

Edward Crossley  
11 Parkchurch House  
108 Grosvenor Avenue  
London  
N5 2NE

7 September 2015

**Re: Objection to Application by Lincoln's Inn - 2015/4404/P 'Education centre'**

1. I am a barrister member of Lincoln's Inn. I work within the Inn as a very junior tenant at one of the Chambers within the Inn's precincts. I have only recently completed my educational training to become a barrister and I intend to practice within the Inn for the whole of my future working life. If successful the proposed works will affect me substantially and I have significant objections to them.
2. I object to the proposed works for four reasons.
  - 2.1. First, the proposed works are unnecessary. The works are being proposed in order to provide educational and training services to its members. But in proposing such works, the Inn has overstated its role as such an educational provider. I have first hand experience of the Inn's role in the training of barristers since I have only recently finished my training to become a barrister. The Inn's role in providing that training was a limited one. The training I was given came principally from two sources. It came from the Bar Professional Training Course, which I completed through an external provider outside the Inn with excellent facilities on Red Lion Road, and it came through my completion of pupillage in Chambers. The added training which the Inn provided, which was very much an adjunct to these principal sources of training, was given perfectly adequately through the Inn's existing offices on Chancery Lane, through events put on in Hall and the Old Hall, and through an off-site weekend at a very pleasant venue. A massive new development within the Inn is simply not necessary to provide the supplemental training which the Inn currently provides.
  - 2.2. Secondly, the proposed works will be disruptive. The proposed works will take several years and during that time will destroy the necessarily quiet working environment which the Inn currently provides. A barrister's job is intellectually

demanding and requires intense concentration. Excessive noise makes it impossible to work within the Inn. As a result, the Inn will be essentially unusable as a working environment for the several years required for the proposed works.

2.3. Thirdly, the proposed works are extremely expensive. I understand that the Inn is proposing to spend almost the whole of its surplus assets in financing the proposed works, and to borrow money too. This causes me serious concern. The rent which the Inn charges for its rooms is already very expensive, and a serious burden for its junior members. The net effect of the Inn spending so much money on this project is likely to be significantly increased rent for its members in the long term. This will in turn be borne most heavily by the Inn's junior members, who have the longest to spend renting rooms within the Inn.

2.4. Fourthly, at no stage in the planning process was I, as an ordinary and junior member of the Inn, consulted about these proposals. The plans have been presented to me as a *fait accompli*.

I would strongly urge you to reject this planning application in order that a proper consultation process may be commenced and in order that the supposed needs which the proposals are intended to meet may be met with more moderate proposals.

**Edward Crossley**

---

Top Floor Flat  
8 Old Square  
Lincoln's Inn  
London WC2A 3 SP

1 September 2015

Camden  
Regeneration and Planning Development Management  
London Borough of Camden  
Town Hall  
Judd Street  
London  
WC1H 8ND

Dear Sirs,

**Application Ref:** 2015/4404/P (Application 3) and 2015/4408/P (Application 4)

**Associated Ref:** 2015/4498/L (Application 3) and 2015/4541/L (Application 4)

**For the attention of Rob Tulloch**

As the occupier of the above Flat I have received Planning Application Consultation Letters re the work to the properties there mentioned, namely the Great Hall in Lincoln's Inn (Application 3) and the Library and Under Treasurer's House (Application 4).

As a member of Chambers in Lincoln's Inn (Thirteen Old Square Chambers) I have also received an e-mail circulated by the Clerks in various Chambers in Lincoln's Inn re the Great Hall / Library Development.

---

---

I (like many other residents and / or practitioners in Lincoln's Inn) have been away in August. I have only seen these documents today (the Notices were delivered to my Flat today some time after my son had left in the morning) and I have taken the opportunity of viewing certain of the plans etc lodged on line.

The Flat I occupy in Lincoln's Inn overlooks the Eastern Side of the Great Hall. Come October, I will have occupied this Flat for 24 years. Come October, I will also have been in Chambers in and around New Square for 50 years.

I have very definite views on architectural matters and I was one of the two individuals who made and persisted in comments in relation to the proposals for the Christopher Pye Fountain in New Square a number of years ago until such time as agreement was ultimately reached in relation to the modification of such proposals prior to the determination of an appeal.

So far as the works now proposed affect the Great Hall and its curtilage (Application 3), I am writing to record my objection and opposition to the works. I could not possibly allow the proposals to proceed without expressing my views.

The present arrangement of buildings in and adjacent to New Square and the Great Hall is a remarkable composite ensemble of buildings (albeit of various dates) and I do not have the slightest doubt that the proposals will compromise the architectural integrity of that arrangement, whether viewed (from the ground or from windows at a higher level) from New Square, from the area (including parts of Old Buildings) adjacent to the Old Hall and the Chapel, or from the Western side of the block of buildings housing 8 to 10 Old Square.

Any necessary development should be confined to the area at present occupied by the Under Treasurer's House (earmarked for the Library extension) and the adjacent land in particular the land to the North.

With regard to Application 4, I am not objecting and opposing the proposals, though the issue of the appropriateness of the glazed link between the new building and the existing library requires careful consideration.

Please send any response to me by e-mail: [REDACTED]

Yours faithfully,

[REDACTED]  
David Lowe QC

---