

THAMESLINK 2000

Proof of Evidence on Blackfriars Station and Bridge

By
Michael Haste

NR/6/A1

Town and Country Planning Act 1990
Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990
Transport and Works Act 1992

Railtrack (Thameslink 2000) Order 1997
Railtrack (Thameslink 2000) (Variation) Order 1999

1. Inquiry into applications by Network Rail for the Thameslink 2000 railway project sites at:

11-15 Borough High Street, London SE1
2-4 Bedale Street, London SE1
7 Stoney Street, London SE1
16-26 Borough High Street and 7 Bedale Street, London SE1
Blackfriars Railway Bridge, London EC4
Blackfriars Station North, London EC4
Blackfriars Railway Bridge, London SE1 (includes proposed south bank station entrance)

2. Re-opened inquiry into applications made by Railtrack plc for orders under the Transport and Works Act 1992 and associated applications.

CONTENTS

1.0	INTRODUCTION	3
2.0	APPOINTMENT	5
3.0	SCOPE OF EVIDENCE	7
4.0	IN RESPECT OF THE THREE PLANNING APPLICATIONS RELATING TO BLACKFRIARS STATION AND RAILWAY BRIDGE, LONDON EC4 AND SE1.	8
4.1	Relevant Matter 1:	
	The extent to which the proposed development would secure a high quality of design having regard to the advice in Annex A to PPG 1 and in particular:	
	(i) whether the design of the proposed replacement for the station would be appropriate to its important townscape setting; and	
	(ii) the suitability of the design of the Blackfriars Station concourse in terms of passenger access and services[CD/176]	8
4.2	Relevant Matter 2:	
	The extent to which the proposed developments are consistent with PPG 15, with particular regard to:	
	(i) the desirability of preserving the listed south abutment or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses	
	(ii) the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the adjacent Whitefriars Conservation Area	
	(iii) the need for the scale and type of development proposed at this location to secure the future of the listed south abutment[CD/176]	15
4.3	Relevant Matter 3	
	<i>The suitability of the revised design of the platform roof canopy across Blackfriars Bridge and its impacts on views of St Paul's Cathedral and on other views across and along the Thames [CD/176]</i>	19
5.0	IN RESPECT OF THE LISTED BUILDING CONSENT APPLICATION RELATING TO THE BLACK FRIAR PUB AT 174 QUEEN VICTORIA STREET	27
5.1	<i>The need for partial demolition of the rear abutment and the realignment of the Queen Victoria Street Footbridge, and the desirability of preserving the listed building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses.[CD/176]</i>	27

6.0	IN RESPECT OF THE LISTED BUILDING CONSENT APPLICATION RELATING TO THE SOUTH ABUTMENT TO THE FORMER WEST BLACKFRIARS AND ST PAUL'S RAILWAY BRIDGE, BLACKFRIARS ROAD	30
6.1	<i>The need for remodelling of the stone abutment in order to accommodate the widened bridge structure of the former West Blackfriars and St Paul's Railway Bridge, and the desirability of preserving the listed building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses[CD/176].</i>	30
7.0	RESPONSES TO CABE LETTER TO PASCALL + WATSON DATED 18 NOVEMBER 2003.	32
7.1	Introduction	32
7.2	Bridge	32
7.3	North Station	40
7.4	Footbridge And Pedestrian Crossings	45
7.5	Southern Station	46
7.6	Conclusions	48
8.0	LONDON VIEW MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK DRAFT SPG	50
8.1	Introduction	50
8.2	Management Plan 9 – River Prospect : Southwark Bridge	50
8.3	Management Plan 11 – River Prospect : Blackfriars Bridge	51
8.4	Management Plan 12 – River Prospect : Waterloo Bridge	52
8.5	Management Plan 13 – River Prospect : The South Bank	54
8.6	Conclusion	55

Appendices [NR/6/B]

Appendix 1: CABE Correspondence

Appendix 2: Photographs and Photomontages

Appendix 3: English Heritage Letter

Appendix 4: Listings

I.0 INTRODUCTION

- I.1 I am a qualified architect of 15 years full standing having entered the architectural profession in 1979 as a student. I achieved the first BA(Hons) degree in Architecture in 1982 followed by the second Diploma in Architecture in 1986 and the third RIBA Part III Professional Examination exemption in 1989. All of the above were undertaken at the University of Sheffield.
- I.2 I have been registered as an architect with the Architects Registration Board since 1990 and registered as a Chartered Architect with the Royal Institute of British Architects from the same time.
- I.3 In 1995 I was awarded an MSc in Construction Law from Kings College London, following a two year part time masters degree course.
- I.4 My specific experience in building design is largely related to the transportation sector and more specifically to both airport and train station design. Below is a brief list of major projects where I have played a significant design role to date:

1987 - 1991	Sir Norman Foster & Partners New Terminal building, Stansted Airport
1991 - 1992	Weston Williamson Architects New Jubilee Line Underground station at London Bridge station
1992 - 1993	Avery Associates Architects IMAX Cinema, Waterloo London
1993 - Present	Pascall+Watson architects Gatwick South Terminal – Check-in Extension building London Luton Airport Parkway Station Wembley Park Station – Capacity Enhancement proposals Blackfriars Station – Thameslink 2000 proposals

- I.5 I am a Director of Pascall+Watson architects, a company employing around 140 technical and administrative staff. I have specific responsibility within our company for rail related project design works along with other responsibilities including Design and Technical Director and Health and Safety Manager.
- I.6 I am currently responsible for the development of architectural design works on behalf of Network Rail for the Blackfriars Thameslink 2000 works, for the design and construction works on behalf of Tube Lines Limited (and London Underground) for the Wembley Park station capacity enhancement project currently on site in North London, and for directing a team of architects currently working on site at the St Pancras CTRL station works in central London.

2.0 APPOINTMENT

- 2.1 Pascall+Watson architects were appointed in 2000 to act as one of two companies of architects progressing the design of the Blackfriars Thameslink 2000 proposals. The other company was Alsop Architects, the original concept architects for the scheme design proposals. Both companies were commissioned by Ove Arup & Partners, providing engineering discipline inputs, who in turn were commissioned by Laing Limited (now Laing O'Rourke) as the Design, Manage & Construct contractor, themselves commissioned by Railtrack (now Network Rail). The results of this initial work, extended over a period of three years, led to the issue in August 2002 and January 2003 of an RIBA Plan of Work Stage D report by Laing O'Rourke to the Network Rail Thameslink 2000 project Team.
- 2.2 In the second half of 2003 the design team, excluding Alsop Architects, were commissioned to undertake further design works, largely as a result of matters arising from the publication of the public inquiry Inspectors report [CD/199], as well as a result of other technical and design issues that had arisen following the issue of the Stage D report. This further work was completed in January 2004 with the submission to Network Rail of revised and updated design drawings suitable for the submission of revised applications for planning permission to be made to the Corporation of London and the London Borough of Southwark. (The Planning Applications and Listed Building Consent applications were submitted by Network Rail in June 2004 following completion of the updated Environmental Statement).
- 2.3 In October 2004 Pascall+Watson architects were commissioned directly by Network Rail to provide further input into the proposed works, more specifically relating to the production of a Design and Access Statement to be submitted to the Corporation of London as a part of the Planning

Application process as had been requested by the Corporation. This work was completed by Pascall+Watson in January 2005 and submitted to the Corporation [CD/178].

- 2.4 The latest commission for Pascall+Watson architects from Network Rail is to provide Expert Witness input at the September 2005 public inquiry by way of this Proof of Evidence, responding to the issues raised by the Statement of Relevant Matters issued by the Secretary of State.

3.0 SCOPE OF EVIDENCE

- 3.1 The evidence following will cover architectural issues relating to the Blackfriars Station Thameslink 2000 proposals, responding directly to the issues identified in the 6 January 2005 Statement of Matters issued by the Secretaries of State.
- 3.2 A full description of the current design proposals (both of existing and as proposed conditions) can be found in the Design Statement [CD/178] document produced by Pascall+Watson architects in January 2005 and submitted to the Corporation of London by Network Rail.
- 3.3 Around 30 computer simulated photomontage images of the proposed design works at Blackfriars have been produced to date, responding largely to requests for particular images from the Corporation of London;
- a. Fifteen of these images were submitted with the revised Planning Application in June 2004[CD/194, CD/195 and CD/197];
 - b. a further five were included within the Design Statement issued in January 2005, and[CD/178];
 - c. a further seven have been produced to accompany this Proof of Evidence (Appendix 2 [NR/6/B]).
- 3.4 As a result of these images being provided in different documents I have decided to reproduce all of the 'proposed' images as Exhibits within Appendix 2 [NR/6/B]. (For copies of the 'as existing' images the Inspector is referred to the aforementioned documents and submissions, although for specific comparison purposes a selected number of 'as existing' images are also reproduced within Appendix 2).
- 3.5 An updated location plan of all of the images is also included within Appendix 2. A reasonable level of understanding of the design proposals can be gathered by first reviewing these images.

4.0 IN RESPECT OF THE THREE PLANNING APPLICATIONS RELATING TO BLACKFRIARS STATION AND RAILWAY BRIDGE, LONDON EC4 AND SEI.

