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ABSTRACT

The decades immediately after World War II saw the construction of many office buildings, largely the result of an unprecedented property boom that swept Britain in the 1950s and 1960s. Nowhere was this more apparent than in the City of London. Within post-war architecture scholarship, in contrast to housing and schools, offices have received little attention. Despite two thematic listing projects, office buildings – particularly speculative developments – represent only a small proportion of post-war architecture on the statutory list of buildings of special architectural or historic interest.

Contemporary accounts of office architecture are often disparaging, with little significance attached to a building typology seemingly at odds with modernist principles supporting the socialist agenda of national reconstruction, something that could be read as a typological ‘class distinction’. A further distinction exists between purpose-built offices and the much more numerous speculatively built offices, the latter usually considered to be of little architectural distinction having been constructed to achieve the greatest financial return.

The lack of an authoritative architectural history of office architecture raises serious conservation challenges as there is a risk that uninformed decisions could be made resulting in the demolition or major alteration of potentially significant buildings. This dissertation attempts an objective assessment of office architecture built between 1945 and 1985 in the City of London, to consider whether the contemporary and later criticism – and lack of scholarship in this area – is justified. It also seeks to evaluate the potential historical and architectural significance of office architecture, considering conservation and management issues.
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INTRODUCTION

On 13 August 1987 the first post-war building in England was added to the statutory list of buildings of architectural or historic significance. This was Bracken House, completed in 1959 to the designs of Sir Albert Richardson as the Financial Times headquarters in the City of London (Figs 1 and 2). Grade II* listing was awarded in response to its proposed demolition. Gavin Stamp, then chairman of the Thirties Society, observed that, following its completion, ‘Bracken House was ignored rather than condemned by the architectural press because it was Classical and, apparently, traditional’, concluding that it is ‘simply the best post-war building in the City’.\(^1\) Given the negative attitudes towards Modern Movement architecture from the 1970s, it is not surprising – in hindsight – that the first post-war listed building evoked a pre-war traditionalist aesthetic as opposed to one with an outwardly modern appearance.

By 2003 twenty-six office buildings had been statutorily listed.\(^2\) By 2015 this number was forty-six, equating to under five percent of all post-war listings.\(^3\) Given their large numbers, post-war office buildings – particularly speculative projects – are proportionally under-represented on the statutory list, even after two thematic listing projects (1993-95 and 2013-15) undertaken by English Heritage. In the City, which experienced England’s highest concentration of post-war office development, there are only six listed offices built between 1945-1985, five of which were prestige headquarters or owner-occupier commissions.

---


\(^3\) Sourced from information supplied by Historic England in June 2015 (Appendix 3).
English Heritage acknowledged in 2015 that ‘the history of the commercial office in the UK has yet to be written’. Within post-war architectural scholarship offices have received less attention than housing and schools, the pillars of welfare state architecture. Key studies, including books by Nicholas Bullock, John Gold and Alan Powers, have discussed offices in the context of the Modern Movement, seeing the appropriation of modernist principles into commercial office design as a ‘simplified’ or ‘routine modernism’. The role of the profit-orientated developer is recognised, as is the willingness of commercial architects, in Bullock’s words, to ‘overlook architectural niceties’ in favour of achieving the maximum permissible floor space. Common references are made towards harsh contemporary criticism of office architecture, which was particularly fierce towards that built within the City of London.

The apparent prejudice against office buildings invites the question of whether contemporary and later criticism directed towards the commercial nature of office buildings has prevented their potential architectural and historical significance from being recognised in the history and conservation of post-war architecture.

In order to explore these issues, this study has chosen the City of London as a case study. As Charles Holden and William Holford wrote in 1951: ‘It is often said that the City is unique, and that its traditions, its prestige and its appearance are unlike those of any other part of London or England... Gradually the City has become more and more devoted

---

to its commercial function’.\textsuperscript{8} Within the space of only a square mile, there is an unusually high concentration of defined commercial uses, and therefore a high concentration of office architecture. Many of these offices date to the post-war period, partly due to the extent of World War II bomb damage, and make an integral contribution to the City’s character and identity. Furthermore, the City has a unique set of commercial pressures that influence the way in which the built environment is managed.

This dissertation examines the significance of commercial office architecture in the City, built from 1945 to 1985. It aims to:

1. Summarise the political, legislative and economic context surrounding the construction of office buildings.
2. Investigate the architectural, historical, technical, cultural and economic significance of post-war office buildings in the City.
3. Explore how office buildings have been received and assess whether the typology of office buildings has suffered, due to their commercial motivation, from a ‘class distinction’ in relation to other major typologies of post-war architecture.
4. Investigate the designation and conservation values of office buildings and consider current pressures and trends relating to post-war office buildings.

The scope is limited to purpose-built or speculative commercial offices, including private development let to government departments. It does not include reconstructed pre-war buildings or retained facades, a prevalent practice from the early 1980s.\textsuperscript{9} Embassies, municipal offices, exchange buildings, institutional buildings (including Livery

Companies), retail premises and industrial buildings are all excluded because of their different commercial and non-commercial processes and requirements. The investigation extends to the mid-1980s ‘Big Bang’ reform of Britain's financial markets, which had a profound impact on the nature of City office development. This cut-off point also conforms to the general ‘thirty-year rule’ governing statutory listing.

Francis Duffy distinguished, in relating to offices, between “the building, that is the main structural and core elements designed to last for many years, and the interior, including internal spatial divisions, the furniture, fittings and furnishings which made an office inhabitable and which are frequently renewed’. The focus of this dissertation is on what Duffy calls the building, although the spatial and organisational arrangements of office interiors are briefly discussed in recognition of their impact on design.

The methodology centres on historical research, using a variety of primary and secondary sources, including published literature, articles in the architectural and general press, contemporary books and pamphlets on office design, and archival material from the London Metropolitan Archives, Guildhall Library and Historic England Historians’ Files. Interviews have been undertaken with selected post-war architectural historians and conservation professionals, namely officers from Historic England, the City of London Corporation (CLC) Planning Department, and the Twentieth Century (C20) Society. Using street directories within the City of London Buildings of England series, office buildings constructed between 1945 and 1985 have been catalogued, along with their dates of construction and architect(s), by address. Research, both on-site

---

and from planning records, has established whether buildings are existing, substantially altered, or demolished. This catalogue is included in Appendix 1 and supplies information for tables within the text. Statistics relating to designations are sourced from Elain Harwood’s *England: A Guide to Post-War Listed Buildings*, information supplied by Historic England in July 2015 and the online National Heritage List for England.\(^\text{12}\)

The dissertation is in four parts. The first summarises the interrelated historical, economic and legislative conditions affecting post-war office development at national and local levels. It then sets out different systems of office development, also reflecting on the role of commercial architects. The second section describes the architectural development of City office buildings, considering wider influences, technological advances, design trends and characteristic materials. The third section presents a critical overview of how office buildings have been received over time, analysing how office buildings were discussed in both the general and architectural press. It considers wider public perceptions and emphasises how the conservation movement used criticism of private urban development as an important campaigning tool. It then gives an overview of how post-war office architecture has been considered in scholarship and reflects on how office buildings are viewed today. The final section considers conservation and management issues, assessing current trends affecting post-war office buildings in the City, including demolition, alteration and changes of use, as well as statutory listing. The section concludes by considering the issue of significance in relation to office buildings, highlighting problems resulting from the absence of an accepted architectural history, and stressing the need for such a study.

---

1. CONTEXT

Office development is rooted in a complex series of processes that inform its conception, construction, use and reception. As the construction of office buildings tends to be driven by commercial activity, it is therefore linked to economic cycles and influenced by socio-political factors.

**Table 1:** Numbers of post-war office buildings started and completed in the City of London, showing noticeable peaks during the late 1950s, early 1960s and early 1970s, illustrative of fluctuating cycles of supply and demand for office space in the City (data based on Appendix 1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dates</th>
<th>Projects started</th>
<th>Projects completed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1945-1950</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1951-1955</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1956-1960</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961-1965</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966-1970</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971-1975</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976-1980</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980-1985</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>92*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>348</strong></td>
<td><strong>348</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


1.1 HISTORICAL, ECONOMIC AND LEGISLATIVE CONTEXT

Wartime air raids devastated some 104 out of the total 393 acres of buildings in the City of London (Fig. 3), concentrated to the north and east of St Paul’s (Figs 4 and 5). The impact on the City’s economic position was of serious concern to the Corporation of London (Corporation), which started planning reconstruction as early as 1941. These aspirations were, however, hampered by dire economic conditions – by 1945 ‘Britain had lost about a quarter of its pre-war national wealth’. Private commercial

---

development was further restricted by materials and labour shortages, as well as tight economic controls, augmented by Clement Attlee’s new Labour government, which was committed to ‘limited state ownership, a welfare state, and planning in the widest sense’.\footnote{Stephen Ward, Planning and Urban Change (London, 2004), p.93.}

The war encouraged widespread acceptance of interventionist economic control. In terms of commercial property, the period 1939-1954 was the most regulated in history and comparatively little was built (Table 1).\footnote{Peter Scott, The Property Masters: A History of the British Commercial Property Sector (London, 1996), p.102,119.} Building Licences, introduced in 1941, restricted development to that which delivered essential economic or social benefit. The reconstruction of bomb-damaged sites was permitted, but a ‘betterment’ tax introduced by the 1947 Town and Country Planning Act, applied at 100 percent to development values generated by planning decisions, provided little commercial incentive.\footnote{Ward, Planning, p.100; Scott, Property Masters, p.104.} The Act, however, introduced a significant loophole – the ‘Third Schedule’ – permitting reconstruction of existing sites with a ten percent increase in volume. With lower ceiling heights this could increase floor space by up to forty percent.\footnote{Oliver Marriott, The Property Boom (London, 1967), p.31; Ward, Planning, pp.115-116.}

The main effect of the 1947 Act was a fundamental shift in development control. Planning permission was introduced and local planning authorities (LPAs) were required to submit a statutory Local Development Plan for Ministerial approval. These were to contained proposals Comprehensive Development Areas (CDAs), which, with the introduction of compulsory purchase powers in the 1944 Town and Country Planning...
Act, allowed for the re-planning of war-damaged areas. By 1967 the Corporation had compulsorily purchased 115 acres of land.

From 1951 to 1964 successive Conservative governments implemented an increasingly market-led approach to economic regulation. Harold Macmillan, then Minister of Housing and Local Government, introduced the 1953 Town and Country Planning Act, stating that ‘the people whom the government must help are those who do things: the developers, the people who create wealth’. There was a sharp increase in demand for office space in the City alongside its growth as the centre of world finance, encouraged by a new commercial airport at Heathrow. The 1953 Act repealed the betterment tax and Building Licences, having been relaxed in 1952, were lifted in 1954. This deregulation laid the foundations for a boom in speculative commercial development. In 1954 The Builder noted ‘the increasing volume of reconstruction being carried out in the City of London’ (see Table 1), listing forty-six ‘major projects now in the course of erection’.

Peter Scott has estimated that ‘from 1948 to 1954 commercial property accounted for only 9.6 percent of all private sector non-residential construction activity, compared to 45.3 percent during 1955-1964’. By the early 1960s, the office market was becoming saturated due to oversupply. A deceleration in the rate of office development was accompanied by legislative reforms reinforced by Harold Wilson’s Labour government, elected in 1964, culminating in an outright restriction on office development in central

---

20 Ward, Planning, p.100.
21 Marriott, Property Boom, p.69.
22 Ibid., p.5.
24 Marriott, Property Boom, p.5.
26 Scott, Property Masters, p.109.
27 Ibid., p.159.
London known as the ‘Brown Ban’ – named after George Brown, Labour’s Minister of Economic Affairs. In 1965 Office Development Permits were introduced for London offices over 2,500 square feet.\textsuperscript{28} Other measures contributing to the control of office development included the introduction of Corporation Tax and Capital Gains Tax.\textsuperscript{29} Regulation of internal environment conditions was introduced by the 1963 Offices, Shops and Railways Act, operational from August 1964, which aimed to protect the health, safety and welfare of employees.\textsuperscript{30}

Office decentralisation policy was promoted from the late 1950s, enabled by the escalation of car ownership.\textsuperscript{31} Recalling policies advocated by Patrick Abercrombie in the 1943 \textit{County of London Plan} and 1944 \textit{Greater London Plan}, in 1958 the London County Council (LCC) organised ‘Offices on the Move’, an exhibition at County Hall supported by the Town and Country Planning Institute.\textsuperscript{32} Relocation to areas such as Middlesex, Kent, Essex and Croydon – where over two million square feet of office space was built between 1957 and 1964 – were endorsed.\textsuperscript{33} Relocation was also encouraged by soaring central London rents; by 1959 \textit{The Economist} estimated annual rents were, at their highest, over £2 per square foot (equivalent to over £40 in 2015).\textsuperscript{34} The 1967 \textit{Strategy for the South East} included extensive proposals for office relocation outside London,\textsuperscript{35} supported and promoted by the Location of Office Bureau, which had been set up in 1963.\textsuperscript{36} Faced with mounting obstacles, including a re-introduction of the betterment tax

\textsuperscript{28} Ward, \textit{Planning}, p.151.  
\textsuperscript{29} Ibid., p.115.  
\textsuperscript{34} ‘The Office Boom’, \textit{The Economist}, 191 (16 May 1959), p.605.  
\textsuperscript{35} Eleanor Smith Morris, \textit{British Town Planning and Urban Design} (Harlow, 1997), p.112.  
at 40 percent, many developers turned their attention to the comparatively unregulated retail development market.37

A relaxation of controls on office development, led by Edward Heath’s Conservative government elected in 1970, gave way to a short-lived surge of building, known as the ‘Barber Boom’ – named after Anthony Barber, Chancellor of the Exchequer. This was facilitated by the expansion of direct involvement by financial institutions and pension funds, an increase in bank lending and an influx of foreign banks to the City.38 However, there was a growing public awareness of the damage caused by the extent of urban redevelopment. Bitter national campaigns, led by an expanding conservation lobby, against the Euston arch demolition and the Greater London Council (GLC) plans for Covent Garden, proved to be a turning point in new office building in London for, after this, developers would... have to show more respect for historic London than they had in the past.39

Harold Wilson’s Labour government returned in 1974. The same year saw a major property crash caused by the 1960s uncontrolled property-investment boom, rising rents and inflation, and soaring interest rates following the 1973 oil crisis and international recession.40 The GLC’s 1975 Office Policy Statement aimed to restrict office growth in central London to 3 million square feet.41 The 1975 Community Land Act enhanced LPAs’ compulsory purchase powers, and the 1976 Development Land Tax applied to land value increases, set at 80 percent with an intended increase to 100

37 Scott, Property Masters, pp.176-178.
38 Ibid., pp.180,183.
41 London Metropolitan Archives, COL/PLD/TP, ‘City of London Development Plan’, 1976, section 3.2
percent. Property development became high risk and little commercial development occurred in the mid-to-late 1970s (see Table 1).

Following the election of Margaret Thatcher’s government in 1979, deregulation of planning control – seen as a burden on enterprise – and reform of financial policy began in the early 1980s. In 1983, the year of the establishment of the Historic Buildings and Monuments Commission (English Heritage), the government embarked on major deregulation of the financial services industry. The ‘Big Bang’ and ensuing property boom would have a profound effect on the City and dramatically alter the future of office development.

1.2 THE CORPORATION OF LONDON

It is by no means easy to reconcile the views of the idealist and the realist in carrying through a plan for rebuilding the City of London. The idealist may tend to disregard expediency and see in a rebuilding plan an opportunity to build a perfect City of the future without regard for the pressing needs of the present, while the realist might perpetuate the defects of the past in his efforts to restore with the utmost speed the vital accommodation for a thriving business community.

The Corporation’s first reconstruction plan was produced in 1944 by F.J. Forty (City Engineer). Heavily criticised by the LCC, the Royal Fine Art Commission (RFAC) and the

---

42 Ward, Planning, p.177.
43 Scott, Property Masters, pp.203,207,213.
architectural press for its lack of imagination and inconsistency with Abercrombie’s LCC plans, it was rejected by W.S. Morrison, the first Minister of Town and Country Planning. The Corporation were instructed to prepare a new plan using external planning consultants; in 1945 Charles Holden and William Holford were appointed. By 1947 they presented their final report, a careful compromise between the City’s interests and Ministerial vision.

Holden and Holford’s plan, approved in 1948 apart from some forty acres, included extensive proposals for comprehensive redevelopment (Fig. 6). It also proposed restoration of pre-war office provision and introduced a new system of controls to limit the scale of development and improve working conditions. Height limits were set through daylighting controls, based on street width and plot ratios (Fig. 7), which set a maximum limit on the ratio of site area to proposed gross floor area at 5:1, with an increase of 5.5:1 around the Bank area.

From 1947 the LCC had power over the Corporation’s planners, which it could exercise if it saw fit, apparently a source of much tension between the two powers. The City was, therefore, covered by the 1951 County of London Development Plan, which adopted, with minor modifications, the main aspects of Holden and Holford’s Plan. The 1963 Local Government Act abolished the LCC and introduced, from 1965, a two-tier system with

---

51 Ibid., pp.275-279,300-302; Corporation, Rebuilding, pp.13-14.
53 Cherry and Penny, Holford, pp.140-141; Marriott, Property Boom, p.67.
54 London Metropolitan Archives, COL/PL/01/081/A, ’County of London Development Plan’, 1951
the GLC and the Corporation alongside reorganised London Boroughs. Planning policies were amended in the 1967 *Greater London Development Plan*.

Four of the twenty-nine CDAs officially announced in 1957 were located in the City, Golden Lane, the Barbican and the Tower of London and St Paul’s precincts. The latter involved a progressive masterplan developed by Holford from 1956-1962. The adopted asymmetrical plan (Fig. 8) was centred on the new Paternoster Square surrounded by a series of buildings of varying height. The result comprised several ten-storey slabs aligned north-south and a slender sixteen-storey tower to the north-west to minimise the disruption of views of St Paul’s (Trehearne & Norman Preston & Partners, 1962-1967; demolished; Figs 9A and 9B).

Perhaps the most interesting commercial CDA in town planning terms was the scheme for London Wall, or Route XI, designed in conjunction with the mixed-use Barbican development, together ‘Britain’s single largest essay in central city reconstruction’. London Wall was delivered as a form of public-private partnership, ‘virtually unknown in town centre development before 1939’. In 1954 the Corporation instructed LCC planners to produce a model, setting out the basic siting, layout and massing of six towers and podiums. Once these aspects were agreed, property rights were sold to individual developers. The development took the form of six towers, between eighteen and twenty storeys, placed at a slight angle to the road to create a staggered effect (Figs 10, 11A and 11B). The towers were linked by a continuous two-storey podium.

---

59 Gold, *Modernism*, p.84.
interspersed by lower blocks. On London Wall itself, City Tower (Sir John Burnett, Tait & Partners, 1962-1964), Bastion Tower (Powell & Moya, 1972) still stand today, as does Roman House, Wood Street (Owen Cambell Jones & Sons, 1957-58; Fig. 54A). London Wall, a representation of ‘post-war commitment to planning to central business district of a modern city’,\(^{61}\) incorporated the innovative ‘pedway’ system introduced by the Corporation in the late 1950s (Fig. 12). It was intended to form an integrated thirty mile network of elevated walkways, remaining City policy until the mid-1970s.\(^{62}\) As a result most 1960s and early ’70s buildings include provision for the pedway system, often later enclosed for use as office space; traces of first floor openings can be seen all over the City.

Bullock has argued that the Corporation ‘where it could, backed progressive architecture’, citing Holford’s engagement and the Golden Lane and Barbican architectural competitions as evidence.\(^{63}\) Although the idea of a progressive and integrated approach to planning, architecture, landscaping of open spaces and pedestrian-traffic systems was heavily endorsed by the Corporation, shown by ‘The Living City’, a promotional film produced in 1970 (see Appendix 2), it is not clear whether this enlightened thinking was rooted within the organisation. Holford had close links with the Ministry of Town and Country Planning, and his views cannot be seen to represent those of City planners. Both Holford and the LCC heavily influenced the City CDAs, and the pedway system was promoted by LCC planners Arthur Ling and Percy Johnson-Marshall.\(^{64}\) It would appear that while the Corporation accepted and promoted some innovative architectural and town planning principles, this was against the grain of its more traditionalist culture. As concluded by Cherry and Penny:

\(^{62}\) Ibid., p.152.
\(^{63}\) Bullock, Building, p.255.
\(^{64}\) Pevsner, London 1, p.109.
the commercial pressures were great and the City’s Planning Officer, Anthony Mealand, was no inspirer of imaginative schemes...it was now up to individual developers and their architects to make the best they could of the general guidelines laid down some ten years before.65

1.3 SYSTEMS OF OFFICE DEVELOPMENT

In the late 1940s, the money-strapped government needed to house increasing numbers of civil servants. Public-private partnerships were established under the ‘Lessor Scheme’, which granted usually unobtainable Building Licences for private development to be leased by the government at a fixed rate of interest and period (usually forty years).66 The government was not involved in the design or architect selection. By 1950 thirteen such buildings were under construction.67 Examples in the City include Atlantic House (T.P. Bennett & Son, 1951; demolished; Fig. 16) and New Change House (Victor Heal, 1953-60; demolished; Fig. 17).

During World War II property prices plummeted. Property investment became increasingly lucrative due to development restrictions and high inflation.68 Budding property developers, including Joe and David Levy, Harold Samuel and Charles Clore, bought up central London property, generally funded by capital borrowed at a fixed rate.69 Alongside rising demand for London office space for the financial and service sectors, as well as the arrival of many large British and international companies, the

65 Cherry and Penny, Holford, p.140-141.
66 Marriott, Property Boom, p.50; Bullock, Building, p.254.
68 Scott, Property Masters, p.105.
speculative office boom took off in the 1950s.\textsuperscript{70} Rising rents enabled easy repayment of site acquisition and construction loans and hefty profit margins were possible, often based on nothing more than credit.\textsuperscript{71} The exploitation of planning loopholes, such as the Third Schedule, were integral to maximise a site’s value. In 1985 the property developer Jack Rose observed that ‘much of the legislation passed...has not produced the intended results. Politicians do not fully understand the business of property’.\textsuperscript{72} Furthermore, Marriott has suggested that government policies often helped, rather than hindered, the profit margins of property developers, at least 100 of whom he estimated were millionaires by 1967.\textsuperscript{73}

In 1972 Holford described developers as ‘a new social phenomenon, a middleman often starting with nothing and continually putting out antennae to any scent of putting together a site and a client’.\textsuperscript{74} They spearheaded the speculative process, bringing dealing skills and market knowledge to the process.\textsuperscript{75} Development companies were usually headed by individuals, although there were some joint companies including the City of London Real Property Company (CLRP; Fig. 13). Investors, commonly insurance companies and pension funds, were also crucial players, often working closely with developers to exploit economic loopholes.\textsuperscript{76} Other important associates were architects (section 1.4) and estate agents, who acted as market intermediaries providing information and professional services.\textsuperscript{77} One large agency, Jones, Lang, Wootton & Sons, produced illustrated publications of recently completed and approved developments,
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\item \textsuperscript{72} Jack Rose, \textit{The Dynamics of Property Development} (London & New York, 1985), pp.261-262.
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including Barrington House (Sir John Burnett, Tait & Partners, 1954-56; demolished; Fig. 14) and B.P. House, Ropemaker Street (Joseph, F. Milton Cashmore & Partners, 1956-60; demolished; Fig. 15). The introduction boasted that ‘the skill of our architects and the craftsmanship of the building industry are combining to give this and future generations a City of which they may be justly proud’; conveying a self-confidence about the sense of modernity symbolised by office buildings.\(^78\)

Tenants and occupiers also played an important role in office development. There was a surge in the late 1950s and 1960s of custom-designed owner-occupier commissions, accounting for around half of commercial offices in 1965; owners would occupy what they needed and rent out the rest.\(^79\) This was part of a wider phenomenon of large companies seeking premises – sometimes prestige headquarters – in central London. Banks and insurance companies were good patrons, as were companies wanting to expand their London-based activities.\(^80\) Custom-designed offices generally cost around a third more to build than speculative schemes,\(^81\) and they were typically intended to showcase their clients’ prestige. In 1976 John Worthington suggested owner-occupier designs exemplified ‘new ideas about the use of office space which filter down to the speculative market’.\(^82\) Speculative offices were often let to multiple occupiers, although some developers preferred single tenants. There were also cases where an occupier was brought in halfway through the speculative process, ‘so allowing the tenant to gain some of the benefits of a custom-designed building’.\(^83\)


\(^79\) Manning, *Office Design*, p.28.


\(^81\) Based on figures provided in Marriott, *Property Boom*, p.29.


\(^83\) Duffy, Cave and Worthington, *Office Space*, p.25.
1.4 ‘COMMERCIAL’ ARCHITECTURAL PRACTICES

Today, there are a number of architects who have a wide knowledge of office building both in Britain and abroad... Such architects are also fully competent to control the construction and economic requirements of their buildings, and advise on the necessary appointment of engineers and quantity surveyors.84

Within both systems of speculative and custom-designed office development, the architects’ role extended beyond design. They were responsible for obtaining planning permission – the major risk factor in any speculative scheme – and for directing contractors. Architects became adept at exploiting regulations to the best commercial advantage, a practice that gained Richard Seifert, ‘king of the developer’s architects’,85 a notorious reputation.86

A small number of practices monopolised the market; in 1967 Oliver Marriott estimated that over half of speculative office buildings in Greater London built since the war were designed by only ten firms, all of which feature in Table 2 with the exceptions of C.H. Elsom & Partners, Newman, Levinson & Partners and Stone, Toms & Partners.87 Many commercial practices working in the City in the late 1940s and 1950s had been established before the war, including T.P.Bennett & Son, Lewis Solomon, Kaye & Partners, Trehearne & Norman Preston & Partners, and Howard Souster & Fairburn, favoured by conservative City clients. By the late 1950s, alongside the rise of the speculative developer, they were rivalled by new practices, most notably Fitzroy Robinson & Partners and Richard Seifert & Partners.

85 Marriott, Property Boom, p.18.
86 Gold, Modernism, p.84-86.
87 Marriott, Property Boom, p.27.
In 1959 Ian McCallum praised the American ‘umbrella’ practice, ‘which may include within one partnership, architects, engineers, landscape and interior designers and many other specialists’. British architectural firms were also impressed with the professionalism of American practices such as Skidmore, Owings & Merrill (SOM) and Mies van der Rohe, and sought to emulate their rationalised corporate model. In this vein, Gollins Melvin Ward Partnership (GMW) and Yorke, Rosenberg & Mardall (YRM) emerged as leading commercial practices, both undertaking several projects within the City. In the late 1970s and ‘80s the need for architects to co-ordinate increasingly

---

**Table 2:** List of practices undertaking four or more office building projects in the City of London during the years 1945-1985. Between them, Fitzroy Robinson & Partners and Richard Seifert designed over 15 percent of City office buildings during the period and another eight practices accounted for a further 17 percent (data based on Appendix 1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Architect</th>
<th>Total number of office projects</th>
<th>Dates of earliest project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fitzroy Robinson &amp; Partners</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1955-56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Seifert &amp; Partners</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1953</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.P. Bennett &amp; Son</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1949-53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gollins Melvin Ward Partnership</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1963-66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trehearne &amp; Norman Preston &amp; Partners</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1950-57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gunton &amp; Gunton</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1949-51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ley, Colbeck &amp; Partners</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1955-60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ellis, Clarke &amp; Gallanaugh</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1954-57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidney, Kaye, Firmin &amp; Partners</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1974-78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Saunders &amp; Associates</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1971-75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Edmund Wilford &amp; Son</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1959-63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLRP Architects</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1962-65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howard, Souster &amp; Fairburn</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1962-65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knapton, Deane &amp; Thompson</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1961-63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ronald Ward &amp; Partners</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1953-56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theo H. Birks</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1957</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yorke, Rosenberg &amp; Mardall</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1960-61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

complex divisions of labour between contractors, including structural and service
engineers, interior designers and space planners, encouraged the development of large
multi-disciplinary practices, such as Arup Associates.

Gold has argued that those working in the commercial, money-making sector were
viewed as 'professionally below the salt' by colleagues working on supposedly more
noble public sector commissions and private housing. This manifested itself as a class
distinction, which Powers argued existed from the late nineteenth century. While post-
war prestige practices rarely ventured into the speculative development arena they did
produce some custom-designed offices. Richard Seifert claimed that the design
competition for the NatWest Tower (1971-1980) included firms headed by Basil Spence,
Hugh Casson and Frederick Gibberd.

While J.M. Richards felt that commercial architects were ‘completely in the stranglehold
of big business’, there were several positive aspects of the working culture. Architects
were able to realise a high yield of projects, in some cases on a massive scale. Gold and
Powers suggested that commercial practice appealed to young architects, who, as long as
they met the space and financial requirements, could have relative freedom in design
terms. However, there were high pressures for speed and efficiency; Herbert Fitzroy
Robinson reputedly took ‘a brief from the Land Securities chief away on a Friday to
produce a considered design for the following Monday’.

90 Gold, Modernism, p.53.
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92 Gold, Modernism, p.54.
94 Gold, Modernism, p.55; Powers, Britain, p.144
In summary, fluctuating economic and political conditions, as well as the emergence of new systems of office development, all had discernible impacts on the commercial office architecture produced during the period 1945-1985. Architectural designs by commercial architects were heavily influenced by client requirements, and, as we will see in the following chapter, by the possibilities offered by new materials and technology and the spread of knowledge of international best practice.
2. OFFICE ARCHITECTURE

There was considerable evolution in post-war office development, moving from the provision of a fairly basic, functional workspace to an increasingly sophisticated and technological affair. Alongside this shift, the visual appearance of offices developed from a traditional, often Stripped Classical, aesthetic towards new architectural forms, styles, and innovative use of materials.

2.1 FORMS, STYLES AND INFLUENCES

In the early post-war period there was a continuation of pre-war architectural traditions in City office design. Offices were often constructed in brick or stone, in Neo-Classical or Neo-Georgian styles. The latter can be seen with heavy classical detailing at Victor Heal’s New Change House, Cheapside (Fig. 17) and 5-10 Great Tower Street (Gunton & Gunton, 1949-1951). Examples of Stripped Neo-Classical offices include Norwich Union, 51-54 Fenchurch Street (Lewis, Solomon, Kaye & Partners, 1951-56), complete with a heavy stone cornice supported by shallow pilasters, rusticated ground floors and scrolled keystones, as well as Terence Heysham’s grand Lloyd’s of London (1950-57; demolished) and Richardson’s celebrated Bracken House (Figs 1 and 2). This traditionalism, particularly favoured by banks, continued into the late 1950s with the National Provident Institution, Gracechurch Street (Green Lloyd & Son, 1957-1959; Fig. 18) and the fully-fledged Neo-Classical Bank Buildings, Princes Street (Victor Heal, 1958-59).

Bullock has argued that this stylistic conservatism, heavily criticised by contemporary architectural commentators (see secton 3.1), was simply preferred over the modernist
idiom by developers and clients. However, it seems likely that stylistic preference was also rooted in the active commercial architects who were part of long established firms, well versed with pre-war Classical traditions, and that the use of traditional materials was necessary due to shortages of other materials. Parallels can be drawn with the stylistic approach taken in contemporary collegiate architecture. Alistair Fair discussed Geddes Hyslop’s work in the late 1940s and early ‘50s at Somerville College, Oxford, designed in a Stripped Classical style using brick and minimal ornament. Fair notes that while the style can be seen as ‘antithetical’ to modernity, Hyslop’s work was also ‘modern’ in various ways, ‘implicated in its context’ as a response to the challenges of the economic climate and the availability of materials.

By the mid-1950s there was a general development of what Bullock has called ‘simplified modernism’. There was a fashion for ‘blocks which adhered to the cornice line but adopted more colourful and decorative materials’, showing an interest in the new aesthetic possibilities offered by Modernist design. One of the best examples is Clements House, Gresham Street (Trehearne & Norman Preston & Partners, 1954-57; demolished; Fig. 19) where the design expresses the structural frame through its clean geometrical composition, displaying mosaic and abstract patterning within concrete panels. There was a concentration of mid-1950s buildings on Gresham Street built in this restrained Modernist style, now all demolished.

---

96 Bullock, Building, p.255.
98 Bullock, Building, p.258.
99 Bradley and Pevsner, London 1, p.128.
Numerous books and pamphlets relating to the design of office buildings appeared from the mid-1950s, aimed at clients, architects and technicians.\(^{100}\) These publications, alongside articles in the architectural press, communicated office developments in other parts of Europe and America and are characterised by an increasing awareness from the 1960s of what is frequently referred to as the ‘office environment’ (section 2.3).\(^{101}\) Examples of best practice published in Michael Rosenauer’s *Modern Office Buildings* (1955) comprise modern offices broadly in the International style from Europe, Brazil and the United States, alongside UK offices including his own Time-Life Building in Mayfair (1951-53; Grade II*).\(^{102}\) The majority of examples in Jürgen Joedicke’s *Office Buildings* (1962) are American, with some notable European offices including Gio Ponti and Pier Luigi Nervi’s Pirelli Tower in Milan (1957-60; Fig. 20).

The strong influence on British architecture of American architectural culture and business models, symbolising the consumer society that Britain aspired to from the mid-1950s, is well-recognised.\(^{103}\) Alongside regular articles on American architecture, the *Architectural Review* dedicated an entire issue in 1957 to ‘Machine-Made America’.\(^{104}\) Two regular contributors to the AR, who both published independently, were notable promoters of American culture, McCallum and Reyner Banham.\(^{105}\) Particularly influential examples of Modernist American office buildings often pictured and discussed in contemporary office design publications were New York’s Lever House (SOM, chief designer Gordon Bunshaft, 1951-1952; Fig. 21) and Seagram Building (Mies van der

---


\(^{101}\) Better Offices, p.29.


Rohe and Philip Johnson, 1956-1958; Fig. 22).\textsuperscript{106} American styles and building forms were ‘usually interpreted by English Commercial practices rather than copied directly’.\textsuperscript{107}

There were two main approaches to the layout of new development. Most common was infill redevelopment of an existing or gap site, generally following established street lines and building heights of adjacent buildings. However, from the late 1950s a new form of site layout emerged through the amalgamation of separate sites, allowing for more comprehensive redevelopment; this new site layout provided a more innovative approach, encouraged by new planning regulations and the desire for improved working conditions and light provision.\textsuperscript{108} Bucklersbury House, Queen Victoria Street (Owen, Campbell-Jones & Sons, 1953-58; demolished; Fig. 25) was the first such City block, occupying an enormous site close to Mansion House. Its shallow floor widths provided natural light, through a fourteen-storey slab with three projecting six-storey wings. The design was much influenced by the RFAC, who were still troubled by what they saw as overdevelopment when it was approved on appeal by the Minister of Housing and Local Government.\textsuperscript{109} Bradley saw the mix of Portland ashlar and pastel floor bands for the cladding as a ‘compromise between London tradition and the aspiration of advanced modernism’.\textsuperscript{110}

The influence of Lever House can be seen in the slab and podium form at Fountain House, Fenchurch Street (W. H. Rogers with Sir Howard Robertson, 1954-1957; Fig. 23). It was
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commissioned by the CLRP, whose chairman, Edmund Howard, was nominated in 1958 for his part in moving away from the City’s ‘classical jelly mould tradition’.\textsuperscript{111} The podium block hugs the street with a thirteen-storey tower set perpendicular to the street in a satisfying composition with an additional oblique block situated to the rear. Other slab and podium London offices include Castrol House, Marylebone (GMW, 1958-60; Fig. 24).

Larger plots also allowed for the emergence in the 1960s of high-rise towers, seen by Pevsner in 1957 as ‘the C20 substitute for Wren’s steeples’.\textsuperscript{112} Notable examples include the curtain-walled tower blocks lining London Wall (Fig. 11) and Drapers’ Gardens, Throgmorton Avenue (Richard Seifert & Partners with F. Norman James, 1962-1967; demolished; Fig. 26), which rose to 326 feet. The influence of the Ponti and Nervi’s Pirelli Tower (Fig. 20) can be seen in its sculptural convex fronts and indented ends. The solidity expressed in the heavy use of reinforced concrete, is greatly contrasted at the Miesian Commercial Union tower (GMW, 1963-69; Fig. 27), which has a striking simplicity of form. Its twenty-eight storey curtain-walled tower rises, podium-less, to 387 feet. It forms a significant grouping with the same architects’ nearby buildings at 4 and 6-8 Bishopsgate (1974-1981). Other noteworthy towers include the former Britannic House, Ropemaker Street (Joseph, F. Milton Cashmore & Partners with Niall D Nelson, 1964-1967; substantially altered).

The 1960s saw the emergence of what could be called a ‘commercial Modernist’ style, with increasing confidence in the use of modern materials and bold compositions. This is exemplified in two adjacent, strikingly angular blocks, National Westminster House

\textsuperscript{111} ‘Tower Office Block in the City of London’, p.548.
\textsuperscript{112} Pevsner, \textit{London I}, p.110.
(Gordon Charratou of J. Seymour Harris & Partners, 1965-68) and Heron House (E.S. Boyer and Partners 1967-1969), High Holborn (Fig. 28). By the late 1960s, there are instances of an increasingly refined application of clean-lined Modernism, with continuing American influence. Merchant banks keenly adopted the Modernist style, seen at the glass-faced Guinness Mahon, Gracechurch Street (Richard Seifert, 1964-68) and the former Scandinavian Bank at 36-38 Leadenhall Street (YRM, 1970-1973; Fig. 29).113 The latter’s crisply executed flush curtain walling was one of the last flourishes of the Modern Movement within the City.

