Barbican and Charterhouse Square. It is therefore unclear why the proposed terraces, with associated loss of privacy for residents and noise nuisance (as below), are considered either appropriate or necessary. The strong objection of local stakeholders to the inclusion of outdoor terraces in this development was made clear during the consultation period.
- **Noise (terraces):** The proposed terraces would lead to an increase in noise directly opposite residential properties in a wholly residential area. Other than temporary construction noise, the surrounding area is generally quiet with only a little background noise. This can be seen from the noise survey. The proposed terraces would, inevitably, be used for socialising which would lead to noise nuisance to the surrounding properties (in

addition to the concerns in relation to privacy set out above). I do not believe that a planning condition would be an acceptable control given the proximity of the proposed terraces to the kitchens, dining rooms and bedrooms of adjacent homes, which are used by residents throughout the day.

• **Privacy (glazing):** The replacement glazing proposed for the west end of the redevelopment appears wider and longer than the existing glazing, leading to a loss of privacy for homes into which the windows face. This is recognised by the developers themselves in their plan for encouraging cycling which refers to "*significant passive surveillance*" from lower floor windows onto Cripplegate Street. From the drawings provided it is not clear that the 'green veil' proposed for the centre of the building will extend to the west end of the building.

1. **Sunlight:** I believe the proposed development would reduce sunlight to my home, in particular my kitchen / homeworking area, although I cannot tell in what degree because it is impossible to tell from the report provided to which flat the reductions in sunlight calculated apply. I also note that the sunlight reading was taken at midday and in relation to direct sunlight, when the majority of sunlight blocked by the new development to properties to the east would, in fact, be enjoyed towards the afternoon and evening.
2. **Environment and listed buildings:** 1 Golden Lane is a listed building and the addition made to it, while maybe not as fashionable now, is listed and, at least in mass and materials, relatively sympathetic to the preserved building. The increased mass of the proposed development dominates the original facade of the building. Further, 1 Golden Lane sits next to the Barbican and Golden Lane Estate, both of which are listed and of great architectural significance. The proposed development should be considered in the context of the preservation of these listed estates, including avoiding the estates being placed in a 'canyon' of larger, dominating buildings. No clear explanation is given in the Visual Impact Heritage Assessment as to why it is believed that the extension will "*enhance the setting of the Barbican RPGSHI*" when from a number of the pictures provided the extended mass of the development appears to loom over the Barbican and surrounding areas. I also object to any aggressive pruning of the lime tree and hazel tree on Golden Lane, which gives significant amenity to the large number of local residents who enjoy a view of it and the passing community in general.
3. **Waste management:** The current proposals for waste management involve both full and empty bins being dragged along Viscount Street and into a newly built temporary bin store on Cripplegate Street on a daily basis. This will, again, cause noise nuisance for local residents and businesses together with the more general loss of amenity associated with a bin store being built directly below a number of homes.

On the basis of the above I ask that you reject this proposal.

Yours faithfully,

E Deas
307 Ben Jonson House, EC2Y 8NQ

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Williams, Amy](#)
Subject: 1 Golden Lane objection
Date: 06 May 2022 10:50:28

Dear Amy,

I have objected to the 1 Golden Lane development through the portal. I understand that there are 2 applications for this scheme. Could you consider my objection as regarding both applications?

Many thanks.

Kind regards,

Liz King



Elizabeth King
Cripplegate Ward
City of London | Guildhall | London EC2V 7HH

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

From: [Williams, Amy](#)
To: [PLN - Comments](#)
Subject: FW: Comments for Planning Application 22/00202/FULMAJ
Date: 06 May 2022 15:02:21
Attachments:

From: PlnComments@cityoflondon.gov.uk <PlnComments@cityoflondon.gov.uk>

Sent: 06 May 2022 09:45

To: Williams, Amy <Amy.Williams@cityoflondon.gov.uk>

Subject: Comments for Planning Application 22/00202/FULMAJ

Planning Application comments have been made. A summary of the comments is provided below.

Comments were submitted at 9:44 AM on 06 May 2022 from Ms Elizabeth King.

Application Summary

Address: Cripplegate House 1 Golden Lane London EC1Y 0RR
Alteration and extension of the existing office building (Class Eg(i)) incorporating a local community/cultural space (Class Eg(i)/F2) at ground floor; to include additional floorspace through upward and infill extensions;

Proposal: altered and additional entrances; creation of office amenity terraces and plant enclosures; facade alterations including urban greening; new landscaping; and associated works. |cr|

Case Officer: Amy Williams

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Name: Ms Elizabeth King
Email: [REDACTED]
Address: Flat 202, Seddon House, Barbican Barbican London

Comments Details

Commenter Type: Councillor/Ward Member

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Reasons for comment:
- Other
- Residential Amenity

Comments: Having read the developer's consultation documents I am at a loss to see any 'genuine public benefit' or 'meaningful feedback' in this scheme. The bulk, height and massing are unacceptable, the terraces are inappropriate for a building completely surrounded by residential buildings. The amplification of speaking voices in this particular setting will be pronounced regardless of the mitigations currently proposed.

The 'greening' is at odds with the vandalism proposed for street level existing trees.

The loss of light, and with it 'solar gain' heating benefits for adjacent flats is particularly egregious at this time of energy price hikes,

The consultation commentary refers to a split of opinion re: the 'workspace', but in the accompanying data on replies, there seems to be virtually no desire for this 'benefit'. Therefore I am very concerned about the quality of the consultation process and how it has been used to inform this project, and therefore the entire scheme.

A listed building, situated between listed buildings must be deserving of a better, and more appropriate, scheme.

From: [Williams, Amy](#)
To: [PLN - Comments](#)
Subject: FW: Please protect our tree
Date: 05 May 2022 14:26:43

-----Original Message-----

From: Sid Wood [REDACTED]
Sent: 05 May 2022 10:20
To: Williams, Amy <Amy.Williams@cityoflondon.gov.uk>
Subject: Please protect our tree

THIS IS AN EXTERNAL EMAIL

Dear Ms Williams,

I'm writing to object to the proposed pruning of the tree located in front of 1 Golden Lane and Ben Jonson House. That tree provides wonderful shade in summer and looks so lovely in autumn it would be a shame if it was tampered with. Please, do not allow the developer to butcher our tree.

Kind regards,

Sidney Wood
527 Ben Jonson House

From: [Williams, Amy](#)
To: [PLN - Comments](#)
Subject: FW: Planning Application to reduce canopy of tree outside 1 Golden Lane EC1
Date: 05 May 2022 14:27:30

From: peter.berry.film50 [REDACTED]
Sent: 05 May 2022 09:06
To: Williams, Amy <Amy.Williams@cityoflondon.gov.uk>
Subject: Re: Planning Application to reduce canopy of tree outside 1 Golden Lane EC1

THIS IS AN EXTERNAL EMAIL

Dear Amy Williams

Re: Planning Application to reduce canopy of tree outside 1 Golden Lane EC1

Please can you help stop the destruction of this beautiful tree. Removal of a significant amount of its canopy, especially at this time of year, will cause great harm and stress to the tree. In a time when we should all be doing as much as we can to improve the quality of our air the decimation of its foliage is ill thought out. I understand cutting back the tree will be to the advantage of the developers but it will be at the expense of the entire neighbourhood. A neighbourhood that it desperate for more trees and a greater canopy.

Please acknowledge receipt of this objection.

Yours sincerely.

P.J. Berry

352, Shakespeare Tower, Barbican, EC2Y 8NJ.

