

MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE PLANNING SUB-COMMITTEE

WEDNESDAY 6 JULY 2022

THIS MEETING WAS LIVE STREAMED AND CAN BE VIEWED HERE:

https://youtu.be/VW3yAPc_PfI

ALTERNATIVE LIVESTREAM LINK OF MEETING:

<https://youtu.be/NzcUV1ccVxA>

Councillors Present:

Councillor Steve Race in the Chair

Cllr Michael Desmond, Cllr Clare Joseph, Cllr Michael Levy, Cllr Jon Narcross, Cllr Clare Potter, Cllr Lee Laudat-Scott, Cllr Jessica Webb (Vice-Chair) and Cllr Sarah Young and Cllr Michael Levy

Apologies:

None

Officers in Attendance:

**Robert Brew, Major Applications Team Leader
Nick Bovaird, Major Applications Team Leader
Graham Callam, Growth Team Manager, Public Realm
Natalie Broughton, Head of Planning and Building Control
Joe Croft, Senior Transport Planner (Development Control)
Mario Kahraman, ICT Support
Leif Mortensen, Senior landscape and tree officer
Matt Payne, Conservation Urban Design and Sustainability Deputy Manager
Isobel Pierce, Project Manager Woodberry Down Regeneration,
Qasim Shafi, Principal Transport Planner (Development Management)
Catherine Slade, Major Projects Principal Planning Officer - Woodberry Down
Joris van der Starre, Senior Conservation and Design Officer
Gareth Sykes, Governance Officer
John Tsang, Development Management & Enforcement Manager
Sam Woodhead, Legal Officer**

Observer:

Cllr Ali Sadek (joined remotely)

- 1 Appointment of Chair and Vice-Chair of the Planning Sub-Committee for the municipal year 2022/23**

- 1.1 The Planning Sub-Committee noted that Councillor Steve Race and Councillor Jessica Webb had been appointed as Chair and Vice-Chair of the Planning Sub-Committee by Council on 25 May 2022, for the municipal year 2022/23.

RESOLVED:

To note that Councillor Steve Race and Councillor Jessica Webb had been appointed as Chair and Vice-Chair of the Planning Sub-Committee by Council on 25 May 2022, for the municipal year 2022/23.

2 The Terms of Reference of the Planning Sub-Committee for the Municipal Year 2022/23

- 2.1 The Planning Sub-Committee noted their Terms of Reference for the municipal year 2022/23.

RESOLVED:

To note the Terms of Reference for the Planning Sub-Committee for the municipal year 2022/23.

3 Apologies for Absence

- 3.1 There were no apologies for absence or lateness.
- 3.2 It was noted that due to an illness Councillor Sadek was joining the meeting virtually. Councillor Sadek would be able to observe the meeting only and would not be able to participate in the discussions or the votes on the Planning applications on the agenda.

4 Declarations of Interest - members to declare as appropriate

- 4.1 Councillor Young declared an interest in relation to Items 7 and 8. In relation to item 7 the Councillor had until recently been a trustee of the night shelter which was currently occupying the site. It was agreed that for this item the Councillor would not recuse herself from the meeting.
- 4.2 In relation to item 8 Councillor Young was involved with the Woodberry Down Community Organisation and other groups of residents in her capacity as Woodberry Down ward Councillor. The Councillor would recuse herself for this part of the meeting.

5 To consider any proposal/questions referred to the sub-committee by the Council's Monitoring Officer

- 5.1 There were no proposals or questions referred to the Planning Sub-Committee by the Council's Monitoring Officer.

6 Minutes of the Previous Meeting

- 6.1 The minutes of the previous meetings, held on 6 and 27 April 2022, were agreed, by the Councillors present at those meetings, as an accurate record of those meetings' proceedings.

RESOLVED:

The minutes of the previous meetings, held on 6 and 27 April 2022, were agreed as an accurate record of those meetings' proceedings.