The enormous NatWest Tower (Richard Seifert & Partners, 1971-1980), at 600 feet Britain’s tallest building for ten years until Pelli’s One Canada Square, Canary Wharf (1988-91), was an exception to the wider 1970s trend away from high-rise construction. Instead the move was towards larger floor plates, enabled by technological advances in servicing, encouraged by an influx of foreign banks and gradually changing business patterns. Up to 1965 office plans had typically been between 35-50 feet in width,114 but demands for large dealing floors and a higher concentration of workers required a much deeper layout. In the City, the first of these deep-plan offices – or ‘groundscraper’ buildings – was Aldgate House, Aldgate High Street (Fitzroy Robinson & Partners, 1971-1796; Fig. 30), built for the Sedgewick Group.115

The 1970s also saw a decline in favour of architectural Modernism, and a more pluralistic approach to the design of office architecture.116 There was an emergence of more expressive and sculptural forms, exemplified in the former Credit Lyonnais bank,

113 Bradley and Pevsner, London 1, p.130.
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115 Ibid., p.417.
Cannon Street (Whinney, Son and Austen Hall, 1973-1977; Grade II; Fig. 31) and in the deep modelling of Fitzroy Robinson & Partners’ former Manufacturers Hanover Trust, Princes Street (1970-1972) and Brown Shipley & Co, Moorgate (1973-1975; Grade II; Fig. 32). The City’s great flourish of High Tech architecture is Lloyd's of London (Richard Rogers Partnership, 1978-86; Grade I; Fig. 33). As Colin Davies explains, High Tech is not necessarily a style, but ‘a branch of industrial technology’, characteristic materials are metal and glass and high priority is placed on flexibility of use. Lloyd's can be seen as an exaggeration of modernist ideas and forms within a celebration of technology, structure and services.

From the 1980s there was a trend towards the heavy use of post-modernist Classicist architectural vocabulary. As Geraint Franklin has observed, ‘bold, idiosyncratic facades were loaded up with over-scaled, polychromatic ornament and allusions to architectural history or symbolism’. The design for offices at 68 Cornhill (Rolfe Judd Group Practice, 1981-1984; Fig. 35) contains multiple historicist references including Hawksmoor, Mackintosh and the Secession. The abstracted Classicism and solidity given by the high ratio of stone to glazed areas reveal a post-modern ideology. Other examples of looser revivalism include numbers 70 and 180-183 Fleet Street (Thomas Saunders & Associates, 1983-96 and 1982-4 respectively). The former’s ‘cartoon-like Ionic capitals’, supporting insincere arches and pediments (Fig. 36), and the latter’s apparent reference to a row of brick gable-fronted houses present a lack of seriousness towards the revival of historicist forms.

118 Franklin, *Late Twentieth-Century Office*, p.7.
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Another important development of the 1980s was the atrium, influenced by the growing presence of large American companies, particularly banks.\textsuperscript{121} Atria often extended to the full height of the building, allowing natural light into internal spaces and creating an impressive visual effect. Examples include the glass atrium at the Lloyds Chambers offices, Mansell Street (Fitzroy Robinson & Partners, 1980-1983), 1 Finsbury Avenue (Peter Foggo of Arup Associates, 1982-84; Grade II; Fig. 37), and the monumental twelve storey barrel vaulted atrium at Rogers’ Lloyd’s of London (Fig. 34), part an enormous single underwriting room.

2.2 MATERIALS

Materials were used in office design to express a sense either of tradition or modernity, and often played an important part in the display of corporate identity, as at Bracken House where the use of pink granite (Fig. 2) was an explicit reference to the paper colour of the Financial Times. While the post-war period saw an influx of industrialised and standardised production of building materials, post-war offices in the City display a tendency towards the use of traditional and natural materials. Brick was used often in conjunction with early Neo-Georgian buildings (Fig. 17) and was later revived in the 1970s and ‘80s alongside more historicist designs, for example at 5 Jewry Street (Biscoe & Stanton, 1979-1982) where brick is employed for a series of full-height bay windows, and 17-21 Godliman Street (Richard Seifert & Partners, 1973-85; Fig. 38). Plain stone cladding, usually in Portland stone, was also used extensively throughout the period, for Classical and Modernist buildings alike (Figs 18, 39 and 40).

\textsuperscript{121} Ibid., p.142; Plender and Wallace, Square Mile, p.29.
The use of more lavish materials, such as polished granite and marble facings, emerged from the 1960s, often in prestigious, custom-designed projects such as Rothschild & Sons offices on St Swithin’s Lane (Fitzroy Robinson & Partners, 1963-1965; demolished). This practice became increasingly popular during the 1970s and ‘80s, and was used on YRM’s former Scandinavian Bank (Fig. 29), as well as for the re-cladding of the former St Bridget’s and Kildare Houses, Tudor Street, undertaken by Renton Howard Wood Levin & Partners in 1984-86 (Fig. 41). In the 1950s contrasting external materials were often used, whereas from the later 1970s the trend moved towards the use of ‘all-over treatments’. This effect could still be achieved using different materials but the effect sought was one of smoothness and unity, for example with the use of flush glass (Fig. 42) and polished marble (Fig. 48).

The occasional use of cavity-filled Portland roach stone (Fig. 43) shows a taste for materials of a rougher texture. Concrete was also sometimes left with its aggregate facing exposed (Fig. 44), and was used for its structural properties and visual effects, for example in Richard Seifert & Partners’ characteristic pre-fabricated Y-shaped supporting piers (Finsbury Pavement, Moorgate, 1971-72 and Faryners House, 25 Monument Street, 1969-71). Other uses of pre-fabrication include the innovative use of glass-fibre reinforced cement at 30 Cannon Street (Fig. 31). From the late 1960s, metal cladding became fashionable, including the use of stainless steel and anodized aluminium (Fig. 45). Other instances of the use of metals, include the steel exoskeleton (Fig. 46) at Bush Lane House, 80 Cannon Street (Arup Associates, 1972-1976) as well as at 1 Finsbury Avenue (Fig. 37) and Lloyd’s of London (Fig. 33).

Curtain walling, imported from the USA, was widely employed in the City from the mid-1950s, an early example being 186-188 Bishopsgate (de Metz & Birks, 1957). As Powers has observed ‘developers, now willing to forego Neo-Classical or Georgian elevations, found that a Miesian wall was not only in line with a new image of Britain as an international economy, but also offered the optimum net to gross space ratio to the developer’. In 1957 the Architectural Review described curtain walling as ‘a common vocabulary of form, pattern and proportion... acceptable to architect, builder, client and public’. It did not discriminate between concrete and steel framing, and could be used between structural members in the form of glazing or in the form of an external wall cladding. Curtain walling was sometimes combined with contrasting metal panels (Fig. 23), examples of this with bronzed panels give a particularly rich finish (Fig. 47).

All-over mirror glass was also used in limited cases, as at PWS Group, Minories (Halpern & Partners, 1971-5; demolished) and Samuel Montagu, 10 Lower Thames Street (Covell, Matthews Wheatley, 1983-1985), preceding its later use by Denys Lasdun at the celebrated Milton Gate, Chiswell Street (1987-91). There are also some examples of reflective blue window glass (Fig. 38), not as widely implemented as the City trend for smoked glass (Fig. 48). Both are illustrative of the extensive development over a few decades of the possibilities in glass from a standardised use of industrial sash or aluminium casement windows in the 1950s.

---
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2.3 NEW TECHNOLOGY, CONSTRUCTION METHODS AND INTERIORS

New construction methods allowed for faster production; in 1959 *The Economist* stated that it took about one and a half to two years to build an office in central London, in contrast to the previous average of three to four years.\(^\text{126}\) By 1962 either reinforced concrete (Fig. 49) or structural steel framing (Fig. 50) were commonly used for office building construction, the move away from load-bearing walls allowing for the ‘principle of flexibility in plan’.\(^\text{127}\) Advances in pre-fabrication and industrialised processes allowed for structural components to be ready-made and assembled on site. Technical advances in construction methods included climbing formwork for concrete structures rising vertically with the building process and the introduction of the tower crane to Britain in 1950.\(^\text{128}\)

Duffy distinguished between the ‘office shell’, the building, which should be designed to ‘leave open many options for many likely users’, and ‘scenery’ or interiors.\(^\text{129}\) It was rare for office interiors to be given distinguished and lasting architectural treatment, although more attention might be paid to public or formal areas, including atriums and board rooms.\(^\text{130}\) As the spatial organisation of post-war office interiors was rooted in management structures, and was regularly subject to organisational change, interiors were often designed with inbuilt flexibility to allow periodic remodelling.

The plan layout of office buildings was often designed on the principle of a dimensional structural grid system, which provided inbuilt flexibility to the planning of internal
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Room dimensions were a multiple of this basic modular form, determined by the width and placement of supporting columns, which could be placed outside or within the thickness of the building’s envelope, or within the office space itself; alternatively structural window mullions could be used to free-up internal space. All of these considerations determined possibilities for either partitioning or opening up internal layouts, and also affected external appearances. Office layouts were usually a combination of cellular offices and open-plan areas, with an increasing need to provide an acceptable humanised ‘office environment’. There was an increasing research undertaken from the 1960s into the design factors impacting on office interiors. The German concept of bürolandshaft, an organic approach to office landscaping in a ‘free rather than a rectilinear geometric way’, was much debated by contemporary commentators, and was influential in the move towards open-plan, creatively-designed office space from the late 1960s.

Advances in technology influenced the fast-moving development of the office interior. Many early post-war offices had simple internal servicing systems, often without air-conditioning. Over the following decades there was an explosion in the office servicing industry, alongside the office boom; this can be seen in the range of advertisements for specialist servicing, including heating and ventilation, lighting and lifts within contemporary publications on office design (Fig. 51). Taller buildings were enabled by
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the increasing availability and affordability of lifts, usually grouped together with stairs in a service core, either located centrally or against an elevation.

While the provision of natural light was valued in the 1950s and ‘60s, also necessary in office buildings that required manual ventilation through the opening of windows, improvements to lighting technology and air conditioning in the 1970s permitted the move to deeper floor-plans. The 1980s heralded the computer revolution and major advances in telecommunications technology. Raised floors to house cable runs were required, increasing the average floor-to-ceiling heights, recommended approximately 10ft in the 1950s and ‘60s to up to 13ft by the 1980s. The fast rate of changing demands for office space accelerated the obsolescence of office buildings, often encouraging redevelopment rather than refurbishment, or out-of-town relocation.

* * *

In conclusion, post-war office architecture in the City was rooted in a unique set of circumstances and influences, and reflects the contemporary character and identity of the City. With notable exceptions, much office architecture produced during the period 1945-85 was of a more restrained, rather than flamboyant, nature, reflecting the City’s largely conservative attitudes. As stated by Plender and Wallace in 1985, ‘nowhere is tradition treated with greater respect, or radicalism with more suspicion, than in the City of London’. The pervading sense of traditionalism was, as we will see in the following section, heavily criticised by contemporary architectural commentators. However,
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broader attitudes, such as the fall in favour of high-rise and Modernism more generally, influenced the development of post-war office architecture, which was largely led by changing commercial taste and client and developers’ preferences.
3. RECEPTION

_Criticism, both favourable and adverse, will continue to be levelled at the present schemes, but it will be history that will ultimately show whether this generation has achieved its objective._142

This quotation, from a catalogue of recent City office projects published by Jones, Lang, Wootton & Sons in 1955, revealed an understanding of the contentious nature of office development. It also showed hope that future generations would come to appreciate post-war office buildings, something that has broadly failed to occur. Notwithstanding contemporary accounts published in the architectural press and specialist architectural publications on office design, relatively little has been written on the history of post-war office buildings.143 This was acknowledged by English Heritage in the thematic listing studies undertaken in 1993-95 and 2013-15 (see section 4.2).144 Also recognised was the fact that post-war office buildings were not well received by their contemporaries, ‘from the time they were finished they were regarded as being architecturally dull, if not mediocre, symbolic of the missed opportunity of post-war rebuilding’.145

3.1 CONTEMPORARY RECEPTION

Architectural commentators took an active interest in the post-war reconstruction of the City. Both the Modern Architecture Research (MARS) Group and the Royal Academy Planning Committee produced plans, the former following a Modernist grid plan and the
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latter a Classical Beaux-Arts inspired layout. In 1945 the *Architectural Review* printed extensive recommendations for reconstruction, with strong emphasis on the City’s function, but also on its connection to the rest of London, indicating a concern about the perceived separation between the Corporation and the LCC. Following the publication of Holden and Holford’s 1947 plan, some concerns were expressed about the system of plot ratios, particularly on smaller sites when the consistent maximum application of a 5:1 plot ratio often resulted in overdevelopment; it was otherwise received well. The City’s architectural output was less well received.

From the 1950s, critics, most notably J.M. Richards, ‘the most influential architectural commentator in [1950s] Britain’, blasted post-war architecture in the City. Richards was particularly critical of the Lessor Schemes, ‘conceived in a spirit of putting cheapness and expediency first’ with ‘no overall planning of sites and no consideration of the overall effect on the architecture of London’. He felt their style represented ‘a return to the taste associated with the kind of pre-war commercial enterprises we thought we have left behind for ever’, noting the lack of government involvement as an ‘inconsistency’ of ‘national control in the public interest allying itself with purely commercial dealings in property’. These sentiments were echoed in 1954 by Sir David Eccles MP, the then Minister of Works, who said in a speech at the Mansion House that ‘unless swift and effective action is taken we shall see fat and familiar, mediocre and characterless Neo-Georgian architecture rising from Hitler’s ruins’.
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The same year, the City was, according to Richards, ‘on the brink of disaster’, condemning recent developments, including T.P. Bennett & Sons’ Atlantic House (Fig. 16) and Richardson’s Bracken House (Figs 1 and 2), as ‘a formidable, and indeed a frightening array’.\(^{153}\) He was concerned both by the conformist use of the Neo-Classical style, ‘culturally sterile and structurally false’, and modern designs, in ‘which strictly architectural values play very little part’.\(^{154}\) Even when limited praise was bestowed on a building that embodied some modernist principles, Owen Campbell Jones & Sons’ Bucklersbury House (Fig.X), ‘a tolerably straightforward and contemporary design’, he still deplored the massing being ‘far too great for the site’, the large scale illustrating that financial considerations came before aesthetics.\(^{155}\)

In a similarly critical, albeit more forward-looking, vein, the MARS Group staged ‘Turn Again’, an exhibition in July 1955 at the Royal Exchange. The intention was to bring public attention to the ‘lowered architecture standards’ of post-war architecture in London, particularly in relation to City office buildings, and to encourage improvements through referencing high quality international examples, including offices from the USA, Brazil and Italy.\(^{156}\) Office architecture was advocated not as utilitarian but as ‘a challenge to create the future out of the present’.\(^{157}\) Unsurprisingly, the possibilities offered by Modernism were extolled as the only way in which the redevelopment of London should be taken forward.\(^{158}\)
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Post-war offices were also criticised by those more attuned to the business world; *The Economist* observed in 1959 that while the public was concerned by the few individuals profiting from a bubble boom, the real objection was that the buildings were:

> so very ugly...Anyone who looks at these buildings, designed either strictly on a Neo-Georgian pattern or – most popular at the moment – in the shape of an up-ended beer crate, cannot fail to be impressed by their unoriginal architecture and apparently out dated construction methods.\(^{159}\)

It is not clear how much architectural criticism filtered through to the wider public consciousness, despite Richards being *The Times*’ architectural correspondent from 1947 to 1971.\(^{160}\) On the other hand, developers were increasingly in the public eye, often ‘cast as the arch villain’ in the context of widespread dissatisfaction with British capitalism.\(^{161}\) Marriott acknowledged that ‘throughout the post-war period developers have been massively abused by politicians, by journalists, by architects and by the public at large’, but felt that criticising property developers for trying to seek maximum profits toward development values was like ‘criticising a giraffe for having a long neck’.\(^{162}\) Resentment extended to commercial architects; Seifert attracted particular attention in the general press and became a household name, largely owing to the scandal surrounding the Centre Point development at St Giles Circus (Richard Seifert & Partners, 1959-1966; Grade II), which was unoccupied for over a decade.\(^{163}\)
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In the early 1970s the office building type ‘became notorious among architects and the general public as a symbol of profligacy and the destruction of our cities’. There was growing public awareness about the damage done to towns and cities as a result of urban regeneration and private development. Perhaps the most significant, and most vocal, challenge to the office development sector was the growth of the conservation lobby. The 1967 Civic Amenities Act introduced Conservation Areas, aimed at protecting wider areas rather than individual buildings and monuments. From 1968, there was a move towards public integration into the planning process, both for individuals and organised interest groups.

Colin Amery and Dan Cruickshank published *The Rape of Britain* in 1975, coinciding with European Architectural Heritage Year. This polemical text set out the considered failures of post-war urban transformation, the evils of developers’ greed, and the ‘grave danger’ Britain was in, faced with the vast scale of demolition in towns and cities across Britain. Amery and Cruickshank noted the polarity between financial interests and the preservation of ‘the city’s traditional scale and character’, observing that as long-term property investment attracted funds from the pension and insurance market, ‘a dangerous field for unwary politicians to tamper with… As always it must be the client that calls the tune and Britain’s new breed of patrons have eyes only for their bank statements’. Their sentiments were echoed in a study, *Save the City*, carried out the following year by national amenity societies. Concern was directed towards the preceding post-war period of rebuilding and redevelopment, which had largely

---

164 Duffy, Cave and Worthington, *Office Space*, p.vi.
167 Ibid., pp.12,128.
destroyed the established ‘historic street pattern’, and inserted substantial traffic routes through the City, including London Wall, of which it was recommended ‘there should be no further extension’. Post-war architecture was not wholly dismissed, with a dedicated chapter by Pevsner; its comparatively short length indicates its problematic position within the study.

Conservation issues were increasingly discussed in Parliament. In 1976 Patrick Cormack MP, chair of the Heritage Parliamentary Committee, published *Heritage in Danger*. Cormack noted the ‘total transformation of the London scene and skyline’, criticising the City’s comprehensive development as well as the lack of ‘inspired’ architects. He lamented the ‘total destruction of the scale of intimacy which had marked the old city’, concluding that ‘hardly a building erected in the City since the War deserves more than a passing glance, nor is it likely that many will be regarded with affection by future generations’.

SAVE Britain’s Heritage’s 1983 publication, *From Splendour to Banality*, showed a renewed venom towards post-war City redevelopment, more actively critical of modern architecture than *Save the City* had been a decade before. Contrasting images of demolished buildings were set against their modern replacements (Fig. 52), and a map showed the extent of ‘total demolition and rebuilding that has taken place since the war’ (Fig. 53). By 1984 even the Corporation admitted that ‘there has been a danger of losing
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its [the City's] unique identity, by the very extent and volume of the post-war building boom'.\textsuperscript{174}

The circulation of specialist conservation and architecture studies is likely to have been limited to interested individuals. However, one way in which the tensions of private development and the public interest were brought to wider attention was through several public inquiries for major developments proposed in central London. These included the 1959 inquiry into Jack Cotton’s development of the Monico site at Piccadilly Circus and that for Lord Palumbo’s site at No.1 Poultry, which was not developed until the 1990s.\textsuperscript{175}

3.2 SCHOLARSHIP

In 1957 Pevsner wrote of the City that ‘what is going up now is mostly not promising’; in 1962 he was concerned about the extent of Neo-Classicism, but had a glimmer of excitement for a ‘small minority...[where] at long last the style of the C20 is accepted’.\textsuperscript{176} In 1973 the proliferation of towers was generally criticised, but the Commercial Union and P&O Towers were singled out as ‘the finest group of buildings...patently inspired by Mies van der Rohe, nor do its qualities seem to me inferior to Mies’s own buildings’.\textsuperscript{177}

Seminal academic texts relating to English post-war architecture include studies by Nicholas Bullock, John Gold and Alan Powers, all of which focus on the diffusion of modern architecture and approach the subject in different ways. Bullock’s study, limited to the first post-war decade, has a dual focus of considering avant-garde debates

\textsuperscript{175} Marriott, Property Boom, p.143.
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surrounding post-war reconstruction led by key architectural figures and organisations (part 1) as well as the practice of rebuilding and its relationship with the dissemination of modernist ideas (part 2). As office architecture received only limited, if critical, reception in the architectural press, it is therefore not covered in part 1. Part 2 covers housing, schools and public sector commissions, dedicating a final chapter to ‘the revival of private and commercial practice’ in the City of London, Coventry and Bristol. Within this structure, the discussion of commercial architecture reads as an addendum to the book’s wider focus on welfare state architecture, and could be read as an hierarchical attitude towards the different building typologies, with the commercial arena placed backstage. Bullock recognises that ‘bright new commercial developments in city centres’, alongside housing estates, were an ‘obvious image of change’, but does not make any reference to commercial output in his list of the achievements of post-war reconstruction, limited to housing, schools and technical advances, implemented within a coherent planning system.\(^{178}\) He also acknowledges that there was some appropriation in early 1950s commercial architecture of modernist forms, but states that ‘much of what was built was of uneven quality’.\(^{179}\) In relation to the City Bullock criticised the ‘dismal architectural standard’, but notes the ‘growing popularity of a simplified, if crude, modernism’, suggesting this shift was due to clients’ attitudes, and the fact that this approach was cheaper and quicker, rather than reflecting any higher moral principles.\(^{180}\)

Gold, covering the later and broader time period of 1954-72, focuses principally on the practice of modern architecture, through an analysis of architectural practice and urban redevelopment. The distribution and associations of architects working in the public and

\(^{179}\) Ibid., p.245
\(^{180}\) Ibid., pp.255-258.
private sectors are discussed at length, as is the concept of urban renewal. Commercial development is considered largely in terms of city-centre reconstruction, with a focus on public-private partnerships. In contrast, Powers gives a more open-minded commentary, exploring British ideas and motivation behind twentieth-century modern architecture, as well as its reception. Compared to Bullock and Gold, Powers has a looser interpretation and definition of Modernism, and the discussion of commercial architecture reads with less of an agenda. He appears unprejudiced by contemporary criticism and even has praise for more ‘creative’ office designs including John Madin’s Post and Mail Building, Birmingham (1962-5; demolished) and the Co-operative Insurance Tower, Manchester (Gordon Tait, 1959-62; Grade II). Elain Harwood recognised that ‘most commercial architecture is of a transitory nature’, but praised the vitality of that produced in the 1960s, ‘it sparkled with much that was most vibrant about the period’, as well as the sophistication of High Tech architecture – ‘buildings as striking as their American counterparts’ – produced by Team 4, Arup Associates, YRM and Ryder & Yates.

Bullock, Gold and Powers give explicit, if limited, attention to the moral distinction between ‘design-led’ firms and commercial practices, of which Gold and Bullock are particularly scathing, the latter writing of commercial firms’ ‘ability to pack a site with the maximum permissible floor space and their willingness to overlook architectural niceties’. Gold does not question the contemporary attitude towards commercial architects as ‘professionally below the salt’ and limits his discussion to the work of Cecil
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Elsom & Partners and Richard Seifert & Partners, quoting the latter as claiming to have designed 700-800 offices in the City, a vastly inflated figure compared to the number listed in the Buildings of England (see Table 2).\(^\text{185}\) Bullock acknowledged that GMW exploited modernist forms with ‘more directness and clarity’, and Powers goes as far as to say they were ‘among the artistically esteemed who showed that ‘good modern architecture’ was not incompatible with developers’ values’.\(^\text{186}\) But on the whole, office architecture is seen as something to be discussed separately from other, more virtuous, areas of post-war reconstruction, perhaps so as to not muddy the water.

Coming from a slightly different perspective, Murray Fraser discusses 1950s and ‘60s British office architecture in the context of the American influence. He is particularly critical of the Lessor Schemes, ‘lumpy blocks of building mass enlivened by nothing’, seeing the early 1950s resistance to American commercial influence as perpetrated by those who favoured European Modernism.\(^\text{187}\) The adoption of ‘corporate Modernism’ in the late 1950s is seen to be directly influenced by America, the shift linked to wider social change in attitudes to American culture ushered in by growing economic prosperity. Alongside criticism for individual buildings, including Bucklersbury House (‘lumpen’), Fountain House (‘dull’), and London Wall (‘an elephant graveyard of monoliths’),\(^\text{188}\) feeble praise is given towards the City’s skyline, grouped with Croydon in south London as the only places where the visual impression ‘remotely matched US cities’.\(^\text{189}\) Given the vast differences in the sense of scale it is hardly possible for British cities to ape American trends in commercial architecture. This discrepancy is used in
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contemporary criticism to convey a sense of inferiority to the United States, as well as to other European cities, branding Britain as behind-the-times.\textsuperscript{190}

Academic architectural history journals have tended to pay little attention to post-war offices. *Twentieth Century Architecture* has dedicated several volumes to housing, churches and university buildings, although it is intended for a future volume to focus on offices. Harwood has written for the journal on office architecture, focusing on the rebuilding of provincial city centres such as Manchester and Birmingham, or out-of-town prestige headquarters buildings.\textsuperscript{191} Similarly, the only article relating to post-war office architecture in *Architectural History* was Jessica Holland and Iain Jackson’s 2013 article on Maxwell Fry and Jane Drew’s prestige headquarters for the unusually artistically-enlightened patrons, the Pilkington Brothers’ Glassworks in St Helens, which included extensive use of contemporary artwork as part of a wider humanising of the essentially industrial site.\textsuperscript{192}

### 3.3 CURRENT PERCEPTIONS

It seems logical that contemporary architectural commentators and later historians do not place great value on office architecture – a vivid symbol of capitalism difficult to equate with the essentially socialist values of the Modern Movement. It is apparent that the commerciality of these buildings was often a focus for disparagement, implying that they lacked moral or social purpose.\textsuperscript{193} Marriott suggested that ‘what irked the critics most was the size of the developers’ profit’, but acknowledged that the office boom did,
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in fact, produce some public benefits, through ‘improving working conditions for at least part of the population’ or through indirect profits from public or private investments.¹⁹⁴

A discernible growth of public interest in post-war architecture can be quantified through the growing membership of the C20 Society and interest in iconic structures like The Barbican, which runs popular daily architecture tours. There is also growing interest in commercial architects, such as John Madin and Richard Seifert & Partners (the focus of much past criticism),¹⁹⁵ the latter being largely down to the senior partner, George Marsh, who designed Drapers’ Gardens (demolished; Fig. 26), as well as Space House, Westminster (1964-68), Centre Point, Camden (1961-66), and the Alpha Tower, Birmingham (1970-72), all of which are Grade II listed. With period television dramas extending their scope to the post-war period, offices are providing idealised sets for popular programmes such as HBO’s _Mad Men_ and the BBC Cold-War spy thriller series, _The Game_.¹⁹⁶ It is, perhaps, revealing that the latter chose to use Madin’s Birmingham Central Library (1974) for exterior shots, despite the extensive availability of more authentic offices within central London, where the drama is set.

However, it is probably fair to say that post-war office buildings, with some notable exceptions, are viewed with aversion by the public at large. In 1992 Richard MacCormac noted the ‘pejorative way’ in which the term ‘office block’ is generally referred to, observing that ‘it says something about the values of our society, that it is unable to

¹⁹⁴ Ibid., pp.9-11.
apportion significance to the office as architecture because perhaps it conjures no feelings of faith, community, pleasure or awe, and it is a revealing insight into our ideas about cities, about work and private interest writ large.\textsuperscript{197} MacCormac alludes to the fact that the association with employment, as opposed to leisure, religion or community, is at the root of public ambivalence. The fact that the commercial office has only existed as a building typology since the nineteenth century may also be partly why it is not necessarily easy to think of offices as 'historic'.\textsuperscript{198} Furthermore, the Modern Movement occupies an uncomfortable position in relation to the emergence of the conservation movement, due to the widespread demolition of Georgian and Victorian architecture to make way for urban renewal.

The conservation movement embodies much deep-rooted emotion, something that post-war office buildings do not tend to inspire in most people. Andrew Saint makes reference to importance of emotional appeal to any conservation philosophy, stating that without it a building can have 'no creative future'.\textsuperscript{199} In 2015 a feature in The Independent asked 'what do offices mean to us? They're anonymous, private, policed spaces. We ignore the ones we walk past, because they put up plate glass and security barriers, and we endure those that we work inside'.\textsuperscript{200} It is this perception of mundane utilitarianism that appears to be a barrier to appreciation, and, as will be explored in section 4, conservation. As Edwin Heathcote wrote, 'the modern office is, perhaps, too close to the drudgery of everyday existence to thrill, and too familiar to seem like heritage'.\textsuperscript{201}

\textsuperscript{198} Ibid., pp.79-81.
4. CONSERVATION AND MANAGEMENT

Post-war office buildings are inherently vulnerable because of changing user requirements, relatively short design lives and commercial pressures. The latter is particularly deep-rooted within the City, reflected in the current CLC Local Plan Strategic Policies, the first of which is to 'maintain the City's position as the world’s leading international financial and business centre'.

Peter Rees, former Chief Planner (1985-2014) at the CLC, summed up his attitudes towards more recent architecture in the City: 'I always thought of the City as a vegetable patch...You cultivate each specimen, then harvest it and move on'.

Although largely outside the scope of the present study, two recent listing cases, both put forward by the C20 Society, nonetheless reveal the polarity between conservation and business interests in relation to City office buildings. Designed by Peter Foggo of Arup Associates, Broadgate, architecturally the 'most significance commercial development in London of the post-war period', was threatened in 2011 with partial demolition for a new headquarters building for UBS Bank. The CLC planning committee approved the scheme but, before work commenced, English Heritage recommended Grade II* listing.

Stuart Fraser, the CLC’s policy chairman said that while Broadgate ‘embodied the newfound dynamism of the Square Mile post-Big Bang’, listing ‘would damage the City’s reputation as a leading global financial centre’. This was echoed in a public statement.
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made by the developers, British Land, which stated that the listing ‘would send out a message to the world that London is not ‘open for business’, undermining the City’s status as a global business centre’. Following extensive lobbying from British Land and the CLC the then Culture Secretary, Jeremy Hunt, rejected the listing, and 4 and 6 Broadgate were subsequently demolished.

Another post-war office was recommended for Grade II* listing in 2015, the Western Morning News building, Plymouth (Nicholas Grimshaw, 1993), celebrated for its iconic ‘ship-like’ appearance and innovative internal layout. Although the application was again made in reaction to its proposed demolition, its listing on 22 July 2015 was not met with any major commercial objections, and a local developer has bought the building and is reported to welcome its protection. Given the out-of-town location, the Western Morning News building is not likely to be subject to anything like the intensity of the commercial pressures that are seen within central London and particularly the City. The Broadgate case shows that, even when outstanding architectural and historic significance is recognised, sometimes commercial pressures wield more power.

4.1 CURRENT TRENDS

Table 3 records that over half of post-war City office buildings have been demolished or substantially altered, with a higher concentration of proportional loss or substantial alterations for buildings constructed pre-1965. In 1997 Bradley recorded that over a quarter of post-war City buildings mentioned in the 1973 edition of London 1 were no
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more; in 2006 this figure had risen to nearly half,\(^{209}\) including many offices that had previously been singled out for praise including Clements House (Fig. 19), Drapers’ Gardens (Fig. 26) – demolished to repair views of St Pauls – and Moscow Narodny, King William Street (Knapton, Deane & Thompson, 1961-63).\(^{210}\) Those that have survived have largely done so fortuitously.

**Table 3**: Distribution of post-war office buildings that have been demolished or substantially altered within the City of London, showing how this is spread across buildings of different ages (data based on Appendix 1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year Range</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Demolished or Substantially Altered</th>
<th>Existing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1945-55</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>28 (54%)</td>
<td>24 (46%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1956-65</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>84 (74%)</td>
<td>30 (26%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966-75</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>43 (47%)</td>
<td>49 (53%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976-85</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>23 (26%)</td>
<td>64 (74%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>345</strong></td>
<td><strong>178 (52%)</strong></td>
<td><strong>167 (48%)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The increasing attrition rate is particularly high in the City compared to the rest of London and the country. As Simon Bradley has observed: ‘to the banks, pension funds and real estate companies who actually own them, these buildings are not worth keeping once they have earned a good return on capital outlay. Once their rental value is less than the redevelopment potential of the site, it is time to call in the demolition men’\(^ {211}\) The pressures of the late 1980s resulted in the rebuilding or refurbishment of approximately one third of the City’s offices.\(^ {212}\) Unsurprisingly, the City’s top priority was, as today, to maintain its high financial and business standing, particularly in the face of intense competition from Canary Wharf from the mid-1980s. In the high stakes of this arena, conservation plays little part and the widespread demolition has not attracted much
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attention. This is hardly surprising given the prevalent negative attitudes and indifference to post-war office buildings (see section 3). Bradley suggests another reason for this could be that ‘regular clearances of failed housing estates have accustomed people to the idea that 1950s and ’60s buildings were never really meant to last’.

The importance of corporate image and commercial desirability should not be underestimated. Faced with the demand for larger areas of ‘Grade A’ office space, it is not surprising that older post-war offices – often short-let, lower-cost accommodation – are being rapidly demolished. Even exceptional prestige headquarters buildings become obsolete in the cycle of demand; notable examples are the 1980s demolition of Lloyd’s of London, Lime Street (Sir Terence Heysham, 1950-57) and the more recent demolition of the former Rothschild’s building, St Swithin’s Lane (Fitzroy Robinson & Partners, 1963-65).

What of the many office buildings that have not yet been demolished? As discussed in section 2.3, there are inherent problems with the adaptability of office buildings, given shifting user requirements and technological advances. The problems of inadequate floor-ceiling heights in older office buildings can seriously affect the usability of an office space. However, as Jeff Parkes has indicated, advances in services engineering are finding ways around these problems. As Chris Rogers has observed, ‘wireless working is rapidly removing the need for deep floors... [making] old buildings more adaptable and thus more saveable’.

---

Another issue relating to longevity of office buildings is the lifespan of some modern building materials; the failing of metal and curtain walling cladding systems are often responsible for the re-cladding of buildings. This can also be the result of a desired change in aesthetic, and some re-cladding projects can leave the original building unrecognisable. With changing tastes, there is a current trend for the removal of unpopular, yet characteristic, smoked and reflective glass windows (see section 2.2) and replacement with clear glass.

There are many examples where office buildings have been successfully re-used, either updated for modern office use, as at Cheapside House, Cheapside (Theo H. Birks, 1958-59), or through a change of use. Residential conversions are more common in office buildings outside the City, as the process is against CLC policy. Successful examples include the conversions of Castrol House (Fig. 24) and the Rotunda, Birmingham (James Roberts, 1960-65; Grade II) to flats in 1998 and 2004-08 respectively. For unlisted offices residential conversion was made even more straightforward with the 2012 legislation allowing for the residential conversion of office space under Permitted Development, from which the City has exemption.\(^{216}\) Within the City, hotel conversions are occasionally permitted; examples include the Premier Inn in former offices on Tudor Street (Trehearne & Norman Preston & Partners, 1950-1957, remodelled by Renton Howard Wood Levin & Partners, 1984-6) and the conversion of Roman House, Wood Street (Owen Cambell Jones & Sons, 1957-58) to serviced apartments in 2014.\(^ {217}\) Conversions sometimes involve major transformations in appearance, as at Roman House (Figs 54A and 54B) and the Rotunda, where, although the key characteristics of


\(^{217}\) Premier Inn has, on several occasions, converted redundant office space to hotels, including at Montrose House, Glasgow (1951-53, Stewart Sim; Grade B).
the simple cylindrical tower, base podium and horizontal banding on the façade were
maintained, the building was completely re-clad.218

English Heritage has recognised that commercial buildings are inherently subject to high
levels of change.219 This is often due to commercial pressures and the requirements for
material replacement. In some cases this can even be welcomed, as with Hopkins’
‘creative adaptation’ of Bracken House that is considered to contribute towards the
building’s significance (see section 4.3). This raises philosophical challenges relating to
conservation. What might be termed ‘traditional conservation philosophy’, principles of
material authenticity and minimal intervention set out in the 1964 Venice Charter and
particularly championed by the Society for the Protection of Ancient Buildings, cannot
necessarily be applied to commercial buildings, particularly those constructed with
modern methods and materials. The debate is not, then, about whether office buildings
should be allowed to change, but rather what is an acceptable level of change and in what
manner is it undertaken.

The fact that most office buildings will have been subjected to various alterations is
relevant to the management of post-war office architecture, but also to the decision-
making process relating to statutory listing. In the early 1990s the Commercial Union
Tower (Fig. 27), widely acclaimed as a distinguished example of the Miesian idiom in
Britain,220 was recommended for listing at Grade II*. It was rejected based on the
outcome of its re-cladding (see Section 4.2), thus the level of alteration was considered to
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220 50 Years of London Architecture: 1960-2010, Catalogue of an exhibition held by the Architecture Club at the Mall
be too great for this building, to qualify for heritage protection. It is also located on a site with particularly strong commercial interests. The building is currently subject to a COI and is threatened with demolition. It is generally accepted that in order to qualify for listing, a building needs to not have been subject to substantial alteration. However, as this practice is common with commercial offices, the hard-line approach to listing appears to be at odds with the more relaxed attitude to management of change.

4.2 STATUTORY DESIGNATION

Most post-war office buildings in the City have not been considered to be of sufficient special interest to warrant statutory listing. The City does not operate a system of local listing and the majority of office buildings constructed 1945-1985 are not subject to any form of heritage protection.

Post-war buildings currently equate to only 0.2 percent of listed buildings in England, with offices accounting for just under 5 percent of that figure (see Appendix 3). The English Heritage brochure *Something Worth Keeping* outlines that in 1991 Lady Blatch, the then Minister for Heritage, requested English Heritage to undertake detailed research to inform a thematic listing project for post-war buildings lead by Diane Kay, dealing first with housing and higher education buildings, followed from 1993 by commercial and industrial buildings. The Historic England Historians’ Files reveal that the potential listing of post-war buildings was being assessed from 1987, when a report recommended the listing of five offices in London (see Appendix 4). In the City this only

---


included Bracken House (listed that year at Grade II*; Figs 1 and 2), although twelve other buildings were shortlisted, including Atlantic, Bucklersbury and Fountain Houses (Figs 16, 23 and 25). Papers produced for the Post-War Steering Group (Appendix 5) as part of the thematic survey show that by September 1993 nearly thirty, mainly custom-built, offices across England were being considered for listing.\(^{224}\) Within the City this involved the YRM offices in Greystoke Place (1961) and the Drapers’ Gardens (Fig. 26) being recommended for listing at Grade II, with the Commercial Union Tower (Fig. 27), damaged by IRA bomb blasts, recommended as potentially Grade II*, subject to the outcome of re-cladding (see above). Thirteen offices were subsequently listed by the Minister in 1995, the only one in the City being the YRM offices. Because of the often reactive nature of listing, several offices in London and the rest of England were considered as individual cases separate from surveys (dates of listing are given in Appendix 6).

