

Stennett, Jasmine

From: Caroline Bennett [REDACTED]
Sent: 05 February 2026 07:47
To: 1 Silk Street; Planning Policy Consultations
Subject: Objection to Silk Street 25/00829/FULEIA and 25/00830/LBC

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

Some people who received this message don't often get email from caroline@moshmosh.co.uk. [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 City of London Planners,

I'm writing in addition to my previous objections to development at 1 Silk Street.

I've been made aware of proposed changes to planning requirements that clause MM55 allows for exception of the redevelopment of buildings outside permissible clusters areas if they have existing sections of the building, however small, in excess of 75m. For the reasons cited below, I oppose this move and object to there being exemptions for all buildings outside the designated cluster areas, the proposal leaves the cluster areas meaningless.

Yours sincerely,

Caroline Bennett

From: Caroline Bennett
Sent: 16 October 2025 11:50
To: '1SilkStreet@cityoflondon.gov.uk' <1SilkStreet@cityoflondon.gov.uk>
Subject: Objection to Silk Street 25/00829/FULEIA and 25/00830/LBC

Dear City of London Planners,

I am writing in objection to the planned proposals for 1 Silk Street.

My primary objection concerns the City of London's appetite for destruction and rebuild over **retrofitting**. In a time when the planet's resources are reaching tipping points, this build facilitates the transfer of natural capital from future generations to enhance profitability of current generations. Just the concrete or substrate alone will release significant carbon while being dredged from the oceans. The Corporation has a duty of care to preserve the natural world for the enjoyment of future generations, the City is already becoming unliveably hot in the summer, and dredging for substrate can only exacerbate this. There has been no evidence to suggest that the developer genuinely intended to retrofit the existing building, from the outset the intent was a new build from the ground up. The proposed buildings estimated embodied

carbon emission is over 77,000 tonnes CO2e on top of the carbon cost of any new material. Nature can ill-afford this, you only have to ask younger people. I have been advised the building could be retrofitted to produce a successful scheme that complies with City policies.

I also feel for my neighbours who will suffer untold **loss of daylight**. Having experienced the very same from developments in Moor Lane they have my full sympathy. I am about to lose yet more daylight with the Tenter House development, while the bedroom side at Willoughby used to be a great space to work, it is now only suitable for sleeping given how dark and rather depressing it has become.

Lastly, though by no means insignificant, is the extraordinarily large **height and mass** of the proposed building. The images we've been shown are simply horrific. The nobility of the Barbican's Towers will be completely lost with this scheme, effecting not only the enjoyment of those living directly underneath it, but of the entire Estate. The **cultural heritage** of the Barbican will be eroded by this scheme, and once again, the Planners put current developers needs ahead of people's enjoyment of living in and visiting this cultural beacon.

Yours sincerely,

Caroline Bennett

A black rectangular redaction box covering the signature area.