

Planning and Building Control Service
Neighbourhoods & Housing Directorate
London Borough of Hackney
2 Hillman Street
London E8 1FB

24th November 2020

Planning Decisions Unit
Greater London Authority
City Hall
The Queen's Walk
More London
London SE1 2AA

Dear Sir/Madam,

Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended); Greater London Authority Act 1999 and 2007; Town and Country Planning (Mayor of London) Order 2008

Site: *Land known as Bishopsgate Goods Yard including Braithwaite Street as bounded by Shoreditch High Street, Bethnal Green Road, Sclater Street, Brick Lane, Wheeler Street, Commercial Street and Quaker Street within the London Boroughs of Hackney and Tower Hamlets, London, E1*

Proposal:

2014/2425:

An OUTLINE application for the comprehensive mixed use redevelopment of the site comprising:

- *Residential (Class C3) comprising up to 500 residential units;*
- *Business Use (Class B1) – up to 130,940 m2 (GIA);*
- *Hotel (Class C1) – up to 11,013 m2 (GIA)*
- *Retail, financial and professional services, restaurants and cafes and hot food takeaways (Class A1, A2, A3 and A5) – up to 18,390 m2 (GIA) of which only 3,678 m2 (GIA) can be used as Class A5;*
- *Non-residential Institutions (Class D1) / Assembly and Leisure (Class D2) – up to 6,363 m2 (GIA);*
- *Public conveniences (sui generis) – up to 298 m2 (GIA);*
- *Basement, ancillary and plant space – up to 21,216 m2 (GIA);*
- *Formation of new pedestrian and vehicular access; means of access and circulation and car parking within the site; and*

- *Provision of new public open space and landscaping.*

The application proposes a total of 10 buildings that range in height, with the highest being 142.4m AOD and the lowest being 19.0m AOD.

With all matters reserved save that FULL DETAILS for Plot 2 are submitted for alterations to, and the partial removal of, existing structures on the site and the erection of a building for office (Class B1) and retail use (Class A1, A2, A3, A5) comprising a part 17 / part 29 storey building; and Plot 7 A, B, C and D comprising the use of the ground level of the Braithwaite Viaduct for retail and food and drink uses (A1, A2, A3, A5) and works to and use of the Oriel and adjoining structures for retail and food and drink uses (A1, A2, A3, A5).

For that part of the site within LB Hackney, the proposed development comprises the following mix of uses:

- *Up to 109,599 m2 (GIA) of Business Use (Class B1);*
- *Up to 4,509 m2 (GIA) of Retail Use (Class A1, A2, A3 and A5), of which only 902 m2 (GIA) can be used for hot food takeaways (Class A5);*
- *Up to 2,254 m2 (GIA) of Class D1 / D2 use;*
- *Up to 12,752 m2 (GIA) of ancillary and plant space.*

2014/2427:

Restoration and repair of the existing Grade II listed oriel and gates and adjoining historic structures to provide a principal western pedestrian gateway into the scheme and to accommodate proposed Class A1/A2/A3/A5/ use into a number of the existing arches at ground floor. Part removal of a section of adjoining structures proposed to provide improved public realm and pedestrian access into the site.

I am writing in relation to the above applications where the Mayor of London issued a decision to act as the Local Planning Authority pursuant to article 7 of the Town and Country Planning (Mayor of London) Order 2008.

The comments of the London Borough of Hackney on the applications were presented to members of the Planning Sub Committee on 16/11/2020. Members resolved to:

Support the development in principle but object to the proposal on design and heritage grounds.

The individual recommendations voted in favour of by members were as follows:

Recommendation A (2014/2425)

1. Support the principle of the development and its general public benefits
2. The bulk and massing of Plot 1 in both the maximum and minimum parameters is considered excessive and would not be mitigated by the illustrative approaches proposed in the design and access statement or the submitted design code. The proposals would have a harmful impact upon its immediate

and wider heritage setting. The proposal at this part of the site would therefore be contrary to NPPF Para 127, The London Plan 2016 Policy 7.7, New London Plan 2019 Policy D8 and Policy LP1 and LP3 of the Hackney Local Plan 2033

3. The design of the proposed building at Plot 2, by virtue of its wide, bulky massing and large cantilevered prow, is such that it would have a harmful impact upon its immediate and wider heritage setting including the listed Oriel Gateway. The proposed approach to wind mitigation is considered to detract from the design of the building and exacerbate its harmful impacts. The proposed colour scheme is considered to be visually intrusive in this context. The tree planting strategy at the base of this building is also considered inappropriate and would harm the setting of the listed Oriel Gateway and may also impact upon the structure of the listed building. The proposal at this part of the site would therefore be contrary to NPPF Para 127, The London Plan 2016 Policy 7.7, New London Plan 2019 Policy D8 and Policy LP1, LP3 and LP51 of the Hackney Local Plan 2033.
4. The massing of Plot 3 in the maximum parameter, is considered excessive and would have a harmful impact upon the wider heritage setting. The relationship with the street edge on Quaker Street is also considered to be unsatisfactory at both the minimum and maximum parameters. The proposal at this part of the site would therefore be contrary to NPPF Para 127, The London Plan 2016 Policy 7.7, New London Plan 2019 Policy D8 and Policy LP1 and LP3 of the Hackney Local Plan 2033.
5. The proposed development at Plot 7A (the Oriel Gate) is harmful to the significance of the listed building and there is no clear and convincing justification for the aspects of the harm discussed at Paragraph 6.2.13 above. The proposed development is therefore contrary to London Plan Policy 7.4 Local Character, Policy 7.6 Architecture, Policy 7.7 Location and Design of Tall and Large Buildings and Policy 7.8 Heritage Assets and Archaeology; and Local Plan Policies LP1 Design Quality and Local Character Parts A and B and LP3 Designated Heritage Assets Parts C and E and LP5 Strategic and Local Views Part D. The proposed development is contrary to NPPF Paragraph 194 and Section 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.

Recommendation B (2014/2427)

The London Borough of Hackney OBJECTS to the proposed works in the Listed Building Consent application for the reasons discussed at Paragraph 6.2.13 above. The proposed development is therefore contrary to London Plan Policy 7.4 Local Character, Policy 7.6 Architecture, Policy 7.7 Location and Design of Tall and Large Buildings and Policy 7.8 Heritage Assets and Archaeology; and Local Plan Policies LP1 Design Quality and Local Character Parts A and B and LP3 Designated Heritage Assets Parts C and E and LP5 Strategic and Local Views Part D. The proposed development is contrary to NPPF Paragraphs 194 and Section 16 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.

Recommendation C (2014/2425 & 2014/2427)

Should the Greater London Authority be minded to grant approval for the proposed development, the matters set out in the addendum to the officer's report should form the subject of conditions and/or a legal agreement.

Accordingly, the following documents are attached with this letter:

- i) A copy of the report to the borough's Planning Sub-Committee on the planning applications, which was prepared by the Case Officer;
- ii) A copy of the addendum to the officer's report;
- iii) Appendix A to the officer's report ('Gazetteer of Heritage Assets')
- iv) Appendix B to the officer's report ('Assessment of Impacts on Wider Setting')
- v) List of Conditions and Legal Agreement Heads of Term sought by Recommendation C.

The London Borough of Hackney requests that the above matters, and the full content of the officer's report, appendices and addendum, be taken into consideration when a decision on the applications is made.

If you have any queries related to the above, [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] [REDACTED]

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]
Head of Planning and Building Control