

## Robinson, Jessica

---

**From:** Richards, Gwyn  
**Sent:** 31 October 2022 10:34  
**To:** Horkan, David; Robinson, Jessica; Carroll, Phillip  
**Subject:** Fwd: 22/00202/FULMAJ and 22/00203/LBC - 1 Golden Lane

Sent from [Outlook for iOS](#)

---

**From:** Frederick Rodgers [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Monday, October 31, 2022 10:33 am  
**To:** Richards, Gwyn <Gwyn.Richards@cityoflondon.gov.uk>  
**Cc:** Joshi, Shravan (Deputy) <Shravan.Joshi@cityoflondon.gov.uk>; Moss, Alastair (Deputy) <Alastair.Moss@cityoflondon.gov.uk>; McLoughlin, Juliemma <Juliemma.McLoughlin@cityoflondon.gov.uk>; Horkan, David <David.Horkan@cityoflondon.gov.uk>  
**Subject:** Re: 22/00202/FULMAJ and 22/00203/LBC - 1 Golden Lane

THIS IS AN EXTERNAL EMAIL

Dear Mr Richards,

Further to my email below, attached is a photo taken whilst sitting at our dining table of our southwestern view over 1 Golden Lane. If the proposal proceeds, we will lose our view of virtually all the sky above it - permanently. The photo also shows the harm the additional 15 metres will do to the historic facade.

Again, please share with all the other Members of P&TC.

Best regards,

Fred Rodgers

Chair, Breton House Group

[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

UK

Tel: [REDACTED]

Mob: [REDACTED]



On 29 Oct 2022, at 11:23, Frederick Rodgers [REDACTED] wrote:

Dear Mr Richards,

I have now seen your report to Committee re the above.

Could you add this email to the many objections you have already received, please. Also, please ensure its circulation to all the other P&TC Members prior to next week's meeting.

**Perceived lack of Impartiality**

First of all, may I say how surprised I was at your failure to accept my invitation to view 1 Golden Lane from some of the flats surrounding it. As the invitation was extended to the applicant, there was no intention of partiality but the failure accept could be seen to imply a lack of impartiality on your part.

That implication is underlined by both the unannounced P&TC Members' site visit, which denied objectors any opportunity to point out the effect of the proposal and the presentation

the applicant was able to make in private. Worse, the factual misrepresentation in some of the latter went unchallenged, something that is even obvious from the error strewn 21-page transcript. For instance, the decision not to attempt to destroy City Corporation's Turkish hazel is a result of an intervention by City Gardens and nothing to do with the applicant's response to public objections.

### **Eastern elevation**

As far as Breton House residents are concerned, your report certainly lacks objectivity. The near 15 metre, almost sheer, increase in the height of the eastern elevation hardly gets a mention but, in paragraph 142, you suggest its effect is "transitory". Around 50 flats in Breton House face directly onto the eastern elevation of 1 Golden Lane, including number 100, and it's difficult to understand how our permanent view can be dismissed as "transitory".

The overlooking effect of the proposals on the other three elevations is said to be mitigated, including by the use of fluting. However, there's no indication that the eastern façade windows are designed to deter overlooking and, of course, these windows are full height.

In addition, the proposal introduces a roof terrace above the historic façade. It may be described as a biodiverse green roof but it will be accessed. Also, there's no guarantee that it would continue to be so used and there are no apparent balustrades or similar attempts to prevent overlooking.

The conclusion to London Borough of Islington's consultee comment states:

*Due to the excessive height and mass in relation to the site's tertiary position within the urban structure, and its relationship to the host building and multiple adjacent heritage assets, the proposal would harm their settings, their legibility, and the rationale of the urban structure. The proposal is therefore not supported.*

However, your response:

*The assertion that the site holds a tertiary urban structure is refuted; Golden Lane is one of the City's main thoroughfares and the site holds a prominent location on Golden Lane, holding its own in between the larger Barbican Estate to the immediate south. As such, it cannot be said to be tertiary*

the absence of a northern "top" to the sandwich aside, ignores your own Department's plans for Golden Lane. This, of course, was closed to all through traffic for 18 months by the Experimental Traffic Order. Under those plans, Golden Lane would, on the worst outcome, only be a through route for non-ZEV traffic from the north.

