



Planning Sub-Committee – 02/06/2021

ADDRESS: Technico House, 4 Christopher Street, 56 & 58 Wilson Street and 1,3 & 5 Earl Street	
WARD: Hoxton East Ward	REPORT AUTHOR: Steve Fraser-Lim
APPLICATION NUMBER: 2021/0116	VALID DATE: 27/01/2021
DRAWING NUMBERS: <u>Existing plans</u> 1577-MAK-PA0200 Rev01; 1577-MAK-PA1203 Rev01; <u>Proposed plans</u> 1577-MAK-PA1900 Rev01; 1577-MAK-PA1996 Rev01; 1577-MAK-PA1997 Rev01; 1577-MAK-PA1998 Rev02; 1577-MAK-PA1999 Rev02; 1577-MAK-PA2000 Rev04; 1577-MAK-PA2001 Rev01; 1577-MAK-PA2002 Rev01; 1577-MAK-PA2004 Rev01; 1577-MAK-PA2005 Rev01; 1577-MAK-PA2006 Rev01; 1577-MAK-PA2007 Rev01; 1577-MAK-PA2008 Rev01; 1577-MAK-PA2010 Rev01; 1577-MAK-PA2011 Rev01; 1577-MAK-PA2013 Rev01; 1577-MAK-PA2014 Rev01; 1577-MAK-PA2015 Rev01; 1577-MAK-PA2016 Rev01; 1577-MAK-PA2019 Rev01; 1577-MAK-PA2020 Rev01; 1577-MAK-PA2021 Rev01; <u>Proposed elevations</u> 1577-MAK-PA2200 Rev02; 1577-MAK-PA2201 Rev02; 1577-MAK-PA2202 Rev02; 1577-MAK-PA2203 Rev02 <u>Proposed sections</u> 1577-MAK-PA2250 Rev02; 1577-MAK-PA2251 Rev02; 1577-MAK-PA6800 Rev01 <u>Supporting documents</u> Townscape, Heritage and Visual Impact Assessment by Tavernor / Cityscape Digital dated December 2020; Design and Access Statement by Make dated December 2020; Acoustics Report by WSP dated December 2020 (ref: 70056507-214); Archaeological Desk-Based Assessment by WSP dated December 2020 (ref: 70056507-212); Air Quality Assessment by WSP dated December 2020 (ref: 001); Arboricultural Report by WSP dated November 2020 (ref: Version 1.1); BREEAM pre-assessment report by WSP dated December 2020 (rev1); Daylight, Sunlight and Overshadowing Assessment by Delva Patman Redler dated December 2020 (ref: version 1.0); Ecological Technical Note and Preliminary Ecological Appraisal by WSP dated November 2020 (ref: Revision2); Energy Statement by WSP dated December 2020	



Planning Sub-Committee – 02/06/2021

<p>(ref: Revision1); Fire Strategy Report by WSP dated December 2020 (ref: P100-RPT-22-FRE REVISION P02); Flood Risk Assessment and Outline Drainage Strategy dated December 2020 (ref: 70056507-DR-REP-001); Framework Travel Plan by WSP dated December 2020 (ref: 70056507 TA2); Marketing Note by Cushman and Wakefield dated November 2020; Outline Construction Logistics Plan by WSP dated December 2020 (ref: 70056507-TA4); Planning Statement and Affordable Workplace Statement by DP9 dated December 2020; Preliminary Risk Assessment by WSP dated November 2020 (ref: 70056507 Rev2); Circular Economy Statement by WSP dated April 2021 (ref: 70056507 Rev01); Health Screening Report by WSP dated December 2020 (ref: 70056507 Rev1); Statement of Community Involvement by Four Communications dated December 2020; Sustainability Statement by WSP dated December 2020 (ref: 70056507_0003 Rev01); Transport Assessment by WSP dated December 2020 (ref: 70056507 TA1 Rev1); Utility Statement by WSP dated December 2020 (ref: 70056507 Rev01); Waste Management Strategy by WSP dated December 2020 (ref: 70056507 002 Rev01); Wind Microclimate Report by WSP dated December 2020 (ref: 70056507 220 Rev1).</p>	
<p>APPLICANT: The London Stock Exchange PLC</p>	<p>AGENT: Mr James Armitage Hobbs, DP9</p>
<p>PROPOSAL: Demolition of the existing buildings, excluding the front façade of 1 Earl Street, and redevelopment of the site with a mixed use development ranging in height from 4-20 stories above ground level, and 3 basement floors, comprising 66,276sqm of office (Class E), flexible retail, café/restaurant space (Class E), ancillary space, back of house areas, cycle storage, plant, landscaping and all associated works.</p>	
<p>POST SUBMISSION REVISIONS: Submission of additional information with regard to transport, sustainability and fire strategy. No re-consultation on this information has been carried out, as revised plans feature amendments which are very small in nature.</p>	
<p>RECOMMENDATION SUMMARY: Grant conditional planning permission, subject to completion of a Legal Agreement and stage II approval from the GLA.</p>	
<p>NOTE TO MEMBERS: This application is referred to members as it is a major application.</p>	

Planning Sub-Committee – 02/06/2021

ANALYSIS INFORMATION

ZONING DESIGNATION:	(Yes)	(No)
CPZ	Yes	-
Conservation Area	-	No (but adjacent to Sun Street Conservation Area, and the Bunhill Fields and Finsbury Square Conservation Area within L.B Islington)
Listed Building (Statutory)	-	No, but in proximity to Flying Horse Public House (grade II), 15-23 Christopher Street (grade II), and Black Sea House (grade II).
Listed Building (Local)	-	No, but in proximity to 5-15 Sun Street, Payne House and Wilson Street Chapel, which are all locally listed.
Priority Office (POA) / Industrial Area (PIA)	Yes (POA)	-
Central Activities Zone	Yes	-

LAND USE DETAILS:	Use Class	Use Description	Floorspace (m2 GIA)
Existing	E(g)(i)	Office	25,622
Proposed	E(g)(i) E(a) / E(b)	Office Flexible retail / cafe / restaurant	65,766 510

PARKING DETAILS:	Parking Spaces (General)	Parking Spaces (Disabled)	Bicycle storage
Existing	0	0	0
Proposed	0	1 (located in Worship Street)	1031 (973 long stay and 58 short stay spaces)

1. SITE CONTEXT

- 1.1 The site comprises a group of buildings with 3 storey basement and 5-6 stories above ground, forming a perimeter block bounded to the north by

Planning Sub-Committee – 02/06/2021

Christopher Street, Wilson Street to the west, Clifton Street to the east and Earl Street to the south. The existing buildings were developed incrementally in the 1960s and the 1980s but include retained building facades facing Wilson Street dating from circa 1930 and at the corner of Wilson Street and Earl Street, which dates from the late 19th century. The existing buildings on site are in use as offices.

- 1.2 The surrounding context is dense and urban in character, with surrounding buildings predominantly in office and commercial uses. The site is within the Central Activities Zone and on the fringe of the City of London. The borough boundary with the City of London to South, and the London Borough of Islington to the west are a short distance from the site. Liverpool Street station is also situated a short distance to the east, and as such the site benefits from excellent public transport accessibility (PTAL6B).
- 1.3 A pair of 29 and 33 storey residential towers upon a podium of mixed hotel, office and commercial uses comprising the Crown Place development is situated on the opposite side of Earl Street to the south. This includes The Flying Horse Public House (grade II listed) and the Wilson Street Chapel (locally listed) facing Wilson Street, and Payne House (locally listed) facing Earl Street.
- 1.4 Further to the south of the Crown Place development a number of office buildings 7-14 stories in height are situated on the south side of Sun Street, within the City of London. There is also a resolution from the City of London planning committee to grant planning permission for an office led 37 storey development at the corner of Sun Street and Wilson Street / Finsbury Avenue (see history section).
- 1.5 Office buildings up to 9 stories in height are situated on the opposite side of Wilson Street to the west, within the London Borough of Islington. A range of building types ranging in height from 3-5 stories (including a terrace of grade II listed buildings) are situated on the opposite side of Christopher Street within office use. A UK Power Networks infrastructure building, and a 20 storey office building are situated on the opposite side of Clifton Street to the east.

2. **CONSERVATION IMPLICATIONS**

- 2.1 The site itself is not within a conservation area, although it is adjacent to the Sun Street Conservation Area to the south, and is in close proximity to South Shoreditch Conservation Area to the north. The southern boundary of the South Shoreditch Conservation Area runs along Worship Street to the north, and the site falls within a designated Area of Townscape Character Interest (ATCI) which is located between the South Shoreditch and Sun Street Conservation Areas. The retained building facades on the site at 56 and 58 Wilson Street are identified as Buildings of Townscape Merit within the ATCI, and as Non Designated Heritage Assets.
- 2.2 Bunhill Fields and Finsbury Square Conservation Area (within the London Borough of Islington) are located on the opposite side of Wilson Street to the west.

Planning Sub-Committee – 02/06/2021

- 2.3 The nearest listed buildings are: the Flying Horse Public House (Grade II) facing Wilson Street to the south, 15-23 Christopher Street (Grade II), and Black Sea House (Grade II) both located on the opposite side of Christopher Street to the north.
- 2.4 The nearest locally listed buildings are: 5-15 Sun Street situated on the north side of Sun Street to the south of the site; Payne House on the south side of Earl Street to the south of the application site; and Wilson Street Chapel, on the east side of Wilson Street to the south of the site.
- 2.5 Part of the site falls within the background of View 8 (Westminster Pier to St Pauls Cathedral), View 16 (South Bank to St Pauls Cathedral / City of London), of the London View Management Framework (LVMF), as set out within Policy HC4 of the London Plan 2021, and the Mayor of London LVMF SPG (2012).

3. **RELEVANT HISTORY**

Application site

- 3.1 EIA Screening and scoping Opinion issued (pursuant to EIA regulations 2017) in December 2019 confirming no EIA required for a development consisting of the demolition of the existing buildings and the redevelopment of the site to provide a building of up to 19 storeys with 71,000 GIA of office floorspace with A class uses at ground floor level (ref: 2019/2612).
- 3.2 Planning permission granted in January 2017 (ref: 2016/4116) for Installation of new front entrance including new staircase and access lift and associated elevational alterations.
- 3.3 Planning permission granted in March 2016 (ref: 2016/0172) for Installation of external mechanical units within the plant enclosure at roof level of Technico House.
- 3.4 Planning permission granted in November 2015 (ref: 2015/3348) for Installation of pressure relief dampers within the courtyard facing elevations at 3rd floor level.
- 3.5 Planning permission granted in January 2013 (ref: 2012/3725) for The temporary placement of 4No. containerised standby generators on the roof for a period of 7 months. The time period for this permission was extended until June 2014 as part of variation of condition application 2013/1793 granted in August 2013.

Nearby sites: 5-29 Sun Street, 8-16 Earl Street, 1-17 Crown Place and 54 Wilson Street

- 3.6 Planning permission granted in December 2015 (ref: 2015/0877) for demolition of 17-29 Sun Street, 1-17 Crown Place and 8-16 Earl Street (excluding front façade) and construction within the eastern part of the site of a 3 level basement plus lower ground, ground level and mezzanine and part 6, part 10 storey podium building above ground level/mezzanine level with two towers of 29 and 33 storeys above ground/mezzanine level. The new building provides flexible office/retail floorspace at lower ground level (Class

Planning Sub-Committee – 02/06/2021

B1/A1/A3/A4), retail at ground and mezzanine level (Class A1, A3 and A4), office (Class B1) at lower ground, ground, mezzanine and levels 1-6 and 247 residential units (Class C3) at levels 7 - 33. Refurbishment of 5-15 Sun Street with roof extension and three storey rear extension (plus basement) to provide a 32 bed hotel (Class c1), Class A3 restaurant, Sui Generis clubhouse and hotel courtyard. Refurbishment and extension of 54 Wilson Street to provide a 7 storey (plus basement) office building (Class B1) with flexible office/retail (Class b1/A1/A3) at ground floor level.

Nearby sites: 13-14 Appold Street

- 3.7 Planning permission granted in for demolition of existing building and erection of a 45 storey mixed use office (Use Class B1) and business hotel (Use Class C1) with ancillary retail / restaurant use (A1/A3) at ground and lower ground and ancillary servicing and plant.

Nearby sites: 2-3 Finsbury Avenue (within the City of London)

- 3.8 A resolution was made by City of London Corporation Planning Committee on 24th February 2021 to grant planning permission, subject to GLA stage II referral (ref: 20/00869/FULEIA) for demolition of the existing buildings and construction of a new building arranged over three basement levels, ground and 37 upper floors to provide an office-led, mixed use development comprising commercial, business and service uses (Class E), flexible commercial, business and service uses /drinking establishment uses (Class E/Sui Generis); and learning and non-residential institutions uses (Class F1); creation of a new pedestrian route through the site at ground floor level; hard and soft landscaping works; outdoor seating associated with ground level uses. The decision notice for the application has not yet been issued, and the application has not been formally determined.

4. CONSULTATIONS

- 4.1 The statutory consultation period for the application started on 27/01/2021 and ended on 04/03/2021. This included neighbour letters sent to 146 neighbouring properties and both site and press notices. 1 response from members of the public have been received raising objections to the proposals which are summarised below:

- Adverse effect of the development on the setting of Listed Buildings within the area, Christopher Street contains a row of grade 2 listed buildings protected since 1975, a development of this size would not be in-keeping with the setting of the local area.
- Restriction of daylight to those on Christopher Street, the existing 4 story building currently allows for natural daylight to filter through the buildings located on Christopher Street, a development of this size would dwarf the existing settings and obscure all natural daylight available to the units.
- There is not a need for further bars, restaurants or pubs within the local area, it will result in increased anti-social behaviour.
- Loss of natural light to neighbouring buildings will harm their rental value.
- The proposed development would make it taller than even the newest developments nearby.
- The disruption to occupants will be extreme, both during the construction and afterwards with increased noise and air pollution.

Planning Sub-Committee – 02/06/2021

- There would be a distinct loss of trade for small, independent and family owned traders in and around the Shoreditch area should this development be approved.
 - Christopher Street will house large commercial vehicles in an already narrow road which will bring stock to the development, this will increase congestion, raise air pollution levels and endanger pedestrians.
- 4.2 It should be noted that additional information has been submitted in response to comments by Hackney officers as well as consultation responses comprising: revised plans featuring internal lightwells and pavement lights to bring natural light to basement levels; redesigned shopfront to retained facade; responses; response letters to GLA, TfL and One Crown Place developers comments.
- 4.3 No re-consultation on this information has been carried out, as revised plans feature amendments which are very small in nature. In addition, other letters and information has been submitted as a response to dialogue between the local planning authority and the applicant, and to respond to consultation comments. This additional information is explanatory in nature to address specific detailed points. As such a consultation was not considered necessary.

Statutory Consultees:

Historic England

- 4.4 Do not wish to offer any comments. We suggest that you seek the views of your specialist conservation advisers, as relevant.

Greater London Archaeology Advisory Service (GLAAS)

- 4.5 If you grant planning consent, paragraph 199 of the NPPF says that applicants should record the significance of any heritage assets that the development harms. Applicants should also improve knowledge of assets and make this public.
- 4.6 The planning application lies in an area of archaeological interest. The site lies on the edge of Moorfields where deep deposits of up to six or seven metres of historic made ground are known to exist and have potential to mask and protect early remains. Roman and prehistoric finds are recorded very close by. Although the southern existing block is likely to have removed archaeological remains when it was built, I note from the submitted archaeological assessment that survival can be expected in areas of single and double basemementing. These would be removed by the proposed sitewide triple/quadruple basement. NPPF Section 16 and the Draft London Plan (2017 Policy HC1) recognise the positive contribution of heritage assets of all kinds and make the conservation of archaeological interest a material planning consideration. NPPF paragraph 189 says applicants should provide an archaeological assessment if their development could affect a heritage asset of archaeological interest I have looked at this proposal and at the Greater London Historic Environment Record. I advise that the development could cause harm to archaeological remains and field evaluation is needed to determine appropriate mitigation. However, although the NPPF envisages evaluation being undertaken prior to determination, in this case consideration of the nature of the development, the archaeological interest and/or practical constraints are such that I consider a two stage archaeological condition could

Planning Sub-Committee – 02/06/2021

provide an acceptable safeguard. This would comprise firstly, evaluation to clarify the nature and extent of surviving remains, followed, if necessary, by a full investigation. I therefore recommend attaching a condition.

- 4.7 NPPF paragraphs 185 and 192 and Draft London Plan Policy HC1 emphasise the positive contributions heritage assets can make to sustainable communities and places. Where appropriate, applicants should therefore also expect to identify enhancement opportunities.

Thames Water

- 4.8 With regard to the combined waste water network infrastructure capacity, we would not have any objection to the above planning application, based on the information provided. The proposed development is located within 15 metres of a strategic sewer. Thames Water requests that a condition is added requiring submission of a piling method statement.
- 4.9 With regard to water supply Thames Water has identified an inability of the existing water network infrastructure to accommodate the needs of this development proposal. As such a condition is recommended requiring any upgrades to water infrastructure or a development as required by Thames Water prior to occupation of the development.

