

Paul Robinson

From: Matt Christie
Sent: 05 May 2016 15:27
To: Joe Wilkinson
Subject: BGY comms with JV

S:\Planning Decisions\Cases\Cases\1200c\Stage III\FOIs\May2016

Matt Christie | Senior Strategic Planner and Urban Designer | Development & Projects

Greater London Authority | City Hall, The Queen's Walk, More London Riverside, London SE1 2AA

Tel: [REDACTED] Email: [REDACTED] [london.gov.uk](mailto:[REDACTED]@london.gov.uk)

Paul Robinson

From: Matt Christie
Sent: 03 May 2016 14:29
To: 'Jim Pool'
Cc: Stewart Murray; 'Julian Shirley'
Subject: RE: BGY - errata and clarifications.
Attachments: DP1200cd Stage III errata.pdf

Jim,

Please find attached our response to your letter of 11 April 2016. We will also be publishing this online.

Please let me know if you have any questions.

Thanks

Matt Christie | Senior Strategic Planner and Urban Designer | Development & Projects Greater London Authority |
City Hall, The Queen's Walk, More London Riverside, London SE1 2AA
Tel: 020 7983 [REDACTED] Email: [REDACTED]@london.gov.uk

-----Original Message-----

From: Jim Pool [mailto:[REDACTED]@dp9.co.uk]
Sent: 03 May 2016 10:49
To: Matt Christie
Cc: Stewart Murray; Julian Shirley
Subject: RE: BGY - errata and clarifications.

Thanks Matt

Jim Pool
Director

direct: 020 7004 [REDACTED]
mobile: [REDACTED]
e-mail: [REDACTED]@dp9.co.uk

DP9 Ltd
100 Pall Mall
London
SW1Y 5NQ

telephone: 020 7004 1700 facsimile: 020 7004 1790 website: www.dp9.co.uk

This e-mail and any attachments hereto are strictly confidential and intended solely for the addressee. It may contain information which is privileged. If you are not the intended addressee, you must not disclose, forward, copy or take any action in relation to this e-mail or attachments. If you have received this e-mail in error, please delete it and notify postmaster@dp9.co.uk

-----Original Message-----

From: Matt Christie [mailto: [REDACTED]@london.gov.uk]
Sent: 03 May 2016 10:34
To: Jim Pool < [REDACTED]@dp9.co.uk>
Cc: Stewart Murray <Stewart.Murray@london.gov.uk>; Julian Shirley < [REDACTED]@dp9.co.uk>
Subject: RE: BGY - errata and clarifications.

Hi Jim,

This is now back from Legal and will be issued today. I'll make sure you get an e-copy as soon as it goes out.

Thanks

Matt

-----Original Message-----

From: Jim Pool [mailto: [REDACTED]@dp9.co.uk]
Sent: 01 May 2016 09:45
To: Matt Christie
Cc: Stewart Murray; Julian Shirley
Subject: Re: BGY - errata and clarifications.

Matt

Good morning. Sorry to chase. I am sure that you are very busy.

I think that you were targeting the end of last week to issue the clarifications and errata.

Can you confirm when this will be issued please?

Regards

Jim

> On 25 Apr 2016, at 10:14, Matt Christie < [REDACTED]@london.gov.uk> wrote:

>
> Jim,
>
> We are still putting this together and should have it with you by the end of the week.

>
> Thanks

>
> Matt

> -----Original Message-----

> From: Jim Pool [mailto: [REDACTED]@dp9.co.uk]
> Sent: 25 April 2016 08:01
> To: Matt Christie
> Cc: Stewart Murray; Julian Shirley
> Subject: Re: BGY - errata and clarifications.

>
> Matt

>
> Good morning. Apologies for chasing but my client asks me on a daily basis about this. Do you know approximately when we can expect to receive the errata and clarification note?
>
> Many thanks
>
> Jim
>
>
>
>
>> On 19 Apr 2016, at 09:41, Matt Christie <[REDACTED]@london.gov.uk> wrote:
>>
>> Jim,
>>
>> I am currently working with our Legal Team on this. I will let you know as soon as it is ready.
>>
>> Thanks
>>
>>
>> Matt
>>
>> -----Original Message-----
>> From: Jim Pool [mailto:[REDACTED]@dp9.co.uk]
>> Sent: 19 April 2016 08:36
>> To: Matt Christie
>> Cc: Stewart Murray; Julian Shirley
>> Subject: BGY - errata and clarifications.
>>
>> Matt
>>
>> Good morning. Stewart mentioned that there have been meetings associated with the issuing of errata and clarifications resulting from the issuing of your report. We would be grateful for an update please. When can we expect this to be issued?
>>
>> Many thanks.
>>
>> Jim
>>

GREATER **LONDON** AUTHORITY
Development, Enterprise and Environment

Mr Jim Pool
DP9 Ltd
100 Pall Mall
London SW1Y 5NQ

Our ref: D&P1200cd/05
Your ref:
Date: 3 May 2016

Dear Jim,

Town & Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended); Greater London Authority Acts 1999 and 2007; Town & Country Planning (Mayor of London) Order 2008
Bishopsgate Goodsynd, London Boroughs of Tower Hamlets & Hackney

I refer to your letter of 11 April 2016 in which you request that we consider reviewing our Stage III report of 8 April 2016 in order to correct any errors and provide clarifications where necessary. We have now gone through the report and produced an erratum report for publication on our website. Copies of the published report and the erratum are enclosed for ease of reference.

Hopefully this addresses the issues raised in your letter and clarifies our position. Please give me a call if you have any further questions.

Yours sincerely,



Colin Wilson
Senior Manager– Development & Projects

cc Nasser Farouq, Team Leader- East Area, London Borough of Tower Hamlets
Rob Brew, Major applications Team, Planning Service, London Borough of Hackney

