



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

**WEDNESDAY 20TH JANUARY 2021**

**Councillors Present:** Cllr Vincent Stops in the Chair

Cllr Katie Hanson, Cllr Clare Joseph, Cllr Clare Potter Cllr Michael Levy, Cllr Peter Snell and Cllr Steve Race

**Apologies:** Cllr Brian Bell

**Officers in Attendance**

Natalie Broughton, Head of Planning and Building Control

Gareth Barnett, South Team Leader

Robert Brew, Major Applications Manager

Graham Callam, Growth Team Manager

Neil Cleary, Project Manager - Affordable Housing

Joe Croft, Sustainable Transport Planner

Joris Van Der Starre, Senior Conservation and Design Officer

Luciana Grave, Conservation Urban Design Sustainability Manager

Alix Hauser, Planning Officer

Mario Kahraman, ICT Support Analyst

Georgia Lazari, Regeneration Project Lawyer

Matt Payne, Conservation, Urban Design & Sustainability Deputy Manager

Louise Prew, Senior Planning Officer

Qasim Shafi, Principal Transport Planner

Christine Stephenson, Specialist Lawyer (Commercialisation, Sustainable Procurement and Regulatory)

Gareth Sykes, Governance Services Officer

John Tsang, Development Management & Enforcement Manager

## **1 Apologies for Absence**

- 1.1. There was an apology for absence from Councillor Brian Bell.

## **2 Declarations of Interest**

- 2.1 The Chair of the Planning Sub-Committee declared an interest: he lived in the next street to 91 Barretts Grove (agenda item 6).

## **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**

- 4.1 The committee agreed the minutes of the previous meetings, held on the 2nd of December and the 16th November 2020, as an accurate record of those meeting's proceedings.

**RESOLVED, the minutes of the 2nd December and 16th November 2020 Planning Sub-Committee meetings were AGREED as an accurate record of those meeting's proceedings.**

## **5 2020/3309 Thaxted Court, Murray Grove, Hackney, London, N1 7QQ**

- 5.1 **PROPOSAL:** Demolition of existing carpark and storage buildings and erection of three buildings of eight storeys each to provide 73 residential units (Use Class C3) and ground floor flexible spaces (Use Class E); infilling of basement carpark to street level around Thaxted Court; alterations at ground floor to Thaxted Court; alterations to boundary treatment of Halstead Court; erection of single storey storage shed; erection of colonnade; and associated car parking, landscaping and public realm works.

- 5.2 **POST SUBMISSION REVISIONS:** Air quality assessment and wind microclimate assessment were provided. These were consulted on as part of the consultation in late December 2020.

Site plans were updated to include an additional blue badge space and an updated UGF document was provided after consultation. Due to the minor nature of this change consultation was not required.

- 5.3 The Planning Service's Senior Planning Officer introduced the application, as set out in the published application report. During the course of their presentation reference was made to the published addendum and the following amendments to the application report\*\*:

- There were 35 existing car parking spaces on site including two blue badge spaces which would not be provided in their entirety. Only 26 were to be re-provided
- The existing Basketball court would not be re-provided
- An Urban Greening Factor letter (Greengage, January 2020) was submitted
- A table on parking details in the report was amended
- Following publication of the report, one further objection was received

- Section 6.8.16 of the report was amended
- The following conditions were amended: 8.1.19, 8.1.4 and 8.1.27
- Section 8.2.9 of the report was amended
- Additional text was added to section 8.2.19 of the report

No persons were registered to speak in objection to the application.

