

London Borough of Islington

**Planning Committee - 10 February 2022**

Minutes of the meeting of the Planning Committee held at Islington Assembly Hall, Town Hall, Upper Street, N1 2UD on 10 February 2022 at 7.30 pm.

**Present:**      **Councillors:**      Poyser (Chair), Convery, Ibrahim, Jackson, North, Picknell, Woolf, Kay, Wayne and Williamson

**Councillor Dave Poyser in the Chair**

**272      INTRODUCTIONS (Item A1)**

Councillor Poyser welcomed everyone to the meeting. Members of the Committee and officers introduced themselves.

**273      APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE (Item A2)**

Apologies were received from Councillor Klute, Khondoker and Clarke.

**274      DECLARATIONS OF SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS (Item A3)**

Councillors Kay, Wayne and Williamson substituted for Councillors Klute, Khondoker and Clarke.

**275      DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST (Item A4)**

There were no declarations of interest.

**276      ORDER OF BUSINESS (Item A5)**

The order of business would be as per the agenda.

**277      MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING (Item A6)**

**RESOLVED:**

That the minutes of the meeting held on 2 November 2021 be confirmed as an accurate record of proceedings and the Chair be authorised to sign them.

**278      FORMER HOLLOWAY PRISON, PARKHURST ROAD, LONDON, N7 0NU (Item B1)**

Phased comprehensive redevelopment including demolition of existing structures; site preparation and enabling works; and the construction of 985 residential homes including 60 extra care homes (Use Class C3), a Women's Building (Use Class F.2) and flexible commercial floorspace (Use Class E) in buildings of up to 14 storeys in height; highways/access works; landscaping; pedestrian and cycle connection, publically accessible park; car (blue badge) and cycle parking; and other associated works.

## Planning Committee - 10 February 2022

(Planning application number: P2021/3273/FUL)

In the discussion the following points were made:

- The Planning Officer informed the meeting that since the agenda was published an Addendum Report was published on 9th February 2022, which includes an updated recommendation stating that the application is to be referred to the Mayor of London.
- Further updates included details relating to the fit-out costs of the women's building; correction of errors and omissions within the report and updated conclusions of the BPS viability appraisal.
- Members were informed that a further 110 representations were received bringing the total number of respondents on the proposal to 195 and that issues raised are consistent with those summarised and addressed in the Committee Report.
- The Planning Officer advised that the latest representations suggested amendments to the scheme and the addition of conditions/obligations. Also Islington's CCG had requested a financial contribution to be secured in relation to the availability of GP services in the area. Planning officers advised that they did not consider that this contribution was necessary but that they would continue to work with the CCG to determine whether a contribution from the site specific CIL would be appropriate reasonable in future.
- The meeting was informed that the proposed Women's Building will be delivered during the first phase of the development and would be secured in perpetuity at a peppercorn rent, that the proposed internal layout is considered to be inherently flexible, and that there would be an opportunity for a future operator to influence its internal layout.
- The proposed Women's Building has been designed with the needs of two separate user groups in mind: firstly, the provision of support and rehabilitation services to women with experience of the criminal justice system; and secondly, local women wishing to access support services and other women centred services and activities.
- The planning officer advised that the building will provide space to replace community based support and rehabilitation services that were lost when the prison closed. Members were advised that the building will provide space for the activities listed in the 'Holloway Women's Building – a Local Needs Analysis' document produced by objectors although perhaps not all at the same time.
- The meeting was advised that the site's previous history will be commemorated through a Heritage Plan and the translocation of cherry trees, both of which will be secured by conditions.
- With regards to the £2.9 million cost towards the fitting out of the Women's building, the meeting was advised that this will need to be secured prior to planning permission being granted. The meeting was advised of Peabody's claim that it is unable to fund the fit out cost due to viability reasons and that subject to a formal decision on funding the Council could agree to fund the £2.9 million fit out costs.
- The scheme proposes a public park and a Residents' facility within Block D both of which will be available for use by all residents of the development.