4.1 Relevant Matter I:

The extent to which the proposed development would secure a high quality of design having regard to the advice in Annex A to PPG I and in particular:

- (i) whether the design of the proposed replacement for the station would be appropriate to its important townscape setting; and***
- (ii) the suitability of the design of the Blackfriars Station concourse in terms of passenger access and services[CD/176]***

Response:

4.1.1 PPG I is now superseded by “Planning Policy Statement I: Delivering Sustainable Development” (PPS I)[CD/149] which sets out the overarching planning policies for the delivery of sustainable development through the planning system. At the heart of sustainable development is the simple idea of ensuring a better quality of life for everyone, now and for future generations. This can be achieved by ensuring a high quality of development through good and inclusive design. The Thameslink 2000 document entitled “Sustainability Report” dated June 2004 [CD/171] provides the basis of the sustainable credentials of the complete Thameslink 2000 works and includes reference to the proposed works at Blackfriars.

4.1.2 For a full description of the site of the proposed works and a detailed description of the proposed works themselves the Inspector is referred to the Design Statement document produced by Pascall+Watson architects and submitted to the Corporation of London in January 2005 [CD/178] in support of the Planning Applications made in June 2004 [CD/194 and CD/195].

- 4.1.3 PPS I [CD/149] states at paragraph 35 that good design should:
- a. address the connections between people and places by considering the needs of people to access jobs and key services;
 - b. be integrated into the existing urban form and the natural and built environments;
 - c. be an integral part of the processes for ensuring successful, safe and inclusive villages, towns and cities;
 - d. create an environment where everyone can access and benefit from the full range of opportunities available to members of society; and,
 - e. consider the direct and indirect impacts on the natural environment.
- 4.1.4 The Thameslink 2000 project station proposals for Blackfriars have been designed based on a number of objectives, provided within Network Rail's brief to the design team. The proposals, having been further developed in the light of consultation with a range of stakeholders, provide a high quality design for a sustainable, accessible and inclusive complex of buildings. The outcomes of this consultation are outlined below:
- a. Stakeholders including London Underground, the Bridge House Trust, English Heritage, the Corporation of London, the London Borough of Southwark, the Environment Agency and the Port of London Authority have all been involved in the development of the architectural design proposals and have each been partly responsible for helping shape the current design proposals;
 - b. Public consultation with local businesses and residential communities has been undertaken by Network Rail with input from all of the design team members;
 - c. An accessibility statement [Appendix to CD/178] has been produced, and submitted to the Local Authorities, to ensure that as far as possible all aspects of accessibility both into and around the station have been addressed by the design proposals. The new station will be easy for passengers to understand and will reach standards of accessibility hitherto unavailable to the current underground and overground stations. This includes full access to all parts of the station for Mobility Impaired Passengers;
 - d. The proposals for utilising the existing redundant West Blackfriars and St Paul's Railway bridge supports will be undertaken whilst protecting the biodiversity, natural habitats and shipping requirements of the River Thames as required by the Environment Agency and the Port of London Authority;

- e. The historic environment and townscape character of the Blackfriars Station locality, as provided by the adjoining conservation areas of Whitefriars and Ludgate Hill, by the listed Unilever House, by the Blackfriars Bridge Road, by the Black Friar Public House on the north bank and by the listed southern abutment of the redundant West Blackfriars and St Paul's Railway bridge on the south bank, have all been acknowledged by the proposed design which has remained respectful to the context provided by those buildings, structures and areas in order not to either detract from their setting and design, nor to draw undue attention to itself;
- f. Protected views over St Paul's Cathedral have been substantially respected by the application of the St Paul's Height Code Limitations provided to the design team by the Corporation of London. The Code sets height limits for any proposed works to certain viewing corridors, because of the strategic importance of views of St Paul's Cathedral as architecturally the most notable building in the City;
- g. Currently vacant and underused previously developed land, on both north and south banks, is proposed to be brought back into beneficial use.
- h. New photomontage images (along with existing images) have been produced to show the effects of the proposed Thameslink 2000 works on strategic views put forward by the Mayor of London (in the document 'London View Management Framework Draft Supplementary Planning Guidance issued in April 2005 for consultation')[CD/249], which are to be assessed if any works affect the setting of landmarks or specific features within those views. These aspects are discussed in detail in Section 10 following.

4.1.5 The concept and essence behind the design proposals for each major element of the works (the north bank, the south bank and the bridge) have not changed since the first inquiry, and have continued to be the development of an architecture that befits the setting of each individual area of the station, and in so doing to ensure that each area has been designed to be appropriate to its individual important townscape setting:

- a. On the north bank the architecture of the proposed station entrance building has sought to develop a language of openness and accessibility for passengers and public alike, whilst respecting the dominance and architecture of Unilever House and the Black Friar Public House, but

also respecting the overall scale, density, massing, height and size of the building that it will replace at 167-179 Queen Victoria Street;

- b. On the south bank the proposed new single storey station entrance building has been kept small and 'jewel-like' to respond to the more intimate and smaller scale of this immediate part of the River Thames walkway and embankment area;
- c. Over the bridge the proposed platform roof design has been kept as low as possible across the entire stretch of the river in order to allow both St Paul's Cathedral to maintain its pre-eminence over all relevant views from around the local environment, and also for the bridge itself and its enclosure to maintain an openness and transparency in order to reduce its impact on views up and down the river. Quality of design along with reticence and understatement have driven the design proposals in this area of the proposed station's development. For proposed plans, sections and elevations to this area refer typically to drawings BFN7, BFN28, BFN30, BFN38, BFN58, BFN59, BFN62, BFN64, BFN66, BFN68.

4.1.6 Passenger access into the proposed new north bank station is to be simplified and made clearer for the travelling public and visitors alike. A new ground level main entrance at the corner of Queen Victoria Street and Blackfriars Bridge Road replaces the current confusing set of entrances (one of which is from the below ground pedestrian subway level) and provides for a common entrance into both the underground and overground stations. The new entrance provides access directly into the proposed new 'cathedral-height' shared ticket hall space, the height giving a feeling of 'entrance' into a major London station. From the shared Network Rail and London Underground concourse areas passengers can move easily into either of the two stations with little additional 'wayfinding' required. Access will thus be simple and straightforward, with 'paid side'

passenger interchange between stations being even simpler avoiding the need for interchange passengers to pass through two ticket barriers as is the case now. The main concourse areas will be provided with discrete but well designed public toilets, retail outlets, banking machines, Photo-Me booths, customer information and other services required of a modern state-of-the-art station complex. Each station concourse area will be overseen by one of two Station Operation Rooms (one operated by London Underground and the other by the Thameslink 2000 train operator) which will provide enhanced levels of security, safety and well-being for all passengers. For the proposed entrance level plan to this area refer to drawing BFN25.

4.1.7 The area at ground floor level, within which all of the facilities of a modern interchange station are required to be provided, is extremely limited. The proposed new facility will offer full use of new escalators, lifts and staircases to all platform areas, both National Rail and underground, and in so doing will significantly improve the station overall. With the provision of a grand 'cathedral height' open space over the station entrance area, the ticket hall will be provided with an entrance worthy of its facilities. These two points were acknowledged by the Inspector at the first inquiry where it was stated in his Report [CD/199](see paragraph 45.10.9 and 10) that "the quality of rail to underground interchange here would be markedly improved, and pay proper regard to integration between the two services".

4.1.8 The previous proposals, considered by the first inquiry, provided for the proposed construction of two new ventilation shafts to serve the underground station both in providing sufficient ventilation and heat removal to achieve modern day standards of comfort with the station, and also to provide for sufficient area of smoke extraction in the event of fire. One of these ventilation shafts was relatively small in diameter and was located within the confines of the central area of the underground station, rising up an existing lightwell area within the Puddle Dock office building

that sits over the underground station. The other was larger in diameter and was proposed to be located within the road island garden area between the north bank site and Unilever House. This location was much more prominent and as a result was considered at the public inquiry. The current proposals have benefited from the additional design works that have taken place since the previous application for planning permission with both of these ventilation shafts having been replaced in favour of a single shaft rising within the proposed new north bank station entrance building. This can be seen in a section on drawing BFN49 and within the photomontage images provided as Exhibits 15, 16, 28 and 29 in Appendix 2 to this Evidence.

- 4.1.9 The proposed new station complex will offer passengers a new facility which creates a safe and accessible environment where the possibility of crime and disorder, or fear of crime, will not undermine quality of life or the environment and will thus enhance its sustainability and help to further develop the community cohesion within Blackfriars.
- 4.1.10 In addition, the proposed provision of new facilities to both the underground and Network Rail stations will ensure that the future stations will become fully upgraded to achieve modern standards of service, operation, access, ease of use, maintenance, repair and sophistication. For instance, in providing new means of entry via an enlarged common concourse area and providing alternative means of escape from all platforms, along with a detailed development of fire strategy scenarios and solutions, emergency escape (for passengers and staff) and emergency service access to platform areas is much enhanced compared to the existing stations of today.
- 4.1.11 The designs put forward for the Blackfriars Thameslink 2000 project provide an opportunity to improve the character and quality of the Blackfriars area on both the north and south banks as well as over the

River Thames. This will be achieved by the high quality of design proposals put forward and by the response of the proposals to their settings and townscape. The roof enclosure to the rail bridge for example will, I believe, become a structure of visual interest to those who walk along Blackfriars Bridge Road and for those who use the station, and has therefore been designed with a creative but subtle quality. This was borne out in the Inspector's Report [CD/199] where at paragraph 45.3.21 it is stated by the Inspector that passengers and those moving around the area "would be able to take advantage of the unrivalled view of the Thames and St Paul's from the sheltered environment of the platforms".

