

The Barbican Association General Council

Draft Minutes of the Meeting on Thursday, 21 July 2022 at 7.00pm by Zoom

Present:

Elected Members: Adam Hogg (Chair), Fred Rodgers (HonSec), Tony Swanson (HonTreas), Jim Davies (MembershipSec), David Bradshaw, Randall Anderson, Ted Reilly, Mark Bostock.	House Group Representatives & stand-ins: Lionel Meyringer (Andrewes), Helen Hulson (Ben Jonson), Karen Munroe (Cromwell), Helen Hudson (Defoe), Jenny Addison (Frobisher), Ian Dixon (Gilbert), Miranda Quinney (John Trundle), Heather Thomas (Lambert Jones), Liz Simpson (Seddon), Brenda Szlesinger (Thomas More), Fionnuala Hogan (Willoughby), Sandra Jenner (RCC)
--	---

No.	Item
1.	<p>Apologies:</p> <p>Deputy Chair: Jane Smith Brandon Mews: Humfrey Brandes Breton House: Andy Hope (Fred Rodgers standing in) Bunyan Court: Derek Penney Cromwell Tower: Tim Cox (Karen Mun standing in) Lauderdale Tower: Gail Beer Seddon House: David Graves (Liz Simpson standing in) Shakespeare Tower: Sandy Wilson Speed House: Christopher Makin Wallside: Mary Bonar</p>
2.	<p>Approval of Previous Meeting's Minutes:</p> <p>Ian Dixon requested more clarity on payments by the scrutiny group. The minutes have been amended to include the following:</p> <p>The role of the scrutiny group is to approve proposed expenditure at the pre-commitment stage with payments being approved by the Treasurer. The idea is that when the LWW team want to commence a process that will result in an expense they submit the contract/scope of work or equivalent to the scrutiny group, whose job is to ensure that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• the contract has an expense cap• that this commitment together with previous commitments is consistent with the overall approval given by the BAGC <p>The role does not include second guessing the need for any expenditure.</p> <p>And a correction: The "DC" referred to in the minutes should be "DS".</p> <p>Subject to these changes, the minutes 19th May were APPROVED.</p>

3.	<p>Matters arising:</p> <p>None</p>
4.	<p>Volunteers for Honorary Secretary:</p> <p>Chair thanked Fred Rodgers for his time as HonSec. No-one present volunteered to take over the role. Chair requested everyone to put feelers out amongst the residents. (TODO for EVERYONE)</p>
5.	<p>Barbican Quarter Action (BQA):</p> <p>General update:</p> <p><u>General comments from Chair + others:</u> Primary objective of BA is to suggest to the City to think hard about what to do with the site and not just automatically build whopping big revenue earning offices totally out of proportion with the surroundings. Formal planning application expected in November. Around 300 at the BQA meeting at St Giles'. Notes will be uploaded to the BA website soon. City of London (CoL) has produced new proposals very similar to the previous. The CoL glossy brochure graphics are favourable to their proposals and downplay the bulk. At the Court of Common Council 21st July, members "onside" petitioned the Court to consider (1) proper discussion (2) need for master plan for culture/Smithfield/changes to Art Centre. The petition failed.</p> <p>(TODO for EVERYONE)</p> <p>Chair requested for the BAGC to amplify the message to residents to: Make their views clear to the London Wall West project team: londonwallwest.co.uk Please cc action@londonstartshere.co.uk so we can log objections submitted BQA focusing on getting responses back and getting traction with common councillors and social media.</p> <p><u>Mark Bostock:</u> Members in the local wards are campaigning actively but the City are pressing to get planning in to avoid the risk that Bastion House might be listed in August 2024. City looking for as much money from the site to offset increasing costs of the new Museum of London. Very difficult to move the City from their mindset. City's baseline position is that Bastion House needs to go.</p> <p><u>Chair:</u> BQA needs to get sufficient councillors to question the proposal and decisions made in order to get the City to reconsider. BQA will be sending out a letter to all the councillors next week in order to grow opposition by after August City recess – targeting councillors outside our own wards.</p> <p><u>Ted Reilly:</u> Shaming city is good – discontent is good – need external force, too, from a superior body. A similar project in Oxford St was halted with help from experts we are now consulting. The discussion reached City Hall and Parliament with positive outcomes.</p> <p><u>Fred Rodgers:</u> BQA should have a written constitution to give more clarity to its position.</p> <p><u>Mark Bostock:</u> Constitution should remove resident nimbysm from the discussion.</p>

Expenditure update:

See the paper from Ted Reilly.

