

Barbican and Golden Lane Consultation Comments

<p>We want your views on the proposed neighbourhood forum.</p>	<p>We want your views on the proposed neighbourhood area</p>
<p>I support this initiative and applaud those who have got the application to this stage. There is obviously a lot more to be done, and one area that I believe needs further clarification is the criteria for Business and Community Group Members.</p>	<p>-</p>
<p>Support the creation of a neighbourhood forum. In the execution of the view that creation of appropriate and balanced governance structures are critical to ensure voices are heard in an unbiased and balanced manner and this should be a key focus for the next stage.</p>	<p>One important comment on the boundary. I propose that the boundary in Moor Lane run to the pavement rather than down the middle of the road. This is because Moor Lane is a quiet cycle lane, is about to be greened as part of neighbourhood greening and wellbeing and hence there is a strong argument to include the road and pavement in the boundary.</p>
<p>-</p>	<p>-</p>
<p>I welcome this initiative</p>	<p>-</p>
<p>I fully support the proposal for a Neighbourhood Forum.</p>	<p>I support the proposed area.</p>

<p>I agree with the proposal which is long overdue</p>	<p>I agree with this proposal extending as marked on the map but within the City of London boundaries.</p>
<p>It is a great development for the area. Completely support.</p>	<p>The proposed neighbourhood area looks appropriate. I'm glad that residents in blocks neighbouring the Barbican and Golden lane estates are included as they are part of our community. Completely support.</p>
<p>This is a brilliant idea. It's high time the residents of the City of London had some recognition and this will help.</p>	<p>It seems entirely sensible. All those within this area share the same interest in maintaining and improving quality of life.</p>
<p>This is an excellent idea and long overdue . The Barbican and Golden Lane estates were originally conceived as an oasis in the heart of the city to encourage people to come back and move where they work . In the last 38 years during which we've lived here we've seen the interests and needs of such residents increasingly ignored by the City planners in every area. We don't have a coherent and a constructive voice to promote the benefits of having a vibrant residential community in the heart of the City and this will help to provide this</p>	<p>It's a great idea to develop a coherent and long term plan for residential areas in the heart of the business community which balances the needs and interests of both communities and provides a useful touchstone for those making planning applications from both. Relations between residents and the City have become quite toxic over the last few years and it is time to engage in constructive debate and create a helpful set of principles to facilitate further consultation and decisionmaking on critical issues such as traffic management, environmental matters and of course development .</p>

I support the formation of the Neighbourhood Forum. The constitution document is, however, vague (to the point of silence) as to how its activities will be financed. Presumably the instigators know that a grant for neighbourhood planning expenses is available from Locality. For example, no membership fee is proposed (probably rightly). I wonder whether the option was considered of forming a civil parish within the City, with universal suffrage and elected parish councillors rather than directors, and with the civil parish area forming the neighbourhood plan area, and with a council tax precept financing the parish council (including a paid parish clerk).

1. The City's draft plan also sees residential development at 'Smithfield'; it might be a good idea to include the rest of the Farringdon Within ward (Barts Square etc) in the neighbourhood area, as this is hard by the Barbican and includes Barbican tube station. In particular, buildings/developments on the west side of Aldersgate St have a huge impact on the Barbican environment, and so it would be beneficial to have neighbourhood plan policies that covered that location.

2. Similarly the eastern end of the Barbican is heavily affected by buildings/development on the eastern side of Moor Lane and in the vicinity of London Wall Place. I would like to see the neighbourhood plan area extended south to London Wall (where it doesn't currently reach there), and east to Moorfields or even Moorgate. After all, the Culture Mile trail extends east to Moorgate Station, which is also the premier transport interchange for the Barbican.

<p>A good idea if this can give more voice to residents in the City.</p>	<p>As a Barbican resident I think the area should be expanded to include Barts Square and Bartholomew Close as residents there will also be affected by significant changes that are on the horizon.</p> <p>With the opening of the London Museum in West Smithfield and the development of the meat market once it moves, the 'culture mile' corridor from the new museum to the Elizabeth Line station entrance in Long Lane and to the Barbican needs to be considered as a whole. It appears that not much thought has been given to movement of people and traffic across this area.</p>
<p>It looks well conceived and likely to be very helpful.</p>	<p>This area makes a huge amount of sense given the location of residential buildings and community assets such as churches and open spaces.</p>
<p>I am supportive of the forum because it builds on existing good community organisations representing individual local buildings.</p>	<p>I support the proposed area because it reads logically as a neighbourhood. It includes buildings and blocks that have a genuine community and feeling of being a mutually shared place.</p>
<p>Neighbourhood Plans are effective at putting the voices of communities into planning law and community initiatives - so I support this.</p>	<p>The area makes sense - it will always seem somewhat arbitrary - but it is centres on the Barbican.</p>

