

MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE PLANNING SUB-COMMITTEE

WEDNESDAY 6 SEPTEMBER 2023

Final minutes approved at 6 December 2023 Planning Sub-Committee meeting.

Councillors Present: Councillor Steve Race in the Chair

Cllr Michael Desmond, Cllr Michael Levy, Cllr Jon Narcross, Cllr Clare Potter, Cllr Jessica Webb (Vice-Chair), and Cllr Sarah Young.

Apologies: Councillor Clare Joseph, Councillor Ali Sadek and Councillor Ifraax Samatar

Officers in Attendance: Gareth Barnett, Team Leader South
Natalie Broughton, Head of Planning and Building Control
Joe Croft, Senior Transport Planner
Erin Glancy, Planning Officer
Alix Hauser, Planning Officer
Luciana Grave, Conservation Urban Design and Sustainability Manager
Mario Kahraman, ICT Support Officer
Christine Stephenson, Specialist Planning Lawyer
Gareth Sykes, Governance Officer
John Tsang, Development Management and Enforcement Manager

1 Apologies for Absence

1.1 Apologies for absence were received from Cllr Clare Joseph, Cllr Ali Sadek and Cllr Ifraax Samatar.

2 Declarations of Interest

2.1 There were declarations of interest from Cllr Desmond and Cllr Race; both Councillors knew the applicant for agenda item 6 2022/1765 Kingsland Road. There was no objection raised to the Councillors sitting on the Sub-Committee for the aforementioned planning application.

2.2 It was noted as a matter of public record that the Planning Sub-Committee members all knew one of the objectors for agenda item 7: 2022/1423 Beaumont Court. One of the objectors registered to speak was a fellow Hackney Ward Councillor.

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

3.1 None.

4 The Terms of Reference of the Planning Sub-Committee for the Municipal Year 2023/24

4.1 The Planning Sub-Committee noted the newly formatted terms of reference as approved at the 24 July 2023 Council meeting as part of appendix three of the Constitution.

RESOLVED:

The Planning Sub-Committee noted their newly formatted terms of reference at appendix three of the Hackney Council constitution, as approved at the 24 July 2023 Council meeting.

5 Minutes of the Previous Meeting

5.1 The Planning Sub-Committee considered the minutes of their previous meetings held on 5 and 25 July 2023.

RESOLVED:

The minutes of the previous Planning Sub-Committee meetings, held on 5 and 25 July 2023 respectively, be approved as an accurate record of those meetings' proceedings.

6 2022/1765: 449 Kingsland Road, Hackney, London, E8 4AU

6.1 PROPOSAL: Redevelopment of the site, including the change of use, refurbishment and extension of the existing warehouse building, to provide 1 dwelling house (Use Class C3), 150sqm of community space (Use Class F) and 1,169sqm of commercial space (Use Class E) together with associated cycle parking and refuse and recycling facilities.

POST SUBMISSION REVISIONS: The enlargement of the mews (site) and 4 residential mews houses were removed from the application. A full period of consultation followed. Following this minor design changes to the elevation of the slot house were made.

6.2 The designated Planning Officer introduced the planning application as published. During the course of the officer's presentation reference was made to a published addendum and the following amendments to the report:

Updated documents:

An updated Design & Access Statement (Rev F prepared by Mowat & Company dated 30/08/2023) was provided that removed references to the Juliette balcony that had been removed from the detailed design of the slot house. An updated Daylight & Sunlight Report (Rel 5&6 Draft 3 prepared by Point 2 Surveyors Limited dated September 2023) was provided to update the length of the rear gardens at pages 23 & 24 to reflect the amended scheme which no longer proposes to extend the site boundary to the west to include the rear areas of the gardens fronting Hertford Road. Additional Drawings Provided:

MCA585-X-02EX-270A (Existing Tram shed Short Section G-G)
MCA585-X-06GA-270A (Proposed Tram shed Short Section G-G)

Additional objections:

After publication of the committee report additional objections were received from a previous objector raising issue with the extent of the site location plan and ownership and the potential ramifications of this for access to the site as well as the installation and operation of construction machinery. Issues of ownership and access are civil matters and are ultra vires to planning legislation. A suggested DCMP condition will deal with the arrangement of construction machinery.