A second thematic listing survey of commercial offices, carried out in 2013-2015, covered the later period of 1964-1984. The C20 Society and the CLC were, among others, involved in the consultation process, the former invited to submit a list of suggested additions to the statutory list. The long initial list was reduced to a ‘sift list’, presented to the steering board. Full assessments were undertaken of all buildings included on the sift list, and all final recommendations put forward to the Minister were unanimously accepted, almost all examples of custom-built or headquarters buildings rather than speculative development. The project resulted in the listing of three additional post-war offices within the City, with as many that were fully assessed not making the final list of

\(^{224}\) The Post-War Steering Group, chaired by Bridget Cherry, provided project governance and determined the final list of recommendations submitted for determination by the Minister of the Department of National Heritage.

In recognition of the impact that statutory listing can have on the development interests of a site, a Certificate of Immunity from Listing can be applied for, lasting for a period of five years. There are several active COIs relating to City office buildings (see Appendix 1), most notably at the Commercial Union Tower, excluding it from the 2013-2015 listing survey. The COI legislation changed in June 2013, following the Enterprise and Regulatory Reform (ERR) Act, allowing for applications to be made at any time instead of in relation to a planning application.\(^{225}\)

Another measure brought in with the ERR Act was the provision for listing entries to exclude elements that lack special interest. This followed a process undertaken in 2012-2013 where English Heritage amended twenty-eight list entries for commercial post-war buildings, including that for Bracken House and the former YRM Offices, to explain better the focus of special interest through more detailed descriptions.\(^{226}\) While no doubt welcomed by owners, particularly those with commercial interests, defining list entries in too rigid a manner is problematic. Conclusions are unavoidably made within our contemporary mind-set and do not allow for future shifts of opinion, the danger being that excluded elements could later be considered significant.

The decision taken in the recent thematic survey not to re-assess the period 1945-1965 is questionable, especially in light of wider changing attitudes towards post-war architecture. There could be buildings initially overlooked or that would benefit from re-assessment; Bracken House and the YRM offices can hardly be seen to represent 1950s and ‘60s City office architecture. English Heritage was keen to emphasise during both thematic listing projects that they were ‘selecting the very best’, the most significant, rather than 'getting one of each'; the selection is not meant to be representative.

4.3 SIGNIFICANCE

_The significance of a place embraces all the diverse cultural and natural heritage values that people associate with it, or which prompt them to respond to it. These values tend to grow in strength and complexity over time, as understanding deepens and people’s perceptions of a place evolve._

Office buildings can reveal much about changes to society, working environments and market factors affecting property, as well as advances in design, materials, technology and construction methods. The City’s post-war office buildings embody a range of heritage values, the sum of which constitutes their significance. They are an important record of England’s commercial and socio-economic history and can have associational value either with notable individuals or organisations. Despite post-war office interiors rarely surviving, the form and layout of offices can be illustrative of working practices and organisational management structures, for example the emergence of deep-plan
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228 Roger Bowdler, English Heritage Designation Director, quoted in Wainwright, ‘Power to the post-war’.

'groundscraper' buildings was prompted by a desire for wide, unobstructed dealing floors. Office development can also reveal advances in technology, either through the modernisation of servicing or through technical advances, such as the computer revolution. In aesthetic terms offices can embody design value in their form, proportions, massing, the inventive or characteristic use of materials, high standard of detailing and craftsmanship. Artistic value is sometimes added through the use of incorporated associated artwork.

In the City five out of six statutorily listed offices were custom-designed offices for specific clients, representative of the wider trend of listing custom-designed offices ahead of speculative development, seen to be of lesser significance. The considered significance of these buildings, as set out in their statutory listing descriptions (see Appendix 7), is summarised below, in order to consider aspects of post-war office architecture that are particularly valued.

Bracken House (Figs 1 and 2) is an unusual case given the value ascribed to both Richardson's original work as well the remodelling carried out by Michael Hopkins in the late 1980s. It is of architectural interest, as a late example of modern Classicism designed by an eminent architect, enhanced by the later High Tech design interventions. It has historic significance as a former headquarters of the *Financial Times*, showing the former prominence of the newspaper industry within the City. Historic significance is also ascribed to the later insertion of an atrium and central lifts. The use of opulent and referential materials, and the high level of detail and finish also contribute towards its significance. The quality of execution and use of materials are also valued at the former
YRM offices at Greystoke Place, listed due to its association with eminent post-war architects and sensitive integration of the building within the historic setting.

The Lloyd's building (Figs 33 and 34) stands out as 'one of the best known and admired modern commercial buildings in the country', valued for its architectural innovation, 'timelessness', flexibility and robustness of design. Innovation is also valued at 30 Cannon Street (Fig. 31), which was the first building in the world to be fully clad in glass-fibre reinforced cement. The sculptural qualities of its 'splayed plan, canted profile and high relief modelling' are also acclaimed. Similarly, the use of opulent materials, including bronze and polished granite, to add grandeur to the deeply modelled facade of Brown Shipley & Co, Moorgate (Fig. 32) is valued, considered to combine a 'rational monumentality with a humane scale'. Lastly, 1 Finsbury Avenue (Fig. 37) is seen to herald a new phase of speculative office development in the City, of planning interest as the first phase of the Broadgate complex (see above). The quality of the form, structure and steel-frame and bronzed anodised curtain walling aesthetic are admired, as is the rigour of the inbuilt internal flexibility and energy efficiency properties.

These six buildings are highly individual, sumptuous designs. With the exception of 30 Cannon Street, all list descriptions emphasise the eminence of the architect. Other common values include technical innovation and use of high quality materials. The artistic interest of John Poole's sculpted bronze doors and window screens at Brown Shipley & Co (Fig. 55) is also valued. Historic interest is noted at Bracken House and Lloyd's, relating to the individual commissioning companies.

* * *
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In summary, there is a wide range of values that can be embodied within post-war office architecture. While some of these values have been recognised through statutory listing, the significance of the wider social and economic history of the massive expansion of post-war office space in the City, embodied within the array of speculative office commissions during this period, does not appear to be considered of historic significance. As we have seen, there is currently no desire to statutorily list post-war office architecture on a representational basis. While it is possible that values embodied within office architecture will grow and deepen over time, the fast rate of loss may result in there being little speculative office development to conserve. As a result, the designation of many custom-designed offices will potentially present a selective history, recording the showy and unusual, risking a selective, potentially elitist, record of this important period in Britain's commercial and economic history.
CONCLUSION

This dissertation has sought to shed some light on the architectural history of post-war office buildings within the City of London. It has shown that there was considerable development over a forty-year period, in terms of architectural forms, style and the use of materials, but also in the nature of office accommodation provided for users, including substantial advances in technology and servicing. Prestige, corporate identity and usability are at the heart of much office design, due to its principal business function. This can be based on location, choice of architect and design factors. Even more unassumingly designed office buildings aspire to prestige through their names, for example Chatsworth House, Houndsditch (North & Partners, 1972-80). Office buildings were often not designed to fit into their context; due to their very nature they often jostle for attention and are frequently built out to the maximum extent that a site can take. These issues reveal the divergence between the office as architecture and as a financial investment, a paradox that underlies the process of recognition, and inevitably affects the way in which conservation of office buildings is considered.

A comprehensive assessment has not yet been undertaken, apart from the research carried out by English Heritage to inform thematic listing projects. While office development has been discussed by both contemporary critics and later scholars, neither can be seen as objective. For most post-war office buildings in the City, there is little reference material beyond the opinions put forward in editions of the Buildings of England. Due to the fast-moving nature of redevelopment within the City, it seems likely that the majority of office buildings constructed during the period 1945-85, with some
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230 Franklin, Late Twentieth-Century Office.
notable exceptions, will be demolished in due course ahead of a comprehensive study of office architecture.

In 2006 Bradley offered the following opinion in reference to these issues:

*Does it matter? Perhaps, not that much...many of these buildings were dreadful architecturally, disastrous in terms of townscape (or urbanism, as we would say today), and not even especially good to work in. And the most remarkable themes in British architecture during the period lie elsewhere...A handful of superior examples are now protected by listing...So it should still be possible in fifty years' time to get some sense of the best work of the period.*

231

This view, although widely held, should be challenged. It is regrettable for only the ‘superior’ examples to be allowed a chance of survival until a possible future change of attitude. As speculatively developed offices are under-represented on the statutory list it is not likely that this significant part of the City’s socio-economic history will be preserved for interpretation by future generations. Whilst the needs of a rapidly changing economy present an obvious challenge, this dissertation argues that the matter should not rest there. It is also strongly recommended that a comprehensive, multi-disciplinary review of the generality of post-war City office building, going beyond the few listed examples, be undertaken before it is too late, to enable a proper assessment of potential architectural and historical significance to be made.