<p>It is my view that this is an excellent idea. The proposed area is coherent, has a wide range of planning needs and will benefit from a well-coordinated approach.</p>	<p>The proposed neighbourhood area is logical and relevant to the needs of this community.</p>
<p>Its a good idea</p>	<p>Looks about right</p>
<p>A good idea if it includes both positive and negative requests</p>	<p>To increase the amount if local neighbourhood facilities. Lots of empty shops that could provide services for community. Farmers food market on a weekend - not just supermarket stuff.</p>
<p>Opposed. No need for it. Barbican and Golden Lane have their own separate associations.</p>	<p>No need for it. Barbican and Golden Lane should be considered separately.</p>
<p>I support the formation of a Neighbourhood Forum. As a resident I support any initiative which promotes collaboration between the residential and working population of the City of London and the Planning authorities.</p>	<p>The neighbourhood area looks exactly right. I support the inclusion of the green spaces in the area, including Postman's park and the Barbican Wildlife Garden.</p>
<p>Yes, this is an excellent idea.</p>	<p>-</p>

<p>The creation of a Neighbourhood Forum is important to collate and represent the views of the people living in the Barbican and Golden Lane Estates along with adjoining buildings.</p> <p>The residential area is very special because of its location - but that also leads to particular pressures being put upon it when the needs of residents are up against corporate interests.</p> <p>Without these residential areas the City of London would lose an important part of its character and ability the culture and visitors which enrich it. So it is important that the needs of the residents can be represented coherently and appropriately in local development and planning matters.</p>	<p>I agree with the proposed neighbourhood area</p>
<p>It is high-time the community took advantage of the legislation to afford it a statutory voice in the future of their neighbourhood.</p> <p>More information on the emerging forum can be found on their recently launched website- https://bglneighbours.wordpress.com</p>	<p>The proposed area follows the City of London wards of Cripplegate and Aldersgate with a few residential blocks added. These wards are predominantly residential and have a thriving local community.</p>
<p>I am a Barbican resident and support establishment of a neighbourhood forum.</p>	<p>I am a Barbican resident and support establishment of a neighbourhood area encompassing the Barbican and Golden Lane Estates.</p>
<p>Why not?</p>	<p>To whom would its members be accountable? How would they be elected/appointed? What would they do?</p>
<p>I enthusiastically support the creation of the Neighbourhood Forum for this amazing place in which to both live and work and believe that the forum will do much to bring diverse people and institutions together to co-create a positive and imaginative shared future that benefits us all.</p>	<p>-</p>

I support this. Sounds like a great idea and surprising we don't have one already in line with other London boroughs & counties. It makes you wonder under legislation what else we don't have here that we have a right to.

I hope this forum has more weight and does not become yet another exclusive working group.

How quickly can this be up and running?

Can the Forum be renamed? eg North City Neighbourhood Forum. There are residential areas which are not part of either estate in the green area eg bridgewater house, Denizen, Tudor rose court. Naming a Forum to be inclusive of all residents is key to the inclusion of voices to feel they are allowed to participate. Or if the area is marked by Cripplegate & Aldersgate Ward to be named as such, eg Cripplegate & Aldersgate neighbourhood forum.

Can the green boundary be extended to the west to include the developments in Barts square?

How will it be clear to public this is different to the existing NHS Neighbour hood forums, of eg City & Shoreditch Park Neighbourhood forum.

<https://cityandhackneyneighbourhoods.org.uk/>

<p>I strongly support the setting up of the Forum, for the proposed Neighbourhood area. It will provide a strong vehicle for the voices of those who live and work in the area and provide a forum for proactive engagement in local planning (rather than simply reactive)</p>	<p>The area makes sense as a discrete coherent neighbourhood within the City's wider "key area of change" Barbican and Smithfield outlined in the emerging Local Plan. It will help keep the neighbourhood's distinctiveness as a residential and cultural area within the City. It recognises the biggest cluster of residences within the City. Can't see any point in extending it to Islington, which is a much more residential borough anyway and doesn't have the same geographically tight relationship between residences and cultural establishments</p>
<p>It is a really good idea and has clear benefits for the local area.</p>	<p>The boundary includes all of the main residential areas in close proximity to the Barbican and Golden Lane Estates - an excellent inclusive approach. It is best not to include those areas that lie within Islington as liaising across 2 local authorities would be complicated and very difficult.</p>
<p>I strongly support this proposal, The area fo the forum has a rich and diverse body of stakeholders who are interested in working collaboratively to enhance all aspects of the area. I would personally feel more involved once this exists</p>	<p>This area already has some cohesion and thus stands as an area but with strong links to the rest of the City and surrounding areas. As an ex planner I have engaged where I felt I could add value but this would enhance that ability</p>

