
London Borough of Hackney
Living in Hackney Scrutiny Commission
Municipal Year 2020/21
Date of meeting Monday, 13 December 2021

Minutes of the proceedings of
the Living in Hackney Scrutiny
Commission held at
Hackney Town Hall, Mare
Street, London, E8 1EA

Chair	Cllr Sharon Patrick
Councillors in Attendance:	Cllr Anthony McMahon, Cllr M Can Ozsen, Cllr Ian Rathbone, Cllr Ajay Chauhan, Cllr Clare Joseph, Cllr Soraya Adejare
Apologies:	Cllr Penny Wrout,
Officers in Attendance	Chris Pritchard (Director, Property Services), Chris Trowell (Interim Director Regeneration), Ken Rorrison (Head of Strategic Design), Tyler Linton (Group Engineer sustainable transport and engagement, Streetscene)
Other People in Attendance	Cllr Richard Lufkin, Cllr Vincent Stops (Chair of Planning Committee), Cllr Mete Coban (Cabinet Member Energy, Waste, Transport and Public Realm)
Members of the Public	None
Officer Contact:	Tracey Anderson ☎ 0208 356 3312 ✉ tracey.anderson@hackney.gov.uk

Councillor Sharon Patrick in the Chair

1 Apologies for Absence

- 1.1 Chair opened the meeting with meeting etiquette information.
- 1.2 Apologies for absence from Cllr Wrout.
- 1.3 The Councillors virtually in attendance were Cllr Adejare, Cllr Chauhan and Cllr McMahon.

2 Urgent Items/ Order of Business

- 2.1 There are no urgent items, and the order of business is as set out in the agenda.

3 Declaration of Interest

3.1 None.

4 Climate Change and Buildings

4.1 The Chair commenced the session by explaining the scrutiny commission did not complete the last item as planned at the previous meeting on climate change and buildings.

4.2 The session covered: New Homes Delivery - how new build home and regeneration developments will achieve / deliver the net zero carbon target. Council Strategic Property - the council's maintenance programme, retro fit and work to deliver net zero carbon for non-residential council properties.

4.3 The Chair welcomed back to the meeting from London Borough of Hackney Chris Trowell, Interim Director, Regeneration and Ken Rorrison, Head of Strategic Design from New Homes. Chris Pritchard, Director Strategic Property from Strategic Property in London Borough of Hackney (LBH).

4.4 The Interim Director, Regeneration commenced the presentation and recapped outlining the content covered at the last meeting: the overall strategic context and net zero ambitions, retrofitting from housing services for the existing housing stock and the work to move towards a net zero across all the housing stock.

4.5 The Director explained the presentation would continue with information about new homes and then finally the Council's corporate estate – covering all non-residential buildings owned by the council.

4.5.1 The Director explained this presentation will look at the new homes being built and how the new homes can contribute to the council's net zero ambitions / targets.

4.5.2 Building new homes will always have a carbon impact. To have no carbon impact would mean not building homes. However, the carbon cost of building new homes was acknowledged.

4.5.3 It was highlighted that news homes are built for the people that need them, new homes for changing needs and to replace the existing housing stock that is beyond economic repair.

4.5.4 The challenge now was to address the council's corporate priorities whilst minimising the carbon impact of building new homes and the environmental impact of the new homes building program.

4.6 The Head of Strategic Design continued the presentation to outline Hackney's sustainable approach to building new homes in the borough.

4.6.1 This information covers the direct delivery of new homes built. This covers in circa of 300 new homes under the estate regeneration programme and the housing supply programme.

- 4.6.2 Net zero is important in the built environment because currently it contributes to approximately 40% of the UK's total carbon footprint. Evidencing this is a priority area to target for emissions reduction.
- 4.6.3 In the context of Hackney new home building, this contributes 4% of the total carbon emissions. This appears to be a small figure but becomes more significant given that Hackney has strong influence/direct control over 29% of carbon emissions including those related to new builds. This increases to a 14% contribution.
- 4.6.4 Carbon is in everything that is built, so one option could be to build less. It's important to do what they can to tackle the supply of good quality council housing. Therefore, they need to find the middle ground between that aspiration and the contributions made towards achieving net zero.
- 4.6.5 Regeneration for building homes is guided by national/ London and local policies which form a hierarchy within which they work.
- 4.6.6 In addition, there is an energy hierarchy which currently is making an improvement on building regulations. Any difference can be made up with a carbon offset payment.
- 4.6.7 These defining policies, standards and guidance are being revised and updated. They are based on the UK net zero targets to be achieved by 2050 whereas Hackney's aspirations are greater (by 2040).
- 4.6.8 The development process for a new home is slow and over a long period. This means it is expensive to delay the process or change course during the process in response to any change in regulation. This can often result in different buildings complying with different regulations and standards.
- 4.6.9 The officer highlighted examples of the improvements in housing for 2 regeneration projects. Kings Crescent Phase 1&2 and De Beauvoir.
- 4.6.10 It was explained that King Crescent phase 1 & 2 had completed, and phase 3&4 were due to commence next year. It was pointed out for phase 1&2 they used a fabric first approach, combined heating power (gas CHP system). This uses a hybrid approach of refurbishing units and new buildings.
- 4.6.11 The refurbishment targets improved thermal efficiency, winter gardens, new roofs, garages converted to residential as well as a PV car free landscape.
- 4.6.12 The hybrid refurbishment new build model considered the future where the carbon advantage of retaining buildings will become increasingly to the fore. The projects illustrated how best practice evolved quickly.
- 4.6.13 The energy strategy used at the time was at the forefront of energy thinking. The changes to the decarbonising grid and subsequent energy strategies favoured this option less. However, the technology used will power the subsequent phases because it is already installed, and it would profligate both financially and in carbon terms not to use it.

