
47 RECOMMENDATIONS

The recommendations I give below are those to be found at the end of every conclusion. All, except those relating to London Bridge, are drafted on the assumption that an acceptable proposal is brought forward for London Bridge Station

Recommendations arising from the objection of the Corporation of London and from Listed Building and Conservation Area consent applications within the City of London (Chapter 5)

I recommend that:

- i) confirmation of the Orders and the associated permissions and consents should not be issued until there is an approved scheme for a building above the Blackfriars station concourse (the 'missing tooth') and an assurance that it will be implemented as part of the Blackfriars Station redevelopment;
- ii) the application for listed building consent, dated 26 November 1999, for a footbridge across Queen Victoria Street be refused;
- iii) subsequent to the approval of a scheme for the 'missing tooth' the planning application, dated 20 October 2000, for a single vent adjacent to Puddle Dock, revised basement street and platform levels of the station and the escape stair enclosure on the North Bank at Blackfriars Station be granted, subject to conditions, and substituted for the corresponding elements of the deemed planning application; or if the SoS disagrees with the recommendation in i) above the planning application, dated 20 October 2000, should be refused and the corresponding elements in the deemed planning permission be granted subject to conditions; or if the SoS disagrees with the recommendation in i) above and the recommendation to refuse the called in application dated 20 October 2000, the corresponding elements of the deemed planning permission should be approved subject to conditions;
- iv) subsequent to the approval of a scheme for the 'missing tooth' or if the SoS disagrees with the recommendation in i) above:
 - a) the listed building consent application, dated 20 October 2000, for works to attach and support a proposed footbridge which will oversail the Black Friar public house be granted, subject to conditions;
 - b) the planning application, dated 20 October 2000, for the revised design and layout of a stair/lift structure together with a footbridge oversailing the Black Friar public house be granted, subject to conditions;
 - c) the planning application, dated 20 October 2000, for erection of gantry overhead electrification equipment on the railway viaduct over Queen Victoria Street be granted;

- d) the planning application, dated 20 October 2000, for the relocation of proposed equipment under the adjacent railway viaduct at Apothecary Street power site be granted, subject to conditions; and
- e) the planning application, dated 20 October 2000, for the revised design of a ventilation shaft structure in the central reservation traffic island at Queen Victoria Street be granted, subject to conditions.

In all cases a) to e) above the planning permissions should be substituted for the corresponding elements in the deemed planning application.

Recommendations arising from the objection of Southwark London Borough Council, and from Listed Building and Conservation Area consent applications within the London Borough of Southwark (Chapter 6)

I recommend that:

- i) planning permission and listed building consent for the works at London Bridge Station be refused;
- ii) Railtrack be invited to submit an alternative design;
- iii) planning permission be granted, subject to conditions, for the revised design of the southern abutment of the former West Blackfriars and St Paul's railway bridge including the revised design of staircase structures to the west and east sides of the railway bridge, in accordance with the terms of the application dated 20 October 2000
- iv) planning permission for all other works within the London Borough of Southwark be deemed to be granted, subject to conditions, in accordance with the terms of the Consolidated Request dated 3 April 2000, and the plans submitted therewith and listed in document RT/100/CV, pages 16-18, and as varied by iii) above;
- v) listed building consent for:
 - a) the relocation of crests and remodelling of the southern abutment of the former West Blackfriars and St Paul's Railway Bridge; and,
 - b) the demolition of part of the rear of 1-13 (odd) Park Street and the building to the rear of 13 Park Street and modifications to the remainder of 1-13 (odd) Park Street,as shown in the applications dated 26 November 1999, be refused;

