

MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE PLANNING SUB-COMMITTEE

WEDNESDAY, 2ND SEPTEMBER, 2020

Councillors Present: in the Chair

**Cllr Vincent Stops, Cllr Katie Hanson,
Cllr Susan Fajana-Thomas, Cllr Brian Bell,
Cllr Peter Snell and Cllr Clare Potter**

Apologies: Cllr Michael Levy, Cllr Clare Joseph and
Cllr Steve Race

Officers in Attendance

1 Apologies for Absence

1.1. Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Joseph, Levy and Race.

2 Declarations of Interest

2.2 There were no declarations of interest.

3 Consider any proposal/questions referred to the sub-committee by the Council's Monitoring Officer

3.3 There were no proposals or questions referred back to the committee.

4 Minutes of the Previous Meeting

4.4 There were no minutes ready for consideration at the meeting.

5 2020/1667 Land at Wimbourne Street London N1 7HB

5.1 **PROPOSAL** : Demolition of existing garage buildings and construction of one six (6) and one eight (8) storey residential building providing 59 residential units, a ground floor commercial space (A1 use class), a new games area, new and replacement car and cycle parking and associated landscape and public realm works.

5.2 **POST SUBMISSION REVISIONS:**

Submission of Health Impact Assessment and Fire Strategy;
Submission of revised Drainage Strategy, Air Quality Assessment and Transport Statement.

5.3 The Planning Officer introduced the planning application as set out in the meeting papers pack. During the officer's presentation reference was made to the addendum and the following:

Wednesday, 2nd September, 2020

An updated Arboricultural Impact Assessment (Rev A) prepared by SES and dated August 2020 was received to replace the previous Arboricultural Impact Assessment (SES, May 2020).

An updated Planning & Affordable Housing Statement (Rev 1) prepared by Tibbalds and dated August 2020 was received to replace the previous Planning & Affordable Housing Statement (Tibbalds, June 2020).

Officer Response: These documents were updated to ensure consistency with the Design & Access Statement in regard to the number of trees felled. Both documents are published online and there is no material change to warrant reconsultation.

Paragraph 6.7.18 amended to read:

Policy LP43 of LP33 states that development will be permitted where it enables new residents to make journeys by active modes and policy LP42 requires development to provide cycle parking in accordance with appendix 2 of LP33. Requirements as set out in appendix 2 of LP33 include a minimum of 1 space per 45sqm dwelling and 2 spaces for every dwelling above 45sqm.

*Additionally, the development is required to provide 1 space per 10 bed spaces for visitors and 1 space per 25 units for visitors (minimum of 2). The proposed development includes the provision of 128 long stay cycle parking spaces and **24** short stay/visitor cycle parking spaces across the site.*

Paragraph 8.1.6 amended to read:

Demolition and Construction Logistics Management Plan

No development shall take place until a detailed Demolition and Construction

Logistics

Management Plan covering the matters set out below has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall only be implemented in accordance with the details and measures approved as part of the demolition and construction management

plan, which shall be maintained throughout the entire construction period.

- A demolition and construction method statement covering all phases of the development to include details of noise control measures and measures to preserve air quality (including a risk assessment of the demolition and construction phase);

- A demolition and construction waste management plan setting out how resources will be managed and waste controlled at all stages during a construction project, including, but not limited to, details of dust mitigation measures during site clearance and construction works (including any works of demolition of existing buildings or breaking out or crushing of concrete), the location of any mobile plant machinery, details of measures to be employed to mitigate against noise and vibration arising out of the construction process demonstrating best practical means

- Details of the location where deliveries will be undertaken; the size and number of lorries expected to access the site daily; the access arrangements (including turning provision if applicable); construction traffic routing and trip generation and effects on the highway network;

details of parking suspensions (if required) and the duration of construction

- A dust management plan to include details of how dust from construction activity will be controlled mitigated against following best practice guidance. This should include monitoring of particulate matter at the application site boundary in the direction of sensitive receptors following the SPG

Mayor of London Control of Dust and Emissions Guidance.

REASON: To avoid hazard and obstruction being caused to users of the public highway and in the interest of public safety and amenity. To protect air quality and people's health by ensuring that the production of air pollutants, such as nitrogen dioxide and particulate matter, are kept to a minimum during the course of building works.

Paragraph 8.1.17 amended to read:

External Lighting

*Prior to the occupation of the development, a detailed external lighting plan detailing light coverage and spill (including lux levels) across the site **and sensor details** shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.*

REASON: To safeguard against adverse light pollution.

Paragraph 8.2 (5) amended to read:

Adoption and compliance with Travel Plan and Travel Plan Monitoring fee of £2,000.

