

DRAFT MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE PLANNING SUB-COMMITTEE

WEDNESDAY 3 NOVEMBER 2021

THIS MEETING WAS LIVE STREAMED AND CAN BE VIEWED HERE:

https://youtu.be/_qW7FmLH0ro

Councillors Present:

Councillor Vincent Stops in the Chair

Councillor Brian Bell, Councillor Katie Hanson, Councillor Humaira Garasis, Councillor Clare Joseph

Officers in Attendance:

**Rob Brew, Major Application Team Leader
Graham Callam, Growth Team Manager
Adele Castle, Team Leader, North Area
Joe Croft, Sustainable Transport Planner
Peter Gray (Governance Services Officer)
Luciana Grave, Conservation Urban Design and Sustainability Manager
Mario Kahraman, ICT Support Analyst
Leif Mortensen, Senior Landscape and Tree Officer
Gerard Livett, Senior Planning Officer
Quasi Shafi, Principal Transportation Manager
John Tsang, Development Management & Enforcement Manager
Matt Payne, CUDs, Deputy Manager
Catherine Slade, Major Projects Planner
Tim Walder, Principal Conservation and Design Officer
Joris VanderStarr, Senior Conservation and Design Officer
Sam Woodhead, Legal**

Portico Learning

Centre, 34 Linscott

Road - Application 2021/1651&2021/1653

Main Speakers

- Dr Clare Highton
- Cllr Chris Kennedy
- Dr Nick Brewer

Applicant's Representatives

- David Borrell
- Jonathan Bainbridge
- Liz Jarett (Architect Lead - ADP)
- Dianna Fletcher (Heritage Lead AD)

Public

- Lorenzo Pandolfi
- (Powerscroft Road
- Residents Group)
- Julia Humphrey
- Elizabeth Coates
- Thummel

Canalside Studios, 2 - 4 Orsman Road, Hackney, London, N1 5FB

Main Speakers (Support)

- Michael Gerrard (Applicant)
- Gemma Golding (Eight Associates)

Objector

- Gideon Corby

Land to rear of 2-28 Belfast Road - Application 2021/1178

Main Speakers:

- Cllr Chris Kennedy
- Dr Deborah Colvin
- Anwara Begum
- Andrew Knock (Architect Lead - ADP)

1 Apologies for Absence

- 1.1. Apologies for absence were submitted on behalf of Cllrs Chauhan and Race.

2 Declarations of Interest

- 2.1 Councillor Hansen told the Sub-Committee that she knew Julia Humphrey (Objector)

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

- 3.1 There were no proposals/questions referred for consideration.

4 Minutes of the previous meeting

RESOLVED:

- **The minutes of the previous meeting were AGREED as an accurate record of that meeting's proceedings.**

5 Portico City Learning Centre, 34 Linscott Road, Hackney, London, E5 ORD

5.1 PROPOSAL:

Change of use of the building from Use Class F.1 (learning and non-residential institutions) to Use Class E(e) (commercial, business and service) for use as a health centre. Partial demolition of existing rear two storey extension (stair core) and replacement with two storey rear extension and erection of a two storey side extension with associated means of access, roof-top plant and landscaping

5.2 Major Projects Planning Officer Catherine Slade presented to the Sub-Committee, highlighting the following:

- The addendum contained an additional lead representation;
- The application was deferred from the previous meeting for further information on alternative proposals;
- The application was unchanged from the previous meeting;
- The existing building was a Greek Revival building with a central west facing portico on a wedge shaped piece of land;
- Access via Linscott Road;
- Neighbouring properties were predominantly residential to the south and west and in educational use to the north and north east;
- There were a number of mature trees on the site and hard surfacing in the south west, available for car parking and servicing;
- The building had been much modified over its life;
- In the 1970s much of the pre-existing building was demolished;
- The building was a fragment of a much larger building;
- Current use as an educational establishment but not in active educational use since 2019;
- The building had been put back on the Heritage at Risk Register;
- Proposal is to change from an educational premises to a medical facility with internal and external alterations;
- At previous planning meeting, members had expressed concern over the impact of the proposal on the building and specifically in relation to a lack of symmetry;

