

MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE PLANNING SUB-COMMITTEE

WEDNESDAY 27 APRIL 2022

- Councillors Present:** Councillor Vincent Stops in the Chair
- Cllr Brian Bell, Cllr Ajay Chauhan, Cllr Katie Hanson (Vice-Chair), Cllr Clare Joseph, Cllr Michael Levy, Cllr Steve Race and Cllr Sarah Young.
- Apologies:** Councillor Humaira Garasia
- Officers in Attendance:** Natalie Broughton, Head of Planning and Building Control
Robert Brew, Major Applications Team Leader
Graham Callam, Growth Team Manager, Public Realm
Barry Coughlan, Deputy Team Leader, Major Projects
Luciana Grave, Conservation, Urban Design and Sustainability Manager
Mario Kahraman, ICT Support
Leif Mortensen, Senior landscape and tree officer
Matt Payne, Conservation Urban Design and Sustainability Deputy Manager
Qasim Shafi, Principal Transport Planner (Development Management)
Catherine Slade, Major Projects Principal Planning Officer - Woodberry Down
Christine Stephenson, Legal Officer
Gareth Sykes, Governance Officer

1 Apologies for Absence

- 1.1 Apologies were received from Cllr Garasia.

2 Declarations of Interest

- 2.1 A declaration of interest was made by Cllr Young in relation to the application at agenda item 5. The Cllr had written to the Chair of the Sub-Committee meeting explaining that the application at item 5 was in her ward. Furthermore, the housing association involved had presented early proposals to the Cllr and Cllr Selman as ward councillors last year. In addition, the current Executive Director of Development at Anchor Hanover was head of Cllr's Young team at Southern Housing Group before he moved to his new job in January 2022.

- 2.2 Cllr Young recused herself from the start of the meeting and for the duration of agenda item 5.
- 3 To consider any proposal/questions referred to the Sub-Committee by the Council's Monitoring Officer**
- 3.1 There were no proposals or questions referred to the Planning Sub-Committee by the Council's Monitoring Officer.
- 4 Minutes of the Previous Meeting**
- 4.1 There were no minutes available for approval at the meeting.
- 5 2021/2732 14 to 40 Newnton Close and 456 to 484 Seven Sisters Road, Hackney, London N4 2RQ**
- 5.1 PROPOSAL: Demolition of existing buildings and redevelopment to provide 2no. buildings, 1no. part 5-storeys, part 7-storeys and 1no. 10 storeys comprising a total of 76 no. retirement apartments and communal facilities, together with associated works and landscaping.
POST SUBMISSION REVISIONS:
- Revisions to the ground floor layouts and the materiality of the northern building
 - Minor revisions to supporting documentation and additional supporting documentation
- A 21 day reconsultation has been undertaken in respect of the amended and additional information, with the exception of a minor realignment of the position of the proposed blue badge parking bays and introduction of additional visitor bicycle storage.
- 5.2 The Major Projects Principal Planning Officer, Woodberry Down, introduced the application report. During the course of the officer's submission reference was made to the published addendum and the following changes to the application report:
- Due to the scale of the proposal, the application was referable to the Mayor of London, and as such the recommendation summary should read as follows (amendment in bold):
- Grant planning permission subject to conditions and completion of a S106 Legal Agreement **and referral to the Mayor of London.**
- As a result of the change to the recommendation summary paragraph 7.3 of the report would be amended;
 - Further amendments and changes had also been made to the drawing numbers;
 - Additional representations had been received;
 - Amendments would be made to the wording for paragraphs 6.2.12, 8.1.3, 8.1.4 and 8.1.15;
 - Amendments would be made to the wording of Recommendation B.
- 5.3 There were no persons registered to speak in objection.