Comments for Planning Application 22/00203/LBC

Application Summary

Application Number: 22/00203/LBC

Address: Cripplegate House 1 Golden Lane London EC1Y 0RR

Proposal: Alteration and extension of the existing office building (Class Eg(i)) incorporating a local community/cultural space (Class Eg(i)/F2) at ground floor; to include additional floorspace through upward and infill extensions; altered and additional entrances; creation of office amenity terraces and plant enclosures; facade alterations including urban greening; new landscaping; and associated works.

Case Officer: Amy Williams

Customer Details

Name: Mr Andrew Hope

Address: 107 Breton House Barbican London

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Noise
- Other
- Residential Amenity

Comment: I object to this planning application on the grounds that:

The height and mass of the proposal is not in character with the listed aspects of the building, will cause material loss of residential amenity and will substantially reduce daylight to Fortune Street Park.

Loss of light to residents.

Noise disturbance and loss of privacy will be caused to residents by the external terraces.

There is currently no incentive or requirement for the terraces to be maintained in such a way as to provide the promised protections from loss of privacy and noise disturbance.

It is not compliant with the corporation's own planning policies.

Proposed changes to the listed features of the building are not respectful of the listing and are actually unnecessary to achieve the developer's overall objectives.

Reduction of the existing trees will reduce amenity for the public by browning what is currently a relatively green space for this area

Services and rubbish collection proposals will generate substantial noise which will reduce the quality of life and mental health of impacted residents.

In summary, this proposal shows extremely limited respect for the amenity of its neighbours and the refusal of the consultation process to consider any of the feedback provided is borderline bad faith.

From: [Williams, Amy](#)
To: [PLN - Comments](#)
Subject: OBJECTION TO LODGE 22/00202/FULMAJ AND 22/00203/LBC FW: Cripplegate House, 1 Golden Lane
Date: 08 June 2022 12:36:08
Attachments: [image001.png](#)

From: Bev Bytheway
Sent: 26 April 2022 17:34
To: Williams, Amy <Amy.Williams@cityoflondon.gov.uk>
Subject: Cripplegate House, 1 Golden Lane

THIS IS AN EXTERNAL EMAIL

I am writing to register my objection to the proposed redevelopment of Cripplegate House, No 1 Golden Lane

I object to the proposed tree works, which seem entirely unnecessary.

The Silver Lime is a beautifully shaped tree and a vital source of shade and nectar for pollinators. The trees are positioned along Golden Lane and are not part of the footprint of the Cripplegate Building. They should be left alone to perform their remarkable functions in supporting wildlife and cleaning pollutants from the air.

Valuable trees have already been lost by recent developments along Golden Lane. Both the Denizen and the COLPAI developments have resulted in the felling of existing mature trees. There has been a substantial loss of habitat already, which has not been replaced by the low priority green space of these developments. In fact the new residential tower of the COLPAI development has no green or outside space at all. This is also a Hawkins\Brown project.

The loss of mature trees is an irresponsible and negligent act, given the current Climate crisis and the growing intelligence around the vital importance of trees to the urban environment.

The City of London is committed to Carbon-zero targets and is in the process of publishing its own bio-diversity action plan, so this proposal to edit trees seems to go against everyone's better judgement.

I find it strange that the new Denizen building next to Cripplegate House has taken its design references from Cripplegate House, especially in the tiering of the upper floors to match. I think this was a condition of the then planning process. So again, it makes nonsense of the process, now that the Hawkins/Brown proposal aims to raise the upper levels of the building and pay little respect to its neighbour.

It is a pity that all of these new developments concentrated along Golden Lane have paid little respect to the public amenity of the Golden Lane Street. Each project has its own rationale, which makes no reference to its neighbours. I sincerely hope that the development of Cripplegate House will not be allowed to blight the street further by the removal and severe pruning of any trees.

Bev Bytheway

Golden Lane Estate

3 Basterfield House

From: [Williams, Amy](#)
To: [PLN - Comments](#)
Subject: OBJECTION TO LODGE 22/00202/FULMAJ AND 22/00203/LBC FW: Objection to Planning Application re: Tree outside 1 Golden Lane EC1
Date: 08 June 2022 12:40:14
Attachments: [image001.png](#)

From: margaret king
Sent: 03 May 2022 16:40
To: Williams, Amy <Amy.Williams@cityoflondon.gov.uk>
Subject: Objection to Planning Application re: Tree outside 1 Golden Lane EC1

THIS IS AN EXTERNAL EMAIL

Dear Amy Williams

Re: Planning Application to reduce canopy of tree outside 1 Golden Lane EC1

I object to this application to remove a significant amount of the canopy of the beautiful tree outside 1 Golden Lane.

The tree is adjacent to the Barbican and Golden Lane conservation area. Surely this warrants it some protection from the developers of the historically significant Cripplegate Institute. The tree canopy is several metres away from the front of the Cripplegate Institute, so it seems unnecessary to decimate the size and natural shape of this healthy tree. It has enormous amenity value for this very urban corner, greatly enhancing the pleasantness of the area. It adds to the bio-diversity of this area, important to the city of london, and is part of the fragile network

of urban green spaces stretching through the Barbican estate and wildlife garden and Fortune Street Park. Lastly it also helps with air quality, which is particularly important as it is so close to the disabled entrance to the primary school opposite.

I would be grateful for your acknowledgement of receipt of this objection.

Many thanks

Kind regards

Margaret King, 352 Shakespeare Tower, EC2Y 8NJ

•

Comments for Planning Application 22/00203/LBC

Application Summary

Application Number: 22/00203/LBC

Address: Cripplegate House 1 Golden Lane London EC1Y 0RR

Proposal: Alteration and extension of the existing office building (Class Eg(i)) incorporating a local community/cultural space (Class Eg(i)/F2) at ground floor; to include additional floorspace through upward and infill extensions; altered and additional entrances; creation of office amenity terraces and plant enclosures; facade alterations including urban greening; new landscaping; and associated works.

Case Officer: Amy Williams

Customer Details

Name: Ms Giovanna Milia

Address: FLAT 32 BRETON HOUSE LONDON

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Noise
- Other
- Residential Amenity

Comment: I object to the current proposals on the following grounds:

-Overlooking, noise and loss of privacy:

The current proposals provide for outdoor terraces for gatherings of office users which will mean the end of peace and quiet and privacy. The promise of a prevention of outward views by screening is not persuasive and the noise level is bound to increase. With office occupancy being still low as a result of flexible working, it could be argued that the noise will be manageable.

However, the opportunity is there for parties and events, entertaining of clients and after hours drinks, which could be all the more raucous the fewer socialising opportunities there are.

There are plenty of locations nearby where office users can gather which would bring these local businesses some welcome trade.

-Loss of light: According to the proposals, there is loss of light of between 10-20% of daylight in parts of Breton House. The loss of sunlight and reduced daylight is unacceptable at any time, but under the 'new normal' flexible working patterns it will have a major detrimental impact on residents.

-Maintenance of the Skyline: when the height of the Denizen (several floors higher than the

previous Bernard Morgan House) was approved, the reasoning was that it would be aligned with 1 Golden Lane. It follows therefore that the current skyline must be maintained.

-Trees: our street trees bring colour, a habitat for bird life and insects and much needed reduction of toxic air. The proposal provides cutting back of the beautiful mature tree by the entrance of 1 Golden Lane, whose 'crime' seems to be that it hides the listed façade of the building, and even removal of another tree. The street and City needs more urban, natural self-sustaining trees and plants, not replacement pot grown greenery the long term maintenance of which is not guaranteed.

I urge the City of London to consider the physical and mental health of its residents and reject the Applicant's proposal.

Comments for Planning Application 22/00203/LBC

Application Summary

Application Number: 22/00203/LBC

Address: Cripplegate House 1 Golden Lane London EC1Y 0RR

Proposal: Alteration and extension of the existing office building (Class Eg(i)) incorporating a local community/cultural space (Class Eg(i)/F2) at ground floor; to include additional floorspace through upward and infill extensions; altered and additional entrances; creation of office amenity terraces and plant enclosures; facade alterations including urban greening; new landscaping; and associated works.