- The importance of symmetry could be overstated due to the limited public views possible of the entirety of the building;
- Two elements to the proposal: the change of use of the premise and the operational development and other works requiring planning permission and listed building consent;
- There was no demand for the educational use;
- The proposed change of use would provide a NHS Health Centre for which there was demonstrable need;
- The change of use was acceptable in policy terms;
- The main elements of the development was the construction of rear and side extension over upper and ground floor levels; this would be separated from the properties in the south by a landscape buffer, within would be planted with native trees;
- Surfacing areas would be located in the south and west of the site;
- General access would be provided by the front steps and door with an alternative for the less physically able provided by a winding ramp in the north of the site.
- No objections had been raised by Historic England as the statutory body;
- The extension would only adjoin the older parts of the building at the southern end of the colonnade;
- The public parts of the building would be brought back in use as waiting areas;
- Bringing the premises into use would ensure longevity and the removal from the Heritage at Risk register;
- The extension was large and was a response to the operational needs of the NHS;
- The site was constrained in the north in comparison to the relative spaciousness of the southern part of the site, allowing a more sensitive approach to be taken to the relationships of the extensions to the historic parts of the building while maintaining the original form and sense of the north colonnade;
- While there would be an asymmetry in relation to the host building, this was mitigated by the fact that it was not possible to see the entirety of the building from a single view point. The impact was also mitigated by the setting back of the rear part of the extension;
- Alternatives had been considered prior to submission, however these constituted pre-application discussions and the proposal had to be considered on its own merits;
- The scheme was felt to be the least harmful in terms of the balance between the heritage impact of the scheme and the functional needs of the occupiers;
- Concerns had been raised in respect to the impact on the occupiers of neighbouring properties. It was accepted that the development would bring built form closer to these dwellings but the impact in terms of light was mitigated in large part by the fact that the application site was to the north of these properties. Impact on all properties fell within guidance tolerances in respect of sunlight and daylight with the exception of one lower ground floor window which fell outside the guidance for no skyline, although it satisfied the vertical sky component. This degree of compliance with BSE guidance was considered to be acceptable;
- In terms of outlook, the relative height from the proposed extension was 6.3 meters from ground level within the neighbouring properties with a separation distance of over 10 meters which, in this type of urban setting was considered to be acceptable;

- The southern elevation was lower than the front elevation;
- In regard to privacy no public access was proposed for the landscaped land along the southern boundary of the site; and there was a condition requiring openings to the elevations to be opaque glazed;
- There was no reason to expect that the development would produce high levels of noise;
- Public access to the southern landscapes would be restricted and the parking areas would be further from the boundary than at present;
- Rooftop plant was proposed. However, this would be enclosed within an attenuation screen;
- Environmental /Health had not raised objection to this in relation to noise, subject to the conditions set out in the report;
- The impact of the proposals on residential amenity was considered to be acceptable, subject to the recommended conditions;
- The proposals would result in the loss of 8 mature and semi mature trees. However, they were not protected by a TPO or by being located within a conservation area and were not of significant amenity value. Because of their age and species they were of limited biodiversity value. The proposals included mitigation for their loss, including tree planting at the southern boundary, while additional tree planting would be accommodated elsewhere on the site;
- The quantum of car parking proposed was a reduction on the current on-site provision and included 2 blue badge spaces and 2 EVCPs; patient and staff cycle parking was in line with Hackney and Greater London Authority guidelines;
- The proposed uses were acceptable in principle and would provide social infrastructure for which there was demonstrable need. The proposal would result in less than substantial harm to a heritage asset. There would be some harm through loss of trees. However this was outweighed by the substantial public benefits of bringing an unused asset on the Heritage at Risk Register back into public use for the purposes of providing public infrastructure. The proposals would have an impact on residential amenity. However, this was limited on scale and largely mitigated through the imposition of conditions and was acceptable. For these reasons and subject to the conditions and legal agreement as set out in the papers, the application was recommended for approval.

