

Matthew Carpen

From: Giles Dolphin
Sent: 12 January 2012 17:10
To: 'erica.morfimer@cgms.co.uk'
Cc: 'chris.drabble@networkrail.co.uk'; Matthew Carpen; Colin Wilson; Justin Carr
Subject: London Bridge Station

Dear Erica,

As you know, the application will be reported to the Mayor on Tuesday for his decision. I am going through the referral material and it is apparent that the removal of the train shed wall in Tooley Street is a matter that I know the Mayor will want clear answers about. At the consultation stage we raised the point about its removal in paragraphs 59 and 60, which I set out below:

"As set out above, the testing work undertaken by the design team considers the complete demolition of the listed train shed and train shed wall. The technical constraints to 'punch' through the train shed wall have been explained to officers on site and are set out in section 7 of the Heritage Statement. The design team has dismissed retention of the wall in isolation on the basis that it would need almost complete removal and rebuild and that the structure it was intended to support (train shed roof) is no longer present and therefore the heritage value is mostly lost. Initially, at pre-application stage, the same treatment as the current design for the Tooley Street elevation was reflected on the St Thomas's Street elevation. It was quickly apparent that the same modern architectural approach to St Thomas's Street is inappropriate given the views of the arches are far more prominent in the wider context and the contrast does not fit in the prevailing and dominating townscape of the arches. This is particularly important given the recent listing of the arches further along the road.

A reconstruction approach using new materials rather than the original form is therefore currently being proposed. The location of the wall is altered from its existing position which creates more generous pedestrian walkway along St Thomas's Street. Whilst this could be a successful solution in townscape terms, particularly with the current modern, honest approach to the materials, the retention options of the wall in isolation are not set out in the Heritage Statement. As set out in HE9.1 of PPS5, there should be a presumption in favour of the conservation of designated heritage assets. Figure 7.8 and 7.10 of the Heritage Statement suggests that part of the wall needs to be removed; however it is not clear why. The configuration of the new concourse should therefore be shown testing retention of the train shed wall as part of the clear and convincing justification for the loss of heritage assets"

To date we have not been provided with sufficient material to enable the Mayor to be fully and properly advised. We need to know:

1) Why the Driver shed wall must come down. You have stated that it must come down to enable the station works to be constructed. We understand that this is explained in the construction logistics study, but we still haven't seen a copy of this and cannot therefore advise the Mayor accordingly. Could you please forward a copy, and also explain whether any options for construction that do not involve demolition were considered and if so could you please let us know what they were, the conclusion and reasons for them.

2) If demolition can be shown to be inevitable and unavoidable, could you please set out your reasons for not re-instating the Driver shed wall. I understand that reinstatement is likely to be expensive but in my experience such solutions are rarely technically impossible.

- Giles

Giles Dolphin | Assistant Director Planning | Greater London Authority
City Hall | The Queen's Walk | London | SE1 2AA | Tel: 020 7983 4271