- 5.4 Hackney Council's Interim Director of Regeneration next gave a brief overview of the consultation process and the proposed scheme. The scheme included, for example, demolition of existing car park and storage buildings and erection of three buildings of eight storeys each to provide 73 residential units.
- 5.5 The Planning Sub-Committee raised a number of the questions whereby the following points were raised:
- Hackney Council hoped, going forward, that the current architect would be taken up by the contractor, however, it was not an absolute requirement. It could be required contractually but it was not clear how that could be achieved through the planning process
  - The scheme tenure mix for the scheme was blind with 10 one bedroom, 8 two bedroom and 10 three bedroom units. It was felt that this mix reflected the housing need on the Fairbank estate and neighbouring Provost estate
  - Each of the proposed buildings had four dual aspect units while the west building had two. The apartments in the Northern block have an aspect of either east or west or north or south. The separation distance between the buildings was greatest to the north with the daylight levels strongest in the northern block
  - Use of the ground floor units was a mixture; there was a community space which was inward facing and there were also two commercial units which were outward and public facing. The latter were kept flexible on purpose as they would be available for three to four years. There was also another space in the south building which also had an element of flexibility. It was noted that the commercial units would not be suitable for food outlets where food was cooked on site as there was no extractor fan system
  - The intention was that the commercial units would be let to generate an income for Hackney Council. They were small units so there was an expectation that they would be appropriate for local business use. Two blue badge spaces were to be re-provided with an additional space for the commercial units bringing the total for the site to three blue badge spaces. The blue badge spaces were within the 50 metre criteria. Also as part of the proposals additional spaces were to be provided in the future if there was a demand. Details of a car parking plan would be required by condition to ensure that additional spaces equivalent to 7% of units could be provided in the future
  - The development sat on top of two Network Rail tunnels which had a large impact on the scheme's development. To avoid overloading the tunnels beneath, the frame of the building would be constructed out of lightweight recycled concrete. The structure was a vital element of the passive environmental strategy for the proposed residential accommodation on site. The concrete would be partially exposed to make use of its inherent thermal mass capacity for storing heat and dealing with overheating in the warmer summer months and the anticipation of rising temperatures in the future. The residential units would be naturally and passively ventilated without reliance on mechanical cooling, plus it was proposed that windows would have included an acoustic ventilation panel which occupants could leave open at night which allows fresh air to enter the building without hindering the occupants' nighttime

without excess noise. Heat stored in the concrete would also disperse as well through passive means thereby cooling the building during the summer months. There were a number of passive means included in the building to reduce energy usage including the form and orientation of the building and the design of the facades which would provide overshadowing. Window sizes were also optimised to reduce overheating but also to optimise natural light in all the rooms. The envelope of the building was also designed to be highly insulated. The heating for the building was provided by a communal air source heat pump which extracts the heat from the air

- The site would also be fitted with solar panels and green-blue roofs. The latter did not only create biodiversity but also collected rain water. The majority of the paved areas were permeable so that rain water went directly into the ground and the pipe network. The planted areas on site were also rain gardens collecting and storing water from the other areas in order to water the plants
- The Carbon Offset Contribution was £69,952
- The height of the buildings was below 30 metres
- The use of lightweight concrete was felt to be the best suited to address the considerations of the site e.g. overheating
- A 'figure above 12' (paragraph 6.10.20 in the report), in relation to the Vertical Sky Component (VSC), referred to a standard figure typical of these types of building in an urban environment. While the scheme did not meet the original VSC test it was still considered to provide a good quality of light
- The proposed west building was seen as a mirror image of the neighbouring 13 Murray Grove building
- It was noted by some of the committee members' their criticism of the two tier cycle storage system, but, as highlighted in the addendum, an informative was to be added to paragraph 8.2.19 of the report. It was stated that 'The applicant should seek to provide the maximum number of single tiered bicycle racks throughout the site, whilst ensuring the delivery of a policy compliant cycle storage arrangement'
- The council's transport team were currently drafting a policy paper on two tier cycle storage where a wide number of views from various stakeholders would be sought
- The Council's Conservation, Urban Design and Sustainability (CUDS) team were satisfied with the materials used, in particular the use of Peterson brick
- The architect was of the view that the proposals, in particular the colonnade to the north, would unify the west and the north buildings and would provide an edge to the estate, as well as serving a number of functions e.g. concealing visitor cycle parking and a space for impromptu play
- The Council were committed to the scheme but within the frame of some further stress testing
- The CUDS team were of the view that in the case of this application they could not identify a case for retaining the current architect. There were cases where there were exceptional circumstances. The committee hoped that the architect could be retained for the scheme
- The Council was keen to have the most secure cycle storage technology on site but there was a balance to be struck with how much this would cost. It was highlighted that the focus was very much on the London Cycle Standard and its emphasis on security. It was noted that there was also a condition in place to review the cycle plan for the scheme to identify any issues. The cycle storage proposals had been consulted on with the police and the Secure by Design officer. The cycle storage was also in a location where it would not be visible