---
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APPENDIX 1

Table of commercial offices in the City of London started between 1945-1985, sourced from Pevsner, London 1, 1973 and Bradley and Pevsner, London 1, 1997. This catalogue does not include conversion, refurbishment, reconstruction of or extension to pre-war buildings, or rebuilt structures behind retained facades.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building name</th>
<th>Street</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Date Started</th>
<th>Date Completed</th>
<th>Architect</th>
<th>Demolished (D), Substantially Altered (A), Existing (E) or Threatened (T)</th>
<th>Listed (I,II*,II) or Certificate of Immunity (COI)</th>
<th>Photos by author, July 2015 (unless otherwise specified)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aldermanbury House</td>
<td>Aldermanbury</td>
<td></td>
<td>1959</td>
<td>1959</td>
<td>Montague Evan &amp; Son</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aldermanbury</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1964</td>
<td>1964</td>
<td>T. P. Bennett &amp; Son</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.1 Love Lane</td>
<td>Aldermanbury</td>
<td></td>
<td>1967</td>
<td>1969</td>
<td>Knapton, Deane &amp; Thompson</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dallas House</td>
<td>Aldermanbury</td>
<td></td>
<td>1970</td>
<td>1971</td>
<td>Whinney, Son and Austen Hall</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ivanhoe House</td>
<td>Aldersgate</td>
<td></td>
<td>1958</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>Howell &amp; Brooks</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Former London Salvage Corps</td>
<td>Aldersgate</td>
<td></td>
<td>1958</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>Howell &amp; Brooks</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aldersgate Street</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1984</td>
<td>1986</td>
<td>Green, Lloyd &amp; Adams (B. L. Adams)</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Navigation House</td>
<td>Aldgate</td>
<td></td>
<td>1957</td>
<td>1957</td>
<td>Theo H. Birks</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building name</td>
<td>Street</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Date Started</td>
<td>Date Completed</td>
<td>Architect</td>
<td>Demolished (D), Substantially Altered (A), Existing (E) or Threatened (T)</td>
<td>Listed (I,II*,II) or Certificate of Immunity (COI)</td>
<td>Photos by author, July 2015 (unless otherwise specified)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aldgate House</td>
<td>Aldgate High Street</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1971</td>
<td>1976</td>
<td>Fitzroy Robinson &amp; Partners</td>
<td>A (reclad c.1996)</td>
<td>(see Fig. 30)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Former Eagle Star</td>
<td>Aldgate High Street</td>
<td>1972</td>
<td>1977</td>
<td></td>
<td>C.W. Kempton &amp; Partners</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minster House</td>
<td>Arthur Street</td>
<td>1954</td>
<td>1957</td>
<td></td>
<td>Trehearne &amp; Norman Preston &amp; Partners</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Augustine House</td>
<td>Austin Friars</td>
<td>1957</td>
<td>1957</td>
<td></td>
<td>Arthur Bailey</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basinghall Street</td>
<td>35-36</td>
<td>1958</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td></td>
<td>Messrs Joseph</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woolgate House</td>
<td>Basinghall Street</td>
<td>1963</td>
<td>1968</td>
<td></td>
<td>C. Lovett Gill &amp; Partners</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murray House</td>
<td>Beech Street</td>
<td>1958</td>
<td>1958</td>
<td></td>
<td>Frank Scarlett</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building name</td>
<td>Street</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Date Started</td>
<td>Date Completed</td>
<td>Architect</td>
<td>Demolished (D), Substantially Altered (A), Existing (E) or Threatened (T)</td>
<td>Listed (I,II*,II) or Certificate of Immunity (COI)</td>
<td>Photos by author, July 2015 (unless otherwise specified)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biiba House</td>
<td>Bevis Marks</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1980</td>
<td>1984</td>
<td>Lister, Drew &amp; Associates</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td><img src="image1.png" alt="Biiba House Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bevis Marks House</td>
<td>Bevis Marks</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1983</td>
<td>1984</td>
<td>Ivan Starkin</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td><img src="image2.png" alt="Bevis Marks House Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building name</td>
<td>Street</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Date Started</td>
<td>Date Completed</td>
<td>Architect</td>
<td>Demolished (D), Substantially Altered (A), Existing (E) or Threatened (T)</td>
<td>Listed (I,II*,II) or Certificate of Immunity (COI)</td>
<td>Photos by author, July 2015 (unless otherwise specified)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absalon House</td>
<td>Billiter Street</td>
<td>1975</td>
<td>1978</td>
<td>C. A. Cornish &amp; Associates</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bishopsgate</td>
<td>186-188</td>
<td>1957</td>
<td>1957</td>
<td>de Metz &amp; Birks</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provident House</td>
<td>Bishopsgate</td>
<td>1966</td>
<td>1970</td>
<td>Knapton, Deane &amp; Thompson</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bishopsgate House</td>
<td>Bishopsgate</td>
<td>106-126</td>
<td>1971</td>
<td>1975</td>
<td>Ley, Colbeck &amp; Partners</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bishopsgate</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>1971</td>
<td>1975</td>
<td>Fitzroy Robinson &amp; Partners</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building name</td>
<td>Street</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Date Started</td>
<td>Date Completed</td>
<td>Architect</td>
<td>Demolished (D), Substantially Altered (A), Existing (E) or Threatened (T)</td>
<td>Listed (I,II*,II) or Certificate of Immunity (COI)</td>
<td>Photos by author, July 2015 (unless otherwise specified)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formerly Credit Suisse</td>
<td>Bishopsgate</td>
<td>22-24</td>
<td>1974</td>
<td>1978</td>
<td>Sidney, Kaye, Firmin &amp; Partners</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building name</td>
<td>Street</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Date Started</td>
<td>Date Completed</td>
<td>Architect</td>
<td>Demolished (D), Substantially Altered (A), Existing (E) or Threatened (T)</td>
<td>Listed (I,II*,II) or Certificate of Immunity (COI)</td>
<td>Photos by author, July 2015 (unless otherwise specified)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tokyo Marine (formerly Banque Belgeique)</td>
<td>Bishopsgate</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1974</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>Gollins Melvin Ward Partnership</td>
<td>E, T</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building name</td>
<td>Street</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Date Started</td>
<td>Date Completed</td>
<td>Architect</td>
<td>Demolished (D), Substantially Altered (A), Existing (E) or Threatened (T)</td>
<td>Listed (I,II*,III) or Certificate of Immunity (COI)</td>
<td>Photos by author, July 2015 (unless otherwise specified)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bishopsgate</td>
<td></td>
<td>42-44</td>
<td>1982</td>
<td>1983</td>
<td>Scott, Brownrigg &amp; Turner</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Former Standard Chartered Bank</td>
<td>Bishopsgate</td>
<td>26-40</td>
<td>1980</td>
<td>1985</td>
<td>Fitzroy Robinson &amp; Partners</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansallis House</td>
<td>Bishopsgate</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>1982</td>
<td>1985</td>
<td>Fitzroy Robinson &amp; Partners</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Friars Lane</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1984</td>
<td>1986</td>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building name</td>
<td>Street</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Date Started</td>
<td>Date Completed</td>
<td>Architect</td>
<td>Demolished (D), Substantially Altered (A), Existing (E) or Threatened (T)</td>
<td>Listed (I,II*,II) or Certificate of Immunity (COI)</td>
<td>Photos by author, July 2015 (unless otherwise specified)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blomfield Street</td>
<td>4-10</td>
<td>1985</td>
<td>1987</td>
<td>Fitzroy Robinson &amp; Partners</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bolt Court</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1953</td>
<td>1953</td>
<td>Richard Seifert &amp; Partners</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Former Evening News</td>
<td>Bouverie Street</td>
<td>1956</td>
<td>1956</td>
<td>Ellis, Clarke &amp; Gallanaugh</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridewell Place</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1978</td>
<td>1980</td>
<td>Rolfe Judd Group Practice with North &amp; Partners</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knollys House</td>
<td>Byward Street</td>
<td>6-12</td>
<td>1962</td>
<td>Howard, Fairbairn &amp; Partners</td>
<td>A (refurb c.1985)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Former Ellerman Lines</td>
<td>Camomile Street</td>
<td>1955</td>
<td>1956</td>
<td>Fitzroy Robinson &amp; Partners / Herbert H. Bull</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cotts House</td>
<td>Camomile Street</td>
<td>1958</td>
<td>1959</td>
<td>Sir Giles Scott &amp; Partners / Theo H. Birks</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kempson House</td>
<td>Camomile Street</td>
<td>1959</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>C. Lovett Gill &amp; Partners</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gateway House</td>
<td>Cannon Street</td>
<td>1953</td>
<td>1956</td>
<td>Trehearne &amp; Norman Preston &amp; Partners</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watling House</td>
<td>Cannon Street</td>
<td>1954</td>
<td>1956</td>
<td>Easton &amp; Robinson</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walbrook House</td>
<td>Cannon Street</td>
<td>1957</td>
<td>1957</td>
<td>Henry Tanner</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bracken House</td>
<td>Cannon Street</td>
<td>1955</td>
<td>1959</td>
<td>Sir Albert Richardson</td>
<td>A (remodelled late 1980s by Michael Hopkins &amp; Partners)</td>
<td>II*; 13/08/1987</td>
<td>(Figs 1 and 2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building name</td>
<td>Street</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Date Started</td>
<td>Date Completed</td>
<td>Architect</td>
<td>Demolished (D), Substantially Altered (A), Existing (E) or Threatened (T)</td>
<td>Listed (I,II*,II) or Certificate of Immunity (COI)</td>
<td>Photos by author, July 2015 (unless otherwise specified)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Former Old Change House</td>
<td>Cannon Street</td>
<td>2-6</td>
<td>1958</td>
<td>1959</td>
<td>Theo H. Birks</td>
<td>A (windows and Infill panels replaced 1982)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCB Corporation</td>
<td>Cannon Street</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>1962</td>
<td>Biscoe &amp; Stanton</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building name</td>
<td>Street</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Date Started</td>
<td>Date Completed</td>
<td>Architect</td>
<td>Demolished (D), Substantially Altered (A), Existing (E) or Threatened (T)</td>
<td>Listed (I,II*,II) or Certificate of Immunity (COI)</td>
<td>Photos by author, July 2015 (unless otherwise specified)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Former Phoenix Assurance</td>
<td>Cannon Street</td>
<td>143-149</td>
<td>1962</td>
<td>1963</td>
<td>Lewis, Solomon, Kaye &amp; Partners</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td><img src="image1.jpg" alt="Photo" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cannon Street 52-60</td>
<td>Cannon Street</td>
<td>52-60</td>
<td>1971</td>
<td>1971</td>
<td>Cotton, Ballard &amp; Blow</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td><img src="image2.jpg" alt="Photo" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bush Lane House</td>
<td>Cannon Street</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>1972</td>
<td>1976</td>
<td>Arup Associates</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td><img src="image3.jpg" alt="Photo" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building name</td>
<td>Street</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Date Started</td>
<td>Date Completed</td>
<td>Architect</td>
<td>Demolished (D), Substantially Altered (A), Existing (E) or Threatened (T)</td>
<td>Listed (I,II*,II) or Certificate of Immunity (COI)</td>
<td>Photos by author, July 2015 (unless otherwise specified)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cannon Street</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>1972</td>
<td>1977</td>
<td></td>
<td>Elsom, Pack &amp; Roberts</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Former Credit Lyonnais (on corner with Queen Victoria Street)</td>
<td>Cannon Street</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1973</td>
<td>1977</td>
<td>Whinney, Son and Austen Hall</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>II; 26/01/2015</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building name</td>
<td>Street</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Date Started</td>
<td>Date Completed</td>
<td>Architect</td>
<td>Demolished (D), Substantially Altered (A), Existing (E) or Threatened (T)</td>
<td>Listed (I,II*,II) or Certificate of Immunity (COI)</td>
<td>Photos by author, July 2015 (unless otherwise specified)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cannon Street</td>
<td>48-50</td>
<td>1974</td>
<td>1978</td>
<td>Alex Shickle</td>
<td>A (reclad in 1996)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Photos taken April 2015 (see also Fig. 31)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building name</td>
<td>Street</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Date Started</td>
<td>Date Completed</td>
<td>Architect</td>
<td>Demolished (D), Substantially Altered (A), Existing (E) or Threatened (T)</td>
<td>Listed (I,II*,II) or Certificate of Immunity (COI)</td>
<td>Photos by author, July 2015 (unless otherwise specified)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Street</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watling Court</td>
<td>Cannon</td>
<td>41-53</td>
<td>1977</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>Fitzroy Robinson &amp; Partners</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td>(see Fig. 51)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Street</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cannon</td>
<td>135-141</td>
<td>1979</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>Haslemere Estates</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building name</td>
<td>Street</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Date Started</td>
<td>Date Completed</td>
<td>Architect</td>
<td>Demolished (D), Substantially Altered (A), Existing (E) or Threatened (T)</td>
<td>Listed (I,II*,II) or Certificate of Immunity (COI)</td>
<td>Photos by author, July 2015 (unless otherwise specified)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sherborne House</td>
<td>Cannon Street</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>1985</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chancery House</td>
<td>Chancery Lane</td>
<td>53-64</td>
<td>1947</td>
<td>1953</td>
<td>Richardson &amp; Houfe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building name</td>
<td>Street</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Date Started</td>
<td>Date Completed</td>
<td>Architect</td>
<td>Demolished (D), Substantially Altered (A), Existing (E) or Threatened (T)</td>
<td>Listed (I,II*,II) or Certificate of Immunity (COI)</td>
<td>Photos by author, July 2015 (unless otherwise specified)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chancery Lane</td>
<td>44-45</td>
<td>1964</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td>Howard V. Lobb &amp; Partners</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wetherall, Green &amp; Smith</td>
<td>Chancery Lane</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1975</td>
<td>1975</td>
<td>Kenzie Lovell &amp; Partners</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chancery Lane</td>
<td>44-45</td>
<td>1973</td>
<td>1977</td>
<td>Howard V. Lobb &amp; Partners</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Charter-house Street</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1954</td>
<td>1950s</td>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building name</td>
<td>Street</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Date Started</td>
<td>Date Completed</td>
<td>Architect</td>
<td>Demolished (D), Substantially Altered (A), Existing (E) or Threatened (T)</td>
<td>Listed (I,II*,II) or Certificate of Immunity (COI)</td>
<td>Photos by author, July 2015 (unless otherwise specified)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheapside 61</td>
<td>Cheapside</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>1954</td>
<td>1954</td>
<td>Richard Seifert</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td>![Image](see above, right)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheapside 60</td>
<td>Cheapside</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>1956</td>
<td>1956</td>
<td>C.J. Epril</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td>![Image](see above, right)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sun Life Insurance Co.</td>
<td>Cheapside</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>1955</td>
<td>1958</td>
<td>Curtis Green, Son &amp; Lloyd (Anthony Lloyd)</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td>![Image](see above, right)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building name</td>
<td>Street</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Date Started</td>
<td>Date Completed</td>
<td>Architect</td>
<td>Demolished (D), Substantially Altered (A), Existing (E) or Threatened (T)</td>
<td>Listed (I,II*,II) or Certificate of Immunity (COI)</td>
<td>Photos by author, July 2015 (unless otherwise specified)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheapside House</td>
<td>Cheapside</td>
<td>134-147</td>
<td>1958</td>
<td>1959</td>
<td>Theo H. Birks</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bow Bells House</td>
<td>Cheapside</td>
<td>46-52</td>
<td>1958</td>
<td>1959</td>
<td>Cotton, Ballard &amp; Blow</td>
<td>A (reclad)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building name</td>
<td>Street</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Date Started</td>
<td>Date Completed</td>
<td>Architect</td>
<td>Demolished (D), Substantially Altered (A), Existing (E) or Threatened (T)</td>
<td>Listed (I,II*,II) or Certificate of Immunity (COI)</td>
<td>Photos by author, July 2015 (unless otherwise specified)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Change House</td>
<td>Cheapside</td>
<td>1953</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td></td>
<td>Victor Heal</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td>(see Fig. 17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Mutual Life Insurance</td>
<td>Cheapside</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ley, Colbeck &amp; Partners</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Vedast House</td>
<td>Cheapside</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>1964</td>
<td>1964</td>
<td>Gunton &amp; Gunton</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bolsa House</td>
<td>Cheapside</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>1964</td>
<td>1964</td>
<td>Kenneth Lindy &amp; Partners / N. Westwood, Piet &amp; Partners</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitre House</td>
<td>Cheapside</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td>Owen Cambell Jones &amp; Sons (R.N.Wakelin)</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cheapside</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>1970</td>
<td>1971</td>
<td>Gotch &amp; Partners</td>
<td>A (stripped back to frame &amp; reclad 2014)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(photo taken April 2015. See also Fig 9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building name</td>
<td>Street</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Date Started</td>
<td>Date Completed</td>
<td>Architect</td>
<td>Demolished (D), Substantially Altered (A), Existing (E) or Threatened (T)</td>
<td>Listed (I,II*,II) or Certificate of Immunity (COI)</td>
<td>Photos by author, July 2015 (unless otherwise specified)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three Keys House</td>
<td>Cheapside</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>1978</td>
<td>1982</td>
<td>T. P. Bennett &amp; Son</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td>![Three Keys House Image]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Templeton House</td>
<td>Chiswell Street</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1954</td>
<td>1956</td>
<td>Hans Biel</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td>![Templeton House Image]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coleman House</td>
<td>Coleman Street</td>
<td>64-66</td>
<td>1955</td>
<td>1955</td>
<td>Richard Seifert &amp; Partners</td>
<td>E, T</td>
<td></td>
<td>![Coleman House Image]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building name</td>
<td>Street</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Date Started</td>
<td>Date Completed</td>
<td>Architect</td>
<td>Demolished (D), Substantially Altered (A), Existing (E) or Threatened (T)</td>
<td>Listed (I,II*,II) or Certificate of Immunity (COI)</td>
<td>Photos by author, July 2015 (unless otherwise specified)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austral House</td>
<td>Coleman Street</td>
<td>1959</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>Gunton &amp; Gunton</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extension to Swiss Bank Corp</td>
<td>Coleman Street</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>1964</td>
<td>David du R. Aberdeen &amp; Partners</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coleman Street</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1963</td>
<td>1966</td>
<td>Gollins Melvin Ward Partnership</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coleman Street</td>
<td>30-32</td>
<td>1972</td>
<td>1975</td>
<td>Parfitt &amp; Craig Hall</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Former Midland</td>
<td>Cooper's Row</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>1963</td>
<td>Richard Seifert &amp; Partners</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piercy House</td>
<td>Copthall Avenue</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1962</td>
<td>1962</td>
<td>Trehearne &amp; Norman Preston &amp; Partners</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Copthall Avenue</td>
<td>4-6</td>
<td>1985</td>
<td>1986</td>
<td>Fitzroy Robinson &amp; Partners</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornhill</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>1984</td>
<td>Rolfe Judd Group Practice</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>(see Fig. 34)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building name</td>
<td>Street</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Date Started</td>
<td>Date Completed</td>
<td>Architect</td>
<td>Demolished (D), Substantially Altered (A), Existing (E) or Threatened (T)</td>
<td>Listed (I,II*,II) or Certificate of Immunity (COI)</td>
<td>Photos by author, July 2015 (unless otherwise specified)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creechurch Lane</td>
<td>12-14</td>
<td>1983</td>
<td>1985</td>
<td>1983</td>
<td>Weightman &amp; Bullen</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td><img src="image1.jpg" alt="Creechurch Lane 12-14" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crosswall</td>
<td>11-13</td>
<td>1957</td>
<td>1958</td>
<td>1958</td>
<td>Knapton &amp; Deane</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td><img src="image2.jpg" alt="Crosswall 11-13" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building name</td>
<td>Street</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Date Started</td>
<td>Date Completed</td>
<td>Architect</td>
<td>Demolished (D), Substantially Altered (A), Existing (E) or Threatened (T)</td>
<td>Listed (I,II*,II) or Certificate of Immunity (COI)</td>
<td>Photos by author, July 2015 (unless otherwise specified)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crosswall</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1984</td>
<td>1985</td>
<td></td>
<td>Greenaway &amp; Partners</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building name</td>
<td>Street</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Date Started</td>
<td>Date Completed</td>
<td>Architect</td>
<td>Demolished (D), Substantially Altered (A), Existing (E) or Threatened (T)</td>
<td>Listed (I,II*,II) or Certificate of Immunity (COI)</td>
<td>Photos by author, July 2015 (unless otherwise specified)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spectrum House</td>
<td>Cursitor Street</td>
<td>20-26</td>
<td>1971</td>
<td>1975</td>
<td>Thomas Saunders &amp; Associates</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenly House</td>
<td>Duke's Place</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1950</td>
<td>1950</td>
<td>Lewis, Solomon, Son &amp; Joseph</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building name</td>
<td>Street</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Date Started</td>
<td>Date Completed</td>
<td>Architect</td>
<td>Demolished (D), Substantially Altered (A), Existing (E) or Threatened (T)</td>
<td>Listed (I,II*,II) or Certificate of Immunity (COI)</td>
<td>Photos by author, July 2015 (unless otherwise specified)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irongate House</td>
<td>Duke's Place</td>
<td>22-30</td>
<td>1973</td>
<td>1977</td>
<td>Fitzroy Robinson &amp; Partners</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td><img src="image1" alt="Irongate House" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NatWest Bank</td>
<td>Eastcheap</td>
<td>2-4</td>
<td>1959</td>
<td>1959</td>
<td>Campbell-Jones &amp; Sons</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td><img src="image2" alt="NatWest Bank" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Eastcheap</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1985</td>
<td>1986</td>
<td>Whinney Mackay-Lewis &amp; Partners</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td><img src="image3" alt="Eastcheap" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building name</td>
<td>Street</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Date Started</td>
<td>Date Completed</td>
<td>Architect</td>
<td>Demolished (D), Substantially Altered (A), Existing (E) or Threatened (T)</td>
<td>Listed (I,II*,II) or Certificate of Immunity (COI)</td>
<td>Photos by author, July 2015 (unless otherwise specified)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associated Press</td>
<td>Farringdon Street</td>
<td>83-86</td>
<td>1949</td>
<td>1951</td>
<td>Eric H. David</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td><img src="image1" alt="Associated Press" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lexus House (Formerly IPC Magazines)</td>
<td>Farringdon Street</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1954</td>
<td>1957</td>
<td>Ellis, Clarke &amp; Gallanaugh</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td><img src="image2" alt="Lexus House" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plumtree Court (Formerly Standard House)</td>
<td>Farringdon Street</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td>Ellis, Clarke &amp; Gallanaugh</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td><img src="image3" alt="Plumtree Court" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caroone House</td>
<td>Farringdon Street</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1970</td>
<td>1971</td>
<td>Murray, Ward &amp; Partners</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td><img src="image4" alt="Caroone House" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building name</td>
<td>Street</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Date Started</td>
<td>Date Completed</td>
<td>Architect</td>
<td>Demolished (D), Substantially Altered (A), Existing (E) or Threatened (T)</td>
<td>Listed (I,II*,II) or Certificate of Immunity (COI)</td>
<td>Photos by author, July 2015 (unless otherwise specified)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Farringdon Street</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1984</td>
<td>1987</td>
<td>T. P. Bennett &amp; Son</td>
<td>E, T</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norwich Union</td>
<td>Fenchurch Street</td>
<td>51-54</td>
<td>1951</td>
<td>1956</td>
<td>Lewis, Solomon, Kaye &amp; Partners</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building name</td>
<td>Street</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Date Started</td>
<td>Date Completed</td>
<td>Architect</td>
<td>Demolished (D), Substantially Altered (A), Existing (E) or Threatened (T)</td>
<td>Listed (I,II*,II) or Certificate of Immunity (COI)</td>
<td>Photos by author, July 2015 (unless otherwise specified)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fountain House</td>
<td>Fenchurch Street</td>
<td>1954</td>
<td>1957</td>
<td>1957</td>
<td>W.H.Rogers / Sir Howard Robertson (consulting architect)</td>
<td>E, T</td>
<td></td>
<td>(see Fig.23)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chesterfield House</td>
<td>Fenchurch Street</td>
<td>1957</td>
<td>1957</td>
<td>1957</td>
<td>Howard, Souster &amp; Fairburn</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kleinwort Benson</td>
<td>Fenchurch Street</td>
<td>1963</td>
<td>1968</td>
<td>1968</td>
<td>CLRП Architects / Wallace F. Smith (consulting architect)</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fenchurch Street</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>1966</td>
<td>1969</td>
<td>Stroud &amp; Nullis</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fenchurch Street</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1969</td>
<td>1971</td>
<td>Cluttons' Staff Architects</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building name</td>
<td>Street</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Date Started</td>
<td>Date Completed</td>
<td>Architect</td>
<td>Demolished (D), Substantially Altered (A), Existing (E) or Threatened (T)</td>
<td>Listed (I,II*,II) or Certificate of Immunity (COI)</td>
<td>Photos by author, July 2015 (unless otherwise specified)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fenchurch Street</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>1972</td>
<td>1975</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fitzroy Robinson &amp; Partners</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fenchurch Street</td>
<td>141-142</td>
<td>1974</td>
<td>1975</td>
<td></td>
<td>A.F. Westmore</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building name</td>
<td>Street</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Date Started</td>
<td>Date Completed</td>
<td>Architect</td>
<td>Demolished (D), Substantially Altered (A), Existing (E) or Threatened (T)</td>
<td>Listed (I,II*,II) or Certificate of Immunity (COI)</td>
<td>Photos by author, July 2015 (unless otherwise specified)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building name</td>
<td>Street</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Date Started</td>
<td>Date Completed</td>
<td>Architect</td>
<td>Demolished (D), Substantially Altered (A), Existing (E) or Threatened (T)</td>
<td>Listed (I,II*,II) or Certificate of Immunity (COI)</td>
<td>Photos by author, July 2015 (unless otherwise specified)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kleinwort Benson</td>
<td>Fenchurch Street</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>1985</td>
<td>Denys Lasdun, Redhouse &amp; Softley</td>
<td>A (original open balcony enclosed)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monotype House</td>
<td>Fetter Lane</td>
<td>1953</td>
<td>1955</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hannen &amp; Markham</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building name</td>
<td>Street</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Date Started</td>
<td>Date Completed</td>
<td>Architect</td>
<td>Demolished (D), Substantially Altered (A), Existing (E) or Threatened (T)</td>
<td>Listed (I,II*,II) or Certificate of Immunity (COI)</td>
<td>Photos by author, July 2015 (unless otherwise specified)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oyez House</td>
<td>Fetter Lane</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1949</td>
<td>1958</td>
<td>T. P. Bennett &amp; Son</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td><img src="image1" alt="Oyez House" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lever House,</td>
<td>Fetter Lane</td>
<td>1959</td>
<td>1963</td>
<td>1963</td>
<td>C. Edmund Wilford &amp; Son</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td><img src="image2" alt="Lever House, Lintas House &amp; No.11" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lintas House</td>
<td>Fetter Lane</td>
<td>109-110</td>
<td>1963</td>
<td>1963</td>
<td>Richard Seifert &amp; Partners</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td><img src="image3" alt="Du Pont House" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Du Pont House</td>
<td>Fetter Lane</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>1972</td>
<td>1975</td>
<td>Douglas Marriott, Worby &amp; Robinson</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td><img src="image4" alt="Du Pont House" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building name</td>
<td>Street</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Date Started</td>
<td>Date Completed</td>
<td>Architect</td>
<td>Demolished (D), Substantially Altered (A), Existing (E) or Threatened (T)</td>
<td>Listed (I,II*,II) or Certificate of Immunity (COI)</td>
<td>Photos by author, July 2015 (unless otherwise specified)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winchmore House</td>
<td>Fetter Lane</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1977</td>
<td>1982</td>
<td>Michael Lyell Associates</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building name</td>
<td>Street</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Date Started</td>
<td>Date Completed</td>
<td>Architect</td>
<td>Demolished (D), Substantially Altered (A), Existing (E) or Threatened (T)</td>
<td>Listed (I,II*,II) or Certificate of Immunity (COI)</td>
<td>Photos by author, July 2015 (unless otherwise specified)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Former SBC Warburg</td>
<td>Finsbury Avenue</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1982</td>
<td>1984</td>
<td>Arup Associates (Peter Foggo)</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>II; 26/01/2015</td>
<td>(see also Fig. 37)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lloyds Bank Overseas Dept</td>
<td>Fish Street</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>1967</td>
<td>1967</td>
<td>David Landaw</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hulton House</td>
<td>Fleet Street</td>
<td>161-166</td>
<td>1955</td>
<td>1957</td>
<td>A.S. Ash</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fleet Street</td>
<td>167-170</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>1962</td>
<td>Richard Seifert &amp; Partners</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td>(see above, left)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building name</td>
<td>Street</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Date Started</td>
<td>Date Completed</td>
<td>Architect</td>
<td>Demolished (D), Substantially Altered (A), Existing (E) or Threatened (T)</td>
<td>Listed (I,II*,II) or Certificate of Immunity (COI)</td>
<td>Photos by author, July 2015 (unless otherwise specified)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fleet Street</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>1983</td>
<td>1986</td>
<td>Thomas Saunders &amp; Associates</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td>(see Fig. 36)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Furnival Street</td>
<td>36-37</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>1982</td>
<td>Rolf Judd Group Practice</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Furnival Street</td>
<td>30-31</td>
<td>1982</td>
<td>1985</td>
<td>Prudential Assurance Architects Dept</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building name</td>
<td>Street</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Date Started</td>
<td>Date Completed</td>
<td>Architect</td>
<td>Demolished (D), Substantially Altered (A), Existing (E) or Threatened (T)</td>
<td>Listed (I,II*,II) or Certificate of Immunity (COI)</td>
<td>Photos by author, July 2015 (unless otherwise specified)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Godliman Street</td>
<td>17-21</td>
<td>1973</td>
<td>1985</td>
<td>1985</td>
<td>Richard Seifert &amp; Partners</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td><img src="image1.png" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goodman's Yard</td>
<td></td>
<td>1979</td>
<td>1983</td>
<td>1983</td>
<td>Richard Seifert &amp; Partners</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td><img src="image2.png" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Provident</td>
<td>Gracechurch Street</td>
<td>1957</td>
<td>1959</td>
<td>1959</td>
<td>Green Lloyd &amp; Son (Anthony Lloyd)</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td>(see Fig.18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midland Bank</td>
<td>Gracechurch Street</td>
<td>1962</td>
<td>1962</td>
<td>1962</td>
<td>Whinney, Son and Austen Hall</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Former Guiness Mahon</td>
<td>Gracechurch Street</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1964</td>
<td>1968</td>
<td>Richard Seifert &amp; Partners</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td><img src="image3.png" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building name</td>
<td>Street</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Date Started</td>
<td>Date Completed</td>
<td>Architect</td>
<td>Demolished (D), Substantially Altered (A), Existing (E) or Threatened (T)</td>
<td>Listed (I,II*,II) or Certificate of Immunity (COI)</td>
<td>Photos by author, July 2015 (unless otherwise specified)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building name</td>
<td>Street</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Date Started</td>
<td>Date Completed</td>
<td>Architect</td>
<td>Demolished (D), Substantially Altered (A), Existing (E) or Threatened (T)</td>
<td>Listed (I,II*,II) or Certificate of Immunity (COI)</td>
<td>Photos by author, July 2015 (unless otherwise specified)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gracechurch Street</td>
<td>77</td>
<td></td>
<td>1983</td>
<td>1986</td>
<td>Kenzie Lovell &amp; Partners</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td><img src="image_url" alt="Building image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great St Helens</td>
<td>34-35</td>
<td></td>
<td>1955</td>
<td>1957</td>
<td>Stevens Hayes Dunne</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td><img src="image_url" alt="Building image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building name</td>
<td>Street</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Date Started</td>
<td>Date Completed</td>
<td>Architect</td>
<td>Demolished (D), Substantially Altered (A), Existing (E) or Threatened (T)</td>
<td>Listed (I,II*,II) or Certificate of Immunity (COI)</td>
<td>Photos by author, July 2015 (unless otherwise specified)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Tower</td>
<td>Great Tower</td>
<td>5-10</td>
<td>1949</td>
<td>1951</td>
<td>Gunton &amp; Gunton</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="image_url">image</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millocrat Houst</td>
<td>Great Tower</td>
<td>1951</td>
<td>1953</td>
<td></td>
<td>A.W. Moore</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowring House</td>
<td>Great Tower</td>
<td>1970</td>
<td>1972</td>
<td></td>
<td>Raymond J. Cecil &amp; Partners</td>
<td>A (currently being converted for hotel use)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Winchester</td>
<td>Great Winchester</td>
<td>1962</td>
<td>1968</td>
<td></td>
<td>Gunton &amp; Gunton</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street</td>
<td>Street</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bank</td>
<td>Street</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garrard House</td>
<td>Gresham Street</td>
<td>1954</td>
<td>1956</td>
<td></td>
<td>A.S. Ash</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barrington House</td>
<td>Gresham Street</td>
<td>59-67</td>
<td>1954</td>
<td>1956</td>
<td>Sir John Burnett, Tait &amp;</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td>(see Fig. 14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Partners</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clements House</td>
<td>Gresham Street</td>
<td>14-18</td>
<td>1954</td>
<td>1957</td>
<td>Trehearne &amp; Norman Preston &amp; Partners</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td>(see Fig. 19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building name</td>
<td>Street</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Date Started</td>
<td>Date Completed</td>
<td>Architect</td>
<td>Demolished (D), Substantially Altered (A), Existing (E) or Threatened (T)</td>
<td>Listed (I,II*,II) or Certificate of Immunity (COI)</td>
<td>Photos by author, July 2015 (unless otherwise specified)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Former Post Office Engineering Dept.</td>
<td>Gresham Street</td>
<td>2-12</td>
<td>1957</td>
<td>1959</td>
<td>Easton &amp; Robinson</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td>(photo: Chris Rogers)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gresham Street</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>1955</td>
<td>1957</td>
<td>Ellis, Clarke &amp; Gallanaugh</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td>(photo: Chris Rogers)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building name</td>
<td>Street</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Date Started</td>
<td>Date Completed</td>
<td>Architect</td>
<td>Demolished (D), Substantially Altered (A), Existing (E) or Threatened (T)</td>
<td>Listed (I,II*,II) or Certificate of Immunity (COI)</td>
<td>Photos by author, July 2015 (unless otherwise specified)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gresham Street</td>
<td>30 Gresham Street</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1958</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>Ellis, Clarke &amp; Gallanaugh</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td>(photo: Chris Rogers)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building name</td>
<td>Street</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Date Started</td>
<td>Date Completed</td>
<td>Architect</td>
<td>Demolished (D), Substantially Altered (A), Existing (E) or Threatened (T)</td>
<td>Listed (I,II*,II) or Certificate of Immunity (COI)</td>
<td>Photos by author, July 2015 (unless otherwise specified)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valiant House</td>
<td>Heneage Lane</td>
<td>1978</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td></td>
<td>Peter Black &amp; Partners</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Westminster House</td>
<td>High Holborn</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td>1968</td>
<td>J. Seymour Harris &amp; Partners (Gordon Charratou)</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td>(see also Fig.28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heron House</td>
<td>High Holborn</td>
<td>1967</td>
<td>1969</td>
<td></td>
<td>E.S. Boyer and Partners</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td>(see Fig.28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Holborn</td>
<td>24-31</td>
<td>1955</td>
<td>1957</td>
<td>Yates, Cook &amp; Darbyshire</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building name</td>
<td>Street</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Date Started</td>
<td>Date Completed</td>
<td>Architect</td>
<td>Demolished (D), Substantially Altered (A), Existing (E) or Threatened (T)</td>
<td>Listed (I,II*,II) or Certificate of Immunity (COI)</td>
<td>Photos by author, July 2015 (unless otherwise specified)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily Mirror Building</td>
<td>Holborn</td>
<td></td>
<td>1957</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>Sir Owen Williams / Anderson, Forster &amp; Wilcox</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td>(Murphy, Continuity and Change, 1984)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holborn 9</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1972</td>
<td>1975</td>
<td>Prudential Architects</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building name</td>
<td>Street</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Date Started</td>
<td>Date Completed</td>
<td>Architect</td>
<td>Demolished (D), Substantially Altered (A), Existing (E) or Threatened (T)</td>
<td>Listed (I,II*,II) or Certificate of Immunity (COI)</td>
<td>Photos by author, July 2015 (unless otherwise specified)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atlantic House</td>
<td>Holborn Viaduct</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1951</td>
<td>1951</td>
<td>T. P. Bennett &amp; Son</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td>(see Fig. 16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Former Chartered Consolidated</td>
<td>Holborn Viaduct</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1950</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>T. P. Bennett &amp; Son</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Former Remington Rand</td>
<td>Holborn Viaduct</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>1956</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>J. Seymour Harris &amp; Partners</td>
<td>A (Refurb 1980-1 by same firm with mottled tiled cladding)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Williams National House</td>
<td>Holborn Viaduct</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>1963</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ronald Ward &amp; Partners</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Holborn Viaduct</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1972</td>
<td>1976</td>
<td>T. P. Bennett &amp; Son</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bath House</td>
<td>Holborn Viaduct</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>1970</td>
<td>1970</td>
<td>T. P. Bennett &amp; Son</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building name</td>
<td>Street</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Date Started</td>
<td>Date Completed</td>
<td>Architect</td>
<td>Demolished (D), Substantially Altered (A), Existing (E) or Threatened (T)</td>
<td>Listed (I,II*,II) or Certificate of Immunity (COI)</td>
<td>Photos by author, July 2015 (unless otherwise specified)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Botolph's House</td>
<td>Houndsditch</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>1966</td>
<td>1966</td>
<td>Richard Seifert &amp; Partners</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chatsworth House</td>
<td>Houndsditch</td>
<td></td>
<td>1972</td>
<td>1980</td>
<td>North &amp; Partners</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ironmonger Lane</td>
<td>24-25</td>
<td></td>
<td>1979</td>
<td>1983</td>
<td>Douglas Marriott Worby &amp; Robinson</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ironmonger Lane</td>
<td>17-20</td>
<td></td>
<td>1957</td>
<td>1957</td>
<td>John V. Hamilton</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boundary House</td>
<td>Jewry Street</td>
<td>7-17</td>
<td>1958</td>
<td>1958</td>
<td>Sydney Clough &amp; Partners</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building name</td>
<td>Street</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Date Started</td>
<td>Date Completed</td>
<td>Architect</td>
<td>Demolished (D), Substantially Altered (A), Existing (E) or Threatened (T)</td>
<td>Listed (I,II*,II) or Certificate of Immunity (COI)</td>
<td>Photos by author, July 2015 (unless otherwise specified)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dawson's House</td>
<td>Jewry Street</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1979</td>
<td>1982</td>
<td>Biscoe &amp; Stanton</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td><img src="image1" alt="Dawson's House" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Carpenter House</td>
<td>John Carpenter Street</td>
<td>1978</td>
<td>1982</td>
<td></td>
<td>Halpern &amp; Partners</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td><img src="image2" alt="John Carpenter House" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tallis House</td>
<td>John Carpenter Street</td>
<td>1985</td>
<td>1987</td>
<td></td>
<td>Royce, Hurley &amp; Stewart</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td><img src="image3" alt="Tallis House" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banco do Brasil</td>
<td>King Street</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>1957</td>
<td>1957</td>
<td>Alan W. Pipe &amp; Sons</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td><img src="image4" alt="Banco do Brasil" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building name</td>
<td>Street</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Date Started</td>
<td>Date Completed</td>
<td>Architect</td>
<td>Demolished (D), Substantially Altered (A), Existing (E) or Threatened (T)</td>
<td>Listed (I,II*,II) or Certificate of Immunity (COI)</td>
<td>Photos by author, July 2015 (unless otherwise specified)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King Street</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1951</td>
<td>1958</td>
<td></td>
<td>C.E. Parker / J. S. Cohen</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td>![Image]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King Street</td>
<td>9-12</td>
<td>1979</td>
<td>1983</td>
<td></td>
<td>Douglas Marriott, Worby &amp; Robinson</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td>![Image]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moscow Narodny Bank</td>
<td>King William Street</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>1963</td>
<td></td>
<td>Knapton, Deane &amp; Thompson</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td>![Image]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building name</td>
<td>Street</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Date Started</td>
<td>Date Completed</td>
<td>Architect</td>
<td>Demolished (D), Substantially Altered (A), Existing (E) or Threatened (T)</td>
<td>Listed (I,II*,II) or Certificate of Immunity (COI)</td>
<td>Photos by author, July 2015 (unless otherwise specified)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phoenix House</td>
<td>King William Street</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1980</td>
<td>1983</td>
<td>Gollins Melvin Ward Partnership</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building name</td>
<td>Street</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Date Started</td>
<td>Date Completed</td>
<td>Architect</td>
<td>Demolished (D), Substantially Altered (A), Existing (E) or Threatened (T)</td>
<td>Listed (I,II*,II) or Certificate of Immunity (COI)</td>
<td>Photos by author, July 2015 (unless otherwise specified)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King William Street</td>
<td>King William Street</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1974</td>
<td>1984</td>
<td>Gollins Melvin Ward Partnership</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td>(see also Fig. 27)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bank of England Offices</td>
<td>King's Arms Yard</td>
<td></td>
<td>1958</td>
<td>1962</td>
<td>Peter S. Ednie</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Streets House</td>
<td>Lawrence Lane</td>
<td></td>
<td>1966</td>
<td>1966</td>
<td>Knapton, Deane &amp; Thompson</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadenhall Street</td>
<td>Leadenhall Street</td>
<td>21-26</td>
<td>1953</td>
<td>1956</td>
<td>Prudential Architects</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Helen's Tower (formerly Commercial Union Assurance Company HQ / Aviva Tower), also known as no.1 Undershaft</td>
<td>Leadenhall Street</td>
<td></td>
<td>1963</td>
<td>1968</td>
<td>Gollins Melvin Ward Partnership</td>
<td>A (re-clad 1993)</td>
<td>COI; 16/04/2012 - 15/04/2017</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building name</td>
<td>Street</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Date Started</td>
<td>Date Completed</td>
<td>Architect</td>
<td>Demolished (D), Substantially Altered (A), Existing (E) or Threatened (T)</td>
<td>Listed (I,II*,II) or Certificate of Immunity (COI)</td>
<td>Photos by author, July 2015 (unless otherwise specified)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Former Scandinavian Bank</td>
<td>Leadenhall</td>
<td>36-38</td>
<td>1970</td>
<td>1973</td>
<td>Yorke, Rosenberg &amp; Mardall</td>
<td>A (roof extension)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(see Fig. 29)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ace House</td>
<td>Leadenhall</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1971</td>
<td>1975</td>
<td>Fitzroy Robinson &amp; Partners</td>
<td>A (reclad 2000)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building name</td>
<td>Street</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Date Started</td>
<td>Date Completed</td>
<td>Architect</td>
<td>Demolished (D), Substantially Altered (A), Existing (E) or Threatened (T)</td>
<td>Listed (I,II*,II) or Certificate of Immunity (COI)</td>
<td>Photos by author, July 2015 (unless otherwise specified)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institute of London Underwriters</td>
<td>Leadenhall Street</td>
<td>42-49</td>
<td>1972</td>
<td>1978</td>
<td>Fitzroy Robinson &amp; Partners</td>
<td>A (reclad), T</td>
<td></td>
<td><img src="image_url" alt="Institute of London Underwriters" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sun Alliance</td>
<td>Leadenhall Street</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1983</td>
<td>1989</td>
<td>Whinney Mackay-Lewis &amp; Partners</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td><img src="image_url" alt="Sun Alliance" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lloyds of London</td>
<td>Lime Street</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1950</td>
<td>1957</td>
<td>Terance Heysham</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td><img src="image_url" alt="Lloyds of London" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royal Insurance</td>
<td>Lime Street</td>
<td>34-36</td>
<td>1970</td>
<td>1975</td>
<td>Richard Sheppard, Robson &amp; Partners (John Heywood)</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td><img src="image_url" alt="Royal Insurance" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cigna House</td>
<td>Lime Street</td>
<td>1972</td>
<td>1975</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sir John Burnett, Tait &amp; Partners</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td><img src="image_url" alt="Cigna House" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lime Street</td>
<td>13-15</td>
<td>1973</td>
<td>1975</td>
<td>Richard Sheppard, Robson &amp; Partners</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td><img src="image_url" alt="Cigna House" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building name</td>
<td>Street</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Date Started</td>
<td>Date Completed</td>
<td>Architect</td>
<td>Demolished (D), Substantially Altered (A), Existing (E) or Threatened (T)</td>
<td>Listed (I,II*,II) or Certificate of Immunity (COI)</td>
<td>Photos by author, July 2015 (unless otherwise specified)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lloyds of London</td>
<td>Lime Street</td>
<td>1978</td>
<td>1986</td>
<td>Richard Rogers Partnership</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>I; 19/12/2011</td>
<td>See also Figs 33 and 34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alderman's House</td>
<td>Liverpool Street</td>
<td>34-37</td>
<td>1982</td>
<td>1984</td>
<td>Fitzroy Robinson &amp; Partners</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lloyds Avenue</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1972</td>
<td>1975</td>
<td>Gollins Melvin Ward Partnership</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building name</td>
<td>Street</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Date Started</td>
<td>Date Completed</td>
<td>Architect</td>
<td>Demolished (D), Substantially Altered (A), Existing (E) or Threatened (T)</td>
<td>Listed (I,II*,II) or Certificate of Immunity (COI)</td>
<td>Photos by author, July 2015 (unless otherwise specified)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lloyds Avenue</td>
<td>10 Lloyds</td>
<td></td>
<td>1972</td>
<td>1975</td>
<td>Lister, Drew &amp; Associates</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building name</td>
<td>Street</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Date Started</td>
<td>Date Completed</td>
<td>Architect</td>
<td>Demolished (D), Substantially Altered (A), Existing (E) or Threatened (T)</td>
<td>Listed (I,II*,II) or Certificate of Immunity (COI)</td>
<td>Photos by author, July 2015 (unless otherwise specified)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clydesdale Bank</td>
<td>Lombard Street</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>1963</td>
<td>1964</td>
<td>Maurice H. Bebb &amp; Notman &amp; Lodge</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Westminster Bank</td>
<td>Lombard Street</td>
<td>1963 1969</td>
<td>Mewes &amp; Davis</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moor House</td>
<td>London Wall</td>
<td>1960 1960</td>
<td>Lewis, Solomon, Kaye &amp; Partners</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td>Figs 10 and 11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austral House</td>
<td>London Wall</td>
<td>1959 1961</td>
<td>Gunton &amp; Gunton</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td>Figs 10 and 11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Alphage House</td>
<td>London Wall</td>
<td>1960 1962</td>
<td>Maurice Sanders Associates</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>COI; 14/03/2008 - 13/03/2013</td>
<td></td>
<td>Figs 10 and 11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royex House</td>
<td>London Wall</td>
<td>1961 1963</td>
<td>Richard Seifert &amp; Partners</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td>Figs 10 and 11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee House</td>
<td>London Wall</td>
<td>1961 1963</td>
<td>Bernard Gold &amp; Partners</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td>Figs 10 and 11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building name</td>
<td>Street</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Date Started</td>
<td>Date Completed</td>
<td>Architect</td>
<td>Demolished (D), Substantially Altered (A), Existing (E) or Threatened (T)</td>
<td>Listed (I,II*,II) or Certificate of Immunity (COI)</td>
<td>Photos by author, July 2015 (unless otherwise specified)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gillett House</td>
<td>London Wall</td>
<td>1963</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td>Ralph Tubbs</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Figs 10 and 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bastion House</td>
<td>London Wall</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>1972</td>
<td>1972</td>
<td>Powell &amp; Moya</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>COI; 22/07/2015 - 21/07/2015</td>
<td>Figs 10 and 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Tower (No.40 Basinghall Street)</td>
<td>London Wall</td>
<td>1962</td>
<td>1964</td>
<td>Sir John Burnett, Tait &amp; Partners</td>
<td>A (reclad)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(see also Figs 10 and 11)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>London Wall</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>1984</td>
<td>1986</td>
<td>Fitzroy Robinson &amp; Partners</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building name</td>
<td>Street</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Date Started</td>
<td>Date Completed</td>
<td>Architect</td>
<td>Demolished (D), Substantially Altered (A), Existing (E) or Threatened (T)</td>
<td>Listed (I,II*,II) or Certificate of Immunity (COI)</td>
<td>Photos by author, July 2015 (unless otherwise specified)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Long Lane</td>
<td>9-12</td>
<td>1956</td>
<td>1959</td>
<td>Ley, Colbeck &amp; Partners</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Long Lane</td>
<td>18-19</td>
<td>1972</td>
<td>1974</td>
<td>Morrison, Rose &amp; Partners</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Long Lane</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>1971</td>
<td>1975</td>
<td>Hugh V. Sprince &amp; Partners</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Long Lane</td>
<td>77-79</td>
<td>1984</td>
<td>1985</td>
<td>Francis Brett Associates</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three Quays</td>
<td>Lower Thames</td>
<td></td>
<td>1956</td>
<td>1959</td>
<td>Brian O'Rorke</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House</td>
<td>Street</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Mary's</td>
<td>Lower Thames</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1973</td>
<td>1977</td>
<td>Fitzroy Robinson &amp; Partners</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Court</td>
<td>Street</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Street</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building name</td>
<td>Street</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Date Started</td>
<td>Date Completed</td>
<td>Architect</td>
<td>Demolished (D), Substantially Altered (A), Existing (E) or Threatened (T)</td>
<td>Listed (I,II*,II) or Certificate of Immunity (COI)</td>
<td>Photos by author, July 2015 (unless otherwise specified)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samuel Montagu</td>
<td>Lower Thames Street</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1983</td>
<td>1985</td>
<td>Covell, Matthews Wheatley</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ludgate Broadway</td>
<td>10-13</td>
<td>1982</td>
<td>1985</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sheppard Robson</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillgate House</td>
<td>Ludgate Hill</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td></td>
<td>Theo H. Birks</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building name</td>
<td>Street</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Date Started</td>
<td>Date Completed</td>
<td>Architect</td>
<td>Demolished (D), Substantially Altered (A), Existing (E) or Threatened (T)</td>
<td>Listed (I,II*,II) or Certificate of Immunity (COI)</td>
<td>Photos by author, July 2015 (unless otherwise specified)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ludgate Hill</td>
<td>Ludgate Hill</td>
<td>1980</td>
<td>1985</td>
<td>T. P. Bennett &amp; Son</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mansell Street</td>
<td>Mansell Street</td>
<td>18-32</td>
<td>1979</td>
<td>1982</td>
<td>Sidney, Kaye, Firmin &amp; Partners</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standon House</td>
<td>Mansell Street</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1980</td>
<td>1983</td>
<td>Fitzroy Robinson &amp; Partners</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lloyds Chambers</td>
<td>Mansell Street</td>
<td>1980</td>
<td>1983</td>
<td>Fitzroy Robinson &amp; Partners</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building name</td>
<td>Street</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Date Started</td>
<td>Date Completed</td>
<td>Architect</td>
<td>Demolished (D), Substantially Altered (A), Existing (E) or Threatened (T)</td>
<td>Listed (I,II*,II) or Certificate of Immunity (COI)</td>
<td>Photos by author, July 2015 (unless otherwise specified)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kings Beam House</td>
<td>Mark Lane</td>
<td>1950</td>
<td>1952</td>
<td></td>
<td>Howard, Souster &amp; Fairburn</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dunster House</td>
<td>Mark Lane</td>
<td>1952</td>
<td>1953</td>
<td></td>
<td>Howard, Souster &amp; Fairburn</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mark Lane</td>
<td>69-70</td>
<td>1962</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td>CLRP Architects</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mark Lane</td>
<td>64-66</td>
<td>1971</td>
<td>1975</td>
<td>Dennis Crump &amp; Partners</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mark Lane</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>1955</td>
<td>1955</td>
<td></td>
<td>A (Re-fronted 1984-5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building name</td>
<td>Street</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Date Started</td>
<td>Date Completed</td>
<td>Architect</td>
<td>Demolished (D), Substantially Altered (A), Existing (E) or Threatened (T)</td>
<td>Listed (I,II*,II) or Certificate of Immunity (COI)</td>
<td>Photos by author, July 2015 (unless otherwise specified)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mason's Avenue</td>
<td>Milk Street</td>
<td>12-14</td>
<td>1978</td>
<td>1980</td>
<td>Parfitt &amp; Craig Hall</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milk Street</td>
<td>Milk Street</td>
<td>18-28</td>
<td>1959</td>
<td>1959</td>
<td>S. Peach &amp; Partners</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girobank</td>
<td>Milk Street</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1972</td>
<td>1975</td>
<td>Corporation of London Architects Dept</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milk Street</td>
<td>Milk Street</td>
<td>1-6</td>
<td>1978</td>
<td>1982</td>
<td>Sidney, Kaye, Firmin &amp; Partners</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Clare House</td>
<td>Minories</td>
<td>30-33</td>
<td>1956</td>
<td>1957</td>
<td>Howard, Fairbairn &amp; Partners</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millbourn House</td>
<td>Minories</td>
<td>151-154</td>
<td>1957</td>
<td>1957</td>
<td>Douglas E. Nightingale</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building name</td>
<td>Street</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Date Started</td>
<td>Date Completed</td>
<td>Architect</td>
<td>Demolished (D), Substantially Altered (A), Existing (E) or Threatened (T)</td>
<td>Listed (I,II*,II) or Certificate of Immunity (COI)</td>
<td>Photos by author, July 2015 (unless otherwise specified)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minories</td>
<td></td>
<td>139-141</td>
<td>1964</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td>Hammet &amp; Norton</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td>Photo of Minories 139-141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minories</td>
<td></td>
<td>142-144</td>
<td>1971</td>
<td>1973</td>
<td>W. Holford &amp; Partners</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td>Photo of Minories 142-144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PWS Group</td>
<td>Minories</td>
<td>52-56</td>
<td>1971</td>
<td>1975</td>
<td>Halpern &amp; Partners</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td>Photo of PWS Group 52-56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building name</td>
<td>Street</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Date Started</td>
<td>Date Completed</td>
<td>Architect</td>
<td>Demolished (D), Substantially Altered (A), Existing (E) or Threatened (T)</td>
<td>Listed (I,II*,II) or Certificate of Immunity (COI)</td>
<td>Photos by author, July 2015 (unless otherwise specified)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building name</td>
<td>Street</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Date Started</td>
<td>Date Completed</td>
<td>Architect</td>
<td>Demolished (D), Substantially Altered (A), Existing (E) or Threatened (T)</td>
<td>Listed (I,II*,II) or Certificate of Immunity (COI)</td>
<td>Photos by author, July 2015 (unless otherwise specified)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peninsular House</td>
<td>Monument Street</td>
<td>1979</td>
<td>1983</td>
<td></td>
<td>Richard Seifert &amp; Partners</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centurion House</td>
<td>Monument Street</td>
<td>1980</td>
<td>1984</td>
<td></td>
<td>Gollins Melvin Ward Partnership</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gartmore House</td>
<td>Monument Street</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1985</td>
<td>1987</td>
<td>Colhern &amp; Partners</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building name</td>
<td>Street</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Date Started</td>
<td>Date Completed</td>
<td>Architect</td>
<td>Demolished (D), Substantially Altered (A), Existing (E) or Threatened (T)</td>
<td>Listed (I,II*,II) or Certificate of Immunity (COI)</td>
<td>Photos by author, July 2015 (unless otherwise specified)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenter House</td>
<td>Moorfields</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>1962</td>
<td>1964</td>
<td>Cotton, Ballard &amp; Blow</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building name</td>
<td>Street (also Moor Lane)</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Date Started</td>
<td>Date Completed</td>
<td>Architect</td>
<td>Demolished (D), Substantially Altered (A), Existing (E) or Threatened (T)</td>
<td>Listed (I,II*,II) or Certificate of Immunity (COI)</td>
<td>Photos by author, July 2015 (unless otherwise specified)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moorfields House</td>
<td>Moorfields</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>1962</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td>Alan W. Pipe &amp; Partners</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Blocks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1971</td>
<td>1973</td>
<td>Leo Hannan Associates</td>
<td>E / D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building name</td>
<td>Street</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Date Started</td>
<td>Date Completed</td>
<td>Architect</td>
<td>Demolished (D), Substantially Altered (A), Existing (E) or Threatened (T)</td>
<td>Listed (I,II*,II) or Certificate of Immunity (COI)</td>
<td>Photos by author, July 2015 (unless otherwise specified)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credito Italiano</td>
<td>Moorgate</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1969</td>
<td>1972</td>
<td>Fitzroy Robinson &amp; Partners</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building name</td>
<td>Street</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Date Started</td>
<td>Date Completed</td>
<td>Architect</td>
<td>Demolished (D), Substantially Altered (A), Existing (E) or Threatened (T)</td>
<td>Listed (I,II*,II) or Certificate of Immunity (COI)</td>
<td>Photos by author, July 2015 (unless otherwise specified)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finsbury Pavement House</td>
<td>Moorgate</td>
<td></td>
<td>1971</td>
<td>1972</td>
<td>Richard Seifert &amp; Partners</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td>(see also Figs 32 and 55)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building name</td>
<td>Street</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Date Started</td>
<td>Date Completed</td>
<td>Architect</td>
<td>Demolished (D), Substantially Altered (A), Existing (E) or Threatened (T)</td>
<td>Listed (I,II*,II) or Certificate of Immunity (COI)</td>
<td>Photos by author, July 2015 (unless otherwise specified)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moorgate 48-54</td>
<td>Moorgate</td>
<td>48-54</td>
<td>1955</td>
<td>1977</td>
<td>Alan W. Pipe &amp; Sons</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td><img src="image_url" alt="Photo" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moorgate 41</td>
<td>Moorgate</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>1977</td>
<td>1978</td>
<td>Sidney, Kaye, Firmin &amp; Partners</td>
<td>A (Reclad 2007 in limestone with additional storeys)</td>
<td></td>
<td><img src="image_url" alt="Photo" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Former AMRO Bank</td>
<td>Moorgate</td>
<td>1975</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td></td>
<td>Trehearne &amp; Norman Preston &amp; Partners</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td><img src="image_url" alt="Photo" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Binney, <em>From Splendour to Banality</em>, 1983</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building name</td>
<td>Street</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Date Started</td>
<td>Date Completed</td>
<td>Architect</td>
<td>Demolished (D), Substantially Altered (A), Existing (E) or Threatened (T)</td>
<td>Listed (I,II*,II) or Certificate of Immunity (COI)</td>
<td>Photos by author, July 2015 (unless otherwise specified)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moorgate</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1979</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>Rolf Judd Group Practice</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moorgate</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>1985</td>
<td>1987</td>
<td>Fitzroy Robinson &amp; Partners</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building name</td>
<td>Street</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Date Started</td>
<td>Date Completed</td>
<td>Architect</td>
<td>Demolished (D), Substantially Altered (A), Existing (E) or Threatened (T)</td>
<td>Listed (I,II*,II) or Certificate of Immunity (COI)</td>
<td>Photos by author, July 2015 (unless otherwise specified)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fleet House, formerly Tote House</td>
<td>New Bridge Street</td>
<td>10-12</td>
<td>1957</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>Shingler &amp; Risdon</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7-8</td>
<td>1983</td>
<td>1985</td>
<td>Elsom, Pack &amp; Roberts</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building name</td>
<td>Street</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Date Started</td>
<td>Date Completed</td>
<td>Architect</td>
<td>Demolished (D), Substantially Altered (A), Existing (E) or Threatened (T)</td>
<td>Listed (I,II*,II) or Certificate of Immunity (COI)</td>
<td>Photos by author, July 2015 (unless otherwise specified)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Bridge Street</td>
<td>35-38</td>
<td>1983</td>
<td>1986</td>
<td>Stone, Toms &amp; Partners</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orbit House</td>
<td>New Fetter Lane</td>
<td>1958</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>Anderson, Forster &amp; Wilcox</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W.H. Smith</td>
<td>New Fetter Lane</td>
<td>1972</td>
<td>1976</td>
<td>Casson, Conder &amp; Partners</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pemberton House</td>
<td>New Street Square</td>
<td>1954</td>
<td>1954</td>
<td>Richard Seifert &amp; Partners</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newspaper House</td>
<td>New Street Square</td>
<td>1957</td>
<td>1959</td>
<td>Richard Seifert &amp; Partners</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Photos by author, July 2015 (unless otherwise specified)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building name</th>
<th>Street</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Date Started</th>
<th>Date Completed</th>
<th>Architect</th>
<th>Demolished (D), Substantially Altered (A), Existing (E) or Threatened (T)</th>
<th>Listed (I,II*,II) or Certificate of Immunity (COI)</th>
<th>Photos by author, July 2015 (unless otherwise specified)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cedric House</td>
<td>New Street Square</td>
<td>1983</td>
<td>1985</td>
<td>T. P. Bennett &amp; Son</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Newgate Street</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1964</td>
<td>1966</td>
<td>Ronald Ward &amp; Partners</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Svenska House</td>
<td>Newgate Street</td>
<td>4-5</td>
<td>1971</td>
<td>1973</td>
<td>Richard Seifert &amp; Partners</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nicholas Lane</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1979</td>
<td>1982</td>
<td>Thomas Saunders &amp; Associates</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelley House</td>
<td>Noble Street</td>
<td>1958</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>Gunton &amp; Gunton</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Norwich Street</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>1983</td>
<td>Comprehensive Design Group</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goodenough House</td>
<td>Old Broad Street</td>
<td>1955</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>Ley, Colbeck &amp; Partners</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winchester House</td>
<td>Old Broad Street</td>
<td>1962</td>
<td>1968</td>
<td>Gunton &amp; Gunton</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building name</td>
<td>Street</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Date Started</td>
<td>Date Completed</td>
<td>Architect</td>
<td>Demolished (D), Substantially Altered (A), Existing (E) or Threatened (T)</td>
<td>Listed (I,II*,II) or Certificate of Immunity (COI)</td>
<td>Photos by author, July 2015 (unless otherwise specified)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dashwood House</td>
<td>Old Broad Street</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>1972</td>
<td>1976</td>
<td>York, Rosenberg &amp; Mardall</td>
<td>A</td>
<td><img src="dashwood_house.jpg" alt="Image" /></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broad Street House</td>
<td>Old Broad Street</td>
<td>52-57</td>
<td>1972</td>
<td>1977</td>
<td>Ley, Colbeck &amp; Partners</td>
<td>E</td>
<td><img src="broad_street_house.jpg" alt="Image" /></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building name</td>
<td>Street</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Date Started</td>
<td>Date Completed</td>
<td>Architect</td>
<td>Demolished (D), Substantially Altered (A), Existing (E) or Threatened (T)</td>
<td>Listed (I,II*,II) or Certificate of Immunity (COI)</td>
<td>Photos by author, July 2015 (unless otherwise specified)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building name</td>
<td>Street</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Date Started</td>
<td>Date Completed</td>
<td>Architect</td>
<td>Demolished (D), Substantially Altered (A), Existing (E) or Threatened (T)</td>
<td>Listed (I,II*,II) or Certificate of Immunity (COI)</td>
<td>Photos by author, July 2015 (unless otherwise specified)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korea Exchange Bank</td>
<td>Old Jewry</td>
<td>27-32</td>
<td>1950</td>
<td>1958</td>
<td>Waterhouse &amp; Ripley</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td><img src="image1.jpg" alt="Photo" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midland Bank Offices</td>
<td>Pepys Street</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>1964</td>
<td></td>
<td>Carl Fisher &amp; Associates</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td><img src="image2.jpg" alt="Photo" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pepys Street</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1972</td>
<td>1974</td>
<td>Thomas Saunders &amp; Associates</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td><img src="image3.jpg" alt="Photo" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Philpot Lane</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1978</td>
<td>1983</td>
<td>McMorrow, Gough &amp; Chung</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td><img src="image4.jpg" alt="Photo" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building name</td>
<td>Street</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Date Started</td>
<td>Date Completed</td>
<td>Architect</td>
<td>Demolished (D), Substantially Altered (A), Existing (E) or Threatened (T)</td>
<td>Listed (I,II*,II) or Certificate of Immunity (COI)</td>
<td>Photos by author, July 2015 (unless otherwise specified)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philpot Lane 9-10</td>
<td>Philpot Lane</td>
<td>9-10</td>
<td>1983</td>
<td>1985</td>
<td>Sheppard Robson</td>
<td>A (rendered)</td>
<td></td>
<td><img src="image1.jpg" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fengate House</td>
<td>Philpot Lane</td>
<td>14-15</td>
<td>1983</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>York, Rosenberg &amp; Mardall</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td><img src="image2.jpg" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scottish Life House</td>
<td>Poultry</td>
<td>1968</td>
<td>1970</td>
<td></td>
<td>Joseph, F. Milton Cashmore &amp; Partners</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td><img src="image3.jpg" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bank Buildings</td>
<td>Prince's Street</td>
<td>1949</td>
<td>1962</td>
<td></td>
<td>Victor Heal</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td><img src="image4.jpg" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building name</td>
<td>Street</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Date Started</td>
<td>Date Completed</td>
<td>Architect</td>
<td>Demolished (D), Substantially Altered (A), Existing (E) or Threatened (T)</td>
<td>Listed (I,II*,II) or Certificate of Immunity (COI)</td>
<td>Photos by author, July 2015 (unless otherwise specified)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Former Manufacturers Hanover Trust</td>
<td>Prince's Street</td>
<td>7-8</td>
<td>1970</td>
<td>1972</td>
<td>Fitzroy Robinson &amp; Partners</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="https://example.com">Image</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aldermary House</td>
<td>Queen Street</td>
<td>10-15</td>
<td>1959</td>
<td>1963</td>
<td>Fitzroy Robinson &amp; Partners</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="https://example.com">Image</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building name</td>
<td>Street</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Date Started</td>
<td>Date Completed</td>
<td>Architect</td>
<td>Demolished (D), Substantially Altered (A), Existing (E) or Threatened (T)</td>
<td>Listed (I,II*,II) or Certificate of Immunity (COI)</td>
<td>Photos by author, July 2015 (unless otherwise specified)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queen Street</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>1982</td>
<td>1986</td>
<td></td>
<td>Terry Farrell Partnership</td>
<td>A (refaced)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queen Street</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>1985</td>
<td>1987</td>
<td></td>
<td>Renton, Howard, Wood, Levine Partnership</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queen Street Place</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>1963</td>
<td></td>
<td>C. Edmund Wilford &amp; Son</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bank of London &amp; South America</td>
<td>Queen Victoria Street</td>
<td>40-66</td>
<td>1950</td>
<td>1957</td>
<td>Victor Heal</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building name</td>
<td>Street</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Date Started</td>
<td>Date Completed</td>
<td>Architect</td>
<td>Demolished (D), Substantially Altered (A), Existing (E) or Threatened (T)</td>
<td>Listed (I,II*,II) or Certificate of Immunity (COI)</td>
<td>Photos by author, July 2015 (unless otherwise specified)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bucklersbury House</td>
<td>Queen Victoria Street</td>
<td></td>
<td>1953</td>
<td>1958</td>
<td>Owen Cambell Jones &amp; Sons</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td>(photo: Chris Rogers, see also Fig. 25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temple Court</td>
<td>Queen Victoria Street</td>
<td></td>
<td>1953</td>
<td>1962</td>
<td>Owen Cambell Jones &amp; Sons</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salvation Army Headquarters</td>
<td>Queen Victoria Street</td>
<td></td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>1963</td>
<td>H. &amp; M. Lidbetter</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Times Offices (Printing House Square)</td>
<td>Queen Victoria Street</td>
<td></td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td>Llewelyn-Davies, Weeks &amp; Partners (design architects) / Ellis, Clarke &amp; Gallannaugh (executive architects)</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominant House</td>
<td>Queen Victoria Street</td>
<td></td>
<td>1966</td>
<td>1966</td>
<td>Searle, Row &amp; Smith</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walker House</td>
<td>Queen Victoria Street</td>
<td></td>
<td>1964</td>
<td>1967</td>
<td>Ronald Ward &amp; Partners</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building name</td>
<td>Street</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Date Started</td>
<td>Date Completed</td>
<td>Architect</td>
<td>Demolished (D), Substantially Altered (A), Existing (E) or Threatened (T)</td>
<td>Listed (I,II*,II) or Certificate of Immunity (COI)</td>
<td>Photos by author, July 2015 (unless otherwise specified)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mermaid House</td>
<td>Queen Victoria Street</td>
<td></td>
<td>1977</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>Richard Seifert &amp; Partners</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royal Bank of Canada House</td>
<td>Queen Victoria Street</td>
<td></td>
<td>1983</td>
<td>1988</td>
<td>Sidney, Kaye, Firmin &amp; Partners with Canadian architects Crang &amp; Boake</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red Lion Court</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1984</td>
<td>1987</td>
<td>RHWL Partnership</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chile House</td>
<td>Ropemaker Street</td>
<td></td>
<td>1955</td>
<td>1956</td>
<td>Joseph Mendleson &amp; Partners</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td>(see Fig. 15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.P. House</td>
<td>Ropemaker Street</td>
<td></td>
<td>1956</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>Joseph, F. Milton Cashmore &amp; Partners</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building name</td>
<td>Street</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Date Started</td>
<td>Date Completed</td>
<td>Architect</td>
<td>Demolished (D), Substantially Altered (A), Existing (E) or Threatened (T)</td>
<td>Listed (I,II*,II) or Certificate of Immunity (COI)</td>
<td>Photos by author, July 2015 (unless otherwise specified)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Britannic House (now City Point)</td>
<td>Ropemaker Street</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1964</td>
<td>1967</td>
<td>Joseph, F. Milton Cashmore &amp; Partners / Niall D Nelson</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fleetbank House</td>
<td>Salisbury Square</td>
<td>1971</td>
<td>1975</td>
<td></td>
<td>C. Edmund Wilford &amp; Son</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building name</td>
<td>Street</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Date Started</td>
<td>Date Completed</td>
<td>Architect</td>
<td>Demolished (D), Substantially Altered (A), Existing (E) or Threatened (T)</td>
<td>Listed (I,II*,II) or Certificate of Immunity (COI)</td>
<td>Photos by author, July 2015 (unless otherwise specified)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Bride's House</td>
<td>Salisbury Square</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1982</td>
<td>1985</td>
<td>T. P. Bennett &amp; Son</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shoe Lane</td>
<td></td>
<td>66-73</td>
<td>1959</td>
<td>H. V. Lobb &amp; Partners</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Press Centre</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hill House</td>
<td>Shoe Lane</td>
<td></td>
<td>1975</td>
<td>1979</td>
<td>Ronald Fielding Partnership</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snow Hill</td>
<td>6-9</td>
<td></td>
<td>1974</td>
<td>1976</td>
<td>Fitzroy Robinson &amp; Partners</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Andrew Street</td>
<td>6-16</td>
<td></td>
<td>1955</td>
<td>1959</td>
<td>Hannen &amp; Markham</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building name</td>
<td>Street</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Date Started</td>
<td>Date Completed</td>
<td>Architect</td>
<td>Demolished (D), Substantially Altered (A), Existing (E) or Threatened (T)</td>
<td>Listed (I,II*,II) or Certificate of Immunity (COI)</td>
<td>Photos by author, July 2015 (unless otherwise specified)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Andrew Street</td>
<td>9-13</td>
<td>1971</td>
<td>1975</td>
<td>Raymond J. Cecil &amp; Partners</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Bride Street</td>
<td>St Dunstan’s Hill</td>
<td>6-18</td>
<td>1964</td>
<td>1966</td>
<td>D.R. Stewart</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Dunstan’s Hill</td>
<td>4-9</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>1983</td>
<td>Fitzroy Robinson &amp; Partners</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lumley House</td>
<td>St Mary Axe</td>
<td>1951</td>
<td>1952</td>
<td>Alan W. Pipe &amp; Sons / Joseph Vermont</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bankok Bank</td>
<td>St Mary Axe</td>
<td>1970</td>
<td>1980</td>
<td>Fitzroy Robinson &amp; Partners</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Bank of Greece</td>
<td>St Mary Axe</td>
<td>1977</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>A. Arvanitakis</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peterhill House and Crest House</td>
<td>St Paul's Churchyard</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td>Owen Cambell Jones &amp; Sons (Alec J. Shickle)</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple Blocks</td>
<td>St Paul's Churchyard</td>
<td>1962</td>
<td>1967</td>
<td>Trehearne &amp; Norman Preston &amp; Partners</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td>(see Fig. 9)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Swithin's House</td>
<td>St Swithin's Lane</td>
<td>1949</td>
<td>1953</td>
<td>Gunton &amp; Gunton</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building name</td>
<td>Street</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Date Started</td>
<td>Date Completed</td>
<td>Architect</td>
<td>Demolished (D), Substantially Altered (A), Existing (E) or Threatened (T)</td>
<td>Listed (I,II*,II) or Certificate of Immunity (COI)</td>
<td>Photos by author, July 2015 (unless otherwise specified)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>St Swithin's Lane</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1954</td>
<td>1954</td>
<td>T. Heysham</td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rothschild &amp; Sons (New Court)</td>
<td>St Swithin's Lane</td>
<td>1963</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fitzroy Robinson &amp; Partners</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eagle Star House</td>
<td>Threadneedle Street</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td>1968</td>
<td></td>
<td>Easton, Robinson, Preston &amp; Partners</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angel Court</td>
<td>Throgmorton Street</td>
<td>1974</td>
<td>1980</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fitzroy Robinson &amp; Partners</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knollys House</td>
<td>Tower Hill</td>
<td>1962</td>
<td>1962</td>
<td></td>
<td>Howard, Souster &amp; Fairburn</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tower Place</td>
<td>Tower Place</td>
<td>1962</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td></td>
<td>George: Trew: Dunn (Anthony Beckles Wilson) in association with CLRP Architects</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building name</td>
<td>Street</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Date Started</td>
<td>Date Completed</td>
<td>Architect</td>
<td>Demolished (D), Substantially Altered (A), Existing (E) or Threatened (T)</td>
<td>Listed (I,II*,II) or Certificate of Immunity (COI)</td>
<td>Photos by author, July 2015 (unless otherwise specified)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Former St Bridget's House and Kildare House</td>
<td>Tudor Street</td>
<td>1950</td>
<td>1957</td>
<td></td>
<td>Trehearne &amp; Norman Preston &amp; Partners</td>
<td>A (reclad by Renton Howard Wood Levin &amp; Partners 1984-86 when converted to KPMG headquarters, subsequently converted to hotel and multiple office use)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building name</td>
<td>Street</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Date Started</td>
<td>Date Completed</td>
<td>Architect</td>
<td>Demolished (D), Substantially Altered (A), Existing (E) or Threatened (T)</td>
<td>Listed (I,II*,II) or Certificate of Immunity (COI)</td>
<td>Photos by author, July 2015 (unless otherwise specified)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gouldens</td>
<td>Tudor Street</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1983</td>
<td>1988</td>
<td>Fitzroy Robinson &amp; Partners</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Gouldens" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Blocks</td>
<td>Upper Thames Street</td>
<td></td>
<td>1957</td>
<td>1958</td>
<td>H. Curtis</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="2 Blocks" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malvern House</td>
<td>Upper Thames Street</td>
<td></td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>C. Edmund Wilford &amp; Son</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Malvern House" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Princess House (Barclays Chief Foreign Branch)</td>
<td>Upper Thames Street</td>
<td></td>
<td>1965</td>
<td>1967</td>
<td>Owen Cambell Jones &amp; Sons (Alec J. Shickle)</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Princess House" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sir John Lyon House</td>
<td>Upper Thames Street</td>
<td></td>
<td>1963</td>
<td>1969</td>
<td>Kersey, Gale &amp; Spooner</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Sir John Lyon House" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suffolk House</td>
<td>Upper Thames Street</td>
<td>140-149</td>
<td>1970</td>
<td>1971</td>
<td>CLRP Architects</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Suffolk House" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queensbridge House</td>
<td>Upper Thames Street</td>
<td></td>
<td>1972</td>
<td>1975</td>
<td>Hubbard Ford &amp; Partners</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Queensbridge House" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mondial House</td>
<td>Upper Thames Street</td>
<td></td>
<td>1969</td>
<td>1976</td>
<td>Hubbard Ford &amp; Partners</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Mondial House" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building name</td>
<td>Street</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Date Started</td>
<td>Date Completed</td>
<td>Architect</td>
<td>Demolished (D), Substantially Altered (A), Existing (E) or Threatened (T)</td>
<td>Listed (I,II*,II) or Certificate of Immunity (COI)</td>
<td>Photos by author, July 2015 (unless otherwise specified)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ebbgate House</td>
<td>Upper Thames Street</td>
<td></td>
<td>1980</td>
<td>1984</td>
<td>Holford Associates</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Walbrook</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>D. Armstrong Smith</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Paul’s House</td>
<td>Warwick Square</td>
<td></td>
<td>1965</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td>Victor Heal &amp; Partners</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compter House</td>
<td>Wood Street</td>
<td></td>
<td>1953</td>
<td>1956</td>
<td>Ronald Ward &amp; Partners</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hill, Samuel &amp; Co (former Nestle)</td>
<td>Wood Street</td>
<td>92-100</td>
<td>1957</td>
<td>1958</td>
<td>T. P. Bennett &amp; Son</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roman House</td>
<td>Wood Street</td>
<td></td>
<td>1957</td>
<td>1958</td>
<td>Owen Cambell Jones &amp; Sons (R.N.Wakelin)</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dresdner House</td>
<td>Wood Street</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>1985</td>
<td>1988</td>
<td>Lister, Drew &amp; Associates</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 2