Case Officer: Amy Williams

Customer Details

Name: Mr Stephen Chapman

Address: 304 Ben Jonson House, Barbican Barbican London

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Noise
- Other
- Residential Amenity
- Traffic or Highways

Comment: I OBJECT to both Planning and Listed Building Applications 22/00202/FULMAJ and 22/00203/LBC for the following reasons

1. HEIGHT/LOSS OF LIGHT: The additional height of the proposed new building is excessive. From the lowest point of the existing roof (south facing) to the top of the new building is 20.39 m (66.89 ft). The height of the new building from the south facing ground average is 50.08 m (164.3 ft). From this perspective the height at maximum will be 76% greater than as existing. This will cause loss of light to flats in all surrounding buildings.

The looming additional height and infilling along the south side by 11 feet will be oppressive.

2 ROOF TERRACES: The proposal for so many roof terraces in a quiet residential area gives significant noise light and privacy concerns. This is especially so as the building will potentially be used 24 hours a day.

3 PLANT: Putting the plant as low as the ninth floor facing outwards towards three residential buildings gives noise concerns in a quiet residential area. The plant should go on the roof - as high

as possible.

4. BEDROOMS: All the flats in Ben Jonson House that face 1 Golden Lane have all their bedrooms facing 1 Golden Lane. Therefore there are huge concerns that there will be noise light and privacy disturbance to all these flats.

5. WINDOWS: 1 Golden Lane will have opening window facing onto Ben Jonson House. Therefore there will be consequent noise light and privacy disturbance.

6 POOR DESIGN/SPECULATION: The new building is disproportionately large and in my opinion ugly and lacking cohesiveness with the listed heritage part of the building. The developers have admitted (on Zoom) the development is purely speculative and not for any specific end user. What appears to me to be over development of this site will be at the expense of the use and enjoyment of many flats in this residential area.

Accordingly I would strongly request and urge you to reject these applications in their existing form.

Comments for Planning Application 22/00203/LBC

Application Summary

Application Number: 22/00203/LBC

Address: Cripplegate House 1 Golden Lane London EC1Y 0RR

Proposal: Alteration and extension of the existing office building (Class Eg(i)) incorporating a local community/cultural space (Class Eg(i)/F2) at ground floor; to include additional floorspace through upward and infill extensions; altered and additional entrances; creation of office amenity terraces and plant enclosures; facade alterations including urban greening; new landscaping; and associated works.

Case Officer: Amy Williams

Customer Details

Name: Ms Jane Hill

Address: The Cottage 36a Highgate High Street London

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of the Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Residential Amenity

Comment: I object on multiple counts all of which contribute to the impoverishment of our urban environment. We desperately need trees. It will be desolation without them.

Comments for Planning Application 22/00203/LBC

Application Summary

Application Number: 22/00203/LBC

Address: Cripplegate House 1 Golden Lane London EC1Y 0RR

Proposal: Alteration and extension of the existing office building (Class Eg(i)) incorporating a local community/cultural space (Class Eg(i)/F2) at ground floor; to include additional floorspace through upward and infill extensions; altered and additional entrances; creation of office amenity terraces and plant enclosures; facade alterations including urban greening; new landscaping; and associated works.

Case Officer: Amy Williams

Customer Details

Name: Mr Steven Wilson

Address: 111 Blake Tower 2 Fann Street London

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Other

Comment: The proposal with 3 extra floors in height will result in a building out of proportion to the surrounding buildings meaning that the urban sky view will be spoiled and the City will look uglier.

The change in shape of the building is radical from the existing shape and colour and there is no need to do so to make the renovation.

Comments for Planning Application 22/00203/LBC

Application Summary

Application Number: 22/00203/LBC

Address: Cripplegate House 1 Golden Lane London EC1Y 0RR

Proposal: Alteration and extension of the existing office building (Class Eg(i)) incorporating a local community/cultural space (Class Eg(i)/F2) at ground floor; to include additional floorspace through upward and infill extensions; altered and additional entrances; creation of office amenity terraces and plant enclosures; facade alterations including urban greening; new landscaping; and associated works [RECONSULTATION DUE TO REVISED DESIGN AND LANDSCAPING PROPOSALS]. |cr|

Case Officer: Amy Williams

Customer Details

Name: Mrs Jo Crighton

Address: 562 Ben Jonson House Barbican London

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Other

Comment: I struggled to process all the documents provided but feel the development proposed is inappropriate bearing in mind the very close proximity to a listed Estate and it being too high and unsympathetic to its environs.

Begum, Shupi

From: Linda Stubbs [REDACTED]
Sent: 27 September 2022 10:10
To: PLN - Comments
Subject: 2200202/FULMAJ and the 22/00203/ LBC

THIS IS AN EXTERNAL EMAIL

As the intention to insert new doors in a listed facade still stands I repeat my original objection and request that the applications be refused.
Linda Stubbs

Sent from my iPad

Begum, Shupi

From: Hazel Brothers [REDACTED]
Sent: 25 September 2022 14:43
To: PLN - Comments
Subject: No.1 Golden Lane

THIS IS AN EXTERNAL EMAIL

Dear Miss Williams

22/00202/FULMAJ and 22/00203/LBC

The revised plans show that the developers still intend to insert new doors into the listed facade. Public seating outside is likely to cause night time noise for local residents. I therefore repeat my original objection and ask for the applications to be refused.

Hazel Brothers
86 Breton House
Barbican
EC2Y 8PQ

Comments for Planning Application 22/00203/LBC

Application Summary

Application Number: 22/00203/LBC

Address: Cripplegate House 1 Golden Lane London EC1Y 0RR

Proposal: Alteration and extension of the existing office building (Class Eg(i)) incorporating a local community/cultural space (Class Eg(i)/F2) at ground floor; to include additional floorspace through upward and infill extensions (+2485sqm GIA uplift); altered and additional entrances; creation of office amenity terraces and plant enclosures; facade alterations including urban greening; new landscaping; and associated works [RECONSULTATION DUE TO REVISED DESIGN AND LANDSCAPING PROPOSALS]. |cr|

Case Officer: Amy Williams

Customer Details

Name: Dr Ben Fenby

Address: 45 Andrewes House London

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of the Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: Local area already heavily overbuilt; developer have take little real notice to respond to residents' concerns as reflected in minimal changes to proposal; does not comply with local authority guidance by developer's own admission (although they describe this as 'acceptable' for reasons unclear.)

Given current climate emergency priority should be give to refit and refurb of existing structures not new developments. A large quantity of empty office space already exists which could be repurposed with any change to existing numbers buildings, light etc.

Comments for Planning Application 22/00203/LBC

Application Summary

Application Number: 22/00203/LBC

Address: Cripplegate House 1 Golden Lane London EC1Y 0RR

Proposal: Alteration and extension of the existing office building (Class Eg(i)) incorporating a local community/cultural space (Class Eg(i)/F2) at ground floor; to include additional floorspace through upward and infill extensions (+2485sqm GIA uplift); altered and additional entrances; creation of office amenity terraces and plant enclosures; facade alterations including urban greening; new landscaping; and associated works [RECONSULTATION DUE TO REVISED DESIGN AND LANDSCAPING PROPOSALS]. |cr|

Case Officer: Amy Williams

Customer Details

Name: Mr Michael Meade

Address: 59 Breton House London

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Noise
- Other
- Residential Amenity
- Traffic or Highways

Comment: The west-facing studio flats in Breton are singularly exposed to this proposed re-development.

They face directly onto 1 Golden Lane; there is no other outlook for these flats than that onto Golden Lane. This means that there would be no escape from noise disturbance opposite and below.