4.2 Relevant Matter 2:

The extent to which the proposed developments are consistent with PPG 15, with particular regard to:

- (i) *the desirability of preserving the listed south abutment or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses***
- (ii) *the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the adjacent Whitefriars Conservation Area***
- (iii) *the need for the scale and type of development proposed at this location to secure the future of the listed south abutment[CD/176]***

Response to parts (i) and (iii):

4.2.1 PPG 15 [CD/7] provides a full statement of the Government's policies for the identification and protection of historic buildings, conservation areas, and other elements of the historic environment. This has been considered by the design team in their design responses to the current proposals.

4.2.2 The existing rail bridge terminates on the South Bank in a series of brick arch bridge structures, through which the existing river walk passes. Alongside, and to the west of the rail bridge is the redundant listed southern abutment bridge structure of the former West Blackfriars and St Paul's Railway. The listing is provided within Appendix 4 to this Evidence. The stone of this abutment is said to have come from the original Westminster Bridge (removed in the mid-1850's), only the second original crossing of the Thames after London Bridge, although this is not stated in the listing. It carries at each of its east and west ends two 'London Chatham & Dover Railway' monumental crests, whose stature is considered reminiscent of the glory and pride of the railways in their earlier days. Occasional access to the top of the abutment structure is provided by a staircase rising from the imposing Express Newspapers building, bordering

on Blackfriars Bridge Road, from where the occasional summer drinks party can be seen to occur. The existing plans and elevation of the Southern Abutment can be seen on drawings BFS37, BFS41 and BFS43.

4.2.3 The underside of the last span of the rail bridge across the Thames meets the south bank in a disappointing manner and as a consequence is fenced off and kept away from public usage. This junction can be seen on drawings BFS35 and BFS44. To the east of the bridge a single storey car park and public toilets building provides a backing to this part of the River Walk – a large building, Sampson House, sits to the rear southern portion of this area alongside the equally imposing Express Newspapers building. Further along the eastern section of this South Bank area can be found the Falcon Point Housing development, the Founders Arms Public House and the new Tate Modern Art Gallery set back from the river frontage. Part of this backdrop of buildings can be seen in drawing BFS43.

4.2.4 To achieve the proposed new south bank ticket hall and concourse area, it is necessary to divert the existing public River Walk from within the arched brickwork bridge structure. This is proposed to be achieved by diverting the Walk to the area underneath where the current southernmost span of the rail bridge rib arches meets the supporting embankment structure. This area of the south bank, underneath the bridge, is currently fenced off, unused and disappointing. To bring this area into use, in order to create the new Station entrance building, requires the ‘opening up’ of the listed West Blackfriars and St Paul’s Railway bridge abutment structure, that currently supports the two London Chatham & Dover Railway monumental crests. This requires the hollowing out of the central fill material of the abutment structure and the removal of most of the eastern and southern flank brickwork walls. These works will allow both a new access staircase up to the new platform level to be installed within the abutment as a necessity for passenger access, providing the abutment with a new use in line with PPG 15 (paragraph 2.18[CD/7]), and for an opening to be created to allow a

diversion of the River Walk – the redundant area underneath the bridge can then be brought into use improving the desirability of this part of the embankment. The proposals for this area can be seen on drawing BFS28, BFS30, BFS32, BFS33, BFS36, BFS38, BFS40, BFS42 and BFS44.

4.2.5 The two existing monumental crests are proposed to be moved together, to be back-to-back, on the western side of the existing abutment. It is proposed to fully safeguard the north and west elevations of the listed abutment as their features are of historic interest as noted earlier. The location of three new rib arches to the western upstream side of the rail bridge will, however, interface with the eastern end of the north-eastern corner of the remaining stone walls and will require an opening to be formed in the listed structure to allow the new rib arches to be founded by passing through this wall and meeting ground just beyond it. This option was developed and the suggestion of English Heritage (see section 3 of English Heritage letter dated 12 November 2003 within Appendix 3 to this Evidence). Consultation on these works has been undertaken with both English Heritage and the LB Southwark, as well as other interested parties. The proposals can be seen in plan on drawings BFS32, SA7 and SA9, and in section and elevation on drawings BFS42, SA14 and SA16.

4.2.6 In size the proposals around the southern end of the existing rail bridge will be small, particularly when compared to the back drop of the large scale Express Newspaper building, Sampson House, Falcon Point housing and the Tate Modern at Bankside (see particularly Exhibit 17 within Appendix 2 to this Evidence). The rail bridge is proposed to rear up behind the proposed south bank provided with an enclosing roof and glazed sides, whilst the new station entrance building is proposed as a single storey building set against the unremarkable rear brick wall to the existing car park and public toilet building. The new station entrance building on the South Bank is set to the eastern side of the rail bridge arch structure whilst the listed abutment is set on the opposite western side. The general composition therefore of the

setting of the listed abutment with the proposed works has been limited in order to recognise the importance of the abutment and its listing, whilst providing a new role for it within a 'railway' context with which to continue its future, as against its current rather undistinguished use as an occasional cocktail party venue. The Inspector referred to this matter in similar vein in his report on the first inquiry (paragraph 39.4.8 [CD/199]).

4.2.7 Lastly, within the Inspectors Report [CD/199] from the first inquiry it is worth noting that the Inspector considered at paragraph 45.3.15 that "the regeneration of the Bankside area makes it appropriate and timely that a southern entrance should be provided at Blackfriars". Equally, that whilst acknowledging that there is an impact by the proposed works on the listed southern abutment structure the Inspector noted in paragraph 45.8.7 of his report that:

"the...proposals represent a reasonable compromise between the maximum feasible retention of the abutment and good and secure public access to the station and the riverside walkway".

Response to part (ii):

4.2.8 As shown on page 103 of the ES2004 Main Report – Inner Area [CD/164], the Whitefriars Conservation Area lies on the north bank of the Thames with its south-western boundary marked by the Unilever Building. The impact of the new building proposed at 167 – 179 Queen Victoria Street on the character and appearance of the Conservation Area is dealt with by William Filmer-Sankey. I adopt his conclusion that the proposals will enhance the setting of the Whitefriars Conservation Area.

4.3 Relevant Matter 3

The suitability of the revised design of the platform roof canopy across Blackfriars Bridge and its impacts on views of St Paul's Cathedral and on other views across and along the Thames [CD/176]

Response:

- 4.3.1 The current bridge crosses the River in five arched spans reaching just under sixty metres per span. The bridge commences on the south side of the river with its brick-constructed abutment forming a covering over this part of the southern River Thames Walk and completes on the north side with its abutment structure integrated into the station infrastructure. On the north side the first arch spans dramatically over the busy north embankment road, whilst the second arch span reduces the width of the bridge by around ten metres as it crosses the Thames – the increased width on the north side allows for sufficient width for the existing five platforms within the current station.
- 4.3.2 With the additional length of the proposed new 12-car trains required of the Thameslink 2000 works, comes the need to provide a roof over the National Rail platforms which are proposed to extend along the full length of the existing rail bridge over the River Thames, in order to account for the proposed increased length of trains. In addition, due to the need for these platforms and the re-modelling of the through and terminating tracks, the bridge width itself is required to expand to accommodate the proposed works. To that end a single new rib arch structure is proposed to be added to each of the downstream Spans 3, 4 and 5 to the eastern side of the existing bridge, along with two new lines of rib arch structure to the upstream Span 1 and three new lines to the upstream Spans 2, 3, 4 and 5 on the western side.