In August 19341 the City of London had its first concentrated aerial bombardment. The first of many that were to continue for the next four and a half years. One third of the City's square mile was destroyed, much of it by fire, which raged through the narrow streets and courts which intersected the City. Following World War II the Corporation of London were faced with the tremendous task of clearing up the debris, and following that the redevelopment of the City in such a way as to provide an environment in which modern business could function most efficiently. At the same time there were homes to be built for the residents, preserving as far as possible the essential amenities and historical monuments. In this one square mile within the vast area of Greater London, their aim was, above all, to provide for posterity a new and vital city, a living city.

During the 19th century, the City was overtaken by a commuter revolution. By the 1860s, when most of the main line and district line stations had been established, the trickle had become a flood, and today nearly half a million commuters pour into the square mile every day. A square mile steeped in ancient tradition and history, where exquisite Wren churches rub shoulders with ultra-modern office blocks, in fact a square mile of contrasts, with a resident population no greater than that of a country market town, but with a commuter population of nearly 500,000.

The Lombards trading with London in the 16th century established the first recognisable banking system in Britain...Lombard Street is still today the centre of many merchant and overseas banks. The head offices of the Big 5 banks are mostly in the few hundred yards surrounding the Bank of England, they’re mainly products of 19th and early 20th century ostentation, their monumental ‘bankers Georgian’ and neo Classical facades were intended to impress clients.

...The Stock Exchange, together with the Baltic Exchange, the Bullion Market, the British Insurance Association, the Great Commodity Markets, Lloyds Register of Shipping and Lloyds of London are household words throughout the world. Lloyds of London is the greatest insurance organisation in the world. Lloyds, together with the British Insurance Association and the London Insurance Companies, make the City the very heart of international insurance.

...Within bow shot of the Tower of London is one of the most up-to-date developments in the City. Richard II decreed that no building should be erected within bow shot of the Tower of London and before Tower Place could be built no less than 23 permits had to be obtained. With its roots deep in history, Tower Place has been built as a vital link in the great rebuilding programme, maintaining the City’s position as a world centre of finance and commerce. It will form, in the long term, part of the overall complex of pedestrian ways and link roads.

Most of the City's daytime population are pedestrian, and the Corporation has taken note of this factor when planning the new development areas. Paternoster, north of St Pauls, is a case in point. This area was razed to the ground in the Blitz. Today there are spacious piazzas with seats in the sun. There are shops and restaurants providing the everyday needs of office workers. The piazzas and walkways are part of the grand plan for providing a network of pedestrian ways throughout the City. Care has been taken by the architects and planners to keep the scale of Paternoster to that of St Pauls.

The Corporation’s most ambitious and forward-looking scheme, The Barbican. The 70 acre site, including Golden Lane, was the most heavily blitzed area in the City, and it was due to the foresight of the Corporation that it did not revert to its original state of somewhat squalid, congested streets, or become an area of uncoordinated piecemeal development. Pedestrian bridges link the north and south sides of London Wall. The ruins of St Alfage Church have been
incorporated into the scheme. Pleasant gardens have been created in the shadow of the Roman wall, which originally marked the City boundary. Pedestrians are entirely segregated on the upper levels from the traffic below. The City claimed to be pioneers of total pedestrian-traffic segregation in the world. There are banks, shops and pleasant open air restaurants.

But this is only the first part of the Barbican saga. The second phase, the residential section, is still under construction. But when complete it will draw back to the City some 6,000 residents. They will have every amenity in this 'city within a city' for a full cultural and social life. There will be swimming pools, tennis courts and schools. There will be a concert hall for the LSO and a theatre for the RSC.

...The only really big-scale industry in the City: newspapers. Fleet Street is traditionally the home of many national, provincial and overseas newspapers. Some of the great newspapers which are household names throughout the world have built themselves interesting new offices.

Great changes are taking place in the Fetter Lane and Aldgate areas. At first sight these may appear as disjointed, but in fact they form essential parts of the great overall re-planning scheme. They can be compared to individual pieces in a vast and highly complex jigsaw puzzle, which when finished will eventually make up the complete picture.

...The [1956 Lord Mayor's Show] procession was a window on the City's economic activities, emphasis being laid on the vast contribution to national economy made by the Bank organisations, international insurance, investments and commodity markets; contributions which have many times rescued Britain from financial crises.

The Corporation of London is always looking to the future, and it is the young people today who will benefit most from the changes taking place in the City. The architects and planners are ever mindful of two significant factors. First the importance of creating a suitable environment in which the highly complex machinery of modern business can function most efficiently. And second, of providing all the social and cultural amenities essential not only for the hundreds of thousands of commuters but for those who live within the City boundaries.'
APPENDIX 3

Post-war statutory listed building typology statistics, 2003 and 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Post-War Listing Entries: Typology (right) and Region (below)</th>
<th>Offices</th>
<th>Housing</th>
<th>Schools</th>
<th>Ecclesiastical</th>
<th>Civic Buildings / Libraries</th>
<th>Higher Educational</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Northern England</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midlands</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern England</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South-Western England</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern England</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South-Eastern England</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London: North of the Thames</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London: City &amp; Westminster</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London: South of the Thames</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>26</strong></td>
<td><strong>85</strong></td>
<td><strong>34</strong></td>
<td><strong>57</strong></td>
<td><strong>14</strong></td>
<td><strong>37</strong></td>
<td><strong>76</strong></td>
<td><strong>329</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. POST-WAR LISTED BUILDING TYPOLOGY STATISTICS, SOURCED FROM INFORMATION SUPPLIED BY HISTORIC ENGLAND IN JUNE 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Offices</th>
<th>Commercial and Industrial (not including Offices)</th>
<th>Private Houses</th>
<th>Housing (Private and Institutional)</th>
<th>Housing (public)</th>
<th>Schools</th>
<th>Ecclesiastical</th>
<th>Civic Buildings / Libraries</th>
<th>Higher Educational</th>
<th>Public and Institutional</th>
<th>Higher Educational</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>774</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Percentage in parentheses)
APPENDIX 4

In May I reported to the Committee (LAC 66/87) that the historians in London Division were preparing a series of reports on post-war buildings in London. This report, and the ones following on educational buildings and on sculpture and decorative art, are the first in the series. They are intended to assist in the evaluation of buildings for listing, following the announcement by the Secretary of State that from 1988 he intends to embark on a rolling programme in which any building at least thirty years old would be considered eligible for listing. At the same time he announced a 'competition' to choose the first fifty post-war buildings to be listed under this new ruling. While these reports may have some relevance for this competition, they are primarily intended to take a longer-term view in assessing post-war buildings for listing.
POST-WAR OFFICE BUILDINGS IN LONDON

This report begins with an introduction which gives an outline history of the architectural development of offices in post-war London and suggests some ground rules for evaluating them. There then follows a gazetteer, arranged by borough, which indicates the examples that merit special attention.

RESEARCH METHODS

Apart from articles published at the time very little has been written about office architecture of the period 1945-60. No doubt academic historians will one day take up the subject, but until that happens our understanding of it is bound to remain less well-informed than it should be. Because there is no authoritative secondary literature to turn to, the research for this report had to begin with a trawl through the architectural periodicals of the period, plus an examination of the modest number of pamphlets and books about office design published in the decade and a half after the war. Many of the articles that were read have been itemised building by building in the gazetteer at the end of this report.

It was out of the question to try and inspect all the office buildings that secured a mention, however slender, in the contemporary architectural press so some selection had to be made on the basis of published material alone. On the opposite count, some buildings have been singled out for inspection which received very little contemporary press coverage when new but which have gained a significant reputation in recent years.

The gazetteer lists almost all the buildings that were inspected. In most cases inspections were confined to exteriors, though in one or two cases where the interior layout or decoration of a block was known to be important (e.g. the Time-Life Building) permission was sought to see inside. As remarked below, although the interior layout and capacity of office buildings were judged the key to their success most were designed according to accepted formulas and few were singled out for comment on account of their interiors alone. The day will no doubt come when the typical office space of the 1950s, still at present so ubiquitous, will have become as much a curiosity as a partitioned counting-house of the eighteenth century, but that degree of rarity value is still a long way off. Where interiors have been mentioned in the gazetteer it is for their unique rather than their representative qualities.

One other point needs to be made about the research which has formed the basis of this report. Although nominally the report covers the whole of Greater London all the examples cited in the gazetteer are from the inner boroughs, especially the City and Westminster. In the years up to c.1958 the outer areas had yet to experience those localised office booms that were the result of decentralisation policies, so most of the office provision in places like Hendon or Sutton was the result of the modest requirements of already-established firms. There seems little evidence that such demand produced any exceptional buildings, though there is always the possibility that there are one or two examples as yet unnoticed which deserve recognition.
POST WAR OFFICE DEVELOPMENT

Although offices suffered just as badly as other types of building during the Second World War, projects for their rebuilding had to wait in line after 1945 behind the more urgent demands for housing, schools and other welfare buildings. The City of London, hub of the office world, lost almost a third of its building stock through bombing, leaving a shortage of 6 million square feet of office space; other parts of London also lost their share of office buildings. While materials and labour were directed to projects of higher priority, firms and organisations that had lost accommodation had to make do as best they could: not until 1952 was the ban on office building lifted, followed two years later by the winding-up of the system of building licences. In the second half of the 1950s the demand for office buildings burst into life, both in the replacement of what had been lost (sometimes using designs made in the late 1940s) and in answer to fresh expectations. Most of the examples in the gazetteer are the result of that building boom.

The exception to the rule in this sequence of events was the provision of offices for government departments. Under the so-called 'Lessor Scheme' selected developers were granted building licences ahead of the pack on the understanding that the blocks they erected would be made available on lease to the government for a fixed period (generally 40 years). Thirteen blocks were put up in London under this arrangement, including Belfort House and Laco House in Theobalds Road for the Ministry of Defence and Atlantic House on Holborn Viaduct for the Stationery Office. In the opinion of many critics the way these were developed, with the government calling the tune but not accepting responsibility for the architectural result, was a shameful lost opportunity, particularly when set against the more creative government interventions in other spheres.

The Lessor Scheme blocks followed an architectural pattern for large office projects which had been established before the war with buildings such as Shell-Mex House(1931). Its main characteristics were the occupancy of the site up to the street line; the provision of light-wells for lighting offices in the heart of the building; and the use of steel-frame or reinforced concrete construction, clad in brick or Portland stone. Others followed the Lessor Scheme example (e.g. the National Farmers Union by Ronald Ward and Partners, 1956) but architects keen to make a name for themselves in the office sphere were ready to adopt other solutions, and were encouraged to do so by the requirements of post-war planning legislation. The introduction of two new principles- Plot Ratio Control and the Daylighting Code- directed attention to other kinds of approach. The administration of a plot ratio system, in place of the previous height limit regulations, offered a chance for architects to break through the old 100 ft. height barrier; and the Daylighting Code, by indicating that better natural lighting could be achieved in tall blocks generously spaced, presented a direct incentive for them to make that break.

Whatever their previous training or inclination, architects working within this new set of rules were driven towards solutions more in the mould of the International Modern style. Some of the most celebrated examples of that style- the Ministry of Education building in Rio de Janeiro(Oscar Niemeyer,1937), the United Nations Secretariat building(Wallace K.Harrison et al,1947-53, and the Lever Building on Park Avenue New York(Gordon Bunshaft of SOM,1952)- offered models ideally suited to satisfy both the new planning
climate and the expectations of building investors. The nett result was that, through foreign example plus local demand, the shape of the typical London office block was transformed— from a massive low building filling its entire site to a tall slab set at an angle to the street, often carried on a one or two storey podium. And with a height of twelve storeys or more these blocks protruded above the London skyline as rivals to the spires and domes of earlier centuries. Fountain House, Fenchurch Street (1957–8) was the first tower and podium scheme to be completed, followed by State House, High Holborn, Castrol House, Marylebone Road and Thorn House, St.Martin's Lane. There seems to have been little overall policy about the location of these towers, other than a rule of thumb that they should not be crowded too closely together and an attempt to protect certain views of St.Paul's.

Were there other factors known to have shaped post-war office buildings which should be taken into account in assessing their development? The architects involved claim to have attached great importance to interior layouts: it was, they said, the size of a typical office floor, especially the depth to which light could penetrate an office interior, that formed the basis of their design strategy. Crucial though that factor undoubtedly was, there seems to have been very little debate about office conditions and planning: the term 'space planning' was never heard, and there was little of to-day's obsessive discussion about the accommodation of electronic communications and other services. And although the typical office building of the 1950s probably met the basic requirements more successfully than its predecessors it was still primitively-equipped compared with what was to come. For instance with a few exceptions, including Huntingdon House, Mark Lane EC3 and New Zealand House, none of the examples cited in the gazetteer had air conditioning. On the same theme, very few of the offices of the period 1945–60 appear to have been singled out at the time of completion for their innovations in layout or servicing.

CONTEMPORARY REACTIONS

It is often remarked that the reputation of buildings follows a cyclical pattern: appreciative notice at the time of completion, then a gradual slide from favour and eventually, after thirty years or so, a return to public esteem. Most post-war office buildings fall outside that cycle for the simple reason that they never reached the first stage. From the time they were finished they were regarded as being architecturally dull, if not mediocre, symbolic of the missed opportunity of post-war rebuilding.

This stamp of failure is particularly true of the Lessor Scheme blocks, which were repeatedly condemned by J.M.Richards in the pages of the Architectural Review 1950–2 and have never since recovered favour. Those blocks, said Richards, were 'conceived in a spirit of putting cheapness and expediency first' with no regard for architectural standards. In almost the same breath he went on to deplore the 'inflated neo-Georgian' of the first blocks put up in the rebuilt parts of the City, particularly those just east of St.Paul's. Others felt the same way. Sir David Eccles, Minister of Works, in a speech of 1954 sounding just like an Architectural Review editorial, remarked: 'I fear that unless swift and effective action is taken we shall see fat and familiar, mediocre and characterless neo-Georgian architecture rising from Hitler's ruins'.

3.
None of the buildings thus referred to have recovered from the low critical reception they received when new. The only glint of appreciation has come in the last year or so from critics and urban designers who have begun to campaign for a revival of uniform height limits in London. In terms of height, but nothing else, the Lessor Scheme blocks and their equivalents may have some partial merit.

What Richards and the influential team at the Architectural Press were looking for was some sign that the tenets of the modern movement, which so neatly matched the requirements of the new planning codes, would be applied to office design. The first two examples of their preferred solution were buildings which, to more recent eyes, seem not much better than the Lessor Scheme blocks: Bucklersbury House, Queen Victoria Street by O.Campbell-Jones, and the development at Eastbourne Terrace, Paddington by C.R.Elsom and Partners. Bucklersbury House was singled out above all because it accomplished the long-awaited device of setting blocks at an angle to the street in order to achieve good daylighting: it could be faulted for its bulk but it was, thought Richards, 'a tolerably straightforward and contemporary design'. At Eastbourne Terrace Elsom had less space in which to achieve artful planning, and was forced to adopt both high and low blocks along the streetline. The virtue of his design was that in doing so he produced a scheme of unassertive regularity. That seemed justification enough for Richards' colleague Colin Boyne to illustrate Elsom's design alongside a classic of the same vintage, the Seagram Building by Mies van der Rohe.

These two projects, both completed in 1959, have yet to attract a new generation of admirers. It seems highly probable that they will never return to favour since their most applauded quality, that of innovation, was also the most transitory. Their immediate successors, buildings such as Castrol House and New Zealand House, did the same things much better, such that even those who questioned the need for buildings of that scale could see the difference. It is from the ranks of those 'Mark Two' modern offices that the examples most likely to be singled out for attention will come.

HEIGHT AND STRUCTURE

Historians who have debated the origins of the tall office building in New York and Chicago in the late nineteenth century have placed great emphasis on the question of height, including the use of the term skyscraper, and on the development of the structural systems which enabled new heights to be achieved. Regardless of their appearance, certain American offices have been endowed with historic status because of their number of storeys or the details of their frame construction.

Can the same test usefully be applied to post-war London office buildings? As regards height, office buildings have made a contribution to the stock of high buildings second only to public housing but they have produced no examples, at least from the years before 1960, of outstanding height or of that quality that Frank Lloyd Wright referred to as 'height triumphant'.

The matter of building structure is more difficult to assess. Most of the buildings cited in the gazetteer are of reinforced concrete frame construction with concrete slab floors, or in a few cases (e.g.Wingate House, Shaftesbury Avenue) steel frame and hollow tile floors. Neither method constituted a
technical innovation. However, one system of concrete frame construction, devised by the engineer Felix Samuely, was an advance on conventional methods. It relied on the window wall as the principal structural frame, with diagonal bracing in the end walls. The components of the frame were pre-cast concrete sections, bolted together on site and grouted after levelling; almost system building but with a greater flexibility for site adjustment. A number of office buildings were constructed on this method, the most celebrated being the National Dock Labour Board building on the Albert Embankment. A variant of it was used at the United States Embassy, a project on which Samuely was the consulting engineer.

FINAL CONSIDERATIONS

At the time of writing only buildings which had been erected or started on site before December 1957 can be considered for listing. However many of the examples cited in the gazetteer, including one which is recommended for listing (Castrol House), are of a slightly later date. In making a study such as this it seemed sensible to look ahead a few years instead of repeating the exercise year by year as the thirty year rule rolls forward.

The asterisks in the gazetteer indicate buildings which are recommended for listing, generally speaking because they were regarded as outstanding at the time of completion and have stood the test of time well. No examples have been singled out as representative of their kind, though the National Dock Labour Board building falls partly within that category. In dealing with a recent period representative buildings are inevitably more thick on the ground than they are for earlier years, and although it might be possible to justify the listing of a typical spec-built office block such a decision might prove difficult to defend. Though office buildings are generally speaking a vulnerable building type, especially in London, no doubt sufficient post-war examples will survive until such time as it is feasible to add a typical example to the lists.
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GAZETTEER

In this gazetteer the examples investigated are cited by borough, and within each borough alphabetically by street.
The abbreviations used in the references to periodicals are: AI- Architecture Illustrated; AJ- Architects' Journal; AR- Architectural Review; A and BN- Architect and Building News; B- Builder.

Camden

1. 'Daily Worker' Building, 75, Farringdon Road, ECI.
R.c.frame with brick infill
AR, August 1949, 101-5.

* 2. TUC Building, Great Russell Street, WC1.
Sculptures by Epstein and Bernard Meadows.
Widely recognised as being, apart from the Royal Festival Hall, the most important public building erected in London in the 1950s. Ingenious integration of offices with meeting rooms and a conference hall, all achieved within a height limit of 80ft. The building is planned around a courtyard, dominated by a triangular marble screen on its west front against which stands an Epstein sculpture. The floor of this courtyard incorporates the hexagonal roof-lights of the basement hall, carried on a welded steel space frame structure. The street elevations are handled in a Corbusian manner, especially the Dyott Street front with its projecting balconies and glazed staircase drum. Still essentially in its original condition.

Trehearne and Norman for Featherstone(Holborn) Properties Ltd., 1956-60.
(Drawing exhib. at RA 1955).
Described by Pevsner as 'far from run-of-the-mill-1960' stuff. Principal part, a 16-storey tower, distinguished by having its facade slung inside its structural frame, like the Inland Steel Building in Chicago (SOM, 1957).

Gordon Jeeves for Cable and Wireless Ltd.

5. Belfort House and Lacon House, Theobalds Road, WC1.
Major A.S. Ash.
Lessor Scheme buildings.
6. Sentinel House, Southampton Row/ Theobalds Road, WCI.

The City

Trehearne and Norman, Preston and Partners, 1954-6.
Eight storeys, the upper two recessed.
AR, January 1956, 42-44; AI, September 1956, 19.

r.c. frame with interesting r.c. elliptical staircase.
AJ, August 9 1951, 167-72; AI, September 1956, 19.

Howard Robertson, 1955-56.
A livelier building than many of its kind, but not quite as lively as the artist's perspective for it foretold. Deep cornice above the fifth floor and slightly protruding floor slabs on the floors below. Occasional balconies on the two principal frontages not as prominent as the perspective suggested. Incorporating a window-wall structural frame as at the NDLB building (Lambeth 2).
A and BN, May 7 1953, 542.

Purpose-built for the FT with offices on its two principal fronts, separated by an octagonal block for compositing and printing. Richardson's last major work, a testimony to his championship of neo-classical principles at a time when other ideals were making the running. The main materials are pinkish-brown brick, enriched by Hollington stone for the plinth and window architraves. Six storey brick pilasters divide the generously-glazed bays, with corners chamfered or rounded in an Italian Baroque manner. The whole building is united above cornice level by a continuously glazed attic storey, more conventionally 'modern' than anything below.
Bracken House did not receive much notice in the architectural journals at the time of its completion, though Colin Boyne spotted it as an 'extraordinary, aggressively-shaped' work; but in recent years its star has been in the ascendency as an example of the twentieth century classical tradition at its best.
(Building listed since this report was written).

5. Swiss Bank Corporation extension, 35, Coleman Street, EC2.
David DuR Aberdeen.
'A lively, unconventional, and a little restless building' (Pevsner):
Godson to the TUC building.
B, October 16 1959, 425.

B, April 26 1957, 766-68.


8. 2-12, Gresham Street, EC2. Easton and Robertson, 1955-7. 'A good, nine-storey slab' (Pevsner).
B, September 16 1955, 467.


AI, September 1950, 114.

12. Bucklersbury House, Queen Victoria Street, EC4. O. Campbell-Jones for Legenland Property Co., 1954-59. The subject of a prolonged planning dispute 1951-53 by the end of which Campbell-Jones had finalised a scheme which the AJ regarded as 'the first...in a contemporary style for that stronghold of conservatism, the City of London'.
AR, June 1954, 382-3; B, January 2 1959, 8-14; AJ, September 3 1953, 277-78.

Trehearn Norman, Preston and Partners for the Wiggins Teape Group, 1953-6.
'Interesting in plan and pleasant in elevation' (Pevsner).

B, June 8 1956, 676-80.

Islington

1. 21-24, Chiswell Street, ECI.
Handyside and Taylor.


2. Pembroke House, 40-56, City Road, ECI.
Morris de Metz for the Hammerson Group, 1960.
Classic 1950s spec-built block, with just enough of a touch of colour
(e.g. the green mosaic panels on the street frontage) to lift it above
the lowest common denominator.


Joseph Mendelson and Partners for Hilbenest Investments Ltd.

B, July 26 1957, 156-8.

Lambeth

1. 20, Albert Embankment, SE1.
On the site of Doulton's Pottery Works.


Frederick Gibberd, 1954-6 (engineer, Felix Samuely).
From the structural point of view, one of the most interesting office
buildings of the 1950s. Window wall structural frame; precast concrete
sections bolted together and grouted after levelling; diagonal wind
bracing in the end walls. Boxed-out balconies on the 4th. and 7th.
floors. And regardless of its engineering, probably the building
which it would be most easy to justify listing as representative of
its type.

AR, October 1956, 224-5; B, March 19 1954, 495 and August 17 1956, 269-73;

3. 111, Westminster Bridge Road, SE1.
R. R. Wakelin (of Campbell-Jones and Sons) for Costain Ltd, 1953-4.
Mural in overseas staff lounge by Mary Adshead, destroyed.

A and BN, November 4 1954, 563-69.

Southwark
1. Fielden House, London Bridge Street, SEL.
   John Lacey.
   H-frame wall construction.

   AJ, June 24 1954, 769-74; Michael Rosenauer, Modern Office Buildings,
   86-7.

2. Bankside House, Summer Street, SEL.
   W. Curtis Green, Son and Lloyd for the British Electricity Authority.
   r.c. frame with brick infill and Portland stone dressings.

   B, January 2 1953, 9-12.

Westminster

1. 45-6, Albermarle Street, W1.
   r.c. frame dimensioned according to the Golden Section. Alcove balconies
   on the third and fifth storeys.


* 2. Time-Life Building, Bond Street/Bruton Street, W1.
   Michael Rosenauer, with interior design supervised by Hugh Casson and
   Misha Black, 1952-3.
   A stone-clad 6-storey elevation acts as a sober foretaste to an ingen-
   iously-contrived interior layout and decoration: only the Henry Moore
   screen on the Bond Street front and the Maurice Lambert bronze above
   the main entrance hint at what lies within. Hugh Casson and Misha Black
   orchestrated a group of artists (including, in addition to Moore and
   Lambert, Ben Nicholson, Robin and Christopher Ironside and Geoffrey
   Clarke) to embellish the reception area, the conference room and
   the first floor open-air terrace. Most of their works are still in
   place, though the setting of the Geoffrey Clarke sculpture has been
   affected by the enclosure of part of the first floor staircase area.
   No other office building embodies the artistic spirit of the 1950s
   to the same degree.

   AR, March 1953, 156-72.

3. Universal House, 56-60, Buckingham Palace Road, SW1.
   H. Courtenay Constantine.
   Office block incorporating the 'Victoria' pub.

   AI, October 1951, 88-9.

* 4. 1, Dean Trench Street, SW1
   H.S. Goodhart-Rendel, 1951-55.
   Redevelopment of a block of 1912 damaged by bombing. Four storeys plus
   hipped roof with dormers, lower extension on Tufton Street.
   Conscientious neo-Georgian of the best kind, with square white painted
   window bays on the Cloth Fair model.
   (Already on the Westminster draft list as a building of 1913).
5. Eastbourne Terrace, W2.  
Two tower blocks (18 storey and 9 storey) linked by a lower building.  
Lavishly praised at the time of its completion ('among the best work of  
any kind that has been done in this country since 1935', AJ) largely  
because it was a redevelopment project of the kind which many commentators had put their faith in.


Eero Saarinen, with Yorke Rosenberg Mardell, 1957–60.  
In appearance as well as function this building is clearly as much  
an office block as an embassy in the strict sense of the word. Deferential to the scale of Grosvenor Square but flashy and pompous in comparison with its neighbours. Relentless chequerboard rhythm to the upper storeys, interspersed with gilded fenestration. Eagle by Theodore Rosak.


8. Henrietta House, Henrietta Place/Welbeck Street, W1.  
J.S. Gibson, Gordon and Montagu for Messrs. Debenhams (Properties) Ltd,  
1957–9.  
A long, 7-storey block with a central tower above the main entrance.  
Touches of 'fifties jollity in the mosaic work of the entrance canopy  
soffit and the tilework in the balcony alcove of the tower.

B, April 10 1959, 676–9.

Guy Morgan and Partners.  
Three linked tower blocks, the easternmost one superficially Miesian.

AR, March 1959, 166–73.