- 4.6.14 The second example De Beauvoir phase 1. This was recently submitted to planning. This demonstrated Hackney's ability to react and pre-empt change through the new build programme. A key change is the move from gas CHP (early assumption) to air source heat pumps (current assumption) by electric technology. Through a combination of the B lean and B clean measures the proposals is expected to reduce on site regulated carbon emissions by 49%. This illustrated the improvement to the new build programme compared to Kings Crescent. This is using the SAT 10 emissions.
- 4.6.15 The 2 projects show a significant improvement and the trajectory of change to achieving the net zero ambitions.
- 4.6.16 The public realm also contributes to the net zero commitments at the De Beauvoir with extensive tree planting. The programme augments Hackney's Street tree programme. Bringing carbon improvements through sequestered carbon.
- 4.6.17 The examples of operational and sequestered carbon need to continue to improve. However, it's the area of embodied carbon that they are likely to see the greatest improvement. But also, where they anticipate encountering their biggest challenges.
- 4.6.18 The challenges were outlined to be:
- Construction Industry and the speed of change. This sector is responding slower to the climate emergency. At COP 26 (Nov 2021) this was explained to be related to the current system being efficient and efficiency being the biggest challenge to system change. There is difficulty with changing a huge multi headed complex system when all the elements are being optimized within an inch of their lives. The slow take up of alternative low carbon construction techniques often manifest itself in a reticence or over pricing at the tender stage. Due to Hackney's housing programme being a cross subsidy housing delivery model it has a reliance on the market so leading from the front will prove more difficult. Therefore, the council will be more reliant on regulatory change.
 - Building Safety Legislation - limitation on structure and materials (current limitation on non-combustible materials and facades). For example, this prevents the use of cross laminated timber or other timber technologies on buildings over 18 meters or over 6 stories. Taking into consideration Hackney's urban conditions and the desire to maximise their assets they are often building at these heights. If they use this technology, it is invariably a hybrid including steel or concrete which are both higher carbon options. With this challenge they are relying on emerging legislation to be more forward looking and a bit more nuanced.
 - Viability - number of homes vs ultimate performance. This is a challenge area. This already suffers from rising tender prices and static sales prices. Therefore, improvements with fabric performance or new technology further challenges the viability. For example, improving fabric performance through passive house is a good aspiration but potentially quoted to be around 7-10% more expensive. Without additional funding or subsidy, they may need to make a choice between the number of homes build and the level of carbon saving they can achieve.

- New Technology - potential conflicts and risks. Using new technologies for example moving to heat pump technology for the new builds, can bring big carbon efficiency savings. The caveat is this is an untried technology on a massive scale of housing. Therefore, there are risks associated with this move such as the cost of electricity and potentially higher fuel bills, increases to capital cost and specialised maintenance. In addition to educating resident to understand and accept lower temperature heating. In addition, the level of renewables they can achieve with new builds e.g. roof tops are being increasingly contested like east plant for air sources heat pumps and a desire for roof top gardens to improve sequestered carbon. This highlights the potential conflicts and tensions.

4.6.19 The De Beauvoir example illustrated how they are starting to respond to these challenges. Although they need to be realistic, they are making in roads and evolving the new homes build program without jeopardizing the delivery of new homes.

4.6.20 The next home building programme needs to be within their viability parameters but result in further improvements in housing and a real benefit to residents.

4.6.21 These were outlined to be

- Increased understanding of the way our buildings are used. Starting with a greater whole Life Carbon Analysis/POE throughout design and construction. Having defined metrics to monitor the impact and help mitigate further carbon emissions. Technical post occupancy evaluation. The current post occupancy evaluation tends to be based on resident satisfaction. This process needs to include more technical POE to supplement their findings. Understanding how the buildings matches their theoretical performance. Having this data will help support their work and provide an evidence base for ongoing refinement, improvement and to support decision making and the design and construction.
- Embodied carbon - investigation and instigation of Lower Carbon Construction. Notwithstanding the challenges outlined earlier there needs to be greater change through brought to the fore for lower carbon construction. These challenges are more reliant on regulatory change to support this. However, lessons learnt from the early adoption of timber systems (laminated timber at great eastern buildings and Daubeny Road) also provides a good evidence base.
- Operational carbon - Low Carbon Energy Systems/Passivhaus design illustrated how the program is responding to the emerging energy strategies nationally, in London and locally. Fabric performance is already at a fairly high level, meaning improvements will be relatively limited. Improvements will benefit residents but will need to be balanced with increased capital expenditure. Moving towards Passivhaus standards, either by performance or certification, will be one of the next goals to be investigated. An adoption should result in greater acceptance and help to normalise it in the construction industry. Reducing the market difficulties highlighted above. The Goldsmith Street Passivhaus development in Norwich (by a Hackney architect) is an example of what is achievable with the right conditions and determination.

- The council starting to look at efficiency through alternative building systems. Offsite construction and repeatable/modular systems. If the numbers can be achieved to produce economies of scale, then offsite construction could help achieve the carbon targets as well as other benefits. A review of council estates is hoping to identify sites which will meet the criteria for a modular method of delivery. In addition to not losing the character and place making qualities of their current emerging projects.
- In tandem there is an increase in industry expertise from various sources like London Energy Transformation Limited, RIBA or architects declare. More and more guidance is being produced which helps them to be more ambitious than to just simply respond to regulatory changes. The council will take the lead of industry experts where there is this increasing body of knowledge and guidance. Using this information to make informed decisions when building low carbon homes and as the targets evolve establish sustainable metrics.

- 4.7 The Director Strategic Property Services commenced the presentation about Hackney's corporate estate (assets).
- 4.7.1 The corporate estate is different to the council's housing stock. There are less units and it performs a different function.
- 4.7.2 It was highlighted the main different with maintaining the corporate estate is the skill sets of the maintenance contractors (qualified in air conditioning, automatic lighting systems etc.) Covering all the fixtures and fitting in office buildings.
- 4.7.3 The corporate portfolio is mainly offices, depots, libraries, and the Town Hall (excluding schools and highways). The corporate assets are the buildings the council occupies to deliver the services by the council.
- 4.7.4 Characteristics of the corporate estate is very varied and range in design, age, use, size, location e.g., Hackney Town Hall building (older building) and the Hackney Service Centre – a more modern age building. These are very different in design, construction, and the way they use the building. In addition, the council also has buildings like Stoke Newington Town Hall which is in a different geography of the borough. The Director pointed out the planning status of a building can be an added complication such as being a listed building.
- 4.7.5 The council has no plans to grow the corporate estate and will not be doing any new capital build programmes.
- 4.7.6 Also in the council's portfolios are other commercial and small properties used by the voluntary and community sector and some temporary accommodation / emergency housing - this has grown recently in response to the housing crisis. These building are leased to businesses in the borough. This is an important revenue stream for the council which helps to cover maintenance costs.