- vi) listed building and conservation area consent for:
- a) the total demolition of 7 Bedale Street, 1, 3, and 5 (listed as 2, 4, and 6) Green Dragon Court at the rear of 22 Borough High Street, and 16-26 Borough High Street;
 - b) the total demolition of 2, 3, and 4 Bedale Street;
 - c) the demolition of the part of No 8 and the whole of No 7 Stoney Street; and
 - d) the total demolition of 11-15 (odd) Borough High Street and 2 London Bridge Street;
- be refused;
- vii) listed building consent be granted, subject to conditions, for:
- a) the relocation of crests and remodelling of the southern abutment of the former West Blackfriars and St Paul's Railway Bridge; and,
 - b) the demolition of part of the rear of 1-13 (odd) Park Street and the building to the rear of 13 Park Street and modifications to the remainder of 1-13 (odd) Park Street;
- in accordance with the terms of the applications, both dated 20 October 2000, and the plans submitted therewith; and
- c) the partial demolition including removal of the second floor and the single storey rear extension at 6 Stoney Street (The Wheatsheaf Public House);
- in accordance with the terms of the application dated 26 November 1999 and the plans submitted therewith;
- viii) conservation area consent be granted for:
- a) demolition of the side extension at 20 Southwark Street;
- and, subject to conditions for;
- b) demolition and replacement of the south area of Borough Market roof;
- in accordance with the terms of the applications, both dated 26 November 1999, and the plans submitted therewith.
- ix) that Railtrack be required to enter the undertakings included in Documents 106/2, 106/3 and 106/4

- x) in the event that the Secretary of State disagrees with my recommendation in i) above (that planning permission and listed building consent be refused for London Bridge Station),
 - a) planning permission be deemed to be granted subject to conditions for the alterations to London Bridge Station in accordance with that application and the terms of the Consolidated Request, and the plans listed on the schedule in document RT/100/CW;
 - b) planning permission be granted, subject to conditions, for the layout of a bus interchange forecourt in accordance with the terms of the application dated 20 October 2000, and the plans submitted therewith;
 - c) listed building consent be granted, subject to conditions, for the demolition and replacement of the north aisle of the train shed roof at London Bridge Station in accordance with the terms of the application dated 26 November 1999, and the plans submitted therewith.

- xi) in the event that the Secretary of State disagrees with my recommendations in Section 4 of this report (that the 'reinstatement framework' be declined and Railtrack invited to submit detailed designs for replacement buildings on the sites created by demolitions in the Borough High Street Conservation Area),
 - a) listed building consent be granted, subject to conditions, for the total demolition of 7 Bedale Street, 1, 3, and 5 (listed as 2, 4, and 6) Green Dragon Court at the rear of 22 Borough High Street, and 16-26 Borough High Street in accordance with the terms of the application dated 26 November 1999 and the plans submitted therewith;
 - b) conservation area consent be granted for the total demolition of 2, 3, and 4 Bedale Street in accordance with the terms of the application dated 26 November 1999 and the plans submitted therewith;
 - c) conservation area consent be granted, subject to conditions, for the demolition of the rear of No 8 and the whole of No 7 Stoney Street, in accordance with the terms of the application, dated 26 November 1999, and the plans submitted therewith;
 - d) conservation area consent be granted, subject to conditions, for the total demolition of 11-15 (odd) Borough High Street and 2 London Bridge Street, in accordance with the terms of the application, dated 26 November 1999, and the plans submitted therewith.

Recommendation arising from the objection made by the London Borough of Lewisham (Chapter 7)

I recommend that if Articles 11A and 11B are included in the Order it should not be confirmed until an agreement has been concluded between Railtrack and the London Borough of Lewisham providing for the maintenance of the Surrey Canal Bridge and the Trundleys Road Bridges in perpetuity. If such an agreement cannot be achieved then the Articles should be omitted from the Order.

Recommendations arising from the objections made by the London Borough of Islington, and from Listed Building and Conservation Area consent applications within the London Borough of Islington. (Chapter 7)

I recommend that:

- i) planning permission be granted, subject to conditions, for the revised design of the footbridge together with the erection of the overall roof at the northern end of Farringdon Station in accordance with the terms of the application dated 20 October 2000 and the plans submitted therewith;
- ii) planning permission for all other works within the London Borough of Islington be deemed to be granted, subject to conditions, in accordance with the terms of the Consolidated Request dated 3 April 2000, and the plans submitted therewith and listed in document RT/100/CV, pages 3, 5, 6, and 7, and as varied by i) above;
- iii) listed building consent be granted, subject to conditions, for:
 - a) a new section of roof to be attached to the existing train shed roof being a variation of the listed building consent dated 26 November 1999, at Farringdon Station in accordance with the terms of the application dated 20 October 2000 and the plans submitted therewith;
 - b) modifications to and extension of Farringdon Station in accordance with the terms of the application dated 26 November 1999 and the plans submitted therewith as varied by iii) a) above;
 - c) the demolition of 54-60 Cowcross Street and part of the road bridge supporting the buildings in accordance with the terms of the application dated 26 November 1999 and the plans submitted therewith; and,
- iv) conservation area consent be granted, subject to conditions, for the demolition of Nos 65/65A/65B Charterhouse Street in accordance with the terms of the application dated 26 November 1999 and the plans submitted therewith.

- v) that Railtrack be required to enter the undertakings included in Document 9/2/C, subject to the omission of paragraphs 5 and 14 prior to confirming the Orders and granting the permissions and consents.

Recommendation arising from the objections made by the London Borough of Haringey (Chapter 7)

I recommend that in Schedule 5 of the Consolidated Order the reference to Tottenham Road in the London Borough of Haringey is deleted.

Recommendation arising from the objection by Harlington Parish Council (Chapter 8)

I recommend that the Secretary of State notes the commitment by Railtrack to work with interested parties to provide a solution to the problems created by commuter parking at Harlington.

Recommendation arising from the objection by Wymondley Parish Council (Chapter 8)

8.4.13 I recommend that the Secretary of State should note the removal of the proposed power reinforcement sites adjacent to Lincoln Crescent, Biggleswade and at Little Wymondley from the Order, and that otherwise no action is taken in relation to these objections.

Recommendation arising from the objections by English Heritage (Chapter 9)

I recommend that:

- i) detailed designs for replacement buildings on the remnants of the sites in the Borough High Street Conservation Area that would arise from the proposed demolitions should be approved and their implementation assured, and an undertaking relating to the reinstatement of streets and pavements should be completed, prior to confirmation of the Thameslink 2000 Orders or any associated consents;
- ii) listed building consent be granted for removal of part of the concourse at Platforms 4-7 and relocation of a kiosk at Brighton Railway Station; and
- iii) listed building consent be granted for construction of a platform extension at Eastbourne Railway Station subject to a condition requiring details of proposed new lighting columns to be submitted for approval.

Recommendation arising from the objections by CARA/BRF and Lambeth London Borough (Chapter 10)

I recommend that no change is made to the Order in relation to the objections by CARA, the BRF, or Lambeth London Borough, and that the objections should be no impediment to the grant of planning permission in accordance with the request.

Recommendation arising from the objections made by residents and businesses in Southwark (Chapter 11)

I recommend no action in relation to these objections.

Recommendation arising from the objection by LUL (Chapter 12)

I recommend no action in relation to this objection.

Recommendation arising from the objections by LTUC (Chapter 13)

I recommend that no action is taken in relation to these objections.

Recommendation arising from the objections presented by Field & Sons (Chapter 14)

I recommend that:

- i) Railtrack be required to give an assurance to the owners of 1 Bedale Street concerning condition surveys and remedial works for any damage occurring due to the works.
- ii) Article 39 of the draft Order should be replaced with the wording set out in Annex 1 of Document RT/100/CK

Recommendation arising from the objections by Cally Rail Group (Chapter 15)

I recommend no action be taken in response to this objection.

Recommendation arising from the objections by the Fleet Ditch Group (Chapter 16)

I recommend no action be taken in response to this objection.

Recommendation arising from the objections by the Kings Cross Railway Lands Group (Chapter 17)

I recommend no action be taken in response to this objection.

Recommendation arising from the objections by the Norwood Forum Partnership Board & Norwood Action Group (Chapter 18)

I recommend no action be taken in response to this objection.

Recommendation arising from the objections by the St John's Conservation Association (Chapter 19)

I recommend that no action is taken in relation to this objection

Recommendation arising from the objections by the Coleridge Resident's Association (Chapter 20)

I recommend that the request for deemed planning permission for works at Goring-by-Sea station be approved subject (in addition to the conditions set out in Document RT/89/B) to the condition that no lighting shall be installed on the platform extensions except in accordance with a scheme to be submitted to and approved by the local planning authority.