I strongly disagree with the developer's assertion that there is no significant harm caused to amenities of light and sun.

The benefit for the developer of adding height to the building is outweighed by the prejudice it would cause.

It would certainly take light and sky away from residents; it would not respect the height of the adjoining Denizen building.

The extra floors on the building would detract from the Victorian aspect of the current 1 Golden Lane building - which despite the 2 mansard floors still retains its pleasing character.

In terms of noise - there will inevitably be an increase in footfall and traffic noise with the expansion of the premises. This will be compounded by the unacceptable plans for the refuse area.

If the developers are planning to have a roof terrace, then this would surely be unacceptable to neighbouring residents in Ben Jonson, Breton House and the Denizen.

the use of the proposed roof terrace would very likely cause noise disturbance, as well as a serious loss of privacy; and is probable to occur outside of office hours too.

It is a recipe for un-ending complaints of noise disturbance.

I would urge the City to review the plans.

All too often these consultations feel like a sham process, where councils go through the motions of listening, to then take no account of what the residents say (council tax payers and human assets to the community).

It is profoundly un-democratic - the City of London is not alone in this approach, alas.

But surely the Corporation should be setting an example of local democracy, by genuinely taking the views of its human constituents into account.

From: [REDACTED]
To: [PLN - Comments](#)
Subject: Re application22/00202/FULMAJ and 22/00203/LBC.
Date: 29 September 2022 18:34:56

THIS IS AN EXTERNAL EMAIL

I have seen the revision to these applications and do not change my comments as submitted regarding earlier applications for this redevelopment. Ann Black

Comments for Planning Application 22/00203/LBC

Application Summary

Application Number: 22/00203/LBC

Address: Cripplegate House 1 Golden Lane London EC1Y 0RR

Proposal: Alteration and extension of the existing office building (Class Eg(i)) incorporating a local community/cultural space (Class Eg(i)/F2) at ground floor; to include additional floorspace through upward and infill extensions (+2485sqm GIA uplift); altered and additional entrances; creation of office amenity terraces and plant enclosures; facade alterations including urban greening; new landscaping; and associated works [RECONSULTATION DUE TO REVISED DESIGN AND LANDSCAPING PROPOSALS]. |cr|

Case Officer: Amy Williams

Customer Details

Name: Ms Sara Marley

Address: Flat 266 Ben Jonson House London

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Residential Amenity

Comment: The proposed height, bulk and massing as well as overlooking and loss of sun/daylight will negatively impact local residents. I also object to interventions into the listed facade.

Comments for Planning Application 22/00203/LBC

Application Summary

Application Number: 22/00203/LBC

Address: Cripplegate House 1 Golden Lane London EC1Y 0RR

Proposal: Alteration and extension of the existing office building (Class Eg(i)) incorporating a local community/cultural space (Class Eg(i)/F2) at ground floor; to include additional floorspace through upward and infill extensions (+2485sqm GIA uplift); altered and additional entrances; creation of office amenity terraces and plant enclosures; facade alterations including urban greening; new landscaping; and associated works [RECONSULTATION DUE TO REVISED DESIGN AND LANDSCAPING PROPOSALS]. |cr|

Case Officer: Amy Williams

Customer Details

Name: Ms Sarah Hudson

Address: Flat 192, Shakespeare Tower Barbican London

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Other

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Other

Comment: I am submitting this objection on behalf of Friends of City Gardens (FoCG), a community group working with the City's gardens team to enhance public gardens and improve biodiversity in the square mile. We have 180 members and contribute over 4,000 hours of volunteer time each year. Nearly 500 individuals volunteer with us every year, including City workers and residents of the City and surrounding boroughs.

1. We are not reassured that the works to the street tree (silver lime) in Golden Lane will only be minor pruning. We are sceptical that the developer and its contractors will restrict the intervention to minor light pruning as shown on the amended arboricultural report. These trees are public assets in the public domain and no works should be conducted unless under the express control and supervision of the City Gardens department. The results of trusting contractors with this work are plain to see on the butchered lime tree next to the Denizen entrance. To expect anything different in this case, when the contractor has already expressed the desire to 'open up' the façade to One Golden Lane, is naïve.

2. The attempt to include the public realm planters in this scheme and demolish the well designed and highly functional brick planters containing a good selection of proven biodiverse plants is not sustainable and should be refused. The developer seeks to install unsustainable planting in deep shade beneath the street trees. This will result in the City Gardens department being expected to

maintain an expensive and unsustainable scheme from the public purse. This is not acceptable.

Comments for Planning Application 22/00203/LBC

Application Summary

Application Number: 22/00203/LBC

Address: Cripplegate House 1 Golden Lane London EC1Y 0RR

Proposal: Alteration and extension of the existing office building (Class Eg(i)) incorporating a local community/cultural space (Class Eg(i)/F2) at ground floor; to include additional floorspace through upward and infill extensions (+2485sqm GIA uplift); altered and additional entrances; creation of office amenity terraces and plant enclosures; facade alterations including urban greening; new landscaping; and associated works [RECONSULTATION DUE TO REVISED DESIGN AND LANDSCAPING PROPOSALS]. |cr|

Case Officer: Amy Williams

Customer Details

Name: Ms Sarah Hudson

Address: Flat 192, Shakespeare Tower Barbican London

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Other

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Other

Comment: I am submitting these comments on behalf of Friends of City Gardens (continued).

3. The carbon cost of removing the existing high quality pavements and the brick planters on Golden Lane - that are part of the public realm - should not be permitted. The carbon cost of replacing these assets with what appears to be inferior surfaces and street level beds has not been evaluated and this cost is unnecessary and unsustainable under the City's climate action policy.

4. Urban Greening Factor (UGF). The London Plan sets the minimum required level for this measure for major commercial developments at 0.3%. The City uses this threshold but applies a less challenging weighting in the calculation of the UGF. In this planning application, the developer has calculated the UGF as 0.277% (GLA calculation) and 0.301% (based on City's calculation). This fails the GLA threshold - and barely scrapes home on the City's more generous calculation. However, the developer here is appropriating the public realm green space i.e., the planters and street trees outside the building to inflate their UGF. If the Site Ownership boundary is used (as it should) the UGF calculation fails both the GLA threshold (0.240%) and the City's threshold (0.256%) i.e., UGF for this project is nearly 15% below the threshold set out by the City in its Local Plan.

It is disappointing that the developers are using this sleight of hand to artificially raise the UGF above the City's minimum level. We are sure, however, that City officers will not be deceived by

Comments for Planning Application 22/00203/LBC

Application Summary

Application Number: 22/00203/LBC

Address: Cripplegate House 1 Golden Lane London EC1Y 0RR

Proposal: Alteration and extension of the existing office building (Class Eg(i)) incorporating a local community/cultural space (Class Eg(i)/F2) at ground floor; to include additional floorspace through upward and infill extensions (+2485sqm GIA uplift); altered and additional entrances; creation of office amenity terraces and plant enclosures; facade alterations including urban greening; new landscaping; and associated works [RECONSULTATION DUE TO REVISED DESIGN AND LANDSCAPING PROPOSALS]. |cr|

Case Officer: Amy Williams

Customer Details

Name: Dr Cathy Ross

Address: 77, Thomas More House, Barbican Barbican London

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Residential Amenity

Comment:I object to the development on the ground of its scale, and the resulting effect on the quality of life for local residents and workers. The massive scale of the proposal will inevitably degrade the character of the townscape, reduce light, increase noise and disrespect the area's existing history and heritage assets (which in turn will reduce future potential for building tourism in and around the City). Your consultants seem to think that the area's present fragmentation and visual diversity is somehow a bad thing. Why not consider this a strength - and surely preferable to a neighbourhood squashed and overshadowed by a colossal monolithic lump.