Approval for component of Phase 1 Spend – **VOTED and APPROVED**

Discussion over how the City doesn't seem to have gone out to market to look for other opportunities rather than offices e.g. Holocaust Memorial (which is having problems finding a location to gain planning permission).

70m is what the City will make if the planning permission is granted and is probably needed to fill the shortfall the City needs to build the new museum.

Randall Anderson:

Will try to get a report into the Finance Committee (capital projection for the city fund). There is a chart with capital in and out over the next 10 years. This might show details of the shortfall the LWW development is going to fill. The museum project is at risk if there isn't enough capital.

6. **Format of future GC meetings:**

Can we meet hybrid in Lilac? No.

Lilac unsuitable at the moment, too, because it's a small and enclosed space.

Carry on meeting virtually for now.

7. **Updates for information:**

Residents Consultation Committee:

See the report from the RCC Chair.

Fionnuala Hogan:

Have residents in Willoughby interested in joining the service charge working party (LSCWP) but don't know the process.

Sandra Jenner:

Seeking new members for LHSCWP.

Chair and Sandra have been working on the analysis of the BEO and produced a number of documents, leading to an agreement by the BRC for an independent review. The other part of the LSCWP looks at the service charge accounts and queries them from an accountancy perspective (liaising with Anne Mason – but responses are often incomplete and unhelpful at the moment). Personal view is that when we get new people on the committee then we should meet up and work out priorities and share out the workload.

One of the documents in the HEADS OF TERMS (HOT) which will go out to consultants to review structure / numbers / skill sets to see if the BEO is effective. Finalising draft now.

When Sandra knows where and when to see the tender, she will share the info with the BAGC for interested residents. **(TODO for SANDRA)**

Chair will find out who will be paying for the cost of the exercise. **(TODO for CHAIR)**

Fred Rodgers volunteered to join the LSCWP. **(TODO for RCC)**

Arts Centre Renewal:

See the report from Francis Pugh.

Mark Bostock:

Francis Pugh to be congratulated for taking the design team round to some of the flats. Claire Spencer CEO of Barbican Centre (BC) is keen to take advantage of another. BC is looking at the strategy side and meetings with the design team give us the opportunity to see where the BC is heading.

Last meeting on the 6th was the same date as the BQA meeting in St Giles' so it was not well attended. Get more people on the next ones.

1st meeting with Claire and with Tom Sleigh (Barbican Centre Board).

Claire is interested, knowing she's responsible for an arts centre embedded within a community of residents.

BA is committed to continued consultation. Further discussions in the autumn.

Suggest Francis takes Claire round again and extends the invite to the other non-resident members of the Barbican Centre Board.

Chair:

Will follow up – seeking minutes from the 1st meeting and dates for the next meetings. (TODO for CHAIR)

Chair apologised to Ian Dixon about accidentally leaving Gilbert House out of the notification for the Guildhall School's party.

Ian Dixon and Mark Bostock will liaise on how Gilbert House can setup the same arrangement which Frobisher has with the BC for consultations. (TODO for IAN and MARK)

Planning and Licensing:

See the report from Fred Rodgers.

Fred Rodgers:

Asked for a meeting with the planning officers to show the planners how residents are going to be affected by 1 Golden Lane. No responses yet.

Planning and Licensing:

See the report from David Bradshaw.

David Bradshaw:

Lot of work to produce the report. Ultimately, the goal is to present a report to discuss with CoL members and officers. Draft report to be produced prior and brought to BAGC for comment/input. David will have the draft report ready for the next meeting (but David might not be there). (TODO for DAVID)

Fred Rodgers:

Lot of vandalism in the wildlife gardens recently. Also cigarette stubbs. Also problems in Thomas More Garden with dogs. We need to make sure that residents remember that the gardens are for pleasure and not misuse.

Heather Thomas:

Heather is a member of the Advisory and Scrutiny Group CoL Police and will liaise with David to get the report disseminated to the right Police representatives. (TODO for HEATHER and DAVID)

	<p>Planning and Licensing: Beech Street: Summer Party:</p> <p>See the reports from Ted Reilly.</p> <p>Ted reminded the BAGC of the approved spend of £1,000. Can we also invite Golden Lane residents? VOTED and APPROVED</p> <p>Environment and Sustainability:</p> <p>See the report from Fred Rodgers.</p> <p><u>Fred Rodgers:</u> A reminder to residents of the changes which affect many routes and especially disabled access – changing buses isn't easy.</p>
8.	<p>Dates for next meetings:</p> <p>2022, BA: 22 September and 24 November. RCC: 20 September. 2023, BA: 26 January, 23 March, 27 April (AGM) and 04 May (post AGM).</p>
9.	<p>Any other business:</p> <p><u>Lionel Meyringer:</u> Asked when the pink slips would be reinstated for parcel deliveries.</p> <p><u>Fred Rodgers:</u> Was involved with David Graves on this working party. Pink slips were too time consuming for the cleaners. CPAs are now supposed to text or call people when something arrives. If they are not, then this issues needs to be escalated to the House Officer (by the resident or the House Group).</p>
12.	<p>The meeting ended at 8:52pm.</p>