- 4.3.3 New platform structures are proposed to be constructed off the structural deck of the bridge and are to be provided with slightly inclined glazed edge screens to the two outside faces of the bridge – this will provide protection to passengers against inclement weather, whilst maintaining maximum transparency through the bridge enclosure. The glass to be used is proposed to be a clear and un-coloured toughened safety glass. A maintenance walkway is proposed to be provided outside of the glazed edge screens for ease of future maintenance, cleaning and repair. The overall degree of transparency, by way of clear glass as against solid supporting structure, has been increased from 91.75% to 94.6% with the current proposals, as against the design originally submitted to the first inquiry - this has been achieved largely by modifying the secondary support structure to the glass panels. A typical proposed section through the bridge can be seen on drawing BFN62.
- 4.3.4 In compliance with the planning conditions put forward at the first inquiry the bridge and platform proposals provide for no advertisements or signage placed on, attached to, or incorporated within the bridge structure or on the platforms, other than operational or directional signage, which will be kept to a minimum where it is strictly required. The Inspector reported at paragraph 9.4.10 of his report [CD/199] that “the conditions agreed between Railtrack and the Corporation.....would ensure there was sufficient transparency to prevent any major obstructions to views”.
- 4.3.5 The proposed roof design over the rail bridge has been modified from that submitted to the first inquiry, but shares the same basic architectural concept of repetitive modularised roof panel structures each separated from the next by glazed rooflights. It has not proven technically possible for the original ‘monocoque’ roof structure design to satisfy the environmental criteria and structural spanning requirements of the bridge and as such the roof has been modified by the current proposals. The detailed reasons for this are as follows:

- a. firstly, with the design development that has occurred since the first inquiry, the design team's structural engineers have researched in great detail the use of a monocoque roof panel structure using either aluminium or stainless steel as the structural cladding material and framework. With depth constraints imposed on the roof structure by both the need to achieve specific railway clearances underneath the structure and a maximum height of the roof itself (determined by the St Paul's Heights Code clearances), the available structural depth of the roof is not sufficient, without incurring unacceptable deflection in the roof structure, to be able to span the full distance across the bridge. This could have potentially been countered by the use of central supporting columns set within the proposed island platform, but these new columns cause obstructions which significantly affect passenger flows along the platforms at peak times causing unacceptable congestion. Equally, at the position where the through-tracks slew across the bridge at the northern end, north of the terminating tracks, the central columns would have had to have been removed – this occurs at a pinchpoint in the central island platform area and would prevent the roof from having any form of central support meaning that the roof could not span the required edge-to-edge distance. A different structural solution was required.
- b. secondly, if structural monocoque roof panels were to be used there was a great deal of concern by the design team and by Network Rail as to the ability to both repair and maintain an innovative roof structure in the event of damage to the roof. As both the top-side and underside linings to the roof panels were to be formed of a structural material, any damage could be significant and difficult to correct without major operational difficulties to the railway itself.
- c. thirdly, the design team carried out a review of the environmental performance of the proposed monocoque roof panels and glazed rooflights and found that their performance could not achieve the levels set by Her Majesty's Railway Inspectorate (HMRI) with regard to heat build-up and removal from the platform areas. This was due to the largely flat glazed rooflights between the monocoque roof panels allowing significant solar gain through. Equally, the same rooflights were allowing significant amounts of light pollution to escape from the platform areas at night time.
- d. Lastly, the repetitive nature of the glazed elements of the roof panels alongside the similar repetitive nature of the solid roof panels meant that, on passing through the platform, train drivers could be distracted by the stroboscopic effect of the roof. This would have been a particular problem in strong sunshine when the rooflights would appear very bright, whilst the underside of the roof in comparison would

appear dark in contrast. This was not considered by Network Rail to be acceptable operationally.

4.3.6 The proposed roof design maintains the modularisation of the previous roof design utilising 67 individual roof panels which are now designed into a 'north light' roof configuration formed from curved and parabolically shaped verendiel roof trusses, spanning across the bridge from one side to the other with no requirement for central support – this is achieved by using the full depth available to the roof as a structural zone. The roof is then formed from top and bottom layers of cladding infill positioned between the upper level chord of one truss and spanning down to the lower level chord of the next truss, repeating along the full length of the bridge enclosure. The open north facing truss structure is then covered by glazed louvres to allow natural ventilation to the platform environment (without attracting solar gain), to provide permanent ventilation and to allow views towards St Paul's Cathedral from within the platform areas. The undulating nature of the original roof edge has been resolved in this amended design by cutting the thin plan ends of each modular roof into opposing directions – this will add interest to the edge profiles when viewed from across the river banks in a similar way as the original twisted bow-tie roof structure did. The roof has equally been designed to restrict light spillage and pollution to the South Bank due to its residential nature – it achieves this by only providing for north facing glazing directed toward the 'commercial' areas

4.3.7 The external roof cladding is proposed to be formed from an embossed aluminium standing seam roof system and will be supported from inclined edge columns at around five metre centres. The width of the roof has been minimised as far as possible whilst providing sufficient rain protection to passengers standing on the platforms. The overall width of the roof has been reduced by around one-and-a-half metres from the design submitted to the first public inquiry. The required width of the roof is a direct

function of a forty-five degree line drawn from the top of the glazed side edge screens to the point where this line intersects with the roof plane – this is to reduce the impact of rain onto the platform areas.

4.3.8 The roof proposal is designed to allow for the necessary National Rail Structural Gauge clearances for trains to satisfactorily pass underneath as defined by Railway Group Standards, and includes an amount of clearance for potential future Overhead Line Electrification (OHLE) – (Railway Group Standard GE/RT8025 ‘Electrical Protective Provisions for Electrified Lines [CD/248]). The roof is defined by these parameters as well as by structural member depths and construction tolerances. The roof is as low as it is able to be given the constraints referred to and is maintained deliberately at this height across the full extent of the bridge.

4.3.9 The original roof design submitted to the first public inquiry did breach the St Paul’s Heights Code limitations toward the southern half of the rail bridge where the Limitations Mesh drops to below the level of the bridge itself and this was recognised in the first inquiry – see Inspector’s Report [CD/199] paragraphs 9.1.15 and 9.3.7 - 9. The design team has produced similar Heights Limitations drawings showing that the modified roof has a similar effect to that previously submitted to, and considered at the first inquiry – these drawings are included within Appendix 4 of the Design Statement document produced by Pascall+Watson architects and submitted to the Corporation of London in January 2005 as further material for the Planning Application [CD/178]. It is recognised that, as the Heights Code is precisely calculated, any infringement is significant. It was accepted by the first inquiry Inspector that the Thameslink 2000 proposals brought significant benefits to London, but that at Blackfriars Station these benefits could only be realised by covering the railway bridge with a canopy to meet operational and passenger needs and to achieve 24 trains per hour through the core. The Inspector acknowledged within his report ([CD/199]paragraph 9.3.5) that “the need for all-weather protection for

users of the station had to be taken into account, as did the significance of the infringement of the Heights”. The Inspector also considered (paragraph 9.3.6) that the “infringement by the proposed station would not adversely affect any existing views of the Cathedral”, and found that on balance the infringement was acceptable. Equally, the Inspector found that (paragraph 9.3.8) “the loss of some (existing) views would be compensated for by new views”. In summary the Inspector stated at paragraph 45.8.6 that:

“the station design would ‘lift’ the appearance of the area and, together with the substantial transportation benefits of the scheme as a whole, would outweigh the insignificant impact on the appreciation of the Grade I listed St Paul’s Cathedral”.

4.3.10 In order to ascertain the impacts of the modified roof design on views of St Paul’s Cathedral and on other views across and along the Thames the design team have re-created the same computer generated views as were submitted previously to the first public inquiry and to the Corporation of London, and have re-submitted them to the Corporation as a part of the revised Planning Application submission. Each view has been produced as an ‘existing’ view and then modified to show the design proposals for comparison purposes as a ‘proposed’ view. All photography has been undertaken anew to provide for the correct London skyline as of January 2004. These show that the proposed modified roof design has no detrimental effect on views of St Paul’s Cathedral from vantage points requested by the Corporation of London, whilst the effects on views both up, down and across the river can be gauged from the images. The ‘proposed’ views are included within this Evidence at Appendix 2. (Views showing the existing environment can be found within the original Planning Application submission to the Corporation of London and within the Design Statement document issued to the Corporation in January 2005[CD/178]). A Key Plan showing the positions of all of the photomontage images is provided within the Design Statement document [CD/178] but has been updated to cover recently commissioned new

images (see below) and is provided as Exhibit 1 within Appendix 2 to this Evidence.

4.3.11 On several occasions English Heritage have raised the issue of both 'safety railings or related apparatus' that may be required to allow maintenance of the roof and of the need to be able to easily clean and maintain the proposed canopy and glazed sides to the rail bridge extension areas to retain the overall transparency of the proposals. In response the design has not proposed any form of roof balustrade edge protection to the bridge proposals as this is considered not only to significantly impact on the aesthetics of the proposals but would also of itself breach the St Paul's Height Code Limitations. However, from a health and safety perspective a suitable means of access and restraint for maintenance personnel must be provided. Subject to the approval of HMRI a 'man-safe fall arrest system' would be used to ensure safety on the roof – the system would ensure that maintenance staff would at all times be harnessed onto the roof structure to prevent any falls from height. Access to the roof is proposed to be provided by a discrete fixed ladder placed in the open area sandwiched between the enclosure to the platforms area and the western escalator enclosure building on the north bank close to Lift L2 (see drawing BFN28), accessed from the maintenance walkway. To either side of the bridge an external open grille maintenance walkway is proposed to ensure that the inclined side edge glazed screens can be easily maintained and kept clean and transparent at all times. This remains as previously proposed. Access to the walkways will be through locked hinged panels within the glazed side edge screens.

4.3.12 Since submitting the design proposals for revised Planning Applications in June 2004 a new draft planning guidance document has been issued by the Mayor of London's office on the 'London View Management Framework' proposals [CD/249]. To address some of the viewpoints referred to in that document further computer generated images have been undertaken and

are included as Exhibits within Appendix 2 to this Evidence. The consultation period for this guidance document published in April 2005 ended on 15 July 2005, with final publication scheduled for winter 2005.