7 2021/1807: Alexandra Court, 1A Belgrade Road, London, N16 8AF

- 7.1 PROPOSAL: Erection of part two, part three, part four storey building facing Princess May Road and a five storey building facing Stoke Newington Road [following demolition of lower-ground and ground floor office floor space (Use Class E) and car park] to provide 15 self-contained residential units and a flexible use at ground floor level (Class E); external alterations to existing Alexandra Court block to include remodelled front entrances; associated landscaping to include replacement trees, a communal courtyard to the rear of Alexandra Court, cycle and bin storage.
- 7.2 POST SUBMISSION REVISIONS:
- Minor layout revisions, clarity on the positioning of a roof terrace, amendments to the remodelled entrance to the Alexandra Court tower, amendments to the ground floor of Block B. These changes were of minor impact and it was therefore considered unnecessary to reconsult the scheme.
- 7.3 The Planning Service's Senior Planner, Major Projects introduced the planning application as published. During the course of the officer's presentation reference was made to the published addendum and the following amendments to the application report:
- Paragraph 6.1.7 would be amended;
 - Paragraph 8.1.35 Accessible Dwellings M4 (3) would be amended;
 - Paragraph 6.1.12 referred to 'First Homes' and was considered unnecessary and would be removed;
 - In paragraph 6.3.2 the number of units proposed should read 15 (rather than 30)
 - and would be amended;
 - In paragraph 6.4.3, it was not fully made clear that the Blue Badge space to be provided on-street prior to the occupation of the development would be within 50m of the proposed entrance to the wheelchair accessible dwelling. As such, the paragraph should be amended;
 - The bicycle parking condition would be amended to ensure that 4 Sheffield Stand spaces were provided.
- 7.4 The Planning Sub-Committee heard from a local resident speaking in objection to the application. A number of concerns were raised centring on the impact on the visual character of the local area, the construction phase in relation to the residents of Princess May Road, in relation to dust, noise and the foundations of some of the neighbouring properties. Similarly there were concerns about the impact of the proposals on schoolchildren during the construction period.

Representatives for the applicant were present at the meeting to answer questions from the Sub-Committee.

7.5 The meeting entered the discussion phase where the following points were raised:

- Committee members were reminded that Controlled Parking Zones (CPZ) were secured through a section 106 agreement and were commonly used across London. There was precedent for using them but the Planning Service could not speak as to their legality;
- The existing building was currently being used as a homeless shelter. The applicant was working with the current occupants to relocate them;
- The proposed tenures were 100% London Affordable Rent. Recent figures had shown that this was genuinely affordable but it was recognised that it was slightly higher than Social Rent accommodation. It was noted that the London Plan and Local Plan considered London Affordable Rent and Social Rent to be genuinely affordable housing;
- In terms of the proposed number of family units, Hackney Council was able to make exceptions to the standard preferred dwelling mix of one, two and three bedroom units. The Council could make a variation if the circumstances allowed. The applicant would also come up with a tenure that would work for them which, in the case of the application before the Sub-Committee, was 100% London Affordable Rent;
- Sub-Committee members were reminded that they needed to consider the proposals in line with the Development Plan, the London Plan and the Local Plan;
- It was unclear from the figures provided in the application whether the proposals were under the Homes for Londoners 2016-2023 programme or the programme that came after it;
- Transport for London (TfL) had the final say on what types of trees would replace those being removed on the Transport for London Road Network (TLRN);
- The Sub-Committee noted that the development had stepped up from two to four floors facing the Tower Block. It was recognised that there would be some loss of light and the applicant had hired a daylight/sunlight consultant who had concluded, like the Council's Planning Service, that the proposals were acceptable;
- Issues around dust, noise and overshadowing would be included as part of the next stage of the planning process through submission of a Construction Management Plan (CMP). The applicant confirmed that there would be engagement with local residents both before and during the construction phase to ensure that there was no impact on their homes;
- Regarding condition 4.7.7 of the application report, the Sub-Committee noted that the Building Research Establishment Environmental Assessment Method (BREEAM) rating related to non-residential buildings. Residential buildings were measured against another set of standards different to BREEAM;
- Part of the proposals included the submission of an energy report. The applicant confirmed that currently Air Source Heat Pumps

(ASHPs) were proposed but if the application was agreed then they could look at a different approach. The Committee noted that the 15 proposed ASHPs would be located on the roof of the development. Their installation would be reviewed by condition (condition 8.1.29);

- On the issue of the overshadowing of the property at number 2 Princess May Road, the proposed adjacent building did not extend beyond that property. Also the daylight/sunlight report had outlined the Vertical Sky Component (VSC) impact of the proposals. The separate Building Control regime was in place to ensure that no damage was caused to neighbouring buildings during the construction phase;
- The Sub-Committee noted from the addendum that on-street blue badge parking bays would be within 50 metres of the site entrance;
- The applicant was allowed discretion over the internal layout of the proposed units;
- For the block B development, the flat on the same level as the roof would have access to the adjacent roof. The green roof and air source heat pump section of the top roof, however, was for maintenance access only. For the block A development, the roof was not for residential use and was for maintenance access only;
- Design of the cycle storage area was based on Secure by Design guidance. It would be accessible through the internal courtyard of the proposed development. This was the first stage of access with the next stage being entry to the storage area through a security fob system. The Sub-Committee noted that every effort had been made to include as much single tier cycle storage on site.

Vote:

For: Cllr Desmond, Cllr Joseph, Cllr Levy, Cllr Narcross, Cllr Potter, Cllr Race (Chair), Cllr Laudat-Scott, Cllr Webb (Vice-Chair) and Cllr Young.

Against: None.

Abstention: None.

RESOLVED:

Planning permission was granted subject to conditions and completion of a Legal Agreement.

At the conclusion of agenda item 7 Councillor Young left the Council Chamber and did not participate in the discussion and vote for the planning application at item 8.