5.3 Julia Humphreys made submissions, objecting to the application, highlighting the following:

- Not against the GP surgery and putting the Portico to good use;
- There were no changes to the proposal since the last meeting;
- Wished for a better design;
- The application continued to be inward looking and underplayed the asymmetric oppressive bulk being added along the border;
- The proposals took little consideration of its impact on the overall site and its neighbours;
- Part of the rationale of the application was that the building would be out of sight and at close range it was hoped that people would be distracted by the entrance. This was considered unusual.
- 11 trees of good health and immunity along the border were to be bulldozed out of the way.

- 5.4 Lorenzo Pandolfi made submissions, objecting to the application, highlighting the following:
- The previous meeting had concerns that the issue of the symmetry of the building had not been addressed properly and asked that good planning reasons be provided in regard to the proposed design. However, nothing had changed in this regard;
 - The proposed design was incorrect;
 - The occupiers of neighbouring properties would suffer from the overbearing effects;
 - There was no evidence that other options were explored at the pre-application stage;
 - The development would generate public benefits but public benefits alone cannot not be used to justify the approval of the building, in particular when it was clear that the applicant and the architect were capable of devising better alternatives;
 - The application should be reviewed. The bulk should not be placed at the southern boundary.
- 5.5 Cllr Ian Rathbone made submissions, objecting to the application, highlighting the following:
- That he supported the views of the residents;
 - That he considered that the applicant should consider the comments of the previous meeting in relation to finance dictating design;
 - That the applicant should consider option 3 and using the land in a better way, bringing relief to the residents,
- 5.6 Councillor Kennedy spoke in favour of the application, highlighting the following:
- that the development involved joint partnerships between the NHS and the council;
 - that the design of development was to a good standard;
 - The Lower Clapton surgery was currently experiencing space difficulties;
- 5.7 Dr Clare Highton made submissions, in support of the application, highlighting the following:
- That the Lower Clapton surgery leaked water into the building, causing disruption and loss;
 - The surgery was excessively hot in the summer;
 - Difficulties in recruiting and retaining staff;
 - The surgery was dealing with a 15,000 population and was having serious capacity issues;
 - Difficulties around seeing patients face to face because of lack of space;
 - It had been necessary to turn down working with extra services;
 - Difficulties around finding a site with adequate space to expand services;
 - Appreciation of the residents point of view.
- 5.8 Dr Nick Brewer made submissions, in support of the application, highlighting the following:

- The new building was an opportunity for the practice, improving the patient experience;
- The proposed building was spacious, allowing for group consultations, education sessions, and wellbeing activities. The garden could be put to therapeutic use;
- Recruitment and retention was a big problem in primary care. The new building would attract new staff and help with retention, benefiting patients;
- Hackney Marshes was the most deprived of all the networks in Hackney;
- The remit was to expand the workforce to improve local services, to benefit health and wellbeing and to reduce health inequalities. The Portico was key to this aim as all five practices in the network were having difficulties in regard to space;
- High levels of NHS funding was to be made available to support the goals of improving health and wellbeing;
- The Practice employed 3 clinical pharmacists, a physiotherapist, a wellbeing team, a social prescriber and a health coach. Because of difficulties with space, many staff members were working remotely. It was hoped to have an occupational therapist in the following year with a mental health worker to start working at the practice. It was hoped to expand further with the funding available.
- The Surgery required the additional space to expand as outlined;
- If the additional clinical space was not provided, funding for additional clinical staff would fall away;
- If it was not possible to expand if the funding was allocated elsewhere

5.9 Liz Jarratt (Architect) highlighted the following

- The 2005 extension was an important part of the design. The decision was taken with sustainability in mind. It was considered necessary to incorporate this into the facility;
- A more symmetrical solution was considered;
- The site to the north was spatially very restricted, limiting the accommodation to single bank of clinical rooms, impacting on the layout;
- In looking at a symmetrical option, the footprint becomes more elongated, with a slight increase in the loss of trees;
- Building on with side of the junction with the central 2005 accommodation would result in the loss of natural daylight;
- By going to a more symmetrical solution on the site substantially increased the facade by 300 sq metres, resulting in an impact on the materials, the embodied carbon and the energy efficiency of the building.

