

Comments for Planning Application 23/01066/FULL

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/01066/FULL

Address: City of London School For Girls St Giles' Terrace Barbican London EC2Y 8BB

Proposal: Retrospective application for removal of three fume cupboard discharge flues and installation of three new extract flues to existing roof plant enclosure

Case Officer: Steph Taylor

Customer Details

Name: [REDACTED]

Address: [REDACTED]

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Other
- Residential Amenity

Comment: The three exhaust pipes will be visible from the Barbican Art Centre, from the public podiums, and from the surrounding residencies. They would be an ugly and unsightly addition and not in keeping with the listed school's roofscape or the Grade II Barbican estate.

Comments for Planning Application 23/01066/FULL

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/01066/FULL

Address: City of London School For Girls St Giles' Terrace Barbican London EC2Y 8BB

Proposal: Retrospective application for removal of three fume cupboard discharge flues and installation of three new extract flues to existing roof plant enclosure

Case Officer: Steph Taylor

Customer Details

Name: Mrs Laurien Farmer

Address: 170 Defoe House, Barbican, London EC2Y 8ND

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Other

Comment: The application states that in response to initial feedback from the planning department, the flues have been painted to match the existing colour, "to aid camouflage, and to respect the Barbican residents' vistas". Two points:

1) one wonders why as well as consulting the planning department, the applicant did not discuss the work with residents.

2) If by camouflage the applicant means hide, they are not hidden. The previous flues were not visible by us. The new ones are, because instead of facing west as previously, they now face north i.e. directly across from our apartment. Also, there are more of them, and they are higher. This does not demonstrate respect for residents' vistas.

Apart from being unsightly, the new flues are out of keeping on a Grade 2 listed building in a conservation area.

Comments for Planning Application 23/01066/FULL

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/01066/FULL

Address: City of London School For Girls St Giles' Terrace Barbican London EC2Y 8BB

Proposal: Retrospective application for removal of three fume cupboard discharge flues and installation of three new extract flues to existing roof plant enclosure

Case Officer: Steph Taylor

Customer Details

Name: Dr Nicholas Deakin

Address: Flat 372, Lauderdale Tower, Barbican Barbican London

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Other
- Residential Amenity

Comment: The Girls School and broader listed Barbican estate was carefully designed with integrated services all well hidden from plain sight, and where visible these were done with very high quality materials and iconic design motifs.

On the contrary, the three utilitarian exhaust pipes are visible from the public walkways, lake, gardens and the Barbican Centre- not to mention the houses/apartments which surround the school.

The installed chimneys are unsightly, utilitarian (and not in a good way) to the listed school's roofscape and to do so with only retrospective permission sets a very dangerous broader precedent for other buildings on the Estate.

The work looks like it's at home on an industrial estate, warehouse or isolated school but not within the setting of the Grade II listed Barbican Estate and the Conservation Area.

Comments for Planning Application 23/01066/FULL

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/01066/FULL

Address: City of London School For Girls St Giles' Terrace Barbican London EC2Y 8BB

Proposal: Retrospective application for removal of three fume cupboard discharge flues and installation of three new extract flues to existing roof plant enclosure

Case Officer: Steph Taylor

Customer Details

Name: Dr Martin Farebrother

Address: 117 Defoe House Barbican London

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of the Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Other
- Residential Amenity

Comment:1 The new pipes are already in place, and the application is retrospective. This should not be allowed

2 the new pipes are more obtrusive than the old ones -

- they are 3 (old ones 2)
- they are on the north side (facing the lake and the Barbican centre), old ones on the west side
- they are much taller
- the supporting structure is visible, and ugly

3 the whole is not in keeping with the listed status of the estate. The already extended roof of the Girls' School is not the most attractive part of the estate even without this new pipework. Although it could be claimed to be only a small change, the accumulation of small changes such as this may lead to as much of a threat to the overall architecture of the estate as can a single large change, which would be much more carefully scrutinised.

4 as a resident in Defoe house, the pipes are visible from our apartment (as were the old ones), and the additional obtrusiveness of the new pipes leads directly to a loss of amenity for us (myself and my wife).