## Planning Committee - 10 February 2022

Members were advised that the space within the residents' facilities will be made available free of charge for at least 1 day per week to residents of the development and that a Community Engagement Plan is to be submitted to the Council. Also a sum of £13,622,376.72 CIL will be paid to the council and £3,285,438.80 of Mayoral CIL will be paid.

- With regards to the design, the Planning Officer advised that the layout, scale, massing, architectural design and materials are considered an appropriate response. Members were advised that the scheme has been presented to the Design Review Panel 5 times with most of the main concerns of the Panel having been resolved.
- The Planning Officer noted that 4 blocks located in the south of site have floors above 30m and one block to the west has a minor infringement of parapet and core above 30m. Members were advised that the impact of taller buildings has been partly mitigated through the positioning of the blocks and designs.
- With regards to the impact of the scheme on neighbouring amenity, the Planning Officer advised that distances between the development and neighbouring properties have been set to reduce the potential for overlooking and designed to protect privacy, for example blocks B1, B4, D2 & E1 have communal roof terraces which have been pulled back from the edge closest to the exterior of the site.
- On the issue of daylight and sunlight loss, the Planning Officer acknowledged that a number of neighbouring properties for example, Bakersfield Estate, Penderyn Way, Crayford House, 2 Parkhurst Road, Poynder House, 2-5 Prospect Place, 275 Camden Road, and 1- 12 Fairweather House will experience significant transgressions.
- Members were reminded that although in general, the level of transgression is high. and in some instances, severe with 40% reductions to either windows (VSC) or rooms (NSL), it is inevitable that some loss/harm would be expected due to the currently underutilised nature of an inner London site & the architectural features of some of the neighbouring properties (overhangs/balconies and secondary windows).
- As part of the schemes' commitment to the Council's Net Zero Carbon emission's target, no gas boilers are proposed, air source heat pumps will be used and Solar Photo Voltaic panels are being proposed for most of the buildings. It was also noted that the scheme proposes a carbon offset payment to LB Islington.
- In terms of quality of homes, the meeting was advised that all homes meet or exceed space standards, that the floor to ceiling heights of the homes are at least 2.6m, that all homes will have its own private amenity space and that a stepped aspect approach to windows is employed which is accepted by emerging GLA guidance.
- Members were advised that in terms of daylight, 93% of new habitable rooms tested achieve BRE guidance for ADF and that overheating concerns are limited to approximately 75 homes with plans in place to mitigate these concerns.

## Planning Committee - 10 February 2022

The Chair invited 9 registered speakers to speak. A summary of their representations is provided below:

- Helen Strongman, Chair of Bakersfield Estate Residents Association was concerned with the density and height of the development as it directly affects residents' homes. Another concern being the impact of the scheme on community cohesion and safety. Members were reminded of the level of transgressions in terms of daylight and sunlight, that they are high and in some cases severe, noting that 40 of the windows on the estate will experience a 40% reduction in light.
- The development is overpopulated for the site, that the proposed 14 storeys are overwhelming compared to the 5 storeys in the Bakersfield Estate, suggesting that any development on the site should be like for like to that of the Bakersfield Estate. Members were reminded that some residents will lose the pleasure of the use of their garden if the proposed development is allowed to proceed.
- On the issue of the submitted daylight and sunlight assessment, Bakersfield residents request that the height of blocks D and E2 is reduced. Members were reminded that the lack of provision of community facilities on the site for over 3500 residents is bound to put pressure on local facilities in the area
- Meeting was informed that although the proposed nature garden is welcomed, Bakersfield residents are concerned that this will attract anti-social activities and behaviour which is an ongoing issue in the area.
- Neil Kahawatte of Penderyn Way, a member of the Penderyn TRA and one of the 34 signatories of a letter of objection reminded members that the committee report identifies Penderyn way as being in the most sensitive part of the site, noting that the oversized building E1 and E2 on the drawings are positioned adjacent to the estate
- He indicated that the key issue that needs to be addressed is in relation to the report's statement on planning balance which in effect sanctions harm for some and gain for others, that despite numerous attempts to engage with Peabody over many years about their legitimate concerns this has not been addressed.
- Meeting was advised that the proposal does not conform with Islington Planning policy in numerous areas, so causing harm to the amenity of residents on the estate.
- Mr Kahawatte was concerned that despite repeated requests for information about light levels, section drawings to identify height relationships, the information was deliberately withheld until the planning application was submitted with the result that that there has been no opportunity during the design process to discuss and to possibly mitigate the harm to existing residents
- Concerns remain that blocks E1 and E2 are in close proximity to Trecastle and Penderyn Way and are over 5-6 storeys higher. This is clearly inappropriate to neighbouring homes and issues of overlooking, daylight and sunlight loss, overshadowing and dominance have not been addressed. Members were reminded of the impact of these tall buildings on the solar

