

## MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE PLANNING SUB-COMMITTEE

MONDAY 3 APRIL 2023

The live stream for this meeting can be viewed here:

<https://youtu.be/heVolqrsQ8Q>

- Councillors Present:**                    **Councillor Steve Race in the Chair**
- Councillor Michael Desmond**  
   **Councillor Clare Joseph**  
   **Councillor Lee Laudat-Scott**  
   **Councillor Jon Narcross**  
   **Councillor Ali Sadek**  
   **Councillor Jessica Webb (Vice-Chair)**
- Apologies:**                                    **Councillor Clare Potter, Councillor Sarah Young**  
   **and Councillor Michael Levy**
- Officers in Attendance:**                **Mark Agnew, Governance Officer**  
   **Graham Callam, Growth Team Manager**  
   **Seonaid Carr, Central Area Team Leader**  
   **Luciana Grave, Conservation and Urban Design**  
   **Sustainability Manager**  
   **Mario Kahraman, ICT Support**  
   **Qasim Shafi, Principal Transportation Planner**  
   **Christine Stephenson, Specialist Planning Lawyer**  
   **Gareth Sykes, Governance Officer**

### **1 Apologies for Absence**

- 1.1 Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Levy, Potter and Young.

### **2 Declarations of Interest**

- 2.1 Councillor Joseph declared an interest. Under Hackney Council's Constitution, section 5.4 paragraph 2.5, Sub-Committee Councillors can hear applications from within their particular ward. Councillor Joseph stated that she not been involved in any discussions with local residents about the application.

### **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 Planning Sub-Committee members approved the minutes of the previous meetings held on the following dates; 1 February 2023 and 11 January 2023.

**RESOLVED:**

**The minutes of the previous meetings, held on 1 February 2023 and 11 January 2023, were approved as an accurate record of those meetings' proceedings.**

**5 2020/3758: 44a to 44b Well Street, Hackney, London E9 7PX**

5.1 PROPOSAL: Variation of condition 2 (development according to the approved plans) of planning permission 2019/3246 dated 29/04/2020 for erection of a roof extension including the extension to the existing external staircase to facilitate the creation of three self-contained flats (2x studio and 1 x 1 bed)". The effect of the variation would be to amend the set back of the roof extension and extend it to the Shore Road elevation, change materials to the roof extension and bike store and to amend the detailing of the fenestration to the elevations of the roof extension.

5.2 POST SUBMISSION REVISIONS:

- The removal of glass boxes to the rear;
- Extension set back to match the existing neighbour extension of number 42;
- Reduction in height of the extension to bring in line with the original approval; and
- Detailing of the windows and doors simplified.

The above revisions were reconsulted on on 16th November 2022. A further amendment of the plans were received which removed the annotation 'Proposed extension to be set back by 100mm with No.42 Well Street.' These were received as this is incorrect the setback is 160mm, officers measured the setback of No.42 on site to confirm this. This amendment was not consulted on as the 60mm is considered non-material and would not require a further consultation.

5.3 The Planning Service's Central Area Team Leader introduced the planning application report as published. During their presentation reference was made to the published addendum and amendments to the following sections of the application report;

- Paragraph 5.3.5
- Paragraph 5.6.5
- Paragraph 5.8.3
- Paragraph 7.6
- Paragraph 7.8

5.4 A local resident, a Hackney Ward Councillor and the agent for the applicant made their submissions at the meeting. Sub-Committee members heard objections about how the application was muddled and unclear. There were further concerns raised about the lack of communication during the planning process, management of the existing building, a shortfall in the waste provision and the structural integrity of the building. The agent for the applicant, acknowledged that there had been some confusion during the planning process with previous iterations of the proposals. They explained that, Nicer Estates Ltd, had come in and overhauled the plans in 2020. The extension was now set

back, the material for the cycle storage was changed from glass to timber and design of the windows had also changed from arch to rectangle and the height of the extension had been lowered