- 4.7.7 The key challenge for the council is the age of the estate. They have a large number of Victorian properties that are over 100 years old. The form of construction can be complex, and all the buildings can be different. There is no single blueprint when it comes to solutions for health and safety compliance or maintenance routines.
- 4.7.8 The assets vary in running costs and in the returns (staff accommodations etc) for the cost of ownership. In relation to capacity this relate to the council's approach in how they treat the building, maintain it or any make big changes made to the building.
- 4.7.9 The property services team has remained lean since austerity commenced.
- 4.7.10 It was highlighted not all the council assets fall under the control of the central council property services function.
- 4.7.11 In regard to data the council has 10 years' worth of condition data, and they do condition surveys of the whole estate over a period of 5 years. That is 20% of the estate each year. This gives a condition report on the current state of the assets.
- 4.7.12 In response to net zero the council's corporate property services have been sharpening up their provision of data to understand the buildings. The data includes condition surveys, energy usage and understanding the total cost of ownership. The ownership costs involve maintenance, energy, soft facilities management, cleaning etc. Corporate Property Services are working towards being able to identify which buildings cost the most year on year to operate.
- 4.7.13 Corporate Property Services are making investments in staff and technology. A new database software has been acquired to enable them to be more effective with the data they hold. The Council holds a large volume of condition data, but this is not easy to manipulate without high quality software.
- 4.7.14 The investment in staff has been to seek out and employ staff with specific skills to sharpen the effectiveness of the data the council holds. Enabling the council to make better, more focused, and informed decisions. Thus, being able to focus their efforts on where they can have the biggest impact.
- 4.7.15 Corporate Property Services is also aligning the council's corporate assets with the council's policy priorities. This is covered in the council's strategic asset management plan. Traditionally this asset plan has focused on general fund properties and included the housing revenue account asset management plan. But going forward they anticipate this will span both the Housing Revenue Account (HRA) and General Fund. Allowing the council to look seamlessly across all its assets. This will give more options and enable more efficient decision making.
- 4.7.16 Acknowledging there is not an abundance of capital so therefore a need to build knowledge, expertise and data to understand the retrofitting benefits and its impact on the council's carbon footprint.
- 4.7.17 Corporate Property Services decided to focus on the actions they can take swiftly. The biggest change has been the reduction in space the council

occupies. This is the biggest impact they can achieve currently. In recent years this has involved removing occupation from Keltan House, refurbishment the town hall to increase accommodation capacity and improvements to the efficiency of the heating system.

- 4.7.18 The Director highlighted as an example the benefits gained from exiting occupation of Keltan House. It was pointed out Keltan House cost approximately £900,000 a year. With the occupation of commercial tenants, the council was able to invest against the future revenue stream and make investment in the fixture and fittings of the building and heating system to make it more modern and efficient. This was of mutual benefit. The council has more recently carried out the same action with the Annex building, Maurice Bishop House and 280 Mare Street. Any further changes to occupancy by the council will depend on working habits as they evolve. As a result, in the last few years the council has moved out of 100,000 square feet of office space. This is the biggest impact on their carbon footprint they have as an organisation.
- 4.7.19 In relation to maintenance the council is currently negotiating their next corporate maintenance contract. This will be in line with the council's sustainable procurement strategy which places obligations on contractors. The council will now expect there to be consideration given to the lifelong carbon impact of the parts they are replacing. This is a new addition to previous contract expectations. This may be a small impact, but on a day-to-day basis this consideration will shift the culture.
- 4.7.20 It was highlighted that listed buildings can have many constraints that require planning applications, consent, and require specific technically skilled people to achieve improvements and preserve the characteristics of the building.
- 4.7.21 Corporate Property Services also feeds in data to other corporate programmes like Hackney Light and Power to help identify the building suitable for PVs on the roof.
- 4.7.22 The Council works closely with neighbouring boroughs and has a working relationship with SITFA. This allows the council to understand the national picture and keep up to date with changes.
- 4.7.23 The next step is to secure capacity in Corporate Property Services to ensure the correct use and focus of the data that allows and enables them to convert it into business cases to identify where their efforts are best targeted. This will identify which asset can deliver savings sooner. Then linking this back to the corporate asset management plan to identify the buildings the council will need to deliver its future policy objectives. From the asset management plan, they can build a long-term strategy which has sustainability at its core.
- 4.8 **Questions, answers, and discussion points – Housing Regeneration**
- (i) **Members commented there is a lot of good work showcased. Members asked if there was learning from other countries who were ahead with their progress to achieve net zero carbon or other parts of the UK to apply to their buildings. Members also made reference to the officer's**

statement about learning from the Kings Crescent phase 1 development and asked if there was more, they could do?

- (ii) **Members referred to retrofitting and the carbon for retrofitting being different to the carbon for a new build. Members asked about the difference in carbon levels for each and the most carbon efficient way of producing new properties.**

In response the Head of Strategic Design from LBH advised in terms of learning from other countries they will take this on board. The officer pointed out there is such an increase in knowledge now and a lot of the guidance available refers to other European examples. The officer highlighted sometimes they have been ahead of the UK. Although in reference to some of the technologies they are on par. For example, when they were implanting air source heat pumps it was difficult to find examples of use for mass housing or examples that had been constructed and were in operation to learn from.

In reference to the difference in carbon for retrofitting and new builds, it is quite difficult to compare the two. The officer highlighted research sources and programmes were being developed to look at the carbon impact of demolition for a new build versus starting from scratch. The aim is to identify if retrofitting existing buildings is carbon beneficial compared to doing a new build. But for this option there are several variables to consider like age of the building, type of construction of the existing building. Pointing out at the last meeting there was a lot of discussion about retrofitting existing buildings. It was also highlighted that starting from scratch brings several advantages too. It is difficult to make a direct comparison of the two because of the nuances depending on the type of building and the new build being completed.

The Interim Director Regeneration from LBH added they have a comparability of carbon costs for retrofit and new builds. The Director highlighted that an estate that has reached the end of its economic life in replacement they may build half or double the number of homes. This is not simple, but they do anticipate a greater place for retrofitting of existing stock as an option going forward.