Minutes

Barbican Centre / Barbican Association

Termly Meeting

Meeting Date: Wednesday 6 July 2022

Attendees:

Barbican Association

Adam Hogg (AH) – Chair, BA
Mark Bostock (MB) – Frobisher Crescent
Francis Pugh (FP) – Gilbert House
Jane Smith (JS) – Chair of BA Planning Subcommittee
Wendy Spurry (WS) – Ben Jonson House

Barbican Centre

Claire Spencer (CS) – CEO Barbican (Chair)
Tom Sleigh (TS) – Chair of Barbican Centre Board
Lauren Brown (LB) – Creative Learning Producer (Theatre, Dance and Poetry), Barbican
Sean Gregory (SG) – Vice Principal and Director of Innovation & Engagement, Guildhall School
Jonathon Poyner (JP) – Director of Buildings and Operations, Barbican and Guildhall School
Barbara Hollingsworth (BH) – PA to Jonathon Poyner, Barbican and Guildhall School (Minutes)

Agenda Item	Actions
1. Opening Statement 1.1. TS: Welcome. 1.2. Introductions.	
2. Minutes and Actions from Previous Meeting 25/01/2022 2.1. AH: Meeting minutes were circulated too late. JHP committed to get these out in an appropriate timeframe. Action: JHP to circulate minutes within a month of the meeting. 2.2. FP: Actions to be shown in bold. 2.3. JHP: Lakeside/Fountains – Cornell Farrell gave an update to residents at the Operations Liaison Meeting on 27 th June. 2.4. JHP: Lifts – Short-term works ongoing; funds received to deal with some of the bigger lifts; will keep residents informed about works on the passenger lifts. 2.5. JHP: Thank you for the kind emails thanking the Engineering Team for their hard work. 2.6. JHP: Furniture for Sculpture Court – Rebecca Oliver is looking into purchasing suitable benches. Prices have increased dramatically, so looking at suitable alternatives, including fabrication. 2.7. MB: Has attended two very good and responsive planning meetings about forthcoming cinema events on the Sculpture Court. Very happy that this area gets used; comms and involvement of residents in the planning are essential. 2.8. JHP: Electrics on Lakeside Terrace - stairs lighting has been replaced.	JHP
3. Chief Executive Introduction 3.1. CS – Introduction and way of working together.	

4. Advance Notice: Static Art Project – Lakeside (LB)

4.1. Contextual information about the project:

S.M.I.L.E-ing Boys Project is a research-led project, created and led by artist Kay Rufai. It which aims to address the specific mental health needs of black boys, whilst challenging the negative stereotypes often associated with this demographic in mainstream media and wider society. From May-July 2022 participants from Leytonstone School took part in a series of creative workshops with Kay, exploring a range of topics connected to agency, culture, identity, mental health, and social issues. The programme culminates with this exhibition of photographic portraits taken by Kay of – and in collaboration with – the boys.

4.2. These photos are at the Barbican’s Silk Street entrance and on the Lakeside Terrace (Level G) from 15 July-4 September 2022.

4.3. Install will take place Thurs 14 July from 9am and should be completed by 6pm or as close to this as possible.

4.4. There will be five freestanding, weighted down plinths with lightboxes. They were tested by the engineering group ODACE.

4.5. CoL Planning Liaison have been consulted with regards to the placement of the plinths. Barbican officers were also involved in the discussion. Placement can be adjusted if deemed an access issue/not safe.

4.5. The Installation will be managed by an Operations Manager.

Action: LB to send plan and further information to BH; BH to circulate to Barbican Association and attach to the minutes.

LB/BH

5. Barbican Renewal Update

TS:

5.1. Multidisciplinary design team led by architects Allies and Morrison and Asif Khan Studio has been appointed, (team was chosen, not a design). Their focus is on reworking underused space, not creating any new space. Also looking at greening spaces around the Barbican; access to the site; they have real sympathy and excitement for the Centre.

5.2. Design itself now underway. Design team spend time in the Centre every week, embedding themselves physically, surrounded by staff, audiences, artists. Very exciting engagement strategy with our many different communities.

