

**DRAFT MINUTES OF THE PLANNING SUB- COMMITTEE
HELD ON
WEDNESDAY, 1 September 2021**

**THIS MEETING WAS LIVE STREAMED AND CAN BE VIEWED HERE:
<https://youtu.be/8LiZmNtzTWs>**

- Chair:** Councillor Vincent Stops in the Chair
- Councillors in Attendance:** Councillor Katie Hanson (vice-chair), Councillor Brian Bell, Councillor Ajay Chauhan, Councillor Steve Race and Councillor Sarah Young
- Apologies:** Councillor Michael Levy, Councillor Humaira Garasia, Councillor Clare Joseph
- Officers in Attendance:** Gareth Barnett, Planning Team Leader
Nick Bovaird, Senior Planner, Major Projects
Natalie Broughton, Head of Planning and Building Control
Robert Brew, Major Applications Team Leader
James Clark, Planning Officer
Barry Coughlan, Deputy Team Leader - Major Projects
Alix Hauser, Senior Planning Officer
Mario Kahraman, ICT Support
Matt Payne, CUDS Deputy Manager
Louise Prew, Senior Planning Officer
Qasim Shafi, Principal Transportation Planner
Jessica Feeney, Governance Service Officer
Tim Walder, Principal Conservation & Design Officer
Sam Woodhead, Planning Lawyer

1 Apologies for Absence

- 1.1 Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Humaira Garasia, Clare Joseph, Michael Levy.

2 Declarations of Interest - Members to declare as appropriate

- 2.1 There were no declarations of interest.

3. Proposals/questions referred to the Sub-Committee by the Council's Monitoring Officer

- 3.1 There were no proposals/questions referred by the Council's Monitoring Officer to the Sub-Committee.

4. Frampton Park Estate - Application 2021/1065

- 4.1 This item was deferred.

5 Sturts Yard, 48 Eagle Wharf - Application 2021/0680

- 5.1 PROPOSAL: Redevelopment of existing self-storage site (B8 use) to provide a mixed use scheme comprising blocks of 2-7 storeys and accommodating a self-storage facility (Use Class B8) at lower basement, basement and ground floor level, office accommodation (Use Class E(g)) at basement, ground and first floor level, 139 residential units (Use Class C3) at second to sixth floor and cafe (Use Class E) at ground and first floor level, along with landscaping and other associated works.

POST SUBMISSION REVISIONS:

- Applicants offer to provide 10% Affordable Housing at Hackney Living Rent;
- Applicants increased Affordable Workspace offer to reflect a 40% discount on 10% of office floorspace, to be provided at ground floor or first floor;
- Review of Financial Viability Assessment provided by Council appointed assessor;
- Minor layout changes to improve proposed standard of accommodation;
- £40,000 to the Canal and Rivers trust towards towpath improvements and biodiversity measures;
- Submission of document justifying B8 car parking;
- Submission of Daylight/Sunlight addenda in respect of internal daylighting and neighbouring canal boats;
- Submission of contaminated land site assessment.

5.2 The Planning Service's Senior Planner of Major Projects Nick Bovaird introduced the planning application, as set out in the published agenda. During the course of their presentation reference was made to the published addendum which referenced an additional objection, and two objectors who had written in for a second time but did not raise any new issues. Members were informed that the total number of objections was 40. Members attention was also drawn to the addendum which details an adjustment to recommendation B, The Hackney Works Contribution should be adjusted to read:

- A Ways into Work contribution of £282,075.30. These additions and amendments included two additional objections having been received, the text of paragraph 6.4.9 of being amended and recommendation A would be amended and conditions attached to planning permission 2019/4559 were to be added to the Section 73 application for clarity and completeness.

5.3 The objector was invited to speak on behalf of local residents the following concerns were raised:

- The height of the proposed building was a total of 7 stories which was 2 stories taller than surrounding buildings, it was felt that the height would loom over the neighbourhood.
- Residents felt that the report contained many compromises and policies had been watered down to suit the development.
- Attention was drawn to the health and wellbeing section of the report, item 6.9, objectors highlighted that only two sections of this report showed positive results the rest were neutral.
- It was felt that 1 apprentice per 2 million pounds worth of construction was an exceptionally thin offer.
- The potential increased footfall at the canal was worrying for the objectors.
- Objectors requested a local resident liaison group and full consultation in line with the construction management plan as there were concerns regarding flood risks and land contamination.

5.4 Councillor Yvonne Maxwell was invited to speak at the meeting, the following concerns were raised.

- The report stated that the development would consist of 11% affordable housing. Councillor Maxwell felt this was disappointing given the current housing crisis, Hackney needed family homes not a development with 30% of studio flats without bedrooms.
- The report detailed the proximity of windows and balconies to neighboring units and how the distance was likely to result in a poor level of amenity for future residents, contrary to the policy D6 of the London Plan.