3May 2016

Bishopsgate Goodsyard

in the London Boroughs of Hackney and Tower Hamlets

planning application no. 2014/2425 & PA/14/02011

Listed building application no. 2014/2427 & PA/14/02096

Section	Pararaph	Page	Errata/Clarification
The proposal		2	"proposed Class a1" should read "proposed Class A1"
Reasons for approval/refusal	1	6	"reasons for refusal that the Committee" should read "reasons for refusal that the Committees (respectively)"
Reasons for approval/refusal	5	7	"Fornier Street" should read "Fournier Street"
Reasons for approval/ refusal	8	7	"to have significantly less height and massing along the north-western edge of the site in particular" should read "to have significantly less height and massing along the north-eastern edge of the site in particular"
Conditions	14	9	"to call in the application in for" should read "to call in the application for" "And relates" should read "and relates"
Site description	20	10	"runes east west" should read "runs east west"
Site description	25	11	"The site is also lies" should read "The site also lies"
Details of the proposal	38	16	"Phoenix street" should read "Phoenix Street"
Hackney Council planning policy	88	29	Delete "insert council's name"
Tower Hamlets Council planning	93	31	"the sites development capacity" should read "the site's development capacity"

policy			
Environmental Impact Assessment	96	31	"Schedule 2 of the Regulations" should read "Schedule 2 of the EIA Regulations"
Representations made to the Mayor of London	162	43	"since September 2014" should read "since September 2015"
Land Use Principle	186	47	"Bishopsgate Good Yard" should read "Bishopsgate Goods Yard"
Other non-residential uses	231	53	"as close as possibly to" should read "as close as possible to"
Housing supply	239	55	"The delivery of 1,356 new housing units on this site" should read "The delivery of up to 1,356 new housing units on this site"
Density	241	55	"should Seek" should read "should seek"
Density	248	56	"he design" should read "the design"
Density	254	57	"The gives" should read "The SPG gives"
Density	257	57	"the Mayors definition" should read "the Mayor's definition"
Affordable Housing/Viability	270	59	"the Councils approach" should read "the Council's approach"
Affordable Housing/ Viability	289	61	"For this purposes, the proposed PiL is converted" should read "For this purpose, the proposed PiL is converted"
Affordable Housing/ Viability	290	61	"in support of the application which the applicant gives a commitment" should read "in support of the application in which the applicant gives a commitment"
Housing Mix	327	68	"Mayors Stage 1 comments" should read "Mayor's Stage 1 comments"
Housing Mix	329	69	"any increased in office" should read "any increase in office"
Housing mix	332	69	"This has then been converted into a notional tenure and unit size split, as is confirmed would be achievable using those assumptions." Should read " The proposed PiL can be converted into a notional tenure and unit size split using cost assumptions"

			provided by Hackney Homes.”
Design	349	73	“A commitment that the park will be open and accessible to the public throughout the day is required as well as conditions stipulating the extent of activities restricted and allowed here.” Should read “A commitment that the park will be open and accessible to the public every day from 0700 to 1900 is proposed in the current draft of the s106 agreement. Conditions stipulating the extent of activities restricted and allowed here are also required.”
Design	352	73	“Phoenix Place” should read: “Phoenix Street”
Design	352	73	“flanked by listed arches to the north” should read: “flanked by arches to the north” - as the arches to the north of Phoenix Street are not listed
Design	354	73	“Phoenix Place” should read: “Phoenix Street”
Design	354	73	“would help justify the removal of the listed Oriel structure” should read “would help justify the removal of the listed wall”. The applicant does not propose to remove the Oriel.
Design	363	75	“Phoenix Place” should read: “Phoenix Street”
Strategic Views	370	76	“landmarks(s)” should read “landmark(s)”
Strategic View	372	76	“to be a negligible” should read “to be negligible”
Applications for Listed Building Consent	390	79	“ Class a1” should read “Class A1”
Applications for Listed Building Consent	398	80	“GLAs statutory duty under s72 of the planning(listed buildings and conservation areas) act 1990 should read “GLA’s statutory duty under s72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990
Designated Heritage Assets	404	82	“Scatter Street” should read “Sclater Street”

Conservation Areas	407	83	"Founier Street" should read "Fournier Street"
Climate change and Sustainability	424		"of the proposed to be taken" should read "of the proposal to be taken"
Air quality	450	91	"changes in concentration of this magnitude are likely to be very different to distinguish" should read "changes in concentration of this magnitude are likely to be very difficult to distinguish"
Neighbourhood Amenity: Daylight/Sunlight/Overshadowing	481	94	"Sclatter Street" should read "Sclater Street"
Neighbourhood Amenity: Daylight/Sunlight/Overshadowing	490	95	Delete: "amelts Hamlets"
Neighbourhood Amenity: Daylight/Sunlight/Overshadowing	540	106	"signioficant impacts" should read "significant impacts"
Neighbourhood Amenity: Privacy	552	107	"These building are all located" should read "These buildings are all located"
Transport	606	115	"this is strongly supported welcomed" should read "this is welcomed"
Transport	607	115	"improvements as identified in s106 agreement" should read "improvements as identified in the s106 agreement"
Transport	618	117	"it is considered that the proposals that the scheme is broadly in accordance with London Plan Policies 6.9 and 6.10." should read "it is considered that the proposals are broadly in accordance with London Plan Policies 6.9 and 6.10."
Transport	619	117	"The park will be accessible between every day from 0700 until 1900 and also secured as such through the section 106 agreement." Should read "The park will be accessible every day from 0700 until 1900, which is reflected in the current draft section 106 agreement."

Transport	621	117	"The proposals broadly accord with aim of the City Fringe OAPF" should read "The proposals broadly accord with the aims of the City Fringe OAPF"
Transport	625	118	"submitted as reserved matters stage" should read "submitted at reserved matters stage"
Conclusion	692	129	"Such a proposals would not, however, be acceptable" should read "Such proposals would not, however, be acceptable"
Conclusion	696	130	"Phoenix Place" should read: "Phoenix Street"
Conclusion	700	131	"to have significantly less height and massing along the north-western edge of the site in particular" should read "to have significantly less height and massing along the north-eastern edge of the site in particular"

for further information, contact GLA Planning Unit (Development and Projects):

Stewart Murray, Assistant Director - Planning

020 7983 [REDACTED] email [REDACTED]@london.gov.uk

Colin Wilson, Senior Manager - Planning Decisions

020 7983 [REDACTED] email [REDACTED]@london.gov.uk

Justin Carr, Strategic Planning Manager (Development Decisions)

020 7983 [REDACTED] email [REDACTED]@london.gov.uk

Matt Christie, Senior Strategic Planner (case officer)

020 7983 [REDACTED] email [REDACTED]@london.gov.uk

Paul Robinson

From: Jonathon Weston <[REDACTED]@ballymoregroup.com>
Sent: 22 April 2016 17:03
To: Matt Christie
Cc: COUGHLAN, Tony; Julian Shirley
Subject: Re: GVA SB - Re: Bishopsgate Goodsyard

Matt

It will be included on the next drawdown. Can you confirm of Gerald Eve's invoice is also forthcoming so we can get them paid in one drawdown

Thanks

Sent from my iPhone

On 22 Apr 2016, at 16:14, Matt Christie <[REDACTED]@london.gov.uk> wrote:

Jon/ Tony,

Please find attached the final invoice from GVASB with regards to the daylight/ sunlight work Ian Absolon did for us. I have checked it and confirm that it is as we agreed. Could you please make arrangements to pay this invoice as soon as possible. Please let me know if there are any issues.