5.3. We will see a plan come together driven by the Barbican Centre Board as the client. Ultimately will require sign-off by the City of London Corporation. Physical design, phasing and implementation of design, and business model that will make this financially sustainable will be brought forward to Board and City by spring 2023 for further consideration.

CS:

5.4. Was involved in selection of the architects; their approach is respectful of place and to all the parties involved. Barbican holds a special place for them as individuals as well as collectively. They are keen to ensure that residents are engaged and consulted in the process, not merely kept informed. They have already been on a number of tours, which included the flats, to gain a deep understanding of the interrelationship of the Centre and the residential areas. FP: Tour organised by him and JS only covered part of the area; north area with Ex Halls, Beech Street Tunnel was left out due to time constraints. Nick Adams is aware that follow-up is needed.

Action: FP to organise tour for CEO and other new members of senior management.

5.5. Pulling together initial ideas at present. Looking at what is possible and what is required (e.g., maintenance elements).

5.6. Strong desire to share regular updates through residents newsletter. AH: He and MB had a meeting with the design team recently and came away feeling very reassured.

FP

<p>Next consultation with residents in September.</p> <p>5.7. AH: Regular bulletins would be welcome; there is a quarterly newsletter that goes to every flat as well; there also is a website. FP: Suggested that the Centre’s Podium leaflet be resurrected; hand delivered to every flat on the Estate and containing news about upcoming events as well as other relevant news. Rob Severyn used to pull this together. Action: Look into reinstating the Podium leaflet. JHP to approach Comms team to get their views.</p> <p>JS: Early communication is key; inviting and addressing feedback early on in the process. CS: Projects like this are a marathon; important that connection points are established early.</p> <p>5.8. JHP: Important to manage expectations in the meantime; short-, medium-, and long-term works. JHP outlined the strategy that we have implemented over the past five year: compliant, efficient, and appropriate, and renewal would continue along this vein, with CWP and Capital continuing to form an essential part of the overall plan and to maintain momentum whilst we wait for Barbican Renewal to take shape and get approval.</p> <p>AH: Residents felt there had been a lack of maintenance around the estate, e.g., weeds on Highwalks. JHP noted that the City had invested ca. £50M in the asset over recent and coming years, so the City’s commitment was evident and was gratefully received. CS: Whole of life needs to be considered, not just the first 10 years. JHP: CWP and Capital would maintain the momentum whilst Barbican Renewal took shape. JHP thanked everyone for the patience and access that will be required over the coming years.</p>	<p>JHP</p>
<p>6. Operational Update – Operations Liaison Meeting</p> <p>6.1. JHP: Meeting took place on 27th June. 6.2. Item 11 – Annual review of the Management Plan has started. Action: JHP with BH.</p>	<p>JHP</p>
<p>7. AOB</p> <p>7.1. Action: Date of next meeting to be agreed within the next 3 weeks. 7.2. Action: Minutes to be circulated within the next month.</p>	<p>JHP JHP</p>

Agenda Item 4

LWW Scrutiny Group BAGC Report

The table below shows a summary of the financial status of the LWW campaign as analysed by the Scrutiny Group as of 8 September 2022. The Scrutiny Groups remit is to ensure that the LWW campaign group do not exceed the funds allocated to them by the BAGC. It does this by managing both disbursements and commitments made by the LWW team. It does not examine the effectiveness of these expenses or commitments, only whether they are consistent with the consent given by the BAGC.

At 8 September 2022 the LWW team have made commitments of £45,098 from a commitment approved by the BAGC of £61,100. By that same date the LWW team have disbursed £21,775

London Wall West Campaign

Supplier/Service	Total BAGC Approved Commitment	Total Commitments Approved to date	Total disbursements Made to date	Commitment Wriggle room
Leigh Day	£13,800.00	£1,800.00	£1,800.00	£12,000.00
SEC Newgate	£16,200.00	£16,200.00	£8,898.00	£0.00
North Design/Website	£9,000.00	£8,300.00	£7,974.90	£700.00
Douglas and King	£5,400.00	£5,400.00	£0.00	£0.00
Sturgis	£6,600.00	£6,600.00	£0.00	£0.00
Contingency	£9,100.00	£6,798.05	£3,102.35	£2,301.95
Total BAGC Approved Commitment	£60,100.00			
Total Commitments approved to date		£45,098.05		£15,001.95
Total Disbursements Made to date			£21,775.25	

Agenda item 5

ASB update for BAGC meeting scheduled for 22 Sept. 2022

The Barbican Estate Security Committee's draft report entitled 'ASB REPORTER June 2021 – June 2022' was issued to all BAGC members on the 27 August and comments were requested.