*10. Castrol House (now Marathon House), 174–204, Marylebone Road, NW1.  
Gollins Melvin Ward and Partners for the Hammerson Group, 1959.  
A 13-storey tower on a 2/3-storey podium: curtain walling with aluminium glazing bars. Entrance hall relief sculpture and bank doors by Geoffrey Clarke. The best British example of the Lever House type tower-on-a-podium design, though slightly spoilt by the irregular height of the podium block.

11. 93, New Cavendish Street, W1.
    An early example of curtain wall construction (on a 2 ft. 10 in.
    module).
    AR, January 1956, 40-41 and October 1956, 226.

    R.C. frame, faced in Portland stone.
    AI, October 1953, 70.

    Incorporating a first floor car park.
    AR, January 1956, 44-45; B, May 18 1956, 535.

*14.* Department store and offices, 65-72, Strand, WC2.
    Denys Lasdun of Fry, Drew and Lasdun, 1957-59.
    Two floors of shopping plus three floors of offices, all clearly stated
    in a straightforward way:

    a layer of shop window, a layer of stone-faced
    showroom wall, a deeply-recessed showroom clerestorey, and then three
    layers of bronze-finished office glazing. A building somewhat devalued
    by its progeny in shopping centres up and down the country, but of its
    time a classic.

    Architectural Design, December 1959, 511-13; A and BN, November 18 1959,
    465-72.

15. Thorn-EKI House, Upper St. Martin's Lane, WC2.
    Sculpture on the end wall, 'The Spirit of Electricity' by Geoffrey
    Clarke.
    Built at the same time as Castrol House according to the same tower-and
    -podium formula, but in this case with an open pilotis beneath the tower
    block. The two-storey podium originally housed electricity showrooms,
    designed by John and Sylvia Reid. The showrooms have since been altered,
    and the pilotis enclosed, with the result that the building as seen
    to-day is a less satisfactory example of its kind than Castrol House.
    AR, January 1956, 47-48; B, October 9 1959, 379-85.

16. Monsanto House, 10-18, Victoria Street, SW1.
    Precast concrete frame with columns at 13 ft. 6 in. centres: recessed
    balcony on the sixth storey.
    AR, October 1956, 226.
APPENDIX 5

POST-WAR STEERING GROUP: SEPTEMBER 1993

COMMERCIAL AND INDUSTRIAL BUILDINGS: LIST OF PAPERS

The following papers are attached below:

1. Refined selection of Commercial and Industrial buildings for consideration (slides will be shown at the meeting).

2. Historical notes (full version)
   These are similar to the papers which went to September HBAAC but have been slightly augmented.

3. Paper as requested on the Shell Centre, South Bank

4. Paper as requested on British Rail Maintenance Depot, Paddington.
POST-WAR STEERING GROUP, SEPTEMBER 1993

COMMERCIAL AND INDUSTRIAL BUILDINGS FOR CONSIDERATION

This list has been revised following Post-war Steering Group consideration on 15 - 7 - 93 and subsequent visits. Various items have been removed. 'Case' numbers have been retained for clarity in the documentation.

OFFICES

1. Manchester International Cruikshank & Seward 1954
   Office Centre, Styal Rd,
   Ringway, Cheshire
   (formerly known as
   Renold House)

   A distinguished building which has worn well. Very crisp concrete details including slim cantilevered canopy over entrance, set in travertine-clad centrepiece. It survives intact and appears to have been recently renovated, while retaining its character. Awarded RIBA Architecture Bronze Medal and Diploma for the Manchester Society of Architects province in 1955.

   Recommended Grade II

3. Carr and Co, E Goldfinger 1955
   Cranmore Boulevard,
   Shirley, Birmingham

   A crisp and well proportioned office building and an important work by this major emigre architect. Constructed with precision and attention to detail. The ground floor pilotis were cast into fluted shuttering.

   Recommended Grade II

5. Own Offices, Gollins Melvin 1955-57
   Manchester Sq
   Ward and Partners
   London W1

   For themselves.
   Ref. DOCOMOMO

   Doubtful for listing.
6. 100 Pall Mall, London
McMorran & D Armstrong Smith
1956-58

A distinguished design in a simplified classical manner in Portland stone, with a recessed vaulted loggia.

**Recommended Grade II**

8. Head Offices, Pilkington Glassworks, Borough Rd, St Helens, Lancs
Fry, Drew & Ptns
1959-63

A most impressive and attractive tailor-made built headquarters building which speaks eloquently of its prestige. Well proportioned and beautifully detailed, it is clad appropriately in striking bright blue storey-height glass panels, and green slate. It was built on a green field site with its own lake and exemplary landscaping, which survives unaltered. The best post-war work in England of this important British architect.

**Recommended Grade II**

9. New Zealand House, Haymarket, London W1
Robert Matthew Johnson-Marshall
1959-63

The most innovative and sophisticated of London’s tall blocks, a uniquely open and light pattern of continuous horizontal bands of clear glazing set behind deep stone cills. None of the structure is prefabricated. It also has the most complex function of any block here, combining embassy and speculative accommodation that produces a complicated arrangement of interpenetrating spaces and courtyards at podium level. Its materials and detailing are very high in quality and there are fine, soaring interior spaces.

**Recommended Grade II**

Ronald Ward & Ptns
1959-63

A fine curtain-walled tower of a distinctive, curved form. The combination of convex and concave shapes with Britain’s first use of projecting stainless steel mullions produces a delightful interplay of sparkly light and deep shadow across the building. The top floors were occupied by Vickers, whose boardroom survives intact; the lower floors were a speculation.

**Recommended Grade II**
(now Marathon House), Marylebone Rd, London

An elegant curtain-walled office tower set on a low horizontal 'podium' of offices, Castrol House was the first office in England to embody what was to become a most influential form, the so-called 'slab and podium', and it remained one of the most accomplished. The source was Skidmore Owings and Merrill's Lever House in New York. GMW were amongst the first architects to use curtain walling convincingly in office building; this is the only one of their major works to survive in anything like its original condition. On the rear wall of the entrance hall is Geoffrey Clark's extremely impressive mural of cast aluminium, one of his major works.

**Recommended** Grade II/II*

block for Max Factor, West Howe, Bournemouth

Light and attractive office block with a playful roofline for this small green field site factory. It survives intact. However, it is empty and the site is up for sale.

**Recommended** Grade II

Hille Offices and E Goldfinger 1959-62
Showroom,
St Albans Rd
Watford

A simple, well proportioned building, which survives virtually intact. A building of integrity.

**Recommended** Grade II

House, Newington
Butts, Southwark, London

Recommended for listing at grade II by HBAC in 1988. With Balfron and Trellick Towers, it was Goldfinger's most monumental work, developing the ideas of the listed Albemarle St offices into impressive and three-dimensional scale.

**Recommended** Grade II/II* (COI expires Sept 1993)
18. Bird's Eye, Station Ave, Walton on Thames, Surrey

An early and extremely elegant example of an out of town office. The beautifully detailed and luxurious cladding of folded stainless steel gives a decorative quality to this distinctive headquarters building, which is set in a fine water garden. Both internal courtyards contain water gardens. The building survives intact and has been well looked after.

**Recommended Grade II**

1. Own Offices, Greystoke Place, London EC4

Yorke, Rosenberg & Mardall

Purpose built as the architects' own offices, this is a most distinguished and well detailed building, clad with great precision in immaculate white tiles.

**Recommended Grade II**

22. Wool Secretariat, Carlton Gardens, SW1

Louis de Soissons

Doubtful for listing.

23. Barclays Bank, York St, Manchester

Green, Lloyd & Son (exhib RA)

1961

This is a clean-cut and attractive tower of granite and glass, whose proportions bely its extremely jewel-like scale. Purpose-built for Barclays Bank, but now empty.

**Recommended Grade II?**

25. Dow Agrochemicals Ltd Offices, Kings Lynn

Fry, Drew & Ptns consultant architects

publ 1961

To visit 17 - 9 - 93.

25b. Coles Department Store, Sheffield

YRM

1961-65

A crisp, clean design in white tiles.

**Recommended Grade II?**
25c. Watson House, Fulham (exhibition block only)

E R Collister and Ptns 1962 with mural by John Piper

Exhibition block (only) included for important external mural of Glass reinforced polyester by John Piper.

Already **Recommended** Grade II*


Howard Robertson 1962

See Ms Harwood's report.

**Recommended** Grade II?

27. Sekers, 190 Sloane St, Brett and Pollen 1963-64 London

A most distinguished building, strong and yet refined in design, and cleverly related to the diverse street scene, unashamedly modern and yet appropriately scaled.

**Recommended** Grade II/II*

28. CIS Building, Miller St, and New Century House, Corporation St, Manchester.

Sir John Burnet, Tait & Ptns with G S Hay 1962

An impressive group of extremely high quality comprising a tall and a lower tower, the latter on an office podium. The taller one (CIS) is symmetrical to the front and rises sheer from its base but is picturesquely varied in profile when seen from afar. It contains a fine storey-height relief mural of fibreglass on the rear wall of the entrance hall by George Mitchell.

**Recommended** Grade II
29. Eros House, Brownhill Rd, Catford, Lewisham

Owen Luder 1962-63

The model Owen Luder office building, with a supermarket behind that Ian Nairn considered 'a fragment of Chandigarh come to Catford'. Most dramatic is the vigorous 'post and beam' idiom with which the construction is expressed, muscular cantilevers and all.

Recommended Grade II

30. Centre Point, 101 New Oxford St, Camden, London WC1

Seifert & Ptns 1962-65

The most famous of Seifert's Brise Soleil towers and his tautest composition. Based on the plan of Gio Ponti's Pirelli Tower in Milan, it was not only early in the use of a precast system but the first tall building erected in Britain without external scaffolding - a necessity of the narrow site. The rear wing includes shops and flats. The building is now fully occupied, but there is planning permission for external lifts and other unsympathetic alterations.

Already recommended Grade II (rejected by DNH 1989 & 1991).

31. Heinz, Hayes End Lane, Hillingdon

Bunshaft of SOM 1962-65

Important and accomplished green field site headquarters building by this major American firm. A recent visit showed it is unaltered and still occupied by Heinz, who have no intention of leaving it for the foreseeable future. It was Bunshaft's only British work, and set new standards in the attention given to every detail of its organisation and finish. An early example for Britain of an open-plan HQ and research building on a green field site; the way the buildings are sunk into the landscape is an important part of their composition as well as a condition of the planning permission.

Recommended Grade II*

33. Offices and showroom Peter Moro for Hille, Albemarle St, London W1

1963

Delicate curtain walled infill. But is it substantial enough to list?

Recommended Grade II?
34. Norgas House, Ryder and Yates 1963-65
Killingworth, Northumbria

Showpiece of impressive quality for the Gas Board. Colourful. 'Horns' which provided a sculptural feature of the refectory block have been removed and some other small alterations have been made.

Recommended II

Ryder, Nicklin Ryder and Yates 1964-65
Partnership offices
(formerly Ryder and Yates' own offices)

Ryder and Yates' own offices, built so that their Norgas House, next door, could be supervised from close quarters. An elegant little building. Pevsner (new edn.,) comments: 'a clever miniature and an important element in the group. Two slabs of white float above ground, parting to reveal a strip of windows and interrupted to allow doors.'

Recommended Grade II

Bank, Drapers Gardens,
City of London

A distinctive design with a strong visual rhythm, especially successful when glimpsed along the narrow surrounding streets. The other Seifert building besides Centre Point to use a plan reminiscent of the Pirelli Tower. It has been reglazed but otherwise survives well externally, and makes a feature of its structure in the bold cantilevers radiating from the narrow ground floor.

Recommended Grade II

40. Commercial Gollins, Melvin Ward 1964-69
Union/P&O,
City of London

Their most important commercial building. An elegantly simple glass-clad slab which rises sheer from its piazza, complemented by the lower P & O building adjacent. Damaged in IRA bomb blasts of 1992 and 1993 and currently being reclad, apparently to the original design. Is it now sufficiently intact to list? Should we await its completion and consider it again at that time?

Recommended that this is considered again when it is fully repaired. A potential Grade II* if sufficiently intact.
40a. Olivetti International  James Stirling  1971-72
Training Centre
Haslemere

Recommended Grade II*

RETAIL & WHOLESALE

43a. Crisp St Market,  F Gibberd  1950-51
and Clock Tower,
Lansbury, Poplar,
London

Recommended Grade II, but postpone for NEW TOWNS AND TOWN
CENTRES study.

44. Peter Robinson  Drake and Lasdun  1957-59
Store (later known
as New South Wales
House), Strand, London

A building of quiet integrity and a good example of early
Lasdun, clad in stone and copper. There is said to be COI on
this, but checks with DNH have failed to confirm that it has
ever been considered for listing.

Recommended Grade II (subject to confirmation that there is no
COI)

45. Lower Precinct,  City Architect’s
Coventry  Dept

Recommended Grade II*, but postpone for NEW TOWNS AND TOWN
CENTRES study.

46. Former motor showroom  Denis Clarke-Hall  1958
and offices (now
Headquarters of the
Lincs Careers and
Education Service
and Library Service),
Lucy Tower St,
Lincoln

A light-hearted building noted especially for the structural
gymnastics of its surprising hyperbolic paraboloid roof.
Notwithstanding a radical change of use this survives intact.

**Recommended** Grade II

46a. Happy Eater restaurant, Denis Clarke-Hall
formerly service station,
on A1 (NW of junction with A57)

An extraordinary building, comprising a concrete hyperbolic
paraboloid vault, in full flight. This was originally a free-
standing service station canopy and the restaurant has since
been successfully inserted underneath.

**Recommended** Grade II

48. Shops and Flats, Chamberlin, Powell & Bon
Goswell Rd,
City of London

Forms part of the Golden Lane Housing Estate.
This block is transitional in date and style between the rest
of the Golden Lane Estate and the Barbican, relating the
language of the Maison Jaoul to a curved site with particular
aplomb and setting against the curve a line of felicitously
canted bays.

**Recommended** Grade II

49. Burtons, Ealing Lasdun, of Fry, Drew, Drake and Lasdun
Broadway, Ealing

To be visited
51. Tyrell and Green
Store, Southampton

A well detailed elevation clad in green slate. Since extended sideways and upwards.

Recommended doubtful for listing due to alterations.

51.5 WH Smiths
formerly David Greig’s butcher’s shop,
George St, Canterbury

Robert Paine & Ptns
1954

A rare, small scale, architect-designed shop, nicely detailed with full-height folded canopy to one side and zig-zag detailing to wall beneath. Interior, originally a single tall storey, now has an inserted suspended ceiling. A lively design in the Festival of Britain spirit and winner of the RIBA Architecture medal in 1956.

Recommended Grade II

57. Covered market
in Accrington

pub 1962

Interesting shell vaulted roof, split to introduce daylight.

Recommended II??

58. Motor Showroom,
Northern Design Group
Manchester Rd, Bury,
Lancs

1963

Single storey Miesian design. Interesting mural on an ethnic theme to rear internal wall, incised in blockwork and painted black and white; this is reported to have been designed by the local college of art.

Recommended Grade II???

59. Keddies Store,
Southend, Essex

YRM
1963-64

To be visited
Probably too late. What a shame (Date to be further checked). Superbly adventurous flying concrete shell roof and vigorous sculptures.

Recommended II* if early enough

INDUSTRIAL

66. May and Baker  Edward Mills  1943-44 (ext 1955)
a. Canteen            c1947
b. Building No 21
  The canteen was the first shell concrete structure in the UK
  (A Saint)
  NB Building No 30 is similar in construction to No 21, but
  with brick instead of concrete walls.
  Recommended II in 1988.
  Recommended Canteen - Grade II
  Building No 21 - Grade II??/NL
  Pharmaceutical building - doubtful for listing

68. Bankside Power  Giles Gilbert Scott  1947-60
  Station, London
  Recommended Grade II on several occasions. Rejected by DOE &
  DNH.
  Recommended Grade II

73. Aero Research Ltd,  Ove Arup & Ptns  1950
    (now CIBA) Duxford,
    Cambs

To visit on 17 - 9 - 93.
Potential Grade II.
74. CIBA Ltd Ove Arup & Ptns 1950-66
Duxford, Cambs (P Dowson)

Structurally interesting earlier block and later parts have great precision and cleanness of line, in a Miesian manner.

Parts recommended at Grade II in 1988
To visit 17 - 9 - 93
Recommended Potential Grade II

75. Sales block at Westwood, Sons & Ptns
CIBA Ltd,
Duxford, Cambs

 Appropriately uses timber laminated using CIBA resin.
To visit 17 - 9 - 93.

77. Bank of England Easton & Robertson 1954
Printing Works,
Debdon, Essex

Remarkable shell concrete roof designed to introduce north light.
Admission to inspect refused in the light of recent terrorist attacks on commercial buildings.
Recommended II in 1988.
Recommended II

79. Factory at Denton, Taylor & Young publ 1955
Manchester under construction

Interesting arched concrete trusses with 'V' supports.
Survives intact and is impressive. Mostly now disused.

Recommended Grade II???

83. Paper mill for Farmer and Dark 1955-8
Bowater, Shere Rd,
Northfleet, Kent
water tower only

Survives intact. Distinctively slim circular tower of office accommodation with crowning water tank.

Recommended Grade II
84. Imhof Factory, Tayler & Green 1957
Cowley Mill Rd,
Uxbridge Industrial
Estate

BC says 'Nicely detailed, good landscaped setting. I have not seen inside.'

A remarkable factory designed in a 'vernacular' revival manner using traditional materials - various colours of brick, some of it patterned and pantile roofs. Therefore probably unique as a factory building. Survives intact, save for minor alterations to front block, including blocking original entrance and rebuilding one gable wall. It has weathered well and is pleasantly mellow.

**Recommended Grade II.**

85. Factory at Hemel Arup Assoc (Dowson) 1957
Hemstead, Herts
for paint and concrete additives

Does this survive? To check and visit.

88. Factory at Maer Lane/ Robert Townsend 1959-60
Station Rd,
Market Drayton, Shrops
(now Gateway superstore)

An attractive building with an exciting roof structure. Same structural method as used in the now demolished Wilton carpet factory by the same architect. Continuous hyperbolic paraboloid timber roof covers whole area. The building survives unaltered (save for a standard green Gateway entrance porch). It has been dry-lined internally, and now provides ample accommodation for the superstore, with only one internal support!

**Recommended Grade II.**

90. Evode, Stafford Ove Arup & Ptns 1961
Varnish Workshop
and Garage

Crisp, high quality design in a Mies IIT manner. Survives intact.

**Recommended Grade II**
92. Printing works
in Hylton Rd,
Worcester for Berrow’s
Newspapers


Recommended Grade II??

93. Furniture Industry
Research Association
Howell, Killick
Headquarters, Stevenage
Partridge & Amis

Fine, stylish building. Survives intact.

Recommended II/II*

94. John Lewis
Warehouse, Stevenage,
Herts

YRM (Felix Candela
engineer)

Remarkable shell concrete structure

To visit.
Potential II*/I

97. Building for
Crysler-Cummins Ltd,
Darlington, Co Durham

James Cubitt & Ptns
in assoc with Eero
Saarinen & Assoc

A well designed and authoritative building. Less important that its neighbour for the same firm (Which is II* already)
DK visited

To discuss

98. BR Maintenance Depot
and Offices,
Paddington, London

Bicknell & Hamilton

Threatened
To be visited
To discuss
99. Water Tower, Scherrer & Hicks publ 1962
Bishop's Stortford, Herts
Mushroom shaped water tower for Lea Valley Water Auth.
To visit

100. Water Tower, E C Percy check date
Tanwell, Herts
Dramatic funnel form with separate panels around perimeter.
To check date & visit

101. Water Tower, E C Percy check date
Arkley, Herts
Blocky design (a little too clumsy?)
To check date & pos visit

102. Water Tower, E C Percy check date
Baydon, Wilts
Dramatic sculptural form with series of triangular legs splaying to carry the water drum.
To check date & visit

103. Lead Shot Tower, E N Underwood & Ptns 1969
Cheese Lane, Bristol (engineers)
Recommended II* and rejected by the Department in 1992.

104. Truman's Brewery, Arup Assoc c1973-76
Brick Lane, London E1: extension
Under threat. We have an official case file on this building.
For discussion.
POST-1939 COMMERCIAL AND INDUSTRIAL BUILDINGS: HISTORICAL NOTES.

1. COMMERCIAL BUILDINGS

These chiefly comprise offices, shops and shopping centres. (The latter overlaps with the forthcoming study of NEW TOWNS AND TOWN CENTRES.) Conference centres appear from the late 1960s.

Offices

After the war, office building resumed with the lifting of building licencing in 1954. London was an early focus and initially buildings were of limited height and squat proportions, a result of the LCC’s system of plot ratios (which related the amount of office space to overall size of building plot). The London Building Act of 1939 had imposed a 100ft height restriction in central London (60ft in outer London). However, developers, planners and architects alike were discontented with this system and high buildings were widely seen as a solution to aesthetic problems of visual bulk and to providing adequate daylight. The LCC Planning Committee’s guidelines of 1956, High Buildings in London, proposed that high buildings should be considered on their merits, taking into account relationship to open spaces and the Thames, quality of design and materials and fire precautions. The result was a spate of tall office buildings in London, around the period 1956-64. The 1956 guidelines and the refinement of plot ratios which followed in 1957 established a clear pattern for the picturesque integration of tall buildings into the existing fabric of London. The provinces followed the trend for high buildings in the mid and late 1960s.

The renewed post-war interest in Picturesque theory probably had some influence on the shape of English office towers. The ‘slab and podium’ form of Lever House in New York (by Skidmore Owings and Merrill, 1952), with its studied asymmetry, was popular in England, an early example being Castrol House in Marylebone (now Marathon House, by Gollins, Melvin, Ward and Partners, 1957-59). ‘Sculptural’ variants followed, notably the curvilinear Millbank Tower (1959-63, by Ronald Ward and Partners). The Commercial Union building in the City of London (Gollins, Melvin, Ward and Partners, 1964-69) was rare in its purity of form, looking instead to Mies van der Rohe’s Seagram Building in New York (1956) and rising sheer from its piazza with astounding simplicity.

An alternative to the office tower was the conscious integration of new buildings into existing urban fabric. To begin with this was done in a traditional or semi-traditional idiom, as at Bracken House in the City of London (Sir Albert Richardson, 1955-59, listed Grade II*). With great skill this could also be done in a modern idiom, as Brett and Pollen did for Sekers in Sloane St, Knightsbridge (1963-64). Another example was a pair of adjacent buildings in King St, Manchester, one also by Brett and Pollen (1968), the other by Casson (designed in 1965). The exemplary group of buildings
for the Economist in St James' by the Smithsons (1960-64, listed Grade II*), included an office tower and lower residential tower, set behind the street-line and a four-storey building on the street-line, related in scale and proportions to its older neighbours. Such buildings showed a way forward, and have rarely been equalled.

Another approach was the siting of offices in green field locations, usually for particular companies. This American-influenced trend came to England in the 1950s and was greatly boosted by the rise of car ownership. In 1953, Loewy Engineering, erecting new offices near Poole, Dorset, envisaged building staff housing nearby, but by 1960 such provision was unnecessary. In its design, Loewy's (by Farmer and Dark, 1953-55) resembled what was to become a standard plan of corporate headquarters, the long, low-lying courtyard building; it was an early example of this genre in England. Landscaping often played an important part in the overall design, as at Heinz Headquarters in Hillingdon (1962-65, by the American firm of Skidmore, Owings and Merrill). This was one of just a handful of accomplished American-designed headquarters offices in England. The same firm later worked for Boots at Beeston, Notts (1967-68) and for Wills at Bristol (1971-75), in both cases with the British firm of Yorke, Rosenberg and Mardall. Progressive British companies used architect-designed buildings on green field sites to impart an air of prestige. One was the Gas Council. A few used American architects. With this American influence sometimes came the open plan office. The West Midlands Gas Board Offices at Solihull (1961-62, by the firm’s architect, Neville Cooley) was perhaps the first building to combine an out-of-town location with a complete open plan.

The growing appreciation of historic buildings brought with it from the late 1960s a movement to convert and extend country houses for business use, at first usually in a modern idiom. An early example was James Stirling’s work for Olivetti at Haslemere (1968-72). Powell and Moya’s extension to Winslade Manor near Exeter (1978) was also well received. At Minster Lovell Conference Centre (1969), Cullinan by contrast chose to convert and extend existing buildings in an idiom which reinterpreted the vernacular forms of the original structures.

The cladding of commercial buildings evolved considerably during the period. Except for a few celebrated pre-war examples, the curtain wall was largely a post-war phenomenon in England, and few pre-date 1955. The famous New York prototypes for the sheer curtain wall were the United Nations Building and Lever House, both going up in the early 1950s. From 1957, British awareness of developments in curtain wall technology intensified and this technology was hailed in some journals as a 'new vernacular'. Two basic types were used: the sheeth wall (where the cladding covered the frame, as at Castrol House, 1957-9) and the panel wall, where the structural members were expressed between the panels, as at Carr and Company offices, Shirley, Birmingham (1955-7, by Erno Goldfinger). England’s best claim to originality in the field of post-war office cladding was in the development of precast
concrete cladding for panel walls. This grew out of the experiments into school building systems in the 1940s and 1950s, and it began to move into flats and offices in the early 1960s. Parallel with this increased use of concrete, the light, fully glazed Miesian forms seen in buildings such as Castrol House were replaced by a heavier, more sculptural architecture, a desire for strong articulation, exemplified by buildings such as Seifert’s Centre Point (1962-65). Later came the development of GRP (Glass Reinforced Polyester) for cladding, which also had sculptural potential; this is rare before the early 1970s and buildings clad chiefly in GRP are not common. The Olivetti Training Centre at Haslemere was an early example.

Retail
Retailing saw major changes in the post-war period, which took place under American influence. Shopping patterns changed rapidly. Self service, an innovation of 1930s California, was introduced into Britain in 1947. Associated with this was the rise of the supermarket (a self-service food store with over 2,000 sq ft of retail area). A New York innovation of the 1930s, the first supermarket in England was opened in Earl’s Court 1951 by Express Dairies. By 1961 there were an estimated 572 in Britain; by 1965, some 2,130. A further trend was the increasing role of the chain store (a 19th century innovation), which laid growing stress in the post-war period on the creation of a strong corporate image; large chains often possessed their own design teams. Also, standard shop sizes were now too small for many retailers and new shop space was required, encouraging inner city development. Furthermore, the role of the shop changed from being a space for buying to being part of the selling process itself. Shop interiors therefore became increasingly ephemeral as short-lived trends resulted in short-life fittings (a tendency epitomised by the rise of the boutique from the late 1950s).

Shop sizes varied widely. At one end of the scale was the small retail outlet, often part of a larger building, of which a mere handful rose above mediocrity; then there was the department store; this type slowed down dramatically in the immediate post-war period. Then there were showrooms: Sandersons in Berners St, London (listed Grade II*), was the retail building which attracted the most attention in the architectural press.

The shopping centre was a post-war innovation in England. Initially it was motivated by the need for town centre renewal following bombing (as at Coventry) or by the creation of a new town centre or neighbourhood. It was characterised by a unified overall design, sometimes combined with pedestrianisation. Coventry had the first pedestrian precinct to be planned (although Lansbury, Poplar, was the first to be finished, in 1951). The late 1960s and 1970s saw the development of the shopping precinct, under American influence. This was increasingly under cover, sometimes with integral parking, and was often primarily driven by commercial motives rather than those of urban creation or renewal. The
forthcoming study on NEW TOWNS AND TOWN CENTRES will deal with this in more detail.

2. INDUSTRIAL BUILDINGS

Industrial buildings fall into five main categories: those for light industry, those for heavy industry, buildings for the utilities and those for the extractive and process industries. Those for light industry have generally lent themselves most to architectural input.

In the post-war period architects’ contribution to buildings for industry rose significantly. There was a growing belief throughout early post-war Britain that life could be better, healthier and more beautiful than ever before, and that there was no need any longer to live in the makeshift ugliness which was perceived to be characteristic of Victorian and pre-war Britain. The conscious employment of architects for industrial buildings, rather than builders, surveyors or engineers was also part of this striving for a more humane and attractive environment. Between the wars, probably only a small percentage of industrial buildings were designed by architects, but in 1955-57 architects designed 34% of all industrial buildings erected.

The pursuit of cleanliness and beauty also led to a more conscious choice of site and a concern for better road communications. Post-war reconstruction confirmed the tendency seen in the 1930s to establish new industries on suburban or green-field sites. Very occasionally these were landscaped (as at Pilkington’s in St Helens, 1956-65 by Fry, Drew and Partners, an exceptional example). Industrial estates were increasingly popular in the early post-war years. In 1945 the Distribution of Industries Act provided a legislative basis for modern industrial estates and the Board of Trade was empowered to purchase land for the purpose. (This power was separate from and additional to, the powers of New Towns to create such estates.) The Business Parks and Science Parks of the 1970s and 1980s were their successors, but were generally better laid out and landscaped and contained a far higher proportion of interesting buildings. (The first of these was at Cambridge, 1969.) From 1948 it was necessary to obtain an Industrial Development Certificate from the Board of Trade for any industrial project exceeding 5,000 square feet; this enabled the Board to exercise control at a national level over the siting of industrial development.

Amenities for workers were much improved in the post-war period. The Factory Act of 1937 had laid down minimum standards for factory workers and during the war welfare provisions had been reinforced (eg from 1943 all factories with more than 250 workers were obliged to provide a canteen which served hot meals). Post-war factories reflected these improvements. In the 1960s the traditional division between management and shop floor workers was increasingly eroded. The Cummins Engine Factory in Darlington (1964-65, by Roche, Dinkerloo and Associates, listed Grade II*) broke new ground
in having a common entrance for all workers, followed closely by Reliance Controls in Swindon (by Team Four, which included Rogers and Foster, 1966-67, now demolished) and progressive firms did this increasingly.

In the 1940s, ideas about the planning of factories remained old fashioned; often a range of offices concealed the shop floor behind. In the 1940s and 1950s factories were still very compartmentalised, having individual workshops for each part of the process. However, by 1960 the trend towards automation led to an integration of activities into a single production flow. Machines themselves merged into a single machine, integrated with its enclosing factory. Allied to this was an increase in the use of moving machinery, such as fork lift trucks and conveyors, which brought about a need for wider column spacings and spans. Floor loading capacities often needed to be high to carry the new machinery. In the later 1960s the benefits of flexible planning to accommodate change were increasingly realised, especially in speculatively built factories, but also in some forward-looking tailor-made ones, such as the Cummins Engine Factory (1964-65), Reliance Controls (1966-67) and Arup Associates' Players Factory at Nottingham (1969-71).

The lighting of the workspace was sometimes exploited for architectural effect. By 1945 there was legislation to govern lighting levels in factories. Most British factories relied mainly upon daylight and most were therefore single-storeyed and top-lit. The traditional north-light roof provided the most even lighting, but was difficult to clean. Monitor lighting was introduced shortly after the war; it comprised raised strips with glazed sides on a flat roof, and access for cleaning could be gained via the flat roof. Top lighting provided architectural opportunities which some architects took up with zeal, particularly in the 1950s, when curved shells of timber and concrete added drama to a number of factory buildings. One such, in concrete, was the Bank of England Printing Works at Debden (1954 by Easton and Robertson). However, shed roofs or flat roofs were far commoner. In the 1960s, roof lighting declined in popularity in favour of flat, solid roofs over deep plan spaces. Occasionally the perimeter was extensively glazed (as at the Cummins Engine Factory, made practical here by the first large-scale architectural use in Britain of neoprene gaskets). However, from about 1970 there was an increasing trend towards the windowless factory with a fully controllable air conditioned, artificially lit environment.

In the early post-war years rationing influenced the choice of materials. Steel was rationed from 1945 to circa 1953 and this encouraged the use of concrete. Concrete had certain advantages over steel, since it was fireproof and was also believed to be resistant to corrosion. Probably a majority of factories of the 1940s and 1950s had concrete frames. However, the construction process for concrete buildings was often labour-intensive and after it had shared the market for a while with steel, the use of concrete declined in the 1960s.
Steel was vulnerable to fire and to rust (except cor-ten steel) and it also had many dust-collecting surfaces. Nevertheless, it was popular. After 1945, its high cost and rationing led architects to find ways of using it economically and light-weight tubular steel lattice roofing was one such application (as at Aero Research Ltd, Duxford by Ove Arup and Partners, 1950). However, lattice framing could not carry heavy loads and heavy steelwork was necessary for some buildings. In the early post-war years, welded steel frames began to replace bolted or rivetted ones - an early example was the Rolling Mills at Scunthorpe Steelworks, by Sir Frederick Gibberd and Partners, 1945-49). In the 1940s, steel frames tended to be hidden externally by cladding, probably for maintenance reasons, but in the 1950s and especially the 1960s, architects began to express them architecturally, in the manner of Mies van der Rohe. A very early example was Chamberlin, Powell and Bon’s Seed Warehouse in Witham, Essex (1953-54, demolished); others were considerably later and comprise a handful of remarkable buildings of the 1960s and ’70s, designed or influenced by American practice. One was the Cummins Engine Factory, built of Cor-ten Steel (which has a high copper content and rusts to a protective patina, requiring no maintenance); another was Reliance Controls, Swindon. However, exposed steel frames remained rare in English industrial buildings and were more often used for prestigious Headquarters offices (such as that for Boots at Beeston, Notts., by Skidmore Owings and Merrill, 1966-68).

A small number of buildings had laminated timber frames. This was an expensive way of building, but tended to have low maintenance costs. At Robert Townsend’s Wilton Carpet Factory, 1957, this technique was used because carpet dies threaten steel. This building has been demolished, but his factory in Market Drayton, Shrops., constructed in the same way, survives.

For cladding, brick cavity walling remained popular, and British architects and industrialists showed some reluctance to adopt prefabricated cladding materials, which were common in the United States. All round glazing remained very unusual, a more common approach being the combination of industrial glazing with profiled metal cladding or with brickwork. In the 1970s the energy crisis increased the importance of thermal insulation and less glass tended to be used; profiled metal sheeting became increasingly popular. At the same time the relative value of industrial plant and machinery was growing in relation to the buildings which housed it, a situation which led in the 1970s and 1980s to an increasingly expendable and flexible building type and to a decrease in architectural involvement in factory building.

Dr Diane Kay
Listing Branch.

This paper draws extensively on work done by officers of London Division.
APPENDIX 6

Table of statutorily listed office buildings in England, 2015
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Name / Street</th>
<th>Date started</th>
<th>Date completed</th>
<th>Architect</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Date Listed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City of London</td>
<td>Bracken House, Cannon Street</td>
<td>1955</td>
<td>1959</td>
<td>Sir Albert Richardson</td>
<td>II*</td>
<td>13/08/1987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westminster</td>
<td>Time / Life Building, New Bond Street</td>
<td>1951</td>
<td>1953</td>
<td>Michael Rosenauer</td>
<td>II*</td>
<td>29/03/1988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westminster</td>
<td>Sanderson Hotel (formerly Sanderson House), 49-52 Berners Street</td>
<td>1957</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>Slater, Moberly and Uren</td>
<td>II*</td>
<td>23/01/1991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westminster</td>
<td>Clareville House, Panton Street</td>
<td>1962</td>
<td>1964</td>
<td>Sir Albert Richardson</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>18/05/1995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of London</td>
<td>Former YRM Offices, 2 Greystoke Place</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>York, Rosenberg &amp; Mardall</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>24/11/1995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Name / Street</td>
<td>Date started</td>
<td>Date completed</td>
<td>Architect</td>
<td>Grade</td>
<td>Date Listed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Helens, Merseyside</td>
<td>Pilkington Brothers Head Offices</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>1964</td>
<td>Edwin Maxwell Fry of Fry, Drew &amp; Partners</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>24/11/1995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nottingham</td>
<td>Boots D90</td>
<td>1967</td>
<td>1968</td>
<td>Skidmore, Owings and Merrill (chief architect Bruce Graham); with Yorke Rosenberg Mardall (chief architect Brian Henderson)</td>
<td>II*</td>
<td>28/08/1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birmingham</td>
<td>Grosvenor House, Bennetts Hill</td>
<td>1953</td>
<td>1954</td>
<td>Cotton, Ballard &amp; Blow</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>18/02/1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hartcliffe, Bristol</td>
<td>Lakeshore, the former Wills Tobacco Headquarters</td>
<td>1970</td>
<td>1975</td>
<td>Skidmore, Owings and Merrill</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>11/04/2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manchester</td>
<td>Pall Mall Court</td>
<td>1966</td>
<td>1968</td>
<td>Brett &amp; Pollen</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>04/12/2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Name / Street</td>
<td>Date started</td>
<td>Date completed</td>
<td>Architect</td>
<td>Grade</td>
<td>Date Listed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plymouth</td>
<td>Nat Provincial (now RBS) Bank, St Andrew’s Cross</td>
<td>1956</td>
<td>1958</td>
<td>Brian C Sherren</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>20/08/2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halifax</td>
<td>The Halifax Building, Trinity Road</td>
<td>1968</td>
<td>1974</td>
<td>Building Design Partnership (BDP)</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>23/01/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenford, Middlesex</td>
<td>Former IBM Distribution Centre</td>
<td>1977</td>
<td>1980</td>
<td>Norman Foster &amp; Partners</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>27/03/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egham, Surrey</td>
<td>Cemex House, Coldharbour Lane</td>
<td>1986</td>
<td>1989</td>
<td>Edward Cullinan Architects</td>
<td>II*</td>
<td>10/07/2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newcastle upon Tyne</td>
<td>Former Office of Ryder and Yates</td>
<td>1964</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td>Ryder &amp; Yates</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>22/10/2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of London</td>
<td>1 Finsbury Avenue</td>
<td>1982</td>
<td>1984</td>
<td>Arup Associates, Group 2</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>26/01/2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westminster</td>
<td>Civil Aviation Authority House (formerly Space House), 45-59 Kingsway</td>
<td>1964</td>
<td>1968</td>
<td>Richard Seifert &amp; Partners</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>26/01/2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of London</td>
<td>Former Credit Lyonnais, 30 Cannon Street,</td>
<td>1974</td>
<td>1977</td>
<td>Whinney, Son &amp; Austen Hall</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>26/01/2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Name / Street</td>
<td>Date started</td>
<td>Date completed</td>
<td>Architect</td>
<td>Grade</td>
<td>Date Listed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chatham, Kent</td>
<td>Gun Wharf, Dock Road</td>
<td>1976</td>
<td>1978</td>
<td>Arup Associates</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>26/01/2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leeds</td>
<td>Bank House, 27 King Street</td>
<td>1969</td>
<td>1971</td>
<td>Building Design Partnership</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>26/01/2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bristol</td>
<td>Former Central Electricity Generating Board HQ</td>
<td>1975</td>
<td>1978</td>
<td>Arup Associates</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>26/01/2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cosham, Portsmouth</td>
<td>Former IBM Pilot Head Office, 1 Northern Road</td>
<td>1970</td>
<td>1971</td>
<td>Foster Associates</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>26/01/2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newcastle upon Tyne</td>
<td>MEA House (former Office of Ryder &amp; Yates), Ellison Place</td>
<td>1972</td>
<td>1974</td>
<td>Ryder &amp; Yates</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>26/01/2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edgbaston, Birmingham</td>
<td>St James’s House, Frederick Road</td>
<td>1954-57</td>
<td>1957</td>
<td>John Madin</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>26/01/2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liverpool</td>
<td>Former Midland Bank, 4 Dale Street</td>
<td>1967-71</td>
<td>1971</td>
<td>Bradshaw, Rowse &amp; Harker</td>
<td></td>
<td>26/01/2015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 7

Statutory Listing Entries for Post-war City Offices, sourced from the National Heritage List for England Online Database, accessed March-July 2015.
http://www.historicengland.org.uk/listing/the-list
List entry

List entry Summary

This building is listed under the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 as amended for its special architectural or historic interest.