Greater London Authority (GLA)

- 4.10 Principle of development: The application site is located in the City Fringe Opportunity Area which London Plan 2021 Policy SD1 identifies as having the capacity to accommodate 50,500 new jobs and 15,500 homes and is identified as having the potential to become a business hub of major international significance built on the emerging digital-creative cluster that has emerged in this location. It also located in the Central Activity Zone (CAZ) where Policy SD4 of the London Plan promotes the provision of nationally and internationally significant office functions including the intensification and provision of sufficient space to meet demand for a range of types and sizes of occupier and rental values. The site is also located in the Shoreditch Priority Office Area where Hackney Local Plan Policy LP26 aims to deliver a minimum of 118,000 sq.m. of new office floorspace by 2033.
- 4.11 The development proposals are for mixed-use office led development, consisting of 65,766 sq.m of office floorspace with 510 sq.m. of flexible A1 / A3 retail/ page 5 café/restaurant use on the ground floor, which will replace existing office floorspace and related uses (Use Class E) of 25,622 sq.m. The proposal also secures 10% affordable workspace at Hackney Council's required percentage of market rent and provides flexible commercial uses at ground floor level which would serve to activate the ground floor frontage. The application is therefore compliant with London Plan 2021 policies in relation to CAZ, Opportunity Area and offices.
- 4.12 Design and heritage: The proposed development occupies an entire urban block and the adopted massing approach has been dictated by the need to respect the three strategic viewing corridors (Westminster Pier 8A.1 and Gabriel's Wharf 16B.1/2) that cross the site; the varying scale of surrounding building heights; retention of historic building facades; and the need to respond to the detailed daylight and sunlight analysis. This has resulted in a

Planning Sub-Committee – 02/06/2021

stepped massing form increasing in height from 4, 5, 10, 15 to 21 storeys. The highest point addresses the existing cluster of tall buildings on Crown Place to the south, which have building heights of up to 34 storeys, and the lower elements relate to lower scaled buildings to the north-west. Additional set backs of 4-5 storeys have been adopted to address the existing lower scale of the neighbouring and historic buildings including the Grade II listed Georgian terrace on Christopher Street and the locally listed Chapel and Grade II Listed Flying Horse on Wilson Street. This is welcome as it responds positively to issues raised at pre-application.

- 4.13 Although the proposal does not fully comply with the locational criteria of London Plan Policy D9B (as the Council has not established a specific height in a Development Plan document), as set out above the site is in an area with a number of existing and proposed tall buildings, and buildings of the proposed height and above are well established. The design of the proposed building is well considered and responds positively to its context. The proposals have been informed by a local design review page 6 panel process and pre-application reviews. The visual, functional, environmental and cumulative impacts of the building have been assessed and set out in detail by the applicant. Having reviewed the submitted information, and as set out further below, GLA officers are of the view that the building would have an acceptable impact on its surroundings, subject to securing any required mitigation measures to address wind and microclimate. It is therefore GLA officers' opinion that the proposed tall building is acceptable in this location.
- 4.14 Having regard to the views analysis the approach to the stepped massing, scale and appearance of the development, officers concur that there would not be any impact on strategic views or local views. The scheme will overall improve the existing streetscape views and contribute to the consolidation of the emerging City Fringe tall building cluster on the skyline.
- 4.15 The ground floor of the proposed development is a significant improvement to the existing situation as it provides a high degree of active ground floor frontage and emphasis is placed effectively on turning the four corners of the urban block through active uses and design detailing and public realm improvements. Notwithstanding this, the applicant should respond to issues raised in the transport section below regarding the public realm proposals and the building layout encouraging the use of Liverpool Street Station.
- 4.16 The development will improve the setting of historic buildings nearby including the Grade II listed Georgian terrace on Christopher Street and the locally listed Chapel and Grade II Listed Flying Horse on Wilson Street. This is because as stated above a clear influence on development massing has been the historic buildings adjacent to the development with building height stepping down to the street. This together with the adopted façade and material treatments influenced by the surrounding historic building fabric mean the streetscape setting of the listed buildings will be enhanced compared to the existing situation. As such the proposals are considered to comply with London Plan Policy HC1.

Planning Sub-Committee – 02/06/2021

- 4.17 Climate change: The applicant has submitted an energy assessment in accordance with London Plan 2021 Policy SI2. Although the carbon dioxide savings exceed the on-site target set and is generally compliant with London Plan policies, the applicant is required to submit the additional information in relation to: carbon emissions reporting; connection to the Citigen district heating network; the feasibility of incorporating photo voltaic on roof areas; the operation and capacity of the proposed heat pumps; and the applicant should demonstrate a commitment to enable post construction monitoring.
- 4.18 The proposed development presents a well-considered approach to green infrastructure and integrating urban greening across the scheme which is strongly supported. The applicant has calculated the UGF of the proposed development as 0.4, which exceeds the target set by Policy G5 of the London Plan 2021 for commercial development. However, the applicant should provide further clarification on its calculation.
- 4.19 Transport: The development proposed is supported by a transport assessment (TA) following the latest TfL guidance, including Healthy Streets, and an Active Travel Zone (ATZ) assessment. In accordance with Policy T2 (Healthy Streets), the TA has demonstrated how the proposed development will deliver improvements that support the ten Healthy Streets Indicators in TfL guidance. TfL also welcomes the high priority on the public transport services, walking and strategic cycle network. The healthy streets assessment for the route to Liverpool Street Station has identified potential for footway improvements along Christopher Street and Wilson Street to match the quality along Sun Street. Hackney Council should consider securing the identified improvements.
- 4.20 Clarification is required in respect to the trip generation assessment and the total trips forecast will need provided rather than solely the net increase in trips. Public realm improvements are proposed on Clifton Street and Christopher Street. This would be supported and would promote active travel and highway safety in the local area in line with policy D8 public realm and T2 of the London Plan. The public realm would benefit from greater landscaping to facilitate sustainable urban drainage (SuDS).
- 4.21 A total of 973 long stay bicycle spaces are proposed in the form of 802 Josta two tier stackers, 32 Sheffield stands and 108 bicycle lockers. This is line with London Plan 2021 Policy T5. Total Cycle parking provision includes 10% folding bike provision demand for office development and 5% provision for larger and adapted cycles. A total of 58 Short-stay cycle parking are proposed; the location should be confirmed.
- 4.22 The proposed development should fund resurfacing of the carriageway along Wilson Street from its junction with Sun Street up to its junction with Worship Street. This stretch of highway is part of CS1 where cyclists mix with general traffic due to low traffic volumes. The main cycling entrance for the proposed development will connect directly to CS1 at this location. An internal Cycle Route Quality Criteria Check of CS1 by TfL has identified that the road surface quality is currently extremely poor making it unpleasant to cycle over. The carriageway surfacing required to improve CS1 will be on local highway rather

Planning Sub-Committee – 02/06/2021

than the TLRN. Hackney Council is therefore recommended to secure this through section 278.

- 4.23 The development will increase demand for cycle hire. There is limited capacity at any of the nearby docking stations therefore potential increase in demand created by this proposal should be mitigated. Cycle hire capacity would directly benefit employees and visitors of the new development, supporting compliance with London Plan 2021 Policy T4. TfL requests a S106 contribution of £60,000 to fund increased redistribution by TfL of bikes to, from and between docking stations in the local area and across London. This will enable local cycle hire infrastructure and operations to accommodate the increased demand likely to be generated by the proposed development.
- 4.24 The development proposes a ground floor internal servicing yard in Earl Street. This is welcomed and in line with the London Plan 2021 policy T7. Safety on the vehicle access route on Wilson Street that is shared with CS1 is of concern and TfL requires a commitment to out of peak hour delivery to minimise any impact on this route. Vehicles are proposed to enter and exit the servicing yard forward gear; this should be secured by condition.
- 4.25 Whilst the construction routing is accepted in principle, the design, number of vehicles, access and hours of operation should be provided and reviewed in some detail and mitigation proposed based on Vision Zero Standards. A commitment to FORS accredited vehicles of at least silver or gold rating is expected. 63 Any proposals for construction vehicles to cycle routes should be supported by a Road Safety Audit to determine the safety of vehicle movements in line with the Mayor's Vision Zero agenda. A full CLP should also be secured by condition.

City of London Corporation

- 4.26 We note that the development is closest to two stations within the City of London Corporation boundary: Liverpool Street and Moorgate. It is therefore likely that pedestrian traffic would be increased within the City boundary as a result of the development. Therefore, please ensure that the impact of pedestrian flows and any other increased traffic has been considered as part of the determination.
- 4.27 We consider the proposed height of the building to be acceptable within the context of its cluster neighbours, in particular with the consented and proposed developments at 2-3 Finsbury Avenue within the City boundary. We note the location of the site within one Protected Vista and two River Prospects designated in the LVMF SPG. The proposed development does not appear to be visible in these strategic views and therefore no objection is raised on those grounds.

Met Police Design Out Crime Advisor

- 4.28 Recommended that data logged access control to limit access for visitors only to relevant floors. Control points should be provided on each floor / staircase, so that managing agents can monitor use of spaces, in tandem with CCTV There should be controls on movement between each floor, basements and affordable workspace.

Planning Sub-Committee – 02/06/2021

- 4.29 Also raised concerns that the large bike store in the basement is easy to enter by tailgating and will be vulnerable to theft. Also access to the basement area, could compromise the security of the rest of the building. Measures to control access to the basement and subdivision of the cycle stores were recommended to address this issue. Undercroft areas / recessed entrances need to be reviewed to consider potential for accommodating anti social behaviour.

London Borough of Islington

- 4.30 It is appreciated that tall buildings exist to the South and East of Finsbury Square, the proposed development is considered to be visually obtrusive and to the detriment of the setting of the Bunhill Fields and Finsbury Square Conservation Area. Views 6, 7, 8, 9, and 22 show that the proposed building would loom over Finsbury Square, harming the character and appearance of the conservation area.
- 4.31 Should planning permission be granted by the Hackney Council for the proposed development, and should adjacent footways and highways (within Islington) be damaged during demolition and construction, appropriate reinstatement will need to be funded by the developer.
- 4.32 LB Islington would welcome appropriate public realm improvements to the streets within Islington close to the application site. In addition, given that staff of the proposed development are likely to rely heavily on Finsbury Square as the nearest significant area of public open space to the application site, it would be appropriate for contributions towards public realm improvements in this location to be secured via a Section 106 agreement. Public space priority project 22 – described at appendix 2 of the Finsbury Local Plan – sets out the improvements LB Islington intends to implement in Finsbury Square. It may also be appropriate to direct Section 106 funding towards other projects within Islington (but within the vicinity of the application site) that would improve conditions for pedestrians and cyclists, and would benefit residents, staff and visitors of/to both LB Hackney and LB Islington. A co-ordinated approach to public realm and related improvements would be appropriate, and officers can be available for discussions in the near future. Given the likely noise impacts during construction, and the length of the construction period, construction monitoring will be necessary. Given the proximity of the site to noise-sensitive properties in Islington, monitoring fees secured by LB Hackney (if permission is granted) should be shared with LB Islington to cover officer time.

Other Council Departments

Drainage

- 4.33 The site is shown to have a 'high' risk of surface water flooding and an increased potential for elevated groundwater. The following conditions are recommended: full detailed specification of the sustainable drainage system supported by appropriate calculations; no development shall commence, other than works of demolition, until a report (including intrusive investigation/trial pit and monitoring where necessary) demonstrating that the basement development will not increase the potential for groundwater flooding to itself or to the surrounding area;

Waste Management

Planning Sub-Committee – 02/06/2021

- 4.34 No objections to the proposals.

Pollution (land contamination)

- 4.35 The submitted Phase 1 Preliminary Risk Assessment and appendices present sufficient evidence and information on the historical and current use of both the site itself and adjoining land to present a qualitative risk assessment of potential contamination.
- 4.36 Through analysis of the conceptual site model (CSM) the risks posed by in situ land quality to potential receptors is considered to be low to moderate. The principal contamination risk is the 73,000 fuel storage tank and asbestos identified in the Asbestos Management Plan.
- 4.37 Recommendations for further investigation have been presented and the overall approach is supported; it is submitted in the following format in accordance with The EA's Land Contamination: Risk Management Guidance. Stage 3, Tier 2: Remediation and Verification should be completed in a separate report once the above has been successfully submitted and signed off by the Council. Stage 3, Tier 3: Long term monitoring and maintenance may be assessed depending on the findings of the investigation.

Transport

- 4.38 The trip generation data indicates that the application site will have a significant impact on the local transport network and public highway. The projected trip generation may underestimate the impacts on the transport network owing to the comparative data and adjustments that have been required. In light of these considerations, mitigation measures are required to reduce the impact on the transport network and ensure that the vast majority of trips are made by active and sustainable transport modes.
- 4.39 A CPZ exclusion to restrict parking permits being issued is recommended for all users of the proposed site (except those with a blue badge). This should be done in the shape of a condition, secured via a legal agreement. Blue Badge holders are permitted to park in pay and display bays without charge in Hackney. There are pay and display bays on Christopher Street and Earl Street that are in close proximity to the application site. The applicant states that these could potentially be utilised by disabled vehicle drivers.
- 4.40 The TA states that if required, disabled parking bays could be provided on-street along Wilson Street and/or Earl Street adjacent to the proposed development. Owing to the importance of providing policy compliant, accessible disabled car parking spaces, the funded conversion of at least two disabled parking bays is required prior to occupation and forms part of the S278 works (see below).
- 4.41 Overall, the proposed cycle parking provision appears to be of a high standard with a well equipped cycle hub with a range of bike storage options including single tier Sheffield stands. These proposals are combined with the sought contributions outlined below which help to offset the underprovision of cycle parking spaces relative to LP33. A cycle parking plan is required, for the above mentioned number of spaces, which shows details of layout, foundation, stand type and spacing. This is recommended to be secured through a condition to ensure timely provision, which is kept in good working

Planning Sub-Committee – 02/06/2021

condition in perpetuity.

- 4.42 The full Travel Plan will be required to be produced and implemented on occupation of the development. This will be secured through the s106 legal agreement inclusive of financial contribution towards the monitoring of the Travel Plan of £5,000. Given the nature of the proposed development, a final Construction Logistics Plan (CLP) and final Construction Management Plan (CMP) are required and must be conditioned to mitigate negative impact on the surrounding highway network. These should be in line with TfL CLP guidance: <http://content.tfl.gov.uk/construction-logistics-plan-guidance.pdf>. To effectively monitor the final CLP the base fee of £8,750 is recommended to be secured via the s106 legal agreement.
- 4.43 The applicant has submitted an active travel zone (ATZ) assessment as part of their application. A number of elements of the transport assessment require further implementation measures and ongoing assessment: Contribute to a safe road environment where traffic accident casualties are steadily reduced supporting Vision Zero objectives (See LP41, iv); Support Low Emission Neighbourhoods (LENs) including but not limited to the increased use of car sharing, low emission vehicles including taxis, freight consolidation and associated engagement with businesses, residents and other stakeholders (See LP41, viii); Contribute towards improved wayfinding including signposted links such as TfL's Legible London to key infrastructure, transport nodes, green spaces and canal towpaths where appropriate (See LP41, vi; LP42, iv); Support sustainable transport initiatives such as cycle hire facilities, electric vehicle charging infrastructure and pocket parks. On-Street car club development in conjunction with car-free development (See LP42, vii; LP44, D). A contribution is sought towards active and sustainable transport.
- 4.44 Owing to the significant impact of the development on the public highway and surrounding transport network, contributions are sought for highways and urban realm improvements within the site vicinity of the site. A final estimation is being prepared by the Council's Highways Engineers. Indicative costs and the scope of the works are provided below. In these proposals, new public realm will be created by setting the base of the building back on the east side of the building in relation to the main entrance of the building on Clifton Street and the existing pedestrianised and landscaped space known as Crown Place, in between the Site and 30 Crown Place.
- 4.45 The base of the building will also be inset at the northwest corner, with new public realm beside the entrance at the junction of Wilson Street and Christopher Street. Potential for a raised table to be implemented on Wilson Street to protect vulnerable road users in close proximity to Cycle Superhighway 1 is also being considered. Reconstruction of the surrounding footways on Christopher Street, Wilson Street and Earl Street with York Stone and new granite kerb, resurfacing of the carriageway of Christopher Street is also sought.

TfL

- 4.46 Transport contributions sought to resurface Cycle Superhighway 1 adjacent to the site, £60,000 contribution towards cycle hire scheme, and other cycle improvements in the City of London. The borough should also seek local transport / public realm improvements.

Planning Sub-Committee – 02/06/2021

Local Groups

Hackney Society

- 4.47 This is a proposal that has been through the mincer - 6 pre-apps, 2 design reviews and 4 consultations. One suspects that too many people have put too many 'oars' into the design development so that it has now arrived at a point where the design has lost cohesion and a sense of self. Like a game of architectural Twister it stretches and contorts itself across the site trying to be all things to all people - acknowledge the scale of the street here, cut back for the rights of lights there, a bit for the public realm, a bit for the retained facades, not forgetting heritage over there and the viewing corridor from over here. It has ended up the sum total of the pragmatic forces acting upon it but fails to transform those forces into a cogent whole. By trying to be all things to all situations it ends up not satisfying any.
- 4.48 The public realm proposals are generic and sterile, it is likely to overshadow and overbear the older terrace in Christopher Street and it doesn't fully engage with any of the townscape scenarios it appears in. The Design and Access Statement includes a number of interesting and sensitive concept sketches the promise of which has not translated into the finished design. It is our view that the form and in particular the elevations need radical simplification with fewer 'concepts' and fewer materials.
- 4.49 We assume the complexity of the form is the unarguable result of commercial forces but it should have as few set backs, parapets and angles as possible, the ungainly "historical proportions" idea should be binned and a well proportioned facade system - possibly based on the "industrial grid: second layer of the mass" element of the current design - applied throughout - something like Peter Foggo would have done in his prime that references a period when City facades had a tailored restraint often described as the architectural equivalent of a Saville Row suit. That may, through calm consistency, help the fragmented form resemble something intentional rather than the camel it currently is.