- (iii) **Members highlighted that in 2019 the council achieved a net increase of 1 social home despite many regeneration projects. The Member expressed a strong view in support of refurbishment as opposed to demolishing to rebuild. The Member also commented that once the emissions are released we cannot do anything to undo them no matter how much they try to do to compensate. Members pointed out the last report advised they would need to see a reduction of almost two thirds of embodied carbon if they are to achieve net zero by 2040. Adding there are several estates in the borough that have not reached the end of their life span.**

In response the Head of Strategic Design from LBH explained that as mentioned previously they are now looking further into retrofitting existing buildings. Kings Crescent is seen as a model for the future despite being an early project. The objective is that the best homes are refurbished and retained and the new home built fit around them. In the officer's view this is a model that may work better as councils look at regeneration in the future.

The Interim Director Regeneration from LBH added it is anticipated there will be more of a hybrid approach in the future.

- (iv) **Cllr Stops Chair of Planning Committee at LBH referred to embodies carbon and timber construction. Pointing out Hackney was the world leader in timber construction of buildings. But acknowledged there has been a setback following the regulation changes made by Government. The Chair of Planning encouraged officers to pursue the use of timber for low carbon construction.**

In response the Head of Strategic Design from LBH explained they do not disagree and was a desire to consider this. Highlighting as more research comes to the fore and regulations become less reactive and more nuanced. The guidance may become based more on technical evidence; then the possibility of CLT may return. But currently as they deliver housing it is difficult and the schemes where they do bring forward timber are generally lower level where the regulations do not apply. The officer explained the council is trying to maximise their assets by building higher. The council is limited but, in the meantime, places like Norway have built the highest timber building to date approximately 12-20 storeys. The lack of timber buildings is not through desire but driven by regulation.

- (v) **Members referred to best practice in relation to communication and engagement with residents. Members asked how they will help to engage and involve residents to develop their understanding about this approach and its contribution to the council's work on net zero. Members commented the high-profile nature of LTNs had taken centre stage when there was a large body of other work related to net zero. Members wanted residents to be engaged and informed about all the work.**

In response the Interim Director Regeneration from LBH agreed this does require lifestyle change. The new homes being built are of good quality and there is a move towards more environmentally friendly heating (heat source pumps) and under floor heating. Making properties more aesthetically pleasing and easier to arrange furniture in a room. The Director explained an education program will need to go with this on how to use the heating system to have a slower warm up and cool down. The move to new energy systems will cut carbon and pollution but electricity is still an expensive fuel. Therefore, this may result in a heavier burden on residents. The Director acknowledged getting the education right would be important. The council is aware they need to improve their communication and education to inform people how to use the equipment more efficiently.

It was reiterated that what will be important is collating and measuring the actual saving from talking to residents as well as having the design savings (predications).

The Director pointed out these homes are also more complicated, and Hackney Council's Housing Services will need to maintain them. The proposal is to have DLO staff involved in the construction of the new homes so they can see how the systems work. The council recognised they need to

embrace the changes and bring their residents and customers on the journey of change.

- (vi) **Members asked if Hackney is considering fostering a collaboration with peer authorities in the house building sector that have similar ambitions and are taking steps to rationalising structural systems.**

In response the Interim Director Regeneration from LBH explained they would like to do more builds like this not just because of the environmental benefits but the quality too. The Director confirmed Hackney works closely with other London boroughs. The Director acknowledged they might need to give some consideration to look beyond their natural partners to other local authorities outside London.

The Head of Strategic Design from LBH explained nationally there is a lot of lobbying to support bringing forward low carbon construction technologies. There is research and they are hoping this research will bring further developments to the regulations. Highlighting in relation to timber build there are tests that show it performs well in a fire as solid timbers chars rather than burns.

- (vii) **Members referred to Kings Crescent estate and asked about the lessons learnt post phases 1 and 2 in respect of the procurement model for the final stages for low carbon construction and the use of timber in the building because the builds will be lower levels.**

In response the Head of Strategic Design from LBH informed the build will be taller than 3-4 storeys. Some 12 storeys so over the 18-meter limit. Therefore, the construction technology in the final phase will be like phase 1 and 2 due to the restrictions and regulation. The officer highlighted there have been lessons learned in small, detailed ways that have been built into the next phase. For example, a different type of public realm. In phase 1 and 2 the court yards were very enclosed and only accessible for the people living around it but not for other people nearby. For the next phases they will be more open and a new public space.

The Interim Director Regeneration from LBH added one area of regulation that had moved on rapidly is building safety. There is a lot of hidden changes in phase 3 and 4 that will be different to phase 1 and 2. The building will look similar but underneath they will be constructed differently and perform differently. The building industry tries to keep up with the changes, but it is like a oil tanker with a lag between regulation to what happens on the ground.

4.9 **Questions, answers, and discussion points – Corporate Property Services**

- (i) **Members commented the upskilling of the internal team will be essential in delivery of this agenda. Members suggested the cost could be shared or resources pooled with their neighbouring boroughs and asked if this was being considered or practical to explore? Members agreed that currently the recruitment environment was challenging.**

In response the Director Strategic Property Services from LBH explained in relation to pooling resources the key resource is knowledge. They currently share knowledge and SITFA is a good in expensive resources for this and has a national profile. Also giving access to information about a full mix of corporate buildings.

In relation to measuring the value from retrofitting and carbon impact this is currently difficult due to the limited evidence base. The Director pointed out Central Government's focus has been on housing not on corporate property. Therefore, they are building their own data which is shared with other colleagues. It is difficult to make direct comparisons because of the mix of assets they all have but there will be themes they can learn from.

- (ii) **Members referred to rental properties like Keltan house and asked if the council insists the occupants have net zero targets. If they do, how is this being monitored to ensure the targets are achieved.**
- (iii) **Members highlighted the Council is undertaking audits but there is no government funding to support this work. This brings some element of risk in relation to the investment required to ensure the building are energy efficient and achieve net zero carbon. Members pointed out in the past councils have had to sell assets due to insufficient funds. Members asked in terms of funding and finances for this work what is the current position? Members recognised the council could lease out properties but queried if this sufficiently helped with the expenditure.**

In response the Director Strategic Property Services from LBH highlighted the restoration of the Town Hall had given the Town Hall a profile as a key community asset. This refurbishment was fundamental to enabling the council to rationalize their occupancy estate.

