

# THAMESLINK 2000

## Proof of Evidence on Heritage

By  
William Filmer-Sankey

**NR/9/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

|  |           |
|--|-----------|
| <b>1.0 INTRODUCTION</b>  | <b>3</b>  |
| <b>2.0 APPOINTMENT</b>   | <b>4</b>  |
| <b>3.0 SCOPE OF EVIDENCE</b>   | <b>6</b>  |
| <b>4.0 POLICY BACKGROUND</b>   | <b>10</b> |
| 4.1 Introduction   | 10        |
| 4.2 Statutory basis  | 10        |
| 4.3 PPG15  | 11        |
| 4.4 The London Plan (February 2004)  | 15        |
| 4.5 The London View Management Framework Draft SPG [CD/249]                      | 16        |
| 4.6 LB Islington UDP   | 20        |
| 4.7 The City of London UDP [NR/10/B Appendix 2]                                  | 21        |
| 4.8 LB Southwark UDP [NR/10/B Appendix 2]  | 23        |
| 4.9 The Borough High Street Conservation Area Appraisal [CD/235]                 | 25        |
| 4.10 The 2004 Environmental Statement and 2005 Addendum<br>[CD/164 –169, CD/202] | 27        |
| <b>5.0 FARRINGDON</b>  | <b>29</b> |
| 5.1 Summary of Heritage Assets   | 29        |
| 5.2 Summary of position at the close of the first Inquiry                        | 31        |
| 5.3 Changes since the Inspector's report   | 32        |
| 5.4 Justification and mitigation of heritage effects                             | 33        |
| <b>6.0 BLACKFRIARS</b>   | <b>35</b> |
| 6.2 Summary of position at the close of the first Inquiry                        | 38        |
| 6.3 Changes since the Inspector's report   | 40        |
| 6.4 Justification and mitigation of heritage effects                             | 42        |
| <b>7.0 LONDON BRIDGE</b>   | <b>49</b> |
| 7.1 Summary of heritage assets   | 49        |
| 7.2 Summary of position at the close of the first Inquiry                        | 53        |
| 7.3 Changes since the Inspector's report   | 54        |
| 7.4 Justification and mitigation of heritage effects                             | 55        |

|            |  |           |
|------------|--|-----------|
| <b>8.0</b> | <b>BOROUGH MARKET</b>  | <b>62</b> |
| <b>8.1</b> | <b>Summary of heritage assets</b>                            | <b>62</b> |
| <b>8.2</b> | <b>Summary of position at the close of the first Inquiry</b> | <b>67</b> |
| <b>8.3</b> | <b>Changes since the Inspector's report</b>                  | <b>71</b> |
| <b>8.4</b> | <b>Justification and mitigation of heritage effects</b>      | <b>72</b> |
| <b>9.0</b> | <b>CONCLUSION</b>  | <b>88</b> |

## **I.0 INTRODUCTION**

- I.1 My name is William Filmer-Sankey and I am a Senior Associate at Alan Baxter & Associates, a multidisciplinary consultancy based in engineering. My principal role in the firm is to advise public and private clients on heritage matters (proposals affecting listed buildings, Scheduled Ancient Monuments and Conservation Areas). The scope of the practice's work is wide, including sites with significant archaeological remains, cathedrals and major institutions, such as the National Gallery, the Church of St Martin-in-the Fields, to 20<sup>th</sup> century listed buildings, such as the Dorchester Hotel.
- I.2 My qualifications are an MA in Modern History, a Diploma in European Archaeology and a DPhil (in early medieval archaeology), all from the University of Oxford. I am a member of the Institute of Field Archaeologists, a Fellow of the Society of Antiquaries and have a Visiting Fellowship at the Department of Archaeology of York University.
- I.3 Prior to joining Alan Baxter & Associates in 2000, I spent eight years as the Director (Chief Executive) of the Victorian Society, the national amenity society with a special interest in the architecture and arts of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, and a formal role in the listed building consent process. Prior to that, I worked as a consultant with Oxford Archaeological Associates, advising private sector clients on the archaeological implications of development proposals.

## 2.0 APPOINTMENT

- 2.1 In May 2005 I was invited by Network Rail, to provide expert evidence to this public inquiry on the heritage implications of the revised proposals, with particular emphasis on the various matters on which the Secretaries of State wish to be informed.
- 2.2 Neither I nor Alan Baxter & Associates were involved with the development of the proposals for Farringdon, Blackfriars or Borough Market, which are the subject of this inquiry. Our role has been to give an independent perspective on the extent to which the proposals meet the criteria set out in relevant national and local policy guidance on the historic environment, and in the Inspector's report on the first inquiry and the Secretary of State's letter of 30 July 2002.
- 2.3 On London Bridge, the situation is slightly different, in that Alan Baxter & Associates were closely involved as conservation advisers and engineers with the development of the Masterplan, which was consented by LB Southwark in September 2003. Most of this work, however, took place before I joined the practice.
- 2.4 In addition to the practice's involvement with the London Bridge Masterplan, Alan Baxter & Associates has a number of past projects and current projects in the vicinity of the proposed Thameslink 2000 route. These include acting as conservation advisers to the Crossrail project, as engineers to the Borough Market Trustees for the refurbishment of the market (including the re-erection of the Floral Hall from Covent Garden), and as members of the team currently working on the Embankment Vision Study. These projects have given the practice a depth of experience which has assisted me in understanding the technical and physical

constraints of the Thameslink 2000 project and in reaching a balanced view on the impact of the new proposals on the built heritage.

### **3.0 SCOPE OF EVIDENCE**

3.1 My evidence covers those issues relating to Listed Buildings, Conservation Areas and protected views, as well as more general townscape issues, identified in the 6 January 2005 Statement of Matters. Specifically:

#### **3.2 Applications for TWA Order and deemed planning permission:**

Matter 5: “The likely effects of construction and operation of the scheme on the character of the Borough High Street/Borough Market area and on the setting and integrity of buildings within that area in the light of changed circumstances since the earlier inquiry, including the cumulative impact of the proposed new buildings in this area.”

Matter 7: “Whether, in the light of the updated assessments arising under 5 ... above, the transport and other benefits assessed under 1 above would outweigh the harm arising to heritage interests, principally in the Borough Market area.”

This Matter is covered in Section 8 below.

#### **3.3 The 3 planning applications relating to Blackfriars Station and railway bridge, London EC4 and SE1:**

1: “The extent to which the development proposed in the applications would secure a high quality of design having regard to PPG1 [CD/4] and in particular:

i) whether the design of the proposed replacement for the existing Blackfriars station would be appropriate to its important townscape setting;

2: The extent to which the proposed developments are consistent with advice in PPG15 *Planning and the Historic Environment*, 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 of the former West Blackfriars and St Paul's Railway Bridge.
- 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 River Thames."

This Matter is covered in Section 6 below.

**3.4 The 4 planning applications relating to development in the Borough High Street areas, at:**

- **7 Stoney Street, SE1**
- **2-4 Bedale Street, SE1**
- **11-15 Borough High Street, SE1**
- **16-26 Borough High Street and 7 Bedale Street**

- 1: "The extent to which the development proposed in the applications would secure a high quality of design having regard to the general advice in PPG1 [CD/4] and, in particular, whether the design of the proposed replacement buildings would be appropriate to their important townscape setting.
- 2: The extent to which the proposed developments are consistent with advice in PPG15 [CD/7] *Planning and the Historic Environment*, with particular regard to:
- i) the desirability of preserving a listed building 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 Borough High Street Conservation Area;
  - iii) the need for the scale and type of development proposed."

This Matter is covered in Section 8 below.

**3.5 The LBC application in respect of the Black Friar Public House, 174 Queen Victoria Street, EC4.**

“The need for the 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.”

This Matter is covered in Section 6 below.

**3.6 The LBC application in respect of the south abutment to the former West Blackfriars and St Paul’s Railway Bridge, Blackfriars Road, SE1**

“The need for the 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.”

This Matter is covered in Section 6 below.

**3.7 All of the 9 above-mentioned applications for planning permission and LBC:**

- 1: “The extent to which the proposed developments are in accordance with the current development plans for their area, having regard in particular to the relevant policies in the adopted Southwark UDP, the Corporation of City of London UDP and the London Plan.
- 2: The suitability of any conditions proposed to be attached to any planning permission or listed building consent.”

This Matter is covered in Sections 5-8 below.

**3.8 All other applications for planning permission (TL1 and TL2) listed building consent (TL10-TL19) and conservation area consent (TL22-TL26) on the attached list.**

I: Any significant changes in circumstances since the earlier inquiry, including any significant changes in plans and policies, that are material to consideration of these applications.

This Matter is covered in Sections 5-8 below.

**3.9 All of the applications shown on the attached list (TL1-TL28)  
The adequacy of the revised and updated Environmental Statement**

This Matter is covered in Sections 5-8 below.

3.10 The next section of this proof sets the background for a consideration of these matters, by outlining the statutory tests and relevant national and local planning policy background. It then follows with a detailed analysis of each area where there have been significant changes to the scheme since the first inquiry: Farringdon (section 5), Blackfriars (section 6), London Bridge (section 7) and Borough Market (section 8).

## **4.0 POLICY BACKGROUND**

### **4.1 Introduction**

4.1.1 The proposed Thameslink 2000 works will have the following impacts on the built heritage within the central section of the railway:

- a. alterations to listed buildings (Farringdon, Blackfriars, Borough Market);
- b. demolitions of listed buildings (Farringdon, London Bridge, Borough Market);
- c. impacts on the setting of listed buildings (all four areas);
- d. demolitions and replacements of unlisted buildings in Conservation Areas (Borough Market, London Bridge);
- e. effects on the setting of Conservation Areas, and on views into and out of Conservation Areas (Farringdon, Blackfriars); and
- f. effects on designated views (Blackfriars, London Bridge).

4.1.2 This section sets out the policies against which these proposals should be assessed.

### **4.2 Statutory basis**

4.2.1 The statutory basis for control of developments affecting the built heritage, whether listed buildings or Conservation Areas, is the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act of 1990 [AD/87 – first inquiry](The Act). *Inter alia*, the Act:

- a. imposes on the Secretary of State a duty to compile or approve lists of buildings of special architectural or historic interest (Section 1);
- b. provides that, once a building is ‘listed’, consent is normally required for its demolition, in whole or in part, and for any works of alteration or extension

which would affect its character as a building of special architectural or historic interest (Section 7);

- c. imposes on local planning authorities a duty to designate as Conservation Areas any 'areas of special architectural or historic interest the character or appearance of which it is desirable to preserve or enhance' (Section 69);
- d. requires that special attention is paid in the exercise of planning functions to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of a Conservation Area (Section 72);
- e. requires local planning authorities considering applications for listed building consent to have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses (Section 16 (2)); and
- f. requires local planning authorities in considering whether to grant planning permission for development which affects a listed building or its setting to have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses (Section 66).

### **4.3 PPG15**

#### *Listed buildings*

- 4.3.1 National government policy on the historic environment (including listed buildings and Conservation Areas) is set out in PPG15 Planning and the Historic Environment (September 1994[CD/7]) which interprets the statutory requirements of the Act.
- 4.3.2 Listed buildings are defined in the Act (section 1) as being of special architectural or historic interest. Any works which would affect that special interest require listed building consent (section 10). PPG15 ([CD/7] paragraph 3.5), lists 'the issues that are generally relevant to the consideration of all listed building consent applications'. They are in summary:

- a. the importance of the building, its intrinsic architectural and historic interest and rarity, in both national and local terms;
  - b. the particular physical features of the building (which may include its design, plan, materials or location) which justify its inclusion in the list;
  - c. the building's setting and contribution to the local scene; and
  - d. the extent to which the proposed works would bring substantial benefits for the community; in particular by contributing to the economic regeneration of the area of the enhancement of its environment (including other listed buildings).
- 4.3.3 PPG15 also considers the use of listed buildings: 'It requires balancing the economic viability of possible uses against the effect of any changes they entail in the special architectural and historic interest of the building or area in question. In principle the aim should be to identify the optimum viable economic use that is compatible with the fabric, interior, and setting of the historic building.' ([CD/7] paragraph 3.9).
- 4.3.4 In cases involving total or substantial demolition of a listed building, PPG15 lists additional considerations for the planning authority determining the application ([CD/7] paragraph 3.19). These are in summary:
- a. the condition of the building;
  - b. the adequacy of efforts made to retain the building in use; and
  - c. the merits of alternative proposals for the site. PPG15 states that subjective claims for the architectural merits of proposed replacement buildings should not in themselves be held to justify demolition of any listed building. Rather, there may very exceptionally be cases where the proposed works would bring substantial benefits to the community which have to be weighed against the arguments in favour of preservation.
- 4.3.5 In his report following the first inquiry, the Inspector accepted that Thameslink 2000 is a case where, in principle, wide public benefit outweighs the loss of listed buildings ([CD/199] paragraph 1.26-7). LB Southwark reached the same

conclusion in its decision to grant listed building consent for the London Bridge Masterplan in 2003.

- 4.3.6 Advice on the setting of listed buildings is found in paragraphs 2.16-17 of PPG15, which give general guidance on the definition of setting. Paragraph 2.16 notes that local planning authorities are required to have special regard to ‘the desirability of preserving the setting of [a listed] building’ when considering applications for planning permission.

#### *Conservation Areas*

- 4.3.7 Conservation Areas are defined in the Act (Section 69) as ‘areas of special architectural or historic interest the character or appearance of which it is desirable to preserve or enhance’. In considering applications for planning permission, planning authorities must pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing that character or appearance (PPG15, paragraph 4.14[CD/7]). The meaning of ‘preserve or enhance’ has been defined by the courts: ‘the objective of preservation can be achieved ... by development which leaves character and appearance unharmed’ ([CD/7] paragraph 4.20, quoting *South Lakeland DC v Secretary of State for the Environment* [1992] 2 AC 141). In other words, it is not essential for new development to enhance the character or appearance of a conservation area, but it is desirable for it at least to preserve those qualities it has.

- 4.3.8 The criteria for assessing proposals for the demolition and replacement of unlisted buildings in conservation areas are set out in PPG 15, paragraph 4.27. This states that there is a general presumption in favour of retaining buildings which make a positive contribution to the character or appearance of a conservation area. Proposals to demolish such buildings should be assessed as if they were listed,

using the criteria in PPG15, paragraphs 3.5 and 3.19, which were outlined above (see above, paragraphs 4.3.2 – 4.3.3).

- 4.3.9 In what PPG15 describes as ‘less clear cut cases – for instance, where a building makes little or no such (positive) contribution’, planning authorities will need to have full information about what is proposed for the site after demolition: ‘Consent for demolition should not be given unless there are acceptable and detailed plans for any redevelopment. It has been held that the decision maker is entitled to consider the merits of any proposed development in determining whether consent should be given to the demolition of an unlisted building in a conservation area.’ ([CD/7] paragraph 4.27).
- 4.3.10 The use of a planning condition is recommended as a way of ensuring that ‘ugly gaps’ do not appear in conservation areas, as a result of demolition far in advance of development ([CD/7] paragraph 4.29).
- 4.3.11 It is accepted that development outside the boundary of a Conservation Area can also affect its setting, or views in or out of the area. The ‘preserve or enhance’ test is therefore a material consideration in such cases ([CD/7] paragraph 4.14).

#### *Views*

- 4.3.12 PPG15 [CD/7] clearly acknowledges the importance of views as an aspect of setting: ‘A proposed high or bulky building might also affect the setting of a listed building some distance away, or alter views of a historic skyline’ ([CD/7] paragraph 2.17).