5.0 IN RESPECT OF THE LISTED BUILDING CONSENT APPLICATION RELATING TO THE BLACK FRIAR PUB AT 174 QUEEN VICTORIA STREET

5.1 *The need for partial demolition of the rear abutment and the realignment of the Queen Victoria Street Footbridge, and the desirability of preserving the listed building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses.[CD/176]*

Response:

5.1.1 The Black Friar Public House is Grade 2* listed – a copy of the listing is provided within Appendix 4. The Thameslink 2000 proposals do not propose any changes whatsoever to the main body of the listed building. Only an interface with a side brickwork wall is proposed and this is set away from the areas of historic and architectural interest. The wall that is proposed to be affected was not originally a part of the Public House but was a part of an original abutment wall supporting a rail bridge which has since been removed. The Public House was constructed up against this existing abutment with its interior extended into it. The abutment wall is not referred to on the listing whereas the features of all of the other external walls are described in some detail. For plans of the existing building refer to drawings PUB9 and PUB11.

5.1.2 The abutment structure to the original railway bridge is located immediately adjacent to the listed Public House. The original railway bridge supported off this abutment was constructed before the Public House and provided the original context of the Listed Public House structure. The operational railway has in this context always been a part of the back-drop to the urban environment of the Pub.

5.1.3 A significant number of passengers interchange between the National Rail and Underground stations during peak hours. For the remainder a number

of exit routes are provided from the National Rail platform areas. This includes a new route which is proposed to lead from the north end of the National Rail platforms, directly to a new passenger footbridge which crosses over the roof of the Underground Station concourse below, meeting the western end of the Puddle Dock office building and then continuing as a new enclosed pedestrian footbridge over Queen Victoria Street. This bridge then passes over the abutment wall referred to above, requiring a partial reduction in height of this wall, before terminating on the northern side in a new stair and lift enclosure giving access onto the public courtyard area outside the pub. For plans of the proposal refer to drawings BFN13, BFN15 and BFN16. For typical sections and elevations refer to drawings PUB18, PUB20, PUB22 and PUB24. The new pedestrian bridge passes over the existing flat roof areas of the Public House rooms below but does not interface with them. The courtyard immediately west of the pub is proposed to be re-modelled to designs that have been developed in consultation with the Corporation of London – this work was included within the Design Statement produced by Pascall+Watson architects in January 2005 [CD/178] and submitted to the Corporation of London – refer to Appendix 5 of that document.

- 5.1.4 The proposed pedestrian bridge over Queen Victoria Street has been slightly modified since the first public inquiry. The design has been simplified such that it no longer curves lazily (in plan) across the road and has been clad in a crisper manner than that previously proposed. The open western elevation of this bridge is proposed to be enclosed in an open stainless steel woven mesh for protection of the road below, rather than in glass (further to discussions with the Corporation of London). The rear elevation is of solid storey-height cladding to help reduce the impact of the rail bridge behind. The roof to this bridge is proposed as a gently sloping glazed roof to give a feeling of openness and security, through transparency. The springing point of the bridge out of the Puddle Dock office building has

been slightly amended due to the partial re-planning of its interior as a result of the new station entrance building proposals for a proposed plan of this refer to drawing BFN28.

- 5.1.5 As the proposed pedestrian bridge passes over Queen Victoria Street and meets the side abutment wall to the old bridge support adjacent to the Public House, it will be necessary to partially reduce the height of this wall, down to the roof level behind it, for a width of approximately 4.2 metres. Other than the setting of the Public House this is the only effect of the new pedestrian bridge.

6.0 IN RESPECT OF THE LISTED BUILDING CONSENT APPLICATION RELATING TO THE SOUTH ABUTMENT TO THE FORMER WEST BLACKFRIARS AND ST PAUL'S RAILWAY BRIDGE, BLACKFRIARS ROAD

6.1 *The need for remodelling of the stone abutment in order to accommodate the widened bridge structure of the former West Blackfriars and St Paul's Railway Bridge, and the desirability of preserving the listed building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses[CD/176].*

Response:

6.1.1 The need for re-modelling of the listed southern abutment structure has been responded to in paragraphs 4.2.4 to 4.2.6 above.

6.1.2 The desirability of preserving the listed structure has been addressed in the design proposals by way of safeguarding all elements of the abutment that are of any architectural interest. This is achieved by safeguarding the northern and western elevations where stone has been used complete with its detailing and corning, as opposed to the southern and eastern elevations where the existing loadbearing brickwork is proposed to be removed. The monumental crests, as referred to earlier, are proposed to be moved back-to-back over the western elevation wall, with the existing easternmost crest being moved to meet the western one.

6.1.3 The Inspector's Report from the first inquiry [CD/199] concludes in paragraph 45.10.15 that

“the manner in which the design of the staircases and riverside walkway are proposed to be incorporated into the existing bridge structure and the adjacent listed abutment would incorporate the redundant listed abutment back into the railway use for which it was originally built, and, given suitable detailing and lighting, could create

spaces of greater interest than the somewhat dull and constricted area which exists today”.

7.0 RESPONSES TO CABE LETTER TO PASCALL + WATSON DATED 18 NOVEMBER 2003.

7.1 Introduction

7.1.1 The following sets out responses to a letter received from the Commission for Architecture and the Built Environment (included within Appendix I to this Evidence [NR/6/B]) following a limited presentation and review of the Blackfriars proposals at CABE's offices on 6th November 2003. The following paragraphs are extracted directly from their letter addressed to myself, and have been numbered for reference purposes only. My response to each paragraph is given immediately below. The headings shown are taken from the CABE letter. An initial response to this letter was drafted and sent by the Network Rail Thameslink 2000 team on 20th January 2004, a copy of which is again attached within Appendix I to this Evidence.

7.1.2 It is important when taking into consideration the following comments from CABE to realise that the scheme in essence has not fundamentally changed from that considered by the Inspector at the first inquiry. The Inspector generally found in favour of the overall architectural proposals subject only to further design works to be carried out on the 'missing tooth' aspects of the north bank station entrance building, which has since been addressed. CABE have had a great deal less time to review the proposals and the determining factors behind them than did the first inquiry and their remit is often at odds with the design team's brief.

7.2 Bridge

CABE Comment:

7.2.1 "Accepting that there is a genuine requirement for full coverage of the bridge in order to meet the service requirements, we generally support the simple aesthetics of the roof structure, and believe this should become the main element of the station complex. In our view this form is elegant, and we would suggest the plain 'cut-off'

appearance of the roof fins is maintained for their simple and utilitarian form.”

Response:

7.2.2 The plain “cut-off” appearance of the roof ‘fins’ at their ends has since been developed further in consultation with the Corporation of London, LB Southwark and English Heritage, such that a proposed ‘feather edged’ solution has been developed and agreed with those parties. This is similar to the end of an aeroplane wing and provides for an enhanced aesthetic compared to a simple ‘slicing off’ of the end of the clad roof structure. I consider this to be an elegant and more architecturally interesting solution to the exposed sides of the proposed structure rather than a straight forward ‘cut-off’ appearance to the roof edges. This has been shown in modified computer aided visualisations submitted to the Planning Authorities - refer to Exhibit 7 within Appendix 2 to this Evidence.

CABE Comment:

7.2.3 “We believe the opportunity for more variety in the height of the canopy towards the river banks should be explored to provide a more varied and uplifting environment on the station platforms and to help link the station canopy with the entrance buildings more effectively. We question what the views will be like looking down the platforms as proposed, suspecting they will be oppressive in places and monotonous. Providing a different condition at either end should also help with the internal environmental conditions.”

Response:

7.2.4 The design of the new platform bridge roof over the widened existing rail bridge is wholly consistent with the original design proposal that was endorsed at the first inquiry and is considered in my opinion to be a high quality architectural solution.

7.2.5 Views down the length of the platform from within the bridge enclosing structure will be different from the north and south ends:

- a. Looking from the north end southwards, all aspects of the station platform environment will be bathed in a consistent quality of north light, enhanced by sunlight from the east or west sides (morning and evening respectively). Views over the platform areas have been designed to be the least encumbered of station platforms on the network to provide for crisp uninterrupted views as far as is possible. Whilst there will be elements of platform furniture such as seating and passenger help points, these will be limited in number and located to ensure maximum transparency through the glazed side edge screens giving views over both the southbank embankment area and up and down the River Thames generally. (The proposed new roof generally sits at a height of around 4.0 metres at its lowest point rising up to 5.0 metres at its highest – clearances are governed by Network Rail Structural Gauges and St Paul’s Height Code limitations).
- b. Looking from the south end northwards, the roof has been designed to appear as a fully glazed northlight roof giving high level views upwards towards St Paul’s Cathedral. There will be little ‘solidity’ within the roof due to its glazed roof light design. Views sideways will be similarly as described above. Exhibits 26 and 27 within Appendix 2 to this Evidence [NR/6/B] have been provided to show views up and down the proposed new platform bridge enclosure.

