



Planning and Transportation Committee

ADDENDUM 2

Date: TUESDAY, 16 NOVEMBER 2021
Time: 10.30 am
Venue: LIVERY HALL - GUILDHALL

4. **115-123 HOUNDSDITCH LONDON EC3A 7BU**
Report of the Chief Planning Officer and Development Director.

For Decision
(Pages 3 - 10)

Item received too late for circulation in conjunction with the Agenda.

John Barradell
Town Clerk and Chief Executive

This page is intentionally left blank

Planning & Transportation Committee – 16 November 2021
Addendum 2 for Agenda item 4.

Planning application 21/00622/FULEIA: 115 - 123 Houndsditch, London, EC3A 7BU

Letters of Representation

1. One additional letter of representation has been received in respect of this application.
2. Mr Fred Rodgers has submitted an objection to the proposals on 15 November 2021.

Representations	
Fred Rodgers, dated 15.11.2021	<p>Objection</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. In paragraph 106, the incorrect years are stated.2. The per square meter comparison is misleading. Unlike the estimated embedded carbon, the estimated operating emissions aren't stated as kg CO2 per square metre, which confuses matters. The Building is nearly five times larger than the existing ones. This means that the graph in paragraph 338 is completely misleading in failing to compare estimated emissions on a total, rather than a square metre, basis. The applicant should be required to submit a graph showing (i) the total estimated operating emissions of the existing buildings through to 2060; (ii) the total estimated operating emissions of the existing buildings as extended and the total estimated additional embedded carbon also through to 2060; and (iii) the total estimated operating emissions and the total estimated embedded carbon of the Building again through to 2060.3. If developers invested the funds required to meet the relevant UGF in enhancing biodiversity in the City Corporation's public open spaces and City Gardens, instead of on site, there could be a win win situation. Diverting the annual maintenance costs that maintaining the UGF would entail to provide more resources for the City Gardens team would be even better.

	<p>4. All plant should be accommodated in the basement, allowing for the installation of biodiverse roofs.</p> <p>Officer response to comments:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. This has been corrected. 2. The proposed overall whole life-cycle carbon strategy reflects the holistic approach of the application to reduce both embodied and operational carbon emissions as much as possible, demonstrating that London Plan targets and benchmarks are exceeded, and therefore policies have been met. The graph in paragraph 338 therefore does not include the implication of the size of development. The estimated operating emissions both for the existing and the proposed building are shown kg CO2 per square metre per year and overall (accounting for the floorspace of the existing and for the proposed floorspace) per year. 3. It is considered important that building occupants have direct access to external spaces with planting from their building to improve well-being. Urban greening also contributes positively to rainwater attenuation and cooling of the building and to the microclimate around the site. It will contribute positively to biodiversity and the creation of biodiversity corridors across the city. 4. The building's air source heat pumps and other plant have to be located somewhere where the extensive ventilation / air requirements can be provided for them to work which is at roof level.
--	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

3. Correspondence has been received from Mr Jason Pritchard CC, Ward Member for Portsoken.
4. Following the representation from Vicky Stewart dated 28/10/2021 included in the background papers to the main report, Mr Pritchard requested a copy of Officer's response to her query on whether the loss of light is accumulative, and, if this proposal is built, will the 20% threshold remain the same?
5. Following receipt of the Officer's response, Mr Pritchard asked for details of how past developments (assumed completed developments) are factored into decisions, and for guidance on cumulative impacts. It was explained that past (completed) developments are included within the existing baseline and the

percentage change is calculated from that baseline, as per the BRE Guidelines. The applicant has assessed how the proposed development would impact the nearby residents, by factoring in the existing buildings and past (completed) developments as the 'baseline' and the new and recently approved buildings to assess the cumulative impact of loss of light over the years. The assessments solely focus on the existing situation of the impact to residential windows vs how the proposed development would impact the residential windows factoring in new and recently approved buildings.