## 4.4 The London Plan (February 2004)

- 4.4.1 The London Plan is the strategic plan for the capital, setting out an integrated social, economic and environmental framework for its future development over the next 15-20 years.
- 4.4.2 In general terms, the Plan develops national policy and applies it to the spatial context of London. It does not itself impose any additional levels of control, although its policies on views (developed in the draft SPG, see below) are useful in defining what is protected and in setting out criteria for assessing potential effects.
- 4.4.3 Objective 6 (To make London a more attractive, well-designed and green city) acknowledges the importance of historic conservation and enhancing the public realm in the protection and enhancement of the quality of the townscape. Building on this is a number of more detailed policies. In particular:
- 4.4.4 Policy 4B.1 includes ‘respect London’s built heritage’ among the *Design Principles for a compact city*.
- 4.4.5 Policies 4B.10-12 deal with *London’s built heritage, Heritage conservation and Historic conservation-led regeneration*. Paragraph 4.60 states the Mayor’s wish to see the sensitive management of London’s extraordinary historic assets planned in tandem with the promotion of the very best modern architecture and urban design.
- 4.4.6 Policies 4B.15-17 establish the framework for the protection of key views (which are listed in table 4B.2). These policies are taken up in the *London View Management Framework Draft SPG [CD/249]*, which is discussed below.

- 4.4.7 Policies 4C.10-11 and 20 deal specifically with the historic environment of London's rivers and waterways and the need for high quality design for all waterside development.
- 4.4.8 Policy 4B.8 promotes the erection of tall buildings in suitable locations, where they will create attractive landmarks, will enhance London's character, will foster related economic activities and/or regeneration. Tall buildings are those which are 75m or above in the City of London, 25m or above in the Thames Policy Area and 30m or above elsewhere (GLA Order 2000). Policy 4B.9 defines design guidelines for tall buildings, which among other criteria, should respect Policy 4B.15 and the *London View Management Framework Draft SPG [CD/249]*.
- 4.4.9 As is explained by John Rhodes, the London Plan contains a number of references which support the completion of Thameslink 2000. Policy 3C.11 commits the Mayor of London to 'work with strategic partners to improve the strategic public transport system in London by ... completing the Thameslink 2000 project'. It is clear from this and other policies (such as 5B.1 and 5F.1) that Thameslink 2000 is seen as a crucially important project not only because of its ability to increase access to the central activities zone but also because of its ability to stimulate intensification and regeneration opportunities throughout the wider area of the capital.

#### **4.5 The London View Management Framework Draft SPG [CD/249] (SPG)**

- 4.5.1 This SPG, which was issued in draft for consultation in April 2005 (the consultation period running until 15 July 2005), is relevant to the Thameslink 2000 proposals for Blackfriars Station, including the new building at 167-179 Queen Victoria Street, and to London Bridge. Its purpose is to give advice and guidance on the

interpretation of policies 4B.15-17 of the London Plan. Once approved, it will replace the existing strategic views policies in *RPG3* [CD/11] *Annex A: Supplementary Guidance for London on the Protection of Strategic Views*. The draft SPG identifies more strategic views (particularly the river prospects) and is more detailed in its coverage and analysis of strategic views than Annex A of *RPG3* [CD/11]. I have therefore based my analysis of the effects of the Thameslink 2000 proposals on strategic views, on the draft SPG.

- 4.5.2 The SPG [CD/249] defines the meaning of the terms used and identifies a number of specific ‘Assessment Points’ (APs) for measuring the impact of development proposals, both on ‘significant views’ and on ‘protected vistas’.
- 4.5.3 Chapter 4 (Qualitative Visual Assessment) also provides visual management guidance for assessing the impact of proposals on general views. Of particular relevance to the Thameslink 2000 proposals for Blackfriars is the guidance on development in “Front and Middle Ground Assessment Areas”. Paragraph 38 notes the London Plan’s objective to “prevent unsightly and overtly prominent elements ... such as intrusive block sizes, building heights, roof design, materials and colour, as they could disrupt the viewing experience”.
- 4.5.4 Where proposed developments may affect significant views, the SPG recommends that Accurate Visual Representations should be created, to allow the impact to be accurately assessed (paragraph 34).
- 4.5.5 Chapter 5 (Management by geometric definition) provides guidance on the assessment of the impact of proposals on Protected Vistas, two of which (Assessment point 12B.2: Waterloo Bridge and Assessment point 13B.1: Gabriel’s Wharf) include parts of Blackfriars, and two of which (Assessment point 2A.1: Parliament Hill and 3A.1: Kenwood) include London Bridge Station. This states that, where a proposal within a defined Landmark Viewing Corridor rises above

the designated threshold plane and fails to preserve or enhance the ability to recognise and appreciate the landmark building, it will normally be refused consent ([CD/249] paragraph 63). Developments within the Landmark Lateral Assessment Areas must be able to demonstrate that they preserve or enhance the ability to recognise and appreciate the Landmark Building ([CD/249] paragraph 66). Developments within the Landmark Background Assessment Area (as is the case at London Bridge) should not detract from the ability to recognise and appreciate the designated landmark (St Paul's). A threshold plane defines the point at which new developments might impact on this ability ([CD/249] paragraph 70).

4.5.6 The SPG also provides Management Plans for the 26 views identified in table 4B.2 of the London Plan. Of relevance to the Blackfriars proposals are:

- a. **Southwark Bridge:** views upstream from the centre of the bridge (Assessment point 9A.1-2) include Blackfriars railway bridge, which is said to lead the eye north to Unilever House, which is described as a 'prominent building' in the view.
- b. **Blackfriars (road) Bridge:** Assessment point 11A.3 from the northern bastion of the upstream side of the bridge gives a particularly fine view of St Paul's, which was first identified in the 1930s by Godfrey Allen who, as Surveyor to the Fabric, led the campaign for the establishment of the St Paul's Heights Code. Paragraph 207 [CD/249] notes that the Mayor will encourage development that improves the setting of St Paul's.
- c. **Waterloo Bridge:** Assessment points 12B.1-2 offer long views of the City, with Blackfriars Bridge and Station in the middle distance, and are also the focus for two Protected Vistas of St Pauls. 167-179 Queen Victoria Street falls within the Lateral Assessment Area of Assessment Point 12B.2.
- d. **South Bank: Gabriels Wharf:** Blackfriars falls within the middle ground of the Protected Vista of St Paul's. 167-179 Queen Victoria Street is within the Viewing Corridor, while the northern part of the station (including the current canopy) are in the Lateral Assessment Area.

- 4.5.7 The view from the Millenium Bridge and Thames side at Tate Modern have not been included in this discussion, as the designated views and the Protected Vista look directly towards St Paul's to the north, and do not include any of the elements affected by the Thameslink 2000 proposals.
- 4.5.8 The impacts of the new building at 167-179 Queen Victoria Street and of the proposed works to Blackfriars station are discussed in section 6 below.
- 4.5.9 Of particular relevance to the London Bridge Masterplan are the London Panoramas 2 (Parliament Hill) and 3 (Kenwood), as the proposed new 10 storey building above the new London Bridge Station appears in the Background Assessment Area of both protected vistas of St Paul's. In the chapter on Parliament Hill, the SPG notes that "St Paul's Cathedral is set within a jumble of buildings" and that "background development diminishes the viewer's ability to recognise and appreciate the landmark" ([CD/249] paragraph 103). It is existing high buildings close to London Bridge station that form the backdrop of the landmark ([CD/249] paragraph 106). There is a similar problem in the protected vista from Kenwood, whence "the foreground of the cathedral is clear, but the viewer's ability to recognise and appreciate it is inhibited by tall buildings behind it" ([CD/249] paragraph 117). In the future, "the backdrop [of both protected vistas] will be encouraged to evolve into a well balanced and appropriate setting for the Cathedral against the natural background of hills" ([CD/249] paragraphs 107 and 124).
- 4.5.10 The effects of the proposed 10-storey building over the new London Bridge Station on these protected vistas are discussed in section 7 below. There have been no objections from the GLA in relation to any of these protected views.

## 4.6 LB Islington UDP

4.6.1 LB Islington Unitary Development Plan (2002) [CD/244] outlines local policy on the historic environment, and should be considered when assessing the Thameslink 2000 proposals for Farringdon. There are strategic policies relating to the historic environment in Part One of the Plan, and Chapter 12 (Design and Conservation) contains the more specific policies.

### *Listed buildings*

4.6.2 Policy ST13 ([CD/244] Part 1) covers strategic policies for design and conservation in the borough, and includes a general policy that the Council will aim to protect and enhance the character, appearance and setting of statutory and locally listed buildings in the borough.

4.6.3 Chapter 12 (Design and Conservation) contains specific policies relating to the conservation of listed building. Policy D39 states that external and internal works to listed buildings should not adversely affect their character or appearance, and wherever possible existing detailing and other features which give character to the building are preserved, repaired, and where missing, replaced.

4.6.4 Policy D38 states that consent for the demolition of listed buildings will not be granted unless all possible efforts to avoid demolition have been demonstrated as outlined in PPG15.

4.6.5 Policy D39 also states that Islington Council will ensure that the setting of listed buildings is protected or enhanced.

### *Conservation Areas*

- 4.6.6 Strategic policy ST13 [CD/244] also includes the general policy aim to preserve and enhance areas of special architectural or historic interest as key elements of Islington's character.
- 4.6.7 Policy D22 states that the design of new development within Conservation Areas should be of a high standard and that new buildings and extensions should normally conform to the height, scale and massing of existing buildings and spaces in the Conservation Area. In addition, Policy D24 states that extensions and refurbishment in Conservation Areas should normally use traditional materials. The form, colour, texture and profile of materials used in new developments in Conservation Areas should be sympathetic to the character of the area.
- 4.6.8 Policy D21 states that there is a presumption in favour of the retention of buildings which make a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. Ideally, proposals for the total or substantial demolition of buildings in a Conservation Area should preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Conservation Area, and in some instances the Council may require redevelopment proposals before consent for demolition is granted.

## **4.7 The City of London UDP [NR/10/B Appendix 2]**

- 4.7.1 The City of London Unitary Development Plan (2002) outlines local policy on the historic environment and should be considered when assessing the Thameslink 2000 proposals for Blackfriars. Chapter 10 (Environmental Quality) focuses on the historic environment, but strategic policies and those relating to the River Thames (Chapter 12) are also relevant.

*Listed buildings*

- 4.7.2 POLICY STRAT 10B is a general, strategic policy which aims to ensure that the special character of the City, as the historic core of the capital, is regarded when new developments or the alteration of existing fabric are considered.
- 4.7.3 The policies in Chapter 10 (Environmental Quality) specifically address listed buildings. POLICY ENV 16 states that permission to alter listed buildings should only be granted where the changes will not detract from the special architectural or historic interest of the building.
- 4.7.4 POLICY ENV 15 states that the demolition of listed buildings should be resisted.
- 4.7.5 POLICY ENV 18 states that development which would adversely affect the setting of a listed building should also be resisted.

*Conservation Areas*

- 4.7.6 POLICY ENV 11 and 12 deal with the demolition of unlisted buildings which make a positive contribution to the character or appearance of a conservation area, and with the need for new development to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Conservation Area. In general terms, they restate PPG15 ([CD/7] paragraph 4.27).

*Views*

- 4.7.7 Policies relating to views are considered in Part 1 (Strategic Policies), Chapter 10 (Environmental Quality) and Chapter 12 (River Thames). POLICY STRAT 10C is a strategic policy which states that new development should regard the City's skyline, including long-distance views of St Paul's Cathedral. POLICY ENV 2 is a similar general policy, stating that significant views of buildings, townscape and skylines should be protected or enhanced. Appendix 5 lists the historic landmarks and skyline features which are protected by these policies; it includes Tower

Bridge. POLICY RIV 1 specifically considers views from bridges and the banks of the Thames and states that development should maintain or improve views of and along the river.

- 4.7.8 Chapter 10 (Environmental Quality) contains more specific policies relating to the preservation of views of St Paul's Cathedral. POLICY ENV 20 states that development which will affect views of St Paul's should not detract from its setting, local views or its impact on the wider skyline. POLICY ENV 21 states that planning permission would normally be refused for developments exceeding the "development plane" in the St Paul's Cathedral strategic viewing corridors. POLICY ENV 22 states that development within the wider setting and in the background of St Paul's Cathedral, which would have an adverse impact on views, should also be resisted. POLICY ENV 23 requires that all new development should comply with the St Paul's Heights limitations.

## **4.8 LB Southwark UDP [NR/10/B Appendix 2]**

- 4.8.1 Chapter 3 of LB Southwark Unitary Development Plan (adopted July 1995) outlines local policy on the historic environment, and should be considered when assessing the Thameslink 2000 proposals for Blackfriars (south bank), Borough Market and London Bridge.

### *Listed buildings*

- 4.8.2 Policy E.4.6 requires that the external alteration and extension of listed buildings should respect the architectural and historic references of the building and be sympathetic to the character of the building. Internal alterations to listed buildings should also be sympathetic to the character and appearance of the interiors and retain all features of interest.

4.8.3 Policy E.4.5 states that consent for the partial or total demolition of listed buildings will only be granted in exceptional circumstances and when a suitable redevelopment scheme has received planning permission.

4.8.4 Policy E.4.6 states that developments adversely affecting the setting of a listed building will not normally be granted consent.

#### *Conservation Areas*

4.8.5 Policy E.4.3 states that new developments or the alteration of existing buildings in Conservation Areas must aim positively to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Conservation Area. However, this must be read in the light of the statutory duty (as interpreted by the Courts) that there is no requirement to protect conservation areas from all development which does not enhance or positively preserve (PPG15 [CD/ 7], paragraph 4.20, quoting *South Lakeland DC v Secretary of State for the Environment*, [1992] 2 AC 141). Proposals should also regard historic building lines, scale, height and massing, traditional patterns of frontages, vertical or horizontal emphasis, plot widths and detailed design (such as the scale and spacing of windows), and the nature and quality of materials.

4.8.6 Policy E.4.2 states that consent for the partial or total demolition or redevelopment of buildings which make a positive contribution to a Conservation Area will not normally be granted.

4.8.7 Policy E.4.3 states that a proposal for a site adjacent to a Conservation Area which would have a significant adverse impact on the character or appearance of the Conservation Area would not normally be granted consent.

#### *Views*

4.8.8 Policy E.2.2. states that new developments should normally be of an appropriate height to respect existing landmarks and historic views, particularly of St Paul's

Cathedral. There were no objections from the LB Southwark with regards to views.

#### **4.9 The Borough High Street Conservation Area Appraisal [CD/235]**

4.9.1 This document, which was published by the LB Southwark in July 2003 has been prepared following guidance given by English Heritage in their *Conservation Area Appraisals*. Its contents are relevant to the various proposals for Borough Market. It has been formally adopted as SPG by LB Southwark.

4.9.2 The appraisal sets out the overall history of the area and divides it into four sub-areas, which, within the overall identity of the area, have a distinct character of their own ([CD/235] paragraph 1.2.6). Those relevant to the Borough Market proposals are:

- a. Sub Area 1: Borough High Street central area: focus of activity and vitality in the Conservation Area. Paragraphs 4.3.2-12 and figure 41 identify listed buildings and other buildings which are judged to make a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area; and
- b. Sub Area 3: The Riverside, based around the Cathedral and separated by the railway viaducts; and Borough Market. Paragraphs 4.3.18-28 and Figure 45 identify listed buildings and other buildings which are judged to make a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.

4.9.3 Section 5 of the Appraisal (Guidelines) applies the general policies of the UDP to the specifics of the Conservation area and sets out “those themes which are essential to the Conservation Area’s historical character, which new development and improvement should pay heed to”. It does however add that “It is not intended to provide a prescriptive methodology for new design in the area or to exclude innovation”. The Guidelines cover the following areas:

4.9.4 *Street and plot patterns* ([CD/235]paragraphs 5.2.2-4), where it recommends that development responds to the character by:

- a. maintaining the established or historic building line on the street;
- b. keeping utility areas behind the street frontages
- c. designing facades to echo the narrow module of the traditional building plot, creating strong rhythms with architectural elements along the street and expressing verticality.