## Planning Committee - 10 February 2022

panels of neighbouring buildings as it will affect residents ability to adapt to council's net zero carbon targets

- Members were reminded that if planning permission is granted 10 properties, notably nos 67-85 Penderyn Estate will no longer achieve the acceptable BRE criteria on daylight levels; that the applicant's daylight report incorrectly states that reduction in daylight and sunlight to the upper stories of homes was of less significance assuming them to be all bedrooms when in fact the first floor of these houses are single aspect living rooms. The proposed scheme will overlook 3 private gardens on the estate and have an adverse impact in areas such as the community garden, vegetable garden box and much needed children play areas
- Residents suggestions to reduce the height of block E2 have been roundly rejected by Peabody
- Mr Kahawatte reminded the meeting that the skyline of Penderyn Estate is already affected by the Bakersfield Estate to the North East, noting that if scheme is allowed to proceed, it will set a precedent going forward especially and is at odds with the council's SPD
- The scheme should not be approved until the issues relating to harm have been resolved as the Council has a duty of care to not only to neighbouring residents but to future occupiers of the development, that Members should either reject the scheme or defer it so as to allow the important changes to be made
- An Islington resident objected to the scheme stating that a failure to consult residents represents a failure of the council in its primary duty to ensure meaningful public participation and that there is concern that the scheme fails to respect the site's history, that there was no provision of a public park in the area, that there is a lack of community facilities, that there should be a combined scheme of social housing for families alongside a public green space and community facilities, repurposing the swimming pool and the gym on the site.
- Members were reminded that the material deficits in the application will need to be addressed, stating that the flawed process especially with lack of public participation could not be salvaged by imposing conditions which later could be made worse when Peabody seek to vary conditions. This process needs to be rectified, that this is an opportunity to work alongside residents to break away from high rise dense developments stifling London and blighting the lives of residents. The council should not be encouraging a gated high rise exclusive dwelling on the site and that this application should be rejected
- Pamela Windham Stewart, a psychologist, who had worked in HMP Holloway until it closed in 2016 and an Islington resident was concerned that the proposed Women's Building was not adequate, noting that there was no attempt to represent the history of the Prison on this site. Members were reminded of the various preventative programmes in the prison before it closed in 2016 which supported inmates from reoffending when released into society, its significance and role within the criminal justice system. Programmes such as the mother and baby unit, education, housing and mental health, therapy groups etc were all so essential for the prevention of crime. Members were reminded that the success of the intervention

## Planning Committee - 10 February 2022

programme should have been recognised by having an iconic building on the site, a place of reference where scholars and children can visit, that such an opportunity should not be lost