Name: Bracken House

List entry Number: 1262582

Location

One Friday Street, London EC4M 9JA

The building may lie within the boundary of more than one authority.

County
Greater London Authority
National Park: Not applicable to this List entry.

District
City and County of the City of London

District Type
London Borough

Parish
Non Civil Parish

Grade: II*

Date first listed: 13-Aug-1987

Date of most recent amendment: 25-Apr-2013

Legacy System Information

The contents of this record have been generated from a legacy data system.

Legacy System: LBS

UID: 434714

Asset Groupings

This list entry does not comprise part of an Asset Grouping. Asset Groupings are not part of the official record but are added later for information.

List entry Description

Summary of Building

Commercial premises, of two phases: the former Financial Times headquarters by Sir Albert Richardson (opened 1959), converted and altered to form the Obayashi headquarters by Michael Hopkins and Partners (started 1988; opened 1992); Ove Arup and Partners, consulting engineers. Both elements are of considerable interest.
Reasons for Designation

Bracken House is listed at Grade II* for the following principal reasons:

* Architectural interest: as a late example of modern classicism, as applied to a post-war City headquarters of high prestige, designed by an eminent C20 architect; this interest is compounded by the sophistication of the later Michael Hopkins-designed phase, which demonstrates the structural exuberance of High Tech design;

* Creative adaptation: as an early and outstanding example of a bold intervention within a listed building, demonstrating sensitivity to the existing fabric while introducing a distinctive, contemporary language of its own;

* Historic interest: as the former HQ of a prominent City publication, named after (and commissioned by) a significant C20 figure, and which shows the former prominence of the press in the heart of London, as well as the arrival of a prominent Japanese firm;

* Planning: the atrium and central lifts (an early instance in England of this American commercial plan) enable easy communication within the building, while creating a dramatic internal space of luminosity and incident. The interior contains large open office and trading floors as befitting new commercial practices, but also has the built-in means to reconfigure space usage, should requirements alter;

* Materials: as a deliberate rejection of the City convention for building in Portland stone, and opting instead for pink sandstone and which alludes to the famous pink livery of the Financial Times. These novel colours are enhanced by the verdigris of the copper roof and the clock on the N elevation;

* Detail and finish: both the Richardson and Hopkins phases are marked by an exceptionally high standard of finish, albeit in contrasting idioms. This ranges from the symbolic clock and oak-leaf decoration to the Richardson parts, to the sophisticated structural expressions of the Hopkins elements.

History

Bracken House was built as the headquarters and printing works for the Financial Times (established 1888). It takes its name from Brendan Bracken (1901-58, created Viscount Bracken in 1952), who served in Churchill’s wartime government as Minister of Information before returning to publishing: he merged the Financial Times with the Financial News in 1945, thereby creating England’s largest business newspaper. New premises were built in 1955-58 on a prominent blitzed site SE of St Paul’s Cathedral, to the designs of Sir Albert Richardson PRA (1888-1964): Richardson was a leading mid-C20 English architect, who worked in partnership with Eric Houfe from 1945, and who is remembered for his writings as well as for his creative fusion of tradition and modernity. Richardson began his designs in 1952; Houfe showed a drawing of the building at the 1954 Royal Academy, in which year planning permission was granted by the LCC. The north range contained editorial offices; the centre contained the printing works; the south range was a self-contained office building capable of being sub-let. Opened in 1959, this was one of the last City buildings to be designed in a classical manner, albeit in an idiosyncratic style which owed much to Richardson’s familiarity with earlier C20 French architecture, as well as with Italian Baroque ( Guarini’s Palazzo Carignano (begun 1678-99), in Turin was a particular inspiration).

In keeping with other leading newspapers in the 1980s, the FT quit its historic inner city premises for production elsewhere in London. Newspaper production ceased at Bracken House in 1988, and a competition was held for a new building on the site: this was won by Michael Hopkins (b.1935) and Partners. Hopkins turned to the pioneering iron and glass office building by Peter Ellis, Oriel Chambers, Liverpool (1864) for inspiration: the key motif of the boxed-out oriel windows, with slender iron columns, is strongly sensed. Bracken House was the first post-war building to be listed, by the Department of the Environment, in August 1987, following a campaign to save the building from demolition. Partial retention of the Richardson building had already been considered as an option. This led to a re-design of the winning scheme, with Richardson’s outer north, east and south ranges being retained, while the central printing hall was replaced with a new structure containing generous office and trading floors. The building was redeveloped by the Japanese Obayashi Corporation (which acquired the freehold from Pearson’s in 1987) as prestigious quarters for the Industrial Bank of Japan, and occupied in March 1992.

Details
MATERIALS The 1950s parts of the building are faced in red Hollington sandstone, from Staffordshire, and pale red bricks with bronze windows, beneath a weathered copper roof. This colour was a deliberate reference to the Financial Times’ pink pages. The newer elements of Bracken House comprise a reinforced concrete frame with external windows of cast gunmetal and bronze, above a sandstone plinth. The principal internal materials are of finely cast concrete, zinc-coated steel, and glass.

PLAN The rectangular site comprises a northern and southern range, retaining Richardson and Houfe’s 1950s structure. Between, on the site of the former printing works, stands a large elliptical central section, planned around an atrium, with four lifts, stairs and landings beneath the glazed roof; on each side, on seven floors, is an open office floor area. The entrance is now from the east, on Friday Street.

EXTERIOR Bracken House is a prominent City building to the SE of St Paul’s. Two of the sides (N,S) retain Richardson’s masonry and brick elevations; the others consist of richly glazed steel and glass High Tech insertions. The N elevation to Cannon Street is of ten bays, with canted angles to each corner; that to the S is of seven bays, with rounded turrets. Seven stories, above two service basements. Richardson and Houfe’s elevational treatment comprises a plain giant order in brick, with sandstone plinth and banding at first and second floor levels, rising up to a cornice with a recessed attic above. Elegant detailing abounds: the prominent astronomical clock in gilt and enamel by Philip Bentham (decorated with Winston Churchill’s face – a tribute to Bracken’s political mentor), the oak leaf enrichment to the main entrance, and the free-standing bronze columns to the ground floor bay windows. The Hopkins element is complementary, while very different in feel. The elevations respect the plinth, cornice and roof lines of the earlier parts, while adopting a High Tech treatment with abundant glazing (necessary for the deep floor-plates within). This glazing consists of rectangular bay windows with angled returns, linked by continuous tie-rods. The outer walls are load-bearing, and faced in cast gunmetal and bronze; external columns run the full height of the building and are supported on metal base brackets which rise up from tall sandstone piers.

INTERIOR Few areas of the Richardson phase’s interior survive, having mainly been converted to open-plan office use: the original entrance hall to the north side is the best-preserved and most interesting, with a decorated door surround, giant pilasters and a mezzanine level landing. The prestigious upper floor along the north side retains marble window surrounds, but is otherwise much altered too. The new central section contains a double-height reception area, beyond which is the imposing atrium. This features a central bank of partly-glazed lifts with exposed cabling, accessed by a daring bridge of glass block set in concrete. The atrium is top lit by a similar grid of glass block. The floor slabs are carried on reinforced concrete columns, and supported in the central section by radial beams. Services are located within the floor void, resulting in minimal visual intrusion. Within the newer spaces, the detailing and execution is of a consistently high standard in the shared areas: the concrete contains sparkling Lee Moor sand, and is very carefully finished, while the use of glass bricks to the floors of the upper levels compounds the intricate luminosity of the spaces. The service areas are not of special interest.

Selected Sources

Books and journals
Amery, C, Bracken House, (1992)  
Barson, S, Saint, A, A Farewell to Fleet Street, (1988), 56-58  
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List entry

List entry Summary

This building is listed under the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 as amended for its special architectural or historic interest.

Name: Former offices of YRM

List entry Number: 1242612

Location

2 Greystocke Place, City of London, EC4A 1GP

The building may lie within the boundary of more than one authority.

County
Greater London Authority

District
City and County of the City of London

District Type
London Borough

Parish
Non Civil Parish

Grade: II

Date first listed: 24-Nov-1995

Date of most recent amendment: 26-Apr-2013

Legacy System Information

The contents of this record have been generated from a legacy data system.

Legacy System: LBS

UID: 442088

Asset Groupings

This list entry does not comprise part of an Asset Grouping. Asset Groupings are not part of the official record but are added later for information.

List entry Description

Summary of Building

Offices, 1961 by Yorke, Rosenberg and Mardall as their own headquarters, with a penthouse flat for senior partner FRS Yorke. Now offices on lower two floors with flats above.

Reasons for Designation
The former offices of YRM at No. 2 Greystoke Place are listed at Grade II for the following principal reasons: * Architectural interest: a flagship building designed by and for a noted firm of post-war architects, exceptionally well detailed and making skilful use of materials; * Setting: a sensitive integration of a frankly modern office building within an ancient street pattern, relating unusually well both to the narrow alleyways to the north and to the former churchyard with its retained boundary walls and railings to the south.

History
No. 2 Greystoke Place was designed by the firm of Yorke, Rosenberg and Mardall (YRM) as their own headquarters, and served as a flagship for the practice’s increasing specialisation in office work. The plot adjoins the former churchyard of St Dunstan in the West, which provided the only access to the site; despite this, building work (carried out by Messrs Trollope and Colls under job architect Beryl Hope) was completed in the exceptionally short time of ten months from initial excavation to final completion in December 1961. The top floor of the building contained a penthouse flat, occupied by the firm’s senior partner FRS Yorke for the short period before his death in 1962. The building received the RIBA Bronze medal for 1961; the RIBA President Sir William Holford, presenting the award, described it as 'an oasis of quality in the midst of quantity'.

Details
MATERIALS: reinforced concrete frame finished externally in 9¾in x 2in horizontally coursed white tiles.

PLAN: the building occupies a small plot enclosed by narrow alleyways (Greystoke Place and Mac’s Place) to the north and east, with the former St Dunstan’s churchyard to the south. It is of six-storeys, comprising a broad two-storey podium and a set-back four-storey tower, the top storey set back still further to form a penthouse. The original main entrance is on the north side, from Greystoke Place: an external flight of steps leads directly to the first-floor lobby; adjoining which are the stairwell and lift shaft. The original layout comprised clerical and secretarial offices at ground level, two large drawing offices on the first and second floors, partners’ offices on the third and fourth floors, and FRS Yorke’s flat in the fifth-floor penthouse. In the present arrangement, the lower two floors remain as offices while the second through fifth floors are now flats. The principal entrance is now from the churchyard to the south, via a new doorway and steps installed c.2005; the north entrance remains, but this and the stairwell and lift now mainly serve the flats.

EXTERIOR: the use of white facing tiles - a clean, mechanical alternative to the tougher exposed brick and concrete surfaces of the 1950s - was a new phenomenon in British architecture, and was to become a signature of YRM’s commercial work. The architects were determined to use the tiles uncut, and the dimensions of a standard tile thus fix the proportions of the building as a whole. Similar tiles form projecting cills to the window openings. The windows themselves are double-glazed timber casements (now painted white) arranged in horizontal bands. Those on the north and south elevations have centrally-pivoting upper lights with integral blinds. On the more formal south elevation they are arranged in two groups of three, thus creating a bipartite division in both podium and tower; an additional single window to the right wraps round the Mac’s Place elevation as a continuous glazed strip. The penthouse windows above are tall horizontally-sliding sashes. The present south entrance with its steps and canopy was installed c.2005, replacing an earlier window; the black metal railings to the right are original. The old main entrance from Greystoke Place is reached via an external flight of steps with green terrazzo treads, and is sheltered by a tile-clad concrete canopy; the stairwell above is lit by a series of horizontal slit windows.

INTERIORS: the principal internal feature is the stair, which is square on plan with the lift-shaft occupying the central well. It has floating treads of green terrazzo cantilevered out of a ranking concrete beam, and tubular steel handrails painted black. The uppermost flight, leading to the penthouse flat, has treads of yellow terrazzo. The lift shaft is glazed to the sides and rear with black-painted doors and metalwork.

The ground and first floors are still in use as offices. These are large open-plan spaces, with smaller areas partitioned off as meeting rooms, kitchens etc. Most of the internal features here, including the partitions and the stair connecting the two office floors, are recent insertions and are not of special interest. The ceilings are of exposed concrete with reinforcing beams supported on pilotis. The upper floors are now private flats, and could not be inspected; the penthouse, built as FRS Yorke’s own flat, may contain features of interest.

SUBSIDIARY FEATURES: the building was designed to be seen across the enclosed green space of the former churchyard to the south, and the latter’s C19 iron railings and stock-brick plinth walls and gate-piers are important framing elements.
Selected Sources

Books and journals
'Architects’ Journal' in Bronze Medal Office, (May 16 1962), 1053
'RIBA Journal' in Greystoke Place Offices, (October 1962), 377-380
'Architectural Design’ in Architects Own Offices, Greystoke Place, London E C, (July 1963), 338-344
'Architect and Building News’ in Greystoke Place, (30 May 1962), 787

National Grid Reference: TQ3124481399
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List entry

List entry Summary

This building is listed under the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 as amended for its special architectural or historic interest.

Name: Lloyd’s Building

List entry Number: 1405493

Location

Lloyd’s Building, 1 Lime Street, London

The building may lie within the boundary of more than one authority.

County
Greater London Authority

District
City and County of the City of London

District Type
London Borough

Parish
Non Civil Parish

National Park: Not applicable to this List entry.

Grade: I

Date first listed: 19-Dec-2011

Date of most recent amendment: Not applicable to this List entry.

Asset Groupings

This list entry does not comprise part of an Asset Grouping. Asset Groupings are not part of the official record but are added later for information.

List entry Description

Summary of Building


Reasons for Designation

The Lloyd’s building has outstanding special interest and is listed at Grade I for the following principal reasons: * Architectural innovation: a seminal late-C20 building by one of Britain’s most significant modern architects. It exemplifies the High Tech style in Britain, with its boldly expressed services and flexibility of plan throughout the impressive exterior and interior. * Historic interest: a purpose-built headquarters for an internationally important organisation that successfully integrates the traditions and fabric of earlier Lloyd’s
buildings (including the Adam Room moved originally from Bowood House, the 1925 Cooper façade and fixtures such as the Lutine Bell). * Flexibility of design: Lloyd’s was innovative for the in-built flexibility of its design that would respond to changing needs in the market. The robustness of the overall design has allowed regular changes to work satisfactorily, and the essential elements of the building survive remarkably well. New additions, while too new to be of special interest, have been thoughtfully incorporated. * Timelessness: the building, which looked to Victorian as well as mid C20 buildings for inspiration, firmly retains the splendour of its awe-inspiring futuristic design, 25 years (at the time of listing in 2011) after it opened. * Group value: Lloyd’s, in the heart of the City of London, has many listed neighbours and it forms a wonderfully incongruous backdrop to many of these in captured vistas throughout the City. It has particular group value with the adjacent Grade II * Leadenhall Market, a significant Victorian commercial building to which Lloyd’s itself nods in the country, with international renown that cast the image of the City of London in a new light.

History

Lloyd’s takes its name from Edward Lloyd, a Welshman who opened a coffee house in Tower Street in 1688. It became a meeting place for seafarers, ship-owners, merchants, and for the first underwriters who insured the ships and their cargoes. By the 1770s this group had found accommodation in the Royal Exchange and, trading as Lloyd’s, it stayed there until the 1920s, when the scale of its members’ operations made a move inevitable. A site was acquired in Leadenhall Street and Sir Edwin Cooper was commissioned to design a prestigious headquarters. The site was awkward, since there was only a small frontage to Leadenhall Street, where Cooper had already designed another building, Royal Mail House. He made the most of the site by setting the building, completed in 1928, behind an imposing triumphal arch and corridor, which led to the ‘Room’, a grandiose 16,000 square foot space where the underwriting business was conducted, laid out on the principle that everyone should be able to see each other. But even so large a space rapidly proved inadequate and in 1936 Lloyd’s acquired Royal Mail House as additional accommodation.

Cooper’s buildings survived the war unscathed, but the underwriters acquired bomb-damaged property across Lime Street, where in 1952 they began a second building, with a new ‘Room’, Chairman’s suite and members’ restaurant, traditionally called the ‘Captain’s Room’. Completed in 1957, it was designed by Terence Heysham, successor to Cooper’s practice, in a traditional style embraced by the City. Known as the Heysham Building, it was extensively remodelled by DEGW in 1990-1 and demolished and replaced in 2006-7 by No.51 Lime Street, designed by Foster and Partners. By the late 1970s the Heysham Building had already become too small and a third building was needed, and having outgrown two permanent buildings so quickly made Lloyd’s very concerned to rebuild the Cooper buildings with greater adaptability in mind. It had recently opened an administrative building in Chatham, designed by Arup Associates, but despite the success of this scheme, it eventually resolved to hold an invited competition for such a prestigious and yet sensitive brief. Cooper’s original Lloyd’s building was listed in 1977, which added a further consideration to the design of the new building.

The choice of a competition was encouraged by Gordon Graham, then President of the RIBA, who advised that Lloyd’s needed a building strategy rather than simply a design. Twelve firms were initially invited to produce ideas, from which six were shortlisted: Piano and Rogers, Foster Associates, Arup Associates, the American I. M. Pei, Webb Zarafa Menkes Housden from Canada and the French Serête practice. Rogers, his partnership with Renzo Piano by now only a nominal one, assembled the English components of the team that had won the competition for Paris’s Pompidou (Beaubourg) Centre in 1971, including architects John Young and Marco Goldschmied and the engineers Peter Rice and Jack Zunz from Ove Arup and Partners. They secured the commission, in April 1978, because they were able to develop a strategy for Lloyd’s to continue to trade through building operations that were already appreciated as likely to be complex and protracted. The complex brief required two main features in addition to continuity of trading: the creation of a single trading space, or Room, and the potential for expansion and contraction. Lloyd’s members overwhelmingly approved Rogers’s designs in November 1978.

When design work began, personal computer technology was only just emerging and the design had to be altered following the realisation that desktop terminals would become a major part of working life. This led to heavier and more dominant service towers, to serve this new technology: power and cabling provision had to be doubled, and cooling capacity dramatically increased. Television screens and computer monitors had to be clearly readable without reflections from the glazing, which is mostly translucent. The six service towers were enlarged, losing their earlier slim and expressive qualities to become the dominant features of the design. Microchips were used in the building to monitor lifts, security and other services: an early example of this technology.
On 20th September 1979, the City’s Court of Common Council accepted the recommendation of its planning committee and granted consent for the Cooper building to be demolished and outline permission for the new building on the site. The interior was stripped and the arched portal to Leadenhall Street was retained as one entrance to the new Richard Rogers Partnership building. Demolition of Cooper’s building began in October 1979, and was only completed in February 1981, the underwriters and office staff having been moved piecemeal into temporary accommodation in the Heysham Building. Work on the new building began in June 1981. The Queen Mother poured concrete for one of the main columns in a ceremony in November, and returned in May 1984 for the topping-out. The building was finally occupied in May 1986.

Richard Rogers, now Lord Rogers of Riverside, was born in 1933 in Florence. He trained at the Architectural Association and Yale University before setting up the Team 4 practice with Norman Foster and others in 1962. Their house for his in-laws, Creekvean in Feock, Cornwall (1964-7) was listed Grade II in 1998 and upgraded to Grade II* in 2002. Rogers subsequently formed an architectural practice with his then wife, Su Rogers, and from 1970-77, worked with the Italian architect Renzo Piano. Their Pompidou Centre building in Paris, which opened in 1977, is a major landmark of the High Tech style (although with a completely steel frame that was not allowed in the City). Other major works by Rogers include: the Channel 4 Building in Westminster, the law courts in Strasbourg, Bordeaux and Antwerp, the National Assembly of Wales in Cardiff, the Barajas Airport in Madrid and Terminal 5 at Heathrow Airport.

Details

Materials In-situ concrete frame (a result of the City of London’s fire regulations which would have required expensive fire protection to a steel frame) of very high quality concrete to combine strength with slimness. Six perimeter towers with stainless steel services (toilet pods, staircases, external lifts, pipes and ducts) dramatically expressed externally. The concrete frame is visible and embraced as part of the aesthetic internally. The weight of the floor grid is transferred via U-beams to the 28 columns by means of distinctive and expressed pre-cast brackets. Members of Rogers’s team studied the latest American concrete techniques in the office of I. M. Pei, and the frame was carefully articulated to avoid staining. John Young, the partner in charge, said that their aim was to create ‘the best concrete building in Britain’. The design appears to be paying homage to American architect Louis Kahn in the slickly finished columns, the strong grid and the coffered ceilings, as honed by Kahn in his Yale Art Gallery extension (1951-3), introduced to Rogers when studying at Yale University in the early 1960s. Stainless steel was preferred to aluminium for the external cladding, again at the behest of the fire authority, with a fine textured finish to give a bright sheen. Steel cranes, painted blue, are permanently sited on upper levels for cleaning and maintenance. The building is set on piled foundations, with propping and underpinning of adjoining buildings because of their considerable depth. The basement acts as a ‘drained box’ with a water-permeable layer beneath the floor slab and a drained cavity between the internal and external skins.

The central atrium is defined by a painted latticed steel and glass barrel-vaulted roof and tall window, similarly detailed, facing Leadenhall Place. The building is more highly glazed than is immediately apparent, and was designed to withstand solar gain. A clever solution using triple glazing facilitates an air conditioning system in which cool air is introduced into the building at floor level and stale air is extracted at high level via the light fittings and down a cavity in the triple glazing. Much of the glass is translucent, or ‘sparkle’, glass so the public cannot see into the trading floor, which is a strictly private operation. There are shallow ‘vision strips’ of clear glass placed at sitting or standing level depending on the floor; this was being re-ordered to allow for a greater proportion of clear glass at the time of listing (2011) in a sympathetic manner by Rogers Stirk Harbour + Partners. The window bays are divided by projecting perforated aluminium mullions, and there are ‘fish tail’ profile ducts connected to the top of each window, which bring the air from the ceiling to the cavity glass of the wall.

Style The design ethos of the Lloyd’s building, which exemplifies the High Tech style in Britain, is centred around its inherent flexibility and dynamism. The aesthetic is boldly futuristic, even thirty years after design began, yet while resoundingly modern, Lloyd’s was inspired and informed by the great traditions of C19 British engineering, perhaps best seen in the atrium (which responds to the adjacent Leadenhall Market). The asymmetric and soaring expressed towers have also led to the building being described as ‘Gothic’. At its heart is the concept of ‘served’ and ‘servant’ space introduced by Louis Kahn, with its clear architectural expression of different functional spaces throughout the building. It is sometimes referred to as ‘the inside out’ building because of the strongly expressed services that define the exterior massing and style. Lloyd’s combines elements of the statuesque and permanent within a dress of the lightweight and disposable. Each elevation is different and part of the architectural excitement is glimpsing different elevations and rooflines.
from different parts of the City.

Plan The building comprises a rectangular block of offices, 67m x 45.5m, set back within a cobbled well with walkways linking the building to the pavement. The rectangular concrete structure at the core of the building is defined by 28 cylindrical piers on a 10.8m x 18m grid forming a rectangular courtyard with a central atrium, while the 'satellite' stair and service towers project in a pinwheel fashion around the perimeter.

Up to 16 storeys of offices, or galleries in Lloyd's parlance (the stepped profile of the building means that not all the building is the same height) with a further two floors below ground. Main reception is currently (2011) on the Lime Street side into the lower ground floor (through replaced revolving doors). There are three other entrances: the original main entrance, with canopy, in the base of Tower 1, through the Cooper building on Leadenhall Street into the base of Tower 5 and in the base of Tower 3 on corner of Lime Street and Leadenhall Place. There is a ramp over the well from Leadenhall Street into the entrance of Tower 1. The ground and first floor is dominated by the most significant of the working spaces: double-height with a largely uninterrupted interior, where up to 6,000 underwriters and brokers can make deals and communicate face-to-face. The offices above are organised around the central, galleried atrium that extends the height of the building and culminates in the steel and glass barrel-vaulted roof. The lower seven storeys (lower ground, ground and levels 1-4) are served by a ladder of escalators within the central space; integral fixings at higher levels allow for future expansion of the escalators to upper floors. The design incorporates Robert Adam's 'Great Room' of c.1763 from Bowood House, Wiltshire in gallery 11.

The special Lloyd's term of 'the Room' is a semi-abstract concept that refers to all the levels of the building that are occupied by the market at that time. The original design always intended this to be flexible, allowing floor area to be expanded or contracted as the market demanded, and it is considered a fundamental component of its success as a working market building. At the time of listing (2011), the market operates at ground level, and levels 1-3 (levels 4, 7, 8, 9, 10 and part of 3 are let to tenants, although this is subject to change); the Corporation of Lloyd's occupies levels 5, 6, 12 and part of level 4, while Level 11 contains the Committee suite.

Exterior The Lloyd's Building is identified by the six different towers that engulf the rectangular core: three for escape stairs and fire-related services, the others for the external glazed lifts (in natural colours, rather than bright primary colours at other RRP projects), the pre-fabricated lavatories (for ease of assembly and maintenance) and ducts. The highest towers are to Leadenhall Street (Towers 1, 5 and 6) and are graduated back to where the street grain is lower (next to Leadenhall Market) at Towers 3 and 4. The elevations between are marked by expressed concrete columns which clasp the glazed offices (each storey is 4 horizontal panes of glazing high) with the distinctive brackets, overlapped by horizontal ductwork. The prefabricated toilet cabins are shiny steel boxes with porthole lights, slotted in to their own concrete structure with more slender corner columns and bands between each storey. To Leadenhall Place are a series of stacked meeting room pods, which start at gallery 1 above the vehicle lifts and rise through gallery 6; these steel pods externally appear quite similar to the toilet pods. The stairwells, with their curved apsidal ends are equally shiny, and the slope of the steps is expressed with a deep gap between each floor. The lifts are particularly light with entirely glazed corners and mounted steel fixings supporting the glass instead of being held in a frame. Four of the towers are topped by major three-tiered plant rooms (these are much larger than were originally planned to cope with increased air-conditioning needs and to ease access for maintenance staff). Boldly expressed and chunky cylindrical ventilation ducts (for return air and supply air) in stainless steel have a strongly vertical quality to the top where the re-circulating duct angles into the air handling plant of the towers. The original main entrance, at the base of Tower 1, is identified by a grand cantilevered canopy with a barrel-vaulted glazed profile, which echoes the atrium roof. A small, fully-glazed cabin was added later to the entrance at Tower 1 to accommodate the 'waiters' (Lloyd's special name for its traditional red-coated staff) is too recent to be of special interest. Revolving doors have also been added to this entrance and are not of special interest. A rectangular, dark blue glazed ceramic City of London plaque, commemorating the foundation of the London Penny Post in 1680, is fixed to the wall near the main entrance.

To Leadenhall Street, the façade of the Lloyd's premises designed by Sir Edwin Cooper of 1925-28 (known as the Cooper building) is now treated as a stone screen and the entrance to Tower 5. This was listed at Grade II in 1977, and has now been consolidated within this listing. The Portland stone classical façade is all that survives. This is dominated by a doorway ornamented with swags and a balustrade, set within a colossal niche with coffered semi-dome. Single windows to 2 storeys at either side, those to ground floor at left and right now carry WWI and WWII war memorials respectively. Five square windows to the enriched upper storey and a full-width pediment with figure sculpture by C.L.J. Doman. There is a plaque to the right announcing: LLOYD'S
The tenants' floors were designed for continuous adaptation: originally screened by timber partitions now traditionally been rung to indicate good or bad insurance-related news) holds a prominent place at the base plan, culminating in a clock, all designed by Edwin Cooper. This distinctive piece of furniture (the bell has within a rostrum that takes the form of a grand wooden tempietto, or miniature colonnaded temple of circular special interest. Also in the main trading floor, prominently sited under the arcade roof, is the Lutine Bell, equipment in this room are not fixtures or utilitarian in nature and would be excluded or noted as not having moveable furniture, rather than fittings, so they are not included in the listing. The pictures, carpet, lights and almost all cases the original bench seating has been removed. These features are of interest but they are moveable furniture, rather than fittings, so they are not included in the listing. The pictures, carpet, lights and in this room are not fixtures or utilitarian in nature and would be excluded or noted as not having special interest. Also in the main trading floor, prominently sited under the arcade roof, is the Lutine Bell, within a rostrum that takes the form of a grand wooden tempietto, or miniature colonnaded temple of circular plan, culminating in a clock, all designed by Edwin Cooper. This distinctive piece of furniture (the bell has traditionally been rung to indicate good or bad insurance-related news) holds a prominent place at the base of the atrium and is a fixture by virtue of its weight (it is owned by Lloyd's). The floor of the atrium is white marble.

The tenants' floors were designed for continuous adaptation: originally screened by timber partitions now...
replaced by translucent glazed partitions that are considered less oppressive and in keeping with the building's overall lightness. The galleries were designed to either have a perimeter corridor around the atrium, or be completely open plan behind a glazed screen. Galleries 1, 2 and 3 are open to the atrium by a transparent glass balustrade and the galleries above have a full height screen in this position with perforated ribs dividing each bay as in to the outside windows. Gallery 8 and part of gallery 7 retain moveable timber partitions which are of interest, but their moveable nature suggests that their interest is not uniquely tied to their current location in the building.

A few of the individual office interiors were designed by Eva Jiricna, working for RRP before she formed her own practice in 1985, but these have since been removed (those on the lower ground floor were removed in 2007), save the panelling on gallery 8. Jiricna also designed some of the furniture, some of which remains, but which is not a fixture. Jiricna was originally also to have designed the interiors of the executive floors, including the offices of the Chairman and other senior officials at Lloyd's. However, in 1983 Sir Peter Green was succeeded as Chairman by Peter Miller, who commissioned the Paris decorator Jacques Grange to fit out the executive floors in a traditional manner with marble and reproduction furniture. The result was incongruous in its setting and reduced the impact of the Bowood Room at its heart, which Rogers had intended as a 'jewel box' of great richness in an otherwise starkly modern interior. The stacked offices to Leadenhall Places (galleries 1-6 inclusive) are wood panelled and originally comprised 1 single room that could be subdivided into 4 rooms with moveable partitions; all have been modified to some degree.

Galleries 5 and 6 and part of 4 house the Corporation, or management staff, of Lloyd's. Gallery 11 contains the Committee suite and Robert Adam's 'Great Room' from Bowood House, designed in 1763 as the drawing room but used from the late 1770s as Bowood's principal dining room. The room was acquired at auction to become the committee room of the new Heysham Building, and installed in 1957 to altered proportions. RRP made space in their building for the Bowood Room to be reconstructed to its original height and width (having been reduced in size for its tenure in the Heysham Building) with some replicated elements to make up the difference. Ian Bristow was appointed consultant for the removal in January 1983, and a methodical reconstruction was made based on the surviving fragments, the drawings in the Soane Museum and photographs of the room in its original location. The original windows, shutters and architraves had been destroyed in 1956, and had to be remade, along with the chair rail and skirtings. The additional length of ceiling and wider spacings between the plaster dishes were retained, while additional arabesque panels were made between the doors to take up the additional length in the walls. The floorboards are the originals from Bowood, with some additional pieces added in 1956. The old work was supported on a steel framework to which timber grounds were fixed. The whole entity is encased in a double-height solid room in a post-modern style with a deeply rusticated plinth and simple recessed arched niches with flat architraves to each deeply-revealed opening. The original colour scheme for the room was only partially recovered, but these bright colours were deemed inappropriate for the Lloyd's building, and the paler hues of straw colour and green were adopted as a compromise. New pier glasses were specially made according to Adam's designs, and tables made based on his drawings for Syon House. The carpet, freestanding furniture, chandeliers and pictures in this room would be excluded form the listing as non-fixtures. There is also a special dining room on gallery 11 (refurbished in 2007) and a wide travertine staircase (designed by Jacques Grange) leading to gallery 12 with a small grid balustrade.

Towers 1, 3 and 5 contain a bridge to a lobby, off which there are 4 lifts to one side and lavatory and staircase pods to the other side. The staircases have double-apsidal ends, wrapped around two columns in line. They are lined with stainless steel and feature a cantilevered extruded aluminium tread. The lavatory pods are lined with stainless steel and have ceramic tile and mirrors on the wall and floor services, and solid white Carrara marble sink counters.

The following features would be considered to lack special interest in any future designation documentation: internal partitions and their doors (except for the timber partitions on gallery 8), carpets, free-standing furniture, raised floor pans and their pedestals, data cabling, mechanical systems, duct work, hidden plant, fire safety systems, internal block walls in the upper and lower basement areas, window blinds, external lighting scheme, hidden external satellite dishes and aerials on the roof and lift controls.

At the time of listing (2011), twenty-five years after its opening, the building survives remarkably well, owing to the inherent flexibility built into its original design and the careful management thus far. Changes include the unfortunate removal of the restaurant interior and meeting rooms designed by Eva Jiricna. There are also thoughtfully-designed but neutral additions such as the waiters’ cabin and bike shed, which are too modern to be included in the listing. The other insertions and removals of partitions were always expected to
accommodate different tenants and have been a fact of the management of Lloyd’s since it opened; it is likely that furniture and partitions will continue to be moved as the building remains in active use. Other changes are minor and superficial, and were always intended as part of the flexible design ethos of this dynamic, working building.
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List entry Summary

This building is listed under the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 as amended for its special architectural or historic interest.

Name: Brown Shipley & Co Ltd

List entry Number: 1422067

Location

Founders Court, Lothbury, London, EC2R 7HE

The building may lie within the boundary of more than one authority.

County
Greater London

Authority
National Park: Not applicable to this List entry.

District
City and County of the City of London

District Type
London Borough

Parish
Non Civil Parish

Grade: II

Date first listed: 26-Jan-2015

Date of most recent amendment: Not applicable to this List entry.

Asset Groupings

This list entry does not comprise part of an Asset Grouping. Asset Groupings are not part of the official record but are added later for information.

List entry Description

Summary of Building

Private bank, designed c1970 and built 1973-5, by Fitzroy Robinson & Partners, incorporating a single bay of an earlier building of 1848 to the Founders Court elevation. Frame construction clad in dark brown/grey polished Swedish Blaubrun granite, bronze-anodised windows. 5-storeys plus three basement levels.

Reasons for Designation

Brown Shipley, designed c1970 by Fitzroy Robinson & Partners and constructed in 1973-5, is designated at Grade II for the following principal reasons:

* Architectural interest: it is an excellent example of post-war commercial architecture that draws on inspiration from C19 commercial designs, but reinterprets this influence in a modern way. The façade’s dramatically dark granite frame and the reflective surfaces of its bronze-anodized windows, enhanced by the ground-floor level massive bronze doors and bronze window screens, by A. John Poole, makes a powerful...
contribution to this City streetscape.

* Materials: the building’s extensive use of fine materials, including bronze, provides an air of opulence apposite for a private bank, and also makes clever reference to Brown Shipley’s history of currency dealing.

* Degree of survival: the exterior remains unaltered, and whilst the interior has incurred considerable change, it still retains notable original features, including the elegant sinuous main stair and the secondary stair, which maintain the stylistic character and distinction of the exterior.

* Architect: it was designed by the notable post-war commercial practice of Fitzroy Robinson & Partners and is one of their most distinguished works, successfully combining a rational monumentality with a humane scale.

History

The merchant bank of William Brown & Co was founded in Liverpool in 1810 by William Brown, the son of Alexander Brown, an Irish linen and dry goods merchant who emigrated to Baltimore, United States in 1798 and went on to become one of America’s richest men. In 1805 William became a partner in his father’s business, which was already dealing in foreign exchange by this time, and in 1810 he was sent to preside over a new office in Liverpool to manage the ships and cargo using the port under his father’s commission. The office later evolved to become the primary bankers to the cotton trade in England.

In 1814 the Liverpool office became known as William & James Brown & Co, and William and his three brothers, George, James and John became partners in each other’s businesses on both sides of the Atlantic. In addition to the Liverpool office, Alexander Brown & Sons was based in Baltimore, John A Brown & Co was based in Philadelphia, and James established Brown Brothers & Co in New York in 1825. A further office in New Orleans managed their cotton trade business. In addition to financing the shipping of dry goods, linen and cotton, and dealing in foreign exchange, the family business was also involved with railways on both sides of the Atlantic and established its own shipping line.