Comments for Planning Application 22/00203/LBC

Application Summary

Application Number: 22/00203/LBC

Address: Cripplegate House 1 Golden Lane London EC1Y 0RR

Proposal: Alteration and extension of the existing office building (Class Eg(i)) incorporating a local community/cultural space (Class Eg(i)/F2) at ground floor; to include additional floorspace through upward and infill extensions (+2485sqm GIA uplift); altered and additional entrances; creation of office amenity terraces and plant enclosures; facade alterations including urban greening; new landscaping; and associated works [RECONSULTATION DUE TO REVISED DESIGN AND LANDSCAPING PROPOSALS]. |cr|

Case Officer: Amy Williams

Customer Details

Name: Ms Alison Lamb

Address: 220 Ben Jonson House Barbican London

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Noise
- Other
- Residential Amenity

Comment: I previously objected to 22/00202/FULMAJ and 22/00203/LBC.

Having seen the revised plans, they do nothing to substantially change my thoughts on the proposal.

Therefore, I repeat my objections and request that both applications are refused.

The increased mass and height of the development continue to result in significant loss of amenity, specifically (i) Loss of daylight and sunlight, including to surrounding residential buildings; and (ii) Overshadowing and overlooking.

While the current building is proportionate in height and scale with the surrounding buildings, the addition of the extra storeys will cause a substantial loss of daylight and sunlight to surrounding residential buildings, the nearby primary school and the nearby park, as well as increased light pollution. The additional storeys will dominate the surrounding residential buildings, with the floor to ceiling windows allowing for intrusion into residents' privacy, and the proposed open terraces overlooking the surrounding residential buildings resulting in loss in privacy and noise pollution.

The proposed development would also narrow the space between it and Ben Jonson House.

The development will also have a significant adverse impact on the architectural and heritage character of the area. The mass and height of the proposed development damage the architectural integrity of the listed Barbican and Golden Lane estates and the heritage of the Barbican and Golden Lane Conservation Area, and appear to be in direct contravention of the draft Local Plan 2036 with respect to residential amenity, loss of sunlight and daylight, overlooking and public realm. The existing east facade of the Cripplegate Library, which is historic and listed, would also be dwarfed and overwhelmed by the mass and height of the proposed development.

Comments for Planning Application 22/00203/LBC

Application Summary

Application Number: 22/00203/LBC

Address: Cripplegate House 1 Golden Lane London EC1Y 0RR

Proposal: Alteration and extension of the existing office building (Class Eg(i)) incorporating a local community/cultural space (Class Eg(i)/F2) at ground floor; to include additional floorspace through upward and infill extensions (+2485sqm GIA uplift); altered and additional entrances; creation of office amenity terraces and plant enclosures; facade alterations including urban greening; new landscaping; and associated works [RECONSULTATION DUE TO REVISED DESIGN AND LANDSCAPING PROPOSALS]. |cr|

Case Officer: Amy Williams

Customer Details

Name: Mr Juan Bosco Fernandez-Alava Chiclana

Address: 9 breton House, EC2Y 8DQ EC2Y 8DQ London

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Other

Comment: As a resident of 9 Breton House, directly overlooking the development, I would be extremely affected by loss of light from the proposed development. Not to mention the noise for the duration of the works.

Comments for Planning Application 22/00203/LBC

Application Summary

Application Number: 22/00203/LBC

Address: Cripplegate House 1 Golden Lane London EC1Y 0RR

Proposal: Alteration and extension of the existing office building (Class Eg(i)) incorporating a local community/cultural space (Class Eg(i)/F2) at ground floor; to include additional floorspace through upward and infill extensions (+2485sqm GIA uplift); altered and additional entrances; creation of office amenity terraces and plant enclosures; facade alterations including urban greening; new landscaping; and associated works [RECONSULTATION DUE TO REVISED DESIGN AND LANDSCAPING PROPOSALS]. |cr|

Case Officer: Amy Williams

Customer Details

Name: David Murray

Address: 7 Breton house Barbican London

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Other
- Residential Amenity

Comment: What an obscene and unnecessary desecration of a vital

Part of the urban environment - unnecessary and unwanted

Comments for Planning Application 22/00203/LBC

Application Summary

Application Number: 22/00203/LBC

Address: Cripplegate House 1 Golden Lane London EC1Y 0RR

Proposal: Alteration and extension of the existing office building (Class Eg(i)) incorporating a local community/cultural space (Class Eg(i)/F2) at ground floor; to include additional floorspace through upward and infill extensions (+2485sqm GIA uplift); altered and additional entrances; creation of office amenity terraces and plant enclosures; facade alterations including urban greening; new landscaping; and associated works [RECONSULTATION DUE TO REVISED DESIGN AND LANDSCAPING PROPOSALS]. |cr|

Case Officer: Amy Williams

Customer Details

Name: Ms Fiona Jackson

Address: FLAT 532, BEN JONSON HOUSE, BARBICAN, BARBICAN BARBICAN London

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Noise
- Other

Comment: The amendments to the height are insignificant. The changes to the listed building are unacceptable as is the lack of regard for local residents. The plans contravene several City policies so how can this possibly be accepted? I object on all of these grounds.

From: [REDACTED]
To: [PLN - Comments](#)
Subject: FW: 1 Golden Lane
Date: 05 October 2022 17:43:16

From: MP Ecosse <[REDACTED]>
Sent: 25 August 2022 12:10
To: Williams, Amy <[REDACTED]>
Cc: Pln - CC - Development Dc <[REDACTED]>
Subject: 1 Golden Lane

THIS IS AN EXTERNAL EMAIL

Dear Amy,

I own Flat 59 Breton House which is directly opposite 1 Golden Lane.

I am very concerned for a number of good reasons:

- My studio flat faces directly onto this site. There is no other outlook to the flat than that onto Golden Lane, so in other words there would be no escape from whatever might occur on Golden Lane. I have lived in Willoughby House and also in Speed House, and in both cases there was a lot of noise disturbance at the rear, but the garden facing side was relatively un-affected.
- I am hoping to use my studio flat as a pied-a -terre when I retire, but this development could rule that plan out, much to my disappointment.
- I think that adding anything to the height of the current structure would on balance not be the right thing to do: it would certainly take light and sky away from residents of Breton House; it would not respect the height of the adjoining "Denizen" building; it would detract from the Victorian aspect of the current 1 Golden Lane building - which despite the 2 mansard floors still retains its pleasing character.
- Surely the expansion to the back would already cater for the creation of a more modern space for the offices, without the need to go higher - which to be honest is more of a "vanity" feature for the developers..." a roof terrace".
- the use of the proposed roof terrace is likely to cause noise disturbance and loss of privacy to residents of Breton, Ben Johnson et al. likely outside of office hours too.
- I am also worried about the increase in footfall and traffic noise that this expansion of the premises is likely to cause.
- I bought in Breton because this side of the Barbican, adjoining Islington has always seemed quieter - and more genuinely residential than other surrounding areas ...it would be a pity to lose this relatively peaceful character of the area.