6. Mr Pritchard responded commenting that 'the planning department is taking the view that the baseline is the existing buildings and have not included the loss of light from previous schemes therefore failing to take on the board the cumulative impact that multiple nearby developments have had on the estate over a number of years.' He has requested that the committee delay making a decision on this scheme until a further report has been produced, noting that he is concerned that if the committee supports this application before resolving the matter of the cumulative impact it will be acting beyond its powers and could leave itself open to a legal challenge.
7. Local Plan policy DM10.7 seeks to resist development which would reduce noticeably the daylight and sunlight available to nearby dwellings and open spaces to unacceptable levels, taking account of the Building Research Establishment's guidelines. As set out in paragraph 386 of the Report, the supporting text for Local Plan policy DM10.7 states that when considering proposed changes to existing lighting levels, the City Corporation will take into account the cumulative effect of development proposals. For the purposes of carrying out daylight and sunlight assessments under BRE, cumulative assessments are those developments with full planning permission, a resolution to grant consent, have been submitted but not yet determined, or potential future applications (none of which will have been completed). Previous completed developments form part of the assessment 'baseline' against which the proposal is assessed.
8. The scope and methodology of the ES was discussed and agreed with City of London officers prior to the submission of the application. As part of their Scoping exercise, the Applicant's daylight and sunlight consultants (Point 2) undertook a series of assessments which considered the proposed development in the context of the cumulative schemes set out in the submitted Environmental Statement.
9. Following this, it was concluded that none of these consented but not yet built buildings are close enough to result in materially different outcomes, and therefore it was considered unnecessary to submit the cumulative impact assessment as part of the application. The assessment has therefore been carried out in accordance with BRE Guidance and Local Plan policy DM10.7.

Alterations to Report

10. In paragraph 106 the years "2010" and "2011" should read "1910" and "1911".

Additional Background Papers

Email Jason Pritchard dated 15/11/2021

Email Fred Rodgers dated 15/11/2021

From: [Evans, Catherine](#)
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: FW: Cutler St Development: Daylight reduction to flats on MSE
Date: 15 November 2021 16:18:27
Attachments: [image001.png](#)
[image003.png](#)
[image004.png](#)
[image006.png](#)

From: PRITCHARD, Jason [REDACTED]
Sent: 15 November 2021 07:39
To: Gelleh, Hibaaq <Hibaaq.Gelleh@cityoflondon.gov.uk>; Stothard, Gideon <Gideon.Stothard@cityoflondon.gov.uk>; Hart, Liam <Liam.Hart@cityoflondon.gov.uk>
Cc: Moss, Alastair <Alastair.Moss@cityoflondon.gov.uk>; Sells, Oliver <Oliver.Sells@cityoflondon.gov.uk>
Subject: Re: Cutler St Development: Daylight reduction to flats on MSE

Dear Hibaaq,

Thank you for your email.

So the planning department is taking the view that the baseline is the existing buildings and have not included the loss of light from previous schemes therefore failing to take on the board the cumulative impact that multiple nearby developments have had on the estate over a number of years as pointed out by my constituent.

I request that the committee delay making a decision on this scheme until a further report has been produced.

My concern is that if the committee supports this application before resolving the matter of the cumulative impact it will be acting beyond its powers and could leave itself open to a legal challenge.

Copying in the Chair and Deputy Chair of Planning.


Kind regards

Jason Pritchard CC



PRITCHARD, Jason Paul | Common Councilman for the Ward of Portsoken

City of London | Members' Room, Guildhall, PO Box 270, London EC2P 2EJ

Connect on  LinkedIn

From: [Evans, Catherine](#)
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: FW: 21/00622/FULMEIA - Proposed redevelopment of 115-123 Houndsditch (the Building)
Date: 15 November 2021 16:17:31

From: Frederick Rodgers [REDACTED]
Sent: 15 November 2021 08:55
To: Richards, Gwyn <Gwyn.Richards@cityoflondon.gov.uk>
Cc: Moss, Alastair <Alastair.Moss@cityoflondon.gov.uk>; Sells, Oliver <Oliver.Sells@cityoflondon.gov.uk>
Subject: 21/00622/FULMEIA - Proposed redevelopment of 115-123 Houndsditch (the Building)

THIS IS AN EXTERNAL EMAIL

Dear Mr Richards,

The Addendum to your report to Committee has amended paragraph 352. However, in paragraph 106, the correct years are, of course, 1910 and 1911.

I understand the total area of the Building is 66,867 square metres. According to Part 2 of the applicant's P&TC Members Presentation, the estimated embedded carbon in its construction will be 526 kg CO₂ per square metre - a total of 35,172,042 kg CO₂.