<p>This is an excellent proposal that stands to support change towards a strong future residential element so fundamental to a great historical city such that the City of London is. Particularly at the time of great change that is upon us: not only the catastrophic impact of global warming and the collapse of non-human species, but the advent of artificial intelligence that will largely eliminate jobs in financial services, universities, and other intellectual-based service roles where humans simply cannot compete (as calculators were to doing arithmetic, AI is to doing intellectual work). At this time we need to shift to people focussed representation that guides us as to how this great city will look and function for residents in the future.</p>	-
<p>I think it is a good idea</p>	Seems fine
<p>Hello, first I have some questions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Who decided to launch this project? 2. Who chose the people to approach to become the first members? 3. Who appointed or chose the steering group members? <p>And who are all these two sets of people as I only know two individuals from among them.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. What activities for this forum do these two groups propose to take up, who will decide which ones to accept and carry out, and which ones to reject, and who will carry out the accepted ones? 4. What role(s) do the rest of us have in this picture? <p>This long, detailed text says almost nothing about "what change do we want to bring about" and "what improvements do we want to implement", and "who will be in charge of implementing them and "who will carry them out", and "how will they be funded and managed". With these answers, I would hope to be able to form an opinion.</p>	My questions above need to be answered first, sorry.
<p>I think is a great idea and fully support it's establishment as soon as possible</p>	-

<p>I think it's a great idea and about time the City had a neighbourhood forum within its boundaries</p>	<p>This makes sense. It is our neighbourhood and contains the majority of the City's residential population, a lot of SMEs, community groups and others. It covers Cripplegate and Aldersgate wards.</p>
<p>Yes definitely. It is important that Barbican and Golden Lane residents can present their views.</p>	<p>Excellent idea - fully supportive</p>
<p>-</p>	<p>An interesting idea, but if it is to include the life of those who live around here, should it look to include all the new flats behind Barts, to the south of Long Lane</p>
<p>Given the small numbers requesting this, compared to the large numbers who reside in the area, they are not representative of the vast majority who live in the area. The mention of somebody in Little Britain also perhaps explains the strange shape of the proposed area, extending south-west to include Little Britain and also many business premises. Also the area to the north-east covers building.</p> <p>There are already enough groups representing residents in these areas, and even those existing ones are in a minority.</p> <p>I lived for 10 years in the Barbican so I know the area well, and now reside in another residential property in the City of London, which also has a resident's committee consisting of a small percentage of the residents, most who are unaware of it's existence.</p> <p>Better would be the City Of London to judge planning application properly and take note of umpteen resident complaints and facts. One example being 150 Aldersgate where a a report wrongly stated there would be no loss of natural light if the balconies/fire escapes were ignored. No more automatic rubber-stamping of all new developments, particularly office, and high-end residential.</p>	<p>-</p>

<p>It sounds like a very good idea.</p>	<p>Combining the areas of Barbican and Golden Lane makes sense.</p>
<p>The proposed area contains a large proportion of non-residential spaces such as schools, offices, arts, and businesses. It is not clear that this in an appropriate forum in which to address the needs of these stakeholders as well as residents.</p>	<p>-</p>
<p>This is a sound proposal that will give a stronger voice to the local community.</p>	<p>-</p>
<p>I think this is a good idea coming just as we move to the new era of recycling, renovating, retrofitting and conserving nature in our neighbourhoods. I would only say I think that the park just east of and next to Golden Lane and the primary school both have an important function for this neighbourhood that should somehow get reflected even if outside the area. Could the head teacher add comments for example? And people comment on how they use the little park - it is a useful cut through route for example.</p>	<p>See the comment above re the Plan content being used to also reflect on things of local importance just outside the area.</p>
<p>I support the proposed forum.</p>	<p>This is the wrong area to achieve the stated purposes. London Wall is the natural Southern boundary. The legislation specifically provides for neighbourhood areas to span local authority boundaries. The Northern boundary should include Prior Weston school, Cherry Tree Walk and adjacent offices.</p>
<p>The Worshipful Company of Plaisterers Hall falls within this proposed area. We would wish to understand the implications of being within this area as they pertain to running a busy Hall that is rented out. We would also wish to understand the reason for the SW boundary goes south of London Wall.</p>	<p>-</p>