Shoreditch Conservation Area Advisory Committee (CAAC)

- 4.50 The SCAAC recognises that the site is located in a part of Shoreditch that is characterised by larger scale development where the City meets the City Fringe, including a number of recent redevelopments of significant scale. However, it is important that redevelopment proposals for such sites recognise their location immediately adjacent to the Conservation Area (and within an area identified in the Conservation Area Appraisal as having Townscape Merit) and provide a design response in both form and appearance that reflects this transitional context. The SCAAC is concerned that insufficient justification has been provided for the substantial demolition of the existing buildings as their general scale, form and building line respects the wider character of the wider area. Furthermore, the retention of the existing buildings, or part thereof, should be carefully considered in the context of environmental sustainability, including the circular economy.
- 4.51 Notwithstanding, the SCAAC has serious reservations about the scale and form of the proposed building and its very significant impact on the Conservation Area due to its overall scale, form and visual impact. The SCAAC does not object in principle to the overall height of the development,

Planning Sub-Committee – 02/06/2021

however, the overall bulk of the proposed development is unrefined and exacerbated by the clunky geometry of the set-backs at upper level. The SCAAC is particularly concerned about the impact of the development in views looking south from within the Conservation Area, and whilst acknowledging that the southerly backdrop to the Conservation Area is characterised by large-scale development, the proposal would result in a wall-like backdrop to the City Fringe which would have a significant detrimental impact.

Hackney Design Review Panel (DRP)

4.52 The pre-application proposals were presented to the DRP for the second time in Oct 2019: *“The Panel welcomed the opportunity to see the scheme again and to further input into its design development. However, concerns remained in relation to the massing, the ground floor, the landscape strategy and the materiality in particular. Although the Panel encouraged the development team to explore the concept further they felt it was necessary to pair it back and not over complicate it. They suggested that as a first step, it was necessary to work out a massing that feels more comfortable in terms of townscape and response to context and then continue to develop the floor plans and materiality. Panel members emphasised the importance to ground the building in a better way, making it more delicate at that level, emphasising the vertical elements and reflecting the finer grain of South Shoreditch and the surrounding area”.*

4.53 Following this feedback, further design development took place and revised proposals presented to a further 3rd DRP review at pre-application stage in October 2020. The Panel commented as follows: *“The Panel is generally supportive of the latest proposal. Changes made to the height and massing since the last review are seen as being positive, although the Panel would like to see further detailed development on all aspects of facades, structure, floor plates and amenity areas. The massing is not finalised on Worship Street and junction of Earl St and Crown Place where the Panel would like to see further townscape and massing assessment. The external architecture including materiality and arrangement are generally positive although in need of refinement, simplification and more controlled use of the special materials. The ground floor and its relationship to the public realm is seen as being critical to the success of the scheme and its public benefit. The Panel would like to see a stronger front to the building on Crown Place, as well as improvements to the ground floor frontage and public realm, particularly on Earl Street, Crown Place, and the corner entrances and colonnades”.*

Consultants on behalf of Crown Place developers (OCP) (CBRE, GIA, City Designer)

4.54 First there is disappointment with lack of engagement with OCP developers. The Application proposes to maximise the development quantum and massing on the south east part of the Site. which is the closest part of the Site to the soon to be completed residential units within OCP. The proposal includes 20 storeys of office development built directly opposite the OCP residential units. We appreciate the top 6 storey are proposed at an angle, but are still located in the south east portion of the Site directly opposite and in close proximity to the OCP residents. Maximising the massing of the Application at the closest point to the OCP residential units has the consequence of amplifying the daylight impacts on the OCP residential units as well as exacerbating impact on outlook and sense of enclosure from the residential units.

Planning Sub-Committee – 02/06/2021

- 4.55 The Application daylight and sunlight report outlines that 174 (56%) of the rooms would meet VSC criteria and 251 (81%) would satisfy NSL guidelines. There is no further discussion on the severity of the impacts beyond stating they would range from low to high magnitude impacts. GIA have reviewed DPR's technical assessments which are appended to their submitted report to fully outline the severity of the daylight losses to OCP as a result of the Application as enclosed in Appendix 1. As VSC is a window based criteria, GIA have summarised the impacts on an individual window basis (rather than on a room by room basis as per the DPR report). GIA have outlined that there are 308 windows within OCP which do not meet BRE Guidelines (36% of the 861 windows assessed). The severity of the impacts are not outlined clearly within the DPR report and GIA have outlined that the impacts on OCP can be categorised as below: 61 windows would experience VSC losses in excess of 80%; 89 windows would experience VSC losses between 60%-79.9%; 83 windows would experience VSC losses between 40%-59.9%; and 75 windows would experience VSC losses of between 21%-39.9%.
- 4.56 This means that 233 windows would be considered to result in major adverse impacts (i.e. impacts above 40%) with 150 windows experiencing VSC losses of 60% and above. It can clearly be seen from the above that there are a significant number of windows with incredibly high daylight impacts, which would severely harm the amenity on OCP residents. GIA have also outlined that out of the 308 rooms assessed within OCP, 46 rooms will fall below BRE Guidelines for both VSC and NSL assessments. There are 24 LKD's which would be considered most sensitive and the GIA summary (Appendix 1) outlines the significance of such impacts and demonstrates many LKD's within OCP will experience hugely significant losses in both VSC and NSL with very low levels of retained VSC (e.g. the three LKD windows in R6/F11 all have VSC losses of 70%+ with retained VCS levels of 5.4% or lower and NSL impacts of 60%). This level of reduction when coupled with the low level of residual light would undoubtedly result in a harmful impact to the residents' daylight amenity. The severity of the impacts needs to be fully understood by officers when making the decision on the application. The severity of impacts experienced by OCP are not detailed within the main DPR report beyond the technical appendices. We understand that there will be flexibility in how the BRE Guidelines are applied in dense urban locations such as this, but the Application does result in numerous very significant impacts to OCP residents that need to be fully understood.
- 4.57 Whilst GIA do not dispute that a mirror massing study may be of some relevance, they do question how it has been run and the reliance placed on the mirror massing assessment to justify the level of impacts. The mirror massing approach is used to provide contextual evidence as to why impacts would be greater where adjoining buildings are located very close to the site boundary, and the concept of mirror massing was formulated for a more typical urban form (not for tall buildings) and where sites are under developed. We would question the application of the mirror massing here, as the OCP development is not built directly on the boundary of the proposal Site and is separated by a normal sized road (as is the norm for building layout in the this area) and, most importantly, the development Site is not undeveloped land with the existing buildings on Site already being a similar scale to several properties to the north, west and east of the Site.

Planning Sub-Committee – 02/06/2021

- 4.58 DPR have used ADF as a third daylight assessment (in conjunction with VSC and NSL). Whilst GIA acknowledge ADF does provide an indication on daylight amenity within a building, as opposed to VSC and NSL which focus on daylight alterations, the primary daylight assessments should be VSC and NSL and the focus on commentary should remain on these two methodologies. ADF should be used as supplementary information but should not be used to justify impacts as is the case here. GIA are also concerned with the comparisons made in terms of ADF compliance used for the 2-3 Finsbury Avenue development accepted by the City of London and we do not consider the heavy reliance to be placed on the decision of a neighbouring Borough to be appropriate to justify such heavy impacts within Hackney.
- 4.59 We have no issue with the principle of a building on the Site acting as a transition in scale between OCP and the lower rise properties to the north. Much of the justification for the tall buildings on the OCP site related to the slender proportions, form, and small floorplates of the two towers, which were successful in breaking up the massing of the Site within key views from around the Site and in particular from Finsbury Square. The approach to massing on OCP also allowed a more sensitive approach to massing on the Wilson Street side of the Site to ensure any harm to the listed pub, and locally listed chapel/terraces along Sun Street were minimised. This is not the case with the Application proposal and the form of the scheme results in the proposing appearing very bulky in key views and causing harm to the surrounding heritage assets. Richard Coleman (Citydesigner) has provided enclosed comments at Appendix 2 of this letter. There is particular concern with the views from Finsbury Square where the proposal is seen as a significant and bulky backdrop to Eric Parry' No. 30 Finsbury Square. The angular form and plain façade of the proposal gives rise to a very large scale and jarring form to what is one of London's most significant examples of contemporary office architecture.

5 POLICIES

5.1 Local Plan 33

- PP5 - Enhanced corridors
- LP1 - Design quality and local character
- LP2 - Development and amenity
- LP3 - Designated heritage assets
- LP4 - Non designated heritage assets
- LP5 - Strategic and local views
- LP6 - Archaeology
- LP9 - Health and wellbeing
- LP11 - Utilities and digital connectivity infrastructure
- LP12 - Meeting housing needs and location of new homes
- LP26 - New employment floorspace
- LP27 - Protecting and promoting office floorspace in the borough
- LP28 - Protecting and promoting industrial land and floorspace in the borough
- LP29 - Affordable workspace and low cost employment workspace
- LP31 - Local jobs, skills and training
- LP41 - Liveable neighbourhoods
- LP42 - Walking and cycling
- LP43 - Transport and development



Planning Sub-Committee – 02/06/2021

- LP44 - Public transport and infrastructure
- LP45 - Car parking and car free development
- LP46 - Protection and enhancement of green infrastructure
- LP47 - Biodiversity and Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation
- LP48 - New open space
- LP51 - Tree management and landscaping
- LP53 - Water and flooding
- LP54 - Overheating
- LP55 - Mitigating climate change
- LP56 - Decentralised energy networks
- LP57 - Waste
- LP58 - Improving the environment - pollution

5.2 London Plan (2021)

- GG1 Building strong and inclusive communities
- GG2 Making best use of land
- GG3 Healthy cities
- GG5 Growing a good economy
- GG6 Increasing efficiency and resilience
- SD1 Opportunity areas
- SD3 Growth locations
- SD4 Central activities zone
- SD5 Offices, other strategic functions and residential in the CAZ
- D1 London's form, character and capacity for growth
- D2 Infrastructure requirements for sustainable densities
- D3 Optimising capacity through the design led approach
- D4 Delivering good design
- D5 Inclusive design
- D8 Public realm
- D9 Tall buildings
- D10 Basement
- D11 Safety, security and resilience to emergency
- D12 Fire safety
- D13 Agent of change
- D14 Noise
- S1 Developing London's infrastructure
- E1 Offices
- E2 Providing suitable business space
- E3 Affordable workspace
- E11 Skills and opportunities for all
- HC1 Heritage conservation and growth
- HC3 Strategic and local views
- HC4 London View Management Framework
- HC5 Supporting London's Culture and creative industries.
- G1 Green infrastructure
- G4 Open space
- G5 Urban greening
- G6 Biodiversity and access to nature
- G7 Trees and woodlands
- SI1 Improving air quality
- SI2 Minimising carbon emissions
- SI3 Energy infrastructure
- SI4 Managing heat risk

Planning Sub-Committee – 02/06/2021

- SI5 Water infrastructure
- SI6 Digital connectivity infrastructure
- SI7 Reducing waste and supporting the circular economy
- SI12 Flood risk management
- SI13 Sustainable drainage
- T1 Strategic approach to transport
- T2 Healthy streets
- T3 Transport capacity, connectivity and safeguarding
- T4 Assessing and mitigating transport impacts
- T5 Cycling
- T6 Car parking
- T6.2 Office car parking
- T6.5 Non residential disabled car parking
- T7 Deliveries, servicing and construction
- T9 Funding transport infrastructure through planning

5.3 SPD/SPG/Other

- Hackney Planning Contributions SPD 2020
- Hackney Sustainable Design and Construction SPD 2016
- Draft Future Shoreditch Area Action Plan April 2019
- Hackney South Shoreditch Supplementary Planning Document 2006
- GLA City Fringe Opportunity Area Planning Framework 2014
- GLA Control of Dust and Emissions During Construction and Demolition 2014
- GLA Sustainable Design and Construction SPD 2014
- GLA Accessible London SPG 2014
- GLA London View Management Framework SPG 2012

5.4 National Planning Policies

- National Planning Policy Framework and Planning Practice Guidance

5.5 Legislation

- Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended)

5.6 Emerging Planning Policy

- 5.6.1 The Hackney Draft Future Shoreditch Area Action Plan (AAP) was subject to public consultation in 2019, and may be subject to examination in public in 2021-2022. As such this AAP is at the draft stage, and only limited weight can be attached to the guidance within the document.

6. COMMENT

6.1 Background

- 6.1.1 The proposals seek to demolish the existing buildings on site, excluding the front façade of 56 Wilson Street, and redevelopment of the site with a mixed use development ranging in height from 4-20 stories above ground level, and 3 basement floors.
- 6.1.2 Basement floors comprise plant and machinery space at level -2 and -3. Cycle parking space, cycle hub, locker and shower rooms are also located at levels -1 and -2. Affordable office workspace is also located at these levels.

Planning Sub-Committee – 02/06/2021

- 6.1.3 The ground floor plan includes main office entrances from Clifton Street on the east elevation of the building, and Wilson Street from the west. Affordable office workspace at ground floor level also has separate dedicated entrances direct from Christopher Street to the north. Retail units are also located at the north east, and south west corners of the building. A retail / cafe unit is proposed at the south east corner of the building. A loading bay is proposed on the south side building, to facilitate servicing, accessed from Earl Street.
- 6.1.4 Upper floors comprise market rate office space with some affordable workspace at first floor level. The building layout steps back at levels 4, 5, 10, 15 to create large landscaped external amenity spaces at each of these levels, for use by occupiers of the building. Plant and machinery rooms are located at level 19 and 20. Building Maintenance Unit (BMU) bio-diverse / green roofs and photovoltaic panels are located at the highest roof level. The application proposals raise the following considerations:

6.2 Land use

Principle of proposed office / retail floorspace and impact of the proposals upon the Shoreditch Priority Office Area

- 6.2.1 The application site is located within the Central Activities Zone (CAZ) and City Fringe Opportunity Area (OAPF) as designated by the London Plan. The site is also within a Priority Office Area (POA) as designated by policy LP27.
- 6.2.2 London Plan Policy E1 supports the development and redevelopment of offices including improvements to the quality, flexibility, and adaptability of office space of different sizes to improve London's competitiveness and address wider objectives of the London Plan. These policies specifically seek to increase office supply within the CAZ to accommodate the projected additional demand for 3.5 million sq.m. of floorspace between 2016 and 2041 as identified within Table 6.1 of Policy E1.
- 6.2.3 Hackney Local Plan policy LP26 sets a target for delivery of 118,000sqm of new office floorspace by 2033 and states that office led development in priority office areas is supported, with employment floorspace maximised. Part B of policy LP26 does state that development should incorporate other priority uses such as conventional affordable housing and have active frontages at ground floor level, where appropriate.
- 6.2.4 The OAPF and Future Shoreditch Draft AAP provides more fine grained information on the part of the CAZ where the site is located and the role the area plays within the wider city economy. The OAPF identifies the site as being within a core growth area, and Old Street / Shoreditch is identified as being a strategic development area within the wider City Fringe Opportunity Area. The Future Shoreditch Draft AAP identifies the site as being within an 'edge of city' neighbourhood which *"marks the threshold between the commercial core of the City Fringe / Tech City area east of the City of London and the core Shoreditch area. Within a short walk of Liverpool Street Station, the area is characterised by large scale, modern office buildings. This type of floor space plays an important role in the city's economy"*. Policy no.1 (a) of the draft Future Shoreditch AAP states that: *"the Edge of the City neighbourhood is suitable for*

Planning Sub-Committee – 02/06/2021

a range of office space including large scale office-led developments. Office space should comprise a minimum of 75% of floorspace in all development within the Shoreditch Priority Office Area”.

- 6.2.5 Both the OAPF and the Future Shoreditch draft AAP also acknowledge the importance of a diverse mix of uses in the area, including housing. This mix of uses is important in maintaining the areas vibrancy, and attractiveness as a location for business, tech and creative industries. Housing also contributes to the vitality of the area, throughout the day and evening. Draft policy FS02 within the draft Shoreditch AAP states that “i) *proposals with 100% B1 use class floorspace will not be permitted, unless the site is allocated as such or it can be demonstrated that it is unviable or unsuitable to introduce other land uses, including housing where appropriate;*
ii) *Ground floor retail, leisure, entertainment or community uses are included where appropriate to support a vibrant mix of uses”.*

- 6.2.6 As such given the above, there is broad policy support for provision of new office floorspace at the site. However Hackney Local Plan policy LP27 includes a detailed set of criteria which must be met to fully accord with the policy:

“New Office Floorspace:

A. *New development involving the provision of new office (B1a) floorspace must comprise well designed, high quality buildings and floorspace that is flexible / adaptable to accommodate a range of unit sizes and types with good natural light, suitable for sub-division and configuration for new uses and activities, including for occupation by small or independent commercial enterprises.*

B. *All applications incorporating new office floorspace should include a marketing strategy which demonstrates the design and layout of the proposed floorspace is of a high quality, is flexible and meets the needs of likely end users.*

Priority Office Areas (POAs):

C. *New development within designated POAs will be permitted where it is employment-led and where B1 use class is the primary use in line with the below thresholds, subject to viability.*

i) *Within the Future Shoreditch AAP (Shoreditch POA and part of the Wenlock POA) - at least 60% of the floorspace across the area as a whole is B1 employment floorspace.*

D. *Retail, hotel, community, leisure, residential development in POAs will only be permitted where all of the following criteria are met:*

i. *The development forms part of an employment-led, mixed-use scheme including conversion schemes meeting the thresholds identified in Ci. and ii. above.*

ii. *Proposals must be appropriate to the characteristics and functioning of the site and will not compromise the on-going operations of businesses in the POA.*

iii. *Proposals must satisfy the requirements of Policies including; other employment policies, Policy LP8 (Social and Community Infrastructure), Policy LP25 (Visitor Accommodation) Policy LP32 (Town Centres), and Policy LP38 (Evening and Night Time Economy).*

Planning Sub-Committee – 02/06/2021

iv. Residential uses are not provided at ground floor level.