5.10 Diana Fletcher (Architect) highlighted the following:

- Consideration had been given to a symmetrical model. The importance of the Greek Revival style was acknowledged. In making the building symmetrical, this would split the building into two halves. There would also be a need to infill within the colonnades to connect the relevant parts of the accommodation. It was considered that this would create more harm to the building than the asymmetrical approach. Most of the space was in the southern part of the site. It was not possible to get a view of the entire building. Therefore, the

appreciation of the symmetry was much less with the impact of the asymmetrical design much reduced.

5.11 Tim Walder highlighted the following:

- That he had advocated exploring a symmetrical design but it became clear that this design would require increased infilling behind the colonnade;
- Historic England advised that the difficulties caused by the increased infilling outweighed the benefits of a symmetrical design;
- It was not possible to reinstate the original form of the building;
- The block of flats on the right was built after the war and visibility of the right side of the existing building would be blocked by the flats;
- It was considered by the architects that an asymmetrical arrangement was preferable;

5.12 Councillor Hanson stated that the objectors had stated that the applicants had taken short cuts with designs and asked if officers had comments on this. She stressed the need to strengthen the condition in relation to the planting of trees.

5.13 Tim Walder told the Committee that it was considered that the development was a good design. Historic England was content with the design. The intention was to keep the building muted and calm with a regular pattern of openings and have buff brick to blend with the material colour of the original building. During pre-application discussions the applicants had been encouraged to locate the wing on the footprint of the original wing. Although not symmetrical, the building was orthogonal, with the buildings at right angles to each other, in line with the design of the original building. A lot of consideration was given to the visual impact through the colonnade and this was complementary to the historic building.

5.14 Councillor Joseph asked whether, if a symmetrical design was pursued, it would affect the distance to the boundary for the residents.

5.15 Tim Walder confirmed that this depended on which design was under consideration. If the option was the pre-app option shown on screen it would make no difference to the residents as the southern extension would be the same as now proposed. The residents preferred option 3. Planning was not consulted on option 3 as it was discounted by the architects before the pre-application process. Therefore, it had not been assessed. A choice between 4b and 4c was offered. Option 3 would involve demolishing the 2005 building which was an award winning building. Efforts were made not to have a building close up against the north and south colonnade. With option 3 the proposed building would have infilled the area behind both colonnades.

5.16 Diana Fletcher told the Sub-Committee that the wish was to retain the 2005 extension because it was such a recently constructed building and because of the impact of the views through the colonnades. A number of the rooms would be compromised in terms of their ability to have natural ventilation and daylight.

- 5.17 The Chair referred to Cavats, financial recompense for taking down A grade trees and why this had not been used.
- 5.18 Leif Mortenson told the Sub-Committee that the 'Cavats' was the capital asset value for amenity trees and was a way of assessing value for trees. This was undertaken when there was an impact on public amenity as well as the intrinsic value of the tree itself.
- 5.19 Councillor Joseph stated that the conditions should be strengthened in relation to the replacement trees. She asked for clarification on the numbers, age and types of trees to be removed.
- 5.20 Leif Mortensen confirmed that there were 8 trees and 3 small olive trees. There were 4 sycamore trees, 2 maple trees and 2 London plane trees. Some of the trees were approximately 60/70 years old. It was considered that they did not have a significant public amenity benefit. Catherine Slade confirmed that the Olive trees in the corner were being retained. 2 trees in the north of the site were being retained which would have been lost with a symmetrical design.
- 5.21 The Chair confirmed that the building was listed. The building had not been maintained and the Council was seeking to maintain it and simultaneously fulfil a public need. The contract was for 30 years and the Portico needed to be maintained well during its lifetime. Officers had been asked to formulate a material planning condition that ensured that the income does continue to go into the project.
- 5.22 The Property Services David Borrell told the Sub-Committee that the maintenance and repair of the Portico was ensured by the lease that the GPs Practice had already signed up to. The practice would take a 20 year lease with an obligation to maintain the building into the future. The rent that the Practice paid, covered, over a 30 year mortgage arrangement, the cost of the development. This was non-profit making to the Council. The Practice would receive the rent from NHS England. They would also receive an overpayment over the rent as a contribution for paying for the maintenance of the entire building. The Chair asked for confirmation on how the value had been arrived at and whether the project had been costed. It was confirmed that the cost of restoring the Portico had been costed out to the satisfaction of the Council's conservation officer and Historic England. Ongoing maintenance on a building of this age was uncertain. The protections were, the terms of the lease, the central government funding and ultimately if the building deteriorated and there were issues with maintenance, the Council could then become involved. The income from the surgery would be used to pay for the borrowing, as agreed by Cabinet.
- 5.23 The Chair asked if the surgery was aware of the scale of the maintenance requirement for the listed building. It was confirmed that they were aware. The majority of the building was modern and would be low maintenance and was highly sustainable. Consequently, the Practice should have much lower operational costs going forwards. The Practice would receive a contribution to assist in future maintenance. Dr Nick Brewer confirmed that they were aware of the commitments and had signed a lease and would make plans to maintain the building.