Only a few, but nevertheless, helpful suggestions were received and these have been incorporated and a final report sent to the Chair of the Barbican Residential Committee (the governing body of the estate); the Chair of the Police Committee and the new Interim Head of the Barbican Estate.

A meeting to discuss this report and how to proceed with addressing anti-social behaviour in the Barbican has been arranged for the end of this month.

DAVID BRADSHAW

Chair, Barbican Estate Security Committee

13 September 2022

ASB REPORTER

June 2021 – June 2022

INTRODUCTION/BACKGROUND

Historically, there has always been an element of anti-social behaviour ('asb') in the Barbican but this has not generally been of a serious nature unlike some estates where knife and gun crime and serious drug use take place.

Skate boarding in particular has long been practised in the Barbican and parkour activity has been a more recent nuisance. Indeed, the Barbican in various videos on YouTube has been promoted as a go to venue by and for parkour enthusiasts.

The Barbican's Car Park Attendants ('CPA's') and local Police Officers have, over the years, been called upon by residents to deal with these and other local anti-social issues.

Various asb activities are governed and forbidden under local byelaws, however, an authorised person such as a Police Officer needs to apprehend any perpetrator in the act in order for a fine to be secured in court.

The City of London Police are not able to provide regular patrols and more often than not any byelaw offenders leave the scene before the Police are able to attend.

The byelaws are also woefully ineffective with a maximum fine of £20.

Graphic signs depicting the main activities not permitted under the byelaws were produced last year and located in key areas across the estate to help reinforce the existing but somewhat wordy byelaw signs.

These have helped to inform and deter potential perpetrators, unfortunately, however, most offenders although aware of their wrongdoing will happily ignore and/or deny knowledge of the byelaws.

Cycling as an issue is the most recent challenge. This has come about as some residents have taken to ordering meals and other products via delivery companies employing cyclists to deliver such as Deliveroo, Just Eat, Getir etc ... Such employees are paid minimum rates of pay and can only increase what they earn by maximising the number of deliveries they make. They are therefore not going to entertain dismounting and walking their bicycles up to the podium and down again.

Also, during the pandemic as well as the growing need to reduce our carbon footprint the use of bicycles has been widely promoted and encouraged.

The Barbican is unique – apart from some 6,000 residents the Barbican Art Centre consists of a concert hall, a theatre, 3 cinemas, art galleries, restaurants, a library, a lakeside terrace and 2 shops. The Barbican is also home to the Guildhall School of Music & Drama, the City of London School for Girls and currently the Museum of London.

Given the arrival of CROSSRAIL at Farringdon & Liverpool Street Stations as well as the planned 'Culture Mile' activities and proposals to refurbish the Barbican Centre, many more thousands of visitors will be attracted to the area.

With this in mind the Barbican Centre already has its own security personnel in the form of ISS Security whose remit is to patrol & safeguard Barbican Centre areas. Residential areas, however, are currently not included.

With its ever growing international recognition and attraction the Barbican Centre, with its adjoining residential apartments, has to be considered as a potential venue for a terrorist attack.

As a result of the tragic event in the Manchester Arena in 2017 a proposed private bill known as Martyn's Law was included in this year's Queen Speech. Martyn's Law, more officially known as the Protect Duty legislation, is a piece of legislation under consultation by the UK government to provide a coherent and proportionate approach to protective security in '**publicly accessible locations**'.

OBJECTIVE

In consideration of all of the above, the Barbican Estate Security Committee – a subcommittee of the Barbican Association – decided that what was needed was evidence of asb activity in the Barbican; the objective being to help persuade the Corporation to provide additional deterrent measures to significantly reduce anti-social behaviour.

METHOD

The Barbican Estate Security Committee set about devising an easy-to-use website whereby Barbican Residents would be able to report any asb incident they had witnessed across the estate. This website was branded as the ASB Reporter and launched in June 2021.

Any non-computer savvy resident or anyone without access to a computer or smart phone were able to verbally report the incident to their CPA or Lobby Porter; all of whom have PC's and would complete the report on behalf of the resident.

KEY FINDINGS

* A total of 891 incidents were reported during the year under review; 624 or 70% of which related to the top 4 asb activities of parkour, cycling, skateboarding and rowdy behaviour.

* 687 (77.1%) of the 891 total reported incidents represent multiple reports of the same incident reducing the actual number of incidents reported on during the year to this level. It should be noted here, however, that multiple reporting of the same incident means that these particular incidents may have troubled more residents than others.