- There were four rooms in the development which had very low levels of daylight. Councillor Maxwell did not support development of potential homes with no light or bedrooms.
- Only 10% of the office space was being proposed as affordable workspace (discounted at 40%), despite many businesses struggling since the Pandemic.
- Councillor Maxwell felt that the development did not meet the area's needs or acceptable standards.

5.4 The Planning Sub-Committee heard from the applicant. The following key points were raised:

- The applicant's ambition was to diversify and repurpose existing facilities around London to provide homes, workspaces and storage.
- It was shared that the concept of the application had begun 5 years ago when the applicants were first in discussion with the council's planning officers. During that period the number of stories has been reduced from 12 to 7.
- It was felt that the development, if approved, would be an asset to the wider community.
- The development would offer a Carbon saving of 52% and 10% of the workspace would be affordable workspace discounted at 40% , all affordable renting will be let at hackney's living rent rates.
- The report noted that the daylight and sunlight levels were acceptable.

5.5 During the discussion phase of the meeting a number of points were raised including the following:

- The sub-committee discussed affordable housing, the planning officer advised they could not impose 30% affordable housing on the basis of the submitted and reviewed viability information, however the applicant did offer 10% affordable housing.
- The Chair questioned the biodiversity of the development, the sub-committee was advised that the development would incur a payment within the legal agreement to the canal rivers trust, which if the trust felt necessary could be spent on biodiversity.
- Councillor Hanson questioned where the 1 apprentice per 1 million pound of contracted work stood against other schemes, the planning officer explained that this was the standard contract that was asked for within the legal agreement.
- Land contamination was discussed, the applicant explained that they have done the extra work on the land contamination however they would be happy to include the standard and pre commencement land contamination conditions.
- The Committee had questions regarding the 1860 Victorian Warehouse, Tim Walder explained that the roof truss system was a

part of the building that should remain, it would be used as the cafe rooftop in the forecourt of the cafe.

- It was questioned why 7 stories was now being recommended for approval, Matt Payne explained that the building would be in keeping with the emerging context of the area along the canal and was in keeping with the regents canal conservation area. Tim explained that there was an impact however it was substantial and was outweighed by the public benefits.
- The committee discussed the mass and design of the accommodation of the application, the planning officer highlighted that the units would be high quality with balconies and acceptable headroom, the planning officer added that the committee report addressed the aspects of the scheme that did not meet policy targets and asked members when making their decision to consider the planning balance.
- The cycling provision was discussed, the applicants confirmed that cycling parking would have security footage, and there would be a condition stating that the majority of cycle parking would be single tier.

5.6 The committee questioned what made the applicant describe the studio flats as high quality. The applicant explained that studio flats had access to large windows and outdoor amenity space and would look over the canal. Councillor Young questioned why the decision was made to build a large number of studio flats and not as many 2 and 3 bedroom flats. The applicant explained that the decision was made under advice from property agents who identified what the rental market was in the locality and wider area. In the private rental sector currently there was not a large demand for 2 and 3 bedroom properties. The planning officer in response to the chair confirmed that the build to rent markets were usually within high density areas and that 1 and 2 bedroom rental properties were likely to meet the housing needs within this area.

5.7 The Chair questioned if the residents could be involved in the construction management plan and if this could be conditioned within the decision, the applicant shared that he would be happy to form a group with residents and local councilors. Legal confirmed that this could be conditioned. The Chair requested for the applicants to consider using timber to construct the building.

Vote:

For: Councillors Stops, Hanson, Bell, Chauhan
Against: Councillors Race, Young
Abstention: None

RESOLVED, that planning permission was GRANTED subject to conditions, legal agreement and referral to GLA.

6 83A Geffrye Street - Application 2021/1215

6.1 PROPOSAL:

Erection of a single storey roof extension to provide additional floorspace (Use Class E) together with associated works to the existing building and the introduction of a replacement access gate, cycle parking, a refuse storage area and associated works to external amenity area.

POST SUBMISSION REVISIONS:

Revised sections and a Daylight and Sunlight Study were provided. Consultation was carried out on these new documents.

6.2 The Planning Officer introduced the report. During the course of the officer's presentation reference was made to the addendum and a number of amendments to the report including the following:

- Add paragraph 4.2.3 - a further objection had been received since the report was written. The objection was on the grounds of loss of light and that an additional storey would have an impact on the skyline. Members were informed that the total number of objections was 13.
- Amend paragraph 7.1 as follows: The development delivers a high quality roof extension to the existing building which will provide additional space for the occupiers of the ~~dwelling~~ building.
- A new condition to be added: 8.1.14 The first three north facing windows at first floor level at the western end of the building shall be fixed shut and obscure glazed below 1.7 metres above finished floor level. REASON: To protect the amenity of neighbouring occupiers

6.3 The objectors were invited to the committee to make a statement. The following concerns were raised:

- It was felt that the proposed building would significantly reduce residents' light and privacy, and the loss of light would have detrimental effects on residents' mental wellbeing.
- 4 windows did not meet the BRE guidelines
- There were 16 rooflights that could open up on the building and it felt that this could cause a lot of noise nuisance for residents.
- The circular window allowed for overlooking into many neighbouring residents' gardens, bathrooms and windows and the objectors felt that the overlooking invaded their privacy.