A full Travel Plan will be required to establish a long-term management strategy that encourages sustainable and active travel. The Travel Plan is required to include SMART targets that are: specific, measurable, achievable, realistic and time bound. The Travel Plan should be reviewed and monitored annually for at least 5 years in consultation with Council Officers and an appointed Travel Plan Coordinator (TPC).

Reviews should evaluate the plan and ensure that the targets are appropriate to encourage

sustainable transport uptake. New interim targets should be set and correspond to our Transport Strategy and LP33.

New occupants must be provided with an information pack containing the location of local travel information i.e. local bus routes, nearest tube and rail stations and local tube or rail network.

Paragraph 8.2 (11) amended to read:

Two blue badge parking bays must be provided prior to occupation. The four blue badge parking bays not immediately established, shall be provided as required, at the request of future occupants of the ground floor residential units.

There were no persons registered to speak in objection to the application.

5.4 Hackney Council's Head of Housing Supply Programme made a brief statement in support of the application focusing on how the project was seeking to address local housing needs and the consultation process involved. The proposal seeks to demolish the existing 27 garages and construct one six (6) and one eight (8) storey residential building, a ground floor commercial space, a new games area, new and replacement car and cycle parking and associated landscape and public realm works. The proposal provides 59 new units within two linear blocks. The north block consists of 41 units across 4-8 storeys and the south block consists of 18 units across 4-6 storeys. In terms of the tenure mix 37 per cent would be social rent, 19 per cent would be intermediate and 44 per cent would be market rate. There had been a considerable level of public engagement about the project including three public exhibitions and before the nationwide lockdown door knocking of 200 homes. From this public

engagement it had been found that there was a real demand for high quality accommodation and this demand had been reflected in the final proposals.

5.5 The Planning Sub-Committee members raised a number of questions and the following points were raised:

- This project meets (and exceeds) the minimal affordable housing policy requirement of 50 per cent on site (56 per cent) which ties into the unilateral undertaking as part of the council's wider housing supply programme. The project also meets the social rent and intermediate housing policy requirements. While it was acknowledged that this specific project would deliver a relatively low number of family sized units, the overall housing supply programme will deliver a policy requirement mix and tenure mix
- The priority of the council housing supply programme was to deliver affordable housing and this would largely be funded through a cross subsidy funding model where enough homes were built for sale in order to pay for the affordable homes. Hackney Council runs a portfolio approach to financial viability so that a project that generates a surplus will be used to pay for a project that has an overall subsidy requirement. Overall the housing supply programme aims to deliver 70 percent of affordable housing, however for planning purposes the council is committed to a affordable housing target of 50 percent and as mentioned earlier the council was currently ahead of that target however in the future times were expected to become tougher and the council was currently, in terms of viability, at break even. So any reduction in viability in the future would result in a reduction in affordable housing in another project further down the line
- Addressing the Design Review Panel's concerns about there being too much permeability the through paths had been defined and would be well sign posted. There would also be ring fencing around park court and there would also be a new path providing access from the north. In terms communal spaces **new bin court** would also be included as part Wimbourne North and there would be access to the new bin storage area. Measures would also be taken to stop people wandering across the site with perimeter planting along **North Road** giving the development a more comprehensive edge (30mins)
- The review by the DRP was sometime ago and was at the time looking at a much earlier iteration of the scheme and a lot had changed since then and many of the issues that had been raised had been addressed e.g. privacy concerns had been addressed by increasing the permeability and by creating more privacy on the site to the north. The planning service were satisfied that the DRP comments were addresses however the panel had not seen the final iteration of the scheme and they very rarely see the final scheme
- It was felt that the best way to lock down quality into the scheme and the architects were of the view that there were certain ways that would best serve this kind of project to provide a high quality development, for example, the detailed banding along the façade. The architects have consulted with various suppliers and experts had concluded that the best method was to have brick slips on a pre cast element. They would be made off site and then brought in would be the best strategy and would be a way of getting a higher level of quality into the scheme, however, it was wa acknowledged those

Wednesday, 2nd September, 2020

concerns of use of brick slips in other projects but the architects felt that on this occasion they would be mechanically fixed and then joined and grouted brick slips were the right solution for this project