* 81.9% of the total number of incidents were reported on by just 5 houses, namely, Ben Jonson, Gilbert, Shakespeare Tower, Frobisher Crescent and Andrewes in that order with Ben Jonson alone accounting for 44.1% of the total.

* Some 40% (tbc) of the 172 reported cycling incidents were by delivery companies such as Deliveroo. However, not every resident distinguished between delivery company cyclists and 'ordinary' cyclists.

* There were 4 main areas in the Barbican where asb incidents were reported on:-

1. Unsurprisingly, the greatest amount of reported asb activity occurred in the North Podium area especially the area between Ben Jonson House and Shakespeare Tower, Beech Gardens, Breton Highwalk and between the ramps from Fann Street – White Lion Court – to the ramp down to Whitecross Street adjacent to Cromwell Highwalk and everywhere in between.

2. The sunken gardens – more commonly known as the igloos – and lakeside terrace.

3. St Giles Terrace

4. Defoe Place and Andrewes Highwalk and areas on the ‘outskirts’ of the estate such as opposite Andrewes House often referred to as Salters Hall garden and the area in Wood Street close to Wallside, below and on the podium area of 125 London Wall.

* In terms of when and at what times asb incidents were reported reveals that during the 12 month period under review there were reports of incidents on every day of the week. Most notably, early evenings Tuesday to Sunday appear to be the prime times for asb activity and also afternoons on Saturdays and Sundays. Saturday and Sunday afternoons and early evenings showed the largest number of reported incidents.

Please note: Specific locations together with the main form of asb activity will be covered by Jim’s graphs/charts/tables.

MAIN RECOMMENDATIONS

In order to significantly reduce asb incidents we are asking the Corporation of London to:-

- Increase the byelaws fines
- Arrange for ISS Security to cover residential areas as well as their current remit of patrolling & safeguarding Barbican Centre areas. This may involve increasing the number of security personnel employed under the ISS Security contract by say 1 or 2 more staff. However, the main areas where asb takes place are essentially adjoining the areas currently covered.
- Provide more regular Police patrols (or possibly Park Guard cover when police are unavailable) at key times especially in the main areas where anti-social behaviour occurs.

DAVID BRADSHAW

Chair, Barbican Estate Security Committee

DJB/HDIH

August 2022

Agenda Item 6

Planning update – September 2022

A few items worthy of mention:

1. 43 trial excavation holes across the Barbican Podium

The Barbican Estate has applied for permission to drill “43 temporary 500mm x 500mm trial hole investigations across the Barbican Podium, land above Beech Street” (application reference 22/00825/LBC).

This application relates to the Barbican Podium Phase 2 (BPP2) works. *“Prior to the submission of applications for planning permission and listed building consent for the BPP2 works, it has been agreed with the CoL that a number of trial holes/pits will be excavated to provide a more comprehensive understanding of the structures immediately beneath the upper podium, including the waterproofing membranes. These investigations will inform the delivery of the wider landscaping works in due course, the warranties associated with such works and the maintenance regime of the space thereafter.”*

The Standard Consultation Expiry date for comments on this application is 4th October 2022.

2. 1 Golden Lane – re-consultation

The application to refurbish and extend 1 Golden Lane has gone to reconsultation “due to revised design and landscaping proposals” (application reference 22/00202/FULMAJ; 22/00203/LBC). A quick look-through suggests that very little changes of significance have been made, particularly in relation to the proximity to the Barbican Estate.

According to the accompanying documents, the key design and access-related amendments focus on:

- Amendments to the massing of the building, reducing its total height and cutting back massing to the north. These amendments have a beneficial effect on daylight and sunlight impacts as addressed in the revised daylight & sunlight assessment and discussed below.
- Several façade amendments, responding to comments of City of London Design Officers.
- Internal layout reconfiguration, responding to comments of City of London Access Officers. The illustrative public realm landscaping scheme is amended as follows: 11/76378392_1 5
- Removal of gates surrounding the bin presentation area in Cripplegate Street. As a result, this area will be provided as open public realm save for the limited periods in which it will temporarily hold bins immediately prior to and following collection.

- Introduction of movable planters adjacent to the Barbican servicing yard to the southwest of Cripplegate Street. This secures the opportunity to allow permeability into this space should its use change in the future.
- Retention of the Category C Turkish Hazel Tree to Cripplegate Street, and resultant amendments to the landscaping scheme including the location of planters, short stay cycle parking and seating in this area. As a result of the amendments, the total Gross Internal Area proposed has reduced by 103sqm

I have not had time to go through every document yet but it appears that the proposed reduction in height is a mere 0.9m (from 68.3m to 67.4m – the current height is 55.3m).