5 I have examined the details of the 'proposed' (actually existing) pipes. The report by Cowan (Architects) states that the proposals meet the requirements of the school for safety. I did not see any evidence presented that any alternative ways of meeting the needs of the school were examined, and if they were, why they were rejected in favour of the already executed scheme.

Comments for Planning Application 23/01066/FULL

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/01066/FULL

Address: City of London School For Girls St Giles' Terrace Barbican London EC2Y 8BB

Proposal: Retrospective application for removal of three fume cupboard discharge flues and installation of three new extract flues to existing roof plant enclosure

Case Officer: Steph Taylor

Customer Details

Name: Mr Richard Tomblin

Address: Flat 160, Defoe House Barbican London

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Other

Comment: My objection is based on the appearance of the replacement pipes, which project above the roofline of the school. The pipes are completely out of keeping with the design of the rest of the estate - indeed the surrounding nationally important architecture is notable for the absence of any visible pipe work or conventional guttering.

The Barbican is the epitome of design by architect- down to the smallest detail of window and door handle.

These pipes are a basic builders solution to a practical problem, and have absolutely not been subject to any design other than that of the industrial estate. They should be removed.

Comments for Planning Application 23/01066/FULL

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/01066/FULL

Address: City of London School For Girls St Giles' Terrace Barbican London EC2Y 8BB

Proposal: Retrospective application for removal of three fume cupboard discharge flues and installation of three new extract flues to existing roof plant enclosure

Case Officer: Steph Taylor

Customer Details

Name: Dr Richard Collins

Address: 4 Lambert Jones Mews London

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Other

Comment: The Barbican is Grade II listed - this imposes a duty on owners/operators of buildings on the Estate to maintain the appearance of the ensemble created by Chamberlin, Powell and Bon. Regrettably, the Girls' School is a serial offender in disfiguring the external appearance of its building and its unauthorised construction of three vent/exhaust pipes has further disfigured the carefully planned profile of a key element in the Barbican ensemble. The new pipes are unsightly and pervasively visible from homes and the public and residential areas of the Estate. They are not in keeping with the historic appearance of the Estate, are incompatible with a Grade II listing and inappropriate to a Conservation Area. Permission should not be granted.

Comments for Planning Application 23/01066/FULL

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/01066/FULL

Address: City of London School For Girls St Giles' Terrace Barbican London EC2Y 8BB

Proposal: Retrospective application for removal of three fume cupboard discharge flues and installation of three new extract flues to existing roof plant enclosure

Case Officer: Steph Taylor

Customer Details

Name: Mr Jan-Marc Petroschka

Address: 349 Ben Jonson House Barbican London

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Other

Comment: I object to the above retrospective planning application on the following grounds:

- 1.) The new pipes are not a like for like replacement of the previously existing flues. As such the new flues should have been carefully designed, concealed and NOT visible from public or private spaces.
- 2.) The proposed exposed pipes are contrary to the design ethos of the Barbican were services were either designed as decorative features or integrated and hidden from view.
- 3) Although small in scale, the proposed exposed pipes set a hazardous precedent and with the accumulation of already inappropriate alterations and furthers to follow, will seriously harm the setting of the Grade II listed Barbican Estate and the Barbican and Golden Lane Conservation Area.
- 4.) The works were implemented without a clear design strategy and without the sensitivity that the listed buildings require. I therefore call on officers to reject this application and request an alternative solution in the spirit of the Barbican and its exceptional design quality.

From: Brenda Szlesinger [REDACTED]
Sent: 21 November 2023 14:20
To: PLN - Comments; Taylor, Steph
Subject: Planning reference: 23/01066/FULL

THIS IS AN EXTERNAL EMAIL

I OBJECT to application 23/01066/FULL on the following grounds:

1. The works should not have been carried out without the requisite planning and listed building consents. The decision to execute the works demonstrates complete contempt for the planning process. The current attempt to present the works as a fait accompli should be subject to the highest scrutiny. Such disregard should be discouraged.
2. The Barbican Estate is Grade II listed. The claim by Cowan Architects that the flues are barely visible from the public areas is wrong as a matter of fact. The image below was taken from the Defoe Highwalk which is a public highway. The following statement by Cowan Architects is mere wishful thinking:
"As is evidenced in the latest photographs, the new flues blend in well with their surroundings".
It is clear from the image below that the flues stand out.
3. No evidence has been submitted by the applicant that any expert heritage advice has been sought. To what extent have alternatives that are sympathetic to the surroundings been considered? Where is that evidence documented? The original application was for a like for like replacement. This is not what has materialised on the roof of the school.
4. Approving this application will set a dangerous precedent for this listed estate. It will encourage a laissez-faire approach to adding plant to the roof-tops and other areas in the knowledge that retrospective permission will be simply waved through by the Planning Department. Listing status is an indicator of the heritage value of the whole estate and must be preserved.
5. Finally, in the Cowan report, there is a reference to "contaminated air". Is there an air quality report in support of this application? Does this comply with the City's air quality strategy?

I urge you to REJECT this application.

Brenda Szlesinger
Flat 112 Thomas More House
Barbican EC2Y 8BU



Comments for Planning Application 23/01066/FULL

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/01066/FULL

Address: City of London School For Girls St Giles' Terrace Barbican London EC2Y 8BB

Proposal: Retrospective application for removal of three fume cupboard discharge flues and installation of three new extract flues to existing roof plant enclosure

Case Officer: Steph Taylor

Customer Details

Name: Michael Jackso

Address: 120 Thomas more jouae London

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Other

Comment: Like for like replacements are available

These were not used

We need to ensure that contractors do their best - it's difficult sometimes but this time it wasn't

Michael

Comments for Planning Application 23/01066/FULL

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/01066/FULL

Address: City of London School For Girls St Giles' Terrace Barbican London EC2Y 8BB

Proposal: Retrospective application for removal of three fume cupboard discharge flues and installation of three new extract flues to existing roof plant enclosure

Case Officer: Steph Taylor

Customer Details

Name: Dr Paul Simmons

Address: flat 96 Thomas More House Barbican London

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Residential Amenity

Comment: Fait accompli is not a reason to approve this retrospective application. The School has a history of 'creep'; indeed the architects themselves admit to the service top floor being on top of the original design. What we have now is a roofscape that is out of character with the general ambience of the Barbican estate as viewed from the terrace or upper story flats. It appears industrial in a mainly residential conservation area. The original plan was like for like replacements and then it seems to have got tangled up with safe access. Painting the new flues to try to camouflage them is worthy but really misses the point. This illustrates yet again that the School is really getting too big for its site.

From: Sandra Jenner [REDACTED]
Sent: 21 November 2023 15:33
To: PLN - Comments; Taylor, Steph
Subject: Fwd: Planning reference: 23/01066/FULL

THIS IS AN EXTERNAL EMAIL

I OBJECT to applica~~o~~n 23/01066/FULL on the following grounds:

1. The Barbican Estate is Grade II listed which is an indicator of the heritage value of the whole estate and must be preserved.
- 2 The works should never have been carried out without the requisite planning and listed building consents. The decision to execute the works clearly flouted the planning process. The School and their advisers must have known this. Such disregard should be discouraged.
- 3 The Architects say that the flues are barely visible from the public areas. This is incorrect. They can be seen clearly from the Defoe Highwalk which is a public highway. Nor do they "blend in well with their surroundings".
- 4 More appropriate alterna~~o~~ves that are sympath~~e~~c to the surroundings should have been used? The original applica~~o~~n was for a like for like replacement. The flues on the school roof are not like for like.
4. If such an applica~~o~~n were to be approved it will set a precedent and encourage similar approaches with plant added to roof-tops and other areas nilly nilly in the knowledge that retrospec~~o~~ve permission will be simply waved through by the Planning Department.

I strongly objec~~o~~n to the applica~~o~~n and the Commi~~s~~ee is urged to reject it.