The objector also raised the issue of an alleged unlawful fence installed at a neighbouring property in the same ownership and requested a condition of permit to require the removal of this fence. This is not considered a reasonable condition, planning officers consider this is not a material consideration to the application and, furthermore, such matters can be investigated by the Planning Enforcement team. Amendments to report:

Paragraph 3.8 to include the following additional summarised objections:

- Disruption to amenity due to the proposed office use and intensification of use of the site.
- Loss of community floor space .
- Proposed layout of the office provides poor quality work space.

Paragraph 5.7.9 amended to read (in response to a revised Daylight & Sunlight Report) One garden, at Welbury Court, receives over 2 hours of sunlight on 21 March in only 3% of the courtyard currently, which is well below the BRE guidelines of 50%. The proposed development however would mean that only 1% of the courtyard would receive 2 hours of sunlight on 21 March which is a 2% absolute reduction, but proportionately is a 67% reduction. This is a minor derogation which is primarily as a result of low existing direct sunlight levels. It is noted that direct sunlight at the summer solstice is high at 56%.

Paragraph 8.1.3 amended to read:

Materials to be submitted

Full details, with samples, of the materials to be used on the external surfaces of the buildings, including glazing, shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority in writing before the relevant work on the site is commenced. The development shall not be carried out otherwise than in accordance with the details thus approved.

REASON: To ensure that the external appearance of the building is satisfactory and does not detract from the character and visual amenity of the area and to protect the amenity of neighbouring occupiers.

Paragraph 8.1.5 amended to read:

8.1.5 Demolition & Construction Logistics Management Plan

No development shall take place until a detailed Demolition and Construction

Management Plan covering the matters set out below has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall only be implemented in accordance with the details and measures approved as part of the demolition and construction management plan, which shall be maintained throughout the entire construction period.

- A demolition and construction method statement covering all phases of the development to include details of noise control measures and measures to preserve air quality (including a risk assessment of the demolition and construction phase);
- A demolition and construction waste management plan setting out how resources will be managed and waste controlled at all stages during a construction project, including, but not limited to, details of dust mitigation measures during construction works, the location of any mobile plant machinery, details of measures to be employed to mitigate against noise and vibration arising out of the construction process demonstrating best practical means;
- A demolition and construction traffic management plan to include the following: the construction programme/timescales; the number/frequency and size of construction vehicles; construction traffic route and trip generation; location of deliveries; pedestrian and vehicular access arrangements; any temporary road/footway closures during the construction period; details of parking suspensions (if required) and the duration of construction;
- A dust management plan to include details of how dust from construction activity will be controlled / mitigated against following best practice guidance. This should include monitoring of particulate matter at the application site boundary in the direction of sensitive receptors following the SPG Mayor of London Control of Dust and Emissions Guidance.

REASON: To avoid hazard and obstruction being caused to users of the public highway and in the interest of public safety and amenity. To protect air quality and people's health by ensuring that the production of air pollutants, such as nitrogen dioxide and particulate matter, are kept to a minimum during the course of building works.

Paragraph 8.1.6 amended to read:

8.1.6 Delivery and Servicing Plan

Prior to the occupation of the development, a Delivery and Servicing Plan shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority, in consultation with Transport for London, setting out:

- Frequency of deliveries per day/week
- Size of vehicles
- How vehicles would be accommodated on the public highway
- identify measures to mitigate the impact of servicing and deliveries
- How sustainable freight will be encouraged and enabled, for example through the provision of on-site cargo cycle parking Thereafter deliveries and servicing shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plan.

REASON: To ensure that the proposed development does not prejudice the free flow of traffic or public safety along the neighbouring highway(s).

Paragraph 8.1.9 amended to read:

Obscure Glazing

The windows located within all elevations of the tram shed and outrigger shall be obscure glazed to a height of 1.8m and fixed shut.

REASON: To safeguard the amenities of the adjoining premises and the area generally.

Paragraph 8.1.15 amended to read:

Building Research Establishment Environmental Assessment Method (BREEAM) (Pre-commencement of above ground construction) Prior to the commencement of above ground construction for the development hereby approved, the BREEAM Interim Design Certificate shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority, providing full details to demonstrate at least the following standards have been met, as set out in the hereby approved BREEAM Report Statement (dated 31/03/2023, prepared by SHA Environmental Limited) - targeted credits must be presented in a tracker comparing credits targeted at BREEAM Pre Assessment stage:

Minimum BREEAM Rating of 74%

The development shall not be carried out otherwise than in accordance with the details thereby approved.