- Materials did form part of the conditions
- Addressing concerns over incidents with some other applications where brick slips were employed and they had slipped off, it was explained that in the case of this application there was pre cast elements so effectively there was masonry façade using high quality clay facing bricks. These would be built up and where there was the pre cast concrete where there was detailing there was pieces of masonry, there would be slips but it would be on a concrete bed
- In terms of how many times the DRP would see the iteration of a scheme, it was noted that the panel had a limited capacity on how many times it could see a scheme, but the planning service noted the comments from some of the committee members, and each scheme would be considered on a case by case and judgement call would be taken on how many times it needed to be seen by the panel
- **There** was an expectation that the project would be policy compliant and it was highlighted the flex in the design of the project when, for example, the four one bedroom flats on the ground floor of Wimbourne North had originally been configured as family units, however, on closer examination of the local need it turned out this was not the case
- There was 13 estate car parking spaces, which was in line with LP45. No one car parking permits would be provided to new members of the estate
- The architects had a good track record of delivering high quality and award winning housing and the standards for this project were very high and the materials were very good
- Some of the Planning Sub-Committee members agreed to go and see mock ups of the materials to be used on site
- It was felt that two tier cycle parking was not a good idea for this project, however, there was an expectation that any cycle parking on site would be in line with London plan design standards with a good level of spacing between cycle parking space and some of the short stay cycle parking would be Sheffield stands for example
- The Electric Vehicle Charing points condition would be amended so that it was clear that they would be on the carriageway not the pavement
- The boundary treatments for the lower ground floor flats at front and back were defensible with fencing and railings. It would also be set back
- One of the larger of the four trees to be removed was a lime tree. It had value but to allow to get the building in this lime tree had to be removed but a lot more planting would be going in and it was felt that this was good compromise

Vote

For: Unanimous

For details on the full conditions for this application please click on the following link:

RESOLVED, planning permission was GRANTED subject to conditions and completion of a Unilateral Undertaking (UU).

6 2020/1576 Land of Buckland Street N1 6TR

6.1 PROPOSAL: Demolition of existing garage buildings and construction of three, six (6) storey residential buildings providing 54 residential units, a flexible, ground floor commercial space (A1, B1, D1, D2 uses), a new ball court, games area, new and replacement car and cycle parking and associated landscape and public realm works.

6.2 POST SUBMISSION REVISIONS:

Health Impact Assessment

Revised Air Quality Assessment

Landscape Statement Addendum

Amended Civil engineering drainage strategy, prepared by Momentum

Given the scope of the minor revisions within each of the documents further consultation was not required.

6.3 The planning officer introduced the planning application, as outlined in the report, and during the course of their presentation reference was made to the addendum and the following:

Paragraph 4.2.1 should read:

Letters of consultation were sent to 2021 adjoining owners/occupiers. At the time of writing the report, **4 objections and 1 general comment** were received in the form of individual representations. These representations are summarised below:

Paragraph 6.7.16 should read:

London Plan policy 3.6 and LP50 seeks development to provide play and informal recreational space. Policy LP50 and the Mayor's SPG 'Shaping Neighbourhoods: Play and Informal Recreation'

recommends 10sqm of dedicated playspace per child for future provision. Based on GLA calculations, the child yield for the development is 31.9 children, thereby resulting in a requirement to provide 318.8m² of designated play space

Wednesday, 2nd September, 2020

to meet both policy LP50 and the GLA requirements. The calculator envisages the development will generate 13.2 children under five and therefore does not specify a separate requirement for doorstep playable space. Table 4.7 of the SPG states

that a development with such a yield of children should provide between 300-500m² of on-site local playable space. The development proposes to provide a total of 362m² of doorstep playspace and 184.9m² of ballcourt playspace through the relocation and refurbishment of the on-site MUGA .

Paragraph 6.9.33 should read:

Additionally, with regards to outlook, it is emphasised that the windows located on buildings located in closer proximity to the proposed villas; i.e. **Cherbury Court** block and Crondall Court block, are serving rooms within the neighbouring units that benefit from other windows. As such, these neighbouring units will continue to enjoy a positive level of outlook both towards the proposed buildings and to other orientations.

Paragraph 8.1.7 should read:

External Lighting

Prior to the occupation of the development, a detailed external lighting plan detailing light coverage and spill (including lux levels) across the site **and sensor details** shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

REASON: To safeguard against adverse light pollution.

- 6.4 Hackney Council's Head of Housing Supply Programme made a brief statement in support of the application. This project was the second of the three projects in the Hoxton West area which in total would deliver overall 186 new homes with 60 per cent being affordable homes as part of the council's housing supply programme delivering affordable homes in brownfield sites. As previously mentioned during agenda item 5, the council was on target to deliver 700 new homes of which 50 per cent would be affordable. As with the previous Wimbourne Street proposal the committee were updated on the steps that had been taken to meeting local housing need and the various initiatives that had been undertaken in terms of public engagement. This new development would comprise of 54 new dwellings and one commercial unit. In terms of tenure split, the proposal has been designed to be tenure blind and would deliver a mix of social rent, shared ownership (intermediate) and units for market sale. At the time of the application there were 49 households in the immediate vicinity in need to alternative accommodation. Local lettings policy was such that those families most in need would be able to move into a brand new council home without leaving the estate and community which in turn would result in their vacant home being available to re let for others on the housing need register. The council had undertaken extensive consultations over the past two years with stakeholders and local residents including newsletters to 300 homes, three public exhibitions and drop-ins as well as 300 door knocks. The feedback received from this public engagement had influenced the final proposals. The boundary was extended to ensure that the local residents could enjoy a high quality public realm. The proposal would also seek to create a shared surface on Clunbury Road, various traffic calming measures and a new bin storage area.