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

- Sub-Committee members were reminded that they were considering a variation to an erection of a roof extension to an application that had been approved on 29 April 2020;
- Concerns raised about the structural integrity of the building to which the extension would be built on top of was not a material planning issue and therefore was not under consideration at the Sub-Committee meeting. Issues involving structural integrity was under the remit of the Council's Building Control;
- The Council's Conservation, Urban Design Sustainability team was of the view that there was already enough variety of colour schemes used by existing neighbouring buildings in the immediate area that the tone of the proposed materials' would not stand out;
- The agent for the applicant reiterated that the window size and design had changed from arch to rectangle. The Council's Planning Service had concluded that this would not significantly depart from the design, character and appearance of the windows and doors in the rest of the Classic Mansion buildings;
- The brick parapet had not been altered and remained unchanged;
- Sub-Committee members were reminded that the proposals under consideration were based on published detailed drawings and the contents of the application report and addendum and not any Computer Generated Images (CGIs);
- On a point of clarification, the Council's Legal Officer stated that concerns raised by the objectors over management of the existing Classic Mansion Building was not a material planning issue and therefore were not under consideration by the Sub-Committee;
- It had been clarified in the addendum that, a condition had been amended in the proposals to state that the walkway to the rear of the extension was not to be used as an outdoor amenity space. It would only be used for access purposes;
- The Sub-Committee noted that a number of neighbouring buildings to 44a to 44b Well Street already had roof extensions on their upper levels. The Planning Service had concluded that because of this they did not have concerns regarding amenity space;
- With the previously refused application, from 2019, the extension had been further forward and the window design with its relationship to the elevation was not supported by the Planning Service. It had also been bulkier extending beyond the neighbouring 42 Well Street. The Planning Service were confident that what was now put forward to the Sub-Committee was suitable;
- The Planning Service stated that wider issues around combustible cladding and the position of the external staircase, particularly in light of changes post-Grenfell Fire were not applicable in the case

**Monday 3 April 2023**

of the proposals because the existing building was not over 30 metres in height;

- Though not under consideration at the planning meeting, the agent gave reassurances that they would pass on to the applicant details of the concerns raised by the building occupants about the structural integrity of the existing Classic Mansions building;
- Sub-Committee members were reminded that they were considering and voting on the amendments and variation application. Other wider issues around the design of the internal layout of the three units, for example, were a building regulation issue and were not under consideration at the meeting. Sub-Committee members were also reminded that the original application had been approved by the Sub-Committee in 2020;
- On those concerns raised about loss daylight/sunlight, the Planning Service highlighted that the number of openings for the application had not changed, it was the formation that had changed. Previously the windows had been single aspect, they were now dual aspect. The light into the three units would remain the same;
- The Planning Service explained that because no increase in the height of the extension, in relation to the impact on neighbours it was not considered necessary to ask the applicant to undertake a daylight/sunlight report;
- As there were no changes to the overall unit mix for the extension the Planning Service could not request any changes to the waste disposal and collection area;
- The Planning Service recognised that it was not ideal having the bicycle storage area located on the first floor, however this was in the original approved application so there was limitations on what could be changed. There had been a reduction in the bicycle spaces; decreasing from the original ten down to six. The Sub-Committee noted that the applicant was only required to provide four spaces so it they were exceeding their requirement.

Vote:

For: Councillor Michael Desmond, Councillor Jon Narcoss, Councillor Steve Race, Councillor Ali Sadek, Councillor Lee Laudat-Scott and Councillor Jessica Webb.

Against: Councillor Clare Joseph.

Abstained: None.

**RESOLVED:**

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

**6 Delegated Decisions**

6.1 The Planning Sub-Committee noted the delegated decisions for the following periods:

1. Delegated Decisions 10 February 2023 to 19 March 2023
2. Delegated Decisions 20 January 2023 to 9 February 2023

3. Delegated Decisions 21 December 2022 to 19 January 2023

Councillor Desmond would contact the head of Planning and Building Control about whether further details could be added to the delegated decisions documents, for example, a brief summary of the reason why a planning application was refused.

**RESOLVED:**

The Planning Sub-Committee noted the following documents:

1. Delegated Decisions 10 February 2023 to 19 March 2023
2. Delegated Decisions 20 January 2023 to 9 February 2023
3. Delegated Decisions 21 December 2022 to 19 January 2023

**7 Any Other Business the Chair Considers to be Urgent**

7.1 None.

**8 Dates of future meetings**

8.1 The Planning Sub-Committee noted the following future meeting dates:

Confirmed:

- 3 May

Proposed:

2023

- 8 June (moved from 7 June)
- 5 July
- 6 September
- 11 October
- 1 November
- 6 December

2024

- 11 January
- 7 February
- 6 March
- 3 April
- 1 May

**END OF MEETING**

**Duration of the meeting: 6.30pm - 7.28 pm**

Chair of the meeting: Councillor Steve Race

Contact:

Gareth Sykes, Governance Officer

Email: [governance@hackney.gov.uk](mailto:governance@hackney.gov.uk)

**Monday 3 April 2023**