- from the street and would have two stages access control and the installation of Closed Circuit Closed Television (CCTV)
- The balconies were not the only source of ventilation to the living rooms in the buildings. The balconies would also be placed on corners which would serve the living rooms along with an additional window to ensure the units were not just the units were not just reliant on the doors to the balconies
  - There were two types of dedicated play spaces on site; rope and doorstep play. The landscape areas were also 'playable'. In total there was 460 square metres of play space
  - The scale and ambition of the engineering endeavour for the site was seen as quite ambitious and seen as a huge improvement. It was a complicated project and was important that the Council chose the right contractor who as a Construction Management Plan (CMP) in place and that they work closely with the local residents to develop the CMP to make sure residents can get to and from their homes safely as well as allowing emergency and refuse vehicles to get in and out of the site during the construction phase
  - The Council would ensure that local residents were familiar with all the features and functions of the proposed scheme

Vote:

For: Unanimous

**RESOLVED, planning permission was GRANTED subject to conditions and completion of Unilateral Undertaking (UU)\*.**

\* As set out in the report and addendum and or Planning Sub-Committee meeting minutes.

The committee agreed to take a 10 minute break before the next agenda item.

## **6 2020/3893 91 Barretts Grove London, N16 8AP**

6.1 **PROPOSAL:** Demolition of existing garage and construction of three buildings ranging between four and six storeys to provide 25 residential units along with associated landscaping.

### **6.2 POST SUBMISSION REVISIONS:**

- Submission of revised Planning & Heritage Statement to include updated details of affordable housing provision;
- Submission of revised Sustainable Urban Drainage Strategy to propose an additional alternative drainage scheme in case infiltration is not feasible;
- Submission of revised affordable housing mix to provide 50% affordable housing;
- Submission of revised Landscape Plan to reflect the two new residential units at ground floor.

The revised details were uploaded during the consultation period. Given the scope of the minor revisions within each of the documents further consultation was not required.

6.3 The Planning Service's Planning Officer introduced the application. During the course of their presentation reference was made to the addendum and the following points\*\*:

- Paragraph 4.25 was amended to include comments from Dalston CAAC received on 17/01/21
- Paragraph 8.2 was amended

No persons were registered to speak in objection to the application.

- 6.4 The representative for the applicant spoke next to the committee giving a brief overview of the application and its benefits. They spoke of how at the previous 5th February 2020 Planning Sub-Committee meeting the agreed scheme provided four units at London Affordable Rent, which equated to an affordable housing provision of 17%. The proposed development would deliver 52% affordable housing, which would comprise a tenure split of 61.5% London Affordable Rent and 38.5% intermediate units. The development therefore met the 50% affordable housing target. It was noted that 48 long stay cycle parking spaces and 10 short stay cycle parking spaces were proposed.
- 6.5 The Planning Sub-Committee raised a number of the questions whereby the following points were raised:
- Committee members were reminded that there had already been a resolution to grant permission on a similar scheme back in September 2020. Members needed to be mindful of the consistency in their decision-making, however, the committee should not be bound by the previous decision but members needed to be mindful of the decision made on a similar scheme
  - In terms of the application and Hackney Council's new Local Plan, the Planning Service highlighted that in the case of this application the most pertinent would be LP28 which looked at industrial floor space. However LP33 did seek protection against a net loss of any floor space, the critical part here was the potential for the proposals to seek 100% housing provision across the site. These proposals before the committee were seeking 50% affordable housing, which was higher than what the Council would normally expect, however, there was an opportunity for the Islington and Shoreditch Housing Association (ISHA) to purchase the site and provide 100% affordable housing. Under normal circumstances Hackney Council would not expect to receive this level of affordable housing. In the case of these proposals the balance fell to meeting the Council's key policy objective, which was meeting the most significant area of housing need, therefore the Planning Service was of the view that these proposals could be determined on this basis, in that it met a high level policy objective. Therefore as that policy objective was relevant, the loss of the employment space could be seen as justified. The Planning Service also noted that the site was currently vacant and had not been used for several years. There was also anecdotal evidence suggesting that the demand for use of small scale industrial floor space, in a residential area, was quite low
  - Boundary fencing had been provided, to reflect the change of the ground floor units from commercial to residential. The planning service had also requested this as part of the condition. The boundary treatment for these two additional ground floor flats would reflect the treatment of the adjacent ground floor units. It would be a combination of brick wall and landscaping
  - There were eight units for rent and five for shared ownership. This exceeded the 60/40 target. London Affordable Rent (LAR) homes were slightly above social rent homes and the planning service were of the view that this was policy compliant. LAR was the Mayor of London's response to the affordable rent regime that did allow for rent rates to go up to 80% of the market. LAR was pegged close to social rent levels.

