

LONDON BOROUGH OF HACKNEY

PLANNING SUB-COMMITTEE
02 June 2021

ADDENDUM SHEET

ITEM 7: 209-223 Hoxton Street, London, N1 5LG

The tenure mix on Page 3 was filled out incorrectly. It should be amended to read as follows:

Tenure	Unit Size	No of units	Proportion
London Living Rent	1 bed 2p	5	
	2 beds 4p	2	
	3 beds 5p	2	
	Total	9	
Market Rent	1 bed 2p	7	
	2 beds 4p	6	
	3 beds 5p	3	
	Total	16	
Total		25	100%

Condition 21 should be amended to read as follows:

8.1.21 Cycle Parking

Notwithstanding the details shown on the approved plans, full details of secure cycle parking for *61 cycles* serving the residential component of the development and 12 serving the retail component *must be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority prior to the occupation of the development*. Details should include the layouts, foundations, stand-types and spacing of the cycle spaces as well as details of showers/lockers for the retail spaces. The development shall not be carried out otherwise than in accordance with the details thus approved.

REASON: To ensure that a reasonable provision is made within the site for the parking of bicycles in the interest of relieving congestion in surrounding streets and improving highway conditions in general.

ITEM 8: Technico House, 4 Christopher Street, 56 & 58 Wilson Street and 1,3 & 5 Earl Street

Drawing Numbers table: Drawing numbers to be amended as follows:

Existing plans

1577-MAK-PA0200	Rev01;	1577-MAK-PA0503	Rev00;	1577-MAK-PA0850	Rev01;
1577-MAK-PA0900	Rev00;	1577-MAK-PA0997	Rev00;	1577-MAK-PA0998	Rev00;
1577-MAK-PA0999	Rev00;	1577-MAK-PA1000	Rev00;	1577-MAK-PA1000L	Rev00;
1577-MAK-PA1006	Rev00;	1577-MAK-PA1200	Rev01;	1577-MAK-PA1201	Rev01;
1577-MAK-PA1202	Rev01;	1577-MAK-PA1203	Rev01;	1577-MAK-PA1597	Rev00;
1577-MAK-PA1598	Rev00;	1577-MAK-PA1599	Rev00;	1577-MAK-PA1600	Rev00;
1577-MAK-PA1600L	Rev00;	1577-MAK-PA1606	Rev00;	1577-MAK-PA1700	Rev01;
1577-MAK-PA1701	Rev01;	1577-MAK-PA1702	Rev01;	1577-MAK-PA1703	Rev01

Proposed plans:

1577-MAK-PA1900	Rev01;	1577-MAK-PA1996	Rev01;	1577-MAK-PA1997	Rev01;
1577-MAK-PA1998	Rev02;	1577-MAK-PA1999	Rev03;	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;	1577-MAK-PA2200	Rev02;	1577-MAK-PA2201	Rev02;
1577-MAK-PA2202	Rev02;	1577-MAK-PA2203	Rev02;	1577-MAK-PA2250	Rev02;
1577-MAK-PA2251	Rev02;	1577-MAK-PA6800	Rev00;	1577-MAK-PA6801	Rev01.

Parking Details table: Proposed car parking amended to “2 disabled car parking spaces on Wilson Street”.

4.56 An additional letter was submitted by the daylight consultants acting for 1 Crown Place and is summarised as follows: *We confirm that we have no issue with the technical modelling, methodology or analysis that DPR have used in the assessment of the daylight and sunlight impacts arising from this proposal. However, we do draw issue with the conclusion they reach. It is our view that the correct policy approach for the assessment of daylight and sunlight matters on a site like this...is would it cause unacceptable harm. It is not therefore a straight test against BRE base criteria to measure noticeability by reference to a 20% change but more to focus upon the retained values and establish whether the level of retained light to One Crown Place is acceptable, and therefore conclude whether this proposed development gives rise to unacceptable harm.*

From our experience and as is widely undertaken in practice, the determination as to whether unacceptable harm occurs uses a suite of methods; principally, however, it is related to context not just within the immediate site area but similar sites across London and also using such BRE tests as the mirror massing assessment. There has been little work done as far as GIA have seen in looking at the wider context of the site to understand what levels of daylight and sunlight One Crown Place could reasonably expect to enjoy with an emerging City development environment around it. The only test that has been done is the mirror massing test and as we have stated previously, we feel far too much weight is placed upon that when it is not really in line with the spirit of the BRE guidance for a site such as this and fails to take into account the wider urban aspects of tower relationships...it is our experience from the multitude of sites which we have worked on that...retained values which are at least in the low-teens and ideally midteens in the majority is what is to be expected and is, therefore, the alternative target when considering these dense urban developments.