In relation to controlling their tenant, when a building is leased the building is largely under the control of the tenant. As a landlord the council does retain certain responsibilities e.g., the fabric of the building – heating, walls, roofs etc.

The council has many commercial and VCS properties (300-400 buildings) that range in variety. They have buildings like Principal Place which is a state-of-the-art headquarters for Amazon to laundrettes in the HRA. The Director explained it is not the tenant's responsibility to replace and modernize the heating in buildings this would be the council's responsibility. The asset management planning is a key resource to understanding and identifying what they have and what the council needs to carry out as a minimum. With this information the council can start to cost analyse and establish where they need to make spend commitments at the earliest point. All work is carried out based on urgency and relative urgency. Health and safety are about risk. In terms of climate and compliance toward their objectives for net zero carbon. The considerations will be about where they can make the most achievements fast with the funding they have.

The Director advised currently it was difficult to give a definitive answer in terms of the finances. The Director explained they are doing the analysis on data and doing this systematically and thoroughly. For example, a building

like Stoke Newington Town Hall has 56 separate roofs which all need replacing and are likely to contain asbestos. This is in addition to the damp in the basement, the quality and conditions of the walls, brick work outside, masonry and the windows. All these needs updating. Requiring approximately £10-20 million spent on one building. This will require careful consideration. The Council would not want to sell Stoke Newington Town Hall due to its community significance. Therefore, this needs a sustainable plan, and the council will need to work with other parties who can help to shoulder some of the burden like they did with Keltan House. Securing a decent rental income could help to support the ongoing maintenance costs of the building and justify upfront capital expenditure to pay back over time. Although this is a good approach for big buildings it may not necessarily work for smaller building assets.

(iv) **Members referred to Stoke Newington Library and asked if any of the roof repair works being carried out will work towards this building being net zero carbon and more sustainable considering the works undertaken are emergency works?**

(v) In response the Director Strategic Property Services from LBH explained the Stoke Newington Library just as sensitive in planning terms as the rest of the Stoke Newington complex. It is all subject to the same listed building status. Any works carried out on the library required a listed building application. The Director confirmed the roof repair work is urgent and the council is currently drawing up a programme of works. This links to the manifesto commitment to draft a programme of works and this is progressing. The changes and upgrades to Stoke Newington Town Hall will follow a similar route to the refurbishment of the Town Hall (this was a listed building too). The Director informed the aim will be to make it as sustainable as possible. The council will do as much as it can taking into consideration the planning constraints of a listed building.

The Director highlighted the library will not be let out for commercial use but retained for the people of Hackney and will be looked after and refurbished in a sensitive way.

(vi) **Members referred to the presentation and highlighted it mentions a reduction in occupation. Members asked how this is likely to affect employees and employers having a permanent base for their work. Is it anticipated that more employees would work from home in the future years? Is there any consideration on the impact of this because this will mean a very different way of working? Members pointed out there are a lot of benefits that come from working in a team, face to face with colleagues and having that support.**

(vii) In response the Director Strategic Property Services from LBH explained when the council exited Keltan House and 280 Mare Street the council had more space than was required. A ratio of 1 desk per person. They never filled all the buildings at any one time. In discussions and looking at the most aggressive hot desking strategies of 6 desks for every 10 people. The Council decided to apply 85% capacity. That is 8.5 desks per 10 people. After implementing this strategy, they still have excess desk space. This has been incrementally reduced. Following the pandemic, a strategic group has

been set up to regularly review the council's working pattern. Staff attitudes have changed dramatically now. Over the last 2 years the council has been running regular working groups and monitoring sessions with a range of different staff to gauge and understand workforce needs. The council has found that staff have been so brave and open to talk about their working requirements from disabled staff to physically able staff. This is enabling the council to build a big picture of how everyone uses the buildings and want to use the buildings. The council's aim is not just to reduce the number of buildings. There will be a lot of work to move towards net zero, but the council needs to remain competitive, that means having a quality offer of office space for staff and have attractive workplaces.

5 Electric Charging Infrastructure

- 5.1 The Chair referred to page 52 in the agenda welcomed to the meeting Lucja Paulinska Head of Hackney Light and Power, Tyler Linton, Group Engineer - Sustainable Transport and Engagement and Cllr Mete Coban, Cabinet Member for Energy, Waste, Transport and Public Realm from London Borough of Hackney.
- 5.2 The Chair explained the purpose of the meeting was to review the electrical charging infrastructure available and consider the council's plans to extend the network of charging points in the borough
- 5.3 The Cabinet Member for Energy, Waste, Transport and Public Realm commenced the presentation for this item and made the following main points:
 - 5.3.1 The electric charging infrastructure is important piece of work towards the council achieving their net zero carbon ambitions.
 - 5.3.2 The Cabinet member acknowledged the price of electric vehicles was currently too expensive for most Hackney residents. However, the Council wants to have the correct infrastructure in place for when residents are able to make that switch to an electric vehicle.
 - 5.3.3 There is collaborative work taking place between the Energy Team, Hackney Light and Power and the Streetscene Team. The collaboration between the teams makes this possible.
 - 5.3.4 The council is here to talk about their ambitious plans around electric vehicle charging infrastructure and highlighted the big ambition to have 3000 charging points by 2030. Pointing out this will be the largest infrastructure roll out of any local authority. Therefore it will important for the council to ensure they place the charging points in locations that creates demands across the borough. Particularly for residents living on council estates.
 - 5.3.5 As part of Hackney's sustainable and emergency transport plan their ambition is to encourage people to walk, cycle and take public transport where necessary. The Council is not encouraging a complete transition from petrol/diesel cars to electric vehicles. But where people do need to drive the preference would be for electric vehicles.