- 5.24 Sam Woodhead advised the Sub-Committee that the intention to maintain the listed building could be considered. A private agreement in place for the surgery to maintain should not be a factor in the application. He advised that the development could be regulated by conditions. Graham Callam advised the planning considerations centered around bringing a building at risk back into active use which would be beneficial and the works proposed would address the condition of the building. The development, when implemented in full, would address the current issues with the building and would remove it from the Heritage at Risk register. The design of the development was such that the historic fabric was integral.
- 5.25 Jonathan Bainbridge clarified that as part of the conversation with the Council an extensive amount of survey work had been carried out in terms of the existing building and there was an awareness of the work required to get it to a level that removed it from the Heritage at Risk Register. The entire building would then be brought into use and maintained.
- 5.26 The Chair asked that the final details required by condition be submitted to ensure that the quality was as the Sub-Committee would require. He stressed that the landscaping condition be submitted as there was a need for a substantial landscaping proposal with the planting of a substantial amount of trees on the site.
- 5.27 Catherine Slade reported that the final details could be reported to the Sub-Committee to ensure an adequate quality of development. Trigger points for conditions were controlled and had to be reasonable in terms of the stage at which they are necessary. Some of the conditions were pre-commencement with others prior to superstructure work. Catherine Slade agreed to strengthen the landscaping condition in relation to the planting of trees, stipulating the sizes that are required.

Action: Catherine Slade

- 5.28 The Chair asked for clarification on the stone to be used in the development. Tim Walden confirmed that buff brick was to be used with bronzed aluminium metal work and windows. As this was a listed building it was designed to a high degree of detail. Any change of material would require listing building consent.
- 5.29 The Chair asked for clarification in relation to the pediment at either end of the wings which were additions. Diana Fletcher confirmed that the pediments were added in the 1970s to tidy up the end of the colonades when the wings were demolished. They were not original and of minor significance.

For: Councillors Hanson, Bell and Stops

Against: None

Abstention: Councillor Joseph

Councillor Garasis did not vote as she was not present for the entirety of the discussion.

RESOLVED :

- To grant planning permission and listed building consent, subject to conditions and completion of a Unilateral undertaking with conditions to be reported back to the Planning Sub-Committee

6. Canalside Studios, 2 - 4 Orsman Road, Hackney, London, N1 5FB

6.1 PROPOSAL:

Creation of a permanent residential mooring with associated timber decking and service bollards.

6.2 Gerard Livett presented the application, highlighting the following:

- Site in the Regent Canal and the Kingland conservation areas;
- View of the site taken from Kingsland Road Bridge;
- View of existing Pontoon area which did not form part of the application;
- Proposal to have a residential mooring for a narrow boat;
- The application was considered by officers and was considered to be acceptable;
- Significant representations relating to the proposal relating to loss of biodiversity; the loss of the utility of the canal; the principle of the development;
- The boat would be moored on the non towpath side of the canal; it was considered that this would not interfere with the navigable features of the canal;
- The Canal River Trust had reviewed the proposal and considered that the Canal would remain navigable and usable by recreational users;
- The applicants had submitted a preliminary ecological appraisal, reviewed by the Canal River Trust and by independent consultants appointed by the Planning Authority. The conclusion was that the biodiversity that was lost would be mitigated by the provision of additional biodiversity features, including vegetative mats and other floating structures within the canal; conditions to this effect were recommended.
- The application was recommended for approval subject to conditions and completion of legal agreement;