4.9.5 *Building form* ([CD/235]paragraphs 5.2.5-6), where it notes that

“there are consistent characteristics which should be observed in conversion and new design:

- underlying architectural detail is a very strong and ordered form, that maintains a strict balance between the horizontal and the vertical elements of the façade;
- cornices and friezes express the horizontal levels of floors, lintels and parapets, while columns and pilasters imply the structural support. Openings are grouped orthogonally within this grid, and decoration is used to emphasise the important elements such as entrances and significant rooms;
- the proportions of the main elevational elements and groups of elements tend to be taller than they are wide. The proportion of window to wall is controlled visually by the detail of surrounds and pediments, helping to exaggerate the apparent areas of windows without losing the visual strength of masonry. Thus the impressive weight of some buildings is balanced by a lightness of detail;
- roof lines are typically seen as parapets behind which the roof structure is not visible from street level;...
- building heights range from a minimum of three storeys ... up to four to five storeys with attic storeys behind the parapet line.”

4.9.6 *New Design in the Conservation Area* ([CD/235]paragraphs 5.2.7-11), which notes that

“There is no reason that new building design should not follow these basic disciplines, observing the scale of the earlier buildings by reference to ordering elements such as string-courses and structural spacing. Overall heights of buildings and their position on the street need also to conform to the established street “envelope”, but the manner of expression can be entirely modern. In each situation a building should remain within the range of heights of the block of buildings in which it is sited.”

4.9.7 Section 3.1.6 describes “Local Materials and Details” as:

- a. Yellow London stock brick as the basic construction material, or red facings in some buildings.
- b. Façade elements arranged in Classical proportions, usually with parapet roofs to provide a horizontal cornice line.
- c. Portland/artificial stone or stucco dressings.
- d. Terracotta or rubbed brick decorations.
- e. Rusticated or arcaded ground floor elevations.
- f. Painted timber shop-fronts and fascias.

4.9.8 Section 8 below discusses the proposed works at Borough Market in the light of the Appraisal.

#### **4.10 The 2004 Environmental Statement and 2005 Addendum [CD/164 –169, CD/202]**

4.10.1 The 2004 ES and the 2005 ES Addendum have reviewed all the impacts of the Thameslink 2000 proposals in terms of their likely effects, according to the latest environmental impact standards. In certain cases, this has led to the identification

of new impacts even though the proposed works have not themselves changed. These cases are noted in the following sections.

4.10.2 The task of assessing environmental impacts is different to that involved in determining the acceptability of proposals for demolitions and replacement of listed buildings and unlisted buildings in Conservation Areas. The former seeks to identify likely significant effects and does not normally allow for wider measures of public benefit obtained to be included within an overall assessment of those effects. With respect to proposals for demolition of listed buildings, paragraph 3.19 iii of PPG15 [CD/7], by contrast, states that: “There may very exceptionally be cases where the proposed works would bring substantial benefits for the community which have to be weighed against the arguments in favour of preservation.” As outlined by the Inspector following the first inquiry, these can include benefits to the wider, national community (paragraph 10.6.41) as well as to the local community. This distinction is important in the case of Thameslink 2000 where, in line with PPG15 guidance, the Inspector concluded that:

“Thameslink 2000 is a proposal which would enhance the existing assets to provide very substantial public benefits, both directly to the travelling public, and in underpinning the economy of London and enhancing the conditions for regeneration of parts of the centre of the capital. It would also provide substantial benefits to other centres in the south and east of the country including the major airports of Gatwick and Luton, all areas which suffer economically from their remoteness...The benefits of the proposal are such as to outweigh harm which would be caused to heritage interests” ([CD/199], paragraphs 1.26-7).

4.10.3 It is also worth noting that unlike environmental impact assessment, PPG15 and local guidance does not in general concern itself with temporary construction effects. Its focus is on permanent effects on built heritage.

## **5.0 FARRINGDON**

### **5.1 Summary of Heritage Assets**

- 5.1.1 The history of the area around Farringdon Station, along with the various heritage designations (and an assessment of potential impacts) is given in ES 2004 [CD/164] and in the *Townscape and Built Heritage Specialist Report* (June 2004)[CD/255]. Appendix 1a [NR/9/B] is a chronological sequence of maps illustrating the development of the area.
- 5.1.2 In summary, the area has a deep and rich history, which is reflected in the built fabric today. Many of the streets (such as Cowcross Street) and some of the buildings (such as the remains of the Charterhouse) are medieval in origin. Apart from this, the earliest surviving buildings are generally of 18<sup>th</sup> century date, before the area was radically transformed by two major 19<sup>th</sup> century infrastructure projects. The first was the construction, in 1865, of the world's first underground railway, the Metropolitan railway, which ran from Paddington to Farringdon. Associated with this was the construction of Farringdon Road in 1863; the railway was driven beneath and alongside the new road. Elements of today's Farringdon Station belong to the station's first phase, while the tracks to the north and south form a largely impenetrable barrier between Clerkenwell and Hatton Garden.
- 5.1.3 The second piece of 19<sup>th</sup> Century infrastructure was the reconstruction and later expansion of Smithfield Meat Market. In addition to the market buildings, notably Horace Jones's Meat Market of 1866-7 (now listed Grade II\*), the surrounding road system was reconfigured to ensure ease of access to the market. Further connections were made to the railways tracks running beneath the market.

5.1.4 Partly as a result of wartime bomb damage, there has been a considerable amount of later 20<sup>th</sup> century development, much of it of low architectural and townscape quality.

5.1.5 Listed buildings in the immediate area include:

- a. Farringdon Station ([NR/9/B] Figure 1c1). The trainshed roof, retaining walls and offices along Turnmill Street date from the original 1865 station. The Cowcross Street elevation, of white brick faced with faience, was added in 1922 by Charles Walter Clark;
- b. 54-60 Cowcross Street ([NR/9/B] Figure 1c2). The faience façade of this parade of shops was also built in 1922 by Charles Walter Clark, to match the station opposite;
- c. The Castle Public House, which occupies a vital townscape location on the corner of Cowcross Street and Turnmill Street, is a pub of 1865 ([NR/9/B] Figure 1c3);
- d. No 101 and 102 Turnmill Street. Late 19<sup>th</sup> century commercial building, which is listed with the Castle pub ([NR/9/B] Figure 1c3);
- e. Smithfield Market ([NR/9/B] Figures 1c4-6). The original blocks, by Horace Jones, date to 1866-7. The Poultry Market, rebuilt in 1963 after its predecessor was destroyed by bombing, is listed on account of its structurally innovative concrete shell dome; and
- f. 25-27 Farringdon Road ([NR/9/B] Figure 1c7). A Venetian Gothic building of 1886, occupying a key townscape location on the corner of Farringdon Street and Greville Street.

Figure 1b [NR/9/B] shows the location of these listed buildings.

5.1.6 All these buildings are listed Grade II, except for Horace Jones's Meat Market, which is Grade II\*. Appendix 1c [NR/9/B] reproduces the list descriptions and photographs of these buildings.

5.1.7 The general area is covered by three Conservation Areas (Hatton Garden, LB Camden; Clerkenwell Green and Charterhouse Square, LB Islington; Smithfield Market, City of London, see [NR/9/B] Figure 1b).

## **5.2 Summary of position at the close of the first inquiry**

5.2.1 The proposals considered at the first inquiry were to widen the existing platforms, extend them southwards and cover them with new roofs at both ends of the station. It was proposed to demolish No. 54-60 Cowcross Street, a listed building which forms a group with Farringdon Station opposite, in order to create a new concourse and ticket hall. Lifts were proposed to provide step-free access to the platforms, and the existing footbridge at the north end of the station would have been replaced with a new interchange footbridge, with new emergency exit staircases from the platforms.

5.2.2 The first inquiry heard evidence in relation to the various heritage impacts, to the proposed designs for the alterations to Farringdon Station and to the building to replace 54-60 Cowcross Street ([CD/199] paragraphs. 2.4.5-11).

5.2.3 Neither LB Islington nor English Heritage objected to these proposals. In his report, the Inspector decided that they met the necessary PPG15 tests ([CD/199] paragraphs. 7.1.3.11-12). He concluded that 'the existing buildings are not suitable for use as a ticket hall and, in my opinion, could not reasonably be modified to be so. Neither Islington nor English Heritage objected to the principle of demolition. I consider the demolition to be justified subject to a suitable replacement design. That design is included in the revised listed building consent application'. The Inspector accordingly recommended that planning, listed building and Conservation Area consent be granted, subject to conditions ([CD/199]

paragraph. 7.1.3.15 i-iv). The Secretary of State raised no objections to the Farringdon proposals (letter of 30 July 2002) [CD/203].

### **5.3 Changes since the Inspector's report**

5.3.1 There have been no significant design changes to the scheme for Farringdon since the Inspector's report found in its favour.

5.3.2 ES2004 notes some slight changes in construction impacts, though these are described as "not materially different from 1999" (*Summary of Significant Changes*, FI-2 [CD/165]).

5.3.3 Finally, since the Inspector's report, it has emerged that the construction of the Thameslink 2000 proposals for Farringdon may coincide with construction of the new Crossrail station. *ES Addendum 2005* [CD/202] has therefore addressed the question of the potential cumulative impact of the two projects.

5.3.4 Clearly, two major projects in the same area will increase the temporary construction effects. Additional permanent effects caused by Crossrail alone include the demolition of two groups of unlisted buildings in the Charterhouse Square Conservation Area, of other unlisted buildings outside the Conservation Area and of Cardinal House, an unlisted 20<sup>th</sup> century 12 storey block at the junction of Farringdon Road and Cowcross Street ([NR/9/B] Figure 1d2) to create access for a new station. The effect of these Crossrail works on the character and setting of the Conservation Area and on the setting of listed buildings cannot be fully assessed at the moment, since no designs for replacement buildings have yet been produced. In principle, however, Crossrail will have to face the necessary tests of PPG15 [CD/7] and of local policy. The proposal by Crossrail to extend

the pedestrianisation of Cowcross Street to Farringdon Road, together with the replacement of the deeply unsympathetic Cardinal House offers considerable potential for the enhancement of the setting of Hatton Garden and Charterhouse Square Conservation Areas and for the setting of Farringdon Station, the Castle pub and 25-27 Farringdon Road.

## **5.4 Justification and mitigation of heritage effects**

5.4.1 The proposed enlargement of the existing Thameslink 2000 station at Farringdon will have the following permanent effects on the built heritage:

- a. Limited demolitions in Farringdon Station, to lengthen platforms and improve circulation. No part of the original 1865 fabric is directly affected.
- b. The total demolition of the Grade II 54-60 Cowcross Street and its replacement by a new building to provide improved ticketing facilities and access to the Thameslink 2000 platforms.
- c. The partial reconstruction of the Cowcross Street bridge (which is mentioned on the station list description).
- d. The demolition of 65, 65a and 65b Charterhouse Street ([NR/9/B] Figure 1d1). These are unlisted buildings which make no positive contribution to the character or appearance of the Conservation Area. They will be replaced by a 2m high brick wall.

5.4.2 However, the creation of a pedestrianised area in front of the station will improve the setting of listed buildings and the wider townscape of the Conservation Area. The new station building on the site of Nos. 54-60 Cowcross Street and associated townscape improvements will mitigate the adverse effect of the demolition of a listed building so that on balance the adverse effect will not be significant. The Inspector considered that “the new booking hall and extended platforms below it

... would greatly improve passenger space and circulation and provide much needed facilities for the travelling public” ([CD/199] paragraph 7.1.3.9).

- 5.4.3 In addition to the permanent effects are short term construction effects. These would affect listed buildings in the wider area (notably The Castle pub, Smithfield Market and 25-27 Farringdon Road) as well as the character and appearance of the Conservation Areas.
- 5.4.4 There would also be some temporary interference with some views of St Paul’s Cathedral from within the Conservation Area.
- 5.4.5 There have been no changes in the scheme for Farringdon Station which require any reassessment of the Inspector’s conclusion that the works at Farringdon satisfy the necessary statutory tests for developments which affect the historic environment.
- 5.4.6 Precise assessment of the specific effects of Crossrail, if its construction does overlap with the Thameslink 2000 works, must await the production of detailed designs for new buildings. The production of such detailed designs should not delay determination of the powers required to construct the Thameslink 2000 scheme.

## **6.0 BLACKFRIARS**

### **6.1 Summary of heritage assets**

- 6.1.1 The history of the area either side of Blackfriars Rail Bridge, along with the various heritage designations (and an assessment of potential effects) is given in ES2004 [CD/164] and in the *Townscape and Built Heritage Specialist Report* (June 2004)[CD/255]. Appendix 2a [NR/9/B] is a chronological sequence of maps to illustrate the development of the area.
- 6.1.2 In summary, the history of the area has been shaped by its proximity to the River Thames. Originally, the proposal area was submerged beneath the Thames; the south bank was reclaimed between the 12<sup>th</sup> and 14<sup>th</sup> centuries, and the north bank possibly as late as the 16<sup>th</sup> century. Yet this area was developed by medieval times, and the narrow, winding, medieval street pattern has survived in Ludgate Hill. The first bridge connecting the north and south banks at this point was constructed by Sir Robert Mylne in 1769, which was replaced with the current road bridge in 1860-9 ([NR/9/B] Figure 2c8).
- 6.1.3 Blackfriars has also been shaped by the construction of railways during the 19th century. The current Thameslink route between Farringdon and Herne Hill was created when the London, Chatham and Dover Railway was extended in 1862-6. West Blackfriars and St Paul's Rail Bridge was built by Joseph Cubitt and F.T. Turner in 1864, and the disused piers and abutments of this bridge survive ([NR/9/B] Figures 2c9-11, 2e3-4). In 1886 Sir John Wolfe-Barry and H.M. Brunel built the current railway bridge ([NR/9/B] Figure 2e1) parallel to the earlier bridge; the original station on the south side of the river was closed and replaced with a new station on the north bank.

6.1.4 The buildings in the Blackfriars area were largely built in the 19<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup> centuries. The Victoria Embankment was constructed in 1870 and led to the development of the area west of Blackfriars Station within a large grid street layout; residential terraces and commercial blocks, often associated with the publishing and newspaper industry, were built in this area in the late Victorian and early Edwardian period. The buildings on Ludgate Hill generally date from the 19<sup>th</sup> century but remain within the medieval street pattern. The office blocks east of Blackfriars Station and on the south bank have largely been built since the end of the Second World War.

6.1.5 Listed buildings and structures in the immediate area include:

- a. Blackfriars House (19 New Bridge Street West Side, [NR/9/B] Figure 2c1). A steel-framed commercial building with white faience facing, built in 1913-16 and designed by F. W. Troup.
- b. Black Friar Public House (174 Queen Victoria Street, [NR/9/B] Figure 2c2-5). Built *circa* 1875 and remodelled in the Arts and Crafts style *circa* 1905 and 1917 by architect H. Fuller-Clark and sculptors Frederick Colcot and Henry Pole, resulting in impressive interiors. The Black Friar was built on a triangular site shaped by the junction of three roads, originally its rear wall directly abutted the viaduct of the London, Chatham and Dover Railway, and it faced a terrace of buildings which ran up the east side of New Bridge Street ([NR/9/B] Figure 2a3). This context has been eroded over time, when the buildings opposite were demolished, presumably in order to widen the road, and when the railway viaduct was demolished ([NR/9/B] Figure 2c4), when the new Thameslink station was created in 1991.
- c. Unilever House ([NR/9/B] Figure 2c6). Eight-storey classical commercial building with a curved façade by J Lomax Simpson, in collaboration with Burnet, Tait and Partners, built in 1930-2.
- d. Temperance drinking fountain ([NR/9/B] Figure 2c7). Circular granite bowl on base carrying a bronze figure of the woman of Samaria, who features in the Gospel of St John, when Jesus met her drawing water at Jacob's well. Sculpted by Wills Bros and cast by Coalbrookdale Foundry in 1861.