- 5.3.6 It was highlighted the electric vehicles pollute in different ways such as bioware and the production of batteries. Therefore, it remains Council policy remains to encourage more walking, cycling to tackle air pollution in the borough.
- 5.4 The Group Engineer Sustainable Transport and Engagement continued the presentation and made the following main points:
- 5.4.1 Referred to page 53 in the agenda and highlighted the council is interested in EV charge points because it forms part of the Council's response to climate emergency and has the potential for major carbon savings as long as the electricity supply to the charge points is from clean and renewable sources.
- 5.4.2 This also links to the areas of focus by Government and Cop 26. It has potential in terms of mitigating carbon emissions by encouraging the switch to EV vehicles.
- 5.4.3 The officer reiterated it is not about switching all vehicles to electric but creating the environment that supports people to switch to when they want to switch vehicles. But the Council's existing objective to achieve an overall reduction of vehicles remains the top priority.
- 5.4.4 By the council getting involved in the electric vehicle charging point marketplace is to have some influence and to make sure the priority remains at the top of the agenda.
- 5.4.5 The Council also wants residents to access the best prices at EV charging points. Good prices have been available for people charging their vehicles at home, but it is recognised that not all inner London residents will have access to off street charging using their home tariff. Therefore, the aim is to provide equity and access to cheaper tariff.
- 5.4.6 The Government has announced the end of combustion engine vehicles (petrol and diesel) by 2030.
- 5.4.7 The council has a duty to ensure that residents who rely on a vehicle for work (economically) whether that is an internal market after 2030 for combustion engines or EV have access to charge points as a service too.
- 5.4.8 The council wants to influence the locations and speed of deployment to achieve these objectives and ensure residents have good services and access to good prices.
- 5.4.9 The officer highlighted that it may appear that electric vehicles are becoming mainstream but wanted to point out this is still a very new market that is rapidly changing and there are new suppliers entering the market regularly.
- 5.4.10 It was highlighted that Hackney's first charge point was installed in 2010 by 2015 Hackney had 15 publicly available charge points. The council executive aims to make EV point available within 500 meters for 80% of Hackney residents by 2022. The council has exceeded this target. This target has shifted to 100% of residents by 2025. The officer confirmed the current roll out program is on track to achieve this.

- 5.4.11 The installation of EV charging points has resulted in a huge transformation change to Hackney streets.
- 5.4.12 A key challenge faced is that residents and consumers will want stability and predictability. One of the barriers for people switching to electric is the anxiety about the charging infrastructure. This anxiety is linked to availability and understanding about the infrastructure. There is also diversity in the market space as well as different technologies. This will require getting the balance right between being agile, promoting and being respectful of the desire for stability and predictability over the medium term.
- 5.4.13 It is acknowledged that just building EV points will not (on its own) encourage people to switch. It can be a barrier and cause second thought, but it doesn't mean that the visibility of EV points will encourage people to switch. There will need to be suite of mechanisms and measures. This is under consideration.
- 5.4.14 The council understands consumers have a desire for stability and predictability, whilst also a different set of needs. The council's goal through procurement is to achieve a good mix of offers and charging options ideally under the Hackney Light and Power brand. Thus, having a trusted source and a single point to obtain information. Therefore, the council has implemented mix of chargers.
- 5.4.15 The current number of commissioned and live charge points were outlined on page 54 of the agenda. The officer highlighted there are 3 different types.
- 5.4.16 The difference with electric charging compared to traditional vehicle energy source (petrol / diesel) is that that you pay a different price based on how fast your vehicle fills up. For electric you pay more for a rapid charge. There are currently 11 rapid chargers in the borough. These tend to be on TfL Road networks and other main roads. These provide a charge in approximately 30 minutes. These can be found in petrol stations. Currently this volume of charge points would not be enough to charge a large proportion of electric vehicles on the road per day.
- 5.4.17 If the council does nothing it is likely that people would choose this option in the future and ultra-rapid charge.
- 5.4.18 In the future mix of chargers, the rapid charger would still be useful for larger battery vehicles, vehicles for work, taxis, commercial vans etc. will want the convenience of a fast charge.
- 5.4.19 Electric vehicles are more expensive to purchase but mainly (depending on battery type and weight of vehicle) cheaper to run and fuel.
- 5.4.20 The most expensive rapid charger in London charges £0.50 per kilowatt per hour. The chargers in Hackney cost £0.30-£0.35 per kilowatt per hour. This roughly equates to £8+ per hundred miles. Roughly 8p per mile. Petrol / diesel is estimated to cost approximately £10-£11 per 100 miles.
- 5.4.21 If you are paying £0.50 per kilowatt hour this can get slightly more expensive than a petrol or diesel car. From £0.40 per kilowatt hour is when electric vehicles become more expensive than a petrol / diesel vehicle.

- 5.4.22 The second type of charger is a fast speed. There are 22 of these types in the borough. The Council is planning to commission 20 more. The speed of charge for these is around 2-4 hours. They are slightly cheaper per pence per kilowatt hour.
- 5.4.23 The 20 new chargers are not being built on pavements but on carriageway buildouts. The current generation of technology requires a feeder pillar like a utility pillar that goes on the pavement. The Council is hoping future technology will address this. The council's procurement expresses a desire to have minimum street furniture on the pavement.
- 5.4.24 The users of fast chargers would be car clubs, visitors such as trades people. It was explained that fast charge points were the initial types of charge points stalled in London.
- 5.4.25 The council has recently taken part in a small trial related to fast chargers under the smart option called agile streets. 30 smart chargers were installed to give the option of setting the time and day you want your vehicle to charge. This can give you an overnight rate which would be a better rate. The trial was due to end in March 2022. It was pointed out this could even the load on the electricity network and make use of off-peak times.
- 5.4.26 The slowest chargers are slow chargers on residential streets. These are called lamp column chargers. This technology has plugs installed in lamp columns. This is good because this means there will be no additional street furniture on the pavements. The charger time is 8-10 hours. In other words, an overnight charge. This is the best tariff. This will provide an option to residents that is like a home charger.
- 5.4.27 These chargers will result in less turnover than the other options because users will stay longer in the bays. This would mean they need more of these chargers.
- 5.4.28 In Hackney there are approximately 250 sites currently. The council estimates they will need more to encourage the mass adoption or to meet demand.
- 5.4.29 The Council commissioned a study that completed in 2020. This estimates to keep up with demand they would need 3000 charge points by 2040. This also assumes a reduction in car ownership.
- 5.4.30 The projections for EV car ownership is outlined on page 53 in the agenda.
- 5.4.31 The council is conscious that if they follow demand and anxieties around charge points. It would be a better idea to lead the demand and make sure there is a better level of service to encourage and give confidence to consumers and residents to make the switch.
- 5.4.32 In relation to publicly available charger points and to meet the target of 3000 charge points they want to front load installation. This is the most ambitious plan for a local authority. The council hopes to get good quality tenders, good prices, terms and conditions for residents from the market.