Paragraph 338 of your report to Committee states:

The applicants have presented the comparison of the Whole Life-cycle carbon emissions of the refurbishment option (with a 2-storey extension) and the proposed redevelopment option per square meter in the following graph (refurbishment in yellow; redevelopment in blue):

The per square metre comparison is something I have complained about before but seemingly to no avail. As a result, misleading information is being submitted to Members for their consideration of the application. Unlike the estimated embedded carbon though, the estimated operating emissions aren't stated as kg CO₂ per square metre, which confuses matters.

According to paragraph 9 of your report to Committee, the total area of the existing buildings is 14,326 square metres, making the Building nearly five times larger than all the existing ones. This means that the graph in paragraph 338 is completely misleading in failing to compare estimated emissions on a total, rather than a square metre, basis.

The applicant should be required to submit a graph showing (i) the total estimated operating emissions of the existing buildings through to 2060; (ii) the total estimated operating emissions of the existing buildings as extended and the total estimated additional embedded carbon also through to 2060; and (iii) the total estimated operating emissions and the total estimated embedded carbon of the Building again through to 2060. I've not mentioned the embedded carbon in the existing buildings as I understand there is no method for calculating it.

Another issue is the "greening" of the Building. There's a reference on page 8 of the applicant's Cultural Strategy and Plan to consultation with Friends of City Gardens (FoCG), which I Chair. The

consultation was a virtual one with We Go Forth. Although FoCG has not made any formal comment on the application, the following is from my recent email exchange with Jack Thompson of Kanda Consulting:

From Jack Thompson:

As Dee [Halligan of We Go Forth] said, the plans include a detailed cultural offer, including the new hub for green initiatives, such as local gardening opportunities and landscaping services. While it'll be some time for the final hub to go live with operators and partners, we're keen to demonstrate that such an initiative would have support, especially in helping provide more green facilities and opportunities within the hyper-urban City of London.

If you'd be open to providing support, we'd really welcome it if you provide a comment on the proposals – even a short note that the public benefits, such as the new community space to provide green initiatives, would be great for the area and the City of London.

To Jack Thompson:

In the meantime, from a personal viewpoint, I note there are a number of objectors all living in Middlesex Street Estate. As a City resident myself, I understand the harm that the ceaseless development of tall buildings both in and around the Square Mile does to our residential amenity.

Also FoCG has recently raised with City Corporation the need for real, sustainable, biodiversity enhancement and not mere box ticking to achieve the required Urban Greening Factor. At the same time, City Corporation's own public open spaces, including the many City Gardens, are suffering due to a lack of resources as Guildhall funding is cut and more gardens, especially parklets, are created.

Were developers to invest the funds required to meet the relevant UGF in enhancing biodiversity in City Corporation's public open spaces and City Gardens, instead of on site, there could be a win win situation. Diverting the annual maintenance costs that maintaining the UGF would entail to provide more resources for the City Gardens team would be even better.

The Building's UGF is impressive but, as stated above, it is merely a box ticking exercise, admirable as the Net Biodiversity Gain may be. The usual hanging plants down the side of the Building, planters and trees at street level, a small garden at level 22 and the so-called "green

crown” above the “sky pavilion” might be expected but the lack of biodiverse roofs is notable.

It seems a minimal amount of operating plant is to be hidden by the “green crown”. Why though is any operating plant being installed on the roofs when there are four basement levels where it could be accommodated, so enabling the installation of biodiverse roofs?

The proposed greening is, by necessity, a compromise. As mentioned, the substantial investment, which may or may not be successful and/or suffer maintenance difficulties, could be made more securely in enhancing biodiversity in the existing public open spaces and City Gardens.

Finally, according to Simon Allford, RIBA President and a Founding Director of AHMM - the Building’s architects - at the launch of the RIBA and Architects Declare Programme for the Built Environment Summit, 8 October 2021:

It’s never been more important for us to unite as a sector. Climate change is our greatest challenge, and to successfully meet this challenge, we need to radically change our approach to designing and constructing buildings. We then become part of the solution rather than the problem

<https://tinyurl.com/3yh478v2>

When will that change come, if approval continues to be recommended for Net Zero target challenging developments such as the Building?

Best regards,

Fred Rodgers

100 Breton House
Barbican
London
EC2Y 8PQ