6.3 Gideon Corby made submissions in opposition to the application, highlighting the following:

- the permanent loss of amenity which would, in particular affect the users of the boat club;
- the loss of the potential benefits that the Regents Canal could provide for the people of Hackney in the future;
- Those recommendations made by the associates be added as conditions or legal agreements, including that the yellow Iris to the east be protected, the 3D habitat should be installed prior to site clearance, that the vegetation is managed regularly with detailed specifications and management monitoring and maintenance plans for the Reed bed and the 50 metres of floating habitat;
- The management should be carried out or checked by Bio-Matrix;
- The site was currently not maintained well for biodiversity;

6.4 Jemma Golding made submissions in support of the application, highlighting the following:

- Although there would be a loss of habitat, a floating Eco system was recommended. Birds would be able to nest there instead;
 - All recommendations were in line with the Managing Body and best practice guidelines;
 - Conversations had taken place with the objector by email;
 - There had been a meeting with the Canal and River Trust to ensure that they were content with the floating harbour;
 - It was important that the habitat was maintained in the long term;
- 6.5 Michael Gerald made submissions in support of the application, highlighting the following:
- It was important for the charity, Circle collective, for the CEO to live in London on the boat. She was not in a position to buy a property in the area given high prices. She had been given the right to place her boat in that location, free of charge. It was important that the boat had the mooring rights free of charge;
- 6.6 Councillor Hansen stressed that the Sub-Committee could not take account of the needs of one person in making planning decisions. She asked if the proposals outlined in the addendum had addressed the concerns of the objector and whether the applicant would be able to comply. This was accepted by the objector. She confirmed that a condition should be added that the site be maintained to an adequate level.
- 6.7 Gerard Livett confirmed that the condition referred to the protection of the yellow iris in the east of the site and to require the floating Habitat be installed prior to site clearance together with a plan for the ongoing maintenance of the site. These arrangements were confirmed by Jemma Golding. A management plan was also in place.
- 6.8 The Chair asked for clarification on who had responsibility for maintaining the site. Jemma Golding confirmed that this would be the applicant's responsibility.
- 6.9 Gerard Livett confirmed that the canal edge was within private ownership. The waterway and the structures in the waterway walls were in the ownership of the River Trust who were responsible for the overall maintenance. The Trust did sub-contract some of those responsibilities.
- 6.10 Councillor Joseph referred to the Laburnum Boat Club and whether it would become difficult for boats to pass as some parts of the Canal were narrow. She asked about the impact on children who were Kayaking.
- 6.11 Graham Callam confirmed that this matter would be a material planning consideration.
- 6.12 Gerard Livett confirmed that, as landowners, the Canal and River Trust were a statutory consortee. It had been proposed to have 3 boats moored up at the site. The Trust had objected to the proposal because of potential navigational difficulties. This was reduced to 1 moored boat.

For: Councillors Bell, Garasia, Hanson, Joseph and Stops

Against: None
Abstention: None

RESOLVED:

To grant planning permission, subject to conditions and completion of section 106 legal agreement.

7. Land to rear of 2-28 Belfast Road, London N16 6UH

7.1 PROPOSAL:

Demolition of existing building and erection of a two storey health centre building (Use Class E(e)) with associated roof plant and site landscaping.

7.2 Catherine Slade presented to the Sub-Committee, highlighting the following:

- The site comprised a single storey commercial building located on a back land site;
- Most properties in the area were in residential use;
- The site did not have any specific economic designation and fell outside the Belfast Road priory industrial area;
- The site was accessed from Belfast Road via a narrow track;
- There were trees on and adjacent to the site - tree protection measures were conditioned;
- Two trees on the site would be lost. The trees had no significant value;
- Existing buildings on site dated for the 1930s;
- The main building had been fully assessed in terms of its heritage value. It was not known to have any community or historical value and was not a non-designated heritage asset. No objection had been raised to its loss;
- The proposal was for the redevelopment of the site to provide a 2 story medical facility for the springhill practice which would relocate from its current premises in stamford hill;
- The current use and the proposed use both fell within use class E and planning permission was not required for the change of use of the land;
- There was an evidenced need for the medical facility;
- The building had not been in use for approximately 5 years;
- The proposed building had a slightly smaller footprint than the current building;
- The building would be U shaped with a recessed central access;
- The building would be in the south of the site. The north of the site would be used for access and landscaping, cycle, car parking and servicing;
- The proposals had been assessed the Council's Streetscene team and had been found to be acceptable in terms of the parking and access arrangements, together with the impact on the local area in terms of highway safety and on street car parking, subject to the conditions and financial contributions;
- The building was designed to minimise impact on the occupiers of neighbouring properties, being set back from the north boundary and having a recess first floor and angled windows to the rear elevation;
- The design incorporated a large roof light;
- The building would be two storey and of a simple architectural style, predominantly finished in brick;
- The overall impact of the building on its setting would be neutral;