“The actual height increase varies across the building, with additional height focused on the core/lift overrun location to the east of the modern part of the building, with massing stepped back to this point resulting in the creation of the amenity terraces. This means that the height increase fluctuates, including height decreases in some locations (partially to the west adjacent to the Cobalt Building)”.

Concerns over loss of light and overshadowing have again been kicked into touch with, according to the so-called specialists, *“compliance with BRE Guidelines in relation to daylight and sunlight enjoyed at all neighbouring residential developments save for isolated incidences of minor adverse VSC reductions which are considered acceptable in the context of overall impact”* (these seem to relate principally to The Denizen) and that *“the overshadowing impact of the Proposed Development is fully BRE compliant in relation to all surrounding open spaces”*

More scrutinising of the documents needs to be made but, at first glance, it does not appear that any significant improvements have been for Barbican residents.

The Standard Consultation Expiry date for comments on this application is 4th October 2022.

3. Refurbishment of Alban Gate 125 London Wall

A proposed “sensitive refurbishment” is being planned for this building. The *“proposals include enhancing the public realm on ground and podium levels with re-positioned retail units, a contemporary office lobby, landscaping, lighting, and high-quality finishes. We are also looking to introduce planting on existing terraces, and provide new vegetated balconies across the building which will assist with encouraging biodiversity and climate resilience.”*

A number of us attended a preliminary briefing last week and a public consultation is due to commence shortly, with the expectation that a planning application is submitted in the autumn and work can commence in the summer of 2023 and be completed by spring 2024.

A few points:

- The size and height of the building will not change.
- JP Morgan's lease on the building runs until 2025
- The works are planned to be carried out with the tenants in situ
- These plans are only for the Podium level works, NOT balcony works

The proposals seem to focus on painting the structural "supports" in primary colours but until we have access to the presentation and schematics it is hard to describe what is being planned other than the public space will be bigger and can be used as a canvas for art, retail will be retained, there are thoughts of converting the Wood Street escalator access to stairs (with greenery), installing a platform lift on the other side of Wood Street by the two out of action escalators and installing more interesting colourful lighting over the London Wall traffic junction.....all with the aim of adding "vibrancy and excitement to the spatial condition".

As ever, there was no mention anywhere of residents.

4. Pipes on roof of CLSG

We note that three rather unsightly pipes have appeared on the roof of the City of London School for Girls in the line of sight of many residents, especially those in Defoe House. The City Planners were contacted to ask if permission to carry out these works was granted as no planning application had been submitted.

The Planners responded quickly and reported that *"It appears that the original intention was to replace the existing flues on a 'like-for-like' basis to avoid the need for planning permission and listed building consent. However, during installation a decision was taken to move the flues to the new location to enable access for servicing and prevent the backflow of gases from the two main flues on the west elevation into the plant/boiler room where they could recycle back into the building. The attached photographs show the pre-existing and current conditions. I am advised that the two flues on the west elevation are to be removed, the louvres made good and the three new flues painted out to a lighter colour. Having assessed the works, I have confirmed with the City Surveyor's Department, the Facilities Manager and the contractor that **retrospective applications for both planning permission and listed building consent will now be required in order to regularise the situation**".*

Agenda Item 7

Barbican Association Summer Party

BAGC Report September 2022

Summary

This appeared to be a great success; residents volunteers and visitors are keen to do it again next year.

Outcome

The party was very well received. Here's a quote from a resident

So wonderful to see such a diverse group of Barbican residents and their families together and enjoying themselves in so many ways. New friendships being formed and old acquaintances made; knowledge of the Barbican community's rich cultural resources gained and shared; old and young having fun together. The bubble of Covid loneliness popped.

There were seven different activities for children and parents; an over-subscribed bat walk in the evening. The Art society, the Horticultural society, the Museum of London and BQA all reported good outcomes from their pitches. The party raised £950 for the Hackney Food bank.

The BA worked very closely with the parents' group, establishing a good relationship. They have asked that we investigate a sub-committee or working party of the BA to continue to foster this relationship.

Support

Over forty volunteers gave up their time on the day and on the days before and after, to make this a success. In addition to the financial support, see below, the BEO were extremely helpful with the loan of assets and the provision of a hi-spec temporary electrical supply.

Cost

The BA provided a budget of £1,000 and the BEO a further £500, making a total of £1,500. We spent £1,453; just under budget. We now have over £1,100 of capital equipment (gazebos, games equipment etc.) and unused consumables. To keep within budget, we needed to scrounge equipment from various sources around the City, including Golden Lane Residents' Association, Friends of City Gardens, and the City's Gardens team.