In 1824 Joseph Shipley, a Quaker merchant from Wilmington, Delaware became a partner in William & James Brown & Co, and in 1837 he became a partner in all four of the family’s merchant houses, William & James Brown & Co subsequently becoming known as Brown Shipley & Co.

Following the end of the American Civil War and the fact that the family’s transatlantic business interests were no longer dominated by cotton, Brown Shipley & Co acquired the former premises of the Central Telegraph Station (constructed in 1848) in Founders Court, near to the Bank of England in the City of London for £22,000, and moved there in 1863. Brown Shipley & Co were early pioneers of payment through ‘letters of credit’ and by the 1970s they were one of the world’s largest dealers in bank notes.

In 1970 Fitzroy Robinson was commissioned to design a replacement building for Brown Shipley & Co’s Founders Court site. The new building was opened in 1975 by the former Prime Minister, Edward Heath MP (1916 - 2005), a former employee. A number of interior refurbishments have been carried out since the building’s construction.

Herbert Fitzroy Robinson (1914-2005) trained at the Bartlett School of Architecture under Professor Albert Richardson and went on to form Fitzroy Robinson & Partners in 1956 amidst a commercial building boom in the City of London. The firm’s reputation in the square mile was consolidated with a high profile bank for NM Rothschild & Sons on St Swithin’s Lane (1963-5), and a flurry of commissions in the City followed in the 1970s and 80s, including 7-8 Princes Street (1970-2), 6-9 Snow Hill (1974-6), and 51 Moorgate (1985-7), as well as regional bullion centres for the Bank of England in Birmingham, Manchester and Newcastle, and the Commonwealth War Graves Commission building in Maidenhead (c1974), a rare non-commercial project. The firm also collaborated with other architects on a number of projects, including the Stock Exchange, City of London (1964-72, radically altered in 2004) with Llewelyn Davies, Weeks, Forester-Walker and Partners, and 50 Queen Anne’s Gate, Westminster (1972-76), designed in association with Sir Basil Spence. By the time Robinson retired in 1986 Fitzroy Robinson & Partners was one of the largest architectural practices in western Europe, responsible for designing nearly 2 million m² of office space in the City of London alone. The practice continues today as Aukett Fitzroy Robinson.

Details

Private bank, designed c1970 and built 1973-5, by Fitzroy Robinson & Partners, incorporating a single bay of
an earlier building of 1848 to the Founders Court elevation. Frame construction clad in dark brown/grey polished Swedish Blaubrun granite, bronze-anodised windows. 5-storeys plus three basement levels.

PLAN: the building has a squat T-shaped plan with a linear range aligned west-east that fronts Moorgate, with the south side of the building, which abuts an adjacent building, incorporating a short projection containing the main stair and lifts. The site's ground level slopes gently downwards from north to south.

EXTERIOR: the front (west) elevation facing Moorgate is of 4-bays with a slightly taller ground floor. The bays have large windows set within deep moulded frames with splayed reveals. The four upper floors are subdivided by lesser mullions to form paired windows. The main entrance is set to the ground floor of bay-3 and consists of a pair of solid bronze doors with a high-relief roundel design by A. John Poole, each weighing 1 1/4 tonnes and costing £24,000 in 1975; replaced glazed inner doors behind lead into the former banking hall, which is now a reception area. Gilded lettering on each splayed polished-granite doorway jamb reads 'Brown Shipley & Co Limited'. Bronze screens with abstract low-relief designs, which were also designed and produced by Poole, are attached in front of the ground-floor windows. The rear (east) elevation facing St Margaret's churchyard is of 3-bays and shares the same styling as the front elevation. The south side elevation faces into the Founders Court alleyway and consists of a single-bay Baroque-style ashlar facade retained (albeit with some alteration, as historic photographs reveal) from the 1848 building. Set to the ground floor is a tall arched doorway flanked by piers with vermiculated banded rustication and with a central keystone above depicting a god's head. The doorway contains a partly-glazed panelled door set within a glazed screen incorporating a fanlight above. Above the entrance is an ornate double-height surround incorporating a segmental pediment supported by hybridised decorated ionic columns with a scrolled apron below. Below the apron is a balustraded ornamental balcony. The surround originally contained banded rustication, but a tripartite window was inserted in 1973-5, which lights the second floor. An historic photograph reveals that the facade has been raised as the balcony originally sat immediately above the entrance keystone, but is now set higher above a stringcourse. Immediately above the segmental pediment, and set just below a deep dentillated eaves cornice, is a glazed roundel, which was also added in 1973-5 and lights the third floor. Set back above the cornice are the two uppermost floors of the 1973-5 build clad with Portland stone and with a wide window to each floor. The near part of the return wall to the left in Founders Court is the rear elevation of a stair hall and lift projection and is clad in Portland stone. A tall ground-floor doorway has square-panelled doors and a wedge lintel above; to the left of the doorway a stone is engraved with bronze lettering that reads 'Brown Shipley & Co Limited', whilst to the right of the doorway is an engraved foundation stone laid in 1973. Ventilators exist to the upper floors and have been designed to resemble windows with wedge lintels.

INTERIOR: internally the building has been heavily altered on all floor levels and spaces have been modernised. At the time of writing (2014), further refurbishment works are also ongoing. Originally there was a proliferation of bronze and dark marble within the interior, such as light switches that were originally custom-made in bronze, but these features have all since been removed. As the bank no longer stores cash on site, or provides a cash service, there is no longer a need for a banking hall. The former ground-floor banking hall*, which has been opened-up to create a large reception area with glazed-partitioned meeting rooms flanking the entrance, is not of special interest. Originally there was a long bronze banking counter with bronze-tinted glass, and the space also had downlighting, dark-coloured marble wall cladding and a contrasting paler marble floor, but these features have all been removed. An open-plan office space on the north side of the ground floor* has also been partly incorporated into the reception space and also partitioned to create further meeting room spaces* and a disabled toilet*, all of which are not of special interest. A lift shaft that originally transported bullion between the ground and basement levels survives behind a later stud wall in the disabled toilet, but the lift car itself has been removed; the lift doors are visible in the basement. The main lift lobbies on each floor* are not of special interest. Originally they had dark-coloured marble wall cladding and bronze moulded lift doors, but the cladding has since been replaced by pale polished stone and plain lift doors have been installed; the lift car interiors have also been refurbished. An altered and modernised lobby area exists just within the Founders Court side entrance* and is not of special interest except for a wall-mounted plaque of carved wood commemorating the bank's employees killed during the First and Second World Wars that was retained from the 1848 building. A former foreign exchange counter area off the north side of the lobby is now a kitchen* and the former clerks/dealers space at the eastern end of the ground floor is now a modern break-out space with an inserted late-C20 mezzanine*; both spaces are not of special interest. The elegant main stair gives access to all the floor levels and lies within the building's southern projection. It has a sinuous form that wraps around a narrow open well with a solid balustrade with a sweeping line on the half-landing levels. The balustrade has a roughcast-render finish to the well face and has pale Italian marble cladding to the stair-flight face and balustrade copings. The balustrade is surmounted by a raised brass handrail. A goods lift with replaced doors is accessed off the stair's landings. An additional
secondary stair is located to the rear right/eastern end of the building and also accesses all the floors. It has a marble riser in place of a closed string and a metal balustrade with a bronze handrail; the balustrade echoes the sinuous design of the main stair although the secondary stair itself has sharp angles. The upper floors are largely open-plan with original partitions removed and are not of special interest. Additional secondary glazing has been added internally to the third-floor windows and, at the time of writing, is due to be added to the windows of the remaining floors. A meeting/boardroom (originally the directors' large dining room) at the eastern end of the fifth floor that was originally designed as a replica of one of the rooms in the 1848 building, has been refurbished and altered, and is not of special interest. However, the room's east wall, which is fully glazed with bronze-anodised frames and sliding patio doors is included within the listing. The doors lead out onto a terrace with views over to the Bank of England. The terrace has a decked floor and bronze railings set behind a parapet. An identical terrace is located at the western end of the fifth floor, and is accessed through an identically styled glazed wall and sliding doors. The building's three basement levels, which contain a mixture of modernised meeting rooms, stores, plant rooms, the former canteen, and vaults are not of special interest.

* Pursuant to s.1 (5A) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 ('the Act') it is declared that these aforementioned features are not of special architectural or historic interest
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List entry

List entry Summary

This building is listed under the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 as amended for its special architectural or historic interest.

Name: 30 Cannon Street (formerly Crédit Lyonnais)

List entry Number: 1422718

Location

30 Cannon Street (formerly Crédit Lyonnais), City of London, EC4M 6XH

The building may lie within the boundary of more than one authority.

County
Greater London

District
City and County of the City of London

District Type
London Borough

Parish
Non Civil Parish

National Park: Not applicable to this List entry.

Grade: II

Date first listed: 26-Jan-2015

Date of most recent amendment: Not applicable to this List entry.

Asset Groupings

This list entry does not comprise part of an Asset Grouping. Asset Groupings are not part of the official record but are added later for information.

List entry Description

Summary of Building

Bank headquarters, 1974-7 by Whinney, Son & Austen Hall (partner in charge Jeremy Mackay-Lewis), structural engineers Ove Arup & Partners.

Reasons for Designation

30 Cannon Street (formerly Crédit Lyonnais), an office building of 1974-7 by Whinney, Son & Austen Hall, is listed at Grade II for the following principal reasons:

* Architectural interest: an expressive and assured design, its splayed plan, canted profile and high-relief modelling confer the exteriors with a sculptural quality;

* Innovation: the first building internationally to be fully clad in double-skinned panels of glass-fibre reinforced cement (GRC), a form of prefabricated cladding that permits rapid on-site assembly as well as a
striking visual appearance;

* Group value: the building has strong stylistic and functional affinities with the Victorian commercial architecture of Queen Victoria Street, and group value through its close proximity and associated design with the Grade II-listed Albert Buildings opposite.

History

Crédit Lyonnais, one of the major Parisian banks, took the decision to build new premises in late 1972, in advance of the expiry of their existing lease in March 1976. They obtained a lease from Wates Property Company on a triangular island site, occupied by a disused fire station and one of the last bomb sites to be redeveloped in the City of London. An Office Development Permit was granted in January 1973, and the architects (Whinney, Son & Austen Hall), were appointed soon after, leaving an unusually short timetable for detailed design and construction. Construction was divided into two phases, with a requirement to complete the first phase in time for occupation by March 1976. The building was completed ahead of schedule, despite the miners’ strike, three-day working week and the discovery of significant archaeological remains on the site including two medieval churches.

The planning authority had rejected several previous schemes for the site and required a high standard of design. The client wanted a prestige building of sufficiently striking appearance to command its island site and be discernible from a distance. The curvilinear design was developed by Jeremy Mackay-Lewis, the partner in charge, ‘over one weekend of concentrated work’, and planning permission was granted four months later, in October 1973. The height of the building was limited by height regulations in the vicinity of St Paul’s Cathedral and a sub-basement was ruled out by the water table, so the minimum lettable floor area was achieved with a raised basement set back from the pavement. The internal area was also boosted by the floor overhangs.

30 Cannon Street is the first building internationally to be fully clad in double-skinned glass-fibre reinforced cement (GRC) panels. The initial choice of cladding was pre-cast concrete, but this was rejected by the freeholder at a late stage. Enamelled pressed steel was then considered, and the architects consulted Jean Prouvé, the authority on this material, but no press was found large enough to manufacture the pre-cast units. Bronze and aluminium were also rejected on grounds of cost and concerns about oxidisation. Fire regulations prevented the use of glass-fibre reinforced plastic (GRP) on a structure of this size. The architects eventually turned to its non-combustible equivalent, GRC.

The idea of adding an ingredient such as glass-fibre to Portland cement to improve its tensile strength had been the long-term aim of research, but a chemically-stable glass-fibre capable of architectural applications was only developed in 1969. The material is obtained by mixing Portland cement with 5% alkali-resistant glass-fibre reinforcement, which forms a matrix easily mouldable to the required shape. It was necessary to determine the structural properties of GRC from first principles, assessing its tensile strength and behaviour under wind loading. Like GRP, inherent strength was increased by incorporating curves in three dimensions, creating a characteristic modelled effect. The GRC units were cheaper, lighter, thinner and less porous than pre-cast concrete equivalents, reducing the costs of the structure, foundations and transport, and permitting more lettable floor area. 1,900 units were manufactured by Portcrete Ltd and delivered to site complete with window frames, leaving only the glass to be fitted in-situ.

Details

Bank headquarters, 1974-7 by Whinney, Son & Austen Hall (partner in charge Jeremy Mackay-Lewis), structural engineers Ove Arup & Partners.


PLAN: 30 Cannon Street occupies a triangular site at the junction of Cannon Street and Queen Victoria Street; the base of the triangle is the narrow Bread Street. The building is of six storeys plus a raised basement. As originally designed, the three external entrances on Cannon Street, Queen Victoria Street and Bread Street gave access to a central circular banking hall, planned around a lift core. The entrance to Bread Street* has since been infilled, an alteration which is not of special interest. The circular design was chosen to provide counter positions of equal importance for up to three banks, whose offices would occupy the three points of the triangle. A suite of conference rooms was located at the centre of the building. The ground floor layout
and finishes* has now been entirely altered with the loss of the circular banking hall, and is not of special interest. The basement* contained plant, mainframe computers and a strong room (not of special interest).

EXTERIOR: the external elevations comprise storey-height GRC cladding units on a 1.5m module, off-white in colour and separated by a band of polished black granite. The upper storeys have tapering windows with rounded corners, set between curved fins which lean outwards at an angle of five degrees. On the uppermost storey the units are turned 180°. The raised ground floor is divided by larger pre-cast units into 4.5m bays, three times the upper floor module. Here the glazing is faceted and terminates in a flattened four-centred arch. Below the glazing is a spandrel panel of black granite. Main entrances to Cannon Street and Queen Victoria Street are highlighted by flanking bays which extend the wide ground-floor bays to the floors above. The cantilevered entrance canopies* have been replaced in glass, and these replacements are not of special interest.

At the narrow Bread Street end the need to obtain adequate daylight and to preserve neighbouring properties’ ‘right to light’ led to a section where each storey is set back from the one below. Full-height, faceted window strips are set between flat mullions. Vertical stair towers separate the two designs. The windows have bronze-tinted, double-glazed units in PVC-covered steel frames.

INTERIOR: the interiors have been much altered. The central banking hall was originally finished in travertine, with counters of bullet-proof glass, marble, stainless steel and suede. The central banking hall has since been replaced by a reception area* which is not of special interest. The office floors above were intended for periodic replacement and were originally finished with standard suspended ceilings and floor finishes. The present office floors* are entirely early 21st replacements and are not of special interest. The internal face of the external envelope is clad in GRC panels of similar appearance to those of the exterior. Although the stairs* and lifts* remains, these features have been entirely refurbished and are not of special interest, nor is the plant* and equipment* contained in the basement and mounted on the roof.

SUBSIDARY FEATURES: The perimeter railings to Cannon Street and Queen Victoria Street incorporate arched shapes of similar appearance to the cladding panels.

* Pursuant to s.1 (5A) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (‘the Act’) it is declared that the ground floor layout and finishes including reception area; upper office floors; stairs; lifts; and basement including plant and strong rooms are not of special interest. Also not of special interest are the infilling of the former Bread Street entrance and the replacement glass canopies to the Cannon Street and Queen Victoria Street entrances.

Selected Sources

Books and journals
‘Banking in Style’ in Interior Design, (), pp.402-03
‘Credit Lyonnais; Inside Story’ in Interior Design, (), pp. 26-30
‘GRC Credit Lyonnais’ in Glass Age, , Vol. 19, no. 3, (), pp.20-23

Other
Building Design, no. 296, 30 April 1976, p. 1
Chartered quantity surveyor, vol. 1, no. 2, February 1979, pp. 35-38
Concrete, vol. 13, no. 1, January 1979, p. 15
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List entry Summary

This building is listed under the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 as amended for its special architectural or historic interest.

Name: 1 Finsbury Avenue

List entry Number: 1422594

Location

U B S Warburg, 1 Finsbury Avenue, London, EC2M 2PP

The listed building is shown coloured blue on the attached map. Pursuant to s.1 (5A) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 ('the Act'), structures attached to or within the curtilage of the listed building (save those coloured blue on the map) are not to be treated as part of the listed building for the purposes of the Act.

The building may lie within the boundary of more than one authority.

County
Greater London Authority

District
City and County of the City of London

District Type
London Borough

Parish
Non Civil Parish

Grade: II

Date first listed: 26-Jan-2015

Date of most recent amendment: Not applicable to this List entry.

Asset Groupings

This list entry does not comprise part of an Asset Grouping. Asset Groupings are not part of the official record but are added later for information.

List entry Description

Summary of Building

Speculative offices, 1982-4 by Arup Associates, Group 2 (Peter Foggo) for Rosehaugh Greycoat Estates Ltd.

Reasons for Designation

1 Finsbury Avenue, speculative offices, 1982-4 by Arup Associates, Group 2 (Peter Foggo) for Rosehaugh Greycoat Estates Ltd, is listed at Grade II for the following principal reasons:

* Planning interest: it was the first phase of Finsbury Avenue Square and the precursor to Broadgate, marking
the rapid growth of speculative office development in the City in the 1980s; * Architect: highly regarded, Arup Associates set new standards for progressive office buildings in their meticulous planning and attention to detail, as epitomised by this building; * Plan and form: an external stepped profile with landscaped terraces and a bronze coloured envelope behind brises soleil, tempering the impact of a large building; * Structural interest: a steel frame clad in bronze anodised curtain walling, the cladding designed by specialists Josef Gartner, all enabling its rapid construction; * Adaptability: rigorously designed ‘shell and core’ building, proven to be fully flexible internally; * Efficiency: an energy-efficient integrated heating system within the cladding; the atrium plan provided environmentally efficient, naturally-lit office space; * Extent of special interest: resides particularly in the external envelope, where the form, structure and aesthetic are unaltered.

History

1 Finsbury Avenue was designed and built as the first phase of the Finsbury Avenue development of speculative offices, by Rosehaugh Greycoat Estates Ltd for (Sir) Stuart Lipton. The masterplan envisaged three large office blocks forming the adjacent sides of a new square - Finsbury Avenue Square - built on land adjacent to Broad Street Station that had become available for development.

Arup Associates (Group 2, team leader Peter Foggo) were appointed in late 1981. The design for 1 Finsbury Avenue was approved in March 1982; construction started at the end of 1982 and was completed in September 1984. At the same time, Group 2 refined the masterplan for the larger site, which provisionally included later phases of offices, developed as 3 and 2 Finsbury Avenue, and designed and constructed in 1986-7 and 1987-8, as land was acquired. The other sides of the square were soon enclosed by the first phases of the Broadgate development, developed by Lipton and the financier Godfrey Bradman, with Foggo’s team responsible for phases 1-4 (1985-7).

Designed as London geared itself for the deregulation of the financial markets (sometimes referred to as the ‘Big Bang’) in 1986, 1 Finsbury Avenue was at the forefront of speculative urban commercial architecture in the economic boom of the mid- and late 1980s. Whereas near contemporary offices such as Richard Rogers’ Lloyds building were demonstrably ‘one-off’ commissions, in design terms 1 Finsbury Avenue drew on Arup Associates’ earlier experience, such as speculative City offices at Bush Lane House (1977) and Foggo’s near-contemporary Gateway 2, Basingstoke (1981-2), while it would inform subsequent City development, notably Broadgate.

The client’s brief for 1 Finsbury Avenue demanded a building which was efficiently planned, functional, cost-effective and of a high quality, to attract potential tenants to a ‘fringe’ site in what was in the early 1980s an uncertain letting market. At the time it was in the Borough of Hackney, only in 1994 being incorporated into the City by which time its commercial success was vindicated. There were in addition a pub, restaurant and a sports club, all entered from the surrounding streets.

As a speculative office development, Arup Associates were commissioned to design the ‘shell and core’ of the building. Foggo, citing the architect Frank Duffy’s concept of ‘shell, services, scenery and sets’, noted that ‘the design must recognise the difference between those parts of the building with a long stable life span and those where constant change, wide variation in aesthetic character and short life are principal characteristics’ (Designers’ Journal, 1985, 29).

Built during a period that saw the globalisation of many aspects of the City, from imported servicing units to office culture, Duffy described 1 Finsbury Avenue as a marriage of American ideas on office planning and construction with British design skill. Drawing on these assimilated ideas, that Lipton had observed at first hand in North America to work particularly well in an economic downturn, and on best practice that Arup Associates had established on previous projects, ensured the building’s rapid construction. The steel frame was erected in 13 weeks and the building completed, ready for occupation, within 21 months. It made use of the management contract strategy that was pioneered in the UK by Arup Associates Group 2 at the Horizon Tobacco Factory, Nottingham (1968-72), whereby external construction management teams were engaged at the design stage, of fast-track construction, where construction stages and activities overlap rather than being executed in sequence, and a high degree of off-site prefabrication.

Key to the design and its rapid construction was the use of a steel frame structure and the cladding, the latter manufactured by specialists Josef Gartner. Developed by Gartner in Germany, and first used in Britain in 1980 by York Rosenberg Mardell in the Hambro Life headquarters in Swindon, it incorporated a ‘double duty’ integrated cladding and heating system.

http://list.historicengland.org.uk/resultsingle.aspx?uid=1422594
The atrium plan, that Foggo had used effectively at Gateway Two, Basingstoke, Hampshire developed ideas on office circulation that were explored by Arup Associates across a range of projects. Designed to be energy-efficient, the atrium and extensive glazed curtain walling provided naturally-lit office floors; sun screens externally and internally controlled solar gain, the ratio of mass to external surfaces limiting heat loss. The building was air-conditioned and the integrated heating system obviated the need for intrusive radiators. The building included one of the first Business Management Systems (BMS) - a computer based system to enhance efficiency and environmental control. Flexible servicing of office spaces was provided in raised floors for electrical and telecommunication cabling runs, and a suspended ceiling system that allowed lighting and air-conditioning to be moved and renewed.

The atrium was built as a full-height interior space, around which, corresponding with the external modelling, floors projected on different planes, the space expanding in the central floors and narrowing at upper level. Each floor was treated separately, some with galleries and balconies set behind gridded balustrades, through which planting could spill, others shaded by vertical gridded screens attached to the vertical structure or, at upper level, diagonally-set sun screens. The atrium culminated in an octagonal, structural steel-framed glazed roof. Internal steel fixtures and fittings were originally white, in contrast to the bronzed exterior.

Designed on the shell and core principle to be totally flexible between the outer skin and atrium, and rigorously detailed, the building proved easily adaptable to new fit-outs in 1986 and notably in 1996-7 when Arup Associates were employed to adapt the atrium to create a full-width trading floor above the third level.

1 Finsbury Avenue was widely acclaimed. Awards included the Financial Times Architecture at Work Award 1985, the Structural Steel Design Award 1985 and in 1987 the RIBA London Regional Award.

Peter Foggo (1930-1993), was regarded 'as one of the most influential architects of his generation' (Building Design 12 Aug 1994, 10). Influenced by Louis Kahn in America, his work was noted for its careful and precise integration of building services with office and circulation space. Born in Liverpool, he studied architecture at Liverpool University. After graduation he worked for Architects’ Co-Partnership, and in his spare time designed a number of small private houses in collaboration with his fellow-graduate David Thomas, including Sorrell House near Chichester, West Sussex (1960, Grade II*). He joined the practice of Ove Arup and Partners in 1959, from which Arup Associates was established in 1963, and was appointed senior partner in charge of Group 2 in 1969. Group 2 was responsible for an important sequence of speculative and commissioned offices for corporate clients including Gateway House (1974-6), Gateway Two (1981-2), both in Basingstoke, but 1 Finsbury Avenue was Foggo’s first major urban building. After Finsbury Avenue and Broadgate, Foggo in 1989 established his own practice, Foggo Associates. He died prematurely in 1993.

Details

Speculative offices, 1982-4 by Arup Associates, Group 2 (Peter Foggo) for Rosehaugh Greycoat Estates Ltd; management contractor, Laing Management Contracting Ltd; external cladding by Josef Gartner (UK) Ltd. Eight floors of commercial offices, originally set round an atrium, now reordered as a lower enclosed hall and upper light well. Basement carpark to the south, ground floor commercial outlets, including a pub, to the north.

STRUCTURE, MATERIALS Rolled steel frame with bolted connections, columns set on a 6 x 6 m grid, increased to 6.75m on the central section, diagonal bracing and metal decking as the permanent formwork for light concrete floors. Dark bronze-anodised aluminium curtain walling designed and manufactured by Josef Gartner; an integrated cladding system that incorporates perimeter heating by the circulation of hot water through hollow window frames; stair towers clad in aluminium sheeting. Bronzed aluminium brises soleil and steel cross bracing. Polished pink/brown granite plinths, ground floor fascias, door and window surrounds. The structure, detail and services are very precisely engineered and integrated within the ‘tartan grid’ developed by Arup Associates.

PLAN The building has a symmetrically arranged 57m x 84 m footprint, forming the east side of Wilson Street and the west side of Finsbury Avenue Square. It comprises eight floors of commercial offices, with a basement carpark to the south, originally also with sport facilities in the basement and a ground floor pub to the north. As built, offices were set round a central atrium with service cores north and south of it internally. Stairs, expressed externally as curved aluminium clad towers, rise towards the outer ends of the long elevations. Entrances from Wilson Street and Finsbury Avenue Square now open onto two-storey lobbies leading to a three-storey central hall c18m x 18m, formerly a full height atrium that was intended as a public
thoroughfare, before greater security was required.

EXTERIOR 1 Finsbury Avenue is of eight storeys, with landscaped terraces stepped down the long sides at the fifth and sixth floor levels, intended in part to reduce the impact of the building when seen at street level. The building has centrally placed entrances, one from Wilson Street and one from Finsbury Avenue Square expressed by set backs on the upper floors.

Simple elevations are enlivened with cross-braced projections which support brises soleil which allow greater areas of glass behind and provide maintenance walkways while also contributing to the aesthetic.

Stair towers are clad in narrow, vertical aluminium panels. Ground floor granite cladding is channelled at the angles and chamfered at the base of the towers.

The centre of the north elevation is set back between forward arms, the same aesthetic applied to it. The south elevation, also partly set back, is treated as a single plane of glazed curtain walling.

INTERIOR In 1997 the atrium was enclosed at third floor level to create an uninterrupted trading floor. The facades of the atrium were simplified, aligning the upper floors on one vertical plane defined by the shafts, simplifying the tartan grid; most of the original balustrades and screens have been removed. The glazed roof was refurbished and a horizontal baffle grid ceiling was inserted at level 7 to reduce glare and support a lighting and services gantry. The lower hall rises through three storeys beneath a backlit ceiling, resembling the sky. It is reached by two-storey east and west lobbies. The plan of the reception area has been reordered and simplified, ground floor cladding and floor surfaces have been replaced.

EXCLUSIONS The former atrium was significant to the historic plan, but all structural intervention and changes to the fabric made in 1997 and thereafter are excluded from the listing.* Aside from the essential structure, all internal fixtures and fittings are excluded from the listing.* Basement levels, including the garage are excluded from the listing.* The interiors of ground floor commercial outlets are also excluded from the listing.*

* Pursuant to s.1 (5A) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 ('the Act') it is declared that these aforementioned features are not of special architectural or historic interest.
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Figure 1: Bracken House, Cannon Street, Sir Albert Richardson, 1955-59, following completion (Colin Amery, *Bracken House*, 1992)

Figure 2: Bracken House today following remodelling by Michael Hopkins & Partners in the late 1980s; Grade I listed (photo: author, July 2015)
Figure 3: World War II bomb damage in the City of London
(Corporation of London, *Rebuilding the City of London*, 1951)
Figure 4: London Wall & Aldermanbury following air raids, 1941 (Museum of London)

Figure 5: View from the north-west towards St Pauls, showing the extent of devastation (Holden and Holford, *A Record of Destruction and Survival*, 1951)
Figure 6: Areas proposed for comprehensive redevelopment in the City of London in the 1947 Holden and Holford Plan, blue shading shows areas omitted by the Minister when confirming the plan in 1948 (Holden and Holford, *A Record of Destruction and Survival*, 1951)
Figure 7: The plot ratio system, as defined by the London County Council (Marriott, *Property Boom*, 1967)

Figure 8: Holford’s sketch of his plan for the St Paul’s Precinct, published in 1956 (Cherry and Penny, Holford, 1986)
Figure 9A: The St Paul's Precinct, constructed by Trehearne & Norman Preston & Partners, 1962-1967; now demolished (Crawford, *City of London*, 1976)

Figure 9B: Paternoster Square, part of the St Paul’s Precinct (Murphy, *Continuity and Change*, 1984)

Figure 10: Plan of the London Wall scheme as completed in 1976 (Bradley and Pevsner, *London 1*, 1997)
Figure 11A: London Wall office blocks, from above (Marriott, *Property Boom*, 1967)

Figure 11B: London Wall, from the junction with Moorgate looking west (Pevsner, *London 1*, 1973)
Figure 12: Pedestrian bridge over London Wall, part of the City's 'pedway' system of raised walkways (still from 1970 Corporation of London film, 'The Living City')

Figure 13: Publicity material for the City of London Real Property Company (Richards, 'Rebuilding the City', 1954)
BARRINGTON HOUSE
59-67 Gresham Street, E.C.2

An important part of the City of London which has changed since the war from textile/warehouse to high-class offices is the Western end of Gresham Street from Guildhall to Aldersgate Street. Extensive devastation was caused by enemy action in 1940 and subsequent bold planning has resulted in upwards of six major office developments. Prominent amongst these new buildings is BARRINGTON HOUSE which, with an area of over 200,000 square feet is one of the largest office buildings completed since the war. The site was developed by Site Improvements Ltd, and the property is now owned by the Legal and General Assurance Society Ltd. The tenants of Barrington House include leading public companies, professional firms, financial and trust management companies.

JONES, LANG, WOOTTON & SONS

Figure 14: Barrington House, Sir John Burnett, Tait & Partners, 1954-56, photographed in 1957; now demolished (Jones, Lang, Wootton & Sons, Rebuilding London’s Offices: the Second Phase, 1957)
Prior to the war, Chiswell Street was predominantly a warehouse address, but in the last few years large-scale office developments have completely altered its character. One of the main reasons for this change is that the immediate locality has been unaffected by the prolonged deliberations which have held up the redevelopment of the land to the South, generally referred to as the Barbican area. The largest project at present in hand in Chiswell Street is B.P. HOUSE, which has been designed with internal block widths of approx. 43 feet, considered by many to allow maximum flexibility and economy in Office Planning. The British Petroleum Co. Ltd. have taken a long lease of this entire building which will have a floor area of some 200,000 feet super and will be ready for occupation towards the end of 1958. There is little doubt this area will be one of the principal office centres in London within the next few years.
Figure 16: Atlantic House, Holborn Viaduct, T. P. Bennett & Sons, 1951; now demolished (Bullock, *Building the Post-War World*)

Figure 17: New Change House, Cheapside, Victor Heal, 1953-60; now demolished (Richards 'Rebuilding the City', 1954)
Figure 18: National Provident Institution, Gracechurch Street, Green Lloyd & Son, 1957-59
(photo: author, July 2015)
Figure 19: Clements House, Gresham Street, Trehearne & Norman Preston & Partners, 1954-57; now demolished (photo: Chris Rogers)
Figure 20: Pirelli Tower, Gio Ponti and Pier Luigi Nervi, 1957-60, Milan (Joedicke, *Office Buildings*, 1962)
Figure 22: Seagram Building, Park Avenue, Mies van der Rohe and Philip Johnson, 1956-1958, New York (Joedicke, *Office Buildings*, 1962)
Figure 23: Fountain House, Fenchurch Street, W.H.Rogers with Sir Howard Robertson as consulting architect, 1954-57 (photo: author, July 2015)
Figure 24: Castrol House, Marylebone, Gollins Melvin Ward Partnership, 1958-60 (Joedicke, Office Buildings, 1962)

Figure 25: Bucklersbury House, Queen Victoria Street, Owen, Campbell-Jones & Sons, 1953-58; now demolished (Richards, ‘Rebuilding the City’, 1954)
Figure 26: Drapers' Gardens, Throgmorton Avenue, Richard Seifert & Partners with F. Norman James, 1962-1967; now demolished (Murphy, *Continuity and Change*, 1984)
Figure 27: Commercial Union Tower, Leadenhall Street, Gollins Melvin Ward Partnership, 1963-68, with the P&O headquarters by the same architects visible on the left, photograph 1970 (Fraser, Architecture and the ‘Special Relationship’, 2007)
Figure 28: Heron House, E.S. Boyer and Partners, 1967-1969 (left) and National Westminster House, Gordon Charratou of J. Seymour Harris & Partners, 1965-68 (right), High Holborn (photo: author, July 2015)

Figure 29: Former Scandinavian Bank Leadenhall Street, Yorke, Rosenberg & Mardall, 1970-73 (photo: author, July 2015)
Figure 30: Aldgate House, Aldgate High Street, Fitzroy Robinson & Partners, 1971-1976; reclad c.1996 (photo: author, July 2015)

Figure 31: Former Credit Lyonnais, Cannon Street, Whinney, Son and Austen Hall, 1973-1977; Grade II listed (photo: author, April 2015)
Figure 32: Brown Shipley & Co., Moorgate, Fitzroy Robinson & Partners, 1973-1975; Grade II listed (photo: author, July 2015)
Figure 33: Lloyds of London, Richard Rogers Partnership, 1978-86, viewed from the south (Davies, *High Tech Architecture*, 1988)
Figure 33: Lloyds of London, Richard Rogers Partnership, 1978-86, internal atrium (Davies, *High Tech Architecture*, 1988)

Figure 35: 68 Cornhill, Rolfe Judd Group Practice, 1981-1984 (photo: author, July 2015)
Figure 36: 70 Fleet Street, Thomas Saunders & Associates, 1983-96 (photo: author, July 2015)
Figure 37: 1 Finsbury Avenue, Peter Foggo of Arup Associates, 1982-84; Grade II listed (photo: author, July 2015)

Figure 38: The use of brick in conjunction with blue reflective glass at 17-21 Godliman Street, Richard Seifert & Partners, 1973-85 (photo: author, July 2015)
Figure 39: Portland stone cladding at Cheapside House, Cheapside, Theo H. Birks, 1958-59 (photo: author, July 2015)

Figure 40: Portland stone cladding at Phoenix House, King William Street, Gollins, Melvin, Ward & Partners, 1980-83 (photo: author, July 2015)

Figure 41: Polished marble used in the recladding of the former St Bridget's and Kildare Houses, Tudor Street, undertaken 1984-86 by Renton Howard Wood Levin & Partners (photo: author, July 2015)
Figure 42: Flush glass at Chatsworth House, Houndsditch, North & Partners, 1972-80
(photo: author, July 2015)

Figure 43: Portland roach at 11-15 Charterhouse Street, Chapman Taylor, 1976-79
(photo: author, July 2015)

Figure 44: Rough aggregate concrete at Faryners House, Monument Street, Richard Seifert & Partners,
Figure 45: Aluminium cladding at Kleinwort Benson, Fenchurch Street, Denys Lasdun, Redhouse & Softley, 1981-85 (photo: author, July 2015)

Figure 46: Steel exoskeleton at Bush Lane House, Cannon Street, Arup Associates, 1972-76 (photo: author, July 2015)

Figure 47: Curtain walling with bronze panelling at Tokyo Marine (formerly Banque Belgique), Bishopsgate, Gollins Melvin Ward Partnership, 1974-1981 (photo: author, July 2015)
Figure 48: Smoked Glass used in conjunction with red polished marble at Peninsular House, Monument Street, Richard Seifert & Partners, 1979-1983 (photo: author, July 2015)

Figure 49: Concrete Framing from Crendon Concrete (Better Offices, 1962)
REBUILDING IN
THE CITY OF LONDON

These illustrations show a few of the post-war buildings in the City of London, built with Dorman Long structural steelwork.

At top: Bucklersbury House
Architect: O. Campbell & Sons, P.B.I.E.
Consulting Engineers: W. A. Mackrell, M.I.C.E., M.I.Met.E.

Main Contractors: Bucklersbury Limited.

Above right: new building for 'The Financial Times'

Contractors: F. G. Minter Ltd.

At right: new offices for the Bank of England
Architect: Victor Hart & Smith, R.I.B.A.
Consulting Engineers: Harry, Potter & Malcolms, M.M.I.C.E., M.I.Met.E.

Quantities Surveyors: Robert C. Griegels, Ltd.

Contractors: Holland & Hunt and Cookies, Ltd.

DORMAN LONG
DORMAN LONG (Bridge & Engineering) LTD. DORMAN LONG (Steel) LTD.

'FINANCIAL TIMES' BUILDING

BANK OF ENGLAND: NEW BUILDING

Figure 50: Steel Framing from Dormans (Gold, Practice of Modernism, 2007)
Figure 51: Advert for Falks' cold cathode lighting (Better Offices 2, 1964)

Figure 52: Contrast of Victorian and replacement post-war architecture at 44-52 Cannon Street; caption reads 'the demolition of this fine Victorian block, with an Art Deco upper storey, was an appalling example of the destruction of the end of a formerly complete terrace' (Binney, From Splendour to Banality, 1983)
Figure 53: Map showing the extent of post-war redevelopment within the City of London (Binney, *From Splendour to Banality*, 1983)
Figure 54A: Roman House, Wood Street, Owen Cambell Jones & Sons, 1957-58, from the south-east (photo: Chris Rogers, January 2001)

Figure 54B: Roman House following conversion, April 2015, from the south (photo: author, April 2015)
Figure 55: John Poole's sculpted bronze doors at Brown Shipley & Co., Moorgate, Fitzroy Robinson & Partners, 1973-75 (photo: author, July 2015)