The Council considered it to be generally affordable and this was reflected in the Local Plan. The rent levels would be fixed.

- In terms of overshadowing in the block, given the layout of the development, it was considered that the site would receive acceptable levels of daylight/sunlight and would meet the Building Research Establishment (BRE) guidance
- The two proposed Blue Badge car parking spaces would be as close to the entrance of 91 Barretts Grove as possible, which was within the 50 metres policy requirement. As there was no provision on site for disabled car parking bays efforts were made to place as near as possible. The Hackney Council's Sustainable Transport Planner, working with the Planning Officer, would clarify for the committee the distance of the Blue Badge car parking spaces from the 91 Barretts Grove entrance
- While studio flats were not normally supported the studio flat that was part of this scheme was supported on balance as part of a scheme that provided an otherwise policy compliant housing mix and it did meet London Space Standards
- The ground floor units did have outdoor amenity space. The internal community space would be separated. In terms of the children's playspace it was noted that the scheme did meet the 130 square metres requirement, however, it was primarily aimed at children under five years of age and it was considered acceptable. There was also an existing play space for children over five years of age 500 metres west of the site at Butterfield Green
- The child yield for the development of approximately 13 was based on Greater London Authority calculations, which they had designated for each borough. The child yield number was not based on whether accommodation was affordable rent or market rate. It was noted that to make up for the shortfall there was a play space contribution of £11,319
- A Written Scheme of Investigation (WSI) had been conditioned
- The Dalston CAAC in its comments had not recommended any changes to the brick work only to the bonding. Details had been conditions and for materials to be approved as part of that condition
- ISHA intended to deliver on the project, working closely with Hackney Council, to deliver 100% affordable housing
- Currently the development had a shortfall of 14.7 tonnes of CO2 per annum, for a period of 30 years, currently at £95 per tonne, this was to be made with a cash in lieu contribution to the carbon offset fund at a figure of £41,895. This would be secured through a s106 agreement
- The Chair of the committee encouraged the representative for the applicant to consult with his client about considering the use of cross-laminated timber during construction

Vote:

For: Councillors Stops, Hanson, Levy, Potter, Snell and Race  
Against: None  
Abstention: None

Due to IT related issues Councillor Joseph was unable to participate in the latter half of the discussion and the vote.

**RESOLVED, planning permission was GRANTED subject to conditions and completion of a Legal Agreement\*.**

\* As set out in the report and addendum and or Planning Sub-Committee meeting minutes.

## **7 Delegated Decisions**

7.1 The committee noted the contents of the delegated decisions report.

**RESOLVED, the Planning Sub-Committee NOTED the contents of the Delegated Decisions document.**

**Duration of the meeting: 18:30 – 20:50**

**Signed:**

.....  
**Chair of Planning Sub-Committee, Councillor Vincent Stops**

**Contact:**

Gareth Sykes  
gareth.sykes@hackney.gov.uk

\*\*The planning application reports and the addendum can be viewed in full by the following link and scrolling down to the relevant meeting on the Hackney Council website: <https://hackney.gov.uk/council-business>