REASON: In the interest of addressing climate change and securing sustainable and net zero development and construction

Paragraph 8.1.21 amended to read:

Land Use Restriction

Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 1987, as amended, or any other Order modifying or revoking that Order whether in whole or in part, the commercial floor space located within the 'Tram shed' portion of the development hereby permitted shall only be used for purposes within Use Class E parts (c) or (g) of that Order.

REASON: To ensure that an appropriate commercial use is provided at this location to protect the amenity of neighbouring occupiers.

Paragraph 8.1.22 amended to read:

The office use hereby permitted may only be used between the hours of 0700-2200 Monday to Friday and the hours of 1000-2000 Saturdays, Sundays and Bank Holidays. The community use hereby permitted may only be used between the hours of 1000-2000 daily.

REASON: To ensure that the use is operated in a satisfactory manner and does

not unduly disturb adjoining occupiers or prejudice local amenity generally.

Inclusion of the following conditions

Noise Report

Notwithstanding the approved Acoustic Assessment, a noise report which includes a detailed assessment of the impact of noise generated from the use of the community space, must be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority, in writing, before the community space is occupied. This report should include any required mitigation measures to be installed in order to manage any disturbance from the community use. The development shall not be carried out otherwise than in accordance with the details thus approved which shall be implemented in full prior to the first use/occupation of the development.

REASON: To ensure that any negative impact on surrounding residential premises is minimised.

Removal of Residential PD Rights

Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 1987, as amended, or any other Order modifying or revoking that Order whether in whole or in part, planning permission shall be required in respect of development falling within Classes A-H of Part 1 of the second schedule to that Order.

REASON: To protect the character and appearance of the development hereby approved.

- 6.3 Local residents spoke in objection to the application raising a number of concerns about a number of issues including overcrowding, overbearing and the proposals being out of scale with existing character of the conservation area. There were also concerns raised about the proposed balconies and their impact on noise nuisance and loss of privacy due to overlooking and overhearing. It was felt that the proposed dark cladding was not keeping with the character of the area. There was also concerns raised about the loss of green space and associated implications for biodiversity and loss of daylight/sunlight within rear gardens. The local residents objected to a proposed opening up of windows on site, as this would contravene an existing restrictive covenant, from the 1950s, from the family that owned the site. It was felt that they should keep their rights to light and air.
- 6.4 The representatives for the applicant in their submission spoke of how who explained that the existing building was under occupied with poor access. They highlighted that the site was a non-designated heritage asset. They added that they proposed a building that was more compatible with the surrounding area and more economical compared to its original use. It would be more workable for local groups including the current tenant to the proposals was to restore and refurbish the existing building. The main element of the proposals was the studio space in the tram shed. It was proposed to install a central atrium which historically had been part of the original site and turning the views inwards from the original surrounding houses. Addressing concerns raised by local residents, on the matter of the covenant, that was a civil matter and therefore was not a material planning issue.

6.5 Following the submissions, the Sub-Committee members asked questions which were responded as follows:

- Responding to a question about the use of zinc, the representative for the applicant replied that they were used because of Photovoltaic (PV) panels. The dark colour of the zinc would hide the panels. The aim was to make the scheme as sustainable as possible and the PV panels were installed in such a way that they were both sustainable and waterproof;
- The representative for the applicant confirmed that they had not yet undertaken a asbestos survey of the building for asbestos;
- Replying to a query about why the height of the building was increased, the representative for the applicant responded that in order for the existing trusses to support the weight of the PV panels, insulation etc. They would have to be upgraded or replaced;
- The representative for the applicant explained that had been given to the embodied carbon present in the building, if a floor was removed there would be a lot of disruption to the neighbours. From a construction and embodied carbon point of view that was why the existing floor level was retained;
- The Council's Conservation and Urban Design and Sustainability (CUDS) Manager explained that in relation to the roof design, while the loss of the historic trusses was regrettable it was concluded that there was minimal harmful impact in relation to the existing roof. In terms of the use of zinc, the officer explained that it had been used in conservation areas previously and its use was not unusual in the context of the proposed scheme. The increase in height was seen as marginal;
- Replying to a question about the issue of the covenant, the designated planning officer explained that it was not a material planning matter and therefore was not for discussion;
- Responding to concerns raised from residents about the raised height of the proposals, the designated Planning Officer replied that the scheme would be visible but it would be slightly set back from the façade of the building. The visibility was assessed and it was concluded that it would not cause an adverse impact on neighbouring properties in light of its location and the minor increase in height;
- Replying to a question about concerns raised by local residents about overlooking, the designated Planning Officer responded that this had been taken into consideration and there was a condition that all windows on all levels would use obscure glazing to a height of 1.8 metres and fixed shut;
- Responding to a question about whether alternative roof coverings were ever considered, the designated Planning Officer replied that in appearance and design terms the Planning Service had concluded that was proposed acceptable in relation to its impact on the surrounding conservation area. The use of zinc was not considered harmful and there was precedent of it being used in similar buildings to the one in the application ;
- Responding to question about what proportion of the scheme would have a green roof, the designated Planning Officer replied that the green roof would only be on top of the existing outrigger building;
- Responding to concerns raised about access to the green roof and the possibility of it being used as a terrace, the designated Planning Officer