I generally support the proposal, which will go a small way to mitigating the democratic deficit for residents of the City of London, which is overwhelmingly governed by representatives with a large business mandate. I am aware that the SMEs and residents in this neighbourhood have more in common with each other than either have with the large and multinational businesses that predominate in the rest of the City. The Neighbourhood Forum is timely as the proposals for the Culture Mile BID have set an aspiration to increase by a step change the visitor footfall in the area. Whilst the regeneration dividend of Culture Mile is potentially of great value to residents and local businesses, there is also a risk that establishing a national visitor destination on our doorstep will have dis-benefits for residents and certain categories of small business if it not carefully planned and managed. A forum anchored in the neighbourhood could be an important balance in policy and implementation of the Culture Mile, to avoid conflicts that have arisen elsewhere with central London destinations with high residential populations (e.g. Covent Garden, Shoreditch, Fitzrovia). The redevelopment of the Smithfield market buildings once relocated, and the re-opening of the Museum of London on its new site have the capacity to bring about radical change fast. The issues of the Golden Lane and Barbican area (and the other residential pockets adjoining) are quite distinct from the rest of the Square Mile, and receive inadequate consideration and attention in City policy making and decision trees. There is a risk that non-residents and businesses primarily based outside the area will have a preponderance. The proposed constitution (clause 16.1) deploys the idea of 'demonstrably resident' and 'demonstrably working' in the area without setting a test for demonstrably. I would prefer to see the phrases 'whose principal place of residence' and 'whose principal place of business' here to help reduce the risk of undue influence from absentee landlords and businesses primarily based elsewhere, even elsewhere in the city. This is because the Neighbourhood Forum should be founded on localism. In recent decades the City of London has not been good at consulting its residents and SMEs and has sometimes shown itself to be seriously out of touch with residents, the numbers of which are rapidly growing, as a matter of policy, from a low base. The Neighbourhood Forum has the potential to contribute to a better balance and a more equitable City.

I am not clear why the residential pockets around St Bartholemew the Great church have been excluded whilst those in Little Britain have been included. Other excluded pockets of primarily residential property (most with SME uses on the ground floor) are along Aldersgate Street and Long Lane. I consider these should be included too to engage both residents and SMEs. These areas as also a part of the setting for the large scale cityscapes of the Barbican and Golden Lane estates. These areas (and those already included) have more in common with each other than either have with the rest of the Square Mile.

-	In general the boundary seems sensible, though it seems odd that Alban Gate is not included
-	Why are only some properties, across roads from the estates, included in the proposed area?
The proposal is sound and reflects the commitment of local residents to shaping their neighborhood as real place.	-
It sounds cohesive, relevant, and ticking all the bureaucratic boxes. A good way to foreground residents voices.	It appears to incorporate all the relevant sub-communities.
-	I am in support of any effort to empower residents to influence their material environment. My Quaker Meeting is located nearby and we find the gross high-rise intrusions of buildings in the City and in our area of Islington (City Road & Old Street roundabout) ominously threatening, odious.
This seems a sensible way of allowing local views to be heard from the residents and small businesses in an important and vibrant area. The current arrangements have until this proposal appeared to discount and undervalue such views.	The area is closely linked and includes a significant proportion of the residential accommodation in the City of London
Great idea. Democratic input from people living/working within the neighbourhood makes complete sense.	It seems to be inclusive enough

<p>The area residents should have a voice. I support this idea</p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p>I</p>	<p>-</p>
<p>As a local councillor for Aldersgate, I support the application. I am not clear whether the Forum would input to the City Police Barbican Cluster liaison, but would encourage that - if relevant.</p>	<p>-</p>
<p>I am very supportive of the proposal in order to have a say in planning decisions and greater influence on CIL funding outcomes. In 2022 Shakespeare Tower House Group applied for CIL funding to support its efforts of refurbishing its lobby, which is part of the historic fabric of the Barbican. Sadly it was rejected which is doubly disappointing considering that the CIL pot was heavily underutilised and was often used for less deserving initiatives. With the Barbican Podium Works, Beech Street Zero Emission Zone and Barbican Renewal Projects all underway, it is crucial that local residents can better voice their concerns and participate in the planning and decision making process.</p>	<p>Consideration could be given to include neighbouring areas all the way to Farringdon/Smithfield (e.g. Barts Square) to improve the collective bargaining power.</p>
<p>It's a great idea and I completely support setting up this forum. The community is very strong here and we would value representation and a voice</p>	<p>-</p>
<p>What is the purpose and/or benefit(s) of this further body?</p>	<p>-</p>
<p>I fully support this application. I am a resident living in Stanley Cohen House, with links with friends in the Barbican Estate and Cloth Fair as well as my immediate neighbours here on the Golden Lane Estate</p>	<p>-</p>

