



P L A N N I N G S U B - C O M M I T T E E

**Thursday 11 January 2024 at 6.30 pm
Council Chamber, Hackney Town Hall**

Supplementary paper: Addendum

Members of the Sub-Committee:

Cllr Steve Race (Chair), Cllr Jessica Webb (Vice Chair),
Cllr Michael Desmond, Cllr Clare Joseph, Cllr Michael Levy,
Cllr Richard Lufkin, Cllr Jon Narcross, Cllr Clare Potter, Cllr Ali
Sadek, and Cllr Sarah Young.

Substitute Sub-Committee Members:

Cllr Eluzer Goldberg, Cllr Shaul Krautwirt, Cllr M Can Ozen,
Cllr Benzion Papier, Cllr Sheila Suso-Runge, and Cllr Claudia
Turbet-Delof.

Dawn Carter-McDonald
Interim Chief Executive
Published on: Thursday 11 January
2024
www.hackney.gov.uk

Contact: Gareth Sykes
Governance Officer
governance@hackney.gov.uk

Planning Sub-Committee

Thursday 11 January 2024

Supplementary paper: addendum

- 6** **2023/1076: 42 Bergholt Crescent, Hackney, London, N16 5JE (Pages 3 - 6)**

LONDON BOROUGH OF HACKNEY

PLANNING SUB-COMMITTEE
11/01/2024

ADDENDUM SHEET

ITEM 6: 2023/1076: 42 Bergholt Crescent, Hackney, London, N16 5JE

Development description to be amended as follows:

Construction of a single-storey rear extension at ground floor level, a first floor infill extension and a rear roof extension as well as the installation of windows in the side elevation, excavation of a full-depth basement with associated front lightwells.

Drawing numbers:

21.1249/017 C to be replaced with 21.1249/017 D. The rear elevation has been amended to show the height of the ground floor rear extension at the boundary with adjoining 40 Bergholt Crescent is 2.8 metres as per the annotation.

Submitted documents:

The submitted daylight sunlight assessment has been amended to correct a minor discrepancy with the labelling of the rear gardens.

Paragraph 3.6 - 6 additional comments have been submitted since the report publication date. 1 of these submissions is a representation from an adjoining occupier who has yet to submit a representation. The total number of objections received is now 11. The following comments relate to additional concerns not listed within the published Officer report.

- The immediate area is likely to be designated as a conservation area in the immediate future and the implementation of this proposal would reduce that possibility.

Officer note: The application site is not situated within an adopted Conservation Area. The potential development of works sought within this application, will not impact the potential for the adoption of a future Conservation Area.

- The proposed basement plans state that the proposed basement already has approval under application 2018/2033, this application relates to a roof extension and not a basement.

Officer note: The submitted basement plan does illustrate an incorrect planning permission reference number. Notwithstanding this the site has planning permission for a basement excavation of a similar size and depth under application 2021/0544.

- The existing plans show an L shaped block which no longer exists as it was required to remove this structure as it was built without seeking appropriate planning permission. The applicants are therefore citing illegal building works as a precedent for this current

application.

Officer note: The existing plans make reference to an L shaped structure which previously existed but has been removed from the site. Officers do not cite this as a precedent for the works sought as part of this application.

- The proposed side door should also feature translucent glazing.

Officers note: The side door is at ground level leading onto a shared access way with no views into private or habitable amenity spaces. Therefore officers do not feel there is a need to require opaque glazing.

- The playroom does not benefit from any windows and therefore cannot be considered to be a habitable room.

Officers note: A playroom is not considered to be a habitable room.

- Front and rear light wells are mentioned in the covering letter though these cannot be seen in the plans.

Officers note: The front lightwell can be clearly seen in the plans however no rear lightwell is included in this application.

- The extension at 36 Bergholt Crescent has caused disturbance in the form of light disturbance and noise disturbance, it should not be used as a precedent to justify the application.

Officers note: The perceived impact of an extension on a different site is not material to the assessment of this application.

- A condition will be attached to prevent the use of the flat roof as a terrace, how will this be enforced?

Officer note: Any reported breach of planning permission will be investigated by the planning enforcement team.

- Enforcement of the CPZ is not sufficient to offset the increased car demand for the site.

Officers note: No additional units are proposed so the potential for additional car parking is negligible.

Paragraph 7.13 to be altered as follows:

The proposed roof extension possesses a setback of 0.2 metres from the end of the outrigger and the eaves of the roof as well as a setback of 0.3 metres from the inner and outer edges of the party walls and a setback of just over a metre from the ridgeline of the roof. Whilst some of these setbacks are marginally below the recommendations within the Residential Extensions and Alterations SPD, officers note the proposed roof extension would broadly match the dimensions of a roof extension that was approved under lawful development certificate application for 2018/2033.

Signed.....

Date.....

NATALIE BROUGHTON
Assistant Director Planning & Building Control

This page is intentionally left blank