replied that under 8.1.20 in the application report there was a condition limiting use of the green roof for emergencies and maintenance only;

- The representative for the applicant explained that in terms of the building and neighbouring properties, they were seeking to retain the non designated asset in a conservation area and that the applicant was restricted by the constraints of the site;
- On a point of clarification the representative for the applicant explained that the external elevation of the site were not actually party walls;
- Responding to concerns raised about the loss of community space, the designated Planning Officer explained that in the case of the application, under policy LP8 of Hackney's Local Plan, there were specific circumstances where there would be a provision where better quality of floor space was being provided. In the case of the application it would be level access with better light and in a modern and sustainable setting. So while it was acknowledged there would be a loss of significant floor space, it was currently underutilised and of poor quality, the proposed replacement was considered to be better and more suitable;
- Responding to a question about the Slot House, the designated Planning Officer replied that it was slightly different to the proposals before the Sub-Committee. The Slot House had previously been extended the whole length of the site. There had been some subsequent design changes but it was still similar to the previous iteration in terms of its bulk, height and materiality.

Vote:

For: Cllr Steve Race (Chair), Cllr Jessica Webb (Vice Chair), Cllr Michael Desmond, Cllr Michael Levy, Cllr Jon Narcross, Cllr Clare Potter and Cllr Sarah Young.

Against: None.

Abstained: None.

RESOLVED:

Planning permission was granted subject to conditions and a section 106 agreement.

7 2022/1423: Beaumont Court, Upper Clapton Road, Hackney

7.1 PROPOSAL: Erection of single-storey roof extension above the existing mixed-use building to create 5 residential units, a rear extension to create a new stairwell and lift core with associated works from ground floor up to the new 5th floor in association with new residential units, external alterations to the front facade, refuse and recycling provision as well as a new secure cycle enclosures.

POST SUBMISSION REVISIONS:

- Submission of proposed landscaping plan
- Revised access and servicing plan drawing which increased the recycling provision to the level required in line with guidance
- Revised Travel Plan (V2.0)
- Revised Daylight, Sunlight and Overshadowing Report
- Revised Fire Safety Statement (version V2)
- Revised Energy Sustainability Statement (version 2.0)
- Revised Design and Access Statement (revision B)

A re-consultation was undertaken on 24/01/2023 following the submission of revised documents.

- 7.2 The designated Planning Officer introduced the planning application as published. During the course of the officer's presentation reference was made to a published addendum and the following amendments to the report:

Updated documents:

Additional drawing to be included in the committee report:

2000A ground floor plan.

An updated Fire Strategy Statement was provided that removed references within the site description to another site (noted that the application site was also described).

Additional comments:

After publication of the committee report an objector notified the council that there were discrepancies in the floor plans shown in the committee report. The ground floor plan shown in the committee report is a superseded version, the above additional plans are the correct versions.

(officer notes: all the current plans have been consulted upon and form part of the assessment of the current planning application).

The objector has also highlighted that the fifth floor plan in the revised Design and Access Statement does not consist of the latest fifth floor plan submitted as part of the application (officer notes: all the current plans have been consulted upon and form part of the assessment of the current planning application).

Transportation and servicing

After publication of the committee report further comments were received from the Council's Streetscene Team.

Paragraph 4.10 amended to include:

"In relation to accessible vehicle parking, owing to the scale of the development, a dedicated Blue Badge bay is not deemed to be a requirement at the outset. There are two existing Blue Badge bays situated on Cleverley's Road. There is additional carriageway space in close proximity to the development that could be converted for Blue Badge bay provision in future.

