

APPROVED MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE PLANNING SUB-COMMITTEE

WEDNESDAY 12 JANUARY 2022

THIS MEETING WAS LIVE STREAMED AND CAN BE VIEWED HERE:

<https://youtu.be/hFbdOozvGWE>

ALTERNATIVE LIVESTREAM LINK OF MEETING:

<https://youtu.be/a9p8-njAq6Y>

- Councillors Present:** Councillor Vincent Stops in the Chair
Cllr Katie Hanson (Vice-Chair), Cllr Brian Bell, Cllr Clare Joseph, Cllr Steve Race and Cllr Sarah Young
- Apologies:** Councillor Michael Levy, Councillor Ajay Chauhan and Councillor Humaira Garasia
- Officers in Attendance:** Ola Akinbinu, Contract Delivery Manager, Capital Projects Team
Nick Bovaird, Senior Planner, Major Projects
Robert Brew, Major Applications Team Leader
Graham Callam, Growth Manager, Planning
Seonaird Carr, Team Leader Development and Enforcement, Planning
Cory Defoe, Area Regeneration Manager
Danny Huber, Planning Officer
Mario Kahraman, ICT Support
Karen Law, Partnership Analyst and Performance Manager, Community Safety, Enforcement and BR
Matt Payne, CUDS Deputy Manager
Gareth Sykes, Governance Service Officer
Jacqueline Thompson, Project Manager Property and Asset Management Neighbourhoods and Housing
John Tsang, Development Management and Enforcement Manager
Sam Woodhead, Planning Lawyer

1 Apologies for absence

- 1.2 Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Ajay Chauhan, Councillor Humaira Garasia and Councillor Michael Levy.

2 Declarations of interest

- 2.1 There was a declaration of interest from Councillor Race; the Councillor had been acting on behalf of local residents in relation to the agenda item 6. Councillor Race would recuse himself from the meeting for the duration of agenda item 6

3 To consider any proposal/questions referred to the Sub-Committee by the Council's Monitoring Officer

- 3.1 There were no proposals/questions referred by the Council's Monitoring Officer to the Sub-Committee.

4 Minutes of the previous meeting

- 4.1 The minutes of the previous meeting, held on the 1 December 2021, 27 October 2021, 6 October 2021 and 7 July 2021, were agreed as an accurate record of those meetings' proceedings.

RESOLVED, the minutes of the previous meetings held on 1 December 2021, 27 October 2021, 6 October and 7 July 2021, were agreed as an accurate record of those meetings' proceedings.

5 2021/2842: 3 Bradbury Street, Hackney, London, N16 8JN

- 5.1 PROPOSAL: Submission of details pursuant to conditions 4 (enlarged bin store/public w.c.facility) and 9 (Bird and Bat Boxes) of planning permission 2018/0792 dated 07/08/2018.

POST SUBMISSION REVISIONS: None

- 5.2 The Senior Planner, Major Projects outlined the application as published. During the course of his presentation reference was made to the addendum, which outlined a number of amendments to the report including details of objections raised by local residents and some Hackney Councillors.

- 5.3 The Sub-Committee first heard from the objectors who felt the proposals did not meet the needs of the users of Gillett Square, particularly those with disabilities and young children. They hoped that any steps that could be taken by the applicant, Hackney Cooperative Development (HCD), to ensure that the security of local residents was not compromised with the installation of toilets would be welcomed. The objectors were of the view that incidents of anti-social behaviour in Gillet Square were not unique to Dalston and to not install toilets in the square because of these incidents was illogical.

The Sub-Committee noted that the representatives for the applicant would be answering questions only.

- 5.4 The Sub-Committee entered the discussion phase where a number of points were raised including the following:
- The Sub-Committee expressed concern about the inclusion in the application report of categories of people who would have access to the cafe toilet. The

Sub-Committee did not agree with the cafe owner having discretion over which members of the public could use the toilet

- In the original application from 2018 the condition did not include an obligation for the applicant to provide toilets in the square
- The applicant explained that they were providing two managed toilets; one in the cafe and one on the ground floor of their building. The cafe would work with HCD to manage use of the toilet
- On a point of clarification, regarding persons staying in Gillet Square, one of the objectors explained that these persons were not rough sleepers
- The Sub-Committee noted that the application before them was about the extension of the bin storage area only
- Hackney Council's Area Regeneration Manager stated that having unmanaged toilets in Gillet Square would compound those anti-social and crime issues already occurring there
- The Council's Partnership Analyst and Performance Manager explained that the situation in Gillet Square was different to the situation in, for example, Hackney Central. The last few years had seen an escalation in violence in the square leading to considerable Council investment in Closed Circuit Television (CCTV). Any unmanaged standalone toilets in Gillet Square would likely be subject to misuse
- The Sub-Committee acknowledged that the application was about the extension of the bin storage area but yet the application had included a detailed report from the Secure by Design Officer. The application needed to be clearer. The Chair reminded the Sub-Committee members that the decision to provide public toilets was not part of the application under consideration
- The Sub-Committee noted that Hackney Council would be subject to challenge if the application was refused on the grounds that it did not include a provision for public toilets
- The Chair recommended that an informative be included stating that the applicant use the least discriminatory language when outlining the list of persons who could use the cafe toilet. The Sub-Committee agreed to the informative
- The Sub-Committee also recommended that a sign be included stating that the cafe toilet was for public use
- The applicant explained that the cafe was in their building and they would allow manage which people would be allowed to use the toilet
- The Chair reminded the Sub-Committee members that they were being asked to make a decision on the design of the bin store, not on whether an external toilet should be provided

Vote:

For: Councillor Bell, Councillor Hanson, Councillor Race, Councillor Stops and Councillor Young.