- 5.4.33 The Council issued a tender and they are currently evaluating the submissions. They are scheduled to make a recommendation in the new year to Cabinet Procurement Committee for decision.
- 5.4.34 The contract will not be covered by council funds. The council sees this as an opportunity for operators to invest their own capita. The model would be an operator capital investment with upfront investment and then to run the sites on the concession contract. Allowing them to recoup their investments. The Council would be leasing them the space on the highway. The contracts are expected to be long contracts in the region of 15 years. There will be 4 different contracts covering each charger type and the council's own fleet of vehicles.
- 5.4.35 Assuming a successful procurement the first step would be to work with the contractor in partnership to devise and approve a detailed network plan for specific locations. The criteria for locations is outlined in the agenda on page 64.
- 5.4.36 Currently council estates are under served. It is also planned to have a consultation and engagement plan with the operator as part of developing the network plan.
- 5.4.37 It is anticipated that the procurement process will secure the best rates, latest technology and will make provision for upgrades during the life of the contract.
- 5.4.38 In the procurement specification they are asking for the energy to be from a renewable source so that they can meet the council's climate and net zero targets.

5.5 Question, Answers and Discussions

- (i) The Chair of Planning Committee in attendance at the meeting referred to the scale of the infrastructure needed and highlighted there were 40,000 vehicles and only 3000 charging points. Why 3000?**
- (ii) Hackney has very low car ownership and high bus use. The Chair of Planning Committee raised concern about public realm and the cluttering of street furniture sharing the pavements with current public realm street furniture. The Chair of Planning Committee was concerned about the space the new electric charging infrastructure would be taking up on the current pathways. The Chair of Planning Committee urged for this to be done well.**
- (iii) Members referred to the use of induction pads in the road. The Member explained that the car drives over the pad and this requires no cabling. The Member urged officers to explore this option too.**
- (iv) Members pointed out there are 4 charging points in Clapton but not all of them work. Some require smart cables which cost £250 to buy to use the EV chargers. This cost / outlay may mean the charge points are not accessible to all.**
- (v) Members asked for more information about the council's work to create designated parking bays by lamp column chargers.**

- (vi) Members suggested officers set clear guidelines and aims not to clutter the pavements. Members asked for existing street furniture to be used for electric charging infrastructure where possible. Members also suggested the council should insist on having buildouts if they are building charging points. Members pointed out Hackney borough is very dense. Therefore, the new electric charging infrastructure should be built on the carriage ways.**
- (vii) Members commented that the officer referred to having electric charging points on estates. But currently charging points are on the streets. Members asked about the council's plans to put them on estates. Members asked if there would be a mix of chargers on estates. Members reiterated the point about not positioning the charging street furniture on the pavements.**
- (viii) Members referred to parking and the ambitions of the council to be a leader in this sphere. Members raised concern about residents from other boroughs coming into Hackney to use the charging points because electric cars do not need a permit to park. Therefore, this might encourage electric car owners from other boroughs to park and charge their car in Hackney.**
- (ix) Members wanted reassurance the council would continue to promote their no car policy and encourage use of public transport in addition to lobbying the Mayor of London not to cut bus routes and central government to adequately fund TfL. Members asked for public transport use to be prioritized over all the other forms of transportation.**

In response the Cabinet Member for Energy, Waste, Transport and Public Realm advised that he and the Mayor of Hackney were in discussions with the Deputy Mayor for Transport in the GLA about transport in Hackney borough and the difficulties being experiencing by residents following the cuts to bus services. It was highlighted that last year Hackney experienced frequency cuts on 25 different routes. It was acknowledged although Hackney does have the overground service many residents depend on the buses in Hackney and that this is the main form of transport to get to work. Particularly for the residents on low income or who may work early shift patterns. The Cabinet Member advised these concerns continue to be raised with TfL.

It was confirmed public transport use and increasing cycling will remain the priority for Hackney Council.

Regarding the question about council estates the tender process is currently underway and once the supplier has been selected there is an engagement plan that talks about the roll out of electric charging points. The desire is to see all council estates with the same access to electric charging points like street properties.

In response to the concerns raised about residents from outside the borough using Hackney parking bays. The Cabinet Member advised the council is not promoting free parking to non-Hackney residents. There was a consultation,

and this has now closed. Streetscene are working with parking services to review the comments.

The Cabinet Member for Energy, Waste, Transport and Public Realm acknowledged receipt of comments about concerns related to permits. The points raised are being considered.

In response to having electric charging parking bays. This is part of the council's parking enforcement plan. They will be looking to convert some of the parking bay to designated electric charging spaces.

Overall, in relation to the many points raised about public realm and the footways the Council agrees. They do not want the public realm cluttered and scrutiny of the council's proposals is welcomed alongside any recommendations. The Cabinet Member confirmed the council is explaining how they can create space within the carriageways to make the infrastructure available.

In response to the query about 3000 charging points and why this figure was selected. The Cabinet Member explained there are several local authorities across the country that have been struggling to meet the demands for electric charging point infrastructure. This is because they are not providing the market with certainty in terms of the number of electric charging points to be installed. With Hackney stating a figure it has curated interest that will enable the council to meet the demand that they need to deliver. Secondly the figure selected is based on the projections of the number of vehicles they expect to see in the borough by 2041.

The Cabinet Member reiterated it is not their aim to see electric vehicles replace the current number of vehicles in Hackney. The Cabinet Member pointed out the council's wider transport policy - from low traffic neighbourhood schemes (LTNs) to schools' streets programme and the cycling infrastructure programme - works with this policy objective and will grow into a more ambitious programme of priorities in the new administration.

The Group Engineer - Sustainable Transport and Engagement from LBH added in relation to the theme around pavement obstructions the Council does have a pavement hierarchy embedded in the Council's transport strategy. Pedestrians are at the top of the movement hierarchy. This means that anything the council does needs to consider putting pedestrians first.

Most electric charging points proposed would be of the slow residential type. In the procurement they have made it clear they are looking for very little impact or zero impact on the pedestrian environment e.g., existing lamp columns. The 3000 figure was derived from a study base on the number of projected vehicles using different scenarios to meet the needs of 30,000 electric vehicles. The scenarios considered all types of chargers. The council has chosen the option that give more chargers overall but because they are the slower types, this will charge 1 or 2 vehicles maximum a day. This should have less impact on the urban environment because they are slow and small.