The proposed quantum of the development is supported by Transport and Highways teams. The design proposals are based on two-tier cycle parking which is generally not supported.

Transport and Highways teams do not support the design of the cycle parking provision. They consider that further revisions to the cycle parking proposals should come through the parking management plan".

8.1.19 The following demolition and construction condition should be included:

Demolition & Construction Logistics Management Plan

No development shall take place until a detailed Demolition and Construction Management Plan covering the matters set out below has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall only be implemented in accordance with the details and measures approved as part of the demolition and construction management plan, which shall be maintained throughout the entire construction period.

- A demolition and construction method statement covering all phases of the development to include details of noise control measures and measures to preserve air quality (including a risk assessment of the demolition and construction phase);
- A demolition and construction waste management plan setting out how resources will be managed and waste controlled at all stages during a construction project, including, but not limited to, details of dust mitigation measures during construction works, the location of any mobile plant machinery, details of measures to be employed to mitigate against noise and vibration arising out of the construction process demonstrating best practical means;
- A demolition and construction traffic management plan to include the following: the construction programme/timescales; the number/frequency and size of construction vehicles; construction traffic route and trip generation; location of deliveries; pedestrian and vehicular access arrangements; any temporary road/footway closures during the construction period; details of parking suspensions (if required) and the duration of construction;
- A dust management plan to include details of how dust from construction activity will be controlled / mitigated against following best practice guidance. This should include monitoring of particulate matter at the application site boundary in the direction of sensitive receptors following the SPG Mayor of London Control of Dust and Emissions Guidance.

REASON: To avoid hazard and obstruction being caused to users of the public highway and in the interest of public safety and amenity. To protect air quality and people's health by ensuring that the production of air pollutants, such as nitrogen dioxide and particulate matter, are kept to a minimum during the course of building works.

7.3 A local resident and Hackney ward councillors spoke in objection to the application raising a number of concerns including that the proposed design was not compatible with existing buildings and negatively disrupted the existing buildings' Art Deco architecture. They also felt that the existing building was in a poor state of repair, and to install a brand new floor on top with no consideration of the original was bad urban design. It was also felt that the proposed extension was bulky and an eyesore on the streetscape. There was also concerns raised about the loss of light to local residents and the proposed bike shed would significantly reduce the size, character, functionality, and outlook to the southern courtyard. The objectors

recommended a number of conditions including the re-pointing and upgrading and the balconies to face outwards and an extension of the existing stairwell to the sixth floor.

- 7.4 The representatives for the applicant speaking in support of the proposals explained that the original application had been rejected because it was too big. The current proposals result in a sensitive scale and massing that complements the existing architecture and was considered to be a more positive development. Addressing local residents' concerns the representative for the explained that the proposed residential units would be dual-aspect which underpinned good design principles and allowed for passive ventilation. On biodiversity, the Sub-Committee members noted the Council had secured revisions to include an area of additional soft landscape to the entrance element at the east elevation. The development would not result in the loss of biodiversity as the extension would be constructed atop the existing building and a green roof to the new cycle store was also included which would also result in a biodiversity net gain for the site. In relation to affordable housing, the applicant had submitted a small site Unilateral Undertaking confirming to pay the offsite contribution of £250,000 (£50,000 per unit), in line with the Hackney S106 Planning Contributions Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD). Addressing a suggestion from local residents about extending the stairs, the representative for the applicant replied that they had no objection to extended the staircase. They added that they had taken a cue from the original architectural drawings for the elongated front. They also highlighted that the roof was not filled out on either side and it was felt that overall the proposals were well thought scheme.
- 7.5 Following the submissions, the Sub-Committee members asked questions which were responded as follows:
- Replying to a question about the concerns raised about the existing building and the suggestion of a condition in relation to repointing and upgrading, the Planning Service's Development Management and Enforcement Manager responded that any additional conditions would be outside the scope of the application before the Sub-Committee. The proposals before the members had to be considered on its own merits and not the condition of the existing building. The designated Legal Officer for the meeting added that any additional conditions brought up at the meeting needed to be based on solid planning grounds. Any further conditions needed to be necessary and relevant and have to be in accordance with the actual application;
 - Sub-Committee members noted that any additional conditions proposed by the objectors to address their concerns would be a matter for building control rather than planning;
 - Responding to a question about whether the conditions included in the application could address those concerns raised by the objectors, the designated Planning Officer cited the example of the central section of the building would be worked on in order to extend to the new roof extension;
 - The representatives for the applicant clarified that there would be some redecoration work to allow for the proposed extension;
 - Replying to a question about the balconies, the designated Planning Officer responded that because of the existing design of the building there was already an element of overlooking. They concluded that the

proposals were not considered harmful above and beyond the existing situation;