- 6.2.7 The proposals have been assessed against the above criteria. In terms of part A of policy LP27, the existing floorspace is dated, of low quality, and supports a very low level of employment density on the site. The proposed office floorspace will comprise purpose built office accommodation, which will be outfitted to a high standard, with efficient and sustainable mechanical and electrical services. The proposed commercial office floorspace has been designed to appeal to the needs of large corporate businesses in the finance / professional services sectors, who seek accommodation in proximity to the city of London financial centre. However the building has been designed flexibly with two main entrances, so that office space can easily be subdivided between / within floors. The stepped back building form also creates a variety of floorplates and as such the building will be suitable to a wide range of future occupiers. The large external terrace areas will also provide an attractive space and outlook for occupying businesses. Affordable workspace areas have also been designed to take into account feedback from affordable workspace providers, and will have their own dedicated shop frontages facing Christopher Street. As such the proposals are considered to meet part B of policy LP27.
- 6.2.8 In terms of part B of policy LP27 a marketing strategy has been submitted with the application which explains how the proposals have been designed to meet the needs of occupiers and to maximise its appeal in the market to potential tenants and investors. The strategy also includes some commentary as to the impact of Covid-19 upon offices. The building will take some years to complete and it is difficult to fully foresee working practices at that point. However the features within the building including external spaces, ventilation and up to date mechanical / electrical engineering will help to support a high quality office environment which is likely to be sought by future occupiers. As such the proposals are considered to meet part B of policy LP27.
- 6.2.9 In terms of part C of policy LP27 the proposal would increase the provision of office floorspace at the site from 25,622 sqm to 65,766 sqm (GIA). This includes 4213sqm GIA of affordable workspace which will be let at no more than 40% of market rents for offices in that area, which is secured within the legal agreement.
- 6.2.10 Overall, the balance of uses within the development would be 99% office floorspace to 1% retail / cafe use. This would be in excess of the target for an employment led development with 60% office floorspace in this POA. The proportion of office floorspace would also be in excess of 75% target for office floorspace in the 'edge of city area within the draft Future Shoreditch AAP, although this document is currently only at a draft stage of development. As such the development would clearly maximise provision of office floorspace within the Shoreditch POA, which would be of significant benefit to the local area, and wider city economy.
- 6.2.11 However office floorspace accounts for nearly 100% of total floorspace, and the proposals would provide only a very limited mix of uses, and a mix of uses are supported by policy such as LP26 and the draft Future Shoreditch AAP. As such the potential for a wider mix of uses as part of the development has also

Planning Sub-Committee – 02/06/2021

been considered.

- 6.2.12 Policy LP12 notes that residential use is the most in demand use in the borough and policy LP26 and LP27 support housing within POAs as part of employment led mixed use developments. residential use is accommodated within One Crown Place to the south. However the immediate surrounding area in general is an 'edge of city' location, in very close proximity to other single use large scale office buildings. Inclusion of residential use would be challenging to provide in this very dense urban context. Provision of any on site affordable housing would also be particularly difficult given the high land value of the site and surroundings. The level of cross subsidy required from the development in order to ensure any affordable housing is genuinely affordable, would be likely to have a significant adverse impact on the ability of the proposals to maximise the provision of employment related development as required by policy LP27. As such, inclusion of residential use within the development is not considered desirable in this case.
- 6.2.13 In addition the proposals do include retail / cafe floorspace within three units at different corners of the building. This will help to ensure that the building will still have active frontages and encourage increased street level activity. Such uses will also support the ancillary needs of office based business uses in the area. As such the overall mix of uses within the development is considered to be appropriate given the sites location and context, in accordance with part B of policy LP26, part D of LP27 and draft Future Shoreditch AAP policy FS02.

Affordable workspace

- 6.2.14 London Plan policy E3 and Hackney LP33 policy LP29 support provision of affordable workspace as part of office and industrial development. Policy LP29 states that for development within the Shoreditch POA *"at least 10% of the new employment floorspace (gross) should be affordable at no more than 40% of the locality's market rent in perpetuity, subject to viability"*.
- 6.2.15 The proposals comprise 4213sqm (GIA) of affordable workspace at ground, 1st floor level, and two basement levels. This would amount to 8% of the total proposed office floorspace NIA and would be let at less than 40% of market rates for offices in this area. As such the proposed affordable workspace provision is lower than the level sought by policy LP29. However in this case the amount of on-site affordable workspace is considered acceptable, due to the large amount of floorspace proposed, which is in excess of nearly all other employment developments. Provision of a greater amount of on-site affordable workspace provision at this site may be difficult to market to providers given the amount available. Discussions are ongoing with the applicants with regard to the potential for workspace to be discounted by a greater level than required by policy to reflect the shortfall. This could also be beneficial for affordable workspace providers as the site is in high value location for office rents. Committee will be updated in due course.

6.3 Design and conservation

- 6.3.1 Policies D1-D4 of The London Plan 2021 require architecture to make a positive contribution to a coherent public realm, streetscape and wider cityscape, incorporating the highest quality materials and design appropriate

Planning Sub-Committee – 02/06/2021

to the surrounding context. LP33 Policy LP1 states that all new development must be of the highest architectural and urban design quality. Development must respond to local character and context having regard to the boroughwide Characterisation Study, and be compatible with the existing townscape and local views.

- 6.3.2 Policy HC1 of The London Plan 2021 requires development proposals affecting heritage assets, and their settings, to conserve their significance, by being sympathetic to the assets' significance and appreciation within their surroundings. LP33 Policies LP3 Designated heritage assets, LP4 Non designated heritage assets, LP5 Strategic and local views and LP6 Archaeology require the Council to conserve designated and non-designated heritage assets (including their settings), protect the LVMF and identified local views and make appropriate arrangements for archaeology.
- 6.3.3 It should be noted here that the design of the proposed building has evolved over time through various pre-application meetings, including three presentations to the Hackney Design Review Panel.

Form, height and massing

- 6.3.4 The proposed building takes up a single urban block defined by Wilson Street, Clifton Street, Earl Street and Christopher Street. The massing is divided into a 6 and 7 storey base with a 10 storey massing set back above which is stated to respond to the geometry and scale of surrounding streets. Above, the massing rises to 15 storeys and is deeply set back at an angle which is stated to respond to the geometry of nearby taller buildings which have themselves been influenced by the St Paul's viewing corridor from Embankment Pier. The tallest element of the proposal rises to 20 storeys from the south east corner of the urban block facing Clifton Street. Part of this tower element is set back at a 45 degree angle from a 7 storey base which is stated to hold the corner of Earl Street and Clifton Street. The tallest elements of the proposal sit in the shadow of the St Paul's Cathedral viewing corridor from Embankment Pier. Material produced by the applicant shows that no part of the proposed building is visible from the viewpoint.
- 6.3.5 The 6 and 10 storey frontage is compatible with the height of newer buildings on Wilson Street and will sit comfortably opposite recently constructed 8-9 storey buildings opposite. The 15 storey element which sits closest to Wilson Street will have a significant impact in long views towards the site from the north and south. From the north, the 15 storey massing will have a significant impact rising behind the roofscape of the eastern side of Wilson Street. However, it will sit in the foreground of a permitted 20 storey building at 2 Finsbury Avenue. The massing reflects the presence of existing and permitted tall buildings in the backdrop of these long views and will not add new development to a view which is not already affected by a taller backdrop.
- 6.3.6 From Pitfield Street and south towards Tabernacle Square the proposal will be a prominent addition to the southern skyline with its glazed 15 and 20 storey elevations appearing in the foreground of The Shard and One Crown Place. In some views the lowest visible areas of sky will be obscured creating a more solid built up view. However, 2 Finsbury Avenue will also obscure the view if

Planning Sub-Committee – 02/06/2021

that scheme is built. Seen from Tabernacle Square, the massing would recede although the 15 storey glazed elevation would still be visible above lower buildings and in an area of sky without towers currently in the backdrop. Again this view will soon be filled by the massing of the 20 storey west tower of 2 Finsbury Avenue.

- 6.3.7 The proposal will add to the layering of tall buildings at the end of the southern view. It could be argued that its stepped massing mediates between the very different scales and defines a limit to the progress of tall buildings northwards. The glazed character of the visible facades will contrast with the masonry buildings in the foreground allowing them to be seen against a 'neutral backdrop'. As landscaping matures there is the potential for the terraced gardens of the development to contribute an interesting green element to these views.
- 6.3.8 Looking north along Wilson Street from south of the proposal site, the 6 and 10 storey frontage will appear compatible with the more recent development on the street. The 15 storey massing will be visible but recessed above the 10th floor and not aligned to Wilson Street, limiting its impact. Views above buildings looking east from the southern part of Wilson Street do include tall buildings. As such it is considered that while the proposed massing will have an impact on views, this change is compatible with the character of the city fringe area of the borough.
- 6.3.9 Along Christopher Street, a 6 storey frontage addresses listed buildings on the north side of the street. The proposed street frontage here is slightly taller but is considered acceptable giving a comfortable street enclosure and good frontage proportions. The proposed 5 floor massing will help to draw attention away from the higher massing which is stepped back by 5m behind it. In views from the east ends of Christopher Street, this 10 storey setback massing is somewhat concealed by the 5 storey frontage. Looking east along the street, the taller proposed street frontages are visible at the junction of Christopher Street and Clifton Street. Views of other tall buildings and permitted tall buildings appear in this view.
- 6.3.10 Looking south along Clifton Street from the Shoreditch Conservation Area, tall buildings are prominent at the end of the street. The recently permitted 39 storey 2 Finsbury Avenue in the City of London will terminate the view along the street blocking views of the sky. The tower element of the proposal site is set back in line with the western building line of Clifford Street in the foreground of other recently completed towers. The view along Clifford Street is defined by views of the City and Hackney's city fringe cluster and as such the proposed tower will add to this emerging scene.
- 6.3.11 The corner of Earl Street and Clifton Street has a 7 storey massing which holds the street corner and aligns with the podium massing of One Crown Place. The massing here will help to create continuity of street frontage and low-level enclosure as well as lessening the visual and microclimatic impact of the 20 storey tower which is set back at 45 degrees above. This upper floor alignment is primarily intended to maintain views from the adjacent One Crown Place tower. Some 15 and 20 storey massing rises directly from the pavement edge on Clifton Street which echoes the scale of the tower on the opposite side of the street. This section of street is the focus of the public

Planning Sub-Committee – 02/06/2021

realm offer and with surrounding towers it will receive sunlight until around Midday.

- 6.3.12 Earl Street, between the proposal site and Crown Place, will feel the impact of cumulative height. However, the tower elements are angled away from the street which will lessen the sense of enclosure. The westernmost section of the development is set back by 3m behind a retained facade on the corner of Wilson and Earl Streets. The setback massing is not visible in long views along Earl Street which gives the retained facade prominence.
- 6.3.13 In views from Finsbury Square, the 15 and 20 storey elements of the proposal are visible. The massing is closely related to neighbouring buildings in terms of geometry and distance from the square. The massing of the proposal creates a step down from the height of Crown Place to the lower buildings further north. As such the proposed massing creates a transition between scales, implying the end of northward encroachment of height into Shoreditch.

Architecture and Materials

- 6.3.14 General: Hackney officers advised that the development, which fills a large urban block, and which has very different and sensitive contexts on all sides, should be conceived as a series of urban elements which relate to their immediate contexts. Early pre-application discussions saw a single, large massing with few variations across the site. However, the impact of such a massive building, particularly on the fine grained townscape to the north, was considered to be too great. In later pre-applications, officers suggested a finer grained massing, which would respond to the various streets and views nearby, creating a massing more akin to a group of buildings making up an urban block.
- 6.3.15 One of the challenges faced by the architects is how to create a coherent design where the massing has been determined by St Paul's view corridors, conservation constraints, and significant variation in surrounding built scale. The proposed architecture aims to make positive features of the constraints which have shaped its appearance. It can be read as a single large massing, clad in brick, which has been sliced through to reveal layers beneath. Where brick is visible the massing confidently defines the street edge. Where the concrete frame is visible the frontage has been stepped back to emphasise the lower elements and draw attention from the height. Where a glazed frontage is visible, view corridors have sliced through the massing. The consistently applied rules which have influenced the massing can be read on all sides and give the building coherence.
- 6.3.16 The proposal is divided into a base, middle and top. It is considered good practice in tall building design to have a base which responds to human scale and streetscape; a middle which is simpler and vertical in emphasis; and a top which responds to the skyline, distant views and which terminates the building with an attractive crown.
- 6.3.17 Base: The 5-7 storey base is the part of the building which people will most frequently interact with and experience up close. The base reflects the scale of adjacent and opposite buildings and defines the street enclosure. Double height, publicly accessible undercrofts which shelter retail uses are positioned

Planning Sub-Committee – 02/06/2021

at the main corners. The base is clad in brick with coloured ceramic used to highlight window reveals, ground floor columns and soffits of publicly accessible undercroft areas. Brick and ceramic are both seen across Shoreditch and have been chosen to create a tactile and contextually responsive character. The extensive use of green ceramic may be overwhelming in some areas and it is recommended that colour is used more sparingly.

- 6.3.18 The top of the base is defined by generous parapets. On Wilson Street a ceramic upper storey and parapet is proposed. This echoes the materially rich and decorative frontages found in Shoreditch.
- 6.3.19 The Christopher Street base is simpler in character and has a plain brick parapet. Every other column is slightly projecting to give the facade a 2-bay rhythm reflecting the historic buildings opposite. On Clifton Street, a 7 storey section of the base is visible at the corner of Earl Street where its height mirrors the podium of One Crown Place. It is topped with a ceramic parapet.
- 6.3.20 The south west corner is defined by a retained historic facade which makes a significant contribution to the historic character of Wilson Street. The massing directly behind and above the retained facade has been setback by 3m to give the facade prominence. In some long views the setback is enough to hide the upper storeys from view.
- 6.3.21 Middle: The middle of the building rises to 10 storeys. Parts of this section are parallel to the surrounding streets and some sections are deeply set back. Pre-cast concrete is the primary facing material on all setback frontages and brick is used on all frontages which are directly on the street edge. Every other floorplate is clad in precast concrete, giving the middle part of the building a double height window expression and more vertical emphasis than the base. Ceramic emphasises window reveals at every level which will help to unify the proposal. The use of green ceramic may be too extensive and would be especially prominent in oblique views. Because of this a materials condition will ask that the colour and extent of ceramic is considered again at a later stage. The middle section is terminated by a simple ceramic parapet.
- 6.3.22 Top: The top of the building is defined by a 15 and 20 storey tower. North-west and south-east facing frontages are angled at 45 degrees from the street. These angled elevations are aligned with the facades of One Crown Place, and are both shaped by the St Paul's view corridor. These elevations are intended to appear as slices through the solid building and will be curtain glazed. The glazed cuts overlook expansive terraces and would offer long views over low-rise townscape. Post-application refinements have been made to the glazed facades to reflect suggestions made at DRP that the glazing should be refined. The floorplate spandrel panels have now been reduced in depth to maximize the size of windows.
- 6.3.23 Materiality: The materiality of the proposal is likely to enhance local street views and add variety and colour to the skyline. However, the extensive use of green ceramic is likely to be overwhelming and it is recommended that it is used more sparingly as a special feature material. We also recommend that the colour itself is very carefully reevaluated given its prominence over a wide area. This work should be undertaken as part of the materials condition.

Planning Sub-Committee – 02/06/2021

Conservation and Heritage Assets

- 6.3.24 The site is not in a Conservation Area. None of the buildings on site are nationally or locally listed. However, the site sits within the Area of Townscape Character Interest (ATCI) outlined in the South Shoreditch and Sun Street Conservation Area Appraisals.
- 6.3.25 The following buildings exist on site: Technico House, Number 4 Christopher Street; The London Stock Exchange building forming Numbers 1, 3 and 5 Earl Street and including older retained facades at 56 and 58 Wilson Street. The retained facades are identified as Buildings of Townscape Merit within the ATCI.
- 6.3.26 Technico House: The building to the north of the site is Technico House and was built in 1962 for A. Gallenkamp and Company Ltd, a company making scientific instruments, with new brown windows and an entrance canopy from 1986 by Richard Seifert and Partners. The north facade of this building is of some interest, being a calm and orderly commercial/industrial building of the period. The ends to Clifton and Wilson Streets are almost windowless and in brown brick and are much weaker in design terms. The subsidiary element to the east of the site, facing Clifton Street, is also weak. This building is not considered to be a heritage asset or worthy of retention.
- 6.3.27 London Stock Exchange Building: This building is a concrete framed office building clad in mid grey steel by Llewelyn-Davies Weeks and dates from 1986. This building is not considered to be a heritage asset or worthy of retention.
- 6.3.28 Retained facades at 56 and 58 Wilson Street: The facade at Number 58 is in red brick and is part of a garage building by F. C. W. Barrett for the City of London Garages Ltd from 1930. The facade retention has been variously described in written sources as “ingenious and complex” and “distinctly incongruous” (Sun Street Conservation Area Appraisal Para 4.16.2). This facade is poorly integrated into the 1986 building, since there is a free standing element with windows facing externally on both sides and a poor relationship with the existing stairs.
- 6.3.29 The facade at Number 56 is in yellow brick and is a much higher quality building element and dates from the late 19th century (before 1894) and in 1926 was, joyfully, at one point Tom Smith’s Christmas Cracker factory. Both facades are designated as Buildings of Townscape Merit and are now considered by the Council to be Non Designated Heritage Assets. Both are considered to be worthy of retention.
- 6.3.30 Impact on the heritage assets on site: The facade at Number 58 is proposed to be demolished. The justification provided is the low significance of the element and the difficulties of integrating it sensibly and meaningfully into the new development, given the floor heights adjacent to the side and behind. There is merit in this justification. NPPF paragraph 197 states that: “*The effect of an application on the significance of a non-designated heritage asset should be taken into account in determining the application. In weighing applications that directly or indirectly affect non-designated heritage assets, a*

Planning Sub-Committee – 02/06/2021

balanced judgement will be required having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset". It is considered that this test is met given the justification provided and the public benefits of the wider proposals.