- e. K2 telephone box ([NR/9/B] Figure 2c7). Telephone kiosk on north-east end of Blackfriars Road Bridge to a design by Giles Gilbert Scott, dating from 1927.
- f. Blackfriars Road Bridge ([NR/9/B] Figure 2c8). Cast iron and granite bridge with Gothic balustrade built in 1869 by James Cubitt.
- g. South abutment of former West Blackfriars and St Paul's Rail Bridge ([NR/9/B] Figures 2c9-11). Portland stone abutment with two large cast iron monumental crests, which are a survival from the disused London, Chatham and Dover railway bridge built by Joseph Cubitt and F.T. Turner in 1862-4. Stone from Charles Labelye's Westminster Bridge of 1738-49 was used to face the south abutment and this may explain why it is listed, when the north abutment and remaining bridge piers are not.

Figures 2b1-2 [NR/9/B] show the location of these listed buildings.

- 6.1.6 All these buildings are listed Grade II, except for the Black Friar Public House which is Grade II\*. Appendix 2c [NR/9/B] reproduces the list descriptions and photographs of these buildings.
- 6.1.7 The area directly affected by the proposals is not within a Conservation Area, although the Whitefriars Conservation Area is directly adjacent and Ludgate Hill Conservation Area is to the north ([NR/9/B] Figures 2b1-2).
- 6.1.8 Blackfriars Road Bridge, the rail bridge, the piers of the disused railway bridge and Unilever House feature in a number of views protected in the *London View Management Framework Draft SPG* [CD/249]:
  - a. 9. River Prospect: Southwark Bridge ([NR/9/B] Figures 2d2-3). Unilever House is highlighted as a "prominent building" in the view from Assessment Point 9A.1, and the railway bridge as leading "the eye to the north as far as Unilever House" in the view from Assessment Point 9A.2.
  - b. 11. River Prospect: Blackfriars Bridge ([NR/9/B] Figure 2d1). Although not specifically identified as landmarks, the railway bridge and the roof of the

Blackfriars Station trainshed are visible in the view of St Pauls' Cathedral from Assessment Point 11A.3.

- c. 12. River Prospect: Waterloo Bridge ([NR/9/B] Figures 2d5-6). Although it is not specifically identified as a landmark, Blackfriars Road Bridge is visible in views downstream from Waterloo Bridge at Assessment Points 12B.1 and 12B.2.
- d. 13. River Prospect: South Bank ([NR/9/B] Figure 2d4). Although not specifically identified as landmarks, Blackfriars Road Bridge, the piers of the disused railway bridge and Unilever House are visible in the view from Gabriel's Wharf (Assessment Point 13B.1).

6.1.9 Although the Millenium Bridge is adjacent to Blackfriars Bridge, the designated view (10. River Prospect: Millenium Bridge and Thames side at Tate Modern) looks north to St Paul's Cathedral, and so nothing in the Blackfriars area is visible in this view.

6.1.10 The City of London UDP protects views of and along the Thames from bridges and river banks, including those from Blackfriars Bridge. Tower Bridge is a protected landmark, within the buffer zone of the Tower of London World Heritage Site, which is currently visible from Blackfriars Road Bridge ([NR/9/B] Figure 2d7). Paragraph 4.7.5 above explains these policies in more detail.

## **6.2 Summary of position at the close of the first inquiry**

6.2.1 The proposals considered at the first inquiry involved widening the Blackfriars railway bridge to accommodate additional Thameslink 2000 platforms. These would have extended the full length of the bridge, and been covered with a roof 5m in height, shielded by side screens. The roof would have rested on a steel frame and consisted of a series of aluminium monocoque 'wings'. The platforms would be accessed via a staircase from the south bank; the design of this was revised, so that

the staircase would be encased within the south abutment of the disused railway. In addition, there were proposals to improve the northern entrance to the Station, with access stairs and a lift adjacent and just north of the Black Friar public house, and a glazed, curving footbridge suspended above Queen Victoria Street leading into the station. The proposals involved the demolition of No. 167-179 Queen Victoria Street ([NR/9/B] Figure 2e2), which would have been replaced with a single-storey ticket office. A 5m high vent shaft was also to be constructed on the traffic island at the north end of the road bridge. These proposals are outlined in the Inspector's report [CD/199] between paragraphs 2.4.12 and 2.4.28.

- 6.2.2 The Inspector's principal concern in respect to the Blackfriars scheme was the proposed single storey building at No. 167-179 Queen Victoria Street which he concluded would appear to be a "missing tooth" in the surrounding townscape ([CD/199] paragraph. 5.3.9). The granting of consent and permission for the Blackfriars Station redevelopment was therefore made dependent on the implementation of an approved scheme for a suitable new building ([CD/199] paragraph. 5.3.9).
- 6.2.3 The Inspector found the applications for planning and listed building consent for the stair, lift and footbridge adjacent to the Black Friar public house to be acceptable in the event that suitable designs for the site of the "missing tooth" were produced and implemented ([CD/199] paragraphs.5.3.23 iv a-b).
- 6.2.4 During the first inquiry, the Corporation of London granted listed building consent for the relocation of the fountain and telephone box, subject to conditions.
- 6.2.5 The Inspector opposed the initial application for the demolition of the south abutment down to the riverside walk, but accepted the revised scheme which retains the north wall and places the iron monumental crests back to back ([CD/199] paragraphs 6.3.91-94, 6.3.109 vii a).

6.2.6 The Inspector decided the effect on views of St Paul's Cathedral would be offset by the benefits of the scheme and new views which would be appreciated along the length of the new platform ([CD/199] paragraph. 9.4.16). The Secretary of State raised no objections regarding the effect of the Blackfriars proposals on views in his letter of 30 July 2002 [CD/203].

### **6.3 Changes since the Inspector's report**

6.3.1 There have been some design changes for the scheme at Blackfriars Station since the first inquiry. (*Blackfriars North Planning Application [CD/194], Blackfriars South Planning Application [CD/195], Blackfriars Railway Bridge South Abutment Listed Building Application [CD/197], Blackfriars Station Design Statement [CD/178]*).

6.3.2 The design concept for the platform and canopy across Blackfriars railway bridge, which the Inspector favoured following the first inquiry, has been developed. The design of the widened railway bridge has been revised so that the structure is tied to the existing structure. An additional single rib arch is proposed for the east side of the bridge, and three new rib arches for the west side. Following advice from the City of London, these new rib arches will replicate the design of the existing bridge arches. Michael Haste's evidence outlines these modifications in more detail.

6.3.3 The design of the canopy over the new platform has been altered to minimise solar gain, so that the roof will be a solid metal structure with a series of louvered roof lights facing north. There will be no diagonal struts, and this has reduced the amount of solid structure from 8.25% to 5.4%, so that the platform side screens are more transparent.

- 6.3.4 The proposed design of the south abutment has similarities with the revised design considered at the first inquiry. However, following advice from English Heritage (letter of 12 November 2003[NR/6/B], Figure 2f3 [NR/9/B]), the new western rib arches will be threaded through single holes in the south abutment in order to minimise the impact on the historic fabric (*Summary of Significant Changes*, BF11, ES 2004 [CD/165]).
- 6.3.5 Designs for the new building at No. 167-179 Queen Victoria Street have now been developed (*Summary of Significant Changes*, BF12, ES 2004 [CD/165]). This will be a glazed station entrance chequered with translucent stone, with a curved façade in the same footprint and a similar height to the existing building. The ventilation shaft previously proposed for the traffic island at the north end of Blackfriars Road Bridge is now to be located inside this new building (*Summary of Significant Changes*, BF 13, ES 2004 [CD/165]).
- 6.3.6 The design of the pedestrian footbridge above Queen Victoria Street has been revised so that it follows a straight line and is constructed from a woven steel mesh, as opposed to the glazed and curving structure originally proposed. The wall abutting the Black Friar Public House, which is deemed to be part of the listed structure by English Heritage, will be partially demolished in order to install the pedestrian footbridge. The area outside the Black Friar public house will also be enhanced (see Appendix 5 of Pascall and Watson's *Blackfriars Station Design Statement* [CD/178]).
- 6.3.7 The methodology used for assessing the temporary effect of the proposals, such as the relocation of the temperance drinking fountain, has been revised (*Summary of Significant Changes*, BF 1-2, ES 2004[CD/165]).
- 6.3.8 There have also been some changes in local policy which need to be considered when assessing the proposals. The *London View Management Framework Draft SPG*

(April 2005) [CD/249] protects river prospect views, including those from Waterloo Bridge, Southwark Bridge, the Millennium Bridge and the South Bank and defines criteria for assessing applications. The City of London UDP (2002) [NR/10/B] also now protects the view of Tower Bridge from Blackfriars Road Bridge.

#### **6.4 Justification and mitigation of heritage effects**

*No. 167-179 Queen Victoria Street: new building*

- 6.4.1 The new building for the “missing tooth” site at No. 167-179 Queen Victoria Street will affect the setting of listed buildings in the immediate area, including Unilever House, Blackfriars House and the Black Friar public house, as well as the adjacent Whitefriars Conservation Area.
- 6.4.2 The Inspector’s recommendations have been considered when developing the proposals for the new building. The Inspector described the contribution of the existing building to the surrounding townscape: its height and bulk effectively encloses the space and frames the view of St Paul’s when approached from the river, and its curving façade mirrors that of Unilever House opposite ([CD/199] paragraph 5.3.3).
- 6.4.3 Although the Inspector did not outline detailed requirements for the design of the new building, he recommended that it should address his concerns that the (previously) proposed single storey building would not relate to the existing townscape or to the proposed station building adjoining it, which would have a different appearance ([CD/199] paragraph. 5.3.11-12).
- 6.4.4 The proposed new building will recreate qualities praised by the Inspector in the existing building at No. 167-179 Queen Victoria Street ([CD/199] paragraph 5.3.3.). It will be constructed on the same footprint as the existing building and its

curving façade will again mirror that of Unilever House. The height of the new station entrance will be 4-5 storeys, a similar height to the adjacent buildings, No. 181 (the Bridge House Trust) and the existing station. The site will not be a “missing tooth” in the townscape. The height and bulk of this new building will enclose the space, and create a worthy approach to the City, while framing views of St Paul’s Cathedral.

- 6.4.5 The use of a translucent stone, which is bonded to the glazing to produce an irregular chequered pattern, responds to concerns raised by the City of London that a wholly glazed façade would be unsuitable in this area. It is an innovative material which will allow light to permeate the building during the day, and to shine out of the station through the walls at night. The stone facing will be concentrated on the side of the façade which faces the Black Friar public house, to complement the setting of this building.
- 6.4.6 English Heritage has reviewed the proposals for the new building and consider that: “the overall scale and form of the proposed building is appropriate to this location” (in a letter dated 12 November 2003 [NR/6/B], Figure 2f3[NR/9/B]).
- 6.4.7 In my opinion, the contemporary design of this building is an improvement on the existing building. In addition it will replicate the curved built form adjoining New Bridge Street where it meets Queen Victoria Street echoing the similar formation of Unilever House. It will enhance the setting of nearby listed buildings, including Unilever House, Blackfriars House and the Black Friar public house. The new building will be an improvement on the existing building and so will enhance the setting of the adjacent Whitefriars Conservation Area.
- 6.4.8 The Inspector decided that the revised designs for the ventilation shaft which was previously proposed for the traffic island at the north end of Blackfriars Road Bridge would preserve the setting of the Black Friar public house and Unilever

House ([CD/199] paragraph 5.3.22). However, the relocation of this vent shaft within the new building at No. 167-179 Queen Victoria Street will, in my view, have still less of an effect on built heritage than the previous proposals would have done. The vent shaft would have been 5m tall and directly adjacent to Unilever House and the Whitefriars Conservation Area. Although it is possible to argue that a well-designed vent shaft might improve the broader townscape, it would have undoubtedly altered the setting of Unilever House, the Black Friar public house and the Whitefriars Conservation Area. English Heritage has rightly welcomed the relocation of the vent shaft inside the new building (in a letter dated 12 November 2003[NR/6/B], Figure 2f3 [NR/9/B]).

*Black Friar public house*

- 6.4.9 A new stair, lift and footbridge are to be constructed immediately adjacent to the Black Friar public house. The installation of the footbridge will require partial demolition of the windowless wall to the rear of the pub, which is part of the listed structure, but the footbridge will be suspended above the roof of the pub and will not affect “the grotto” ([NR/9/B] Figure 2c5).
- 6.4.10 The Inspector concluded that the construction of the footbridge, lift and staircase would be an acceptable intrusion onto the setting of the adjacent Black Friar public house, on the condition that a suitable new building for the “missing tooth” site is provided ([CD/199] paragraph 5.3.23 iv a-b). As explained above (paragraphs 6.4.1 to 6.4.8 above) this condition has now been met.
- 6.4.11 The partial demolition of the wall abutting the pub is acceptable because this wall is not a significant part of the listed structure. The wall was not built at the same time or as part of the pub. The lower part of the wall was originally part of the railway abutment, but the upper part of the wall was built later; a photograph taken in the 1960s, before the viaduct was demolished, shows that the wall was originally much

shorter ([NR/9/B] Figure 2c4). Certainly, without its connection to the pub the wall would not be listed. The wall will support the new footbridge, similar to its original use as a railway viaduct (as required by PPG15 [CD/7] paragraph 3.19 ii).

#### *South Abutment*

6.4.12 The south abutment of the disused railway bridge is to be remodelled and the eastern monumental crest is to be relocated back-to-back with the western monumental crest. Although there will be an adverse effect on the south abutment during construction, the original use of the abutment will be reinstated, resulting in my view, in a beneficial permanent effect.

6.4.13 The designs for the remodelling of the south abutment have not been significantly altered since the first inquiry, when the Inspector accepted the revised proposals to insert the staircase within the abutment and leave the north wall undisturbed (as it was built from Portland stone from the original Westminster Bridge) ([CD/199] paragraphs 6.3.91-94, 6.3.109 vii a). Intervention has been further minimised so that only two or three holes will be created in the stone (north) face to enable the new bridge rib arches to pass through.

#### *Temporary effects*

6.4.14 In addition to the permanent effects there are short term construction effects. The construction site would affect the setting of listed buildings and structures in the wider area, including Blackfriars Road Bridge, Unilever House and the drinking fountain (which is to be moved to outside the Black Friar public house to make space for a new escape staircase close to the north end of the road bridge). The telephone box is to be removed during construction and replaced 1m from its original location and therefore there will be no permanent effect. These temporary effects are not considered in PPG15 [CD/7].

### *Conservation Areas*

- 6.4.15 As explained above, the new building at No. 167-179 Queen Victoria Street will be of a better quality design than the existing building and so will enhance the setting of the adjacent Whitefriars Conservation Area. There will be no effect on the Ludgate Hill Conservation Area which is too remote and is separated by too much built structure to be affected by the proposed works.

### *Views*

- 6.4.16 The construction of a canopy over the new platform across Blackfriars railway bridge will affect the setting of St Paul's Cathedral when viewed from the south bank and Blackfriars Road Bridge. Views of St Paul's Cathedral from Blackfriars Road Bridge are protected in the *London View Management Framework Draft SPG [CD/249]* (Assessment Point 11A.3) and the City of London UDP [NR/10/B]. Pascall & Watson's *Blackfriars Station Design Statement [CD/178]* includes photomontages to illustrate the effect on this and other protected views.
- 6.4.17 The southern half of the proposed canopy will exceed the height limit imposed by the St Paul's Height Limitation (Appendix 4 of Pascall & Watson's *Blackfriars Station Design Statement [CD/178]*). Although the design of the canopy has developed since the first inquiry, it is the same height (5m) and overall the infringement of the St Paul's Height Limitation will be, on balance, the same. Michael Haste outlines this point in more detail in his evidence. Following the first inquiry, the Inspector concluded that the infringement was acceptable given that the public would be able to appreciate views of St Paul's Cathedral along the length of Blackfriars railway bridge for the first time ([CD/199] paragraph 9.4.16), which is, in my opinion, a material benefit. The same conclusion can reasonably be reached with respect to the revised canopy design.