Thank you very much,

Best regards,

Michael Smart

59 Breton House,

Barbican,

London EC2 8DQ

THIS E-MAIL AND ANY ATTACHED FILES ARE CONFIDENTIAL AND MAY BE LEGALLY PRIVILEGED. If you are not the addressee, any disclosure, reproduction, copying, distribution or other dissemination or use of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you have received this transmission in error please notify the sender immediately and then delete this e-mail. Opinions, advice or facts included in this message are given without any warranties or intention to enter into a contractual relationship with the City of London unless specifically indicated otherwise by agreement, letter or facsimile signed by a City of London authorised signatory. Any part of this e-mail which is purely personal in nature is not authorised by the City of London. All e-mail through the City of London's gateway is potentially the subject of monitoring. All liability for errors and viruses is excluded. Please note that in so far as the City of London falls within the scope of the Freedom of Information Act 2000 or the Environmental Information Regulations 2004, it may need to disclose this e-mail. Website: <http://www.cityoflondon.gov.uk>

THIS E-MAIL AND ANY ATTACHED FILES ARE CONFIDENTIAL AND MAY BE LEGALLY PRIVILEGED. If you are not the addressee, any disclosure, reproduction, copying, distribution or other dissemination or use of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you have received this transmission in error please notify the sender immediately and then delete this e-mail. Opinions, advice or facts included in this message are given without any warranties or intention to enter into a contractual relationship with the City of London unless specifically indicated otherwise by agreement, letter or facsimile signed by a City of London authorised signatory. Any part of this e-mail which is purely personal in nature is not authorised by the City of London. All e-mail through the City of London's gateway is potentially the subject of monitoring. All liability for errors and viruses is excluded. Please note that in so far as the City of London falls within the scope of the Freedom of Information Act 2000 or the Environmental Information Regulations 2004, it may need to disclose this e-mail. Website: <http://www.cityoflondon.gov.uk>

Comments for Planning Application 22/00203/LBC

Application Summary

Application Number: 22/00203/LBC

Address: Cripplegate House 1 Golden Lane London EC1Y 0RR

Proposal: Alteration and extension of the existing office building (Class Eg(i)) incorporating a local community/cultural space (Class Eg(i)/F2) at ground floor; to include additional floorspace through upward and infill extensions (+2485sqm GIA uplift); altered and additional entrances; creation of office amenity terraces and plant enclosures; facade alterations including urban greening; new landscaping; and associated works [RECONSULTATION DUE TO REVISED DESIGN AND LANDSCAPING PROPOSALS]. |cr|

Case Officer: Amy Williams

Customer Details

Name: Mr Stephen Chapman

Address: Flat 304 Ben Jonson House London

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Noise
- Other
- Residential Amenity
- Traffic or Highways

Comment: I OBJECTED to the original Planning Application 22/00202 FULMAJ and Listed Building Application 22/00203/LBC on 5 May 2022

I continue to OBJECT to it in its revised form for the following reasons:

I repeat all the objections I made in my original OBJECTION dated 5 May 2022 (see below) namely the height of the proposed building, noise concerns relating to the roof terraces and plant, light and privacy concerns and the overall unsympathetic and poor quality of the proposed design.

None of these have properly been addressed by the Developers. The changes made as a result of the almost universal objections to the original proposal are minimal in effect. For example the height of the proposed building is reduced by a mere 930 mm (3.05). Completely de minimis.

Additionally the proposal to have deliveries start at 7 am coming down Brackley Street and Viscount Street (and accordingly also Bridgewater Street) is far too early for a predominantly residential area/neighbourhood. A starting time of no earlier than 8 am Monday to Friday and 10

am on Saturdays and Sundays would seem more reasonable.

This Development will be a disaster for all surrounding residential buildings namely Ben Jonson House, Breton House, the Cobalt Building and the Denizen. Accordingly I ask the Planners to reject the proposed Development in its current form. The Developers have paid only lip service to the almost universal objections to the current proposal. This Development is by the developers' own admission only a financial speculation to pass on to another occupier. When so many people are adversely affected by it, I think it should be rejected in this location. The existing building built in around 1990 was a good compromise for the area.

Accordingly, I trust the Planners will refuse this Application.

All the above comments/objections relate to both the Planning Application 22/00202/FULMAJ and Listed Building Application 22/00203/LBC

Begum, Shupi

From: Williams, Amy
Sent: 07 October 2022 10:00
To: PLN - Comments
Subject: FW: 1 Golden Lane

Please upload below reiteration of original objection to the file to [22/00203/LBC](#). I have also emailed you separately this morning because I could not see her original objection from 01/06 is on the system.

Kind regards,
Amy

Amy Williams | she/her
Planning Officer (Development Management and Design)
Development Division
Environment Department
Tel: 07749 714 816



Environment Department
City of London Corporation

City of London Corporation | PO Box
270 | London EC2P 2EJ |
www.cityoflondon.gov.uk

From: Helen Hulson [REDACTED]
Sent: 06 October 2022 20:31
To: Williams, Amy <Amy.Williams@cityoflondon.gov.uk>
Subject: 1 Golden Lane

THIS IS AN EXTERNAL EMAIL

Dear Amy Williams,

In spite of some modest changes by the developer, I wish to reiterate the objections I raised in the email below, which I sent to you on 1.06.2022
I feel very strongly that the proposals are unacceptable for this site and have also expressed my views again today in a shortened form under the Comments option on the Planning site.
As far as I can see, my email to you of 1st June 2022 did not appear in the documents. Please can you let me know how this can be remedied?

Thank you for your assistance.

Yours sincerely,

Helen Hulson
523 Ben Jonson House
EC2Y 8NH

I wish to object to the Planning Application made by Castleforge for No.1 Golden Lane.

1. No. 1 Golden Lane is a commercial island with residential blocks on every side, all of which will be adversely affected by the plans currently submitted. If permitted, it will have a permanently damaging effect on our amenities at Ben Jonson House and will destroy our outlook on a well loved and respected heritage asset.

I realise that it is part of the planning policy of CoL to encourage commercial developments, but is it the intention was to apply the policy indiscriminately? It seems clear that the particular location of this site makes it completely unsuitable for the commercial expansion proposed. It will overshadow neighbouring residential blocks and considerably reduce visibility of the sky. I would hope that the government's recent announcement in the Queen's Speech, of a change of approach to development proposals affecting local residents, will help to inform the Planning Committee's decision in this case.

2. The proposals for 1 Golden Lane lack a proper understanding of the listed part of the building and the necessity not to detract from it. Cripplegate House was originally designed and built to provide educational facilities for the community and the importance attached to this purpose is reflected in the quality of the original architecture. The fact that the façade was listed when the building was converted to a commercial use at the end of the 20th century recognised its significance, both aesthetically and in terms of its heritage. It is clear that the modern façades on the South, West and North of the current building show a proper understanding of the need to be in harmony with the listed East façade, by reflecting it in materials and form. By contrast Castleforge appear to have discarded any attempt to relate the new to the old.

Furthermore, they fail to take into account the fact that this building is bordered by the Barbican Listed Estate and Conservation area to the South and East and will affect the Golden Lane Listed Estate and Conservation area to the North. I understand that listed status is intended to provide protection from adverse impact by neighbouring development proposals. The roofline between the two estates, as viewed from Fortune Park, has been carefully considered and should not be permitted to exceed the height of the Denizen, which was restricted to the current height of 1 Golden Lane.

3. The flats in Ben Jonson House with living rooms and bedrooms facing 1 Golden Lane, number about 90, with a total of 210 windows. For all of us there will be a substantial reduction in light from the sky when it is obstructed by the huge upper extension. Currently the sky is visible through the upper quarter of my windows, but the proposed extension will virtually obscure it. I am also very concerned about the imposition of numerous terraces which will inevitably have an impact on noise levels because voices are very audible in this particular built environment. These terraces will overlook about 120 bedrooms.

4. In terms of consultation, I have looked again at the Webinar (v. link below) produced by the developers, Castleforge, for the purpose of persuading local residents that the development was beneficial. There was relatively little reference to the extent of the raised height, or of the proposal to bring forward the facade facing Ben Jonson House by 11 feet. The current facades, which refer respectfully to the listed facade in terms of materials and form, were described as dated. The planned new façades appear neither to relate to the existing listed façade nor to any of the surrounding buildings. By contrast, the developers placed much emphasis on the introduction of greening elements through vertical screening, landscaped terraces and improvements to landscaping around the building. There were also references to communal benefits in the form of a Library of Things, Maker Space and a Meeting Room (I am not aware of any serious need for these additional facilities). Altogether, what we were being offered was pitiful compared with what was to be taken from us. The proposal to crop back the beautiful and healthy mature tree in front of the building is yet another example of the developer's lack of sensitivity.