Many thanks

Matt Christie | Senior Strategic Planner and Urban Designer | Development & Projects

Greater London Authority | City Hall, The Queen's Walk, More London Riverside, London SE1 2AA

Tel: 020 7983 [REDACTED] Email: [REDACTED]@london.gov.uk

From: Cullen, Julie [[mailto:\[REDACTED\]@gva.co.uk](mailto:[REDACTED]@gva.co.uk)]
Sent: 22 April 2016 12:02
To: Matt Christie
Subject: GVA SB - Re: Bishopsgate Goodsyard

Good Afternoon Matt,

Could you please confirm that the following invoice has reached you for authorisation :-

30-Mar-16 Bishopsgate Goodsyard Regeneration Limited Inv 2095585 £10,291.92

Attached is a PDF copy for your immediate attention.

Kind regards
Julie

Julie Cullen, Credit Controller, Bilfinger GVA

Direct Dial: 0121 609 [REDACTED] - Email: [REDACTED][gva.co.uk](mailto:[REDACTED]@gva.co.uk)

Web: www.gva.co.uk - National Number: 08449 02 03 04 - Fax: 0121 609 8500

Please note my working hours are Monday to Friday 9.00 – 17.30 hrs

Paul Robinson

From: Jonathon Weston <[REDACTED]@ballymoregroup.com>
Sent: 12 April 2016 18:09
To: Matt Christie
Cc: [REDACTED]@dp9.co.uk; Emma Luke; Tony Coughlan
Subject: Re: LUC Invoice

Matt/Emma

It's been signed off and its on the payment run. I'll double check with Tony (cc'd) on a date and come back to you both

Regards

Jon

Sent from my iPhone

On 12 Apr 2016, at 18:07, Matt Christie <[REDACTED]@london.gov.uk> wrote:

Jon,

With regards to the below and our previous conversations concerning this matter. Could you please advise as to when this will be paid or whether you need anything else from the GLA.

Thanks

Matt Christie | Senior Strategic Planner and Urban Designer | Development & Projects

Greater London Authority | City Hall, The Queen's Walk, More London Riverside, London SE1 2AA

Tel: 020 7983 [REDACTED] Email: [REDACTED]@london.gov.uk

From: Emma Luke [[mailto:\[REDACTED\]@landuse.co.uk](mailto:[REDACTED]@landuse.co.uk)]
Sent: 12 April 2016 17:52
To: Matt Christie
Cc: 'Jonathon Weston'
Subject: RE: LUC Invoice
Importance: High

Hi Matt

I have left you some phone messages but not received any updates on this. Can you advise on when we will receive payment, as I need to update LUC's finance team.

Thanks

Emma

Emma Luke (Deen) BSc MSc Associate RTPI
Principal Environmental Planner

12th Floor, Colston Tower, Colston Street. Bristol BS1 4XE | T: +44 (0)117 929 [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] [landuse.co.uk](mailto:[REDACTED]@landuse.co.uk)

My working days are Tuesday, Wednesday and Friday.

From: Matt Christie [[mailto:\[REDACTED\]@london.gov.uk](mailto:[REDACTED]@london.gov.uk)]
Sent: 17 March 2016 16:54
To: 'Jonathon Weston'; [REDACTED]
Cc: [REDACTED] [hammerson.com](mailto:[REDACTED]@hammerson.com); [REDACTED] [dp9.co.uk](mailto:[REDACTED]@dp9.co.uk); Emma Luke
Subject: RE: LUC Invoice

Jon,

Many thanks. You should soon also get the invoices from GE and GVA, please let me know soonest if there are any issues.

Regards

Matt

From: Jonathon Weston [[mailto:\[REDACTED\]@ballymoregroup.com](mailto:[REDACTED]@ballymoregroup.com)]
Sent: 17 March 2016 16:28
To: Matt Christie; [REDACTED]
Cc: [REDACTED] [hammerson.com](mailto:[REDACTED]@hammerson.com); [REDACTED] [dp9.co.uk](mailto:[REDACTED]@dp9.co.uk); Emma Luke
Subject: RE: LUC Invoice

Matt

Thanks for the confirmation. We'll process the payment. We just need sign off so that we have confirmation the invoices are correct against the works instructed as we have no role in the consultant instruction

Regards

Jon

From: Matt Christie [[mailto:\[REDACTED\]@london.gov.uk](mailto:[REDACTED]@london.gov.uk)]
Sent: 15 March 2016 18:09
To: Jonathon Weston <[\[REDACTED\]@ballymoregroup.com](mailto:[REDACTED]@ballymoregroup.com)>; [REDACTED] <[\[REDACTED\]@landuse.co.uk](mailto:[REDACTED]@landuse.co.uk)>
Cc: [REDACTED] [hammerson.com](mailto:[REDACTED]@hammerson.com); [REDACTED] [dp9.co.uk](mailto:[REDACTED]@dp9.co.uk); Emma Luke <[\[REDACTED\]@landuse.co.uk](mailto:[REDACTED]@landuse.co.uk)>
Subject: RE: LUC Invoice

Jon,

I have reviewed the invoice and can confirm that it is in accordance with the fee agreed with the GLA for the services required in advance of the Reg 22 consultation. I asked LUC to invoice you directly in accordance with instructions received from Claire Dutch at Hogan Lovell on 29th February 2016.

Could you please confirm that all is in order and that Bishopsgate Goodsyrd Regeneration Limited will be paying LUC directly.

Many thanks

Matt

From: Jonathon Weston [[mailto:\[REDACTED\]@ballymoregroup.com](mailto:[REDACTED]@ballymoregroup.com)]
Sent: 15 March 2016 10:15
To: [REDACTED]
Cc: [REDACTED]@hammerson.com; [REDACTED]@dp9.co.uk; Matt Christie; Emma Luke
Subject: RE: LUC Invoice

[REDACTED]

Thank you for your email.

As far as I am aware the PPA for the project remains unsigned. In addition the Applicant (BGRL) have no confirmation as to whether the fee submitted for payment is in accordance with the fee agreement between LUC and the GLA and will require confirmation that this is due payable.

Finally, we do not operate on a 7 day payment process, but subject to the above confirmation and approval will pay the invoice on the next drawdown

Regards

Jon

From: [REDACTED] [[mailto:\[REDACTED\]@landuse.co.uk](mailto:[REDACTED]@landuse.co.uk)]
Sent: 09 March 2016 09:52
To: Jonathon Weston <[REDACTED]@ballymoregroup.com>
Cc: [REDACTED]@hammerson.com; [REDACTED]@dp9.co.uk; [REDACTED]@london.gov.uk; Emma Luke <[REDACTED]@landuse.co.uk>
Subject: LUC Invoice

Please find attached a copy of our invoice.

Could you please arrange for the attached invoice to be paid within 7 days of receipt.