- 6.4.18 The construction of the canopy over the new platform will affect views from Waterloo Bridge, Southwark Bridge and from Gabriel's Wharf, which are now protected in the *London View Management Framework Draft SPG* [CD/249] (Assessment Points 9A.1, 9A.2, 12B.1, 12B.2, 13B.1). In particular, the canopy will affect the view of Unilever House, which is identified as a "prominent building", in views from Southwark Bridge (Assessment Points 9A.1 and 9A.2).
- 6.4.19 Although the canopy will be visible in these views, the effect will be no worse than that produced by the earlier design, and arguably will be better. Firstly, the canopy only affects a small component of the river prospect, so will have a minor, if not negligible effect. Secondly, the demolition of the existing train shed roof will improve views from Waterloo Bridge (Assessment Points 12B.1 and 12B.2) and of Unilever House from Southwark Bridge. Third, the railway bridge will continue to lead "the eye to the north as far as Unilever House" in the view from Assessment Point 9A.2; indeed the canopy is likely to increase this effect.
- 6.4.20 The canopy will not effect protected views from the Millennium Bridge (River Prospect 10) as these look north to St Paul's Cathedral.
- 6.4.21 The construction of the canopy over the new platform will also affect the view of Tower Bridge from Blackfriars Road Bridge which is now protected in the City of London UDP [NR/10/B]. However, views from the rail bridge will be gained. The new platform will also enable people to appreciate the view of Tower Bridge along the entire length of the railway bridge, as well as from the new station, which will compensate for the adverse effects on the existing views from the road bridge.
- 6.4.22 English Heritage have voiced concerns about the transparency of the canopy and walls of the new platform across the railway bridge, including the potential visual effect of advertisements, signage and maintenance safety railings on views (letter 12 November 2003 [NR/6/B], Figure 2f3[NR/9/B]). The architects have refined the

designs of the canopy so that the side screen will be made from clear, low-reflective glass, positioned at a slight incline to reduce the reflection of the sky. Signage and seating will be kept to a minimum, and there will be no advertisements. The canopy and side screens will not be covered with railings, but will be cleaned from an adjacent walkway or through the opened louvres. The revised design has a greater proportion of glazed material (as opposed to solid structure) than the previous proposals. These efforts to make the side panels as transparent as possible means that it should still be possible to see Tower Bridge from the road bridge.

#### *Conclusion*

- 6.4.23 The recommendations made by the Inspector following the first inquiry have been considered when revising the proposals for Blackfriars and as a result the effect on the built heritage has been reduced. The new building at No. 167-179 Queen Victoria Street will be better quality than the existing building and so will improve the setting of the adjacent listed buildings and Conservation Area. The canopy covering the new platform will affect views protected by the *London View Management Draft SPG* [CD/249] and the City of London UDP [NR/10/B], but the canopy will only form a small part of these views, the demolition of the existing train shed is likely to reduce visual distractions and improve views from Southwark Bridge and Waterloo Bridge, and the scheme will allow greater public appreciation of views of St Paul's Cathedral from the railway bridge. Overall this amounts to a material benefit to the appreciation of the historical environment.

## **7.0 London Bridge**

### **7.1 Summary of heritage assets**

- 7.1.1 The history of the London Bridge area, along with the various heritage designations (and an assessment of potential effects) is given in ES 2004 [CD/164] and in the *Townscape and Built Heritage Specialist Report* (June 2004) [CD/255]. Appendix 3a [NR/9/B] is a chronological sequence of maps illustrating the development of the area.
- 7.1.2 In summary, the London Bridge proposal site has been developed since medieval times, but since 1836 has been dominated by the railway station.
- 7.1.3 The Roman settlement of Southwark was to the west of the proposal site, clustered around the southern end of London Bridge. At this time the proposal site was uninhabitable land in the Thames tidal zone. This land was gradually reclaimed and by the medieval period Southwark had grown along Tooley Street, where the 17<sup>th</sup> Century street pattern has survived in places. However, much of the proposal site remained marshy, open land until the 16<sup>th</sup> Century.
- 7.1.4 Tooley Street runs parallel to the Thames, and development along it has historically been commercial buildings associated with the export and import of goods to the City via the river. However, most of the buildings date from after 1861, when the Great Fire of Tooley Street razed the existing buildings to the ground. Warehouses have survived north of the Station, including St Olaf's House and Hays Galleria ([NR/9/B] Figure 3f2). To the east of the Station and on the south side of Tooley Street, there are commercial warehouses and residential mansion blocks.

- 7.1.5 The area around London Bridge has been favoured by hospitals since the 12<sup>th</sup> Century, when St Thomas' Hospital was founded as the infirmary for the Augustinian Priory of St Mary Overie (which later became Southwark Cathedral). From 1212 St Thomas' Hospital was located on the north side of St Thomas Street, until it was subsumed by the railway station and relocated to Lambeth Palace Road in 1871.
- 7.1.6 Guy's Hospital has been an influential presence since the 18<sup>th</sup> century. Thomas Guy founded a hospital opposite St Thomas' Church in 1721-5. The original building, by Thomas Dance, was extended in 1738-41, 1774-7 and 1852, and survives in St Thomas Street ([NR/9/B] Figures 3d8-11). This 18<sup>th</sup> Century planned townscape characterises the area south of the Station.
- 7.1.7 London Bridge Station was first built in 1836 as the terminus to the London and Greenwich Railway. By 1847, the station had become the terminus for two railway companies: the South Eastern Railway (in the north of the site) and the London, Brighton and South Coast Railway (in the south).
- 7.1.8 The development of London Bridge Station is shown in Appendix 3b [NR/9/B]. The historical development of London Bridge Station explains many of its problems. The Station developed as two distinct parts, which were even separated by a wall (built in 1850), and this helps to explain why the Station is so impermeable and difficult to navigate today.
- 7.1.9 London Bridge Station was originally a terminus. However, since the Station was connected with Charing Cross and Cannon Street in the 1860s, there has been a need for through platforms. The historical development of the Station has meant that there are currently more terminus platforms (nine) than through platforms (six).

7.1.10 During the 20<sup>th</sup> century a number of tall buildings were built around London Bridge Station, including New London Bridge House, Southwark Towers and Guy's Tower, built 1963-75, as an addition to the hospital ([NR/9/B] Figures 3f3, 3f6 and 3f1). The height and bulk of these buildings mean that they are dominant features in the townscape.

7.1.11 Listed buildings and structures in the immediate area include:

- a. London Bridge Station ([NR/9/B]Figure 3d1). The train shed was built in 1864-7 by FD Bannister, a railway engineer, and CH Driver, the architect. It is similar to other train sheds erected between 1850 and 1880; it uses a crescent truss, similar to those used at Liverpool Lime Street (1846-49 and again 1867-74), Birmingham New Street (1850-4), Charing Cross (1864) and Cannon Street (1866). Most of these have since been demolished; Liverpool Lime Street (designed by William Baker and erected after 1867) and London Bridge Stations contain the only surviving examples of crescent truss train shed roofs in the country. The central span, at 88 feet, is not unusually large for its time. The GWR station at Penzance and Metropolitan District Railway stations built in London during the 1860s are of similar dimensions. Furthermore, the train shed roof was damaged during the Second World War when its the eastern part of the roof was destroyed by bombs and was subsequently rebuilt.
- b. The iron bridge over Joiner Street ([NR/9/B] Figure 3d2). Six early truss girders, built to James Warren's (1848) patent in 1850. Used as a pedestrian walkway since 1890.
- c. The Counting House (No. 51-57 Tooley Street, [NR/9/B] Figure 3d3). Mid 19<sup>th</sup> century brick warehouse.
- d. Denmark House (No. 15 Tooley Street, [NR/9/B] Figure 3d4). Early 20<sup>th</sup> century office block with elaborate cartouche and carved plaque on façade.
- e. Colonial House (No. 17-25 Tooley Street, [NR/9/B] Figure 3d5). Elaborate buff terracotta commercial building, now part of London Bridge Hospital. Designed by CS Peach and built in 1903.
- f. No. 29-33 (odd) Tooley Street ([NR/9/B] Figure 3d18). Commercial and residential four storey buildings. Yellow brick with stucco dressings, and 20<sup>th</sup> century timber shop fronts at street level.

- g. No. 47-49 Tooley Street ([NR/9/B] Figure 3d6). Last remaining warehouse of Cotton's Wharf; late 19<sup>th</sup> century warehouse in stock yellow brick with stucco and artificial stone dressings.
- h. Shipwrights Arms Public House (No. 88 Tooley Street, [NR/9/B] Figure 3d7). Mid to late 19<sup>th</sup> century brick and stucco pub. Decoration includes a crouching caryatid with outstretched arms.
- i. Main building, Guy's Hospital, St Thomas Street ([NR/9/B] Figures 3d8-11). Hospital and chapel dating from 1721-5 and 1728, with 18<sup>th</sup> century additions, partly rebuilt in later 20<sup>th</sup> century. Includes large forecourt with buildings on three sides and two inner quads behind, decorative iron gates and 18<sup>th</sup> century Italianate chapel.
- j. Former church of St Thomas, St Thomas Street ([NR/9/B] Figure 3d12). Fine red brick building of 1702-3, formerly a church, now a museum.
- k. Former Treasurer's House (No. 9 St Thomas Street, [NR/9/B] Figures 3d13-14). Fine four storey Georgian house of c. 1706.
- l. Mary Sheridan House (No. 11-15 St Thomas Street, [NR/9/B] Figure 3d15). Early 18<sup>th</sup> Century terrace of houses with 19<sup>th</sup> Century extension. Originally the house of the apothecary for the hospital.
- m. No. 2, 4-8 and 12-16 St Thomas Street ([NR/9/B] Figures 3d16-17). Early 19<sup>th</sup> Century terrace of houses.

Figure 3c [NR/9/B] shows the location of these listed buildings.

7.1.12 Most of these buildings are listed Grade II, although the main building of Guy's hospital, the former church of St Thomas and the former Treasurer's House on St Thomas Street are Grade II\*. Appendix 3d [NR/9/B] reproduces list descriptions and photographs of these buildings.

7.1.13 Part of the proposal site is in the Tooley Street South Conservation Area, which also extends to the east of the site. Figure 3c [NR/9/B] illustrates that there are also a number of adjacent Conservation Areas: Tooley Street North Conservation

Area (to the north of the site), Bermondsey Street Conservation Area (to the south), and Borough High Street Conservation Area (to the west).

7.1.14 The proposal site, and a number of tall buildings in the vicinity including Southwark Towers, New London Bridge House and Guy's Tower, are visible in the background of views of St Paul's Cathedral from Parliament Hill and Kenwood. These views are protected in the *London View Management Framework Draft SPG* [CD/249](Assessment Points 2A.1 and 3A.1, [NR/9/B] Figures 3e1-6).

## **7.2 Summary of position at the close of the first inquiry**

7.2.1 The previous proposals for London Bridge Station involved increasing the number of through platforms by three and reducing the number of terminus platforms also by three, to create a ratio of terminus to through platforms which would better suit the needs of Thameslink 2000. These platforms would have been situated at the higher level of the Station and south of the existing through tracks. This would have required the removal of the northern bay of the listed train shed roof and the entire supporting wall. The new platforms would have been enclosed with a new steel and glass roof. The existing concourse would have been extended and a new bus station constructed.

7.2.2 However, the Thameslink 2000 proposals put to the Inquiry did not redress the wider platform and circulation issues, which were acknowledged to cause significant problems to those using or moving through London Bridge Station. Indeed, their implementation would effectively have prevented any future scheme to improve the station's overall operation and its effect on the local townscape.

7.2.3 At the time of the first inquiry, the London Bridge Masterplan was being developed, with the support of LB Southwark, as a holistic approach to the station,

which not only met Thameslink 2000's requirements but also resolved the wider problems. It was not, however, possible for it to be considered at the Inquiry.

- 7.2.4 In his report, the Inspector expressed concern that if the Thameslink 2000 proposals before the Inquiry were constructed it would inhibit the realisation of the Masterplan ([CD/199] paragraph 6.3.36-38) and thus the implementation of a long-term solution to the problems of London Bridge Station. The Inspector therefore recommended that planning permission and listed building consent for previous proposals for London Bridge be refused and that Network Rail should submit an alternative design ([CD/199] paragraph 6.3.109 i-ii).

### **7.3 Changes since the Inspector's report**

- 7.3.1 The principal changes since the Inspector's report have been that London Bridge Masterplan has been adopted by Network Rail as the Thameslink 2000 proposal for London Bridge, and that it has been granted detailed planning and listed building consent by LB Southwark. The Section 106 Agreement which sets out the conditions of the consent was signed on 30 September 2003.
- 7.3.2 The greater scope of Masterplan has necessitated a significant number of design changes for the Station from the previous proposals, with increased effects on the heritage (*Planning Drawings for Consented London Bridge Masterplan Scheme [CD/198] (Approved by London Borough of Southwark 30 September 2003)*). These are listed in the Summary of Significant Changes [CD/165] as:
- a. The total demolition of the train shed roof.
  - b. The demolition of the South Eastern Railway Offices ([CD/165] *Summary of Significant Changes LB13*).

- c. The exposure and repair of the existing internal brick vaults and arches ([CD/165] *Summary of Significant Changes LB16*) to help mitigate some of the adverse effects on the built heritage.
  - d. The construction of a new 10-storey office building above London Bridge Station ([CD/165] *Summary of Significant Changes LB17*).
- 7.3.3 The methodology used for assessing the temporary effect of the proposals has also been revised ([CD/165] *Summary of Significant Changes, LB 1-4*).

## **7.4 Justification and mitigation of heritage effects**

### *Benefits of Masterplan*

- 7.4.1 As noted above (and in Christopher Bennie's evidence, Masterplan is intended to be a holistic approach, combining the specific operational requirements of Thameslink 2000 with a resolution of the acknowledged problems caused by the current station. It will maximise the station's overall operational capacity, redress the circulation problems within the station and significantly improve its effect on the townscape. Among its proposals is the creation of a large new public concourse at street level, linking Tooley Street and St Thomas Street.
- 7.4.2 In his report, the Inspector was concerned that if the previous Thameslink 2000 proposals were constructed, they could jeopardise the implementation of Masterplan, and thus lose the opportunity for the (much needed) improvement of London Bridge Station as a whole ([CD/199] paragraph. 6.3.38).
- 7.4.3 From the start Masterplan has sought to integrate the Thameslink 2000 requirements into the wider scheme for the station. Figure 3gI [NR/9/B] illustrates this solution. The proposed platform realignment will maximise the station

capacity, delivering very substantial benefits for all the train operators and passengers which use London Bridge Station, and not just Thameslink. Christopher Bennie explains Masterplan in more detail in his evidence.

7.4.4 Furthermore, Masterplan resolves the movement and townscape issues which have so long dogged London Bridge Station. For the first time passengers and pedestrians will be able to walk through the station at street level between Tooley Street and St Thomas Street. It will now be clear where to access the underground, the bus station or taxi rank. There will be shops and restaurants in the concourse, and so it will become an attractive destination in its own right. The new concourse and the new northern façade of the station will enhance Tooley Street, so that it will become a major new urban space for London. These townscape improvements will contribute to the regeneration of run-down areas around the station, many of them in Conservation Areas.