Against: None.

Abstention: Councillor Joseph.

RESOLVED, to discharge the conditions.

At the conclusion of agenda item 5 Councillor Race left the meeting for the duration of item 6 (see agenda item 2 above for further details).

6 2021/2864: 21 Purcell Street, London, N1 6RD

6.1 PROPOSAL: Replace existing timber windows and doors with uPVC double glazed windows and doors, colour Rosewood.

POST SUBMISSION REVISIONS: None

6.2 The Planning Officer introduced the planning application as published. During the course of his presentation reference was made to the published addendum which included details of an objection to the application.

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

6.4 On a point of clarification, the application was being considered at the meeting because of the objections received.

6.5 The Sub-Committee entered the discussion phase where a number of points were raised including the following:

- The Senior Quantity Surveyor confirmed that the timber would be replaced with uPVC. Appearance-wise only the panels would change
- The focus of the application was on the building's elevation facing west
- Hackney Council's Project Manager for Property and Asset Management, Neighbourhoods and Housing, explained that the Council had identified that it was not an additional requirement to provide additional fire safety measures to the panels because they were the height of the building, but they had taken the decision to upgrade them.

Vote

For: Councillor Bell, Councillor Hanson, Councillor Joseph, Councillor Stops and Councillor Young.

Against: None.

Abstention: None.

RESOLVED, planning permission was agreed subject to conditions.

7 2021/2489 and 2021/2436: 96 Brooke Road, London, N16 7RT

7.1 PROPOSAL: Erection of an outbuilding in the rear garden.

POST SUBMISSION REVISIONS: A tree plan was provided that showed the existing situation on site as well as the proposed species and number of trees proposed to be removed to facilitate the application. Given the tree plan simply evaluates the need for mitigation, a re-consultation exercise was not deemed necessary

2021/2436

PROPOSAL: Erection of single storey rear extension at lower ground floor level including associated alterations to rear staircase and openings on rear elevation at lower and upper ground floor levels.

POST SUBMISSION REVISIONS: A tree plan was provided that showed the existing situation on site as well as the proposed species and number of trees proposed to be removed to facilitate the application. Given the tree plan simply evaluates the need for mitigation, a re-consultation exercise was not deemed necessary.

- 7.2 The Council's Planning Service's Team Leader introduced the application 2021/2489 as published. During the course of the presentation reference was made to the addendum which included drawings that were not part of the A3 plans pack previously circulated.
- 7.3 No persons were registered to speak in objection to the application. Representatives for the applicant were present at the meeting and were available to answer any questions for both applications.
- 7.4 The Sub-Committee entered the discussion phase where a number of points were raised about application 2021/2489 including the following:
- The application was not subject to Permitted Development Rights
 - In terms of drainage the application would include a green roof to help with the run off of rain. It would only partly cover the garden with a sufficient amount of garden space being retained
 - The Sub-Committee noted there was a prevalence for these types of outbuildings in the local area, examples of outbuildings in the wider area were shown on an aerial image.
 - There was a tree replacement condition included (8.1.4 in the report). Any replacement trees would be maintained by the Council for a period of 10 years including the replacement of any plants that die, were severely damaged, seriously diseased, or removed. If the plants did not survive then the Council would be able to take enforcement action.

2021/2489

Vote:

For: Councillor Bell, Councillor Hanson, Councillor Joseph, Councillor Race, Councillor Stops and Councillor Young

Against: None

Absentations: None.

RESOLVED, planning permission was agreed subject to conditions.

- 7.5 The Council's Planning Service's Team Leader introduced the application 2021/2436 as published. During the course of the presentation reference was made to the addendum which included drawings that were not part of the A3 plans pack previously circulated.

The Sub-Committee did not raise any questions in relation to application 2021/2436.

2021/2436

Vote:

For: Councillor Bell, Councillor Hanson, Councillor Joseph, Councillor Race, Councillor Stops and Councillor Young

Against: None
Absentation: None.

RESOLVED, planning permission was agreed subject to conditions.

8 Delegated decisions

8.1 The Sub-Committee noted the document.

RESOLVED, that the delegated decisions document be noted.

9 Any other business

9.1 There were no other business items.

10 Dates of next meeting

10.1 The Sub-Committee noted the following meeting dates:

2022

2 February, 3 March (to be confirmed), 6 April and 27 April.

Duration of the meeting: 6:30pm - 7:53pm.

Chair for the meeting: Councillor Vincent Stops

Contact:
Gareth Sykes
Governance Services Officer
gareth.sykes@hackney.gov.uk