- The building would be constructed to a breame standard of excellence and would be designed in line with sustainable and passive design principles;
- The proposed development would result in an overall height and massing of the building, offset by the envelope of the building being brought in from the site boundaries;
- The building had been assessed in terms of light and outlook on neighbouring properties and was found acceptable;
- In terms of privacy there were 1st floor openings proposed to most elevations;
- In the South elevation this was mitigated through recessing and angling of openings. A condition required the opening to the north elevation to be fixed and obscure glazed.
- There was no reason to expect that the development would increase noise levels;
- A condition restricting the hours of operation was proposed;
- There were no objections from the Council's environmental health team;
- The redevelopment of the site was acceptable in principle and did not represent a material change of use. The proposals would have a small potential impact on residential amenity, however, this was limited and mitigated through conditions. The building would be visible in views of the conservation area. However, the impact for development would be neutral. All other material considerations had been assessed and found to be acceptable. The application was recommended for agreement, subject to conditions and legal agreement.

7.3 Councillor Kennedy waived his right to speak in favour of the application.

7.4 Dr Deborah Coleman made submissions in favour of the application, highlighting the following:

- The benefits to the practice's population;
- The practice had 14000 patients registered and required more space;
- The practice was one of 3 practices in the primary care network for Stamford Hill;
- The practice served a very deprived population;
- Tollgate Lodge was unsuitable premises and was over-crowded;
- The Practice was not properly accessible for disable people;
- The Practice wished to offer more services and need more space to do so;
- Better premises would assist in attracting staff;
- Meetings rooms were required;
- The premises needed to be flexible, responsive and welcoming;

7.5 Anwara Begum made submissions in support of the application, highlighting the following:

- Difficulties with the present location;
- The need to provide other services in a larger building;
- Many doctors were currently working from home because of lack of space;

7.6 Councillor Joseph asked if consideration had been given to refurbishing and extending the existing building as opposed to demolition.

7.7 Andrew Knock confirmed that the existing building did not offer heritage use. The footprint was an issue and there was a need to take it away from the boundaries.

The building was not considered to be fit for use with asbestos present within the building. The existing fabric and makeup would not be suitable for extension.

- 7.8 Tim Walder told the Sub-Committee that it was considered that the building was not of architectural interest and was not a designated heritage asset. It was considered very difficult to reuse the building because of roof structure and single skinned brickwork. The building was in poor condition in some places.
- 7.9 The Chair asked about the quality of the material in the building. He said that there was some concern from residents about parking in the street.
- 7.10 Joris Vander Starr confirmed that the material was considered to be of sufficiently high quality. The bricks were considered to be the most suitable for the surroundings, tying in with the adjacent residential buildings.
- 7.11 Councillor Joseph asked for clarification in regard to asbestos in the building.
- 7.12 Andrew Knock confirmed that there was asbestos in the building together with ground contaminants.

For: Councillors Garasia, Hanson, Bell, Joseph and stops

Against: None

Abstention: None

RESOLVED:

To grant planning permission subject to conditions and completion of a Unilateral undertaking.

8. Delegated decisions

The Sub-Committee noted the decisions.

RESOLVED, the Planning Sub-Committee noted the delegated decisions document.

Duration of the meeting: 18:30 - 21:00 hours

Chairperson for the meeting: Councillor Vincent Stops

Contact:

Peter Gray, Governance Services Officer

Contact: Peter.gray@hackney.gov.uk