Kind Regards,

[REDACTED]

Sales Ledger Administrator

[REDACTED]@landuse.co.uk

<image006.jpg>

Paul Robinson

From: Julian Shirley <[REDACTED]@dp9.co.uk>
Sent: 11 April 2016 13:59
To: Stewart Murray
Cc: Matt Christie; Colin Wilson; Justin Carr; Jonathon Weston; COUGHLAN, Tony; Jim Pool
Subject: Bishopsgate Goods Yard
Attachments: L-GLA 110416.pdf

Stewart

Further to the publication of the Hearing report, please see the attached letters noting a number of errors and requesting points of clarification to points raised in the report.

We would be grateful to receive confirmation of receipt.

Regards

Julian Shirley

direct: 020 7004 [REDACTED]
mobile: [REDACTED]
e-mail: [REDACTED]@dp9.co.uk

Dp9 Limited
100 Pall Mall
London
SW1Y 5NQ

telephone: 020 7004 1700 **facsimile:** 020 7004 1790 **website:** www.dp9.co.uk

This e-mail and any attachments hereto are strictly confidential and intended solely for the addressee. It may contain information which is privileged. If you are not the intended addressee, you must not disclose, forward, copy or take any action in relation to this e-mail or attachments. If you have received this e-mail in error, please delete it and notify postmaster@dp9.co.uk

11 April 2016

Greater London Authority
City Hall
The Queen's Walk
More London
London
SE1 2AA
For the attention of Stewart Murray

DP9 Ltd
100 Pall Mall
London SW1Y 5NQ

Registered No. 05092507

telephone 020 7004 1700
facsimile 020 7004 1790

www.dp9.co.uk

Dear Sirs

**BISHOPSGATE GOODSYARD
GREATER LONDON AUTHORITY REFS. D&P/1200c&d/04
LONDON BOROUGH OF TOWER HAMLETS (REFS. PA/14/02011 PA/14/02096) AND
HACKNEY (REFS. 2014/2425 and 2014/2427)**

We write in regard to the above site for which the Mayor of London is acting as the local planning authority for the purposes of determining the above planning applications and associated applications for listed building consent.

We have reviewed the Hearing report published on 8th April 2016 and set out below a number of inaccuracies in the report which we request are addressed in an Erratum to the Hearing report.

1. There are inconsistencies in the report when referring to the part of the site where the massing needs to be addressed. The following paragraphs refer to the north-eastern part of the site (our emphasis in italics):
 - Paragraph 3 refers to “significant building mass *along Sclater Street* that drives the majority of the unacceptable impacts.”
 - Paragraph 348 refers to “locating tall and bulky buildings along the *northern edge of the site in Plots C and D* produces significant overshadowing of Bethnal Green Road and Sclater Street...”,
 - Paragraph 545: reference to “The majority of the impacts are caused by the development proposed along the *southern edge of Sclater Street*”,
 - Paragraph 363: reference to overshadowing of neighbours from “the mass of buildings on the *north-east section of the site*, in Plots C and D.”
 - Paragraph 695: reference to the development “*along Sclater Street* that drives the majority of the unacceptable impacts.”

However, the following paragraphs refer to the “north-western edge of the site” where the height and massing of buildings needs to be revised:



- Paragraph 8 refers to “a scheme would have to have significantly less height and massing along the “*north-western edge of the site in particular.*”
- Paragraph 700 refers to: “...a scheme would have to have significantly less height and massing along the “*north-western edge of the site in particular.*”

We therefore request that this is clarified and references in the report to the “north-western” edge of the site in paragraphs 8 and 700 are amended to refer to the “north-eastern” edge of the site.

2. Paragraphs 352, 354, 363, 696 of the report refer to “Phoenix Place”. This should be amended to read Phoenix “Street.”
3. Paragraph 352 refers to Phoenix [Place] being “flanked by listed arches to the North...” This is incorrect, as the arches immediately adjacent to the north of Phoenix Street are not listed.
4. Paragraph 699 refers to the “*cumulative harm to heritage assets could outweigh the potential public benefits of the scheme.*” Paragraph 700 then acknowledges that the proposal delivers public benefits “*but in a way that causes unacceptable and avoidable harm in respect of daylight/ sunlight impacts.*” There appears to be a contradiction between these two paragraphs. In the context of paragraph 700, we believe paragraph 699 should be re-worded as follows, “The potential public benefits of the scheme could outweigh the cumulative harm to heritage assets.”

We consider that the above points are important and would be grateful to receive confirmation at your earliest opportunity that the above comments will be addressed and published in an Erratum to the Hearing report.

Yours faithfully

DP9 Ltd.

CC :	Matt Christie:	GLA
	Colin Wilson:	GLA
	Justin Carr :	GLA
	Jon Weston:	Bishopsgate Goodsyrd Regeneration Limited
	Tony Coughlan:	Bishopsgate Goodsyrd Regeneration Limited

11 April 2016

Greater London Authority
City Hall
The Queen's Walk
More London
London
SE1 2AA
For the attention of Stewart Murray

DP9 Ltd
100 Pall Mall
London SW1Y 5NQ

Registered No. 05092507

telephone 020 7004 1700
facsimile 020 7004 1790

www.dp9.co.uk

Dear Sirs

**BISHOPSGATE GOODSYARD
GREATER LONDON AUTHORITY REFS. D&P/1200c&d/04
LONDON BOROUGH OF TOWER HAMLETS (REFS. PA/14/02011 PA/14/02096) AND
HACKNEY (REFS. 2014/2425 and 2014/2427)**

We write in regard to the above site for which the Mayor of London is acting as the local planning authority for the purposes of determining the above planning applications and associated applications for listed building consent.

We have reviewed the Hearing report published on 8th April 2016 and set out below two points in the report where we request clarification.

1. Paragraph 701 refers to the need for "*a more comprehensive scheme redesign is required*". In light of the comments raised in the report with regard to the need to revise the north-eastern edge of the site, clarification is requested that only a "comprehensive scheme redesign" of the north-eastern part of the site is required.
2. Confirmation is requested that in respect of the listed building consent application submitted to LB Hackney, the only issue relates to the proposed demolition of the listed wall to the south of the Oriel (B2) and no other issue.

We trust that this is acceptable and would be grateful to receive confirmation at your earliest opportunity that the above comments will be clarified an Addendum to the Hearing report.

Yours faithfully

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads 'DP9 Ltd'.

DP9 Ltd.

Paul Robinson

From: Julian Shirley <[REDACTED]@dp9.co.uk>
Sent: 07 April 2016 13:08
To: Matt Christie
Cc: Jonathon Weston; COUGHLAN, Tony
Subject: The Goods Yard - Heritage
Attachments: 1455 KMH note concerning wall to Commercial St.pdf

Matt

Further to our ongoing discussions on heritage matters, please see the attached further note prepared by KMHeritage.