- There is concern that the legacy and the space for therapeutic interventions for all are not represented by this offer and that the retention of the cherry trees is not sufficient, that more can be done on the site for community safety
- Linda Clarke, local resident, requested that the Committee reject the scheme on the grounds of its failure to comply with Islington's policies & GLA requirements and above all its failure to achieve Climate Emergency targets
- Members were advised that following the Edmonton incinerator issue, any scheme going forward should comply with the Council's Environment Policy with a top priority to combat climate change. Peabody's proposal, one of the largest developments in the borough fails to address Islington's 2030 Net Zero carbon targets.
- The scheme also fails in a number of policy areas such as density with its 200 units above the preferred option in the SPD, the council's tall buildings policy and the lack of provision of community facilities. The meeting was reminded of the major transgressions in terms of daylight sunlight loss, especially as the Mayor's housing design quality guidance requires that buildings should be dual aspect with the majority of flats proposed for social rent being single aspect which is bound to cause significant overheating and ventilation problems. Islington's Bio diversity emergency plan is undermined by overdevelopment of the site and its green space policy.
- A local resident involved in the Campaign for 4 Holloway Group was concerned about the tenure mix on the site stating that every block should have mixed tenure. Marj Mayo suggested that by amending a specific condition, the developers could introduce mixed tenure in an innovative way as an experiment to foster community cohesion. She identified block D with the resident lounge as a good place to experiment in that it will bring tenants and residents together to manage the facility in a socially inclusive way and encourage all to participate in social and cultural activities together.
- Debbie Humphrey a housing and planning researcher from Oxford Brooke's university, speaking on behalf of Islington Homes for All objected to the scheme on the basis of the location of the social rented units which represents 42% of housing provided on site in comparison to the location of private sale units which is around the same percentage of 40%. Members were reminded that 3 of the 5 blocks facing the Parkhurst Road are designated for social rent, and that 85% of the flats facing the polluted major road will be for social rent. However of the flats facing the park, 5 of the blocks are for private sale and one for social rent demonstrating the uneven distribution of housing tenure.
- Peabody claims that blocks facing the road will have great views, it ignores resident's health and increasing energy cost especially as an estimated 25,000 vehicles go through Parkhurst Road each day with social tenants being highly disproportionately exposed to pollution and noise levels.

## Planning Committee - 10 February 2022

- Members were reminded that the high number of single aspect windows were non-compliant with all relevant Islington policies.
- Andy Bain, Islington Homes 4 All, an objector to the scheme welcomed the commitment for no less than 42% of social housing, however there is concern about shared ownership as it is not considered to be affordable. He noted that evidence shows that less than 10% involved in the scheme ever buy out right their properties and over 80% ever buy more than their initial share of the scheme. Members were reminded that purchasing a 25% share in a Peabody shared ownership property will require a household income of over £67,000 which is double the joint income of Islington resident which the scheme is aimed at and further more service charges can be high and unpredictable which further makes shared ownership unaffordable
- Considering this space is public land which is being used for much needed housing, Islington Council should interpret its own SPD to maximise its social housing.
- To address and promote community cohesion within the development, a condition should be imposed requiring the setting up of a democratic tenant and resident association which should also be recognised by Peabody.
- Jonathan Ward, local resident, member of the design review panel objected to the flagrant disregard of GLA & Islington policy, and stated that the extreme density of the proposal will result in poor quality homes and public space
- Members were reminded that over £90m of public money has gone into the project via grant and loans and that it is a travesty that this will result in poor quality homes. The proposed number of homes is 36% more than the Council's own capacity assessment for the site thereby making St George's ward the 12th most dense ward in London.
- Concerns that 210 rooms will not receive the minimum recommended daylight levels and the annual sunlight levels will not be achieved in over 53% of the rooms. An additional concern is that despite the deficit of outdoor space in the area, the scheme falls short of policy requirements and it is important to recognise that once this scheme is built the amount of open space per person in the Ward falls because of the dense nature of the scheme.
- Concern with regards the access road that cuts through the development.
- Lawrencia Frempong, a local resident and trustee of the Community Plan 4 for Holloway group was concerned that the scheme will not promote community cohesion, that a mixed tenure within all blocks will enhance harmony and that all open areas should be accessible to all the scheme's residents. The lack of provision of a community centre is a concern with a potential influx of 3500 new people on the site. The nearby Williamson centre will be unable to manage the number of residents. She highlighted that with children living in such a development it will be essential to have adequate facilities to enable space for learning and recreational activities which will promote healthy active integration of young people into the society.
- Peabody's arrangements and plan of a private lounge on the site is not ideal as it excludes social tenants and in particular low income earners which will not promote community cohesion

