

MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE PLANNING SUB-COMMITTEE

WEDNESDAY 7 DECEMBER 2022

Councillors Present: Councillor Steve Race in the Chair

Cllr Steve Race in the Chair

Cllr Michael Desmond

Cllr Michael Levy

Cllr Jon Narcross

Cllr Clare Potter

Cllr Ali Sadek

Cllr Jessica Webb (Vice-Chair)

Cllr Sarah Young

Apologies: Cllr Clare Joseph and Cllr Lee Laudat-Scott

Officers in Attendance

Rob Brew, Major Applications Team Leader
Natalie Broughton, Head of Planning and Building Control
Graham Callam, Growth Team Manager
Louise Claeys, Principal Sustainability and Climate Change Officer
Luciana Grave, Conservation, Urban Design and Sustainability Manager
Mario Kahraman, ICT Support
Peter Kelly, Conservation, Urban Design and Sustainability Officer
Catherine Nichol, Senior Planning Officer - Central Team
Qasim Shafi, Principal Transportation Planner
Gareth Sykes, Governance Officer
John Tsang, Development Management & Enforcement Manager
Sam Woodhead, Legal Officer

1 Apologies for Absence

1.1 Apologies for absence were received from Cllrs Joseph and Laudat-Scott.

2 Declarations of Interest

2.1 None were declared.

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

3.1 None.

4 Minutes of the Previous Meeting

4.1 The minutes of the previous meeting, held on 2 November 2022, subject to minor amendments, was agreed as an accurate record of those meetings' proceedings.

RESOLVED:

The minutes of the previous meeting, held on 2 November 2022, subject to minor amendments, was agreed as an accurate record of those meetings' proceedings.

5 2022/1480: 49 - 51 East Road, London, N1 6AH

5.1 PROPOSAL: Erection of a three storey roof extension to create office accommodation (Use class E), partial rear infill to provide improved vertical circulation, creation of terraces at second, fourth, fifth, and sixth levels, replacement of plant and alterations to the windows and doors at ground floor level, and alterations of the existing building.

POST SUBMISSION REVISIONS:

Submission of additional information with regard to transport, sustainability and fire strategy. No re-consultation on this information has been carried out, as revised plans feature amendments which are very small in nature.

5.2 The Senior Planning Officer introduced the application as published. During the course of their presentation reference was made to the published addendum outlining a number of amendments to the following sections of the published application report:

- 6.1 Affordable Workspace;
- Paragraph 6.1.7
- Paragraph 6.2 Design: Conclusions;
- Paragraph 6.2.18
- Paragraph 6.4 Quality of Commercial Accommodation;
- Paragraph 6.4.4;
- Paragraphs 6.8 Flood Risk Impact and 6.8.1 to 6.8.3;
- 8. Recommendation: 7 Overheating 26. Privacy Mitigation Strategy;
- 28. Energy Statement;
- 29. Energy Statement;
- 8.2 Recommendation B.

No persons had registered to speak in objection to the planning application.

5.3 The Sub-Committee heard from the agent and applicant who gave a brief overview of the existing site and the proposals. They were seeking to transform the existing building into a flexible and modern office space with proposals that would significantly enhance the building's appearance and use, providing an affordable and flexible workspace specifically aimed at local small businesses. Remodelling and extension work would make the most efficient use of the existing building while sustainability would be at the core of the applicant's proposals.