- 6.3.31 The proposals retain the facade at Number 56 and this is welcomed. This retention is subject to a structural engineering condition to ensure it is able to be achieved. However there are a number of conservation issues with what is proposed. It is agreed that the existing ground floor frontage is neither high quality nor does it relate to the Victorian facade above. Given that the proposed use is a shop, the applicant's approach of providing a practical shopfront in the Victorian style is supported in principle. This is complicated by a need for ventilation louvres. Despite the welcome 9th April 2021 revisions, the currently proposed design for the shopfronts is not fully supported and further detailed design work is required. This is proposed to be managed by condition, which will also allow security and other details to be addressed.
- 6.3.32 Impact on surrounding heritage assets: Officers have undertaken an assessment of the visual impact of the proposals, using information from the THVIA submitted by the applicant, as well as site visits and the Council own VUcity model. The potential views and settings which the proposals impact are listed, and the officers' assessment, are set out below in Table 1. It should be noted that officers disagree with the applicants' assessment in the TVHIA on the grounds of both the methodology and the conclusions.
- 6.3.33 Strategic views: The impacts on views protected in the London Plan LVMF SPD and views of the Tower of London World Heritage Site are assessed within the THVIA at Views 1 to 3. These show that the building would not be visible and there is no impact.
- 6.3.34 Listed buildings: The most serious impact on the setting of a listed building is to 15 to 23 Christopher Street. See Views 17 and 22. These Grade II listed Georgian former houses (in office use) run along the north side of Christopher Street. The proposed building is immediately to the south across the street. The listed buildings are four residential storeys in height. The existing Technico House building is slightly taller at about six storeys, but has a comfortable relationship with the listed buildings in terms of height, and the regularity and plainness of the elevation.
- 6.3.35 The proposed building is between 4 and 20 storeys in height. Consideration has been given to modelling the massing to reduce the street level impacts of this mass, including setbacks on the north and west elevations to create an illusion of a street scale building. The upper levels are smaller in footprint and angled in a series of stages to reduce visual impacts.
- 6.3.36 In View 17, looking along Christopher Street to the west, the results of this can be seen. The main part of the proposed building towards the west end of Christopher Street is setback after the fifth floor, and this reduces the visual impact of the next stage of the building. The element of the building to the north east corner is much taller and, although out of shot in View 17, will appear as a tall mass from ground level, when looking up (and office workers do look up on their way to work).

Planning Sub-Committee – 02/06/2021

- 6.3.37 This is clearer in View 22, looking along the same street to the east. In this view the setbacks have much less effect in mitigating the apparent height. The mass is more apparent, particularly the massing above the fifth floor and in the north east corner. The dramatic change in scale from the 18th to the 21st century is clear.
- 6.3.38 The existing setting of 15 to 23 Christopher Street makes a moderate contribution to the significance of the listed buildings, since their immediate setting is within buildings which, although modern, are of a sympathetic mass and height. The proposed building, despite the efforts made to mitigate the height and mass, has a moderate adverse (View 17) and major adverse (View 22) impact on the setting of the listed buildings and therefore causes harm to their significance. Overall, this harm is considered to be “less than substantial” in terms of the NPPF Para 196 test.
- 6.3.39 Impact upon the Flying Horse Public House: This listed pub sits on the northeast corner of the junction of Sun Street and Wilson Street, within the Sun Street Conservation Area. The layout of the north south axis forming Wilson Street (in the City of London and in Hackney) and Paul Street (in Hackney) is such that the proposed building appears within views of the listed pub. In existing View 10 the pub can be seen as a low scale (four storey) building within a low scale setting. It is backdropped by the modern building at 54 Wilson Street, but this building features a plain rendered wall to this elevation, forming a plain and sky coloured background. Proposed View 10 shows the pub backdropped by three tall stages of the proposed building. Although the second stage of the building is set back from the first, the setback is insufficient to have much beneficial effect in this view and the third stage is clearly visible in any case. There is a similar but lesser impact in View 21, looking down Wilson Street to the south. In this view the principal corner of the pub is less visible and the mass of 54 Wilson Street intervenes more clearly between the pub and the proposed building.
- 6.3.40 The existing setting of The Flying Horse Public House makes a moderate contribution to the significance of the listed building, since its immediate setting is within buildings of a comparable scale. The proposed building, despite the efforts made to mitigate the height and mass, has a moderate adverse (View 21) and major adverse (View 10) impact on the setting of the listed buildings and therefore causes harm to the significance of the listed building. Overall, this harm is considered to be “less than substantial” in terms of the NPPF Para 196 test.
- 6.3.41 Impact upon conservation areas: Views 4 and 5 within Bunhill Fields and Finsbury Square Conservation Area show the proposed building at some distance and in the context of other tall modern development: the impacts are minor to negligible.
- 6.3.42 Views 6 to 9 within Bunhill Fields and Finsbury Square Conservation Area backdropping modern buildings at 30 and 33 Finsbury Square. These views were a significant concern during pre-application discussions and resulted in substantial re-modelling of the massing to reduce impacts. Although the height and mass of the proposed building are a significant change in the view, the backdropping is to modern buildings in a context of an emerging group of

Planning Sub-Committee – 02/06/2021

other tall modern buildings to the south east. The remodelling of the mass creates a coherent effect, with massing rising from north to south in this view. The impact is therefore assessed as major in scale but neutral in nature.

- 6.3.43 View 10 within Bunhill Fields and Finsbury Square Conservation Area and showing part of Sun Street Conservation Area is more problematic: The Flying Horse Public House is a key building in this small Conservation Area at Sun Street and the pub is backdropped by three tall stages of the proposed building. Although the second stage of the building is set back from the first, the setback is insufficient to have much beneficial effect in this view and the third stage is clearly visible in any case. To the extent that the setting of the Sun Street Conservation Area has not already been eroded by tall modern buildings, it contributes to the significance of the area. The proposed building causes a major adverse (View 10) effect to this more intact view of the setting and is therefore harmful to the significance of the Conservation Area. This harm is considered to be “less than substantial” in terms of the NPPF Para 196 test.
- 6.3.44 No view is provided to show the proposed building in relation to 5 to 15 (odd) Sun Street. VuCity modelling shows the proposed building backdropping these locally listed buildings within the Conservation Area. While this is harmful, it is in a cumulative context of backdropping caused by One Crown Place. The impact is moderate adverse.
- 6.3.45 Views 12 and 13 within Sun Street Conservation Area show the proposed building within views of lesser interest, which already feature other tall modern buildings which, together with trees, tend to shield the building from view. The change is moderate in magnitude because the proposed building is taller than existing, but the nature of the impact is neutral.
- 6.3.46 Views 15, 16 and 18 within the South Shoreditch Conservation Area show the proposed building within views of lesser interest, in the context of existing modern buildings of a similar scale, although the height and mass of the proposed building are apparent. The impact is negligible adverse (View 18) and minor adverse (Views 15 and 16). View 19 and 20 within the South Shoreditch Conservation Area show the views down Paul Street. In this view the height and mass of the proposed building are apparent and block views down the street and the impact is moderate in magnitude and adverse in nature. To the extent that the setting of the South Shoreditch Conservation Area has not already been eroded by tall modern buildings, it contributes to the significance of the area. The proposed building causes a moderate adverse (Views 19 and 20) effect to the setting and is therefore harmful to the significance of the Conservation Area. This harm is considered to be “less than substantial” in terms of the NPPF Para 196 test.
- 6.3.47 Impact on the setting of Non Designated Heritage Assets: These include locally listed buildings and the Area of Townscape Character Interest and the Buildings of Townscape Merit within it): View 15 shows the proposed building within the setting of the locally listed building at Clifton House, 75 to 77 Worship Street, within views of lesser interest, in the context of existing modern buildings of a similar scale, although the height and mass of the proposed building are apparent. The impact is negligible adverse. View 14

Planning Sub-Committee – 02/06/2021

shows that the proposed building is not visible within the setting of the locally listed buildings at 10-12, 14 and 15-21 Holywell Row.

- 6.3.48 No view is provided to show the impact on the setting of All Bar One at Numbers 18 to 20 Appold Street. VuCity modelling shows the proposed building backdropping the locally listed building, albeit at some distance. While this is harmful, it is in a cumulative context of backdropping caused by One Crown Place and 30 Crown Place. The effect is minor adverse. No view is provided to show the impact on the setting of 5 to 15 (odd) Sun Street. VuCity modelling shows the proposed building backdropping the locally listed building. While this is harmful, it is in a cumulative context of backdropping caused by One Crown Place. The impact is moderate adverse.
- 6.3.49 View 13 shows the proposed building within the setting of the locally listed building at Payne House, Numbers 8 to 16 (even) Earl Street. The setting of this building, which is a retained facade, includes tall modern buildings in close proximity and is not considered to contribute to the significance of the building. The impact is therefore moderate in magnitude and neutral in nature.
- 6.3.50 View 11 shows the proposed building within the setting of the locally listed building at the Chapel at Number 52A Wilson Street. The existing medium rise buildings are replaced by a tall building. While the historic facade is retained on the corner and relief is provided by two setbacks, the impact of the tall building is substantial. The impact is major adverse.
- 6.3.51 As noted above, the retained facade at 56 Wilson Street is considered to be a Non Designated Heritage Asset since it is a Building of Townscape Merit within an Area of Townscape Character Interest. View 11 shows the proposed building within the setting of 56 Wilson Street. The existing medium rise building above is replaced by a tall building. While the historic facade is retained on the corner and relief is provided by two setbacks, the impact of the tall building is substantial. The impact is major adverse.
- 6.3.52 The settings of Non Designated Heritage Assets can contribute to significance. The relevant consideration is therefore whether the negative impacts which the proposed development causes to significance can be outweighed by the benefits of the scheme, using the test in NPPF Para 197.

Planning Sub-Committee – 02/06/2021

Table 1 Assessment of impacts on protected views and the setting of heritage assets

View Number	View Name	Description of impact	Scale and nature of impact
View 1	LVMF 8A.1 Westminster Pier: Orientation Plaque	The proposed building is not visible.	None.
View 2	LVMF 16B.1 The South Bank: Gabriel's Wharf	The proposed building is not visible.	None.
View 3	LVMF 16B.2 The South Bank: Gabriel's Wharf	The proposed building is not visible.	None.
View 4	Bunhill Fields	The proposed building will be partially visible in the distance through trees.	Minor adverse. Negligible adverse in the cumulative scenario.
View 5	Honourable Artillery Company Grounds	The proposed building backdrops the listed Lowndes House and Triton House.	Minor adverse. Negligible adverse in the cumulative scenario.
View 6	Finsbury Square North West	The proposed building backdrops 30 Finsbury Square, in a context of taller buildings to the south east. The varied massing and the apparent slope of the building to the north reduces impact.	Major neutral.
View 7	Finsbury Square	The proposed building backdrops 30 Finsbury Square, in a context of taller	Major neutral.

Planning Sub-Committee – 02/06/2021

	Central	buildings to the south east. The varied massing and the apparent slope of the building to the north reduces impact.	
View 8	Chiswell Street / Finsbury Pavement	The proposed building backdrops 30 Finsbury Square, in a context of taller buildings to the south east. The varied massing and the apparent slope of the building to the north reduces impact.	Major neutral.
View 9	Finsbury Square, south side	The proposed building backdrops 30 Finsbury Square, in a context of taller buildings to the south east. The varied massing and the apparent slope of the building to the north reduces impact.	Major neutral.
View 10	Wilson Street / junction at Lackington Street	The view up Wilson Street to the north is substantially blocked. The listed The Flying Horse Public House is backdropped.	Major adverse.
View 11	Wilson Street looking North	The existing medium rise buildings are replaced by a tall building. While the historic facade is retained on the corner and relief is provided by two setbacks, the impact of the tall building is substantial.	Major adverse.
View 12	Crown Place looking North	The proposed building is much taller than those existing, however, in this view, the tall building at 1 Crown Place and the street trees help to shield the massing from view to some extent.	Moderate neutral.
View 13	Earl Street	The proposed building is much taller than those existing, however, in this view, the existing building at 30 Crown Place helps to shield the massing from view to some extent.	Moderate neutral.
View 14	Scrutton Street / Holywell Row	The proposed building is not visible.	None.
View 15	Clifton	The proposed building appears in the	Minor adverse.

Planning Sub-Committee – 02/06/2021

	Street junction at Holywell Row	middle distance within a context of taller buildings nearby.	
View 16	Clifton Street looking South	The proposed building appears in the middle distance within a context of taller buildings nearby.	Minor adverse.
View 17	Christopher Street / Clifton Street	The proposed building is much taller than the existing Technico House. The double setbacks help to reduce the apparent bulk of the proposed building in this view, in the context of the listed buildings at 15 to 23 Christopher Street (see discussion above).	Moderate adverse.
View 18	Leonard Circus looking South	The proposed building is slightly visible above other buildings nearby.	Negligible adverse.
View 19	Paul Street / Epworth Street looking South	The proposed building is at some distance but the view down Paul Street to the south is substantially blocked.	Moderate adverse.
View 20	Paul Street looking South	The proposed building is close at hand and the view down Paul Street to the south is substantially blocked.	Moderate adverse.
View 21	Wilson Street looking South	The proposed building is much taller and more massive than the existing. The proposed building blocks views of 1 Crown Place.	Moderate adverse.
View 22	Finsbury Square north/ Christopher Street	This view is a contrast to View 17. The increased height of the proposed building on the north east corner and the increased height overall appear massive and incumbent on the smaller listed buildings at 15 to 23 Christopher Street (see discussion above). The	Major adverse.



Planning Sub-Committee – 02/06/2021

		setbacks do little to mitigate the effect in this view.	
--	--	---	--

Landscaping / Public realm / open space

6.3.53 Policy LP48 states that “All major mixed-use or commercial development must maximise on-site provision of open space and where feasible provide: i. 4 sqm of communal open space per employee; and ii. An Urban Greening Factor score of at least 0.3. C. Where A and B cannot be fully achieved, developments must:

i) Make physical improvements to the public realm to improve access to existing public open spaces, and

ii) Make financial and/or physical contributions towards the provision of new open space, the enhancement of existing public open space or the enhancement of other green infrastructure and biodiversity in the locality.

D. All new open space should meet the following criteria:

i. Be provided on site where possible, and

ii. Be of high quality, and

iii. Be incorporated into the design of the scheme from the outset, and

iv. Maximise biodiversity benefits, and

v. Be publicly accessible and useable where possible”.

6.3.54 The application proposals comprise coverage of the whole site with development, although large terrace areas (1180sqm) are created due the setbacks with the building form. The submitted landscaping strategy shows these terraces to be attractively landscaped, with outdoor seating and meeting space, lawn areas, tree and shrub planting, and potential for food growing. These spaces will therefore be a significant amenity for business occupiers of the development, as well as contributing to urban greening and biodiversity.

6.3.55 However there would still be a shortfall in open space provision given the high number of likely employees at the site. The applicant proposes to make up for the shortfall in open space provision on site as required by policy LP48 by delivering improvements to the public realm surrounding the site. Enhancements to Clifton Street are proposed adjacent to the site, to create a pedestrian / cycle only space with new stone sett paving, street furniture such as seating and tree planting. These improvements to Clifton Street will link up with the improvements to Crown Place, which have been delivered as part of the 1 Crown Place development to the south, to provide an expanded area of high quality public realm amenity area capable of range of uses including street markets. Further improvements to Christopher Street Wilson Street, and reinstatement of footways around the site are under discussion. The precise scope and cost of the public realm improvements are currently still under discussion and the committee will be updated in due course.

6.3.56 These measures are considered to be sufficient to meet the requirements of policy LP48 and help to deliver a significant improvement to the character and quality of the public realm surrounding the site. The financial contribution to deliver the improvements will be secured as part of the S106 legal agreement. Comments from LB Islington with regard to contributions towards Finsbury Square are noted. However officers consider that the public realm contributions adjacent to the site, are more suitable and better located for improvements than Finsbury Square which is a further distance away.

Planning Sub-Committee – 02/06/2021

Design and conservation conclusions

- 6.3.57 The proposal has been significantly refined and developed over the course of the pre-application process. The design of the buildings has responded to the points raised as part of officer and DRP feedback. The development massing has evolved so as to be more responsive to the site constraints and context.
- 6.3.58 Some less than substantial harm has been identified to the setting of nearby listed buildings, conservation areas and non-designated heritage assets. In making this assessment the Council has given special regard to the settings of listed buildings and Conservation Areas in terms of the requirements of Sections 66 and 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.
- 6.3.59 NPPF paragraph 196 states that *“Where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use”*. In this case the proposals for a purpose built, energy efficient office building will maximise the employment potential of the site in this highly accessible, city fringe location, which is of importance to the London economy. Provision of a significant amount of affordable workspace will also be of significant benefit to the local economy. In addition the proposals would deliver significantly improved public realm surrounding the site, which would enhance the appearance of surrounding streets, as well as providing improved amenity of workers and residents. These public benefits of the proposals are considered to outweigh the less than substantial harm which has been identified above.