Recommendation arising from the objections by the The Green Party (Chapter 21)

I recommend no action be taken in response to this objection.

Recommendation arising from the objections by the Bedford Commuter's Association (Chapter 22)

I recommend no action be taken in response to this objection.

Recommendation arising from the objections by ADAPT (Chapter 23)

I recommend no action be taken in response to this objection.

Recommendation arising from the objections by the NCIT (Chapter 24)

I recommend that no action be taken in relation to this objection

Recommendation arising from the objections by the RDS (Chapter 25)

I recommend that no action is taken in relation to this objection

Recommendation arising from the objections by the SAWTAG (Chapter 26)

I recommend that no action is taken in relation to this objection

Recommendation arising from the objections by Mr AJG Sturgeon (Chapter 27)

I recommend that no action is taken in relation to this objection

Recommendation arising from the objections by Mr G Winbourne (Chapter 28)

I recommend no action be taken in response to this objection.

**Recommendation arising from the objections by Town & Country Strategies
(Chapter 29)**

I recommend that no action is taken in relation to this objection

Recommendation arising from the objections by Mr A Moody (Chapter 30)

I recommend that no action is taken in relation to this objection

**Recommendation arising from the objections by Faircharm Investments Ltd
(Chapter 31)**

I recommend

- i) that the order be confirmed as far as it relates to plot 397;
- ii) Railtrack be required to undertake to the owners of the land that it will not be retained longer than six months after the last requirement to deliver materials by rail from the Ewer Street sidings.

**Recommendation arising from the objections by Citigen (London) Ltd (Chapter
32)**

I recommend that no amendment should be made to the Order in response to this objection.

**Recommendation arising from the objections by London & Continental Stations
and Property Ltd (Chapter 33)**

I recommend that no amendment should be made to the Order in response to this objection.

**Recommendation arising from the objections by Star Television Programme Ltd
(Chapter 34)**

I recommend that the order be confirmed as for as it relates to plot 256

**Recommendations arising from the objections by the Whympeas Investments
Ltd and PricewaterhouseCoopers (Chapter 35)**

I recommend that:

- i) planning permission for the works at London Bridge Station be refused;
- ii) that the called in application dated 20 October 2000 for the layout of the bus station be refused;

- iii) that listed building consent for the alterations to London Bridge station be refused;
- iv) that the order should not be confirmed in respect of plot 536;
- v) that Railtrack be informed that there is no objection to the track and platform layout adopted;
- vi) in the event that the Secretary of State disagrees with my recommendations above, Railtrack should be required to undertake to Whympeas Investments Ltd in accordance with the draft undertaking of 5 April (RT/109), subject to:
 - a) clause 5.9.1 agreed between the parties, should apply;
 - b) an acoustic barrier will be provided on both sides of the viaduct between points X and Y on attachment 1;
 - c) clause 5.10, of 11 May 2001, will apply;
 - d) clause 3.2, as proposed by Whympeas will be included, subject to the retention by Railtrack of reasonable rights of access to their works for maintenance purposes;
 - e) clause 16 will be amended as follows:

If Railtrack acquires plot 536 and the part of plot 540 coloured blue on the annexed plan for London Bridge Bus Station it will offer to Whympeas an interest in the car park at basement level for no less than 125 years.
 - f) in clause 18.1 after 'of Civil Engineers' will be added 'or the Royal Institution of Chartered Surveyors, as appropriate.';
 - g) clause 19 will be deleted.

Recommendations arising from the objections by Cardinal House Ltd (Chapter 36)

I recommend that:

- i) that permanent compulsory acquisition of plot 116 be limited to the land necessary to construct the scheme to which the request for deemed planning permission applies; that is, the land shown hatched on plan 623/8
- ii) that Railtrack be required to undertake to Cardinal House all matters necessary and within their powers to facilitate a single ramp access the underground car parks affected by plots 110-116;

- iii) that Railtrack be required to enter the agreement set out in document 623/10, save that the height of air space should be set to give at least 2.1m clearance to any Railtrack structure beneath.