<p>I fully support the proposed neighbourhood forum as a way for the residents and workers in this area to have more of a voice in the vision for our area and how CIL money is spent in our neighbourhood.</p>	<p>I agree with the proposed area which aligns with City of London boundaries and takes in both major residential complexes.</p>
<p>I strongly support this proposal which will have significant benefits for the people living in the area.</p>	<p>The area appears relevant and proportionate.</p>
<p>I think this is an excellent initiative for a cohesive community to have a statutory voice in the future of their neighbourhoods. Residents's associations don't have this and it is long overdue. Neighbourhood forums have been around since 2011/12. The fact that the City is a one of 8 neighbourhood deserts speaks volumes. This has my full support.</p>	<p>I think this is an excellent initiative for a cohesive community to have a statutory voice in the future of their neighbourhoods. Residents's associations don't have this and it is long overdue. Neighbourhood forums have been around since 2011/12. The fact that the City is a one of 8 neighbourhood deserts speaks volumes. This has my full support.</p>
<p>I support the application in relation to both the creation of a neighbourhood area and forum.</p>	<p>I support the application in relation to both the creation of a neighbourhood area and forum.</p>
<p>This is a good idea. The Corporation needs to listen to its residents.</p>	<p>Exclude the offices to the South East of the London Wall roundabout.</p>
<p>I fully support the proposed Neighbourhood Forum.</p>	<p>The boundary strikes a good balance between commercial/office and residential development.</p>

<p>I fully support the proposed forum. We need to find a way to strengthen our local community and give it a more active voice that the City of London will listen to in all areas of activity, regulation, development and expenditure that affect our lives.</p>	<p>This is a vibrant local area with a wonderfully diverse mix of residents and to recognise it as a neighbourhood area will only strengthen the community. Bringing together Golden Lane and the Barbican in this way is eminently sensible and I hope will be the beginning of a process that local residents feel invested in and will contribute to.</p>
<p>I am in favour of this.</p>	<p>I agree with the proposal.</p>
<p>-</p>	<p>All residential of course except for the area of office blocks south east of Museum of London?</p>
<p>try it for a period, say 2 years, and then assess its value objectively.</p>	<p>a good concept</p>
<p>I am in favour</p>	<p>I agree with one caveat. The boundary along Moor Lane should include both the road and the pavement along the East side. The move toward greater greening of the neighbourhood should be encouraged; extending the boundary to include the pavement would allow the neighbourhood to fully embrace this objective.</p>
<p>Seems a good idea for an area where the corporation tends not to take the interests of residents as seriously as those of businesses</p>	<p>Seems logical given the focus of residential development in this area</p>

<p>I support this initiative and applaud those who have got the application to this stage. There is obviously a lot more to be done, and one area that I believe needs further clarification is the criteria for Business and Community Group Members.</p>	<p>-</p>
<p>Support the creation of a neighbourhood forum. In the execution of the view that creation of appropriate</p>	<p>One important comment on the boundary.</p>
<p>-</p>	<p>*****</p>
<p>I welcome this initiative</p>	<p>-</p>
<p>I fully support the proposal for a Neighbourhood Forum.</p>	<p>I support the proposed area.</p>
<p>I agree with the proposal which is long overdue</p>	<p>I agree with this proposal extending as marked on the map but within the City of London boundaries.</p>
<p>It is a great development for the area. Completely support.</p>	<p>The proposed neighbourhood area looks appropriate. I'm glad that residents in blocks neighbouring the Barbican and Golden lane estates are included as they are part of our community. Completely support.</p>
<p>This is a brilliant idea. It's high time the residents of the City of London had some recognition and this will help.</p>	<p>It seems entirely sensible. All those within this area share the same interest in maintaining and improving quality of life.</p>

This is an excellent idea and long overdue . The Barbican and Golden Lane estates were originally conceived as an oasis in the heart of the city to encourage people to come back and move where they work . In the last 38 years during which weâ€™ve lived here weâ€™ve seen the interests and needs of such residents increasingly ignored by the City planners in every area. We donâ€™t have a coherent and a constructive voice to promote the benefits of having a vibrant residential community in the heart of the City and this will help to provide this

Itâ€™s a great idea to develop a coherent and long term plan for residential areas in the heart of the business community which balances the needs and interests of both communities and provides a useful touchstone for those making planning applications from both. Relations between residents and the City have become quite toxic over the last few years and it is time to engage in constructive debate and create a helpful set of principles to facilitate further consultation and decisionmaking on critical issues such as traffic management, environmental matters and of course development .

I support the formation of the Neighbourhood Forum. The constitution document is, however, vague (to the point of silence) as to how its activities will be financed. Presumably the instigators know that a grant for neighbourhood planning expenses is available from Locality. For example, no membership fee is proposed (probably rightly). I wonder whether the option was considered of forming a civil parish within the City, with universal suffrage and elected parish councillors rather than directors, and with the civil parish area forming the neighbourhood plan area, and with a council tax precept financing the parish council (including a paid parish clerk).