6.4 Impact on amenity of adjoining occupiers

Daylight and sunlight

- 6.4.1 London Plan policy D3 states that development should have regard to the form, character and function of an area and the scale, mass and orientation of surrounding buildings. A daylight and sunlight assessment prepared has been submitted to assess the impacts of the proposal on the daylight and sunlight received by neighbouring buildings.
- 6.4.2 With regards to daylight, the Vertical Sky Component (VSC) method has been used to measure the amount of skylight reaching windows of neighbouring properties. BRE guidelines state that impacts upon daylight of an existing building will be noticeable if the VSC measured at the centre of an existing main window is less than 27% and less than 0.8 times its former value. % reductions in VSC of 30% or more can be considered to result in significant noticeable impacts, whereas reductions in daylight marginally above the 20% threshold will be more minor.
- 6.4.3 VSC is the most suitable method of assessment to understand the degree of change to windows of neighbouring properties resulting from the development. The daylight sunlight assessment also refers to two further methods of assessment. The No Sky Line (NSL) method involves plotting the NSL in

Planning Sub-Committee – 02/06/2021

affected rooms (when layout of affected properties is known), to understand the proportion of the room, where views of the sky would be visible.

- 6.4.4 A third method of assessment of assessing daylight, is the Average Daylight Factor (ADF) and involves a detailed calculation of the amount of sky visible at each of the windows serving the room, taking into account a range of factors including window and room sizes. ADF is most appropriately used to assess the levels of daylight within proposed buildings, although ADF can on occasion be used to assess impacts on adjacent developments where these are consented but not yet occupied.
- 6.4.5 With regards to sunlight, the Annual Probable Sunlight Hours (APSH) method has been used to assess the amount of sunlight available within a room. BRE guidelines are for rooms to receive 25% of Annual Probable Sunlight Hours (APSH) in total, including 5% in winter.
- 6.4.6 It should be noted that BRE guidance is applied with regard to the site context. Factors such as the layout and orientation of adjacent buildings, and the amount of existing development upon an application site can all have significant impacts upon the daylight sunlight assessment. As such in dense inner urban locations, it may not be possible to achieve BRE target criteria if development is to take place at a similar scale as others in the surrounding area.
- 6.4.7 Daylight / sunlight impacts to the nearest residential properties were tested:
- 1 Crown Place: Flats are located at floor 7 and above in this 29-31 storey development to the south of the site, which is under construction but nearing completion.
 - 52 Wilson Street: Ancillary residential accommodation above the Flying Horse Public House.
 - 69 Wilson Street: Flats at 5th to 7th floors.

1 Crown Place

- 6.4.8 861 windows that have been assessed within One Crown Place (floors 7 and above, within the north face of the northern tower). Of these, 553 (64%) would meet the VSC criteria. That means 308 windows within One Crown Place will be impacted beyond BRE guidance for VSC. Of these 308 windows: 61 windows would experience VSC alterations in excess of 80%, 89 windows would experience VSC alterations of between 60%-79.9%, 83 windows would experience VSC alterations of between 40%-59.9%. 75 windows experience VSC alterations of between 21% - 39.9%. As such it can be seen that 233 windows would experience some very significant and noticeable reductions in daylight, with the remaining 75 windows less significant but still noticeable reductions in daylight.
- 6.4.9 308 rooms were assessed using the VSC, NSL and ADF criteria. Of the 98 Living / Kitchen / Diners (LKD), the impacts on 51 (52%) would satisfy the VSC guidelines and 74 (76%) would satisfy the NSL guidelines. Of the 97 winter gardens, the impacts on 59 (61%) would satisfy the VSC guidelines and 96 (99%) would satisfy the NSL guidelines. Of the 113 bedrooms, the impacts on 64 (57%) would satisfy the VSC guidelines and 81 (99%) would satisfy the

Planning Sub-Committee – 02/06/2021

NSL guidelines. Overall, of the 308 rooms assessed, 174 (56%) would satisfy the VSC guidelines and 251 (81%) would satisfy the NSL guidelines

- 6.4.10 However the existing building is significantly lower in scale than many other more recent developments within the surrounding area, such as 1 Crown Place, 30 Crown Place, 2-3 Finsbury Avenue and 13-14 Appold Street (see history section). As given the sites edge of city location, within the CAZ and within the City Fringe Opportunity Area, there is a reasonable expectation that new development at the site would significantly larger than existing, and likely to be similar in scale to surrounding buildings. In such circumstances the BRE guidelines state that it may be appropriate to assess daylight impacts using a building which is the 'mirror image' of adjacent development, in the existing situation.
- 6.4.11 The applicants have undertaken a theoretical daylight assessment featuring an 'existing' building on the application site which has the same massing as the 1 Crown Place building on the south side of Earl Street. This shows that around 190 rooms of the 308 tested would receive better daylight with the proposed development, than with a mirror image building.
- 6.4.12 The daylight report also includes some information on retained daylight levels in 1 Crown Place when assessed using ADF. Of the 98 LKDs assessed, 88 (90%) would meet the alternative guideline of 1.5% ADF for living rooms with the proposed development in place or would experience no worsening. All of the 97 winter gardens assessed (100%) would meet the living room guideline (1.5% ADF) with the proposed development in place. Of the 113 bedrooms, 109 (96%) would meet the bedroom guideline (1% ADF) with the proposed development in place. The applicants daylight report also includes some comparison with the impacts resulting from the development at 2-3 Finsbury Square, which resulted in a higher number of rooms at 1 Crown Place failing to meet ADF guidelines.
- 6.4.13 Given the above it is clear that the proposals will result in very significant daylight impacts to rooms on some units within the northern facade of 1 Crown Place. However impacts are unavoidable if development is to take place to a similar scale as other buildings in the surrounding area. Therefore impacts should reasonably be expected by future occupiers of flats within 1 Crown Place. Retained levels of daylight appear to be largely appropriate for new build development.
- 6.5.14 The impact of the proposals upon sunlight to 1 Crown Place was not assessed as the affected side of the building faces within 90 degrees of north and the BRE guidelines state that assessment in these circumstances are not required.

52 and 69 Wilson Street

- 6.4.16 2 rooms at 52 Wilson Street and 8 rooms at 69 Wilson Street were assessed using the VSC and NSL methods of assessment. were tested for daylight loss and none were found to experience noticeable reductions in daylight. In terms of sunlight the only neighbouring residential property with windows facing within 90 degrees of due south and taking light from over the Site is 69 Wilson Street. Within that building, which contains flats at fifth to seventh floor levels.

Planning Sub-Committee – 02/06/2021

The assessment shows that there will be negligible impact, and the affected windows would continue to receive good levels of sunlight.

Summary of daylight / sunlight impacts

- 6.4.17 Objections are raised by daylight sunlight consultants for the developers at 1 Crown Place (see consultation section of the report) who raise concerns that: the level of daylight impacts upon this property is very significant; question the appropriateness of using a mirror image in this case to assess daylight impacts, as the application site is not a cleared site; that it is inappropriate to use ADF assessment in this case as 1 Crown Place is ready for occupation; and that the comparison within the applicants daylight assessment to impacts from 2-3 Finsbury Square upon 1 Crown Place is not appropriate given differences in flat design in the southern Crown Place residential tower and an earlier extant planning permission at 2-3 Finsbury Square.
- 6.4.18 The applicants consultants have responded to these objections in a separate letter, reiterating the conclusions of their report. They consider that provision of ADF, and comparison with 2-3 Finsbury Square are relevant in the daylight assessment. Officers have had regard to information submitted by the applicants and objectors and consider that the use of mirror image to compare impacts upon Crown Place is reasonable in this instance. As noted above the site is located in an edge of city location, within the CAZ and within the City Fringe Opportunity Area, there is a reasonable expectation that new development at the site would be significantly larger than existing buildings.
- 6.4.19 The northern tower at 1 Crown Place is sited immediately upon the northern boundary of its site facing Earl Street. This is a common arrangement within the wider Shoreditch area, where buildings usually immediately abutt the back edge of the pavement and streets often have a canyon-like, highly enclosed character. Given this prevailing pattern of development it is considered reasonable for future occupiers at 1 Crown Place to expect that new development at the application site will be of similar scale to adjoining buildings and also not set back from the street. Nonetheless it is noted that the upper parts of the proposed development are angled in a 'v' form facing 1 Crown Place, so as to mitigate daylight impacts, in a similar manner to the angled form of the 1 Crown Place towers.
- 6.4.20 Objection comments with regard to the inclusion of ADF, and comparisons with 2-3 Finsbury Square within the applicants daylight assessment are also noted. Officers consider that this information is relevant background information to be considered as part of the assessment. However the conclusions in this officer report have been primarily based upon the degree of daylight reduction, and retained values measured in terms of VSC and NSL. For the reasons outlined above, officers consider that there will be significant adverse impact to the daylight of neighbouring buildings from the proposals. However these impacts are acceptable given the site context and the pattern of development in the surrounding area.

Overshadowing of outdoor amenity spaces

- 6.4.21 Impacts of the proposed development on overshadowing of surrounding publicly accessible space in Crown Place and Clifton Street, as well as roof

Planning Sub-Committee – 02/06/2021

terrace amenity spaces within the development have also been assessed. BRE guidelines recommend that at least half of a garden or amenity area should receive at least 2 hours of sunlight on March 21st, or the area which receives 2 hours of direct sunlight should not be reduced to less than 0.8 times its former value.

- 6.4.22 The assessment shows that following the development on 21st March none of the Crown Place / Clifton Street public realm will receive more than two hours of sunlight. about one fifth (19%) will receive between one and two hours of sunlight, and the majority (81%) will receive less than an hour of sunlight. However overshadowing impacts are caused primarily by other large constructed or consented developments in proximity to the site (1 Crown Place, 30 Crown Place, 13-14 Appold Street). Sun on the ground increases by 21st June when 58% of the public realm receives more than 2 hours sunlight. In addition the space will largely receive sunlight on the ground between 11:30am and 12:30pm when the space is most likely to be used.
- 6.4.23 1 Crown Place development to the south includes a private communal roof terrace area at 7th floor level. However as the proposed development is located to the north, it will not result in any increased overshadowing to this terrace. The majority of roof terrace areas within the application site would receive in excess of 2 hours sunlight on 21st March.
- 6.4.24 Overall, given the above factors the impacts of the development on sunlight levels to outdoor amenity spaces is therefore considered to be acceptable.

Outlook, Privacy and Overlooking

- 6.4.25 The Council has no specific policy guidance on acceptable separation distances for outlook. This is due to the differing established grain and density of the borough, the potential that such guidance would have to limit the variety of urban space and unnecessarily restrict density.
- 6.4.26 The closest facing residential units are within 1 Crown Place which are situated on the opposite side of Earl Street about 11m to the south. This level of separation is considered acceptable given that this is a similar distance in which most other buildings are separated from each other, across generally narrow streets in Shoreditch. A condition is proposed to ensure that suitable boundary treatments are installed along the boundaries of roof terraces to mitigate overlooking to the south.

Wind

- 6.4.24 A Wind Assessment has been submitted. This report establishes that, wind levels at ground level near building entrances and the adjacent public realm are expected to be suitable for sitting, standing and strolling use even during the windiest season (which are the activities which require the least windy environments according to the Lawson Criteria). Wind levels on nearly all areas of the roof terraces within the development would also not be unduly high. In addition given the location of the development to the north of roof terraces in 1 Crown Place, the proposals are not expected to result in any significant impacts on this space. As such wind impacts resulting from the development are not considered to raise any concern.

6.5 Transport

Site accessibility & Trip generation

- 6.5.1 The Public Transport Accessibility Level (PTAL) rating of the site is 6b. The site has easy access to a number of bus routes, and is in proximity to Liverpool Street Station (national rail / underground), Old Street Station (national rail / tube) and Moorgate station (underground). The main pedestrian access to the existing building is from Christopher Street. Vehicle access is from Wilson Street. Cycle Superhighway 1 (CS1) passes adjacent to the western side of the site.
- 6.5.2 The proposed development could generate 1,183 additional two-way trips during the AM peak and 1,098 trips in the PM peak. However In reality and as a result of changing working behaviour, it is expected that the effective density of occupation of the offices will be a lot closer to 60%. This will result in a net increase of 909 two-way trips in the AM peak and 846 two-way trips in the PM peak. The Travel Plan will seek to monitor this in more detail and encourage transport by sustainable modes, in particular walking and cycling.

Car Parking

- 6.5.3 The proposed development is car free, and a head of term within the S106 agreement will prevent business occupiers of the development from applying for residents' parking permits. This is in accordance with LP33 policy LP45 and policy T6 (Car parking) of the London Plan. An on street disabled car parking space is proposed, and will be secured as part of S278 highways works around the site to facilitate Blue Badge parking. The applicant's have identified space on Wilson Street as being suitable for provision of the disabled parking space, with significant space available to create further spaces if required.

Cycle Parking

- 6.5.4 A secure cycle storage area is proposed within the basement level-1 with capacity for 973 cycles. This comprises 108 folding cycle lockers, 64 Sheffield stand spaces, with the remainder in double stacked spaces (443 lower tier and 358 upper tier). The basement is accessed via a dedicated cycle entrance from CS1 on Wilson Street. Cyclists then travel down to the basement using 2 cycle lifts or a ramp. A cycle hub is also proposed with cycle repair facilities. Showers and lockers are provided at basement level-2. 58 short stay visitor spaces using Sheffield stands are proposed on the street within the public realm surrounding the site.
- 6.5.5 The proposed cycle parking provision exceeds London Plan standards, which require 918 spaces but is less than required by LP33 policy requirements. The amount of cycle parking provision is considered acceptable in this instance, given the site's location adjacent to the City of London, where levels of cycle use are likely to be similar to other large scale office developments in this area. The quality of cycle parking provision is considered to be high with other ancillary features which will support cycle use. adaptations to the design of the

Planning Sub-Committee – 02/06/2021

cycle parking to prevent opportunities for tailgating access, and subdivision of the storage areas into a larger number of smaller spaces, have also been undertaken at the request of secure by design officers to ensure that the space is secure.

- 6.5.6 TfL have also highlighted that cycle hire docking stations in the vicinity of the site are among the most highly used stations in London, which gives rise to some issues lack of cycle supply in other locations, and lack of parking spaces at these sites at certain points in the day. A financial contribution of £60,000 is sought to assist with re-distribution of cycles in the network, so as to allow these stations to operate more effectively. This contribution has been included as a head of term within the legal agreement. As such the proposals are considered to be broadly in accordance with London Plan and LP33 policies with regard to cycling.

Highway Works and public realm

- 6.5.7 In accordance with LP33 policy LP48 all developments are expected to integrate into the public realm and/or provide contributions to urban realm improvements in the vicinity of the site. The applicants are proposing significant improvements to the public realm in Crown Place, Clifton Street, Christopher Street and footways surrounding the site, as noted above. Provision of a disabled car parking space in Wilson Street is also proposed. These measures will be secured as part a contribution in the S106 agreement and S278 agreement. The precise scope and cost of the public realm improvement works, and reinstatement of footways around the site is still under negotiation with applicants and members will be updated in due course.
- 6.5.8 In addition TfL have highlighted the poor condition of CS1 on Wilson Street, and requested a contribution of around £30,000 for resurfacing of this route. This is also included as a head of term within the legal agreement.

Service vehicles including deliveries

- 6.5.9 Servicing and waste collection is proposed to take place within an internal off street loading bay accessed from Earl Street. The loading bay on the ground floor of the development has been designed to accommodate one 10m rigid truck, two 10m rigid waste trucks with compactors, two 7.5t box vans and cargo bikes. Tracking drawings have been provided to show how these vehicles will be able to enter and egress from the loading bay.
- 6.5.10 Compactors are proposed within the servicing area, which will reduce the requirement for waste collection to 4 waste vehicle collections per week. up to 116 deliveries per day could be expected for an office building this size, although the applicants Transport Statement aims to reduce this by consolidating deliveries. Deliveries by cargo bikes are also encouraged. Full details of deliveries and servicing will be secured through the requirement for a Delivery Servicing Plan. Subject to these measures the proposed servicing arrangements are considered acceptable.

Construction Logistics Plan

Planning Sub-Committee – 02/06/2021

6.5.11 Given the nature of the proposed development, within a dense urban location with complex access arrangements, a Construction Management Plan is required and will be conditioned and a fee of £8,750 for CLP/CLOCS monitoring will be secured through a S106 agreement. This will help to mitigate the negative impact on the surrounding highway network.

6.6 Biodiversity / Urban greening / trees / Sustainable Drainage

6.6.1 London Plan Policy G5 states that proposals should include urban greening as a fundamental element of the design process, incorporating measures such as high-quality landscaping (including trees), green roofs, green walls and nature-based sustainable drainage and requires major applications to calculate an Urban Greening Factor.

6.6.2 In line with London Plan policy G5 and LP33 policy LP48, the applicant has provided an Urban Greening Factor calculation demonstrating that the scheme will achieve an Urban Greening Factor of 0.4, which is compliant with the target of 0.3 for commercial developments. Urban greening will be achieved on the site through the landscaped terrace areas with lawn areas, planters with shrub and tree planting. In addition green / biodiverse roofs are proposed at the highest roof level, and green walls at ground floor to building entrances and recessed corners. As such the proposals would incorporate very large amounts of soft landscape and urban greening features, which would go beyond provision often seen as part of other office developments in the surrounding area in accordance with policies G5 and LP48.