Regards

Julian Shirley

direct: 020 7004 [REDACTED]
mobile: [REDACTED]
e-mail: [REDACTED]@dp9.co.uk

Dp9 Limited
100 Pall Mall
London
SW1Y 5NQ

telephone: 020 7004 1700 facsimile: 020 7004 1790 website: www.dp9.co.uk

This e-mail and any attachments hereto are strictly confidential and intended solely for the addressee. It may contain information which is privileged. If you are not the intended addressee, you must not disclose, forward, copy or take any action in relation to this e-mail or attachments. If you have received this e-mail in error, please delete it and notify postmaster@dp9.co.uk

This message has been scanned for viruses by the Greater London Authority.

Click [here](#) to report this email as spam.

Bishopsgate Goods Yard - matters raised by LB Hackney relating to heritage assets

Contents

Introduction	1
The status of the wall to Commercial Street	1
If the wall to Commercial Street was considered to be listed	2
<i>The law concerning listed structures</i>	2
<i>Assessment: the statutory test</i>	3
<i>Assessment: the National Planning Policy Framework</i>	4
Conclusion	6

Introduction

- 1 The purpose of this note is to assess the proposed development, if the B2 wall to the south of the Oriel were considered to be listed.

The status of the wall to Commercial Street

- 2 We would emphasize from the start that, as previously stated to the GLA, we do not agree that the wall to Commercial Street forms part of a listed structure.
- 3 The list description for the Oriel reads as follows:

SHOREDITCH HIGH STREET EI 1. 5013 (East Side) ----- Forecourt
Wall and Gates to Old Bishopsgate Goods Station TQ 3382 35/558 II

2. Late C19. At east side a red brick wall having wide entrance with stone entablature and tall panelled parapet over holding elliptical oriel bay with 3 sash windows. Oriel is of stone with console bracketed cornice and scrolled abutments to parapet. Hoodmoulds over windows. Double wrought iron entrance gates, each of 3 panels with large ornamental medallion in centre panel, and top cresting. Double standards below half rail. Running west from the north corner of the entrance bay a long single gate with curved slope down from left to right. 4 panels with medallions, similar to other gate, and double standards below half rail. Cresting on top slope, and date: 1884. A tall ornamental cast iron pier, with lamp-brackets, holds west end of gate, which fastens to shorter similar pier attached to wall at right.

Listing NGR: TQ3349082216

- 4 It is clear that the intent of the listing decision made, and the special architectural and historic interest that is identified, relates to the Oriel, its host structure and the gate that is immediately adjacent to it. It is a matter of common sense that the listing does not relate to any structure further afield. It almost certainly would not have been in the mind of the decision maker at the time of the listing (1975) to include structures further afield. At that time far more of the encircling wall to the Goods Yard survived and would thus have been explicitly referred to in a list description intended to describe special interest.
- 5 In making these comments we are aware that list descriptions are for identification purposes only, and do not constitute an exhaustive description of special architectural and historic interest. However we believe that to include the B2 wall in the listing of the Oriel and the R4 gate is to willfully expand the extent of listing to an unacceptable and unjustified degree.

If the wall to Commercial Street was considered to be listed

- 6 However, and notwithstanding the important points made above regarding the status of the wall, the purpose of this note, as stated above, is to consider whether the proposal to remove the wall (B2) can be justified if the wall is considered to form part of a listed structure.

The law concerning listed structures

- 7 The legislation governing listed buildings and conservation areas is the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990. S.7 of the Act states that 'Subject to the following provisions of this Act, no person shall execute or cause to be executed any works for the demolition of a listed building or for its alteration or extension in any manner which would affect its character as a building of special architectural or historic interest, unless the works are authorised'. Section 66(1) of the Act requires decision makers to 'have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses' when determining applications which affect a listed building or its setting. Section 72(1) of the Act requires decision makers with respect to any buildings or other land in a conservation area to pay 'special attention... to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area'.
- 8 'Streamlining Listed Building Consent: Lessons from the use of management agreements' (English Heritage, 2003) states (with my emphasis) that:

*Consent is required for works that would affect the character of the building as one of special architectural or historic interest. Thus, **what is being protected is that which makes the building of special interest, which justifies its inclusion in the list, not any and every aspect of its interest or significance to anyone.** It is what is significant at the national level, not what is significant only at the local level. Thus, it is not sufficient that works would affect the character of the building as one merely of architectural or historic interest; to require consent, they must affect its special interest.*

- 9 In the case ‘Regina v Major Sandhu’ (No. 96/1727/W5, Court of Appeal Criminal Division, 10 December 1996), the account of the case records that:

It is common ground between the parties that the section [S7 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990] calls for the court (whether it be Justices or a jury) to answer five questions:

(1) Was the building in question (Hainault Hall) a listed building?

(2) If so, were the works specified in each count executed for its alteration?

(3) If so, did the defendant cause the works specified in each count to be executed?

(4) If so, were such works executed in a manner which affected the character of the building as a building of special architectural or historic interest?

(5) If so, were such works authorised?

- 10 The appeal court took the view that, in respect of the fourth question, the judge in the original trial ‘properly directed the jury that they must be sure that the alteration in the particular count which they were considering had affected the character of the building as a whole’.

Assessment: the statutory test

- 11 As we state above, it is clear that the special architectural and historic interest that is identified in the list description relates to the Oriel, its host structure and the gate that is immediately adjacent to it. For this reason, it is also clear that even if the B2 wall is technically considered to be listed, its removal does not harm the special architectural and historic interest that is identified; i.e., that this special architectural and historic interest is preserved in the proposed scheme. If B2 possessed of itself something that could be linked to the identified special architectural and historic interest then its removal might cause harm, but that link does not exist nor is that harm caused.

- 12 The listed oriel is a 'designated heritage asset', as defined by the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). 'Significance' is defined in the NPPF as 'the value of a heritage asset to this and future generations because of its heritage interest. That interest may be archaeological, architectural, artistic or historic'. 'Conservation Principles, Policies and Guidance for the sustainable management of the historic environment' (English Heritage, April 2008) describes a number of 'heritage values' that may be present in a 'significant place'. These are evidential, historical, aesthetic and communal value.
- 13 It would assist in the consideration of these matters if the list description contained an explicit statement of special interest. It does not. In the absence of such an explicit statement, one must rely on a common-sense assessment of what is 'special' in relation to the listing that we have, and then what effect the removal of the B2 wall would have on the 'special' quality.
- 14 While the wall is of some architectural and historic interest, the oriel is clearly 'special'. It is a distinctive feature with a discernible architectural identity. It possesses, by virtue of its classically-influenced design, evident architectural, artistic or aesthetic value. Its prominent position shows that it was obviously intended as a visual focus for this part of the former station, and thus has communal and historic value, as a familiar feature of the Shoreditch High Street area and an echo of the architecture of the long-demolished station building.
- 15 The B2 wall, in contrast, lacks these qualities. It is a generic example of the type of structure it represent. That is, of course, not to say that a plain and unadorned engineering structure cannot possess special architectural and historic interest and thus be listed - the fact that the Braithwaite Viaduct is listed at Grade II is evidence of this. However the fact that the Braithwaite Viaduct is listed at Grade II and the B2 wall is not explicitly listed is a powerful indicator of the relative - and lesser - interest of the B2 wall in terms of architectural and historic interest.