7.4.5 Masterplan has been granted planning and listed building consent by LB Southwark and the section 106 Agreement, which sets out the conditions has now been signed. English Heritage raised no objection. In reaching its decision, the Council found that the tests to justify the demolition of listed and unlisted buildings in Conservation Areas, as set out in PPG15 [CD/7] and the Southwark UDP [NR/10/B], had been met.

7.4.6 However, Masterplan will result in additional adverse effects on the built heritage around London Bridge Station, which need to be considered. The most significant of these are the loss of the listed trainshed roof and of the unlisted South Eastern Railway Offices. These must be assessed in terms of the criteria set out in PPG15, paragraphs 3.5 and 3.19 (for listed buildings and unlisted buildings making a positive contribution to the character and appearance of a Conservation Area).

*Demolition of the train shed roof*

- 7.4.7 Masterplan requires the total demolition of the train shed roof; however, the early Victorian vaulted market arcade which runs east from Joiner Street will be opened up along its full length, and restored, allowing a better appreciation of the early fabric of the station.
- 7.4.8 The listing defines the train shed roof as being of national importance, as the only surviving example of a crescent truss train shed roof in London. On the other hand, an example of a contemporaneous crescent truss roof survives in Liverpool, and the span of the London Bridge roof is not unusual. The importance of the London Bridge train shed was significantly diminished after the eastern part of the roof (five spans of the central nave and four transverse roofs) was destroyed by bombs during the Second World War, and was replaced with crude and unsympathetic steel trusses.
- 7.4.9 Neither the new platform configuration, essential for operation efficiency, nor the new street-level concourse through the Station, essential for circulation, can be achieved without the demolition of the train shed roof. Figure 3g2 [NR/9/B] illustrates why total demolition is necessary and why re-erection is not possible without severely compromising the capacity of the terminus station.
- 7.4.10 LB Southwark has granted listed building consent for this demolition on the condition that the train shed roof is recorded and stored in case a suitable location for re-erection is discovered. These requirements are set out in the Section 106 Agreement [CD/181].

*Demolition of No. 64-88 Tooley Street and its effect on the character and appearance of Tooley Street South Conservation Area and the setting of the Shipwrights Arms public house*

- 7.4.11 The demolition of No. 64-88 Tooley Street, which includes the South Eastern Railway Offices, is required in order to construct a new ticket hall and entrance to the Station. The listed Shipwrights Arms public house is adjacent to the South Eastern Railway Offices, and so the demolition of this building and the reconstruction of the station will alter the context and setting of the pub.
- 7.4.12 The South Eastern Railway Offices undoubtedly make a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the Tooley Street Conservation Area. The case for its demolition therefore needs to be assessed as if it were a listed building (PPG15 [CD/7] paragraph 4.27).
- 7.4.13 Applying the criteria in PPG15 (paragraph 3.5iv and 3.19iii) the scheme will provide substantial “community benefits” in terms of:
- a. the townscape improvements, which will increase the permeability and legibility of London Bridge Station, and will stimulate the regeneration of Tooley Street and the surrounding area. The demolition of the South East Railway offices is important to maximise these townscape improvements, as well as to provide a new entrance and ticket hall for the station;
  - b. the improved operational capacity of London Bridge Station; and
  - c. the improved circulation within the station, for those wishing to change trains, or transfer to the underground, bus or taxis.
- 7.4.14 The demolition of No. 64-88 Tooley Street to create a new entrance at the north-east corner of the Station will significantly alter the setting of the adjacent, listed Shipwrights Arms. However, the townscape improvements associated with the

new entrance will mitigate this effect, so that overall, the effect on the setting of the Shipwrights Arms will be neutral.

7.4.15 In addition to this, the new station façade along Tooley Street and the restored brick viaduct will improve the setting of a number of listed buildings in Tooley Street, including: Denmark House, Colonial House, No. 29-33 Tooley Street and No. 47-49 Tooley Street.

7.4.16 LB Southwark has granted Conservation Area consent for the demolition of No. 64-88 Tooley Street.

#### *Temporary effects*

7.4.17 In addition to permanent effects are short-term construction effects, which would affect listed buildings on St Thomas Street and Tooley Street. However, as these effects are only temporary, and considering the substantial long-term benefits of the scheme (as outlined above in paragraph 7.4.13), they are, in my opinion, acceptable.

#### *Effects on other Conservation Areas*

7.4.18 Masterplan will have no effect on the Tooley Street North, the Borough High Street and Bermondsey Street Conservation Areas, as these are outside the immediate proposal area.

#### *Views*

7.4.19 The proposed new 10-storey building over London Bridge Station will be visible in the background of views of St Paul's Cathedral in views from Parliament Hill and Kenwood, which are protected by the *London View Management Framework Draft SPG [CD/249]* (Assessment Points 2A.1 and 3A.1, [NR/9/B] Figures 3e1-6).

- 7.4.20 The new 10-storey building will be visible to the left of St Paul's Cathedral from both Parliament Hill and Kenwood; however, from Kenwood the proposed building will appear to be further away from the Cathedral dome. It will not break the skyline at either viewpoint ([NR/9/B] Figures 3e7-10).
- 7.4.21 The proposed building is less tall than a number of existing tall buildings: Southwark Towers, New London Bridge House and most notably, the 30 storey Guy's Tower, which currently dominates the views of St Paul's from both vantage points, particularly from Kenwood, where it is directly behind the dome. The *Draft SPG* acknowledges this: "the viewer's ability to recognise and appreciate it is inhibited by tall buildings behind it" ([CD/249] paragraph 117 on Kenwood; reference to this is also made in paragraph 103 on Parliament Hill).
- 7.4.22 London Bridge Tower, referred to as the 'Shard of Glass', proposed for the site where Southwark Towers currently stand, will be 70-storeys and at 1,016 feet will be the tallest building in Europe. It has been granted planning permission and is included in the *Draft SPG* [CD/249] aerial views ([NR/9/B] Figures 3e2 and 3e5). John Gray, the London Bridge Tower inquiry inspector, noted that there is an "existing cluster" of tall buildings at London Bridge ([CD/246] paragraph. 16.8), which are "offensive to the eye" and concluded that the 'Shard of Glass' will be a building of "undoubted architectural quality", which "by itself attracting the eye, would lessen the harmful effect of the existing Guy's tower in the Strategic Views" ([CD/246] paragraph. 16.53).
- 7.4.23 In my opinion, the effect of the proposed 10-storey building above London Bridge Station on views of St Paul's Cathedral from Parliament Hill and Kenwood will be acceptable, given that the view had already been compromised by existing tall buildings around the station and in particular Guy's Tower. In comparison with these tall buildings, and particularly the proposed 70-storey "Shard of Glass", the

new building will be modest and will have a minimal effect on the views. This concurs with LB Southwark's decision to grant planning permission for the 10-storey building in September 2003.

### *Conclusions*

7.4.24 In summary, it is my opinion that Masterplan will bring considerable benefits to the operators and users of London Bridge Station and its immediate area. The scheme will deliver substantial townscape improvements, particularly at the new entrances, and along the Tooley Street façade, where the brick viaduct will be restored, which will galvanise the regeneration of the surrounding area. Masterplan will resolve long-term circulation issues by creating a large new concourse between Tooley Street and St Thomas Street, which will mean that the station is more permeable and easier to navigate. The demolition of the train shed roof and No. 64-88 Tooley Street are necessary in order to create the new station concourse and the north east entrance, and can be justified because of these substantial "community benefits". In addition to these townscape and movement enhancements, the Masterplan will deliver the operational requirements of Thameslink 2000, and will also improve the general capacity of the Station for all train operators. The effect of the proposed 10-storey building on protected views from Parliament Hill and Kenwood is minimal considering that existing tall buildings already clutter the background of St Paul's Cathedral from these vantage points, and (if built) the "Shard of Glass" will substantially improve the skyline (as outlined in point 13 of the Secretary of State's decision notice of 18 November 2003 regarding London Bridge Tower [CD/247]). In taking this view, I am following the LB Southwark and English Heritage who have granted the necessary consents for the scheme to go ahead.

## **8.0 Borough Market**

### **8.1 Summary of heritage assets**

- 8.1.1 The history of the Borough Market area, along with the various heritage designations (and an assessment of potential impacts) is given in ES2004 [CD/164] and in the *Townscape and Built Heritage Specialist Report* (June 2004) [CD/255]. It is also given in the LB Southwark's *Borough High Street Conservation Area Appraisal* (July 2003) [CD/235]. Appendix 4a [NR/9/B] is a chronological sequence of maps illustrating the development of the area.
- 8.1.2 In summary, the area has long been a focus for human occupation on the southern side of the river Thames, situated on what was originally a gravel island at the lowest crossing point of the river.
- 8.1.3 With the construction by the Romans of the first London Bridge, a significant settlement grew up around the bridgehead. Borough High Street marks the line of the principal Roman road, linking the gravel island by a series of causeways to the higher ground to the south.
- 8.1.4 Southwark's location at the head of the only bridge across the river gave it a continuing importance in the mediaeval period. It was defended by the Anglo-Saxons, and the London palace of the Bishops of Winchester was there, as was the Priory of St Mary Overie (now the Cathedral), which is first mentioned in the Domesday Book of 1086.
- 8.1.5 Borough Market is first mentioned in 1276, having moved from its original location, actually on London Bridge. It was a general market, "selling everything from bullocks to flour" (*Conservation Area Appraisal* [CD/235] paragraph 2.1.4).

- 8.1.6 At the Reformation, the suppressed Priory became the parish church of Southwark. With London Bridge remaining the only bridge over the Thames, the area was famous for its many inns (including the Tabard, from which Chaucer's pilgrims departed). Warehouses were built along the river frontage and Southwark also developed as a service centre for the City.
- 8.1.7 In 1756 the market, which had hitherto taken place on Borough High Street, was moved to a new site, away from and to the west of the main road, in order to ease congestion. As it subsequently expanded, the market has gradually grown back towards Borough High Street, as if seeking to re-establish its historic link. Appendix 4b [NR/9/B] illustrates the historical development of Borough Market.
- 8.1.8 In 1864-6 the area's character was radically altered by the arrival of the railways, with high level viaducts linking the rapidly expanding London Bridge Station to Charing Cross and Cannon Street stations. Competition from the railways (as well as the construction of additional bridges over the Thames) weakened Southwark's role as the principal transport corridor from London to the south and also forced many of its inns out of business. Existing small scale industries and trades (in hops, for example) moved in to fill the gap, and maps show a gradual densification of the area's settlement pattern.
- 8.1.9 The 19<sup>th</sup> century also saw considerable changes in the area's infrastructure of roads. In 1831, London Bridge was rebuilt and a new approach road, closer to the Cathedral but raised up above the natural ground level, was laid out. In 1866, Southwark Street was built to provide a new link with Blackfriars. These wide Victorian roads provide a striking contrast to the older, denser pattern of medieval streets which survives on either side.
- 8.1.10 In 1905 St Mary's became the Cathedral for the newly established Diocese of Southwark.

- 8.1.11 Borough Market continued its expansion back towards the High Street, infilling the gaps between the railway viaducts with the characteristic pattern of iron (later steel) and glass roofs. In 1932 it finally managed to reconnect with the High Street, with a direct entrance at 8 Southwark Street.
- 8.1.12 The latter part of the 20<sup>th</sup> century saw a decline of the industries and trades traditionally associated with Southwark, but the market has recently seen a notable revival, with the establishment of the twice weekly ‘gourmet’ retail market. The benefits of this have spread out into the surrounding area and made it one of London’s most distinctive and vibrant areas.
- 8.1.13 The Borough High Street Conservation Area was designated in 1968 and extended in 1973 and 1980. The *Conservation Area Appraisal* [CD/235], while recognising its ‘clear overall identity’, has subdivided Borough High Street into four sub-areas, each with their own distinctive characters (paragraph 1.2.6). These are:
- 1: *Borough High Street central area*: focus of activity and vitality in the Conservation Area;
  - 2: *Borough High Street south and St George’s*: continuation of historic street and inns, with a focus on the church of St George the Martyr;
  - 3: *The Riverside*, based around the Cathedral and separated by the railway viaducts; Borough Market; and
  - 4: *St Thomas Street and Guy’s Hospital*, primarily Georgian street and Medical School precinct.

Figure 4d2 [NR/9/B] is a map of the Borough High Street Conservation Area.

8.1.14 Of these, sub areas 1 and 3 are most affected by the Thameslink 2000 proposals. These contain various listed buildings, notably:

- a. The Cathedral of St Mary (Grade I, [NR/9/B] Figure 4e1). Though significantly restored and extended by Sir Arthur Blomfield in the late 19<sup>th</sup> century, the Cathedral still retains much Medieval fabric of the Priory of St Mary Overie. Its setting has been significantly altered, particularly by the raising of the approach road to London Bridge and by the 19<sup>th</sup> century densification of development in the area between it and Borough High Street. This has had the effect of severing it visually from its original connection with the High Street, though important glimpsed views remain from Borough High Street, Bedale Street, Stoney Street and Park Street;
- b. 16-26 Borough High Street (together with 7 Bedale Street and 2, 4 and 6 Green Dragon Court; Grade II, [NR/9/B] Figures 4e2-4). The Borough High Street façade of these buildings was designed by Robert Smirke in c1832 as part of largely unexecuted scheme for a grand approach to the newly rebuilt London Bridge. The concept of a visual lead-up to the bridge was ruined by the railway bridge of 1864, which also led to the demolition of the northern part of Smirke's block. Behind the façade, the buildings are older, with remnants of 17<sup>th</sup> and 18<sup>th</sup> century plan form and fabric in the buildings which open onto Green Dragon Court;
- c. The Post Office, 19A Borough High Street (Grade II, [NR/9/B] Figures 4e5-6). This was built in 1842-4 as a ward block for the former St Thomas's Hospital in a late Georgian Style. Its gable end faces onto the High Street; its northern elevation is today largely hidden behind 11-15 Borough High Street;
- d. No. 28 Borough High Street (Grade II). Late 19<sup>th</sup> century bank and offices on the island site between Borough High Street and Southwark Street;
- e. The Globe Pub, Bedale Street (Grade II, [NR/9/B] Figure 4e7). A Gothic Revival pub of 1872, by Henry Jarvis, built hard up against the existing viaduct to the north and with an unusual oval footprint;
- f. 5 Stoney Street (Grade II, [NR/9/B] Figure 4e8). Early 18<sup>th</sup> century terraced house with warehouse at ground level and 20<sup>th</sup> century shop front;
- g. The Wheatsheaf Public House, 6 Stoney Street (Grade II, [NR/9/B] Figure 4e9). A mid Victorian pub, partly rebuilt in the late 19<sup>th</sup> century, it retains interesting original bar fittings;

- h. The Hop Exchange, Southwark Street (Grade II, [NR/9/B] Figures 4e10-11). Built, as its name suggests, for trading in hops – an established Southwark industry – in 1866 with a great curving façade along the newly created Southwark Street and a grand entrance portico. The upper floors were rebuilt after a fire in the 1920s. Like Southwark Street, its scale and architectural pretensions contrast with the rest of the Conservation Area;
- i. 1-13 Park Street (Grade II, [NR/9/B] Figure 4e12). A fine early 19<sup>th</sup> century terrace, converted later to shops, with some good shop fronts.

Appendix 4e [NR/9/B] reproduces the list descriptions and photographs of these buildings.