Kind regards

Sandra Jenner
52 Defoe House
Barbican
EC2Y 8DN

From: Helen Hudson [REDACTED]
Sent: 22 November 2023 04:49
To: PLN - Comments
Subject: OBJECTION : Planning reference: 23/01066/FULL

THIS IS AN EXTERNAL EMAIL

I OBJECT to application 23/01066/FULL on the following grounds:

1. The undertaking of these works without the necessary planning and listed building consents reflects a blatant disregard for the planning process. The attempt to present the completed works as a fait accompli should be subjected to thorough scrutiny. Such negligence needs to be strongly discouraged.
2. The Barbican Estate holds Grade II listing, and the assertion by Cowan Architects that the flues are hardly visible from public areas is factually incorrect. A view from the Defoe Highwalk, a public thoroughfare, contradicts Cowan Architects' optimistic claim that the new flues seamlessly blend with their surroundings. The visual evidence makes it evident that the flues are conspicuous.
3. The applicant has not provided any evidence indicating consultation with heritage experts. The consideration of alternatives that harmonize with the environment is unclear. Where is the documentation supporting this? The initial application proposed a like-for-like replacement, but the actual installation on the school's roof deviates from this plan.
4. Approval of this application would establish a risky precedent for the listed estate, potentially endorsing a casual approach to adding infrastructure to rooftops and other areas. This could lead to a belief that retrospective permissions will be easily granted by the Planning Department. Preserving the listing status, which signifies the heritage value of the entire estate, is imperative.
5. The Cowan report mentions "contaminated air," but no supporting air quality report is provided with this application. Does this align with the City's air quality strategy? It is crucial to ensure compliance before considering approval.

In light of these concerns, I strongly advocate for the rejection of this application.

Helen Hudson
Flat 15 Defoe House
Barbican EC2Y 8DJ

From: Helen Hudson [REDACTED]
Sent: 22 November 2023 04:54
To: PLN - Comments
Subject: Planning reference: 23/01066/FULL

THIS IS AN EXTERNAL EMAIL

Dear Sir/Madam,

I formally oppose application 23/01066/FULL based on the following grounds:

1. The execution of these works without obtaining the requisite planning and listed building consents demonstrates a blatant disregard for the established planning process. The attempt to portray the completed works as a fait accompli should undergo rigorous scrutiny, and such negligence must be strongly discouraged.
2. The applicant has not furnished any evidence demonstrating consultation with heritage experts. The consideration of alternatives that align with the environment remains unclear, and documentation supporting this is absent. Although the initial application proposed a like-for-like replacement, the actual installation on the school's roof deviates from this plan.
3. The Barbican Estate is designated as Grade II, and the claim by Cowan Architects that the flues are barely visible from public areas is factually inaccurate. An observation from the Defoe Highwalk, a public pathway, contradicts Cowan Architects' optimistic assertion that the new flues seamlessly integrate with their surroundings. Visual evidence clearly reveals the conspicuous nature of the flues.
4. Approval of this application could set a precarious precedent for the listed estate, potentially endorsing a lax approach to adding infrastructure to rooftops and other areas. This may foster the belief that retrospective permissions will be readily granted by the Planning Department. Preserving the listing status, indicative of the heritage value of the entire estate, is of utmost importance.
5. The Cowan report references "contaminated air," yet no accompanying air quality report is provided with this application. Does this align with the City's air quality strategy? Ensuring compliance is crucial before contemplating approval.

Considering these concerns, I strongly advocate for the rejection of this application.

Sincerely,

Helen Clifford Flat 34 John Trundle Court Barbican EC2Y 8DJ

Comments for Planning Application 23/01066/FULL

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/01066/FULL

Address: City of London School For Girls St Giles' Terrace Barbican London EC2Y 8BB

Proposal: Retrospective application for removal of three fume cupboard discharge flues and installation of three new extract flues to existing roof plant enclosure

Case Officer: Steph Taylor

Customer Details

Name: Robert Hawkins

Address: 27 thomas more Barbican London

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Other

Comment: I received a troubling message from Thomas More House Board today that detailed how construction work had been done on 3 vents on the girls' school roof. This was done without permission and did not come close to following or even making any attempt at following, the lawful guidelines of like for like replacement.