## Planning Committee - 10 February 2022

- A suggestion was made that if the application is to go ahead, a condition be imposed for 50% of the residents lounge to be used by the community free of charge making it accessible for all residents to mix together whatever their income
- Niki Gibbs, a local resident and a member of Reclaim Holloway was concerned with Peabody's current plans regarding the Women's Building, that the proposed flexible all purpose building is not similar to the Women's centre in the HMP building which pioneered and housed some of the more progressive therapeutic and holistic services for women within the criminal justice. Members were reminded that the council's SPD states that with any replacement and relocated facility for the specific use, it should at least be equal to the existing facility, however the scheme's current plan for a single floor leaves approximately only 600 sqm of floor space for services, which represents one seventh of the space available to women in the prison. It was noted that this space will be expected to additionally provide services for vulnerable women in the community particularly young women and provide a hub for 40 women's organisations to deliver services from accessible services
- The single floor is what the developer is prepared to offer at a peppercorn rent and the building does not attempt to meet the needs of women or honour their legacy. Meeting was informed that following a briefing by the council's design officer about the Women's building the proposal was deemed inadequate by 24 of the 28 service providers who responded.
- Reclaim Holloway have concerns with the £2.9m being secured to kit out the Women's building as this amounts to fitting out a place that is not fit for purpose, as the building should be a jewel on the site as a legacy to honour women and the prison workers, that nothing less than a standalone building will be sufficient, noting that block E2 will be a perfect place for a women's building. It was suggested that funding should be sought from the £1.2billion Prison Reform budget towards the Women's building

The applicants were invited to speak and address the concerns raised by the residents. They stated that:

- The proposal will result in the provision of 985 homes, 60% which are affordable( 415 social rent (including 60 extra care homes) and 178 shared ownership, exceeding policy and this is regarded as a substantial contribution to addressing affordable housing need in the borough
- Meeting was advised that 269 jobs will be provided across the whole scheme both during and after completion, that there will be an on site green skills hub. As a founding member of the Women's Trade Network, both women and 51 apprentices will be actively involved throughout the phases of development, an employment obligation which goes beyond policy requirement.
- Peabody will retain the freehold interest of the development and will be responsible for the estate management of the buildings and the green space. The scheme is carefully designed for its future residents for both its functionality and longevity, hence the reason that robust high quality materials are being used that will complement the surroundings and stand



## Planning Committee - 10 February 2022

the test of time. Meeting was advised that beyond the buildings, Peabody aims to create and sustain communities, looking forward to fostering the Holloway community by delivering a Community Engagement Plan.