<https://vimeo.com/656938059>

5. This building, which was marketed to Castleforge as a purchase with "floors fully fitted to a high grade specification available in 'Plug and play' condition with all furniture in situ", has been subjected to more than 2 months of gutting, together with radical plans for altering the exterior. This is far from the sustainable approach of

which the developer boasts and to which the City of London subscribes. This proposal evidently runs counter to several important CoL policies, as already specified in the Barbican Association submission to the Planning Department.

I ask you, on behalf of myself and my neighbours, to reject this proposal in light of the total absence of understanding with regard to listing issues, the particular circumstances of this site and the damaging effect it will have on residents in immediately neighbouring properties on all four sides.

Yours sincerely,

Helen Hulson
523 Ben Jonson House
EC2Y 8NH

Comments for Planning Application 22/00203/LBC

Application Summary

Application Number: 22/00203/LBC

Address: Cripplegate House 1 Golden Lane London EC1Y 0RR

Proposal: Alteration and extension of the existing office building (Class Eg(i)) incorporating a local community/cultural space (Class Eg(i)/F2) at ground floor; to include additional floorspace through upward and infill extensions (+2485sqm GIA uplift); altered and additional entrances; creation of office amenity terraces and plant enclosures; facade alterations including urban greening; new landscaping; and associated works [RECONSULTATION DUE TO REVISED DESIGN AND LANDSCAPING PROPOSALS]. |cr|

Case Officer: Amy Williams

Customer Details

Name: Mr Michael Meade

Address: 59 Breton House London

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Noise
- Other
- Residential Amenity
- Traffic or Highways

Comment: The west-facing studio flats in Breton are singularly exposed to this proposed re-development.

They face directly onto 1 Golden Lane; there is no other outlook for these flats than that onto Golden Lane. This means that there would be no escape from noise disturbance opposite and below.

I strongly disagree with the developer's assertion that there is no significant harm caused to amenities of light and sun.

The benefit for the developer of adding height to the building is outweighed by the prejudice it would cause.

It would certainly take light and sky away from residents; it would not respect the height of the adjoining Denizen building.

The extra floors on the building would detract from the Victorian aspect of the current 1 Golden Lane building - which despite the 2 mansard floors still retains its pleasing character.

In terms of noise - there will inevitably be an increase in footfall and traffic noise with the expansion of the premises. This will be compounded by the unacceptable plans for the refuse area.

If the developers are planning to have a roof terrace, then this would surely be unacceptable to neighbouring residents in Ben Jonson, Breton House and the Denizen.

the use of the proposed roof terrace would very likely cause noise disturbance, as well as a serious loss of privacy; and is probable to occur outside of office hours too.

It is a recipe for un-ending complaints of noise disturbance.

I would urge the City to review the plans.

All too often these consultations feel like a sham process, where councils go through the motions of listening, to then take no account of what the residents say (council tax payers and human assets to the community).

It is profoundly un-democratic - the City of London is not alone in this approach, alas.

But surely the Corporation should be setting an example of local democracy, by genuinely taking the views of its human constituents into account.

Comments for Planning Application 22/00203/LBC

Application Summary

Application Number: 22/00203/LBC

Address: Cripplegate House 1 Golden Lane London EC1Y 0RR

Proposal: Alteration and extension of the existing office building (Class Eg(i)) incorporating a local community/cultural space (Class Eg(i)/F2) at ground floor; to include additional floorspace through upward and infill extensions (+2485sqm GIA uplift); altered and additional entrances; creation of office amenity terraces and plant enclosures; facade alterations including urban greening; new landscaping; and associated works [RECONSULTATION DUE TO REVISED DESIGN AND LANDSCAPING PROPOSALS]. |cr|

Case Officer: Amy Williams

Customer Details

Name: Mrs Helen Hulson

Address: 523 Ben Jonson House Barbican London

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Residential Amenity

Comment: I refer to my objection of 2.05.2022, which still stands. The changes made by the developer do not address my principle concerns.

1. The reduction in height of less than 1 metre is paltry compared with the remaining increase in height of approx. 12.5 metres. Together with the huge additional overall bulk proposed it will still mean a substantial loss of sky compared with the present height.
2. The proposed architecture of the non listed façades is entirely unrelated to the listed facade, unlike the current modern elevations, which were carefully considered as to form and materials in order to complement the listed part of the building.
3. For the developer to refer to the City of London's policy of increasing office space as a justification for these plans, does not take into account this particular location, which faces residential properties in every direction. This is a case where I would expect the Planners to use their discretion in positive consideration both of the amenities of immediate neighbours and of the listed status of the Barbican Estate.
4. The extension of the South facing elevation towards Ben Jonson House by 11 ft is a substantial imposition which has barely been mentioned by the developer.
5. It is evident that in the case of the Denizen, its impact on the listed Golden Lane Estate was recognised and it was not permitted to exceed the height of 1 Golden Lane. This principle should be applied to limit the permitted height of 1, Golden Lane itself.

6. I am not convinced that it is more sustainable to undertake this massive building project than to work within the restraints of the building as it stands.

I reiterate my objections to this proposal and urge the Planning Committee to reject it.

Comments for Planning Application 22/00203/LBC

Application Summary

Application Number: 22/00203/LBC

Address: Cripplegate House 1 Golden Lane London EC1Y 0RR

Proposal: Alteration and extension of the existing office building (Class Eg(i)) incorporating a local community/cultural space (Class Eg(i)/F2) at ground floor; to include additional floorspace through upward and infill extensions (+2485sqm GIA uplift); altered and additional entrances; creation of office amenity terraces and plant enclosures; facade alterations including urban greening; new landscaping; and associated works [RECONSULTATION DUE TO REVISED DESIGN AND LANDSCAPING PROPOSALS]. |cr|

Case Officer: Amy Williams

Customer Details

Name: Mr Richard Lynch

Address: 114 Thomas More House London

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: The revised design and landscaping proposals fail to address fully the objections raised to the earlier application. The revisions admit that the loss of light and refuse re-design is insufficient but plead mitigation. This is unsatisfactory.

More broadly, the re-design still represents a massive and totally unjustified alteration to mass of the building. For example, the claimed redesign to reduce this issue shows less than one metre reduction in height! The new plans show that the building will still be 12 metres higher than the existing structure!

These proposals need to be completely reworked, not just tinkered with.

Comments for Planning Application 22/00203/LBC

Application Summary

Application Number: 22/00203/LBC

Address: Cripplegate House 1 Golden Lane London EC1Y 0RR

Proposal: Alteration and extension of the existing office building (Class Eg(i)) incorporating a local community/cultural space (Class Eg(i)/F2) at ground floor; to include additional floorspace through upward and infill extensions (+2485sqm GIA uplift); altered and additional entrances; creation of office amenity terraces and plant enclosures; facade alterations including urban greening; new landscaping; and associated works [RECONSULTATION DUE TO REVISED DESIGN AND LANDSCAPING PROPOSALS]. |cr|

Case Officer: Amy Williams

Customer Details

Name: Dr Dimitri Varsamis

Address: Apartment 83, Roman House, Wood Street, London EC2Y 5AG

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Other
- Residential Amenity

Comment: The proposed building is not at all in keeping with the original or the neighbouring buildings or the area. It is a completely unacceptable design of irrelevant colours and materials. It is far too tall.

Creating outside space for people to congregate and work from, right opposite established, existing homes is not acceptable.