7.2.6 It is important to recognise that architecturally the roof has been designed to be respectful to its impressive surroundings and as such has been developed without any specific focal point. The raising or lowering of the roof to either north or south side of the river will try to pull the viewers eye towards an ‘event’ or ‘happening’ within the visual panorama, something that to date on the bridge has been avoided.

7.2.7 I believe that a crisply and technically well detailed roof structure, far from being monotonous and oppressive will be a naturally lit delight and an

architectural ‘tour de force.’ Standing on the new platforms over the impressive River Thames waiting for a train will be an experience like no other for train travellers provided anywhere on the existing rail network, within either Greater London or arguably the country as a whole. This can easily be envisaged by the quality of view from almost any other bridge over the river within central London – to a large degree, however, this view will not be subject to the vagaries of the weather as all other views from bridges are, due to the proposed enclosure over the bridge. This was recognised by the Inspector in the first inquiry and in his Report [9.3.5 CD/199] as noted in my Evidence at paragraph 4.3.9 above.

CABE Comment:

- 7.2.8 “We are concerned about the unfinished appearance of the new bridge piers, both the ‘cut-off’ top and the ‘set-in’ base. We urge a flexible approach by the Environment Agency in order to resolve the issue of these apparently ‘floating’ piers. If this cannot be resolved, then in our view a new approach needs to be taken to the engineering requirements of supporting the widened bridge platforms. We suggest this could result in a more imaginative and inventive response”.

Response:

- 7.2.9 The treatment of the new upstream bridge piers has been developed since the first inquiry following consultation with the Port of London Authority, the Environment Agency, the Corporation of London and LB Southwark, with the revised proposals (see Exhibit 7 within Appendix 2 to this Evidence).
- 7.2.10 The design of the bridge width extension, on the western upstream side of the existing rail bridge, has been driven largely by the structural engineering requirements of a ‘single bridge’ solution. This has significantly varied the original proposal submitted to the first inquiry, largely as a result of further study of the effects of a potential ship strike. As a stand-alone structural bridge extension, the previous structural solution could not have withstood

a significant strike. To resolve this issue has entailed the wholesale stitching together of the pier abutment extensions into the existing Bridge 410 piers that support the current rail bridge.

7.2.11 Additionally, further to discussions with the Corporation of London it became clear that the Corporation's preference was for a design of the bridge width increase that was a simple extension of the existing rib arch bridge structure and did not therefore compete in design terms with the existing aesthetic of the bridge. English Heritage's view (stated in their letter to Thameslink 2000 dated 12 November 2003 included as Appendix 3 to this Evidence) is that "there should be an overall coherence in the final, altered appearance, so that the bridge reads as one structure".

7.2.12 To those ends Network Rail has developed the single bridge solution for the extension works. This entails the removal of the existing column and capping to the existing inner line of redundant Bridge 409 piers, the driving of piles through the existing remaining core supporting columns and their connection to a reinforced concrete structure rising from the redundant column bases which are then tied structurally into the existing Bridge 410 pier ends. This provides for sufficient structural resilience to protect against ship strike. However, issues arose during the design, of what works were to be allowed within the river and how safe such works would be. In addition there were concerns with regard to 'scour' of the river bed (both locally and downstream) if the existing profiles of the structures within the river were to be affected.

7.2.13 The solution arrived at was for the inner line of redundant 409 piers to carry a structure that matched in width the existing rail bridge pier abutments, thus providing maximum structural integrity between the new and existing structures to resist ship strike. In order to both avoid problems of possible scour and to avoid directly working within the river it was determined not to carry works down to the river bed level but to stop

works around the Mean High Water Level. In so doing however a further problem arose – as the rail bridge abutment is wider than the redundant piers the new structures would be wider than their supporting existing column base structures. This brought with it the possibility that with a rising tide boats could potentially become trapped underneath the stepped out structure. This has led directly to the chamfered base shown in the photomontage images provided as Exhibits 7 and 31 within Appendix 2 to this Evidence. It is worth noting that this image is shown with a low tide and the effect will be less pronounced during high tides.

7.2.14 With regard to the ‘cut-off’ top referred to by CABE a further more detailed photomontage has now been produced which shows more detail of this parapet – this is included as Exhibit 31 within Appendix 2 to this Evidence. The design of the top has been a simple architectural response to the structural requirements established by the Engineers.

7.2.15 Further information on the ‘Ecology and biodiversity’ of the Thames and on ‘Surface water resources’ can be found at Sections 7.4 and 7.5 within the Environmental Statement [ES2004 – CD/164].

CABE Comment:

7.2.16 “We would also suggest that there is significant potential for the dramatic illumination of the canopy structure, and this should be considered at an early stage of the design of the structure.”

Response:

7.2.17 I agree with the potential for dramatic illumination of the roof canopy at night time, although this must not detract from night views over St Paul’s Cathedral from across the river, which must be preserved. Pascall+Watson architects are committed also to reducing light spillage from our proposed roof design for both the protection of local residents and also for more generalised environmental concerns. This level of design

input, working with experienced lighting designers, would be expected to take place during the next significant stage of the development of the design proposals, when state-of-the-art solutions for the architectural lighting of the bridge itself and the proposed roof plane structures will take place. To help visualise what the lighting could be like a further night time computer visualisation has been prepared taken from the Godfrey Allen viewpoint (see paragraph 8.3.1 below) and is provided as an 'as existing' and 'as proposed' image as Exhibits 24 and 25 within Appendix 2 to this Evidence.

CABE Comment:

- 7.2.18 “We believe the canopy structure should be used to inform the station designs, particularly the ‘missing tooth’ on the City of London side, and this would help unify and link the numerous elements of the project. This new linear station should be the focus and leading element of the scheme and be developed to be more than a canopy, but also a structure with a street presence.”

Response:

- 7.2.19 The view put forward by CABE is fundamentally at odds with the concept design developed by Alsop Architects from which the current design proposals have been developed. The use of the rail bridge canopy structure was not an element of the scheme in anyway considered by the first inquiry, as an element that should inform the station entrance design and as such has not been addressed in the way put forward by CABE. The proposed station entrance building has been designed as a response to the ‘missing tooth’ established at the first public inquiry, and is one building element within a number of individual elements that go together to form the entire Blackfriars Station complex. The complex is not a single building or statement. As an architect I do not believe that in the location and urban environment of the current station it is necessary to unite the whole station in a singular expressive aesthetic of long span roof panels. The alternative proposal of individual building ‘occurrences’ within street- and

river-scape is equally as valid and historically more pertinent to this area of London. An overly expressive roof to the station entrance building would, I believe, compete inappropriately with the Grade II listed Unilever House (opposite) and the Grade II* listed Black Friar Public House (adjacent).

7.3 North Station

CABE Comment:

- 7.3.1 “In our view the proposed entrance takes away from the elegance of the platform enclosure, mimicking the mistakes of the past. What is missing is not a filling for a missing tooth but something significant and spectacular for London; and this scheme should rise to this challenge. We believe the vent is potentially a magnificent feature, which should be celebrated as part of this project rather than covered up, as it has potential to provide a focus and marker for this new entrance.”

Response:

- 7.3.2 I do not consider that there are “mistakes of the past” being proposed at Blackfriars Station. Far from it, I believe that the station entrance building together with the bridge roof and enclosing structure represent a very high quality architectural response to the Blackfriars Station Thameslink 2000 brief. The brief for this project is limited in so far as it does not encompass the existing No 1 Puddle Dock office building. To that extent the ‘grand gesture’ represented by CABE by reference to both Liverpool Street and Paddington Stations is not available to the design team (see CABE’s ‘Conclusions’ below).
- 7.3.3 The tall coloured vent shaft will be highly visible throughout its full height through the transparent glazed external envelope. The ventilation shaft will largely be viewed externally by pedestrians from ground level where it will be easily and highly visible. At night time with excellent lighting the shaft will become a ‘personality’ within the streetscape as the glazed envelope will apparently disappear from view due to the lighting conditions. The shaft will simply and easily establish its architectural credentials and will become a ‘marker’ or feature of the station entrance. I do not feel it necessary in this respect to bring the shaft outside of the glazed envelope. To help visualise what this will be like during daytime a further computer

visualisation has been prepared and is provided as Exhibit 28 within Appendix 2 to this Evidence.

7.3.4 The proposed platform enclosure structure addresses the architectural environment of an operational railway sitting directly over a major river - the technical and architectural solution to this is specific to its needs and to its location. The proposed station entrance building addresses the busy urban and vehicular environment of Blackfriars Bridge Road and Queen Victoria Street. The entrance building is a concourse area where decisions have to be taken by the travelling public in a contemplative environment. The requirements for each element of these two differing urban areas of the station complex are very different and have resulted in different solutions to their architectural treatment.

7.3.5 The design of the new station entrance building has been developed in response to the First Secretary of State (letter dated 30 July 2002, paragraph 7[CD/203]), to submit plans for a replacement building which overcomes the deficiency identified by the Inspector at the first inquiry.

7.3.6 The design of the station entrance has been developed in consultation with the Corporation of London and English Heritage and I believe that the proposed building is an excellent and appropriate design, both for its function as a railway station entrance and in its position in its immediate urban setting.

