

First Name	Second Name	Comments
Ben	Allen	<p>I am commenting as an architect that practices in London. The proposed scheme is incongruous, of poor architectural quality and has a negative impact on the neighbouring buildings. This comment not only relates to the "spoon" skygarden but the interrelation between different elements of the building. By expanding the footprint from that occupied by the current office building it will have a significantly detrimental impact on the public space. A private "skygarden" is no replacement for public space. This part of the city is at risk over gross overdevelopment with the outcome being that no one will want to work there. I urge those considering this scheme to read Ben Derbyshire's (past RIBA president) article in the latest issue of Building Design: https://www.bdonline.co.uk/opinion/from-miesian-cool-to-urban-discord-why-the-new-1-undershaft-scheme-misses-the-mark/5130435.article?utm_medium=email&utm_campaign=Daily%20Building%20Design%20%20Daily%20news&utm_content=Daily%20Building%20Design%20%20Daily%20news&CID_0c01f90c3dfdfcebbd3b1a0d96c0cc10&utm_source=Campaign%20Monitor%20emails&utm_term=From%20Miesian%20cool%20to%20urban%20discord%20Why%20the%20new%201%20Undershaft%20scheme%20misses%20the%20mark. The initial 2016 scheme proposed by Eric Parry architect was a much more coherent proposal. It seems that the scheme has been diluted in order or occupy more space on the site.</p>
Luke	Bligh	<p>The current design of this tower is unacceptable. This skyscraper will be the tallest building in the square mile and will be seen from miles - even from outside of London. This project has a duty to be iconic, and visually appealing to Londoners and visitors alike - something that the current render isn't.</p> <p>This 1 Undershaft proposal is a box on top of what can only be described as a fried egg. This box-like structure could be built in Canning Town, and it wouldn't stand out. Why on earth should we settle for such mediocrity in one of the world's leading financial centre's?</p> <p>The previous design was a lot stronger and oozed sophistication. This proposal looks like it's been value engineered and designed by a committee of people that have no respect for London's ancient or high-rise history.</p> <p>London deserves better. We deserve better. Please do better.</p> <p>Here's a link to a forum thread where this building is being regularly discussed - the vast majority of feedback has been negative: https://www.skyscrapercity.com/threads/1-undershaft-city-of-london-294m-74-fl-proposed.1791935/page-98</p> <p>Thank you, Luke</p>
Rupert	Booth	<p>I am a fan of new architecture and old, embracing excellent examples of both. When considering new projects of this size, particularly in our Capital, in the financial centre, and furthermore as the 'crown' of The City, we MUST get it right; we cannot just pander to requirements for increased floor plates, value engineering and strange originality (fried egg/loo seat being an example). This is too important for a mish-mash of clashing styles, too serious to be made a mistake of and too much of an opportunity to showcase excellence in British design and architectural prowess. It should not be so challenging that it becomes a "we now just have to live with it" example, The Walkie Talkie and the Torre Velasca building in Milan being cases in point. Something of this bland, lumpen, unsightly nature should not represent the UK internationally as our Capital's peak. Across the river is a tasteful and beautiful design, in The Shard, that was instantly an icon, deserving of its prominence. The pinnacle of The City should emulate this grace - and reputation - that radiates style and ambition, not build something which, although undoubtedly unique, achieves only height and bulk. Only an outstanding class act will do; London deserves far better than the current proposal. There is very little enthusiasm for his design, and it should not be executed - it is not good enough for the huge significance - both literally and figuratively - of the profile to which it will aspire.</p>
Yvonne	Courtney	<p>The revised scheme for 1 Undershaft has shafted local residents and workers. The original sunken garden was wonderful (evoking New York's Rockefeller Centre's sunken garden/ice rink) - and the best thing about the whole development. We must not lose the precious 'plaza' area in front of the current 'Aviva' building. A 'podium garden' on the 13th floor or whatever simply doesn't cut it. Who expects to queue or take a lift when going out for a breath of fresh air or short walk? Post pandemic, we've all recognised how crucial outside/green space is to our physical/mental well-being... which this part of the square mile is particularly crying out for (especially as all the promised trees as part of new developments - Cheesegrater, 22 Bishopsgate, Willis - have all died or been cut down). The amended design is down to sheer greed. Shameful.</p>