- 5.4 The representatives for the applicant spoke to the Sub-Committee about the planning merits for the application as well as operational matters.
- 5.5 During the discussion phase of the Sub-Committee meeting the following points were raised:
- On the east side of the proposed site both terraces had blank flank elevations. The only openings to the properties on that side were at the front and rear. The direct overlooking was oblique;
 - It was noted that the proposals would be next to a Berkeley Homes planning application. The Planning Service was of the view that they [Berkeley Homes] would have to accommodate those proposals. It was anticipated that the proposals would not be built right up to the boundary line because of existing constraints on site;
 - Two trees would be lost as a result of the proposals. They were classified as B Class and had been heavily pruned over the years and no longer had any natural shape;
 - The existing rent level was housing association target rent level. It was proposed to provide London Affordable Rent levels. Those existing tenants with a right to return would return under the existing rent level. The London Affordable Rent was set higher than the Housing Association rent level and across London the level was set out at 40% of local market value;
 - There was an error identified in the report on pages 14-15. The classification of the rent would be amended to read Social Rent rather than London Affordable Rent;
 - Under Hackney Council's local plan policy LP13, in terms of the types of Affordable Housing Tenures, Social Rent covered Social Rent/London Affordable Rent. As for Intermediate affordable housing, this covered Hackney/London Living Rent or London Shared Ownership or other genuinely affordable that the Council considers appropriate;
 - The proposed dwellings were suitable for use by wheelchair users;
 - Some of the Sub-Committee members were against the S106 legal agreement including a car free development clause preventing future occupiers from being able to apply for parking permits; they believed that older persons should have the right to apply for a disabled parking space;
 - It was noted that the applicant's previous three developments had been car free and that they had not noted it as an operational concern that local residents could not park their cars. Hackney Council had sought to keep the development in line with the Hackney Local Plan LP33 policies in seeking a car free development and that any residents with a blue badge would have access to a disabled car parking space. The Council also understood that the proposed units were for persons were 55 years of age and over and that this was thought to not necessarily equate to mobility issues;

- The Sub-Committee noted on the A3 plans a storage area for electric-powered buggies, so there appeared to be a provision available for those residents did not have a blue badge;
- Concerns raised by the Stoke Newington Conservation Advisory Committee had been addressed in the addendum;
- All the single aspect units were south west facing and all of the north facing units were dual aspect. The latter were round the corner units;
- The applicant explained that if 100% dual aspect units had been proposed they would not have been able to provide the number of homes currently proposed. Having two buildings rather than one would maximise the dual aspect homes. This in turn would take advantage of natural daylight and also help to create a central green space;
- It was noted the concerns about solar gain in the south west units of the site but the applicant was of the view that this was mitigated by residents' access to natural daylight and the use of recess balconies. Testing had been undertaken and along with the installation of mechanical ventilation it was accessed that the issue was not a concern;
- On the Seven Sisters Road side of the proposed site there would be planters included as part of the frontage. There was a footpath along the New River way;
- The Chair of the Sub-Committee proposed a condition that the applicant undertake best endeavours to look at the use non-cement based mortar as a recyclable material. The applicant explained that they had looked into its use and had determined that currently, due to supply issues, non-cement based mortar was limited in its availability on the scale needed for the proposed development;
- The Sub-Committee members were reminded that the right to return process for existing residents was not a material planning matter.

Vote:

For: Cllrs Bell, Chauhan, Hanson, Levy, Race and Stops.

Against: None.

Abstention: Cllr Joseph.

RESOLVED:

Planning permission was granted subject to conditions, completion of a S106 Legal Agreement and referral to the Mayor of London.

6 2022/0694: Worship Square, 65 Clifton Street, Hackney, London, EC2A 4JE2

6.1 PROPOSAL: Submission of details pursuant to condition 3a (Materials) attached to planning permission 2019/0462.

POST SUBMISSION REVISIONS: N/A

- 6.2 The Deputy Team Leader, Major Projects, introduced the application report as published.
- 6.3 There were no persons registered to speak in objection.
- 6.4 Representatives for the applicant were present at the meeting to respond to any questions from the Sub-Committee.
- 6.5 No questions were asked by the Sub-Committee members.

Vote:

For: Cllrs Bell, Chauhan, Hanson, Joseph, Levy, Race, Stops and Young.
Against: None.
Abstention: None.

RESOLVED:

The details were approved.

7 Delegated decisions document

- 7.1 The Sub-Committee noted the Delegated Decisions document.

RESOLVED:

The Delegated Decisions document was noted.

8 Any Other Business

- 8.1 Cllrs Bell, Chauhan, Hanson and Stops were thanked for all their years of service sitting on the Sub-Committee.
- 8.2 Cllr Hanson thanked Cllr Stops for all his years of service as Chair of the Sub-Committee.

9 Dates of next meetings

- 9.1 Provisional meeting dates were listed on the Hackney Council website and would be subject to approval at the 25 May 2022 Council meeting.

END OF MEETING

Duration of the meeting: 6:30pm – 7:40pm.

Chair for the meeting: Cllr Vincent Stops.

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