

Stennett, Jasmine

From: Darrell Corner [REDACTED]
Sent: 06 February 2026 06:35
To: Planning Policy Consultations
Subject: Change MM55 to the City Plan 2040

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

You don't often get email from [REDACTED]. [Learn why this is important](#)

CAUTION: This email is from outside the Corporation. Do not open attachments, click on links or scan QR codes in this email unless you recognise the sender's e-mail address and know the content is safe.

I am writing in relation to the effect the above will have on the redevelopment of 1 Silk Street - the subject of my Objection in the email below dated 02 November 2025.

My understanding is that MM55 can broadly provide for the reversal of the policy requiring the clustering of the development of tall buildings. I oppose this change.

I have had the experience of working in such cities as Paris, Singapore, Kuala Lumpur, Sydney and Hong Kong where the traditional has had to accommodate modern demand for greater space through taller buildings. In each of these examples, the balance has been achieved through confining tall building development to clusters. Indeed, London itself has followed this approach through its clusterisation around the Fenchurch St., Leadenhall St., areas and Canary Wharf. Moreover, business sectors perform best where they are grouped in clusters e.g. insurance, banking, legal services, commodity trading, etc. Consequently, where such businesses are allowed to dissipate to buildings outside of a cluster, it inevitably leads to a weakening of these sectors.

Without wishing to sound cynical, isn't it a coincidence that MM55 emerges when 1 Silk Street is reported as having been overwhelmed with over 1,000 Objections ? Therefore, is this not a cheap and nasty ploy to attempt to invalidate the cases made in these Objections and bend to serve the will and greed of rapacious property developer ?

Darrell Corner

Resident
[REDACTED]

From: Darrell Corner [REDACTED]
Sent: 02 November 2025 11:11
To: 1SilkStreet@cityoflondon.gov.uk <1SilkStreet@cityoflondon.gov.uk>
Subject: Redevelopment of 1 Silk Street - Ref. 25/00829/FULEIA and/or 25/00830/LBC

I am formally writing to file an Objection to the above redevelopment plans.

As the leaseholder and permanent resident of my flat in [REDACTED] - which overlooks 1 Silk Street, I have a genuine "stakeholder" interest in the Redevelopment.

In principle, I believe it is wrong to demolish perfectly usable buildings to replace them with new structures. This is based on carbon and environmental concerns and with the allocation of scarce resources. The City of London Corporation supports this position, as its planning policies state "it is no longer acceptable to treat buildings as disposable". As it seems likely the developers failed to thoroughly consider retro-fitting, the Redevelopment is in clear breach of this policy.

It is reported that the planned building is 63% larger than the existing structure through greater height and mass. This puts it totally out of proportion with its surroundings and is unbelievably ugly ! Its design architecture appears formed by a "cut & paste" job from the developer's previous projects and therefore gives the impression of being cheap and tacky. Surely not fit for what the City should expect to stand adjacent to the Barbican's world class architecture ?

I have tried to reflect on what would possess a developer to seek to impose such a grotesque building ? Is it because his roots are in the 1980s era of individualism - which generated a rapacious but bland wave of office development, and is now looking for a last hurrah ? If so, then what better legacy than a monument to greed - plunged like a dagger in to the heart of the Barbican !

Consequently, the Redevelopment will intimidate the whole Barbican Estate - a conservation area including schools and gardens and an internationally renown site of architectural, historical and social interest, drawing thousands of visitors from across the world. A further detriment would be the noise, smells and disturbance emanating from the proposed retail outlets - totally out of context with the environment of the area.

The structure will likewise have a serious impact on Barbican residents' right to daylight and sunlight. Indeed, my own flat will have its source of sunlight blocked from my balcony, living-room / kitchen and bedroom.

Books and articles have been published accusing the City of London of acting as a magnet for "dark money". Therefore, in relation to 1 Silk Street, will Due Diligence be performed to ascertain the credibility of the parties concerned ? For example, what and where is the source of the funds supporting the project and have they been obtained legitimately ? Likewise, what is the developer's track record of producing sustainable, long-term quality buildings of architectural merit - is the Broadgate Development considered such an example ?

In the light of the above factors, it is impossible not to conclude that the Redevelopment threatens our unique inner-city residential community, overshadows and compromises its arts centre, gardens and schools, and will have a seriously adverse impact on the quality of my life and the peaceful enjoyment of my property.

DARRELL CORNER

A large black rectangular redaction box covering the signature area.