Hamish	Emerson	<p>I must say the Crown is very uninspiring, it is going to be the pinnacle of the city! Many people I know in person and online agree!</p> <p>I wish for this building to be constructed.</p>
Steven	Jacobs	<p>The Eastern Cluster requires a pinnacle less broad than 22 Bishopsgate, which the latest design at 1 Undershaft stands to provide: Being slightly taller than the consented tower (16/00075/FULEIA), it would create a more distinguishable summit beside 22 Bishopsgate's wide roof when seen from Primrose Hill, Greenwich Park or Canary Wharf. The excessive breadth of the cluster's current apex would thus be lessened from such vantage points.</p> <p>Furthermore, this building would add much-needed density and variety to northerly and southerly views unaffected by the above problem. Consider, for example, the gap it would fill in the cityscape visible from the Thames Path by London Bridge Pier.</p> <p>Recent complaints that this proposal is insufficiently bold or imaginative strike me as naive. The exceptional cost of land and financing in the City render it increasingly unviable to erect the tapering, spire-topped forms commonly demanded. I do concede that the design has been Value Engineered to use a larger footprint than its predecessor, but such additional mass is constrained to its lower floors and does not affect the vital soar of its crown.</p> <p>Today's economic circumstances, I quite expect, present the following choice concerning this site: to build the skyscraper currently proposed, or to build nothing. For the sake of London's skyline, I recommend the former.</p>

Daniel	McLaughlin	<p>I object to this application. I have been visiting St Helen's Square since it was first built. It is a lovely spot in the heart of the eastern side of the city, overlooked as it is today by the Gherkin, the Lloyds of London Buildings and St Helen's Undershaft Church. I cycle there these days often with my granddaughter where she can run around for ten minutes in what, if you are small, is quite a dramatic space. Only in recent years did I see the representative Maypole stored at the corner of St Mary Axe and Leadenhall Street, now seemingly disappeared, commemorating the use of this location as a central gathering and celebratory spot in the City. The proposed development which would essentially eliminate all this ground level space and amenity, is completely unacceptable in scale and impact on those of us who live in or close to the place _ I am nearby by Tower Bridge. A park / public space on an elevated floor allows the City to have bragging rights about its latest innovative solution and goes down well with tourists, but as we have seen with the one at Fen Garden, its fantastic views will shortly disappear due to a new development south of Fenchurch Street. This elevated garden could go the same way. Additionally, I want to stay at ground level where I can take my granddaughter on a bike or tricycle which would doubtless be prevented in whatever high level park is envisaged. Now, I can just lean the bike against a wall or lay it down and we can just relax. I don't want to have to go through intrusive security and or join a long queue of tourists to enjoy the beauty of our city currently available to me at ground level and without any form of barriers to access. I very strongly oppose this ongoing privatisation of our public spaces - one that we have seen happen already at Star Alley on Fenchurch Street.</p>
S	Reginald	<p>What a missed opportunity. Now don't get me wrong, i'm all for the recent boom in skyscrapers that have been popping up around the Square Mile, and with the recent announcement of what will likely become the tallest of the lot, you would expect something exemplary, a design of superb architectural quality and a unique principle within the already exciting cluster forming at the centre of our city. Words fail me at the sight of this proposal. This design is not the peak of a mountain, this design is not the cherry on the cake. Unfortunately this design is far from the high standard showstopping icon that you would expect the tallest building in a global city to exemplify. There is a lot of potential, and I fear that Eric Parry Architects have severely missed the mark on this one. The tower at street level is a mess, the toilet bowl deck that will overshadow most of the square below is a dreary sight, possibly only offering a small halo of what little sunlight we fetch under our infamous London sky. Mayhops. The crown is the defining feature of a landmark, it's