6.4 The applicant and agent were invited to the meeting to speak. The following points were raised:

- The applicant explained that he was an experienced property developer within Hackney and owned a number of properties in Pearson Street.
- It was explained that previously the building was a commercial warehouse, however it was no longer in use.
- It was stated that the development would not have an adverse impact on the neighbouring residents.
- An energy statement had been undertaken to maximise the building sustainability and bird boxes would be provided for endangered species.

6.4 During the discussion phase of the meeting a number of points were raised about the application including the following:

- Members discussed the issue of overlooking, the Planning Officer shared photos and described to the committee that the window on the rear of western elevation would be obscure glazed and fixed shut below 1.7 metres above finished floor level, to prevent any overlooking. The other windows of concern were 5.2 metres away from the nearest building however these were roof lights and there would be no view into neighbouring windows.
- Councillor Hanson stated that there was no right to not be overlooked and most properties in Hackney were overlooked, The Chair added that many properties within Hackney did have some form of overlooking.
- Councillor Young questioned the BRE (Building Research Establishment) figure. Gareth Barnett the Planning Team Leader shared that the results were very modest and there were just 4 shortfalls for NSL which were slightly under the BRE guidance, it was felt that this was acceptable.
- Councillor Hanson questioned paragraph 6.5.10 within the report, which stated that a nearby property window had 67% light as opposed to the recommended 80%.

Vote:

For: Councillors Stops, Hanson, Bell, Chauhan, Race and Young
Against: None
Abstention: None

RESOLVED, that planning permission was GRANTED subject to conditions.

7 Gayhurst Primary School - Application 2021/1543 and 2021/1564.

7.1 PROPOSAL:

External repairs and replacement of parts of the roof, leadwork and rainwater goods; repointing and repair of brickwork; repair and redecoration works to high level louvres, doors, stonework and metalwork; repairs to concrete windows sills and boundary walls and; installation of snow guards.

POST SUBMISSION REVISIONS:

Further information on the boundary proposals on the western boundary were provided. Re-consultation was carried out in the form of letters to surrounding occupiers and objectors for a period of 14 days post submission of revised drawings.

7.2 The Planning Officer introduced the report as published in the meeting papers. During the course of their presentation reference was made to the published addendum and a number of amendments to the application report including the following:

- Paragraph 6.1.2 amended to read. 6.1.2 New anti-climb wire boundary fencing is also proposed along the western boundary to consist of a free-standing fence situated within the boundary of the school and affixed to the existing boundary walls to a maximum height of 2m.
- Paragraph 6.1.3 deleted.

There were no persons registered to speak in objection to the application.

During the discussion phase of the meeting a number of points were raised about the application including the following:

- Tim Walder provided details to the committee regarding the history of the school, it was explained that new fencing above the existing walls was to be installed.
- Councillor Young questioned what vegetation would be lost, the planning officer shared that some residents wished for vegetation along the wall to be removed and some wished for it to stay and that all vegetation that could be reasonably retained would be.

Vote:

For: Councillors Stops, Hanson, Bell, Chauhan, Race and Young
Against: None
Abstention: None

RESOLVED, that planning permission and listed building consent was GRANTED subject to conditions.

8. 1-10 Purcell Street, Hackney, London, N1 6RD - Application 2021/1385

8.1 PROPOSAL:

Replacement of the existing timber windows with UPVC windows on the front and rear elevations.

POST SUBMISSION REVISIONS:

Revisions are as follows:

- The proposed elevations and design and access statement were modified to clarify that the proposed replacement windows will be Rosewood in colour to match the existing brown windows. No further consultation letters were sent given the lack of material changes to the proposal.

8.2 The Planning Officer introduced the report as published in the meeting papers.

8.3 The Chair invited Hugo Jay the objector to the speak, the following key points were raised:

- Concerns were raised around insulation and the environmental impacts of the new windows being installed, as the existing windows were wooden and the new windows were to be UPVC.
- Residents were confused as to whether the windows being installed were going to be white in colour or rosewood.
- There were concerns that the windows in the stairwell were not being replaced too, it was felt it would look odd if half of the building had the new windows and the other half had the old.

The Chair proposed that the application be deferred as the applicants who were the Council Officer were not present to answer questions from the objector. Councillor Katie Hanson seconded the proposal. The committee voted on the proposal

Vote:

For: Councillors Stops, Hanson, Chauhan, Race and Young
Against: None
Abstention: None

RESOLVED, that application be deferred.

9. Delegated Decisions

9.1 The Planning Sub-Committee noted the document.

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:

Jessica Feeney, Governance Services Officer
jessica.feeney@hackney.gov.uk