CABE Comment:

7.3.7 “However, in our view the mismatch of the materials and finishes proposed in this part of the project creates confusion, and detracts from the ‘cathedral-like’ aspirations of the entrance. We believe it is perverse that it should follow the limitations of the existing building on the site. We believe the premise of a transparent building in this location is flawed: there is little opportunity to look out from within, and the internal arrangement, necessitated by function, offers little in term of views into the building.”

Response:

- 7.3.8 CABE have not stated where or how they consider there to be a mismatch of materials. There are a number of individual building elements within the north bank proposals which together form the station complex. Each element has a distinct form and each is treated according to its location, setting, operational and maintenance needs. There is an overriding design philosophy of clean-cut, simple modern architectural expression throughout the proposals.
- 7.3.9 I do not believe at all that any material mismatch detracts from the 'cathedral-like' aspirations of the entrance building, which is formed of glass, stainless steel and stone in ways reminiscent of many elaborate and admired modern architectural buildings.
- 7.3.10 The building profile follows the size, shape and general massing of the existing building that it replaces, not only as a direct architectural response to the first inquiry Inspector's report, but also as a response to its urban setting. A taller building would be likely to breach St Paul's Height Code Limitations, whilst a shorter building would not satisfactorily respond to the issue of the 'missing tooth'. The building's plan could not be adjusted because of existing highways and other operational constraints (such as both the London Underground tunnels and KPMG office building structures, the existing underground subway passages and the underground services passageway – these are significant existing obstacles to change).
- 7.3.11 I refute the suggestion that the premise of a transparent building is flawed. There is much opportunity to look out from this building particularly from the upper second floor public retail level, which is some 7.2 metres (24 feet) above pavement level providing direct views over both the adjacent Grade II listed Unilever House (currently being fully refurbished) and also up New Bridge Street in a northerly direction. There will also be views in a

south-westerly direction over the River Thames from this location. In addition to Exhibit 28 within Appendix 2 to this Evidence, referred to in 9.12 above, a further computer visualisation has been provided, from the upper level of the station entrance building, looking outwards south-westerly in the direction of Waterloo – this proposed image is attached as Exhibit 29 within Appendix 2 to this Evidence.

CABE Comment:

- 7.3.12 “We strongly suggest the interest of the station entrance should come from the canopy solution for the bridge rather than the “kissing cousin” option currently proposed. Why limit the extent of the architecture of the structure on the bridge, which we believe is the most resolved element of the proposals, when it would be possible to bring the language of the roof through to celebrate the entrance rather than provide another faceless office frontage? This new entrance could also provide a public space and congregation point, becoming a much-needed breathing space in this heavily trafficked area.”

Response:

- 7.3.13 I do not believe that the station entrance building represents another ‘faceless office frontage’. The proposed building represents externally the function of the tall ‘cathedral-like’ public concourse space within it and does not in anyway represent floors of offices piled on top of each other - there is no feature in the design that could in any way be considered to represent this. The use of full height glazing, steel or aluminium louvres and translucent stone in architectural elevations is not the wholesale domain of office building architecture, but is typically representative of all modern building types. There is no reason why this aesthetic should not admirably represent the modern station entrance building.
- 7.3.14 The very constrained plan area of the station entrance building and its associated concourses, ticket hall and vertical circulation areas has prevented any possibility of expanding the ground level public space any

further to provide even greater public open space and congregation points. The open space provided within the building meets the standards required of the operational railway environment.

CABE Comment:

- 7.3.15 “The proposal should also show constructively how it will contribute to the proper redevelopment of the remainder of the Puddle Dock building when the opportunity arises, which we are sure it will. We urge the client to revisit the possibility of buying out the present tenant at this stage in order to be able to address the issues arising with the whole site, and remove many of the constraints affecting the design of the entrance in this location.”

Response:

- 7.3.16 There has been no invitation from the ODPM to widen the scope of the scheme at Blackfriars to redevelop the Puddle Dock site – this is not required to fulfil the needs of the Thameslink 2000 works. The Thameslink 2000 team does not have the powers that would be needed for such a scheme, nor will the TWA Order provide them.
- 7.3.17 For such redevelopment, the necessary landownership and financial agreements will take time to create. Agreement over any future Puddle Dock Masterplan will not be quickly achieved. While Network Rail is likely to be a major stakeholder in future redevelopment plans, Thameslink 2000’s remit is, and always has been, to gain the necessary powers to implement a long overdue railway infrastructure scheme.
- 7.3.18 In my opinion the proposed Thameslink 2000 station works do not in any way preclude further development of the remainder of the north bank site in the future for whatever purpose it may then have.

7.4 Footbridge And Pedestrian Crossings

CABE Comment:

- 7.4.1 “We question the need to disturb the environment of the Black Friar pub and the well used public open space in front of it with the stair and lift access to the connecting footbridge. With 80% of the passengers using the station at peak times simply changing between the train and tube, we question the need for this footbridge. In our view these pedestrian movements would be better provided for by the surface level crossings linking to the new ‘cathedral entrance’ of the station, celebrating the station rather than providing a route of almost apologetic nature which not only offers what is effectively a tradesman’s entrance to the City but also interferes unnecessarily with an incidental but popular piece of public space
- 7.4.2 In our view this appears to be a lost opportunity in failing to provide real benefits to the pedestrian at street level in the public realm immediately outside the station. We believe the problems raised by the underpasses need to be addressed as part of this project, which should provide adequate crossings at street level. This would mean that the pedestrian bridge link, providing a mean and disappointing entrance to the station on the northern side of Queen Victoria Street, would not be necessary.”

Response:

- 7.4.3 Network Rail have acknowledged in their discussions with Transport for London (TfL) that there is merit in the idea of a level approach to the station. They have discussed with TfL the feasibility of introducing surface road crossings at Blackfriars and they are actively progressing studies on this matter.
- 7.4.4 It is my understanding that Network Rail is continuing to have discussions with TfL with the intention of contributing to the implementation of a wider scheme to install pedestrian crossings in the Blackfriars junction area. I understand it is likely that a formal agreement will be drawn up on this matter in due course.

7.4.5 However, the existing pedestrian subways are outside the remit of the Thameslink 2000 project and outside the limits of deviation of the TWA Order application. It may be that TfL can be encouraged to address the subway in the context of Network Rail developing the new station entrance.

7.4.6 The ‘well used open space’ to the west of the Black Friar public house has been subject to further design proposals since CABA’s letter, in discussion with the Corporation of London, as this land is owned by them. The Thameslink 2000 teams proposals are detailed within Pascall+Watson’s ‘Design Statement’ document issued to the Corporation of London through the Network Rail Thameslink 2000 team in January 2005 [CD/178] – refer to Appendix 5 of that document. The proposed works enhance the setting of this external space alongside the public house and strengthen the pedestrian route from the proposed new staircase and lift structure through towards New Bridge Street. New hard and soft landscaping proposals have been agreed with the Corporation of London based on a review of works already carried out within the Aldermanbury Ward by the Corporation.

7.5 Southern Station

CABA Comment:

7.5.1 “The station on the southern side will become the main public transport link for Tate Modern; it should not in our view be anything less than the best that can be achieved. We believe a similar approach to that advocated for the north side, extending the bridge canopy, would help anchor the structure effectively in this river side location and provide a real sense of place.”

Response:

7.5.2 A proposed extension of the bridge canopy roof to cover the new south bank station entrance building has never been a part of the concept architects proposals, was not brought into question by the first inquiry Inspector, and has not been an issue with LB Southwark. The proposed architecture of this smaller station entrance building is modern and dynamic, whilst not being overpowering or overbearing within its setting. It responds in size to the small-scale existing building against which it sits (and masks). Its architecture responds to the needs of a small ticket hall not to a long span bridge roof covering track and platform areas. There is a desire within the architectural proposals to remain reticent to surrounding buildings and views rather than to attempt to try to dominate the scene – the urban surroundings are too massive to try to compete with them.

7.5.3 Notwithstanding the importance of the southern entrance of Blackfriars station to Tate Modern, I believe that the building as proposed is an appropriate design for a station entrance on a constrained site. The Network Rail Thameslink 2000 team have met with LB Southwark independently and the design team have prepared an additional photomontage view of the proposals for this building which has been included within Pascall+Watson architects Design Statement document [CD/178] referred to above. LB Southwark have been positive towards the scheme in discussions with the Network Rail Thameslink 2000 team and has recommended its approval. The design team are continuing work with LB Southwark to explore whether there are additional improvements that can be incorporated within the context of their aspirations for the area.

7.6 Conclusions

CABE Comments:

7.6.1 “This is an unusual opportunity to create a truly memorable station where the bridge itself becomes the station concourse crossing the River Thames. The two land based elements, however, need a fundamental re-think, and the principles behind the project need to be revisited to arrive at a coherent and well considered response. In Liverpool Street and Paddington we have (admittedly larger) recent examples of how it is possible to deliver well-designed major station projects in the capital; the quality of Blackfriars ought to measure up to these.