In any event, your assertion re the prominence of 1 Golden Lane doesn't hold good when considering the street's whole length, including from within the London Borough of Islington, something that images 3, 4, 8 and 9 in the applicant's Townscape Visual Impact Heritage Assessment underline. In fact, the latter clearly emphasises London Borough of Islington's conclusion as well, it seems, as challenging the objectivity, indeed professionalism, of your peer to peer response.

### **Cripplegate Street**

Much is made, both in your report and the applicant's presentation, not only of the current state of Cripplegate Street but its intimidating nature. As we have used this route almost daily for over thirteen years, there is nothing intimidating about it, whatever the time of day or night nor is it poorly lit.

If there's an issue about the area under the Barbican ramp, the applicant has owned 1 Golden Lane for over seven years and, during that time, has done nothing to ameliorate the

alleged deficiencies. Even then, although the paintwork on the surrounding metalwork is tired, there is nothing exceptional about Cripplegate Street which justifies your subjective claim (para 231) that it is both "undesirable and undermaintained".

### **Interventions In the historic façade**

Whilst the intention to make interventions in the historic eastern façade to provide level access has to be welcomed, it seems that no serious consideration has been given to alternatives to the two eastern interventions. Paragraph 459 accepts the harm caused in providing level access but fails to question the duplication of access to the same room.

In addition to the proposed intervention in the northern side of the historic façade, another harmful intervention within a few metres of it is recommended for approval. An intervention could be made on the southern side of the historic façade, opposite the northern one, protecting the full eastern façade from intervention but this hasn't been considered, let alone required, despite the comments of the Victorian Society.

In fact, the handwringing justification in paragraph 462 would be far more palatable if the proposed interventions in the historic façade were made on the north and south and not the east:

*462. It is the view of Officers that giving great weight to the conservation of this heritage asset, and considerable importance and weight to the desirability of preserving the special architectural and historic interest and heritage significance of the listed building, the identified harm to the significance of the designated heritage asset is outweighed by the public interest benefits associated with the proposed development.*

### **Roof terraces**

A further problem arises regarding the use of the roof terraces, even if identification of users from outside 1 Golden Lane were possible. According to:

*372. A series of terraces are proposed which would be accessible to occupants of the office accommodation ... and .. Use of the terraces would be managed by conditions.*

but no condition is proposed that would prevent use by non-occupiers nor is any condition proposed as to how the roof terraces are to be used. Conditions 26-31 merely control how these areas are not to be used. If approved and conditioned as proposed, members of the public could use the roof terraces without there being effective sanctions - see my comment, below, under the proposed condition 26.

Further, according to:

*374. .. the proposed terraces would result in some overlooking to neighbouring buildings and a small loss of privacy to residents*

but a *small loss of privacy* is subjective. Surely, there is either privacy or there is none. The loss of residential privacy should not be acceptable other than in the most exceptional cases. The proposal is not one such.

### **Embodied Carbon**

From the outset, the decision to refurbish 1 Golden Lane, rather than destroy it, has been welcomed. As a result, we have to accept an increase in embodied carbon but that increase could be easily mitigated by maintaining the current overall height of 1 Golden Lane. After all, the additional 2,471 sqm don't add a great deal of extra space to 1 Golden Lane and hardly has any impact on the total amount of currently consented but undeveloped office space in the City.

## Response to objections

You have, thankfully, rejected the proposed refuse bin presentation arrangement along Cripplegate Street. And, of course, the Turkish hazel is no longer under threat but I trust it will be outside the proposed security hoarding shown in the Outline Construction Management Plan. These two apart, my other objections have not been conceded and, so remain.

## Conclusion

All in all, there is little, if any, merit in the proposal that warrants approval. Certainly the claimed benefits don't outweigh the actual harm and I repeat my request that permission be refused.

However, in the event that the P&TC Members are minded to approve the proposal, some of the proposed conditions are unacceptable as drafted and must be amended beforehand. These conditions are set out, with my comments, below but the necessary restriction on users and the permissive use of roof terraces must also be conditioned.