1. The City's draft plan also sees residential development at 'Smithfield'; it might be a good idea to include the rest of the Farringdon Within ward (Barts Square etc) in the neighbourhood area, as this is hard by the Barbican and includes Barbican tube station. In particular, buildings/developments on the west side of Aldersgate St have a huge impact on the Barbican environment, and so it would be beneficial to have neighbourhood plan policies that covered that location.

2. Similarly the eastern end of the Barbican is heavily affected by buildings/development on the eastern side of Moor Lane and in the vicinity of London Wall Place. I would like to see the neighbourhood plan area extended south to London Wall (where it doesn't currently reach there), and east to Moorfields or even Moorgate. After all, the Culture Mile trail extends east to Moorgate Station, which is also the premier transport interchange for the Barbican.

<p>A good idea if this can give more voice to residents in the City.</p>	<p>As a Barbican resident I think the area should be expanded to include Barts Square and Bartholomew Close as residents there will also be affected by significant changes that are on the horizon.</p> <p>With the opening of the London Museum in West Smithfield and the development of the meat market once it moves, the 'culture mile' corridor from the new museum to the Elizabeth Line station entrance in Long Lane and to the Barbican needs to be considered as a whole. It appears that not much thought has been given to movement of people and traffic across this area.</p>
<p>It looks well conceived and likely to be very helpful.</p>	<p>This area makes a huge amount of sense given the location of residential buildings and community assets such as churches and open spaces.</p>
<p>I am supportive of the forum because it builds on existing good community organisations representing individual local buildings.</p>	<p>I support the proposed area because it reads logically as a neighbourhood. It includes buildings and blocks that have a genuine community and feeling of being a mutually shared place.</p>
<p>Neighbourhood Plans are effective at putting the voices of communities into planning law and community initiatives - so I support this.</p>	<p>The area makes sense - it will always seem somewhat arbitrary - but it is centres on the Barbican.</p>

<p>It is my view that this is an excellent idea. The proposed area is coherent, has a wide range of planning needs and will benefit from a well-coordinated approach.</p>	<p>The proposed neighbourhood area is logical and relevant to the needs of this community.</p>
<p>Its a good idea</p>	<p>Looks about right</p>
<p>A good idea if it includes both positive and negative requests</p>	<p>To increase the amount if local neighbourhood facilities. Lots of empty shops that could provide services for community. Farmers food market on a weekend - not just supermarket stuff.</p>
<p>Opposed. No need for it. Barbican and Golden Lane have their own separate associations.</p>	<p>No need for it. Barbican and Golden Lane should be considered separately.</p>
<p>I support the formation of a Neighbourhood Forum. As a resident I support any initiative which promotes collaboration between the residential and working population of the City of London and the Planning authorities.</p>	<p>The neighbourhood area looks exactly right. I support the inclusion of the green spaces in the area, including Postman's park and the Barbican Wildlife Garden.</p>
<p>Yes, this is an excellent idea.</p>	<p>-</p>

<p>The creation of a Neighbourhood Forum is important to collate and represent the views of the people living in the Barbican and Golden Lane Estates along with adjoining buildings.</p> <p>The residential area is very special because of its location - but that also leads to particular pressures being put upon it when the needs of residents are up against corporate interests.</p> <p>Without these residential areas the City of London would lose an important part of its character and ability the culture and visitors which enrich it. So it is important that the needs of the residents can be represented coherently and appropriately in local development and planning matters.</p>	<p>I agree with the proposed neighbourhood area</p>
<p>It is high-time the community took advantage of the legislation to afford it a statutory voice in the future of their neighbourhood.</p> <p>More information on the emerging forum can be found on their recently launched website- https://bglneighbours.wordpress.com</p>	<p>The proposed area follows the City of London wards of Cripplegate and Aldersgate with a few residential blocks added. These wards are predominantly residential and have a thriving local community.</p>
<p>I am a Barbican resident and support establishment of a neighbourhood forum.</p>	<p>I am a Barbican resident and support establishment of a neighbourhood area encompassing the Barbican and Golden Lane Estates.</p>
<p>Why not?</p>	<p>To whom would its members be accountable? How would they be elected/appointed? What would they do?</p>
<p>I enthusiastically support the creation of the Neighbourhood Forum for this amazing place in which to both live and work and believe that the forum will do much to bring diverse people and institutions together to co-create a positive and imaginative shared future that benefits us all.</p>	<p>-</p>

I support this. Sounds like a great idea and surprising we don't have one already in line with other London boroughs & counties. It makes you wonder under legislation what else we don't have here that we have a right to.