Recommendation arising from the objections by Coutts & Co (Chapter 37)

I recommend that Railtrack should be required to undertake to Coutts & Co in accordance with the draft undertakings of 7 August 2000 and 5 April 2001.

Recommendation arising from the objections by English Welsh and Scottish Railways Ltd (Chapter 38)

I recommend that the following clause is inserted into the Order:

Railtrack shall not construct or operate the authorised works in any way that would prevent EWS, in accordance with an access contract, from operating 2 trains per day in each direction between Cricklewood and the Stewartby & Forders siding.

Recommendation arising from the objections by United News and Media plc (Chapter 39)

I recommend that the Orders be confirmed as drafted in relation to Plot No 364.

Recommendation arising from the objections by J.N.Pearson (Chapter 40)

I recommend that plot 423 should be deleted from the Order

Recommendation arising from the objections by Bass Leisure (Chapter 41)

I recommend that the order should not be confirmed in respect of plots 540, 542 and 543.

Recommendation arising from the objections by Union Car Parks/Union Properties Ltd (Chapter 42)

I recommend that plots 583 and 585 be retained within the Order. I make no recommendation as to whether acquisition should be permanent or temporary, or as to the appropriate means of safeguarding the objector's human rights in relation to the acquisition.

Recommendations arising from the written objections by Statutory objectors (Chapter 43)

- i) If negotiations have not been concluded with the following objector's the SoS should request both parties to make final representations in writing on which a decision can be made:

2, 3, 4, & 18	Tonex Properties	69	South Bank Studio Centre Ltd
90	Pocock Brothers Ltd	129	A G Kirk

253	Southwark Metals Ltd	265	Whole Crown Ltd
298	BHM Components (Plastics) Ltd	500	The Corporation of Wardens of the Parish of St Saviour, Southwark
568	Fairway Business Forms Limited	631	Thames Water Utilities Limited
638	The Royal Air Force Museum	646	Dalgety PLC
704, 710	Lloyds TSB Group PLC	783	Minerva PLC
878	Higham Nobbs Consulting	921	Harmsworth Pooled Property Unit Trust
934	Brimpath Limited		

- ii) Confirmation of withdrawal should be sought from Trapps Cellars or both parties invited to make final written submissions on which a decision can be made.
- iii) Apart from land at London Bridge (see paragraph 43.3.38) the compulsory purchase powers within the draft Consolidated Order should be confirmed with the following exceptions:
- a) Plot 11 in the London Borough of Camden should be deleted from the Order if temporary access has been granted by agreement. If there is no agreement the Order should be confirmed in respect of plot 11.
 - b) Plot 6 in the District of South Cambridgeshire.
 - c) Plots 1-4 in the District of Mid Bedfordshire
- iv) Railtrack should be invited to provide evidence on the availability of an alternative means of access off Dells Lane. If that alternative is not possible the Order should be confirmed in respect of Plot 20 in the District of Mid Bedfordshire. If the alternative is to be adopted then Plot 20 should be deleted from the Order.

Recommendations arising from the written objections by non Statutory objectors (Chapter 44)

- (i) Plots 21-22 in the London Borough of Barnet should be excluded from the Order. If Railtrack conclude an agreement to move the power reinforcement site at Scratchwood to the eastern side of the railway track then plots 16-20 should also be excluded.
- (ii) Conditions relating to authorities outside the core area as set out in RT/89/B 5.1-5.7, 6.1-6.3, 7.1-2 should be attached to the deemed planning permission together with a condition worded as 7.1 relating to the London Borough of Greenwich (Mottingham) and the District of Tandridge (Oxted).
- (iii) Railtrack should be asked to confirm whether all or part of plots 7 and 8 (Station Close) at Plumpton in the District of Lewes and plot 9 at Durrington in the Borough of Worthing can be deleted from the Order in the light of their responses to objections.

Recommendation concerning planning conditions (Chapter 46)

I recommend that the planning conditions set out in RT/89/B and RT/109 are applied to any permission deemed to have been granted as a result of the request made to the Secretary of State.