If one does however look at the results submitted by DPR, it is quite evident that the impacts are very significant. By their own admission, 56% of all the rooms will see a noticeable change in VSC. Over 60 windows will see more than an 80% loss of VSC, a further 87 windows will see between a 60-79.9% loss and a further 82 windows will experience between 40-59.9% loss. In our opinion, losses in excess of 60% would constitute unacceptable harm, given that most of these windows currently enjoy excellent levels of sky visibility with high VSC and NSL values.

Part of the justification given by DPR is that the ADF values remain equal to, or more than, the minimum for most rooms. However, there are still 14 rooms (ten LKD's and four bedrooms) which see less than the minimum ADF values once the proposal is in place. This is also assuming that the alternative target value of 1.5% for LKD's is considered acceptable in this specific instance, when the guidance on ADF recommends that it should be 2%. It is also extremely important to remember, and is already acknowledged by DPR, that the ADF method of assessment should not be used when assessing existing buildings. We acknowledge that One Crown Place is not yet occupied but it is in the process of being occupied and the flats have been designed and sold on the existing baseline condition. It is also extremely important to remember that the residents which are moving in now will probably have been in occupation for at least a year if not two or more years by the time this development, should it be consented, is actually constructed.

Officer response: "The above comments are noted and expand upon the earlier objection comments submitted and set out in the committee report. The officer assessment of daylight impacts remains as set out within the committee report. It is accepted that the proposals would result in significant daylight impacts to some adjacent residential units. However it is considered that there is sufficient justification (in terms of mirror image assessment, Average Daylight Factor assessment of retained levels of daylight at 1 Crown Place / comparison of impacts with other nearby developments) that daylight impacts are justified, when taking into account the character of the surrounding area, and the site's planning policy context".

6.2.15 Discussions with the applicant with regard to affordable workspace provision have been ongoing. The applicants are unwilling to increase the level of on site affordable workspace provision above the level currently proposed (4231sqm GIA, 8% of total office floorspace GIA). This is due to concerns that the relatively large amount of affordable workspace proposed will be completed in a single phase and would be difficult to let to one or more affordable workspace providers. In addition an increase in affordable workspace provision at the expense of floorspace let at market rates would have a significant adverse impact on development viability. As such the applicants have made an alternative proposal that the affordable workspace provided on site is let at 25% of market rates, which would be a greater discount than the 40% required by policy LP29. Officers consider that an increased rent discount, rather than a greater quantity of on site floorspace would be desirable in this instance, as the site is in an area of the borough with very high office rent levels. A greater rent discount would make the proposed affordable workspace more attractive to future occupiers, and the development would still provide a very substantial amount of affordable workspace on site. As such the proposed affordable workspace provision is overall considered to represent a good level of provision which would accord with the broad aspirations of policy LP29 and is supported by officers.

6.3.55 Discussions with the applicant with regard to public realm improvements have been ongoing. Transport / Highways officers seek substantial public realm improvement works to three areas with an estimated cost of £1,352,000: 1) Clifton Street to the east of application site at the main office entrance comprising new stone sett paving, street furniture and soft

landscaping; 2) area around junction of Clifton Street, Christopher Street and Pindar Street, involving resurfacing and traffic calming measures, with similar materials to area 1; 3) Junction of Christopher Street and Wilson Street where aspiration is to construct a raised table to improve pedestrian cycle environment. The applicants have agreed to meet this contribution.

The agreed contribution would be in excess of other large nearby developments such as 1 Crown Place and Bishopsgate Goodsyrd. Overall the proposed public realm improvements are considered to be extensive, of high quality and would deliver a significant uplift to the appearance of the streetscene in the surrounding area.

In addition and separate to the public realm improvement works listed above, the applicants have agreed the Councils estimate of £341,878 for highways works immediately surrounding the site including reinstatement of footways using materials to match the public realm improvement works, resurfacing of Christopher Street, and provision of disabled car parking spaces on Wilson Street. These works are necessary to mitigate damage to the highway during the construction phase of the development.