From:
To:
Subject: 1 Golden Lane Objection
Date: 01 October 2022 10:45:52

THIS IS AN EXTERNAL EMAIL

I previously objected to 22/00202/FULMAJ and 22/00203/LBC. Having seen the revised plans, they do nothing to substantially change my thoughts on the proposal. Therefore, I repeat my objections and request that both applications are refused.

Mitra Karvandi-Smith
544 Ben Jonson House
Barbican

From: [Williams, Amy](#)
To: [PLN - Comments](#)
Subject: OBJECTION TO LODGE 22/00202/FULMAJ AND 22/00203/LBC FW: 1 Golden Lane - Planning Application 22/00202/FULMAJ
Date: 08 June 2022 12:40:37
Attachments: [image001.png](#)

From: Linda Thompson
Sent: 03 May 2022 16:55
To: Williams, Amy <Amy.Williams@cityoflondon.gov.uk>
Subject: 1 Golden Lane - Planning Application 22/00202/FULMAJ

THIS IS AN EXTERNAL EMAIL

Dear Amy,

I wish to object to the proposal contained within this Planning Application to raise the crown of the Silver Lime tree to 5 metres. I recall pruning of this tree being carried out only a few years ago – probably at the time the Denizen development began - so was surprised to hear of this plan. There are few large trees in the area and as they help greatly with air quality initiatives I am against such radical pruning of this tree. Such trees are important urban assets and we should not be affecting a residential amenity in this way. Also, recent studies have shown that Linden tree blossom is of particular benefit to the health of our bee populations - something we should all be concerned about – and the proposed pruning could affect the tree's flowering for several years.

My grounds for objection are that this aspect of the planning proposal, if approved,

would adversely impact the residential amenity.

Sincerely,

Linda Thompson
705 Frobisher Crescent
Barbican

From: [Williams, Amy](#)
To: [PLN - Comments](#)
Subject: FW: Cripplegate House 1 Golden Lane London EC1Y 0RR - Objection
Date: 20 May 2022 16:43:28
Attachments: [image001.png](#)

-----Original Message-----

From: [REDACTED]
To: amy.williams@cityoflondon.gov.uk <amy.williams@cityoflondon.gov.uk>
Sent: Fri, 6 May 2022 17:41
Subject: Cripplegate House 1 Golden Lane London EC1Y 0RR - Objection

Dear Amy,

I had intended to submit my comments on-line but there is a 2000 character limit, which was insufficient for my objection. As such could you please register the objection below to the standard and the LBC applications. I hope you can also post my objection into the website using administrator privileges if necessary so my comments are publically available.

I write as the Alderman for the Ward in which the site is located. I note and endorse the many reasons which others have given for objecting to the application and urging that it be refused. The proposed expansion upwards of the building is by far the most significant single objectionable matter.

Rather than repeat what others have said I wish by this submission to address the Members of the Planning Committee and to remind them that proper decisions in planning matters are not entirely predicated upon technical judgements of the sort which professional planners might take into account. Local politics is firmly embedded into the planning process; this is precisely why planning powers are by Statute exercised by elected Members, who are accountable publicly for their decisions, rather than by technical experts alone. This point seems to get lost among a host of technicalities such that process can sometimes seem to be an end in itself, not a means to a satisfactory outcome in a particular case.

There is a widespread perception among residents that the local planning system is one-sided and favours the developer. This is entirely understandable for the following reasons:

1. The developer professional team usually discusses their proposal with City planning officers with

the intention, from the developer's perspective, of maximising the potential of the site (typically to maximise the financial gain). The planners and the developer function at this stage as a team working together.

2. The City planners ability to assist the developer in maximising the developer's gain exists within the constraints and boundaries of planning policy. Fortunately for developers, these constraints are highly elastic and the Officer view is that these can 'flex' to suit the circumstances. The evidence for this is the many occasions where the Officer report to Committee recommending approval recognises a number of areas where there is a breach of policy but that "in the round" there are compensating benefits which result in the scheme being recommended for approval.

3. It is almost unheard of for the Planning Committee to disagree with an Officer recommendation to approve a development. There is no perceived downside to granting permission as objectors have no recourse (other than a judicial review which would require grave procedural errors to succeed). The playing field here is not even, because a disappointed applicant can appeal a refusal to grant permission. Appeals are unpopular among the planners because the appeal might be upheld, implying criticism of our process of decision, and even if the appeal is dismissed there is displacement of Officer time in dealing with an appeal. So, there is an obvious safety net in, on balance, giving approval rather than refusing it.

4. There is in my view a mindset among many Planning Committee Members and Officers, that development is necessary if the Square Mile is to remain a world-leading business centre. Achieving this necessitates the willingness to work with developers in achieving mutual goals (in terms of an adequate supply of high-quality office space) which contribute to the success of UK PLC - that this is work of national importance. Saying yes to planning applications, especially the largest and most ambitious is God's work is the impression given.

5. This perspective, alongside the desire to keep the attendant professions supplied with work well before the construction phase begins can bolster the impression that not only is the planning process procedurally skewed to the advantage of developers (see para 3 above) but that some Members deciding Applications consider it their duty to Approve applications whenever that is the Officer recommendation.

6. It is instructive to consider one of the very rare recent occasions when the Planning Committee has refused permission against an Officer recommendation to approve. This was the application which was strongly opposed by the Bevis Marks synagogue predominantly because of loss of light. The application was also strongly opposed by a former Lord Mayor who is very closely connected to the developer community. His year as Lord Mayor began with a blessing at the Bevis Marks Synagogue. The campaign against the Application was so effective that approval was refused. Even a past Lord Mayor still on the Committee voted to refuse permission, which is a highly unusual event.

Having considered the perception that the Planning Committee is predominantly "pro" developer in its approach to planning decisions, is this inevitable? In many instances "flexing" policy to accommodate very large buildings will have limited adverse consequences in terms of amenity value and indeed one consequence of "good" development can be a clear amenity benefit. This point is particularly persuasive in the City's tall buildings cluster where the "resident" element is usually non-existent or very small. Decisions to approve may be self-evidently correct in such a context. In the context of this application, it is in my view insensitive and will invite push-back to ignore sensitivities to development in areas of the City which are predominantly residential in character. What might be acceptable in the City tall buildings cluster could and should be deemed unacceptable within or on the periphery of a heavily residential part of the City. Turning to the 1 Golden Lane site, it is bounded on all four sides by residential accommodation. The current proposal entails clear loss of amenity for residents through loss of light. It looks positively harsh and brutal to suggest that up to a 20% loss of light is "acceptable" in an urban environment. This metric is promulgated by the Building Research Establishment and . The judgement of the BRE is seized on by the developer community as gospel, but it is not binding on elected Members who may choose to take a more caring and compassionate view given the obvious sensitivity to such issues. Suggesting that an alternative proposal could be worse does not in any way make the current proposal good or even acceptable.

The Comms company engaged to support the consultation process asked local residents whether they had any wishes in terms of amenity gains. What is proposed is some sort of artists collective

which I suggest the local community is not crying out for. To suggest that this offer in any way "compensates" for the harms caused by increased bulk and mass is risible. Quite simply the developer has nothing useful to offer. that local residents would accept as a fair exchange for loss of light. The greening ideas are entirely undone by the proposal to savagely prune an established tree which lives outside the main east-facing facade of the building.

An Applicant for planning permission has no right to receive it but it is entitled to fair treatment and a decision. I believe that developers consider the system's outcomes very fair indeed (if time-consuming and expensive) but the resident perspective is very different. A decision to allow permission in this case would only serve to confirm the perception that the City's planning system cannot say no to developers despite the overbearing extent of the proposed changes to the current building. I hope that permission will be refused.

Best wishes,

David Graves
Alderman for the Ward of Cripplegate