5.4 The meeting entered the discussion phase where a number of points were raised including the following:

- The applicant had undertaken a series of measures to ensure their proposals were as energy efficient as possible including, for example, eradicating the use of fossil fuels, installing sass windows and implementing a natural ventilation strategy;
- Ensuring a zero carbon policy on site was challenging for the applicant because of the existing site's constraints. It was noted that the proposed extension would be over and above the current set compliance standards;
- The monitoring of the buildings' energy statement would be undertaken by part of the Greater London Authority (GLA). The Planning Service would contact the GLA to ascertain if they were content to extend the statement beyond the proposed one year as set in the application report. If it was possible to grant an extension for five years the relevant condition in published report would be amended accordingly;
- The Planning Service was satisfied that the development could achieve a certain level of sustainability, however, they were not entirely confident over some of the information that had been submitted. They required a lot more information to ensure that the applicant's sustainability objectives could be delivered. They felt that the applicant could do more, but they agreed that the applicant could achieve the net zero carbon target. Despite there being an information gap it was felt that this was not fundamental to the scheme and could be dealt with by condition;
- Constructing a new build, instead of retrofitting the existing site, was not an option for the applicant because it would result in it being carbon positive. On site renewables had been exhausted and the highest efficiency cooling systems had been provided along with domestic hot water. The natural ventilation strategy would also be of the highest efficiency compared to the installation of a mechanical ventilation system;
- A commitment to a target of 10% affordable work space in the proposals was secured by condition. If the affordable work space had been below 10% only then the Planning Service would have required a viability assessment;
- It was noted a correction in the addendum and the published application report under section 6.1.7: the affordable workplace strategy would apply to the ground and basement floor;
- The basement's affordable workspace had been proposed following the applicant's consultation with an affordable workspace provider. This part of the proposals was policy compliant;
- The qualification criteria for proposed occupants and its monitoring of that system was part of the Workspace Management Plan. The criteria varied depending on the site and its surrounding area;
- The affordable workspace component of the proposals were secured under a s106 legal agreement;
- The existing basement was already being used as office space, under the proposals part of it would be retained for office use while another part would be used for bicycle storage and shower facilities for example. The applicant considered the basement not to be at risk from flood;
- There were existing light vaults on site allowing light into the basement area but the applicant was also making interventions to open up the space. The configuration of the ground floor plate was such, being set back from the facade, to allow for a large amount of natural light to enter the basement area. Pavement lights were also to be refurbished in the basement and in

some areas new sets of stairs were to be installed in the basement to allow for more light to enter;

- The basement area would be the only area on site that would have ventilation. There was an existing plant room in the basement area, in that area there would be a mechanical heat recovery unit which would ventilate the lower ground space. It would be disconnected from the back of house and would only be used for the habitable space on site;
- For the staircases and roof balustrades revised drawings had been received and it was noted for the latter that they had been set back so that it could not be seen from street level. In relation to the stair core, amendments were sought to reduce it, however, it was discovered that this would conflict with fire safety requirements. Therefore the most practical solution was for the stair core to follow the length of the fire escape;
- A condition was proposed to secure final details of the plant room's installation on the roof;
- The Planning Service concluded that the proposed height of the roof extension was appropriate against the southern tall buildings and provided a buffer between the 23 storey high mixed use building, and the northern modest warehouse buildings;
- A range of cycle parking spaces with a mix of single and two tier cycle spaces was proposed. The Sub-Committee were not keen on the installation of two tier cycle spaces;
- It was noted that some outdoor communal space would be lost, however this would be balanced out in the proposals by a payment in lieu as required under the policy LP48 to provide or improve additional space elsewhere. This payment would be captured within the s106 legal agreement and the Planning Service considered this to be acceptable;
- It was noted that a collapsible safety railing was a safety railing that was designed to fold down when not in use;
- The applicant explained that under their business model they would provide bookable office space to their clients so that they would not have to build their own office space. It could be booked by the hour at an affordable rate;
- Page 52 of the published application report, between the end of 8.2 Recommendation B paragraph and the Highways and Transportation section, would be amended to include a recommendation C. This would state that 'planning permission should be granted subject to a section 106 legal agreement';
- As set out on page 53 of the published application report, the affordable workspace shown on the approved plans was to be provided with a discount of 40% in perpetuity;
- As set out in the published addendum, under recommendation B, additional contributions would be added to Highways and Transportation including a payment of £3000 in lieu of a blue badge, which would provide highways with the means to provide a blue badge space within 50m of the existing site.

Vote:

For: Cllr Desmond, Cllr Levy, Cllr Narcross, Cllr Potter, Cllr Race, Cllr Sadek, Cllr Webb and Cllr Young.

Against: None.

Abstention: None.

RESOLVED:

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

6 Delegated decisions

- 6.1 The Sub-Committee noted the delegated decisions document.

RESOLVED:

The Delegated Decisions document was noted.

7 Future meeting dates

- 7.1 Sub-Committee members noted the following future meeting dates:

2023

11 January
1 February
22 February
3 April
3 May

Duration of the meeting: 6:30pm – 7:42pm

Signed:

.....
Chair of Planning Sub-Committee, Councillor Steve Race

Contact:

Gareth Sykes

gareth.sykes@hackney.gov.uk