8 2021/3606 Woodberry Down Phase 3, Seven Sisters Road Hackney, London N4 2SB

- 8.1 PROPOSAL: Submission of details pursuant to condition 18 (materials and architectural details) parts (i) Samples (including sample boards) and specifications of all external materials (including obscure and clear glazing, screening, spandrels and cladding) and full details of junctions/interfaces between different material types; and (ii) A physical full scale mock-up of a typical facade arrangement for the building relevant to each block (the extent of which shall be agreed with the Local Planning Authority); and (iii) Annotated plans at a scale of 1:10 or 1:20 of the details of the typical ground floor facade

treatment including residential entrance(s), shop front(s), Seven Sisters Road frontage of energy centre, vehicular accesses to Blocks A and B, and openings to refuse and bicycle storage; and (iv) Details of all window, door, balcony, surround, soffit, canopy, reveal, glazing and corner detailing types (including details of where used in the development, detailed drawings at a scale of 1:5, 1:10 or 1:20 as appropriate, frames and glazing bars, product literature and samples); and (vi) Details of expansion joint positioning; and (vii) Details, including samples and annotated plans at a scale of 1:10 or 1:20, of each balcony type and wind screening of balconies; and (viii) Details of the layout of each lobby type which shall show details of storage of mail and deliveries and natural lighting and ventilation, including annotated plans at a scale of 1:20 or 1:50; and (ix) Permanent façade cleaning equipment attached to planning permission 2019/2514 dated 9th December 2020. THE SUBMISSION DOES NOT INCLUDE part (v) Details of screening and/or enclosure of roof top plant, including drawings to a scale of 1:20 or 1:50 as appropriate.

8.2 POST SUBMISSION REVISIONS: Substitution of an alternative light grey brick for the tower building and light buff brick.

8.3 The Planning Service's Major Projects Principal Planning Officer - Woodberry Down introduced the planning application as published. During the course of the officer's presentation reference was made to the published addendum and the following amendment to the application report:

The approved documents list should be amended through the deletion of the following drawing numbers:

- E730A-RJA-AZZ-12-DR-A-009-1001 rev P03 and E730A-RJA-AZZ-12-DR-A-009-1002 rev P02

There were no persons registered to speak in objection to the application. The applicants had decided to answer questions from the Planning Sub-Committee meeting.

The applicant had brought along to the meeting samples of the materials to be used on site which the Sub-Committee members examined.

8.4 The Planning Sub-Committee entered the discussion phase where the following points were raised:

- All the components and materials specified had been tested in compliance with those regulations that had been introduced post-Grenfell fire and had also been considered by fire safety engineers and cladding consultants. The majority of the materials, insulation and supporting brackets to be used were non-combustible. Cavity and fire barriers were also in place at key locations on the building which were also in line with building regulations and fire safety advice. All key components and materials had been tested beforehand before they were placed on site to ensure that they were non-combustible;
- In relation to site supervision, Berkeley Homes would conduct hourly on site Health and Safety inspections as well as ongoing independent inspections and reports to ensure compliance;
- A very small amount of cladding would be used on the building, the majority of the material was brick;

Wednesday 6 July 2022

- A brick pallet had been used to ensure that they were longer lasting and not weather as quickly as render. It was not anticipated the brick work would turn ugly over time. The abseiling equipment that would be used on site for window cleaning would also be used for general of the brick as of when required;
- On the issue of overheating, conditions were already agreed as part of the previous application 2019/2514;
- Woodberry Down Phase 4 currently out for public consultation with a view to submit the application to the Planning Sub-Committee in November 2022. Details on these proposals were currently available on the Berkeley Homes website;
- On a point of clarification, reference to the appearance of the development preventing 'opportunities for anti-social behaviour' (page 91 of the published papers) this referred to public façade and recesses to prevent loitering;
- Across most of the development handset brick slips would be used. The Planning Service would ensure that the brick slips used on site were of the highest quality and was common to tower element;
- The use of brick was reflective of the surrounding area where it had been used in the past and to keep the trust of the local community. Phase three was a large development and to come up with other materials instead of brick was considered at the time of the proposals being formulated;
- On the issue of permeability, the applicant explained that measures would want to be in place to prevent any water entering the caveat behind the brick work. Permeable mortar would allow any water in a development to drain out of the building.

Vote:

For: Cllr Desmond, Cllr Joseph, Cllr Levy, Cllr Narcross, Cllr Potter, Cllr Race (Chair), Cllr Laudat-Scott and Cllr Webb (Vice-Chair).
Against: None.
Abstention: None.

RESOLVED:

The condition was discharged.

9 Delegated decisions

9.1 The Planning Sub-Committee noted the contents of the Delegated Decisions document.

RESOLVED:

The delegated decisions document was noted.

10 Any other business

10.1 None.

11 Future meeting dates

11.1 Sub-Committee members to note the following meeting dates:

2022

27 July
7 September
28 September
2 November
7 December

2023

11 January
1 February
22 February
3 April
3

May

Duration of the meeting: 6:30pm – 8:08pm