8. Amend Recommendation B head of term 1 to *“agreement will be made under Section 278 of the Highways Act and will require payment of a highway contribution of £341,878 to enable the Council to reinstatement of footways and carriageways surrounding the site”*.
8. Amend Recommendation B head of term 2 to *“Financial contribution to the Council of £1,352,000 to deliver public realm enhancement works surrounding the site including Crown Place, Clifton Street and Christopher Street”*.
8. Amend Recommendation B, head of term 12 to *“Affordable workspace provision of 4,213sqm at 25% of market rates, to be let to an affordable workspace provider who is on the Council’s list of approved bodies or such other provider as is approved by the Council in writing”*.

ITEM 9: Land Corner Of Ormsby Street And Pearson Street, London, E2 8JD

An additional consultee comment has been received:

Kingsland CAAC

The scheme is interesting and looks good in the proposed location. As a temporary use it may allow the character of the wider area to develop around the rear of the Geoffrey Museum over the next few years before a more permanent solution is found for the site. We had a concern about temperature control in the hotel rooms, particularly during the summer months and we also hoped that the timing of the self-closing doors in the communal areas would be frequently checked to prevent the possibility of tailgating (Portable Living Group Document ‘Design Out Crime’).

Officer’s Response: The hotel rooms will be air conditioned and connected to the proposed Air Source Heat Pumps, as well as soundproofed to protect from the noise of the neighbouring railway. A recommended condition requires an Operational Management Plan, which will detail the ways in which the hotel access is to be managed but the applicant has already committed to providing 24 hour security on site.

An additional document has been received in respect of Fire Safety, As such, paragraph 6.7.7 should be amended to read:

6.7.7 Following the adoption of the new London Plan, the applicant has provided a Fire Statement for review by Hackney Building Control but this was provided at too late a stage to allow it to be reviewed before this committee meeting. Nevertheless, the document is detailed and shows that attention has been paid to the fire safety of the development. In the circumstances it is considered appropriate that a condition is recommended to ensure that a detailed Fire Statement is provided prior to the commencement of any development and that compliance with this document, when approved, should be required.

Therefore, the relevant condition (10) should be amended as follows:

8.1.10 - Fire safety strategy

Prior to the commencement of development, details and measures in respect of the Fire Safety strategy shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The recommendations thereby approved shall be carried out in full and maintained to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority for the lifetime of the development.

REASON: To ensure that measures to mitigate the risks of fire are detailed, effective and remain part of the development as constructed.

Condition 2 should be amended to read as follows:

8.1.2 - Temporary Use

The uses of the site hereby permitted shall be operated for a limited period only until five years from the date of this permission, on or before which date the use shall be discontinued and all the buildings and structures hereby approved removed from the site, unless otherwise approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

REASON: To ensure the site becomes available for a permanent development and to reflect the fact that the design of the development would be considered unsuitable for a permanent construction on this site.

Condition 21 should be amended to include protection of the street trees on Ormsby Road during the construction process and would read as follows:

8.1.21 - 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 and Rail for London (RfL). 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) A demolition and construction method statement to include details of all noise and vibration (including noise from ancillary or temporary power supplies, details and locations of noisy activities including mobile plant machinery) and details of the best practicable means of mitigation employed against noise and vibration in accordance with British Standard Code of Practice BS5228 and measures to control dust and preserve air quality (including a risk assessment of the demolition and construction phase);

b) A detailed demolition and construction logistics plan to include the following: the construction programme/ timescales; the number/ frequency and size of construction vehicles;

construction traffic route; location of deliveries; pedestrian and vehicular access arrangements; any temporary road/ footway closures during the construction period;

- c) A demolition and construction waste management plan setting out how resources will be managed and waste controlled at all stages during the construction project;
- d) Details and locations of all noisy activities including mobile plant machinery, and details of the best practicable means of mitigation employed against noise and vibration in accordance with British Standard Code of Practice BS 5228;
- e) Procedures for maintaining good public relations including complaint management, public consultation and liaison. Arrangements for liaison with the Council's Community Safety Team.
- f) Demonstration that the development shall be carried out in accordance with Railway for London's document entitled 'Special Conditions for Outside Parties developing on or near the railway'.
- g) Providing a reflected glare assessment to confirm there shall be no impact to Railway operations during or after the completion of the Development.
- h) Details of measures to protect the existing street trees on Ormsby Street.

REASON: To avoid hazard and obstruction being caused to users of the public highway and railway, to protect street trees and in the interest of public safety and amenity.

Signed..... **Date**.....

ALED RICHARDS
Director, Public Realm