In response to future proofing the options in relation to technology advancement i.e., induction pads. The officer explained there is nothing in their

procurement that excludes any type of future technology or prohibits a bidder from suggesting the induction pad technology. In the tender they are asking for an indication of their approach to future upgrades to enable new technology to be adopted as it becomes available. Currently it is anticipated that induction pads are not economically viable in the market. The Council is aiming to have a flexible model that allows them to bring in new technology during the life of the contract or negotiate a contract length that allows them to upgrade to future technology.

The officer explained the council started to see a lot of cables being trailed across the pavement. Although the council can enforce against trailing cables across the pavement the most pragmatic way would be to provide a solution to prevent that type of behaviour.

This aims to balance the impact of the future infrastructure which the council has tried to minimise through the contract specifications and providing a solution to potentially 30,000 vehicles in the borough.

- (x) Members commented the biggest cost for Hackney residents is the cost of electric vehicles. The average cost is approximately £44,000 from new. Members asked is there anything that can be done to make them more accessible for people. Members supported the previous comments about looking at transport holistically and considering what can be done to increase bus services in the borough. Members urged the council to press TfL more in terms of diverting funds from bigger vanity projects like the sliver town tunnel, old street roundabout etc. to focus on maintaining bus services because they do not have tube services in the borough.**
- (xi) Members referred to the statement that electricity will be from renewable sources. Members acknowledged that electric vehicles will be far less polluting than petrol or diesel vehicles but pointed out electricity comes from fossil fuels and the batteries have lithium and this is mined in a concerning way by children in Africa. Members asked how the council will aim to ensure that their fleet vehicle battery components come from ethical sources and the electricity comes from renewable sources?**

In response the Group Engineer - Sustainable Transport and Engagement from LBH agreed the upfront cost for an electric vehicle is a barrier. The officer pointed out there are some city sized cars on the market that come in at a lower cost to the figure quoted by Members. But acknowledge that commercial vehicles are still quite expensive and out of reach for many people who rely on commercial vehicles.

The projections show that in 2030 and as petrol and diesel car sales draws to a close. There should be a greater choice and variety of electric vehicles on the market. The Council is trying to be ready for this rather than being behind the curve to create the environment where people can make that choice.

In relation to the life cycle of any procurement. With renewable energy in the procurement process they will be able to assess whether the charge point operators are guaranteeing renewable energy. In relation to guaranteeing the provenance of batteries all procurement processes are subject to the Council's

sustainable procurement policy. If the council is buying electric vehicles this should feature in that procurement process.

In relation to influencing the private car manufacturing market that is something to take away and consider.

The Cabinet Member for Energy, Waste, Transport and Public Realm from LBH added he was talking to the fleet manger about electric refuse vehicles. The Cabinet Member Informed Members of the electric fleet vehicle cost of £450,000 compared to a non-electric vehicle cost of £190,000. Pointing out the cost difference is significant.

The Cabinet Member pointed out as the technology is new and the supply is very limited the cost is high and out of reach for many people in Hackney.

Therefore, electric vehicles are not exempt from the low traffic neighbourhood schemes because this could be perceived as disadvantaging people who need to drive that are on lower incomes.

The Cabinet Member reiterated the Council is trying to control and curate in the areas they are in control of; so that when people make the switch the infrastructure is there to make the transition.

In relation to the points about the bus routes in the borough, the Cabinet Member urged for all Councillors to work collectively to lobby about this issue. The Council recognises the connectivity issues particularly in the east of the borough. The Cabinet Member pointed out venue owners like HereEast have their own electric bus that runs from Westfield to the campus due to the limited transport options in that part of the borough.

The Council has presented an option of diverting some Section 106 funding to subsidise the bus services in locations that need better transport links. They are awaiting guidance. It is estimated that 87% of people either take the bus, cycle or walk in the borough. The Cabinet Member acknowledged they need to keep raising these points at every platform possible.

- (xii) Members asked what level of consultation was carried out for the initial spaces implemented in 2021. Members commented it was important to carry members of the public with them when making changes. Members commented they are aware there has been some push back from residents. Members wanted to know how resident views were being incorporated.**
- (xiii) Members asked if there were any statistics on the residents' requests for both on and off estates?**
- (xiv) Members asked if there have been steps taken to analyse the council's revenue share? Members suggested an analysis of revenue was carried out to ensure they have sufficient levels of staff. Members pointed out this could increase the workload of staff and they wanted assurance this would not result in a detrimental impact on staff in the long term.**

- (xv) **Members referred to the 1500 spaces in the next phase and asked if there would be dual use for community groups e.g., disabled residents. Members were concerned there may be a lag in uptake and demand initially and that there could be empty spaces.**

In response the Cabinet Member for Energy, Waste, Transport, and Public Realm from LBH explained in relation to the location of charging points. This was in response to demand and, they needed to create demand. Therefore, they need to install charging points in places to encourage the switch.

The Council is aiming to have a very strong engagement plan with the supplier. They will try to make sure its consultative. This desire has been feedback to the supplier. Engagement will allow a lot of the questions and concerns related to the public realm to be answered. The council recognises it's important to understand the impact that this is having on the streets and the communities when they are rolling out the infrastructure.

The Chair made the following points at the end of the discussion. At the meeting there were strong views expressed about not cluttering the pavements, continuing funding for buses and that electric car charging points will become more significant as petrol and diesel cars stop production and people switch to electric vehicles.

6 Minutes of the Previous Meeting

- 6.1 The minutes of the previous meeting held on 26th October 2021 in the agenda for approval.
- 6.2 The minutes of the previous meetings were agreed.

RESOLVED:	Minutes were approved
------------------	-----------------------

7 Living in Hackney Scrutiny Commission- 2021/2022 Work Programme

- 7.1 The Chair referred to the work programme and commented it was as set out for the remaining meetings of the municipal year.
- 7.2 The next meeting (January 2022) will cover fire safety related to housing stock and the private sector housing licensing scheme.
- 7.3 The February 2022 meeting will be a joint meeting with CYP scrutiny commission covering care leavers and housing.

8 Any Other Business

- 8.1 None.

Duration of the meeting: 7.00 - 9.45 pm