8.1.15 In addition to the listed buildings (i.e. those which are considered to have national architectural or historic importance), the *Conservation Area Appraisal* [CD/235] has identified virtually all the buildings in sub areas 1 and 3 as making a positive contribution to the character or appearance of the Conservation Area ([CD/235] figs. 41 & 45). Of particular relevance to the Thameslink 2000 proposals are:

- a. 11-15 Borough High Street ([NR/9/B] Figure 4g8). A terrace of c.1860-70 in an Italian style, with shops on the ground floor and commercial premises above;
- b. Borough Market roofs ([NR/9/B] Figure 4g2-3). As the market gradually expanded back towards its original location on the High Street, the areas between the railway viaducts were infilled with canopies to protect the traders. The earliest surviving roofs are attractive Victorian iron and glass structures, typical of their period. The 20<sup>th</sup> century additions immediately behind the High Street are totally functional and of no aesthetic merit;
- c. 1-5 Bedale Street ([NR/9/B] Figure 4g7). Nos. 1-3 are an architecturally united terrace of 1930s shops. Their style is also shared by No. 5. In between nos. 3 and 5, however, no. 4 is a later 19<sup>th</sup> century commercial building typical of the area. It is possible that the architect of nos.1-3 and 5 had intended to include no. 4, to make a continuous terrace;
- d. 7 Stoney Street ([NR/9/B] Figure 4g4). A late 18<sup>th</sup> or early 19<sup>th</sup> century building, currently in poor condition, sandwiched between the Wheatsheaf pub and the railway viaduct.

## **8.2 Summary of position at the close of the first inquiry**

8.2.1 The Thameslink 2000 proposals for a new bridge over Borough High Street and a new viaduct passing over Borough Market were the focus of intense scrutiny at the first Inquiry, with evidence from LB Southwark, English Heritage and the Cathedral Area Residents Association (CARA). The reason for this scrutiny was the fact that, if permitted, the new railway works would have more significant effects on the built heritage in this area than on any other part of the Thameslink 2000 route. These effects include:

### **8.2.2 *Listed buildings:***

- a. The total demolition of the Grade II listed 16-26 Borough High Street, 7 Bedale Street and 2,4 and 6 Green Dragon Court, to allow for the new viaduct and for the construction of the Borough High Street bridge;
- b. The demolition of the top floor of the listed Wheatsheaf pub, in order to allow the new viaduct to run above it;
- c. Partial demolition and works to the rear extensions of 1-13 Park Street, to accommodate the new viaduct; and
- d. Some relocation of plant on the roof of the Hop Exchange.

### **8.2.3 *Unlisted buildings in the Borough High Street Conservation Area***

- a. the demolition of 11-15 Borough High Street, to make way for the new bridge;
- b. The demolition of 2-4 Bedale Street, to allow for the new viaduct;
- c. The new viaduct will cut across areas of the roof of the market. The functional 20<sup>th</sup> century elements will be demolished. The more attractive 19<sup>th</sup> century elements will be dismantled and then re-erected in a different configuration within the restored market. The demolition of 20 Southwark Street (which does not make a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area) is required to achieve this;

d. The demolition of 7 Stoney Street to allow the viaduct to pass over it.

*Setting of listed buildings*

8.2.4 The most significant impact on the setting of a listed building will be on the Globe pub, which will become sandwiched between the existing and the new viaducts.

8.2.5 The setting of Southwark Cathedral will not, however, be affected.

*Views and the character and appearance of the Conservation Area*

8.2.6 The principal view affected is that looking from Borough High Street towards London Bridge ([NR/9/B] Figure 4f7). Currently there is a narrowing sense of enclosure, as the broad space of the historic market funnels and is then terminated by the existing railway bridge. 11-15 Borough High Street, on the east side, and 16-26 on the west side, play an important role in creating that sense of enclosure. The demolition of both sets of buildings, combined with the new rail bridge, will both widen out and foreshorten this sense of narrowing space.

8.2.7 Views of the Cathedral from Borough High Street ([NR/9/B] Figure 4f1) will also be affected by the new bridge, though there is scope for the creation of new views. Characteristic views along Stoney Street and Bedale Street and in Green Dragon Court ([NR/9/B] Figures 4f2-6, 4f8-10) will also be significantly altered by the demolitions and by the new viaduct.

*Temporary effects*

8.2.8 In addition to the permanent impacts, are short term construction effects. These would affect all the heritage assets of the Borough Market area, but only for the period of construction which is estimated at 24 months. It is important to note that it is committed that the market, one of the principal elements in the character

and appearance of the Conservation Area, will continue to function throughout the construction period.

- 8.2.9 As noted above, these proposals were the subject of detailed evidence at the first inquiry. There was no dispute as to the seriousness of the impact on the heritage of the proposals, but rather debate as to whether they met the PPG15 [CD/7] and other criteria for justifying works of this magnitude of impact. In his report, the Inspector concluded that they did in principle meet the necessary criteria, noting that, overall 'the benefits of the proposal are such as to outweigh harm which would be caused to heritage interests, principally in the area of the Borough Market' ([CD/199] paragraph 1.26). The Secretary of State reiterated the 'very substantial transportation, economic and regeneration benefits' of the Thameslink 2000 scheme (point 7, letter of 30 July 2002 [CD/203]).
- 8.2.10 The Inspector was, however, concerned by the lack of definite proposals (in the form of applications for planning consent) for the new buildings in the Borough Market area ([CD/199] paragraph 9.4.19). This was, in his opinion, contrary to policy with no case having been made to allow an exception to be made.
- 8.2.11 The need for acceptable and detailed plans for new buildings (as set out in PPG15, 4.27) was of particular importance, given the 'serious effect' of the demolitions on the Conservation Area. In the Inspector's opinion, 'the quality of any replacements would therefore need to be exceptional to justify allowing the demolitions' ([CD/199] paragraph 9.4.19). The need for 'exceptional' new buildings was echoed in the Secretary of State's letter of 30 July 2002 [CD/203]. It was one of the main reasons why permission to proceed with Thameslink 2000 was withheld, until Network Rail could demonstrate that it could achieve the necessary standard of new design.

8.2.12 In addition to his overall conclusion on the 'in principle' acceptability of the Borough Market works, the Inspector's reports also contains useful guidance on individual elements of the proposals. He concluded that:

- a. the historic street pattern of the Conservation Area will not suffer ([CD/199] paragraph 10.6.23);
- b. the loss of the Smirke terrace (16-26 Borough High Street) and of 2, 4 & 6 Green Dragon Court was harmful both because of the loss of architecturally significant buildings and because of the loss of the narrowing effect of 16-26 on the view towards the north. The careful reinstatement of frontages after construction could not, because of the inevitable shortening, replicate the existing sense of enclosure. However, a new building on this site was important to retain a sense of enclosure and to shield the area behind from traffic noise ([CD/199] paragraph 10.6.24);
- c. 11-15 Borough High Street are undistinguished buildings. Their demolition would reveal views of the listed Post Office, which could be a positive aspect. He did not believe that any new building, because of its inevitably shortened frontage, could replicate the sense of enclosure which the current buildings give to this part of the streetscape ([CD/199] paragraph 10.6.26);
- d. the proposals for the new Borough High Street Bridge are for: 'a dramatic, landmark structure to the fore of what is now a mundane, utilitarian girder... By its unique design, it would add to the sense of place, and... contribute to the continuity of notable buildings which make up the diversity which reflects the area's long history, identified by the Borough Council as a characteristic of the conservation area' ([CD/199] paragraph 10.6.25);
- e. the setting of the Globe pub will be damaged by the new viaduct, but the character of the immediate area, already dominated by railway engineering at a high level, would remain no less interesting than it is today ([CD/199] paragraph 10.6.29). The alteration will be one of intensification of an existing use, rather than the introduction of something entirely new;
- f. the proposed reconfiguration of the roof of Borough Market would preserve the character of the Conservation Area ([CD/199] paragraph 10.6.30);
- g. the demolition of 7 Stoney Street and the upper floor of the Wheatsheaf pub would be a loss to the heritage. However, the proposals for the Wheatsheaf

would not lead to an incongruous building, nor to the loss of its original fittings in the public rooms. Nor should they jeopardise its continued operation as a pub. The character of the Conservation Area would be preserved by the retention of buildings in this locality ([CD/199] paragraph 10.6.31); and

- h. the remodelling of Park Street is not harmful to its historic interest ([CD/199] paragraph 10.6.32).

8.2.13 The Secretary of State accepted the Inspector's advice that suitable reinstatement proposals for the Borough Market buildings should be approved and their implementation assured before the Thameslink 2000 Order and associated applications could be granted consent (points 5 and 7, letter of 30 July 2002 [CD/203]).

### **8.3 Changes since the Inspector's report**

8.3.1 Since the Inspector's report, there have been some minor design modifications to the bridge and viaduct, but these are not judged to have a significantly different effect on the heritage.

8.3.2 The principal change since the first Inquiry is that applications for planning permission have been made for new buildings at:

- 11-15 Borough High Street [CD/192]
- 16-26 Borough High Street [CD/193 and CD/242]
- 2-4 Bedale Street [CD/192]
- 7 Stoney Street [CD/192].

- 8.3.3 These buildings are described in detail in Tom Jestico's evidence, and are considered further in the following sections.
- 8.3.4 The other principal change has been the publication of the *Borough High Street Conservation Area Appraisal* (July 2003) [CD/235]. This identifies those buildings which, though unlisted, make a positive contribution to the character of the Conservation Area (Figures 41, 44 and 45). It also analyses the character of the area, audits its current condition and provides guidance on new development (see paragraphs 4.9.1 to 4.9.7 above).
- 8.3.5 ES2004 has reassessed all the impacts according to current best practice and has noted some minor changes in construction impacts, due to changes in best practice in appraisal (*Summary of Significant Changes* [CD/165] BVI-2).

## **8.4 Justification and mitigation of heritage effects**

- 8.4.1 Following the Inspector's report (and the adoption of its conclusions by the Secretary of State), the principal outstanding issue at Borough Market is not the justification for the demolitions, but whether the new buildings comply with the guidance in PPG15 [CD/7]. These are that they should 'preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the Conservation Area'. The new *Conservation Area Appraisal* [CD/235] provides useful guidance in assessing the contribution potentially made by the new buildings.
- 8.4.2 The Inspector wrote that: 'the quality of any [new buildings] would therefore need to be exceptional to justify allowing the demolitions' ([CD/199] paragraph 9.4.19). The guidance in PPG15, paragraph 3.19 ii) states (in the context of proposals to demolish listed buildings) that: 'There may very exceptionally be cases where the

proposed works would bring substantial benefits to the community which have to be weighed against arguments in favour of preservation'. The same paragraph notes that the architectural merits of proposed new buildings are a material consideration, though not in themselves sufficient to justify the demolition of listed buildings.

8.4.3 Before assessing whether the proposed new buildings meet these tests, it is important to define what is meant, in this context, by 'exceptionally'. This in turn requires an understanding of the character and appearance of the Conservation Area, particularly in its Borough High Street and Riverside/Borough Market sub areas.

8.4.4 The character of the Conservation Area is very much dominated by its historical uses:

- a. as a principal thoroughfare into the City of London. The traffic on Borough High Street continues to reflect this role;
- b. as a market. The historical relationship of Borough Market to the High Street is of relevance. Initially, it took place actually on the High Street, until it caused so much congestion that, in 1756, it was moved to a site separated from the High Street. Ever since then, it has been continually moving and expanding to the east, seeking to reconnect with the street that, historically, was its focus and the reason for its existence;
- c. as a railway corridor. In a way that is very unusual, the high level viaducts have not had the effect of cutting one side off from the other, but have allowed the historic permeability of the streets below to continue. The spaces beneath and between the viaducts also allowed the market to expand. By creating a series of relatively small and curiously shaped blocks, hemmed in by working viaducts, the railways have also protected the area from the large scale 20<sup>th</sup> century redevelopment that has occurred elsewhere in Southwark. The railways and the market have thus a symbiotic relationship; both are essential to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. The new viaduct will not unbalance this relationship; it will reinforce the character of the market around and beneath it.

8.4.5 The appearance of the central parts of the Conservation Area is, in architectural terms, very mixed. The majority of the buildings are 19<sup>th</sup> century, but there are significant earlier survivals, as well as later additions (generally of lesser quality); Figure 4a10 [NR/9/b] illustrates this. There are two particularly relevant characteristics:

- a. although there is a wide variety of date and style (and some exceptions to the rule, such as the Hop Exchange), there is an overall continuity of block size, height and materials; and
- b. the character of the Conservation Area is derived not from individually outstanding (or exceptional) buildings, but rather from a collection of generally functional buildings and structures, which in turn reflect the long term character of the Conservation Area, as thoroughfare, market and railway corridor.

8.4.6 In short, I suggest that, for a new building to meet the test of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the Conservation Area, a new building should not be architecturally 'exceptional' *per se*, for this would necessarily introduce an alien element in to the Conservation Area which would distract attention from its overall appearance. Nor should its use be one which does not already feature in and contribute to the area's character. What is required is that the design should be appropriately sensitive to its location in the Conservation Area, both visually and in terms of its function. It should thus be able demonstrably to provide the exceptional case for the demolition of the existing buildings, contrary to the presumption in policy, in circumstances in which demolition is necessary if the project is to go ahead.

8.4.7 It is against these criteria that the new buildings are assessed in the following sections.

## **11-15 Borough High Street**

### **Description**

- 8.4.8 The proposed new building will be on a smaller footprint than the existing 11-15 Borough High Street, on account of the need to allow space for the new viaduct and bridge. The building line on Borough High Street will be set back behind the existing, in order to line up with the façade of the listed Post Office (19A Borough High Street).
- 8.4.9 The proposed new building is described in detail in Tom Jestico's evidence. It has ground plus three stories. Retail/café use is envisaged for the ground floor, with office use above.
- 8.4.10 Its main body, in a stripped neo-classical design, will be symmetrically arranged, with the entrance to the office floors set back to the north. It will be clad in oolitic limestone with zinc cladding to protect fins and window enclosures. The roof will be marked by a vestigial projecting cornice.

### **Contribution to the character or appearance of the Conservation Area and neighbouring listed buildings**

- 8.4.11 The proposed building's contribution to the character and appearance of this part of the Conservation Area is expressed in various ways:
- a. it has a similar mass and volume to the existing building;
  - b. its proposed uses are part of the existing character;
  - c. in its neo-classical design, its vertical emphasis and in its use of a cornice to disguise the roof form.

- 8.4.12 The use of oolitic limestone could be seen as a new element in the Conservation Area, but the use of stone is not foreign to its character or appearance (as the neighbouring Post Office shows). Tom Jestico examines the limestone cladding in more detail in his evidence. In summary the building will be a recognisably 21<sup>st</sup> century addition to the Conservation Area (in much the same way as the existing buildings are recognisably 19<sup>th</sup> century additions), which would reflect the continuing dynamic in the townscape. It at least preserves the character of the Conservation Area, and will enhance it if (as is likely) it generates a more appropriate use and higher level of maintenance than the current buildings.
- 8.4.13 There are other relevant considerations in deciding whether the design of the new 11-15 Borough High Street meets the necessary tests. The first is its relationship to the new bridge, which will itself be a striking contribution to the appearance of the Conservation Area. The proposed building has been purposefully designed so that it does not seek to match or compete with the bridge, but to provide a relatively 'quiet' foil for it. The new buildings on Borough High Street and the bridge will form a coherent new group.
- 8.4.14 The second factor is the relationship to the listed Post Office, which is an architecturally strong building, currently obscured, not least by the advanced building line of nos. 11-15. By virtue of setting the new building back to the same line as the Post Office, it will both give the listed building more space and will acknowledge its stronger architectural presence. It will also free up views of its side elevation.
- 8.4.15 The third factor is the role of the new building in the wider townscape. It is accepted that the enclosing function of the existing building cannot be replicated (Inspector's report [CD/199] paragraph 10.6.26). By setting back the building line,

the new building takes the opportunity to create a wider pavement and introduce a new public space adjacent to the entrance to the Post Office.

- 8.4.16 In view of its underlying contribution to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area, and the additional benefits to the listed Post Office, the appreciation of the new bridge and the wider townscape, I believe that the proposed new 11-15 Borough High Street will moderately enhance the special interest of the Conservation Area. This justifies an exception being made to the policy presumption against demolition, in circumstances in which demolition is inevitable if the project is to proceed.