Assessment: the National Planning Policy Framework

- 16 The NPPF says at Paragraph 133:

Where a proposed development will lead to substantial harm to or total loss of significance of a designated heritage asset, local planning authorities should refuse consent, unless it can be demonstrated that the substantial harm or loss is necessary to achieve substantial public benefits that outweigh that harm or loss, or all of the following apply:

- the nature of the heritage asset prevents all reasonable uses of the site; and*
- no viable use of the heritage asset itself can be found in the medium term through appropriate marketing that will enable its conservation; and*

- *conservation by grant-funding or some form of charitable or public ownership is demonstrably not possible; and*
- *the harm or loss is outweighed by the benefit of bringing the site back into use.*

17 Paragraph 134 says that ‘Where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal, including securing its optimum viable use.

18 Planning Practice Guidance provides further advice regarding public benefit:

Public benefits may follow from many developments and could be anything that delivers economic, social or environmental progress as described in the National Planning Policy Framework (Paragraph 7). Public benefits should flow from the proposed development. They should be of a nature or scale to be of benefit to the public at large and should not just be a private benefit. However, benefits do not always have to be visible or accessible to the public in order to be genuine public benefits.

19 Paragraph 7 of the NPPF refers to sustainable development, and talks about development ‘contributing to building a strong, responsive and competitive economy, by ensuring that sufficient land of the right type is available in the right places and at the right time to support growth and innovation’; and about development ‘supporting strong, vibrant and healthy communities, by providing the supply of housing required to meet the needs of present and future generations; and by creating a high quality built environment, with accessible local services that reflect the community’s needs and support its health, social and cultural well-being’.

20 A detailed and extensive justification for the proposals has been provided in the planning submission. This justification makes clear the effect that the removal of the Commercial Street wall has on the heritage significance of the Goods Yard site, and that this effect is acceptable in heritage terms. It demonstrates how the proposals comply with the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 and with local and national policy and guidance, and how the overall scheme delivers very substantial public and heritage benefits.

21 Given the relatively low significance of the B2 wall in relation to the principal focus of the listing in question - the oriel and its immediately supporting structure - we are of the view that any ‘harm’ that might arise from its removal is considerably less than substantial and effectively minor in nature.

22 In relation to the less than substantial harm that may be caused by the loss of the B2 wall, and given that the core special architectural and historic interest of the oriel is preserved, that minor 'harm' caused is far outweighed by the public and heritage benefits of the scheme. The effect of the proposed development will be powerfully regenerative, involving substantial gains in social and economic terms and in relation to heritage assets on the site. The oriel being will be retained, refurbished and incorporated into a scheme that will better reveal its heritage significance. On balance of the effect of scheme is positive - it enhances heritage assets and townscape quality in the ways explained elsewhere in the planning and listed building consent applications. The scheme provides very extensive and tangible socio-economic, urban design, architectural and heritage benefits. These more than outweigh what low level of 'harm' - if any - might be alleged regarding the loss of the B2 wall.

Conclusion

23 The Goods Yard project has taken a number of years to develop. During a very long pre-application process every single key stakeholder has been shown the proposals for the western end of the site on a number of occasions, and has had multiple opportunities to comment on heritage significance, the extent of listing and the nature of the proposals. The key stakeholders include the London Boroughs of Hackney and Tower Hamlets, English Heritage/Historic England, Historic Royal Palaces - and the Greater London Authority. The assessment by the applicant's consultants as to what was listed on the site and the nature and distribution of heritage significance on the site has been accepted and agreed. At no point in that process has it been suggested that the wall to the south of the Oriel is listed.

24 The proposals to remove the wall to the south of the Oriel has been examined and accepted repeatedly in these discussions. Detailed engineering assessment of the wall to the south of the Oriel has shown that it is in very poor structure condition, and any intervention would involve substantial rebuilding. In addition, 'sensitive breaches in the enclosure made to create openings into the new development behind' would be severely compromised by the physical reality of the structure, which would create cramped, low-head-height and compromised access to the regenerated Goods Yard.

25 This, in turn, would directly contradict the achievement of what was considered by stakeholders and the Greater London Authority, and which was agreed to be of key importance to the success of the project - creating clear permeability into the site from Shoreditch High Street and the west.

26 In our opinion, therefore, a realistic and reliable assessment of the proposal to remove the B2 wall is as follows: even if the wall to the south of the oriel were to be

considered to be *technically* listed by being attached to the oriel structure, a proposal to remove the wall would comply with Section 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990. This is because it is not directly related to the special architectural and historic interest of the listed oriel. Its loss would therefore represent only minor or less than substantial harm. That low level of harm is greatly outweighed by the socio-economic, urban design, architectural and heritage benefits of the overall proposal of which the restoration works to the oriel forms a part.

KMHeritage

72 Pymer's Mead

London SE21 8NJ

T: 020 8670 9057

F: 0871 750 3557

mail@kmheritage.com

www.kmheritage.com

© 2016

Paul Robinson

From: Matt Christie
Sent: 06 April 2016 11:37
To: 'Jonathon Weston'
Cc: 'Julian Shirley ([REDACTED]@dp9.co.uk)'; 'Tony Coughlan ([REDACTED]@hammerson.com)'
Subject: RE: Mayor of London Site Visit

Jon,

The protocol is as follows:

The site visit will:

- focus precisely on the observation of site factors which are relevant to the decision;
- not be an opportunity for lobbying, public address, submission of new information etc;
- always involve officer representation; and
- be carefully conducted so that the Mayor cannot be accused of bias in favouring any of the parties involved.

The following individuals are able to attend the site visit:

- The Mayor
- The Chief of Staff and Deputy Mayor for Planning
- GLA officers (including GLA legal advisors)
- TfL Officer(s)
- Two representatives from the Local Planning Authority
- Two representatives from the applicant
- Objectors/supporters will not normally be invited to attend a site visit.

PR - Removed Page 2 as blank page

Any request for objectors/supporters to attend will be considered by the Mayor and attendance will be at the discretion of the Mayor.