6.6.3 Four street trees (2xMaidenhair and 2x Tree of heaven), identified as category C trees (low quality with life expectancy of 10 or more years), are located in proximity of the site on Christopher Street and Crown Place. An arboricultural report has been submitted with the application which confirms that with standard tree protection measures they can be retained during construction. These measures will be secured by condition.

Biodiversity

6.6.4 London Plan policy G6 and LP33 policy LP47 states that development should protect and where possible enhance biodiversity and lead to a net gain. An ecological appraisal has been submitted stating that the site as existing has limited potential as habitat for bat roosts. Black Redstart bird species have been recorded in the surrounding area and are identified as a species of concern, although no evidence of nesting on the existing buildings was found. A condition is recommended requiring no demolition during the bird nesting season to limit potential impacts on bird species such as this.

6.6.5 In addition the proposals incorporate a range of bird and bat box types affixed to both trees and building facades at different roof levels of the building. The high quality proposed landscaping and tree planting will also contribute towards enhancing the biodiversity value of the site. These measures will be secured by condition.

Drainage

Planning Sub-Committee – 02/06/2021

6.6.6 A Sustainable Drainage Strategy has also been submitted which prioritises retention of surface water on site. The strategy proposes to attenuate rainwater at source where possible at both roof and upper terrace levels via the use of a combination of hard and soft landscaped Blue Roofs. At the roof level, the Blue Roof can be accommodated and located around the proposed plant. At the terrace levels, the Blue roof can be accommodated within the proposed 400mm for surface build ups. As such the proposals accord with the Sustainable Drainage Hierarchy which seeks to retain surface water as close to source as possible, and slow run-off rates to green field levels. Conditions are required to ensure that the drainage systems are installed in accordance with the strategy.

6.7 Sustainability

6.7.1 LP33 policy LP55 Mitigating Climate Change, and London Plan policies SI2, SI3 and SI4 require all new developments to mitigate the impact of climate change through design which minimises exposure to the effects, and technologies which maximise sustainability. Policy LP55 states that all non-residential developments must achieve the BREEAM 'Excellent' rating (or an equivalent rating under any other system which may replace it) and where possible achieve the maximum number of water credits, and must be built to be zero-carbon. Where it can be robustly demonstrated that it is not possible to reduce CO2 emissions on-site by the specified levels, carbon off-setting payments will be required and secured via legal agreement.

6.7.2 The proposed energy strategy includes energy efficiency measures, including a range of passive design features and demand reduction measures such as good fabric insulation, high quality glazing; improved air tightness; energy efficient lighting; high performance mechanical ventilation; and high efficiency water cooled chillers (WCC), including high efficiency water source heat pumps (WSHPs) connected to the condenser water loop to provide space heating and hot water from heat recovery with gas fired boilers are also provided for peak heating demand and for rooms which require frost protection overnight.

6.7.3 An on site Combined Heat Power Engine was not considered desirable for the development, as due to the falling levels of carbon dioxide emissions from national grid supplied electricity, a gas fired CHP would have greater emissions. Connection to the nearest District Heat Networks (DHN) such as the Citigen network has been ruled out as the carbon factors of the DHN were likely to be higher than for the proposed on site energy strategy. However should the carbon factors of the nearest DHN reduce, then connection points have been provided to allow for a future connection. Finally, renewable technologies in the form of photovoltaic panels will be provided on the roof, will help to meet electricity demand.

6.7.4 These measures would achieve a 46% reduction in CO2 emissions. The shortfall to zero carbon is currently estimated as £1,259,905 (to be secured by legal agreement). This assumes 35 tonnes of CO2 per annum at a cost of £95 per tonne and for a period of 30 years, to be secured via a S106 agreement. The development is also projected to achieve a BREEAM Excellent rating.

Planning Sub-Committee – 02/06/2021

6.7.5 The London Plan 2021 also introduces a new ‘be seen’ requirement to the energy hierarchy, to secure submission of information with regard to ongoing monitoring of building performance. The applicants have confirmed that these measures will be met.

6.7.6 The Energy Assessment has been subject to scrutiny by GLA officers and is considered to broadly accord with policy requirements, as well as “lean, clean, green, seen” energy hierarchy. However GLA officers requested further information with regard to carbon emissions reporting; connection to the Citigen district heating network; the feasibility of incorporating photovoltaic on roof areas; the operation and capacity of the proposed heat pumps. The applicants have engaged with the GLA to address these issues. Although provision of additional PV panels is not considered desirable, due to the impact this would have on roof terrace areas and urban greening. As such, subject to a number of conditions to secure the measures within the strategy (conditions regarding biodiverse roofs, air permeability, zero carbon materials, PV array, monitoring ‘be seen’), the proposals are considered acceptable in terms of London Plan and LP33 sustainability policies.

6.8 Pollution

Noise

6.8.1 Policy LP58 states that new development will need to demonstrate that it would not result in adverse noise impacts upon nearby sensitive uses. The proposed development is located adjacent to a residential building currently under construction, and the potential for disturbance from visits to and from the development have been considered. The residential units under construction to the south, benefit from modern construction techniques including Mechanical Ventilation Heat Recovery, and fully screened winter gardens. This will mitigate potential noise impacts from plant and machinery to a significant extent. As such occupiers of these units would be unlikely to result in undue disturbance as a result of the proposed development. A condition is proposed to ensure that noise from plant and machinery will not result in adverse noise impacts.

Ground and air pollution

6.8.2 A contaminated land assessment has been submitted and reviewed by pollution officers. They have confirmed that risks to human health from contaminated land can be adequately managed through appropriate planning conditions. In addition an Air Quality Assessment has been submitted. The application proposals are car free and promote transport by sustainable means. NO₂ / particulate emissions from plant and machinery will also be minimal and the development will therefore air quality neutral when complete. Air quality impacts during the construction phase can be mitigated through the Demolition / Construction Method Statement / Logistics Plan.

6.9 Waste

6.9.1 waste storage and compaction facilities are proposed within the loading and servicing bay which will serve the whole development. Waste storage / collection arrangements are considered acceptable although full details will be

Planning Sub-Committee – 02/06/2021

secured through an Operational Management Plan / Delivery Servicing Plan, required by condition.

6.10 Fire Safety

6.10.1 London Plan policy D12 states that *“All major development proposals should be submitted with a Fire Statement, which is an independent fire strategy, produced by a third party, suitably qualified assessor. The statement should detail how the development proposal will function in terms of:*

1) the building’s construction: methods, products and materials used, including manufacturers’ details

2) the means of escape for all building users: suitably designed stair cores, escape for building users who are disabled or require level access, and associated evacuation strategy approach

3) features which reduce the risk to life: fire alarm systems, passive and active fire safety measures and associated management and maintenance plans

4) access for fire service personnel and equipment: how this will be achieved in an evacuation situation, water supplies, provision and positioning of equipment, firefighting lifts, stairs and lobbies, any fire suppression and smoke ventilation systems proposed, and the ongoing maintenance and monitoring of these

5) how provision will be made within the curtilage of the site to enable fire appliances to gain access to the building

6) ensuring that any potential future modifications to the building will take into account and not compromise the base build fire safety/protection measures”.

6.10.2 Fire Strategies for both the development has been submitted which includes evacuation strategies, measures to prevent internal and external fire spread, and access for fire service vehicles and personnel. The submitted Strategy sets out how all these factors can be addressed in the detailed scheme design, so that the proposals can accord with relevant Building Regulations. GLA officers consider that the submitted information is in accordance with policy D12 and final details can be secured by condition.

6.11 Hackney Works local labour scheme

6.11.1 The legal agreement for this application will also include a number of commitments and financial contributions in connection with the Hackney Works local labour scheme. 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act. The applicants will be required to submit an Employment and Skills Plan (ESP) for both the construction and operational phases of the project. In the construction phase this will include targets for hire of apprentices (1 apprentice per £2,000,000 of construction value), and accreditation as a considerate constructor. A financial contribution towards delivery of the ESP in the construction phase is also required, in accordance with the formula with the Planning Contributions SPD (£298,242).

6.11.2 In the operational phase financial contributions towards delivery of the Employment and Skills Plan and incorporation of local labour are also sought for the operational phase, in accordance with the formula within the Planning Contributions SPD (£1,233,382).

6.12 Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL)

Planning Sub-Committee – 02/06/2021

- 6.12.1 The proposal is liable for a Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) as it involves new build floor space of over 100m² as well as one or more new dwellings. The application is liable under both the London Mayoral CIL and Hackney CIL Charging Schedules. The proposal involves office (65,766sqm GIA) and retail (510sqm GIA). The existing buildings on the site have a GIA of 25,622sqm.
- 6.12.2 The London Mayoral CIL Charging Schedule 2 (MCIL2) sets a rate of £185 per sqm of office and £60 per sqm of retail floorspace in the city fringe. Based on the total net chargeable floor space of 40,341sqm the development is liable for a CIL of 7,481,885 under the London Mayoral CIL Charging Schedule.
- 6.12.3 The Hackney CIL Charging Schedule has a rate of £50 per sqm of offices and £65 per sqm of hotel floorspace in the city fringe. Based on a net chargeable area of 40,341sqm the development is liable for a CIL of £2,037,392.60 under the Hackney CIL Charging Schedule.

6.13 Equalities Considerations

- 6.13.1 The Equality Act 2010 requires public authorities, when discharging their functions, to have due regard to the need to (a) eliminate unlawful discrimination, harassment and victimisation and other conduct; (b) advance equality of opportunity between people who share a protected characteristic and those who do not; and (c) Foster good relations between people who share a protected characteristic and persons who do not share it. The protected characteristics under the Act are: age, disability, gender reassignment, marriage and civil partnership, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion or belief, sex and sexual orientation.
- 6.13.2 Having regard to the duty set out in the Equality Act 2010, the development proposals do not raise any equality issues.

7 CONCLUSION

- 7.1 The proposal complies with pertinent policies of the Hackney Local Plan 2033 (LP33), the London Plan (2021). The granting of full planning permission is recommended subject to conditions and the completion of a legal agreement, and referral to the GLA.

8 RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation A

- 8.1 That planning permission be GRANTED, subject to the following conditions:

Time limit / development in accordance with approved plans / genuine pre-commencement

8.1.1 SCB0 – Development in accordance with plans

The development hereby permitted shall only be carried out and completed strictly in accordance with the submitted plans hereby approved and any subsequent approval of details.

REASON: To ensure that the development hereby permitted is carried out in full accordance with the plans hereby approved.

Planning Sub-Committee – 02/06/2021

8.1.2 SCB1 - Commencement within three years

The development hereby permitted must be begun not later than three years after the date of this permission.

REASON: In order to comply with the provisions of Section 91(1) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended.

8.1.3 Contaminated land (pre-development)

Development will not commence until physical site investigation work has been undertaken and fully reported on; with a plan being produced all to the satisfaction of and approved in writing by the Planning Authority. Where physical site investigation work has not been agreed at a pre-application stage further physical investigation work must be agreed with the contaminated land officer before being undertaken. Moreover, development will not commence until all pre-development remedial actions, set out within the remedial action plan, are complete and a corresponding pre-development remediation report has been produced to the satisfaction of and approved in writing by the Planning Authority. Work shall be completed and reported by a competent person/company in line with current best practice guidance, including the Council's contaminated land planning guidance. The Planning Authority and Contaminated Land Officer must receive verbal and written notification at least five days before investigation and remediation works commence. Subject to written approval by the Planning Authority, this condition may be varied, or discharged in agreed phases.

REASON: To ensure that potential contamination risks are identified and suitable remediation is agreed.

8.1.4 Demolition and Construction Management Plan

No development shall take place until a detailed Demolition and Construction Management Plan covering the matters set out below has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall only be implemented in accordance with the details and measures approved as part of the demolition and construction management plan, which shall be maintained throughout the entire construction period.

- A demolition and construction method statement covering all phases of the development to include details of noise control measures and measures to preserve air quality (including a risk assessment of the demolition and construction phase);
- The operation of the site equipment generating noise and other nuisance causing activities, audible at the site boundaries or in nearby residential properties shall only be carried out between the hours of 08:00 – 18:00 Mondays-Fridays, 08:00-13:00 Saturdays and at no time on Sundays or Bank Holidays unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority;
- The best practical means available in accordance with British Standard Code of Practice BS5228-1:2009 shall be employed at all times to minimise the emission of noise and vibration from the site;
- A demolition and construction waste management plan setting out how resources will be managed and waste controlled at all stages during a construction project, including, but not limited to, details of dust mitigation measures during site clearance and construction works (including any works of demolition of existing buildings or breaking out or crushing of concrete), the location of any mobile plant machinery, details of measures to be employed to mitigate against noise and vibration arising out of the construction process demonstrating best practical means

Planning Sub-Committee – 02/06/2021

- Details of the location where deliveries will be undertaken; the size and number of lorries expected to access the site daily; the access arrangements (including turning provision if applicable); construction traffic routing and trip generation and effects on the highway network; details of parking suspensions (if required) and the duration of construction

- A dust management plan to include details of how dust from construction activity will be controlled / mitigated / suppressed following best practice guidance. This should include monitoring of particulate matter at the application site boundary in the direction of sensitive receptors following the SPG Mayor of London Control of Dust and Emissions Guidance. Upon demand a monthly monitoring report should be sent to the council for review.

REASON: In the interests of public safety and amenity and to ensure noise and air pollutants such as nitrogen dioxide and particulate matter are kept to a minimum during the course of building works.

8.1.5 Structural Method Statement

Prior to the commencement of demolition works to the existing buildings, a Structural Method Statement shall be prepared by a suitably qualified and experienced structural engineer and submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The Structural Method Statement shall address how the existing retained facade at 56 Wilson Street stands, how it will be supported during the works of demolition and how it will be supported as part of the completed building. The development shall not be carried out other than in accordance with the details as approved, unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority.

REASON: To ensure that the heritage benefit of the retention of the Non Designated Heritage Asset is achieved.

8.1.6 Archaeology WSI

No demolition or development shall take place until a stage 1 written scheme of investigation (WSI) has been submitted to and approved by the local planning authority in writing. For land that is included within the WSI, no demolition or development shall take place other than in accordance with the agreed WSI, and the programme and methodology of site evaluation and the nomination of a competent person(s) or organisation to undertake the agreed works. If heritage assets of archaeological interest are identified by stage 1 then for those parts of the site which have archaeological interest a stage 2 WSI shall be submitted to and approved by the local planning authority in writing. For land that is included within the stage 2 WSI, no development except for demolition of standing buildings to ground level and associated works up to the internal face of basement slab and walls (but excluding the basement slab or walls which may not be removed) shall take place other than in accordance with the agreed stage 2 WSI which shall include:

A. The statement of significance and research objectives, the programme and methodology of site investigation and recording and the nomination of a competent person(s) or organisation to undertake the agreed works

B. Where appropriate, details of a programme for delivering related positive public benefits.

C. The programme for post-investigation assessment and subsequent analysis, publication & dissemination and deposition of resulting material. this part of the condition shall not be discharged until these elements have been fulfilled in accordance with the programme set out in the stage 2 WSI.

Planning Sub-Committee – 02/06/2021

REASON: To secure the provision of archaeological investigation and the subsequent recording of the remains prior to.

Prior to commencement (relevant part):

8.1.7 Detailed elevation drawings

Prior to the commencement of above ground works for the development, detailed elevation and sections at 1:20 scale shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The submitted information shall include the following details: Facing materials; doors; windows; window surrounds and reveals; entrance canopies; gates, railings; parapets; plant room enclosures; surfacing to ground and roof terraces. The development shall not be carried out other than in accordance with the details as approved, unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority.

REASON: To ensure that the external appearance of the development is satisfactory.

8.1.8 Shopfront details

Notwithstanding the approved drawings, documents and details, prior to the commencement of the relevant part of the works, details of the proposed shopfronts shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The submitted drawings shall include a 1:20 elevation showing the glazing pattern and layout and 1:5 details of the window frames, cills, stallriser, door frames and fascias with materials and dimensions shown. The submitted information shall also include details of the ventilation louvres, lighting, security features (including cameras and shutters) and any other fixtures on the shopfronts. The development shall not be carried out other than in accordance with the details as approved, unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority.

REASON: To ensure that the heritage benefit of providing replica Victorian shopfronts to the Non Designated Heritage Asset is achieved.

8.1.9 Details of materials / Mock up panel

Prior to the commencement of above ground works for the development full details (including scale 1:20 plan, section elevations) and samples of all external materials including: facing materials; doors; windows; window surrounds and reveals; undercrofts and entrance side walls; entrance canopies; gates, railings; parapets; plant room enclosures; roof surfacing not comprising soft landscaping, shall be submitted for approval. This shall include the assembly on site (or alternative agreed location within reasonable travel distance) of a mock up panel / bay detail or other form as agreed with officers for approval in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall not be carried out other than in accordance with the details as approved, unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority.

REASON: To ensure that the external appearance of the development is satisfactory.

8.1.10 Fire Strategy

A full Fire Strategy shall be submitted prior to commencement of the development (excluding demolition) demonstrating in detail how the measures in the Fire Strategy prepared by WSP (ref: P100-RPT-22-FRE REVISION P02) dated November 2020 will be implemented into the design of the building.

REASON: To ensure that the development incorporates the necessary fire safety measures in accordance with London Plan Policy D12.