- Other proposals include a generous open space maintained by Peabody, tenant resident activities available to all regardless of tenure, commercial space,- play spaces, the Women's Building and the mix of tenure being evenly distributed across the site which will all help to produce a sustainable and inclusive community.
- The Project Manager advised that the scheme is able to deliver on the supplementary planning document and importantly is going beyond policy requirements to create a fantastic place for people to live and spend time and to honour importantly the legacy of the site and to making a significant contribution to the borough's affordable housing crisis.
- Meeting was advised that it has been a long process, working in conjunction with planning officers with the result that the scheme before the Committee is a high quality, well designed, landscape led development with 60% affordable housing.
- With regards to the use of the resident facilities on site, the Project Manager assured the Committee that it will be available for all residents regardless of their tenure and welcomed the suggestion as to the setting up of a TRA
- On the lack of a community centre on site, the project manager referred members to a 2020 report commissioned by the council which clearly states that there is currently no demand for new community centres within Islington , reminding members that there is scope through CIL - for it to be used towards improving existing neighbouring community centres
- With regards to the question about tenure distribution and especially around Camden and Parkhurst Roads, the Project Manager acknowledged that along that elevation and looking onto Camden Road 40% of the homes are social rent with the remaining being shared ownership or market.
- On potential anti-social behaviour, the Project Manager noted concerns, reassuring the meeting that as the scheme evolves and with Peabody's stewardship of the site, it will ensure this is addressed and will continue to consult with the Met Police, reminding the Committee that conditions have been secured as part of the proposal to address this issue
- The Project Manager reassured the Committee that there will be no segregation within the proposed play space on the site, that it will be available to all residents to use.
- In response to a lack of provision for teenagers on site and a discussion on improving its offer on the site, the Project Manager stated that the scheme caters for all ages of young people within the scheme, reiterating the 1.4acre of public park and the resident's facilities which are available to all.
- The Project Manager reiterated that in terms of provision for young people, the scheme has exceeded policy requirement however reminding members that landscaping condition which has been secured.
- In addition to the above, the Director of Planning referred members to condition 52 in the addendum report which states that prior to the occupation of the development, details of the play spaces should be

## Planning Committee - 10 February 2022

submitted to the local planning authority and it clearly states that all age groups would be catered for.

- The Chair suggested that maybe a condition specifically to address all age groups could be recommended so as to remove any ambiguity about the age of children as presently it is a broad definition.
- In response the Project Manager reiterated some of the provision for teenagers such as table tennis, rope climbing, out door activities such as marbles, informal lawn areas and hammocks and will be secured by a condition.
- On the question of whether there was an indoor provision for teenagers, the Project Manager stated that the residents and tenant facilities will be open to all residents on the development, however there was acknowledgment that the final use of the building has yet to be finalised.
- With regards to a Member question about the viability of the scheme and its projection of a £44m deficit and how it aims to address this shortfall, the Project Manager advised that based on their assessment that over time the sales value of the flats will increase and help to reduce the deficit.
- On the issue of tenure distribution around the site, the Project Manager acknowledged that along Camden and Parkhurst road, 40% homes facing the road are for social rent and the remaining ones are allocated to shared ownership and market sales. Providing further details of affordable housing facing the road, it was noted that 53% will be shared ownership and 7 % will be market sales which amounts to a total of 93, so overwhelmingly amount of social housing will be facing Camden road
- A Member sought clarification of Peabody's plans to build an inclusive and sustainable community without providing enough community indoor space and especially the renaming of the 'Residents lounge' to 'Residents space'.
- In response, the Project Manager reiterated that in terms of internal spaces, there will be a resident and tenant facility which is situated on the ground floor of block D, the uses of which are yet to be finally determined and that the scheme's indicative plans in the design and access statement show a proposed gym, a lounge, work space and a dining room, that the spaces will be available to all residents and not be run for profit.
- On the question of whether these facilities on site will be available to be used by the wider Holloway community, the Project Manager advised that it will be restricted to those who live in the development, however residents can invite outsiders to enjoy the facilities.
- On Peabody's claim of delivering a landmark Women's building, and in reality only committing to providing a shell and core building, the Project Manager acknowledged that due to the financial deficit noted in the submitted viability assessment report, it is unable to fund the fit out costs of the women's building. The Project Manager reminded the committee that granting planning permission is conditional on funding for the fit out being secured.
- In terms of the future use and management of the women's building, the Project Manager informed members that a feasibility study will be carried out in conjunction with council officers.
- In response to a Member's assertion that the scheme is unable to deliver a landmark women's building therefore not policy compliant as the SPD

requires, the Project Manager reminded the meeting that there is an obligation to fit out the Women's building and it will have to seek funding from somewhere else if the Council is unable to provide funds.