The architects and engineers should be given the opportunity to come up with the best possible solutions rather than be constrained by the client and the outcome of the TWA public inquiry. This is a project we would very much like to see happen. What is needed, in terms of standard setting, is a scheme, which would be a strong candidate for the Prime Minister’s Better Public Building award. This would show the commitment of the client to providing valuable additions to the public realm and in creating stations and places that people enjoy and want to see.”

Response:

7.6.2 It is my opinion that the architecture proposed at Blackfriars Station under the Thameslink 2000 proposals is of very good quality, both conceptually and in the detail put forward to date. The proposed design is sufficient architecturally not to warrant the criticism put forward by CABE. The views put forward in the letter received from CABE have selectively ignored the circumstances and constraints under which the design proposals have had to have been progressed and have assumed that this project must produce a ‘landmark’ building capable of winning awards – the reality is that the individual areas of design have addressed their individual contexts, constraints and opportunities and as such have not directly sought to achieve award winning status but have sought to solve the numerous requirements of both the brief and urban contexts within which these proposed works sit. In considering the many and various needs that

the proposed designs need to address, the solutions as submitted for planning approval provide for an admirable architecture. In particular there is no doubt at all in my view that the proposed new bridge and enclosing envelope could become a much admired structure within the Thames riverscape.

8.0 LONDON VIEW MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK DRAFT SPG

8.1 Introduction

8.1.1 In April 2005 the Mayor of London's office issued the Draft Supplementary Planning Guidance document [CD/249] noted above for consultation purposes.

8.1.2 The Guidance document recognises the value of London's historic built environment and the need to protect and enhance its most important views. The Guide provides precise details on the location of viewing corridors, backdrops and front and middle ground assessment areas, as well as qualitative character assessments.

8.1.3 Following a review of the Management Plans four of the strategic Assessment views could be affected by the proposals at Blackfriars Station and need therefore to be taken into account.

8.2 Management Plan 9 – River Prospect : Southwark Bridge

8.2.1 View 9A.1 from approximately the centre of Southwark Bridge looks westwards towards Blackfriars Bridge and notes Unilever House as one of a small number of 'prominent buildings' within the assessment view. The new Millennium Footbridge, east of the Blackfriars rail bridge partially obstructs direct views over the bridge.

8.2.2 Pascall+Watson architects have previously produced, at the request of the Corporation of London, before and after views from a point slightly further north along Southwark Bridge, which were submitted as a part of the Planning Application documentation. These were produced prior to the publication of the GLA Guidance document and can be found within the Planning documentation referred to as:

- a. Photomontage 10 : 'Existing view from Southwark Bridge looking upstream', and;
- b. Photomontage 10 : 'Proposed view from Southwark Bridge looking upstream' .

(The latter of the two images referred to above can be seen as Exhibit 11 within Appendix 2 to this Evidence).

8.2.3 A location plan showing the position of the views can be found within Pascall+Watson architects Design Statement document dated January 2005 [CD/178] as well as Exhibit 1 within Appendix 2 to this Evidence.

8.2.4 In my professional opinion the proposals for the Blackfriars Station Thameslink 2000 works have no impact on any aspects of this strategic view. With the proposed removal of the North Bank train shed roof there will be a slightly increased view of the 'prominent' Unilever House available at its lower levels from this vantage point.

8.3 Management Plan 11 – River Prospect : Blackfriars Bridge

8.3.1 View 11A.3 from the western side of Blackfriars Road Bridge, slightly north of the centre of the bridge, looks north-eastwards directly over the site of the proposed North Bank area of the Blackfriars Thameslink 2000 station works, concentrating on the dome of St Paul's Cathedral in the background. As stated in the GLA Guidance document:

"This viewpoint was originally noted by Godfrey Allen, the Surveyor of the Fabric of St Paul's Cathedral during the 1930's. The construction of Faraday House was a significant factor in Allen's campaign to protect river views of the Cathedral, which led to the establishment of the St Paul's Heights Code".

8.3.2 Pascall+Watson architects had previously prepared at the request of the Corporation of London a similar view but from a position much more southerly on Blackfriars Bridge Road than the 'Godfrey Allen' viewpoint, (refer to Exhibit 1 within Appendix 2 to this Evidence).

8.3.3 To ensure that there is no effect of any significance on this View Management Framework Assessment point new photomontages have been produced showing both the 'as existing' and 'as proposed' views - these are provided as Exhibits 22 and 23 within Appendix 2 to this Evidence.

8.3.4 In my professional opinion the proposals for the Blackfriars Station Thameslink 2000 works do not in anyway impinge upon let alone adversely affect the primary landmark of the St Paul's Cathedral dome within this view. (Please note that the same view has been reproduced as a proposed night time view to demonstrate the proposed quality of lighting onto the proposed new roof canopy over the rail bridge and is presented as Exhibits 24 and 25 within Appendix 2 to this Evidence— this was undertaken to respond to comments received from CABE – refer to paragraphs 7.2.16 and 7.2.17 above).

8.4 Management Plan 12 – River Prospect : Waterloo Bridge

8.4.1 Views 12B.1 and 12B.2 from the north end and centre of Waterloo Bridge on the eastern side, both look eastwards towards the Blackfriars bridges. In both views St Paul's Cathedral is the prominent landmark with a number of secondary landmarks.

8.4.2 Pascall+Watson architects have previously produced, at the request of the Corporation of London, before and after views from a point more southerly along Waterloo Bridge, which was submitted as a part of the Planning Application documentation [CD/195]. As noted above these were produced prior to the publication of the GLA Guidance document and can be found within the Planning documentation referred to as:

- a. Photomontage 7 : 'Existing view from Waterloo Bridge looking downstream', and;
- b. Photomontage 7 : 'Proposed view from Waterloo Bridge looking downstream'

(The latter of the two images referred to above can be seen as Exhibit 8 within Appendix 2 to this Evidence).

- 8.4.3 A location plan showing the position of the views can be found within Pascall+Watson architects Design Statement document dated January 2005 [CD/178] as well as Exhibit 1 within Appendix 2 to this Evidence.
- 8.4.4 The views produced above whilst not identical to the GLA Guidance document Assessment view, do provide sufficient evidence to determine the impact of the proposed Thameslink 2000 works on this Assessment view.
- 8.4.5 In my professional opinion the proposals for the Blackfriars Station Thameslink 2000 works will have no impact on either the primary or secondary landmarks within this strategic view, although views immediately down river over the Blackfriars rail bridge will be affected by the proposed station platform roof and glazed side enclosures on the bridge, as they will affect transparency upstream.

8.5 Management Plan 13 – River Prospect : The South Bank

8.5.1 View 13B.1 from close to Gabriel's Wharf on the South Bank looks north-eastwards towards St Paul's Cathedral looking over the site of the proposed North Bank area of the Blackfriars Thameslink 2000 station works. St Paul's Cathedral is the prominent landmark with a number of secondary landmarks and other prominent buildings.

8.5.2 Pascall+Watson architects have previously produced, at the request of the Corporation of London, before and after views from two points in almost identical positions, which were submitted as a part of the Planning Application documentation [CD/195]. These were produced prior to the publication of the GLA Guidance document and can be found within the Planning documentation referred to as:

- a. Photomontage 8 : 'Existing view from the South Bank river walk looking towards St Paul's', and;
- b. Photomontage 8 : 'Proposed view from the South Bank river walk looking towards St Paul's';

along with:

- c. Photomontage 9 : 'Existing view from the South Bank river walk looking downstream', and;
- d. Photomontage 9 : 'Proposed view from the South Bank river walk looking downstream'

(The latter of each of the two images referred to above can be seen as Exhibits 9 and 10 within Appendix 2 to this Evidence).

8.5.3 A location plan showing the position of the views can be found within Pascall+Watson architects Design Statement document dated January 2005 [CD/178] as well as Exhibit 1 within Appendix 2 to this Evidence.

8.5.4 Within this Assessment view the proposed North Bank station entrance building sits below the west facings portico of the front of St Paul's, whilst

the existing Bridge House Trust building sits immediately below of the dome. The protected 'vista lines' given within the GLA Guidance document are not in anyway infringed by the Thameslink 2000 proposals and to that extent neither the primary landmark building nor any of the secondary landmark buildings (and other prominent buildings and structures listed) are affected.

- 8.5.5 Architecturally the proposals for the Blackfriars Station Thameslink 2000 works have no significant impact on any aspects of this strategic view, although as noted earlier above, views immediately down river over the Blackfriars rail bridge will be affected by the proposed station platform roof and glazed side enclosures on the bridge, as they will marginally affect transparency upstream.

8.6 Conclusion

- 8.6.1 In conclusion I do not consider that any aspect of the proposed Thameslink 2000 works at Blackfriars station has any material effect on any significant aspect of the Management Plans for each of the views identified within the GLA Guidance document for View Management Framework [CD/249] within which the proposed works are visible. In reviewing aspects of the Guidance document such as 'Development within Front and Middle Ground Assessment areas' there are small scale affects with the development of the enclosure over the Blackfriars rail bridge, but with regard to 'landscape strategy in the foreground', 'development in the background of significant views', 'consideration of primary landmarks in significant views', 'consideration of secondary landmarks in significant views', etc, I would proffer that there are no material considerations that affect the views referred to above.