importance in grabbing attention and visual impacts cannot be understated. Now I for one appreciate the approach Eric Parry took with the lipstick red design, promising, albeit falling short on identifying with the nature of its surrounding developments. In my opinion a poor effort. As a standalone, the skyscraper could fit within any cluster in New York/Chicago or a Chinese city. However, as the pinnacle of this our beloved city, I certainly expected a lot more. The City should really consider if this is the design that they wish to approve for their tallest skyscraper. Their Ying to the Yang (The Shard). Please reconsider and push architects to strive for high quality, not just bulk and mass. Respect our heritage and attain for beauty, not just structure.</p> <p>I find the addition of the screen and the changes to the public realm at ground floor to be a great improvement over the previous proposal.</p> <p>Creati</p>
S	Reginald	<p>I find the addition of the screen and the changes to the public realm at ground floor to be a great improvement over the previous proposal.</p> <p>Creating a new communal space at the centre of the City cluster anchors the site as a local destination that will benefit workers and visitors alike.</p> <p>I hope that the developer follows through with the planting of green spaces both at ground floor and on the terrace overlooking the square. The inclusion of greenery would massively improve the space</p>
Mark	Richardson-Griffiths	<p>This image shows why planning permission should be resolutely rejected - we can't allow such profiteering of public space to go ahead.</p> <p>https://x.com/RowanMoore/status/1795366663396929917/photo/1</p>
Trevor	Saville	<p>Honestly this new monster high rise development planned for London is an absolutely overwhelming in its scale. It looks far too tall for its ugly monolithic and chunky design which has absolutely no finesse of design that other great monuments in London have. Foster (Gherkin) Rogers (cheesegrater) Piano (shard) all tried incredibly hard to come up with unique and innovative buildings and they succeeded in spades- These are Architectural monuments admired around the globe and come to signify London is also a city that has great buildings. These submitted plans show nothing but a typical monolithic square staggered tower block - which is absolutely HUGE as it is so bulky and lacking in any semblance of what a modern dynamic form might resemble. Man has been building boring square tower blocks for over a century. If you look at many modern Chinese and Middle Eastern cities they have AMAZING examples of what modern tower blocks can look like- this is just 'little bang for little buck' boring square architecture which I deplore . What is proposed here will dominate and completely ruin the skyline of London , dwarfing our best examples of modern Architecture (by Rogers and Foster). It should be rejected for not offering sufficient quality of Architecture in one of the principle cities on our planet and our Capital city. The Architects should be asked to resubmit a quality Architectural Design, one that we can be as proud of as the Gherkin, Cheesegrater and Shard. If they cannot then it should be passed over to a practice that can develop Quality Architecture. I believe the developer is trying to get as much lettable/saleable area for as little money as possible and is not interested in creating a much loved addition to London's skyline. I hope common sense will prevail and this will be rejected outright. If you want to keep it this tediously square then knock 33 stories off its height so it does not obscure our quality architectural monuments.</p>
Simon	Stone	<p>I represent Stone Real Estate Limited who act as the appointed Development Manager for Baltic Exchange Holdings Limited who own the long leasehold interest in The Baltic Exchange, 38 St Mary's Axe.</p> <p>We are concerned that the proposed development would see a significant reduction in light amenity at The Baltic Exchange and would represent an infringement on our client's Right to Light. We would ask that the Development proposals are reduced in height, bulk and mass so as to avoid any infringement whatsoever. The proposed revisions make no improvement to the infringement and loss of light we will suffer.</p>

Martyn	Werrett	I don't believe that a construction of this size is necessary. There are sufficient skyscrapers within the City of London and a number of them aren't fully occupied so not sure what this brings with it. Additionally there are more buildings going up and it's going to make the City seem like a continual building site and not a very pleasant experience, particularly for those who use the City on a regular basis.
--------	---------	---