Planning Sub-Committee – 02/06/2021

8.1.11 Flood resilience

No development shall commence, other than works of demolition, until a report (including intrusive investigation/trial pit and monitoring where necessary) demonstrating that the basement development will not increase the potential for groundwater flooding to itself or to the surrounding area has been submitted to the Local Planning Authority for approval. Where groundwater is identified as a potential risk, details of appropriate controls including flood resilience and/or resistance measures shall be submitted to the LPA for approval and the approved measures incorporated before the basement is occupied. The basement shall be constructed and completed in accordance with the approved plans in line with BS 8102:2009 code of practice for "protection of below ground structures against water from the ground" and current best practice.

REASON: To mitigate surface run off and flood risk

8.1.12 Sustainable Drainage

Prior to commencement of the relevant part of the development the applicant shall submit, and have approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, construction details (including cross-sections), full specifications, a drainage layout and a site-specific management and maintenance plan for following. The approved details shall be installed prior to first occupation of the development:

- (a) Green/blue roof with a substrate depth of between 80 and 165mm, not including the vegetative mat.
- (b) Below ground attenuation system
- (c) Flow control system
- (d) Surface water from the site shall be managed according to the proposal referred to in the Flood Risk Assessment & SuDS Strategy Report agreed otherwise

REASON: To ensure sustainable drainage and mitigate flood risk

8.1.13 Secured by design

Prior to commencement of the relevant part of the development, details shall be submitted to and approved, in writing, by the Local Planning Authority to demonstrate that such building or such part of a building can achieve 'Secured by Design' Accreditation. The development shall only be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

REASON: In order to reduce opportunities for crime, and to safeguard the security of future occupiers and users of the development.

8.1.14 Zero global warming materials.

Prior to commencement of the relevant phase of construction, the selection of insulation and refrigerant materials to have a low or zero Global Warming Potential (GWP) and Zero Ozone Depleting Potential (ODP), shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

REASON: In the interest of addressing climate change and reducing greenhouse gases.

8.1.15 Piling Method Statement

No piling shall take place until a Piling Method Statement (detailing the depth and type of piling to be undertaken and the methodology by which such piling will be

Planning Sub-Committee – 02/06/2021

carried out, including measures to prevent and minimise the potential for damage to subsurface sewerage infrastructure, and the programme for the works) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority in consultation with Thames Water. Any piling must be undertaken in accordance with the terms of the approved piling method statement."

REASON: The proposed works will be in close proximity to underground sewerage utility infrastructure. Piling has the potential to significantly impact / cause failure of local underground sewerage utility infrastructure.

8.1.16 Details of water main diversion

No construction shall take place within 5m of the water main. Information detailing how the developer intends to divert the asset / align the development, so as to prevent the potential for damage to subsurface potable water infrastructure, must be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority in consultation with Thames Water. Any construction must be undertaken in accordance with the terms of the approved information. Unrestricted access must be available at all times for the maintenance and repair of the asset during and after the construction works.

REASON: The proposed works will be in close proximity to underground strategic water main, utility infrastructure. The works has the potential to impact on local underground water utility infrastructure.

Prior to occupation:

8.1.17 Biodiversity enhancements

Details of Biodiversity enhancements including bird / bat boxes and provision for invertebrates, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority, prior to the first occupation of each building or part of a building or use hereby approved. The approved details shall have been fully implemented prior to first occupation of the development.

REASON: To provide potential habitat for local wildlife.

8.1.18 Landscaping

A hard and soft landscaping scheme illustrated on detailed drawings, shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority, in writing, prior to occupation of the development. Details shall include: - soft landscaped areas to roof terraces; hard landscaping to roof terrace areas, external ground floor areas within the application site; tree planting; details of bio-diverse green / brown roofs and walls; and details of boundary treatments to roof terraces. All landscaping in accordance with the scheme, when approved, shall be carried out within a period of twelve months from the occupation date or shall be carried out in the first planting (and seeding) season following completion of the development, and shall be maintained to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority for a period of five years, such maintenance to include the replacement of any plants that die, or are severely damaged, seriously diseased, or removed.

REASON: To enhance the character and ecology of the development, to provide undisturbed refuges for wildlife, to promote sustainable urban drainage, and to enhance the performance and efficiency of the proposed building.

8.1.19 Cycle Parking

Planning Sub-Committee – 02/06/2021

Prior to the first occupation of the development, details of the secure bicycle storage facilities for 1031 bicycles (973 long stay plus 58 visitor cycles) including layout, stand type and spacing, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Such details as approved shall be implemented prior to the occupation of the development and shall thereafter be retained, unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority.

REASON: To ensure that adequate provision for the safe and secure storage of bicycles is made for occupants and visitors.

8.1.20 Contaminated land (pre-occupation)

Prior to the first occupation of the development, a post-development verification report will be produced to the satisfaction of and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The verification report must fully set out any restrictions on the future use of a development and demonstrate that arrangements have been made to inform future site users of the restrictions. Work shall be completed and a report produced by a competent person/company in line with current best practice guidance, including the Council's contaminated land planning guidance. The Contaminated Land Officer must receive verbal and written notification at least five days before development and remedial works commence. Subject to written approval by the Planning Authority, this condition may be varied, or discharged in agreed phases. Any additional, or unforeseen contamination encountered during the course of development shall be immediately notified to the Local Planning Authority and Contaminated Land Officer. All development shall cease in the affected area. Any additional or unforeseen contamination shall be dealt with as agreed with the Contaminated Land Officer. Where development has ceased in the affected area, it shall recommence upon written notification of the Local Planning Authority or Contaminated Land Officer.

REASON: To ensure that the application site and all potentially contaminated land has been remediated to ensure contamination risks at the site are suitably dealt with.

8.1.21 Air Permeability Testing

Prior to the first occupation the development, a full air permeability test report confirming the development has achieved an average air permeability of 3.0 m/h/m² at 50pa shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

REASON: To ensure the development meets the sustainability requirements of the Local and London Plans

8.1.22 PV system

Prior to the first occupation of the development, a report by an accredited PV installer confirming that arrays covering a minimum of 249sqm and generating a minimum of 31968 kwh (per annum) have been installed, with any shortfall object of alternative compensation measures or an increased carbon offset payment, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

REASON: To ensure that the development is adequately sustainable and contribute towards local, regional and national commitments to a net-zero carbon emission future.

8.1.23 Delivery and Servicing Plan / Operational Management Plan

Planning Sub-Committee – 02/06/2021

Prior to the first occupation of the development a Delivery and Servicing Plan shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority setting out:

- (a) Frequency of deliveries per day/week
- (b) Size of vehicles
- (c) How vehicles would be accommodated on the public highway
- (d) Waste / recycling / storage and collection arrangements

Thereafter deliveries and servicing shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plan.

REASON: To ensure that the proposed development does not prejudice the free flow of traffic or public safety along the neighbouring highway(s).

8.1.24 Waste and recycling facilities

Prior to the first occupation of the development, waste and recycling facilities shall be provided in accordance with the details contained within the approved drawings.

REASON: To ensure adequate provision is made for the storage of refuse and recycling in the interests of amenity.

8.1.25 Drainage strategy verification

Prior to the first occupation of the development, evidence (including as-built drawings, photographs, post construction surveys) and a final completion statement signed off by an appropriate, qualified, indemnified engineer shall be submitted showing that the drainage system has been constructed as per the approved designs and in accordance with best practice. The hereby approved drainage measures shall be retained and maintained thereafter.

REASON: To ensure sustainable drainage and to mitigate flood risk

8.1.26 Measures to prevent overlooking from terraces towards nearby residential units

Prior to first occupation of the development, details of boundary treatments to prevent undue overlooking of residential units to the south of the site from the proposed roof terraces shall be submitted for approval to the local planning authority. The approved details shall be installed prior to first occupation and retained and maintained thereafter.

REASON: To prevent undue overlooking and loss of privacy to neighbouring residential units.

Post-occupation:

8.1.27 BREEAM Assessment

Within 12 weeks of occupation of the development hereby approved, a BREEAM post-construction assessment (or any assessment scheme that may replace it) confirming an 'Excellent' rating (or another scheme target of equivalent or better environmental performance) has been achieved shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

REASON: To ensure the development meets the sustainability requirements of the Local and London Plans

8.1.28 Secure by design accreditation

Within three months of the first occupation of any part of the development, a 'Secured

Planning Sub-Committee – 02/06/2021

by Design' accreditation shall be obtained for that relevant part of the development.

REASON: In order to reduce opportunities for crime, and to safeguard the security of future occupiers and users of the development.

8.1.29 Building Management Systems monitoring 'be seen'

In order to demonstrate compliance with the 'be seen' post-construction monitoring requirement of Policy SI 2 of the London Plan, the legal Owner shall at all times and all in all respects comply with the energy monitoring requirements set out in points a, b and c below. In the case of non-compliance the legal Owner shall upon written notice from the Local Planning Authority immediately take all steps reasonably required to remedy noncompliance.

a. Within four weeks of planning permission being issued by the Local Planning Authority, the Owner is required to submit to the GLA accurate and verified estimates of the 'be seen' energy performance indicators, as outlined in Chapter 3 'Planning stage' of the GLA 'Be seen' energy monitoring guidance document, for the consented development. This should be submitted to the GLA's monitoring portal in accordance with the 'Be seen' energy monitoring guidance.

b. Once the as-built design has been completed (upon commencement of RIBA Stage 6) and prior to the building(s) being occupied (or handed over to a new legal owner, if applicable), the legal Owner is required to provide updated accurate and verified estimates of the 'be seen' energy performance indicators for each reportable unit of the development, as per the methodology outlined in Chapter 4 'As-built stage' of the GLA 'Be seen' energy monitoring guidance. All data and supporting evidence should be uploaded to the GLA's monitoring portal. The owner should also confirm that suitable monitoring devices have been installed and maintained for the monitoring of the in-use energy performance indicators, as outlined in Chapter 5 'In-use stage' of the GLA 'Be seen' energy monitoring guidance document.

c. Upon completion of the first year of occupation following the end of the defects liability period (DLP) and for the following four years, the legal Owner is required to provide accurate and verified annual in-use energy performance data for all relevant indicators under each reportable unit of the development as per the methodology outlined in Chapter 5 'In-use stage' of the GLA 'Be seen' energy monitoring guidance document. All data and supporting evidence should be uploaded to the GLA's monitoring portal. This condition will be satisfied after the legal Owner has reported on all relevant indicators included in Chapter 5 'In-use stage' of the GLA 'Be Seen' energy monitoring guidance document for at least five years.

REASON: In order to ensure that actual operational energy performance is minimised and demonstrate compliance with the 'be seen' post-construction monitoring requirement of Policy SI 2 of the London Plan.

Compliance conditions:

8.1.30 No new pipes and plumbing

No new plumbing, pipes, soil stacks, flues, vents grilles, security alarms or ductwork shall be fixed on the external faces of the building unless as otherwise shown on the drawings hereby approved.

REASON: To ensure that the external appearance of the building is satisfactory and does not detract from the character and visual amenity of the area.

8.1.31 Noise from plan and machinery

Planning Sub-Committee – 02/06/2021

Noise levels from fixed plant and machinery associated with the proposed development shall be 5dB(A) or more below the background noise level when measured at any nearby noise sensitive premises at any time.

REASON: To ensure that occupiers of the neighbouring premises do not suffer a loss of amenity by reason of noise nuisance from fixed plant and machinery

8.1.32 Development in accordance with energy strategy

The measures identified in the submitted Energy and sustainability strategy (and any subsequent revisions / addendum) shall be incorporated prior to occupation of the development.

REASON: In order for the development to demonstrate an adequate response to climate change and climate change adaptation.

Recommendation B

8.2 That the above recommendation be subject to a legal agreement being entered into under section 106 Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and other enabling powers in order to secure the following matters to the satisfaction of the Council:

1. The agreement will be made under Section 278 of the Highways Act and will require payment of a highway contribution to enable the Council to reinstatement of footways and carriageways surrounding the site. The estimated cost of works is to be confirmed and the committee will be updated in due course.
2. Financial contribution to the Council to deliver public realm enhancement works surrounding the site including Crown Place, Clifton Street and Christopher Street.
3. Employment and Training contribution to support training, employment and local procurement during construction of £298,242.
4. 117 Apprenticeships – apprentices (residents of Hackney) in the various building trades such as brick laying, carpentry, electrical, plumbing and plastering and the new methods of construction. At least one full framework apprentice is to be employed per £2 million of construction contract value (£235M), with a support fee of £1500 per apprentice (£175,500)
5. Commitment to the Council's local labour and construction initiatives including Employment & Skills Plan
6. Employment and Training contribution to support training, employment and local procurement during operation of £1,233,382.
7. Considerate Constructors Scheme – the applicant to carry out all works in keeping with the National Considerate Constructors Scheme.
8. Adoption and compliance with Travel Plan and Travel Plan Monitoring fee of £2000.
9. Car Free - business occupiers to be ineligible to apply for parking permits for

Planning Sub-Committee – 02/06/2021

the local Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) (with the exception of disabled residents).

10. Construction Logistics Plan / Construction Logistics and Community Safety (CLOCS) monitoring fee of £8,750
11. Carbon Offset Contribution of £1,259,905
12. Affordable workspace provision of 4,213sqm at around 35% of market rates and submission and approval of Affordable Workspace Statement along with measures to monitor the provision of the workspace moving forward (the precise amount of discount is currently under discussion and will be confirmed in due course, with members updated).
13. Financial contribution towards CCTV in the surrounding public realm of £7,655
14. Financial contribution for TfL to resurface CS1 near to the site estimated at £30,000.
15. Financial contribution of £60,000 for TfL for improvement / operation of cycle hire system in the vicinity of the site.
16. Payment by the landowner/developer of all the Council's legal and other relevant fees, disbursements and Value Added Tax in respect of the proposed negotiations and completion of the proposed Legal Agreement prior to completion of the Legal Agreement.
17. S106 Monitoring costs payable prior to completion of the Legal Agreement.

Recommendation C

8.3 That the Sub-Committee grants delegated authority to the Director of Public Realm and Head of Planning (or in their absence either the Growth Team Manager or DM & Enforcement Manager) to make any minor alterations, additions or deletions to the recommended conditions or legal agreement as set out in this report provided this authority shall be exercised after consultation with the Chair (or in their absence the Vice-Chair) of the Sub-Committee (who may request that such alterations, additions or deletions be first approved by the Sub-Committee).

9 INFORMATIVES

- SI.1 Building Control
- SI.2 Work Affecting Public Highway
- SI.3 Sanitary, Ventilation and Drainage Arrangements
- SI.6 Control of Pollution (Clean Air, Noise, etc.)
- SI.7 Hours of Building Works
- SI.25 Disabled Person's Provisions
- SI.27 Fire Precautions Act
- SI.28 Refuse Storage and Disposal Arrangements
- SI.34 Landscaping
- SI.45 The Construction (Design & Management) Regulations 1994
- SI.48 Soundproofing



Planning Sub-Committee – 02/06/2021

NSI - Should the Local Planning Authority be minded to approve the planning application, Thames Water would like the following informative attached to the planning permission: "A Groundwater Risk Management Permit from Thames Water will be required for discharging groundwater into a public sewer. Any discharge made without a permit is deemed illegal and may result in prosecution under the provisions of the Water Industry Act 1991. We would expect the developer to demonstrate what measures he will undertake to minimise groundwater discharges into the public sewer. Permit enquiries should be directed to Thames Water's Risk Management Team by telephoning 020 3577 9483 or by emailing trade.effluent@thameswater.co.uk. Application forms should be completed on line via www.thameswater.co.uk. Please refer to the Wholesale; Business customers; Groundwater discharges section.

NSI - Thames Water will aim to provide customers with a minimum pressure of 10m head (approx 1 bar) and a flow rate of 9 litres/minute at the point where it leaves Thames Waters pipes. The developer should take account of this minimum pressure in the design of the proposed development.

NSI - The applicant must seek the continual advice of the Metropolitan Police Service Designing out Crime Officers (DOCOs) to achieve accreditation. The services of MPS DOCOs are available free of charge and can be contacted via docomailbox.nw@met.police.uk or 0208 733 3465.

Signed..... Date.....
Aled Richards – Director, Public Realm

	BACKGROUND PAPERS	NAME/DESIGNATION AND TELEPHONE EXTENSION OF ORIGINAL COPY	LOCATION CONTACT OFFICER
1.	Make GIA area calculation; Make Technico House response to design comments document; VUCity London city model; WSP Stage 1 Report Technico House – Transport Response dated 01/04/2021; Public Realm Cost Estimate by Turner and Townsend dated April 2021; Letter from WSP with regard to wind impact on 1 Crown Place dated 29/04/2021; Letter from Delva Patma Redler dated 05/05/21 regarding daylight impacts on 1 Crown Place; Hackney	Steve Fraser-Lim Planning Officer (Major applications) 020 8356 8093	2 Hillman Street, London E8 1FB



Planning Sub-Committee – 02/06/2021

	<p>Design Review Panel feedback letter dated 29th 20 May 2019; Hackney Design Review Panel feedback letter dated 29th October 2019; Hackney Design Review Panel feedback letter dated 29th October 2020; Floorspace schedule SK0009; Email from applicant dated 30/04/21 with regard to wind and daylight sunlight reports; Correspondence between applicant and Met Police Design out Crime Advisor dated 28/04/21; Hackney CIL Calculator.</p> <p>Application documents and LBH policies/guidance referred to in this report are available for inspection on the Council's website. Policy/guidance from other authorities/bodies referred to in this report are available for inspection on the website of the relevant authorities/bodies Other background papers referred to in this report are available for inspection upon request to the officer named in this section. All documents that are material to the preparation of this report are referenced in the report</p>		
--	---	--	--