I hope this forum has more weight and does not become yet another exclusive working group.

How quickly can this be up and running?

Can the Forum be renamed? eg North City Neighbourhood Forum. There are residential areas which are not part of either estate in the green area eg bridgewater house, Denizen, Tudor rose court. Naming a Forum to be inclusive of all residents is key to the inclusion of voices to feel they are allowed to participate. Or if the area is marked by Cripplegate & Aldersgate Ward to be named as such, eg Cripplegate & Aldersgate neighbourhood forum.

Can the green boundary be extended to the west to include the developments in Barts square?

How will it be clear to public this is different to the existing NHS Neighbourhood forums, of eg City & Shoreditch Park Neighbourhood forum.

<https://cityandhackneyneighbourhoods.org.uk/>

<p>I strongly support the setting up of the Forum, for the proposed Neighbourhood area. It will provide a strong vehicle for the voices of those who live and work in the area and provide a forum for proactive engagement in local planning (rather than simply reactive)</p>	<p>The area makes sense as a discrete coherent neighbourhood within the City's wider "key area of change" Barbican and Smithfield outlined in the emerging Local Plan. It will help keep the neighbourhood's distinctiveness as a residential and cultural area within the City. It recognises the biggest cluster of residences within the City. Can't see any point in extending it to Islington, which is a much more residential borough anyway and doesn't have the same geographically tight relationship between residences and cultural establishments</p>
<p>It is a really good idea and has clear benefits for the local area.</p>	<p>The boundary includes all of the main residential areas in close proximity to the Barbican and Golden Lane Estates - an excellent inclusive approach. It is best not to include those areas that lie within Islington as liaising across 2 local authorities would be complicated and very difficult.</p>
<p>I strongly support this proposal, The area fo the forum has a rich and diverse body of stakeholders who are interested in working collaboratively to enhance all aspects of the area. I would personally feel more involved once this exists</p>	<p>This area already has some cohesion and thus stands as an area but with strong links to the rest of the City and surrounding areas. As an ex planner I have engaged where I felt I could add value but this would enhance that ability</p>

<p>This is an excellent proposal that stands to support change towards a strong future residential element so fundamental to a great historical city such that the City of London is. Particularly at the time of great change that is upon us: not only the catastrophic impact of global warming and the collapse of non-human species, but the advent of artificial intelligence that will largely eliminate jobs in financial services, universities, and other intellectual-based service roles where humans simply cannot compete (as calculators were to doing arithmetic, AI is to doing intellectual work). At this time we need to shift to people focussed representation that guides us as to how this great city will look and function for residents in the future.</p>	-
<p>I think it is a good idea</p>	Seems fine
<p>Hello, first I have some questions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Who decided to launch this project? 2. Who chose the people to approach to become the first members? 3. Who appointed or chose the steering group members? <p>And who are all these two sets of people as I only know two individuals from among them.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. What activities for this forum do these two groups propose to take up, who will decide which ones to accept and carry out, and which ones to reject, and who will carry out the accepted ones? 4. What role(s) do the rest of us have in this picture? <p>This long, detailed text says almost nothing about "what change do we want to bring about" and "what improvements do we want to implement", and "who will be in charge of implementing them and "who will carry them out", and "how will they be funded and managed". With these answers, I would hope to be able to form an opinion.</p>	My questions above need to be answered first, sorry.
<p>I think is a great idea and fully support it's establishment as soon as possible</p>	-

<p>I think it's a great idea and about time the City had a neighbourhood forum within its boundaries</p>	<p>This makes sense. It is our neighbourhood and contains the majority of the City's residential population, a lot of SMEs, community groups and others. It covers Cripplegate and Aldersgate wards.</p>
<p>Yes definitely. It is important that Barbican and Golden Lane residents can present their views.</p>	<p>Excellent idea - fully supportive</p>
<p>-</p>	<p>An interesting idea, but if it is to include the life of those who live around here, should it look to include all the new flats behind Barts, to the south of Long Lane</p>
<p>Given the small numbers requesting this, compared to the large numbers who reside in the area, they are not representative of the vast majority who live in the area. The mention of somebody in Little Britain also perhaps explains the strange shape of the proposed area, extending south-west to include Little Britain and also many business premises. Also the area to the north-east covers building.</p> <p>There are already enough groups representing residents in these areas, and even those existing ones are in a minority.</p> <p>I lived for 10 years in the Barbican so I know the area well, and now reside in another residential property in the City of London, which also has a resident's committee consisting of a small percentage of the residents, most who are unaware of it's existence.</p> <p>Better would be the City Of London to judge planning application properly and take note of umpteen resident complaints and facts. One example being 150 Aldersgate where a a report wrongly stated there would be no loss of natural light if the balconies/fire escapes were ignored. No more automatic rubber-stamping of all new developments, particularly office, and high-end residential.</p>	<p>-</p>