- The representative for the applicants explained that the orientation of the amenity spaces was moved from the inside to the ends of the H design of the building, so any concerns about overlooking were mitigated against. The amenities were now on the narrow edge of the design of the units on the top of the proposed fifth floor;
- Responding to a question about the southern garden space, the Planning Service's Team Leader South replied that the southern courtyard was communal amenity space. Under the proposals access to this area was not denied to residents of the building and there was no discernible loss of communal amenity space. The Planning Service would seek to protect overall these types of spaces. Under the proposals there would be a relatively minor loss of a grass area along the southern perimeter and it was highlighted that there was a courtyard to the north which would remain untouched;
- The representative for the applicant added that the main area for the bicycles would result in the demolition of a hard standing and redundant boiler room;
- One of the objectors replied that the redundant boiler room was currently used as a communal decking space and garden area by residents;
- Some of the Sub-Committee members expressed their disappointment that the applicant was not present at the meeting particular in light of the number of objections received;
- Replying to a query about the amenity space, the representative for the applicant responded that that could consider reconfiguring the proposed bin and bike area to push that into the stair area;
- The Sub-Committee noted that there would be conditions to include flower beds to the rear of the site and also and also the inclusion of the green roof to offset the loss of the small area of the garden;
- Sub-Committee members noted that a landscaping condition was included to offset the loss of the strip of land due to the cycling parking provision. There was a biodiversity gain and as previously mentioned there was an offer to the northern end of the site;
- Replying to a question about the communal roof terrace, the representative for the applicant stated that they were content to accept any related condition relating to deck access such as preventing access or adding a green roof. The Planning Service clarified that there were communal walkways with five proposed residential units and there was an expectation that there would not be an increase in the population that would occupy the roof. Due to the restraints of the roof, the likelihood of gatherings on the roof would be minimal. An additional condition installing fencing may be possible. Any additional structure added to the roof area it was noted would require separate planning permission;
- The representative for the applicant clarified that was no communal roof terrace other than the walk way up from the lift and the stairs;
- Responding to a question about whether the floor space on the plan was not currently partitioned off, the two horizontal sections at the bottom H shape design (as indicated on the published drawings), the representative for the applicant replied that the private flats would have terraces and would have a boundary of 1.1 metres. An additional condition was suggested that only allowed access for maintenance purposes only or could become green roofs to ensure residents did not

have access beyond their existing terrace. The representatives for the applicant suggested added additional details to the proposed landscaping condition;

- The Planning Service's Team Leader South explained that they could look at extending the green roof condition to be extended to the other areas of the room deemed where necessary;
- Responding to a question about biodiversity and green space, the Planning Service's Team Leader South replied that there was garden area to the north of the site already, however, there was a condition for additional landscaping, so there was a net increase in biodiversity and green space. Currently the existing site was on an area of hard paving so there was not a net loss;
- Sub-Committee members were reminded that any issues around the structural stability and integrity of the existing building was not a material planning matter;
- Responding to a question about the integration of the proposals into the existing building, the CUDS manager replied that the proposals were in keeping with the existing architecture . While it was accepted that it was not an exact match, it was acknowledged a number of changes had taken place over a number of years, e.g. the installation of new PVC window, therefore it would prove difficult to get an exact match;
- Replying to a question raised about concerns raised about segregation as a result of the proposals, the Planning Service's Team Leader South explained that the new stairwell and lift core had to adhere to fire safety specifications. The representative for the applicant added that they could look at extending the staircase and that there would be normal access for residents on site;
- The representative for the applicant clarified that their plans had factored in any extension of the existing stairwell. The designated legal officer added that if the applicant was willing to agree in principle to a condition, securing the extension the stairwell, then this could be deemed acceptable;
- Replying to a suggestion about extending of the existing lift to the new proposed extension, the Planning Service's Development Management and Enforcement Manager responded that if the proposals did not show the extension of the existing lift then it would have to form part of a entirely new planning application;
- The designated Planning Officer explained that the new stairwell and lift core would extend to the fifth floor only and would not serve the existing floors;
- Replying to a question about why a new lift was being installed, the representatives for the applicant responded that the size of the lift needed to be bigger to comply with current building regulations and be a firefighting lift and they could not be achieved with the existing lift shaft. They added that any extension of the existing lift shaft would create more disruption. It was felt that concerns expressed previously about segregated access of floors were already mitigated against with amendments to the stairwell;
- The new lift was only servicing the sixth floor because of the layout of the existing building; the new lift was located in an area with no windows and was not expected to cause any disruption to existing tenants. With this proposals any construction work would only impact on a corridor rather than a residential unit;