Considering that the roof of the girls' school has for 30 years been the ugliest part of the Barbican property, it's really a moot point, but the fact that there was improper work done without having permission to do so is another example of the blatant disregard for rules, laws and regulations that protect the Barbican and its residents, and has only increased resentment and strengthened sentiments to battle the City of London's irresponsible, indifferent and venal (money based) attitude toward the Barbican. This is what I am complaining about now. I don't care about the hideous roof of the Girls school that I've had to look at for 26 years, I am complaining about your disregard for rules and regulations. In America the term used for what has been done so often is "scoff-law", but the City of London does not seem to have a comparable term in its vocabulary. This is a formal complaint, hopefully. Although I expect nothing from the City of London nor the Barbican Estate Corporation.

Comments for Planning Application 23/01066/FULL

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/01066/FULL

Address: City of London School For Girls St Giles' Terrace Barbican London EC2Y 8BB

Proposal: Retrospective application for removal of three fume cupboard discharge flues and installation of three new extract flues to existing roof plant enclosure

Case Officer: Steph Taylor

Customer Details

Name: Mr Simon Cooper

Address: 27 Thomas More House London

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Other

Comment: This is a retrospective application for work that did not follow the original plan. Such an approach is unacceptable.

Comments for Planning Application 23/01066/FULL

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/01066/FULL

Address: City of London School For Girls St Giles' Terrace Barbican London EC2Y 8BB

Proposal: Retrospective application for removal of three fume cupboard discharge flues and installation of three new extract flues to existing roof plant enclosure

Case Officer: Steph Taylor

Customer Details

Name: Ms Eleanor Duffy

Address: 115 Thomas More House Barbican London

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Other
- Residential Amenity

Comment: The school has already significantly undermined the original design intent for the roofline of this building through unfortunate extensions over the years - but that is no reason to make things worse.

It is not a good look for a school to apply for pp retrospectively - what sort of message does that convey to pupils let alone the rest of the world?

Comments for Planning Application 23/01066/FULL

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/01066/FULL

Address: City of London School For Girls St Giles' Terrace Barbican London EC2Y 8BB

Proposal: Retrospective application for removal of three fume cupboard discharge flues and installation of three new extract flues to existing roof plant enclosure

Case Officer: Steph Taylor

Customer Details

Name: Dr Ruth Holt

Address: 96 Thomas More House Barbican London

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Other

Comment: Gaining retrospective planning application in this way sets a very unwelcome precedent. The City of London School for Girls has put in repeated applications for a number of expansion projects that encroach on the Barbican estate, its architecture and nature. This apparently harmless piece of work has been agreed (retrospectively) without any evidence of the project being properly considered. The City Corporation needs a much more active stance on conserving and maintaining the Barbican estate architecture and detail.

[REDACTED] [REDACTED]

From: Rodney Jagelman [REDACTED]
Sent: 24 November 2023 14:21
To: PLN - Comments
Subject: City of LondonSchhol for Girls

THIS IS AN EXTERNAL EMAIL

This email relates to the application for retrospective permission to reeplace three extract flues. Reference 23/01066/FULL and is for the attention of StephTaylor whom we understand to be the case officer dealing with this application.

Retrospective permission is a serious matter not to be lightly granted.. I do not know wherter the failure to adhere to the proper procedures was an act of carelessnesson the part of the staffand/or governors of the school or a cynical attempt on their part to get away with saving time and money by acting unlawfully or something in between.

The school should replace the flues on a like for llike basis . That is the way that the integrity of the estate will be preserved and slackness in enforcing the proper procedures is unfair on all of us who respect the regulations. It is especially unseemly for the Corporation as planning authority to appear to connive with the staff/ trustees to whitewash the latter's failings as an institution with which the Corporation is so closely connected.

Rodney Jagelman

153 Thomas More House

Comments for Planning Application 23/01066/FULL

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/01066/FULL

Address: City of London School For Girls St Giles' Terrace Barbican London EC2Y 8BB

Proposal: Retrospective application for removal of three fume cupboard discharge flues and installation of three new extract flues to existing roof plant enclosure

Case Officer: Steph Taylor

Customer Details

Name: David Mackie

Address: 41 Thomas More House Barbican London

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Other
- Residential Amenity

Comment: I agree with the other two objections I have read and do not repeat them but add this. The consent was for flues to be like for like. There is no suggestion that the construction team even tried to comply with this requirement. Whatever the motives for this, it seems an abuse of the planning system and consent should be refused for that reason alone.