<p>It sounds like a very good idea.</p>	<p>Combining the areas of Barbican and Golden Lane makes sense.</p>
<p>The proposed area contains a large proportion of non-residential spaces such as schools, offices, arts, and businesses. It is not clear that this in an appropriate forum in which to address the needs of these stakeholders as well as residents.</p>	<p>-</p>
<p>This is a sound proposal that will give a stronger voice to the local community.</p>	<p>-</p>
<p>I think this is a good idea coming just as we move to the new era of recycling, renovating, retrofitting and conserving nature in our neighbourhoods. I would only say I think that the park just east of and next to Golden Lane and the primary school both have an important function for this neighbourhood that should somehow get reflected even if outside the area. Could the head teacher add comments for example? And people comment on how they use the little park - it is a useful cut through route for example.</p>	<p>See the comment above re the Plan content being used to also reflect on things of local importance just outside the area.</p>
<p>I support the proposed forum.</p>	<p>This is the wrong area to achieve the stated purposes. London Wall is the natural Southern boundary. The legislation specifically provides for neighbourhood areas to span local authority boundaries. The Northern boundary should include Prior Weston school, Cherry Tree Walk and adjacent offices.</p>
<p>The Worshipful Company of Plaisterers Hall falls within this proposed area. We would wish to understand the implications of being within this area as they pertain to running a busy Hall that is rented out. We would also wish to understand the reason for the SW boundary goes south of London Wall.</p>	<p>-</p>

I generally support the proposal, which will go a small way to mitigating the democratic deficit for residents of the City of London, which is overwhelmingly governed by representatives with a large business mandate. I am aware that the SMEs and residents in this neighbourhood have more in common with each other than either have with the large and multinational businesses that predominate in the rest of the City. The Neighbourhood Forum is timely as the proposals for the Culture Mile BID have set an aspiration to increase by a step change the visitor footfall in the area. Whilst the regeneration dividend of Culture Mile is potentially of great value to residents and local businesses, there is also a risk that establishing a national visitor destination on our doorstep will have dis-benefits for residents and certain categories of small business if it not carefully planned and managed. A forum anchored in the neighbourhood could be an important balance in policy and implementation of the Culture Mile, to avoid conflicts that have arisen elsewhere with central London destinations with high residential populations (e.g. Covent Garden, Shoreditch, Fitzrovia). The redevelopment of the Smithfield market buildings once relocated, and the re-opening of the Museum of London on its new site have the capacity to bring about radical change fast. The issues of the Golden Lane and Barbican area (and the other residential pockets adjoining) are quite distinct from the rest of the Square Mile, and receive inadequate consideration and attention in City policy making and decision trees. There is a risk that non-residents and businesses primarily based outside the area will have a preponderance. The proposed constitution (clause 16.1) deploys the idea of 'demonstrably resident' and 'demonstrably working' in the area without setting a test for demonstrably. I would prefer to see the phrases 'whose principal place of residence' and 'whose principal place of business' here to help reduce the risk of undue influence from absentee landlords and businesses primarily based elsewhere, even elsewhere in the city. This is because the Neighbourhood Forum should be founded on localism. In recent decades the City of London has not been good at consulting its residents and SMEs and has sometimes shown itself to be seriously out of touch with residents, the numbers of which are rapidly growing, as a matter of policy, from a low base. The Neighbourhood Forum has the potential to contribute to a better balance and a more equitable City.

I am not clear why the residential pockets around St Bartholemew the Great church have been excluded whilst those in Little Britain have been included. Other excluded pockets of primarily residential property (most with SME uses on the ground floor) are along Aldersgate Street and Long Lane. I consider these should be included too to engage both residents and SMEs. These areas as also a part of the setting for the large scale cityscapes of the Barbican and Golden Lane estates. These areas (and those already included) have more in common with each other than either have with the rest of the Square Mile.

-	In general the boundary seems sensible, though it seems odd that Alban Gate is not included
-	Why are only some properties, across roads from the estates, included in the proposed area?
The proposal is sound and reflects the commitment of local residents to shaping their neighborhood as real place.	-
It sounds cohesive, relevant, and ticking all the bureaucratic boxes. A good way to foreground residents voices.	It appears to incorporate all the relevant sub-communities.
-	I am in support of any effort to empower residents to influence their material environment. My Quaker Meeting is located nearby and we find the gross high-rise intrusions of buildings in the City and in our area of Islington (City Road & Old Street roundabout) ominously threatening, odious.
See written letter	
See written letter	
See email response	
See written letter	
See written letter	
See email response	