Site visits will be conducted in a formal manner and organised as follows:

- On assembling at the site, the GLA case officer will open the visit and advise those present of the purpose of the visit in line with this procedure, to ensure that all those present are aware that it is a fact-finding exercise and that no decision will be taken until the hearing
- The case officer will then describe the development and point out/explain the issue(s) which the Mayor has come to view
- The Mayor should stay with the GLA officers and should not engage in discussion individually with the applicant's representatives or any other persons present
- Any request for the Mayor to express a view or to accept an offer of hospitality should be politely declined
- The Mayor should address any questions of clarification to the GLA officers present. Questions should not be directed to the applicant's representatives or other parties present.

A written note of any questions and issues raised at the site visit will be taken by the GLA case officer.

We have already had confirmation that each borough will be sending two representatives and there will be The Mayor, Sir Ed Lister, myself, Esther Thornton, Colin Wilson and Joe Wilkinson from the GLA.

With regards to access, I assume that we just meet at the access point under the bridge in Braithwaite Street where we have done in the past?

Matt

From: Jonathon Weston [[mailto: \[REDACTED\]@ballymoregroup.com](mailto: [REDACTED]@ballymoregroup.com)]
Sent: 05 April 2016 17:02
To: Matt Christie
Cc: Julian Shirley ([REDACTED][dp9.co.uk](mailto: [REDACTED]@dp9.co.uk)); Tony Coughlan ([REDACTED][hammerson.com](mailto: [REDACTED]@hammerson.com))
Subject: Mayor of London Site Visit

Matt

Please can you confirm the protocol for the visit on Friday?

Both so that the JV understand the process but also so that we can ensure access is in place for the correct number of attendees

Thanks

Jon

Jonathon Weston
Projects Director

+44 (0)20 7510 [REDACTED]
+44 (0)7747 [REDACTED]



Ballymore Group

Paul Robinson

From: Matt Christie
Sent: 04 April 2016 12:39
To: 'Julian Shirley'
Subject: BGY- Site visit

Julian,

As the April 18 Hearing is now confirmed, the Mayor needs to conduct a site visit in line with our protocol. The only date the Mayor currently has available between now and the hearing is this coming Friday between 1000 and 1200. Can you please confirm that we can access the site during those times? Once confirmed I will get back to discuss arrangements and who can attend from your side etc.

Thanks

Matt Christie | Senior Strategic Planner and Urban Designer | Development & Projects

Greater London Authority | City Hall, The Queen's Walk, More London Riverside, London SE1 2AA

Tel: 020 7983 [REDACTED] Email: [REDACTED] london.gov.uk

Paul Robinson

From: Matt Christie
Sent: 01 April 2016 18:19
To: 'Jim Pool'; Stewart Murray
Cc: 'Julian Shirley'
Subject: RE: Goodsyrd scenario

Jim,

Thank you for your email. As you appreciate your proposals introduce significant new legal points at a late stage in the planning process. They require careful consideration and we are seeking legal advice.

Regards.

Matt Christie | Senior Strategic Planner and Urban Designer | Development & Projects Greater London Authority | City Hall, The Queen's Walk, More London Riverside, London SE1 2AA
Tel: 020 7983 [REDACTED] Email: [REDACTED] london.gov.uk

-----Original Message-----

From: Jim Pool [[mailto:\[REDACTED\]@dp9.co.uk](mailto:[REDACTED]@dp9.co.uk)]
Sent: 01 April 2016 16:23
To: Stewart Murray
Cc: Matt Christie; Julian Shirley
Subject: Goodsyrd scenario

Stewart

I mentioned in passing a scenario whereby the Mayor could grant permission for the LBH application alone and defer a decision on the LBTH application to allow the part of the scheme within LB Tower Hamlets to be modified, should the Mayor see fit, to address any perceived daylight and sunlight issues.

With that in mind Hogan Lovells have prepared the attached note.

We also mentioned an option where we undertook not to build out a block. HL would be happy to discuss on a theoretical basis the logistics of this with your lawyers. Who should they speak to?

Regards

Jim

A

Paul Robinson

From: Jonathon Weston <[REDACTED]@ballymoregroup.com>
Sent: 01 April 2016 15:50
To: Matt Christie; Stewart Murray
Cc: COUGHLAN, Tony; COLE, Peter; Jim Pool; Julian Shirley ([REDACTED]@dp9.co.uk); John Mulryan
Subject: Bishopsgate Goodsyard
Attachments: 160401_BGY scenario comparison - FINAL.xlsx
Importance: High

Stewart,

As discussed, please find a breakdown of the new Scenarios that we discussed and their results for the daylight and sunlight impacts for BGY:

- **Submitted Scheme - Maximum Parameter**
350 impacted rooms (166 within Telford Homes)
- **Revised Proposal (29th March 2016) - Maximum Parameter (Minimum for Plot D only)**
281 impacted rooms (110 within Telford Homes)
- **Scenario 01 - Minimum Parameter for Plot A,B,D,E & K**
239 impacted rooms (98 within Telford Homes)
- **Scenario 02 - Maximum Parameter (Tower D1 Removed)**
281 impacted rooms (110 within Telford Homes)
- **Scenario 03 - Maximum Parameter (Minimum for Plot D & E only)**
267 impacted rooms (100 within Telford Homes)
- **Scenario 04 - Maximum Parameter (Minimum for Plot D, E & K only)**
239 impacted rooms (98 within Telford Homes)
- **Scenario 05 – Minimum Parameter (Tower D1 Removed)**
171 impacted rooms (40 within Telford Homes)

Whilst GIA remain resolute that their assessment methods and criteria used within their previous reports is correct, we have agreed to show the above scenarios based on the 4 tests set out by the GLA and undertaken by GVA. We are confident that when these are reviewed by GVA, they will be in agreement in terms of the assessment numbers.

These numbers reflect the full/complete analysis of the data but unfortunately differ slightly from the number quoted on the call. One area to note is the reduction in height of plots A&B to the minimum scenario have no impact on the improvement of the number affected rooms.

We have also asked GIA to issue the information to GVA and to give GVA a call to talk through the information and provide any further details that may be required and to verify that both parties are in agreement on the starting point of 350 impacted rooms within the Submitted Scheme.

If there is anything else you need, please let us know.