Best regards,

Fred Rodgers

Chair, Breton House Group

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

UK

Tel: [REDACTED]

Mob: [REDACTED]

Unacceptable conditions

***26 No part of the roof areas except those shown as roof terraces on the drawings hereby approved shall be used or accessed by occupiers of the building, other than in the case of emergency or for maintenance purposes. REASON: To safeguard the amenity of the adjoining premises and the area generally in accordance with the following policies of the Local Plan: DM15.7, DM21.3.***

The problem with this condition is that local residents will be unable to distinguish occupiers from non-occupiers, who aren't restricted from either use or access. This will mean breaches of this condition are likely to be undetectable and, therefore, unenforceable by City Corporation.

***27 No live or recorded music that can be heard outside the premises shall be played. REASON: To safeguard the amenity of the adjoining premises and the area generally in accordance with the following policies of the Local Plan: DM15.7, DM21.3.***

This condition should prevent noise of any sort being heard outside 1 Golden Lane at any time.

**28 No amplified or other music shall be played on the roof terraces.  
REASON: To safeguard the amenity of the adjoining premises and the area generally in accordance with the following policies of the Local Plan: DM15.7, DM21.3.**

If condition 27 were to prevent noise being heard outside 1 Golden Lane at any time, there would be no need for this condition.

**29 There shall be no promoted events on the premises. A promoted event for this purpose, is an event involving music and dancing where the musical entertainment is provided at any time between 21:00 and 09:00 by a disc jockey or disc jockeys one or some of whom are not employees of the premises licence holder and the event is promoted to the general public.**

**REASON: To safeguard the amenity of the adjoining premises and the area generally in accordance with the following policies of the Local Plan: DM15.7, DM21.3.**

It's difficult to understand this condition. It appears to allow a free for all by employees of "the premises licence holder".

**30 The external terraces hereby permitted shall not be used or accessed between the hours of 21:00 on one day and 09:00 on the following day and not at any time on Sundays or Bank Holidays, other than in the case of emergency.**

**REASON: To safeguard the amenity of the adjoining premises and the area generally in accordance with the following policies of the Local Plan: DM15.7, DM21.3.**

Firstly, Saturdays must be included along with Sundays and Bank Holidays. Secondly, there's no reason why the restriction shouldn't be from 20.00 to 10.00.

**40 The development shall provide:**

**15,471 sq.m (GIA) of office floorspace (Class E) and 71 sq.m (GIA) of cultural/community floorspace (Class F2).**

**REASON: To ensure the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans.**

As mentioned under 41, unless the "lobby/café" floorspace is to be ancillary to the Class E office use, then this area should be all cultural/community Class F2(b).

**41 The floorspace within the development marked as lobby/cafe on the floor plans at ground floor level hereby approved, shall be used for retail (Class E(a)) and/or cafe/restaurant (Class E(b)) and for no other purpose (including any other purpose within Class E of the Schedule to the Town**

*and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 1987 (as amended by the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes)(Amendment)(England) Regulations 2020) or in any provision equivalent to that Class in any statutory instrument revoking and re- enacting that Order with or without modification.*

*REASON: To ensure that active public uses are retained to ground floor.*

Irrespective of anything else, there is no accessible WC serving this floorspace. However, whilst a café, restaurant even, might be acceptable if solely for 1 Golden Lane's occupiers, the possibility of this floorspace being used for any commercial activities aimed at the general public, whether café, restaurant or retail is totally unacceptable. The use must be ancillary to Class F2(b) local community use if open to other than occupiers of 1 Golden Lane.

*42 The floorspace within the development marked as community/cultural floorspace on the floor plans at ground floor level hereby approved, shall be used for local community (Class F2(b)) and for no other purpose (including any other purpose within Class F of the Schedule to the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 1987 (as amended by the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes)(Amendment)(England) Regulations 2020) or in any provision equivalent to that Class in any statutory instrument revoking and re- enacting that Order with or without modification.*

*REASON: To ensure compliance with policy S6 of the Draft City Plan 2036.*

It's not clear how this condition is consistent with a binding commitment to an approved Cultural Plan in the S106 agreement but this condition must prevail.

FR