### **16-26 Borough High Street**

#### **Introduction**

- 8.4.17 The quality of the building which replaces 16-26 Borough High Street is of particular importance, as the current building is both listed grade II and is by a well known architect (Robert Smirke, 1832). The building has also been identified as having a particular townscape importance (*Borough High Street Conservation Area Appraisal* [CD/235] paragraph 3.2.1; Inspector's report [CD/199] paragraph 10.6.24).
- 8.4.18 It would be wrong to suggest that there is one correct solution to replacing the existing building. Rather, there are various possibilities which, in different ways, can satisfy the necessary tests and be shown to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Conservation Area. Rather than impose a single solution, Network Rail has made applications for two different options, to allow views to be expressed and tested. These are:
- a. Option 1: a new building in brick and stone;
  - b. Option 2: a steel and glass market hall.

8.4.19 The purpose of this part of my evidence is not to express a preference as to which of these options should be adopted, but rather to analyse how each one contributes to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area and to the wider townscape, according to the criteria defined in paragraph 8.4.1 to 8.4.6 above.

### **Option 1: new building in brick and stone**

8.4.20 This option has been designed to fit around the new bridge and viaduct with maximum use of space. It follows the existing Borough High Street building line, but curves back behind it in Bedale Street, to open up access to Green Dragon Court.

8.4.21 Like the existing building, it proposes retail ground floor use, with three stories of office use above.

8.4.22 On Borough High Street and Bedale Street, it will have shop fronts with limestone cladding at ground level and regularly spaced aluminium windows set in brick panels above. There will be a stone string course at each window level and the roof and plant will be set behind a parapet. Zinc will be used in the detailing.

8.4.23 The curved corner of Bedale Street will be marked by a vertical strip of glazing. The Green Dragon Court elevation, beneath the viaduct, will have glazed shop fronts at ground level, with an aluminium curtain wall above.

### **Contribution to the character or appearance of the Conservation Area and neighbouring listed buildings**

8.4.24 The building's contribution to the character and appearance of this part of the Conservation Area is expressed in various ways:

- a. it has a similar presence in the streetscape insofar as the reduced footprint (which will decrease from 1800m<sup>2</sup> to 1046m<sup>2</sup>) allows;
  - b. its proposed uses are part of the existing character;
  - c. in its restrained design, its use of materials characteristic of the area and in its use of a cornice to disguise the roof form; and
  - d. in maintaining the strong corner with Bedale Street.
- 8.4.25 As with 11-15 Borough High Street, it would be a recognisably 21<sup>st</sup> century addition to the Conservation Area. It would reflect the continuing dynamic in the townscape and would preserve both the character and appearance of the Conservation Area, and will enhance both if it has a more appropriate use and higher level of maintenance than the current buildings.
- 8.4.26 There are other relevant considerations in deciding whether the design of the new 16-26 Borough High Street meets the necessary tests. The first is its relationship to the new bridge, which, as described above in the context of 11-15 Borough High Street, will itself be a striking contribution to the appearance of the Conservation Area. The existing building has been purposefully designed so that it does not seek to match or compete with the bridge, but to provide a relatively 'quiet' foil for it. The common use of certain materials (limestone and zinc) subtly links 16-26 and 11-15, at either end of the bridge, so that they form a coherent group, without making them too obviously a 'pair'.
- 8.4.27 The second factor is the wider townscape. The new building will preserve some sense of enclosure, but will be accessible from Green Dragon Court. This, and the gradual setting back of the building line on Bedale Street will improve pedestrian circulation through the area.

8.4.28 In view of its underlying contribution to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area, and the additional benefits to the appreciation of the new bridge and to the townscape, I believe that the proposed new building on the reduced site of 16-26 Borough High Street will have a moderately beneficial effect on the special interest of the Conservation Area. This justifies an exception being made to the policy presumption against demolition, in circumstances in which demolition is inevitable if the project is to proceed.

### **Option 2: the Market Hall**

8.4.29 This option has been deliberately designed to provide a new frontage and presence for Borough Market on Borough High Street, thus complementing the existing, but very low key 1932 entrance at 8 Southwark Street. The structure will also include a self-contained retail unit beneath the bridge.

8.4.30 The new building follows the line of the existing building. On Borough High Street and Bedale Street it will have a steel and glass façade. On Green Dragon Court it will be entirely open. There will be a new steel and glass roof butting up to the new viaduct.

### **Contribution to the character or appearance of the Conservation Area and neighbouring listed buildings**

8.4.31 It is fair to say that the contribution of the Market Hall to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area must be assessed along entirely different lines to the previous option. It is a more extrovert piece of contemporary architecture, which brings the iron/steel and glass construction of the market on to the Borough High Street for the first time. As it is lower than the existing building (and the other options) it will provide enhanced views of the tower of the Cathedral. In this sense, it could be argued to be markedly different from the

existing character of this part of Borough Market, as set out in the *Conservation Area Appraisal* [CD/235].

- 8.4.32 At the same time, and whatever happens to 16-26 Borough High Street, it is true that the setting of this part of the Conservation Area will be radically changed by the new bridge, in a way which the *Conservation Area Appraisal* [CD/235] did not anticipate. At 16-26 Borough High Street, this gives an opportunity for a new building which does not have to adhere rigidly to the traditional forms and materials of the Conservation Area, but can make its own contribution to strengthening the character and appearance of the Area.
- 8.4.33 There are three ways in which this option seeks to achieve this strengthening.
- 8.4.34 The first is that, by bringing the Market back to the High Street in a way that it has been trying to achieve since its move in the 18<sup>th</sup> century, the Market Hall would restore the historic relationship between the two and it would celebrate the market's contribution to the area. It would also help to strengthen the existing 'gourmet' retail market, by providing it with new, high quality covered space. Appendix 4c2 [NR/9/B] shows how the new Market Hall will relate to the existing activity and circulation patterns of the retail market. In its fit-out this new area offers the opportunity to include facilities, such as secure cycle storage and seating, which are currently in short supply. This will further strengthen the market's function and presence on the High Street.
- 8.4.35 The Market Hall would also strengthen the character and appearance of the Conservation Area by reinforcing the visual link with the Cathedral. Existing views of the Cathedral from Borough High Street, for example from the Post Office, will be compromised by the new bridge. The Market Hall will allow new views to compensate for this loss and, by allowing the market and the Cathedral to be seen

together, will symbolise the two powerful historical forces which have formed the area.

8.4.36 Finally, the Market Hall will provide an appropriate foil for the new bridge, not competing with it but as a complementary piece of 21<sup>st</sup> century design.

8.4.37 As stated above, the contribution of the Market Hall to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area must be seen in very different terms to that of the other options. It reinforces the point that there is no one correct solution to the challenge of finding a building which meets the necessary tests. In my view, it demonstrates an alternative, but no less acceptable way, of meeting the requirement for an appropriate new building at 16-26 Borough High Street, which will reinforce the special interest of the Conservation Area.

#### **Façade retention**

8.4.38 In addition to the two options for which applications for planning permission have been made, the option of a façade retention was also investigated, following LB Southwark Planning Committee's resolution [CD/240] to that effect. It would be technically feasible, albeit complex, time-consuming, expensive and potentially hazardous to retain the façade of Nos. 16-26 Borough High Street, and of the Bedale Street return, while the construction of the bridge and viaduct take place behind it. The remainder of the façade and the buildings behind would require demolition, to make way for the bridge and viaduct. Tom Jestico explores this option in more detail in his evidence.

8.4.39 The new building behind the retained façade would reconfigure the ground and 3 storeys of the existing, partly fitted beneath the new viaduct (although keeping the existing floor levels would cause compromises).

8.4.40 It is my opinion that the retention of the façade would not be an appropriate solution. The main contribution of the current building to the character of the Conservation Area is its role in enclosing the space at the northern end of Borough High Street. This will inevitably be compromised by the need to demolish more than 50% of the existing façade. This would leave a stump of a building, the architectural effect of which – as a visual lead up to London Bridge – has already been very seriously compromised by the fact that it was never completed and has been truncated by the construction of the existing railway bridge.

8.4.41 In addition to this is the strong conservation objection to the principle of façade retention; as paragraph 3.15 of PPG15 [CD/7] states ‘The preservation of facades alone, and the gutting and reconstruction of interiors, is not normally an acceptable approach to the re-use of listed buildings: it can destroy much of a building’s special interest and create problems for the long-term stability of the structure’.

8.4.42 In summary, it was my advice to Network Rail that retention of part of the façade of Smirke’s building might barely preserve the character and appearance of the Conservation Area, but it is in my mind very doubtful that it would pass the ‘exceptional design’ test outlined above. No application for this option was made. The option of dismantling and rebuilding part of the Smirke façade was also considered, but dismissed for the same reasons.

### **Conclusion on Options for 16-26 Borough High Street**

8.4.43 The two application proposals for the building to replace 16-26 Borough High Street, outlined above, can both be seen to preserve the character and appearance of the Conservation Area and thus meet the basic test set down in PPG15. In his report on the first Inquiry the Inspector articulated a test that the new buildings should be ‘exceptional’. I have interpreted this to mean appropriate to their

position in the Conservation Area, and as a replacement for an important listed building, which has to be demolished to allow Thameslink 2000 to proceed, and thus of sufficiently good design to warrant an exception being made to the presumption against demolition. In my opinion, both the options meet this test, although in different ways. The former is a more conventional piece of architecture, which fits well, through its design, materials and detailing, into the prevailing appearance of this part of the Conservation Area. The latter (the Market Hall) introduces a new architectural style – the steel and glass of a classic market building – onto Borough High Street. However, this is an entirely appropriate answer to designing a building against the backdrop of the new viaduct, which (as the Inspector previously noted ([CD/199] paragraph 10.6.24-5)) will itself radically alter the character of the northern part of Borough High Street. In restoring the historic link between the market and the High Street and in offering new views of the Cathedral, the building has the potential to make a powerfully positive, if distinctively new, enhancement of the Conservation Area.

## **2-4 Bedale Street**

### **Description**

- 8.4.44 The existing buildings are unlisted but are judged by the *Conservation Area Appraisal* [CD/235] to make a positive contribution to its character or appearance (Figure 41, though they are not otherwise mentioned in the text).
- 8.4.45 The new buildings in Bedale Street will occupy the same footprint as the existing and, except where they are underneath the new viaduct, will be of the same general height, width and massing as the existing.
- 8.4.46 The proposed new buildings are described in detail in Tom Jestic's evidence. They will replicate the existing relatively narrow frontages, and there will also be a

new pedestrian access to Borough Market. The use will be retail, as existing, and the materials will be brick and glass.

### **Contribution to the character or appearance of the Conservation Area**

- 8.4.47 The new buildings will continue to provide the sense of enclosure, which is an important characteristic of this part of Bedale Street, opposite the relatively open area of Green Dragon Court. Their proposed scale and massing is absolutely consistent with that existing in this part of the Conservation Area, as are their materials.
- 8.4.48 By providing a new access to the main part of Borough Market, the new 2-4 Bedale Street will strengthen links between Borough High Street and the existing market, which will enhance the character of the Conservation Area.
- 8.4.49 The contemporary, but unassuming architectural style of the proposed new 2-4 Bedale Street buildings will be in keeping with the style of the existing buildings and will not seek to compete with the unusual plan form and Gothic Revival exuberance of the listed Globe pub or to dominate the street scene. This is precisely what is needed in this part of the Conservation Area. By providing practical retail spaces and a new access to the market, the new buildings will enhance the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. I believe that the proposed new buildings for 2-4 Bedale Street meet the necessary test of being appropriately sensitive to their location within the Conservation Area. This justifies an exception being made to the policy presumption against demolition of buildings which make a positive contribution to the character or appearance of the Conservation Area, in circumstances in which demolition is inevitable if the project is to proceed.

## **7 Stoney Street**

### **Description**

- 8.4.50 The existing building is unlisted but is judged by the *Conservation Area Appraisal* [CD/235] to make a positive contribution to its character or appearance (Figure 41, though it is not otherwise mentioned in the text).
- 8.4.51 The new viaduct passes directly through the site of 7 Stoney Street, which is currently derelict and in poor structural condition. In its place, and beneath the new viaduct, it is proposed to create a beer garden for the Wheatsheaf pub, with an entrance from Stoney Street, and an access stair to the new viaduct for maintenance purposes.
- 8.4.52 As described in Tom Jestico's evidence, the access stair will be enclosed in stainless steel mesh, for security reasons. It will be relatively unobtrusive to the passer by. The entrance to the beer garden will be marked by gates, for which an indicative 'long waving grass' design has been submitted for planning consent. It is anticipated that the gates will be fabricated by a local metalworker, who may wish to design them in a different pattern (subject to obtaining the necessary consents).

### **Contribution to the character or appearance of the Conservation Area**

- 8.4.53 Both the access stair and the entrance to the beer garden will be on the existing building line and will generally respect the massing and height of the existing buildings. The beer garden will take the place of a building which is currently derelict and will provide additional sitting space within the area of the market, and will add to the amenity of the area. The design of the gates has the potential to introduce high quality craftsmanship into the area and to complement the cast iron of the existing market roofs.

8.4.54 In my opinion, it will enhance the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. I believe that the proposed new beer garden at 7 Stoney Street, with its architecturally designed and crafted gates, meet the necessary test of being appropriately sensitive to their location within the Conservation Area. This justifies an exception being made to the policy presumption against demolition of buildings which make a positive contribution to the character or appearance of the Conservation Area, in circumstances in which demolition is inevitable if the project is to proceed.

## 9.0 Conclusion

- 9.1 It cannot be denied that the proposals for Thameslink 2000 will have some adverse effects on the built heritage where it passes through Farringdon, Blackfriars, London Bridge and, most particularly, Borough Market. On the other hand, given the magnitude of the project and the benefits which it will deliver, the impacts on the built heritage are remarkably limited.
- 9.2 The effects of these impacts were the subject of detailed scrutiny at the 2000/2001 Public inquiry, with witnesses from the London Boroughs of Islington and Southwark, the Corporation of London, the Dean and Chapter of St Paul's, English Heritage and the [Southwark] Cathedral Area Residents Association all providing evidence on the potential effects.
- 9.3 Having heard and considered all this evidence, the Inspector in his report concluded that, on balance, the damage to the heritage was outweighed by the benefits that an upgraded Thameslink 2000 would bring ([CD/199] paragraph 1.26-7). In reaching this conclusion, he applied the tests which are required by Government guidance, notably in PPG15 [CD/7]. However, he also concluded that, in the absence of detailed plans for buildings to replace those to be demolished, whether listed or in Conservation Areas, he was unable to conclude that all the necessary tests had been met ([CD/199] paragraphs 5.3.9 and 9.4.19). For this reason (among others) he felt unable to recommend that Thameslink 2000 should be given the necessary permission to go ahead. The Secretary of State agreed with this conclusion.
- 9.4 Since that first Inquiry, Network Rail has commissioned designs and made the necessary applications for all the new buildings that are required. It has been my task independently to assess whether these buildings meet not just the tests of

PPG15, the London Plan [CD/150] and local UDPs, but also the particular test of 'exceptional' quality which the Inspector himself (and the Secretary of State) set out.

- 9.5 It is my professional opinion that, for the new stations at Farringdon, Blackfriars and London Bridge, and for the buildings which will allow the Borough High Street bridge and Borough Market viaduct to be built, all the relevant tests have been met. The new buildings are, in short, of the required quality in the context of their surroundings to justify the demolitions which are required to allow the Thameslink 2000 project to go ahead and thus an exception being made to the presumption against demolition. The shortcomings of the previous proposals have been met.
- 9.6 I therefore respectfully suggest that, with regard to their effect on the national and local built heritage, there is no reason why the Inspector and the Secretaries of State should not give consent for the Thameslink 2000 proposals.