- On being asked whether there is an improved offer regarding London Living Rent, the meeting was advised that the scheme is in deficit and Peabody cannot at this stage make any changes or improvements to the intermediate offer by introducing London Living Rent as the scheme will incur a significant cost and the whole benefit of the proposal will have to change. Project Manager reminded the meeting that by offering shared ownership the scheme is able to fund the 415 social rent homes.
- Members were reminded that shared ownership is a recognised intermediate affordable product and policy compliant
- On the accessibility concerns into neighbouring site such as Bakersfield Estate, the project manager informed the meeting that this is dependent on third parties opening up their sites, and that in the last few years, there have been productive discussions with Notting Hill Genesis and City of London on opening up the access route into the neighbouring site.
- On the issue of the schemes' Net Zero Carbon targets, the Project Manager advised that Peabody's net zero assessment will ensure that the buildings are sustainable, that Peabody will upgrade its PV panels and as the scheme evolves there will be scope to look at ways of improving performance against the target, noting that there is an obligation in the s106 agreement that with the beginning of each phase and new technology coming into the market, this issue will be revisited. Peabody will continue to strive to address this issue.
- With regard to objectors' suggestions about having a mix of both social renters and market occupiers and shared ownership in the same block, the Project Manager acknowledged service charges are important and the separation of tenures ensures a better management of service charges so as keep these at a minimum for social rented tenants, that the business model is driven by the desire to keep cost low.
- On the question of Council deciding not to provide CIL monies to the scheme but prefer to spend it elsewhere, the Project manager reiterated that this will act as a further incentive for Peabody to seek funding elsewhere as there is a full commitment to provide the 415 affordable homes.
- With regards broadband provision, the meeting was advised that all homes will have fibre broadband infrastructure as standard and that free public wifi will be made available in the park, however occupiers will have to seek their internet services from their providers
- Members had concerns about the lack of provision on the development for teenagers, that there are issues around the running cost of the women's centre, the possibility of exploring more social mix of the tenures, daylight and sunlight concerns and broadband provision.
- A member suggested that more time will be required for a scheme this big and complex, suggesting that the application be deferred so issues such as the mix of tenure and its effectiveness can be resolved. There is concern about the huge discrepancy in relation to the deficit of the scheme as

provided by both the applicant and the council's experts and the fitting out cost of £2.9m for the women's building and also possible running costs.

- Another member was not clear as to the provision of activities for young people, suggesting there is scope for the developers to be more specific on the offer and would welcome more information especially as a development of this size will have lots of families living there.
- There was concern that there was no improved offer in relation to London Living Rent especially as it is well known today that shared ownership is not affordable.
- Another member was not satisfied with the applicants explanation on the £2.9m fitting cost especially with the suggestion that the scheme is subject to the Council proving CIL monies, an odd arrangement considering that CIL monies are the only funding available to council to fund improvements across the borough.
- Not satisfied with Peabody's claim about promoting community, that the scheme looks like a private development. Peabody should be looking at the high cost of fibre optics as it is expensive for low income earners.
- A Member requested more details about the access route into neighbouring sites as applicants have not provided an adequate answer to this issue
- Member enquired if it was possible for the applicant to reconsider the disproportionate number of social rented units facing the busy polluted roads.
- The Committee agreed to defer the application so as to allow both the applicant and planning officers to look at addressing some of the issues, specifically -
- In response to the above, the Director of Planning advised the Committee that officers will work with the applicants to address the issues raised and that subject to the progress with resolving the issues, that it is proposed that the application be brought back to the committee on 8 March.
- The Legal Officer advised that if the Committee is to meet to consider the specific issues noted above only, the same members will be required when it comes back for consideration.

Councillor Convery proposed a motion to defer the application. This was seconded by Councillor Kay and carried.

**RESOLVED:**

That consideration of the application be deferred for the reasons outlined above.

**279 ADDENDUM COMMITTEE REPORT (Item B2)**

The meeting ended at 11.15 am

**CHAIR**

