

Stennett, Jasmine

From: Kate Hammer [REDACTED]
Sent: 06 February 2026 17:03
To: Planning Policy Consultations
Subject: Objection: No loopholes allowing tall buildings outside defined clusters

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.

Dear Planning and Policy Team

[REDACTED] I am or could have my residential amenity directly affected and the townscape of my neighbourhood adversely altered if MM55 as drafted is adopted.

The modification MM55 undermines the plan, which has tall buildings in clusters. It undermines a plan-led strategy by introducing an exemption or route to exemption for sites outside the defined clusters to be treated as appropriate for tall-building redevelopment.

What good is a plan-led strategy if such exemptions are permitted? The whole point of a plan-led tall buildings strategy is to identify suitable locations through evidence and mapping. Legacy height threshold should not in itself be sufficient grounds for suitability in the future.

Without clear controls, incremental increase in height, but and massing — such as those proposed in the hideous 1 Silk St redevelopment — will I fear be inevitable. Those 1000+ of us who have objected to 1 Silk Street have said with eloquence and at some length what residential amenity we fear losing.

The point for your team to take in hand is that reducing policy certainty and allowing internal inconsistency defeats or undermines having a strategy at all. Identifiable areas for tall buildings gives clarity and coherence. MM55 blurs the clarity and makes work for residents and visitors having to continually monitor applications at application stage. What a waste of human effort and attention, when a unified strategy could be formulated and implemented consistently.

I ask that MM55 be removed. Rewrite substantially if inspectors see the need for explaining existing tall buildings outside the designated areas, but please rewrite it in a way that preserves the integrity of the plan-led clustering and doesn't create loopholes. Make the existing height of a building being redeveloped outside a designated cluster be the benchmark for any future height.

Thank you for considering my objection.

Sincerely yours,

[REDACTED]