Kind regards,

Jonathon Weston
Projects Director

+44 (0)20 7510 [REDACTED]
+44 (0)7747 [REDACTED]



THE GOODSYARD

Scenario Analysis
31st March 2016

20 Properties	
SUBMITTED SCHEME	
Maximum Parameter	
Property	
Number of Windows Tested	1607
Number of Rooms Tested	879
Number of windows passing (test 1)	494
Number of windows failing	1113
Number of these retaining >15% (test 2)	415
Number of these < 15%	698
Number of rooms these < 15% serve	473
Number of these rooms passing ADF	174
Number of these rooms passing ADF and >70% NSL	123
Number of these rooms passing ADF but <70% NSL	51
Number of these rooms failing ADF	299
Number of these rooms failing ADF and >70% NSL	104
Number of these rooms failing ADF but <70% NSL	195
Windows fail test 1 and 2 (VSC)	698
Equates to rooms	473
Pass ADF and NSL (tests 3 and 4)	123
GVA fail all tests (ADF and NSL)	350
GIA fail (ADF or NSL)	195
Telford Homes	
GVA fail all tests (ADF and NSL)	166
GIA fail (ADF or NSL)	104
Residual Properties	
GVA fail all tests (ADF and NSL)	184
GIA fail (ADF or NSL)	91

Impact to The Goodsyard
no change

20 Properties	
REVISED PROPOSAL (29th Mar 2016)	
Maximum Parameter (Minimum for Plot D only)	
Property	
Number of Windows Tested	1607
Number of Rooms Tested	879
Number of windows passing (test 1)	593
Number of windows failing	1014
Number of these retaining >15% (test 2)	426
Number of these < 15%	588
Number of rooms these < 15% serve	392
Number of these rooms passing ADF	190
Number of these rooms passing ADF and >70% NSL	111
Number of these rooms passing ADF but <70% NSL	79
Number of these rooms failing ADF	202
Number of these rooms failing ADF and >70% NSL	87
Number of these rooms failing ADF but <70% NSL	115
Windows fail test 1 and 2 (VSC)	588
Equates to rooms	392
Pass ADF and NSL (tests 3 and 4)	111
GVA fail all tests (ADF and NSL)	281
GIA fail (ADF or NSL)	115
Telford Homes	
GVA fail all tests (ADF and NSL)	110
GIA fail (ADF or NSL)	41
Residual Properties	
GVA fail all tests (ADF and NSL)	171
GIA fail (ADF or NSL)	74

Impact to The Goodsyard
Loss of approx 50 New Homes in Plot D

20 Properties	
SCENARIO 01	
Minimum Parameter for Plot A,B,D,E & K	
Property	
Number of Windows Tested	1607
Number of Rooms Tested	879
Number of windows passing (test 1)	633
Number of windows failing	974
Number of these retaining >15% (test 2)	446
Number of these < 15%	528
Number of rooms these < 15% serve	347
Number of these rooms passing ADF	181
Number of these rooms passing ADF and >70% NSL	108
Number of these rooms passing ADF but <70% NSL	73
Number of these rooms failing ADF	166
Number of these rooms failing ADF and >70% NSL	78
Number of these rooms failing ADF but <70% NSL	88
Windows fail test 1 and 2 (VSC)	528
Equates to rooms	347
Pass ADF and NSL (tests 3 and 4)	108
GVA fail all tests (ADF and NSL)	239
GIA fail (ADF or NSL)	88
Telford Homes	
GVA fail all tests (ADF and NSL)	98
GIA fail (ADF or NSL)	38
Residual Properties	
GVA fail all tests (ADF and NSL)	141
GIA fail (ADF or NSL)	50

Impact to The Goodsyard
Loss of approx 62 New Homes in Plots D & E
Loss of approx 120,000 sq.ft of commercial space in Plots A,B & K

20 Properties	
SCENARIO 02	
Maximum Parameter (Tower D1 Removed)	
Property	
Number of Windows Tested	1607
Number of Rooms Tested	879
Number of windows passing (test 1)	593
Number of windows failing	1014
Number of these retaining >15% (test 2)	426
Number of these < 15%	588
Number of rooms these < 15% serve	392
Number of these rooms passing ADF	217
Number of these rooms passing ADF and >70% NSL	111
Number of these rooms passing ADF but <70% NSL	106
Number of these rooms failing ADF	175
Number of these rooms failing ADF and >70% NSL	83
Number of these rooms failing ADF but <70% NSL	92
Windows fail test 1 and 2 (VSC)	588
Equates to rooms	392
Pass ADF and NSL (tests 3 and 4)	111
GVA fail all tests (ADF and NSL)	281
GIA fail (ADF or NSL)	92
Telford Homes	
GVA fail all tests (ADF and NSL)	110
GIA fail (ADF or NSL)	20
Residual Properties	
GVA fail all tests (ADF and NSL)	171
GIA fail (ADF or NSL)	72

Impact to The Goodsyard
Loss of approx 118 New Homes in Plot D

20 Properties	
SCENARIO 03	
Maximum Parameter (Minimum for Plot D & E only)	
Property	
Number of Windows Tested	1607
Number of Rooms Tested	879
Number of windows passing (test 1)	611
Number of windows failing	996
Number of these retaining >15% (test 2)	429
Number of these < 15%	567
Number of rooms these < 15% serve	375
Number of these rooms passing ADF	183
Number of these rooms passing ADF and >70% NSL	108
Number of these rooms passing ADF but <70% NSL	75
Number of these rooms failing ADF	192
Number of these rooms failing ADF and >70% NSL	82
Number of these rooms failing ADF but <70% NSL	110
Windows fail test 1 and 2 (VSC)	567
Equates to rooms	375
Pass ADF and NSL (tests 3 and 4)	108
GVA fail all tests (ADF and NSL)	267
GIA fail (ADF or NSL)	110
Telford Homes	
GVA fail all tests (ADF and NSL)	100
GIA fail (ADF or NSL)	39
Residual Properties	
GVA fail all tests (ADF and NSL)	167
GIA fail (ADF or NSL)	71

Impact to The Goodsyard
Loss of approx 62 New Homes in Plots D & E

20 Properties	
SCENARIO 04	
Maximum Parameter (Minimum for Plot D, E & K only)	
Property	
Number of Windows Tested	1607
Number of Rooms Tested	879
Number of windows passing (test 1)	633
Number of windows failing	974
Number of these retaining >15% (test 2)	446
Number of these < 15%	528
Number of rooms these < 15% serve	347
Number of these rooms passing ADF	181
Number of these rooms passing ADF and >70% NSL	108
Number of these rooms passing ADF but <70% NSL	73
Number of these rooms failing ADF	166
Number of these rooms failing ADF and >70% NSL	78
Number of these rooms failing ADF but <70% NSL	88
Windows fail test 1 and 2 (VSC)	528
Equates to rooms	347
Pass ADF and NSL (tests 3 and 4)	108
GVA fail all tests (ADF and NSL)	239
GIA fail (ADF or NSL)	88
Telford Homes	
GVA fail all tests (ADF and NSL)	98
GIA fail (ADF or NSL)	38
Residual Properties	
GVA fail all tests (ADF and NSL)	141
GIA fail (ADF or NSL)	50

Impact to The Goodsyard
Loss of approx 62 New Homes in Plots D & E
Loss of approx 25,000 sq.ft of commercial space in Plot K