- Sub-Committee members were reminded by the planning service that any extension of the lift would lead to additional structures and mass on the roof which was outside the scope of the application;
- The Chair of the Sub-Committee was of the view that the members could not defer making a decision on the application simply on the basis that the existing lift shaft was not being extended to the roof, particularly in mind that the representative for the applicant had already agreed to a condition to amend access to the stairwell;
- The designated legal officer reminded Sub-Committee members that the applicant was not present at the meeting and therefore careful consideration needed to be given to any additional conditions put forward. The application before the members related to the fifth floor;
- Replying to a question about the installation of the Air Source Heat Pumps and PV panels, the representative for the applicant confirmed that these features were just for the five proposed residential units..

Vote:

For: Cllr Michael Levy, Cllr Steve Race and Cllr Jessica Webb.

Against: Cllr Michael Desmond.

Abstained: Cllr Jon Narcross, Cllr Clare Potter and Cllr Sarah Young.

RESOLVED:

Planning permission was granted subject to conditions and completion of a legal agreement.

8 2023/0899: 108 Blurton Road, Hackney, London, E5 0NH

8.1 PROPOSAL: Erection of a single-storey ground floor rear extension.

POST SUBMISSION REVISIONS: Plans amended to reduce the depth of the proposed extension.

8.2 The designated Planning Officer introduced the planning application as published. During the course of the officer's presentation reference was made to a published addendum and the following amendments to the report:

Additional Drawings Provided:

ZAAVIA/108BR/109 Rev A (Proposed Section AA)

No persons had registered to speak in objection.

The applicant had joined the meeting remotely unfortunately the internet reception was poor and the Sub-Committee was unable to hear their submission.

8.3 Following the submissions, the Sub-Committee members asked questions which were responded as follows:

- Responding to a question about objections received about the application, the designated Planning Officer explained that a number of revisions had been received changing its design. The Planning Service had concluded that the additional massing would not cause any adverse amenity impact;

Wednesday 6 September 2023

- Replying to a question about concerns expressed about the loss of green space, the designated Planning Officer responded that they had concluded that the proposals would not significantly impinge on the garden space;
- Responding to a question raised about the lack of details as to the location of waste pipes and drainage, the designated Planning Officer replied that those details were not included as part of the application. They added that there was PDR for the installation of pipes, for example. They highlighted that the existing kitchen was under the outrigger, there appeared to be no reason to install pipes in the extended area. The additional floor space was for the extension of the kitchen.

Vote:

For: Cllr Steve Race (Chair), Cllr Jessica Webb (Vice Chair), Cllr Michael Desmond, Cllr Michael Levy, Cllr Jon Narcross, Cllr Clare Potter and Cllr Sarah Young.

Against: None.

Abstained: None.

RESOLVED:

Planning permission was granted subject to conditions.

9 Delegated Decisions documents

9.1 The Planning Sub-Committee to note the delegated decisions documents for the following periods:

- 13 July 2023 to 24 August 2023; and
- 23 June 2023 to 12 July 2023*

*Re-submitted for noting.

RESOLVED:

The delegated decisions document for the following periods be noted:

- 13 July 2023 to 24 August 2023
- 23 June 2023 to 12 July 2023

10 Any Other Business the Chair Considers to be Urgent

10.1 Sub-Committee members noted that their next meeting was on 11 October 2023 and also that a pre-application meeting was proposed for 13 November 2023.

Duration of the meeting: 6.30pm - 8.44 pm

Date of next meeting: 11 October 2023

Councillor Steve Race
Chair of the Planning Sub-Committee

Wednesday 6 September 2023

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