

Dear Mr Johnson,

Re: The Bishopsgate Goodsyard.

GLA ref: D&P/1200c/03. LPA ref: 2014/2425 and 2014/2427

I am writing to you as Chair of the Spitalfields Community Group (SCG). SCG was founded nearly 5 years ago to represent people working and living in Spitalfields. We have over 200 members making us the largest such group in the area.

In November 2014 we wrote to LBTH objecting to the proposed development at the Bishopsgate Goodsyard. I have attached a copy of that letter to this email. We would now like to reiterate our objection to the plans. Our reasons for so doing are largely unchanged but I would like to highlight the points below.

- **Height/massing.** While the developer has slightly reduced the height of the towers since our last letter, the loss of light in the Redchurch Street Conservation Area and Boundary Estate is still considerable. Lighting studies reinforce this. The large number of towers will undoubtedly create a “wall of development” that is detrimental to the areas to the north of the site. The scale of the development is clearly detrimental to the sensitive five surrounding conservation areas and their many listed buildings.
- **Quality of design.** Much of the reduction in height has been effected by lowering the ceiling heights of the residential units. Clearly the developer is placing commercial interests above the needs of their prospective future tenants. In addition, the public garden that will be created is so overshadowed that it will be totally in the shade in early evening during the summer. This is exactly the time when it might expect the highest number of visitors, when the local markets are closing down. This is ill thought-out and shows a lack of regard for the public spaces.
- **Poorly designed office space.** Spitalfields has long been characterised by units with a relatively small footprint, an area where SMEs can flourish. This continues to this day – the new Second Home business unit on Hanbury Street is a good example of this. The offices in this development are clearly designed to appeal to larger corporate users. An influx of such companies will have a significant and detrimental effect on the neighbourhood. The experience of Spitalfields Market makes this clear – office workers have everything they might need, an in-house restaurant, even a hairdresser apparently, on site and so rarely leave their building to spend money in the local community.
- **Lack of affordable housing.** The amount of affordable housing has actually been reduced since our last representation. Housing is desperately short in Spitalfields, especially for key workers.

Planning is a divisive issue. We consult our members before making representations on planning matters. Often there is little consensus amongst our members. Sometimes there is a minority that strongly oppose our suggested action. This is one of very few applications where our entire membership, and indeed the whole of Spitalfields, seems to be united in opposition to the proposals. *We request that these proposals be rejected outright.* Otherwise the chance to create a sustainable scheme that gives something back to the communities who live in the vicinity will be missed.