6.5 The Planning Sub-Committee members raised a number of questions and the following points were raised:

- This was a challenging project which originally had no front and back. The proposal had gone to the DRP twice and as a result the height had been scaled down and the ground space had been changed to make it more defensible. At the first DRP the scheme was much larger and its following recommendations had been reduced by seven storeys. Permeability had also been a consideration that had come out of the first DRP. There had originally been no mass between the villas and there was no clear front and back. Through subsequent discussions during the pre-application stage a front and back was created for the scheme. There was a front on to Buckland Street while the back led to the new landscape area. This scheme had a generous landscape offer and communal area was a fenced off area with gates
- The issues raised by the DRP had almost everything had been resolved. The only issue that had remained that the DRP had asked for greater spacing between the three blocks or for mitigation measures to be put in place could be used instead. The architects responded by maximising the private areas on site e.g. overlooking minimised. With the three blocks being separated out the natural light had been maximised and the dual aspect had been maximised which otherwise could not be realised. The north and south permeability also had been maintained. Generally the council's design officer was happy with the mitigating measures that were in place
- The recycling rates were low in flats accommodation. On Buckland Street there was a new bin storage area which was hoped would encourage further recycling. With the villas each villa would have their own dedicated easy-to-use bin storage area
- The Car Parking Zone (CPZ) was on street parking. All on site parking was to be lost. It was understood the new homes would be car free but a return resident would be able to park within the CPZ. The Committee agreed that the Hackney Council's Head of Housing Supply Programme would provide a written response on this issue
- The bin storage areas were located in such a way that they were immediately adjacent to the blocks for ease of use. A similar principle had been applied to the bicycle storage area
- East of the site, where the garden was located, it was understood would be open to the public during construction. Open spaces around the site would be accessible to the public. During construction local residents would not be at a loss for amenity space. Within a 100 metres of the site, to the South, was another Multi Use Games Area (MUGA) provision, a fenced off basketball court. Also to the North was Shoreditch Park
- The existing garages on site were originally built for private car use. Currently all of the garages were vacant and the council had worked with the users of those garages to locate replacement premises and some the users had taken up the offer. There had been no evidence to suggest that the garages had been used for business use, they had been used for personal storage
- The materiality was slightly different to the previous Wimbourne Street. A high quality pre cast concrete material was being used and the appropriate conditions were in place and as with the previous application the committee could see a mock up of the materials prior to commencement
- As with the previous Wimbourne Street application the Electric Vehicle Charging points would be on the carriage way

Wednesday, 2nd September, 2020

- The scheme was such that it had the flexibility to consider the use of cross laminated timber as part of its materiality

Vote:

For: Unanimous

For details on the full conditions for this application please click on the following link:

<http://mginternet.hackney.gov.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=125&MId=4950>

RESOLVED, planning permission was GRANTED subject to conditions and completion of a Unilateral Undertaking (UU).

7 2020/1788 Disinfecting Station, Millfields Road, London, E5 0AL

7.1 PROPOSAL: Roof repairs; refix of front lead dome; removal of ceiling plaster; replacement of box gutters; redress existing lead-work; removal of 9 courses of brickwork to rear extension and demolition of lower flat roof and front lean-to roofs; boarding up of all windows and doors; and other repairs as included in the submitted schedule of works.

There were no post-submission revisions.

7.2 The senior planner introduced the application as set out in the report in the meeting papers and during the course of his presentation he made reference to the addendum and the following:

Replace paragraph 8.1.4 - Expert supervision with:

Before work begins it shall be agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority the appropriately qualified professional specialising in conservation work who will supervise the hereby approved works of alteration or demolition. Any proposed changes to the agreed supervision arrangements shall be subject to the prior written agreement of the LPA.

REASON: To ensure that special regard is paid to protecting the special architectural and historic interest and integrity of the building in conformity with Section 16 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 and to ensure that special regard is paid to specific architectural features or fixtures and to ensure the fabric is protected from damage during the course of works.

7.3 The council's Principal Conservation and Design Officer gave a brief overview of the history of Disinfecting Station. The Governance Services Officer agreed to circulate information on the history of the station to the committee members and planning service after the committee meeting.

Vote:

For: Unanimous

RESOLVED, listed building consent was GRANTED, subject to conditions.

8 Delegated Decisions document

The committee noted the document.

Duration of the meeting: Times Not Specified

Signed:

.....
Chair of Planning Sub-Committee

Contact:

Emma Perry

0208 3563338

emma.perry@hackney.gov.uk