Agenda Item 8

Beech Street

BAGC Report September 2022

Summary

The City are proposing to consult on a hybrid scheme which essentially permits only zero emission vehicles in both directions for most of Beech Street but allowing **any** vehicle to turn left out of Golden Lane and proceed along Beech Street in an easterly direction. Residents would not be exempt from the scheme, but camera timings should allow residents to come and go from resident carparks. If this consultation has a successful outcome, there is money available to implement the scheme.

At the same time, the City would **engage, not consult** on the wider Healthy Streets Plan for the Barbican and Golden Lane (and now possibly Bunhill) area. There are no funds available to implement such a scheme.

Discussion

These options were discussed at the Streets and Walkways meeting on 6 September. I wouldn't like to write the minutes. Three alternate immediate options were presented. 1a 1b 1c. they're outlined in an appendix to this note. All three of these options attempt to resolve the issue of Fortune Street being used as a rat run, together with Islington's reluctance to provide resident exemptions to a no turn into Fortune Street restriction.

1a and 1b are preferred by the City. 1c, which is the proposal outlined in the summary above, is preferred by Islington and reluctantly accepted by the City as a compromise. Both Sue Pearson and Randall Anderson objected to the 1c proposal on several grounds, not the least of which was that the lower end of Golden Lane, which is effectively a School Street would become a rat run for eastbound non-zero emission vehicles.

The committee concluded that if within four weeks the City and Islington had not come to an agreement on either of options 1a or 1b a decision would be made under urgency as to whether or not to proceed to consult on option 1c. It seems very unlikely that any option other than 1c will be put forward for consultation.

At the same time, the City would engage, whatever that means, on the Healthy Streets Plan for the Barbican and Golden Lane area.

Local Plans sub Committee 21 September

The meeting considered the Officer's report which was in two parts:

The first part considered the proposals relating to health, inclusion and well-being, summarised in 15 bullet points. However, there was concern that members weren't being asked to consider the complete draft policy instead of bullet points.

However, the contributions from Randall, Natasha Lloyd-Owen, Sue Pearson and Marianne Fredericks were positive with particular concerns over GP, children's play, adolescent's recreation, public convenience and retail healthy food provision. Roof terraces weren't considered to enhance well-being, especially when overlooking residents' homes.

John Edwards continued his quest for a running track, again targeting the Barbican, even suggesting that chunky women who didn't like gyms could benefit from being able to run around here. Marianne suggested that they could achieve the same benefits from dancing, if facilities were available.

The second part related to engagement. At the July meeting, officers were asked to provide a list of informal consultees. This was now more relevant as an informal consultation process has been ongoing throughout September, if not earlier. No list was produced and it wasn't certain from the meeting if this would be made public with officers only committing to provide it to members of the sub Committee.

It is obviously important that the BA is treated as an informal consultee and several members – Randall, Natasha, Sue and Marianne notably pushing on this point, as well as there being an opportunity for wider public consultation before the draft plan is approved by the Court for submission to public examination. The

officers hoped this would be by next . Members stressed that there was a need to produce all the policies as completed drafts rather than bullet points.

Whole Lifecycle Carbon Optioneering Planning Advice Note (PAN)

The public consultation on the PAN closes on 30 September. In addition to the public presentation at the City Centre, which should also have been online, and a webinar the following day, two workshops were planned – one for developers and the other for consultants.

The public presentation wasn't very well attended but was very comprehensive, including an interesting question and answer session. Hopefully, other residents were able to join the webinar.

The PAN will be informative, rather than binding. Even so, it shows that a consistency in presentation of Whole Lifecycle Carbon Assessments (WLCA) will assist both planners, when it comes to advice, and elected members, when it comes to decisions.

I suggested that developers should be required to pay for peer review of their WLCAs in the same way that developers have to pay for peer reviews of Ecology reports. If the same consultants were used each time, there would be a consistency in appraisal.

As far as London Wall West is concerned, after the meeting, I emailed Kerstin Kane, the City's planning officer responsible for sustainability and included a request that Simon Sturges be added to the list of consultants invited to attend the workshop. Kerstin's response wasn't positive, as the only commitment was to "consider" my request.

In any event, since the LWW WLCA published in May isn't fit for purpose as regards the PAN, any planning application will require a WLCA that conforms to the PAN. Even if the PAN hasn't been formally adopted at that time, the City will still have to conform to its intentions.

Later in the year, the City will produce a draft Sustainability Supplemental Planning Document (SPD). This, presumably will cover the three aspects of sustainability – economic, social and environmental. Again this will go out to public consultation.

Fred Rodgers, BA Sustainability and Environment sub Committee