



MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE PLANNING SUB-COMMITTEE

WEDNESDAY, 2ND DECEMBER 2020

Councillors Present: Cllr Vincent Stops in the Chair
Cllr Katie Hanson, Cllr Brian Bell, Cllr Clare Potter,
Cllr Michael Levy, Cllr Peter Snell and Cllr Steve Race

Apologies: Cllr Clare Joseph

Officers in Attendance

Gareth Barnett, Major Projects Planner
Natalie Broughton, Head of Planning and Building Control
Luisa Brotas, Senior Sustainability and Climate Change officer
Joe Croft, Sustainable Transport Planner
Mario Kahraman, ICT Support Analyst
Peter Kelly, Senior Urban Design Officer
Claire Moore, Senior Planner
Matt Payne, Conservation and Design Officer
Robert Offord, Area Regeneration Manager
Christine Stephenson, Acting Senior Legal Officer
Gareth Sykes, Governance Services Officer
John Tsang, Development Management & Enforcement Manager
Dominic West, Principal Planner

1 Apologies for Absence

1.1. There was an apology for absence from Councillor Joseph.

2 Declarations of Interest

2.1 Councillor Stops declared an interest: the application was in his ward. Under 5.4 of the Planning Code of Practice for Members, paragraph 2.5, in Hackney Council's Constitution, Sub-Committee Councillors can hear applications from their particular ward.

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 minutes of the 29th July 2020 meeting were agreed as an accurate record of those meeting's proceedings

RESOLVED, the 29th July 2020 Planning Sub-Committee meeting minutes were agreed as an accurate record of those meeting's proceedings.

5 2020/3325 HACKNEY CENTRAL STATION, 231 -237 GRAHAM ROAD, HACKNEY CENTRAL E8 1PE

5.1 PROPOSAL: Creation of new access to Hackney Central Overground Station on Graham Road and creation of associated facilities including a gating shelter with ticket gates, a kiosk, bike storage, a new staff refuge area and landscaping.

5.2 POST-SUBMISSION AMENDMENTS: None

5.3 The Planning Service's Senior Planner introduced the planning application as set out in the published meeting papers. During the course of their presentation reference was made to the addendum which highlighted a number of amendments to the application report and additional responses received to the consultation*.

There were no objectors registered to speak.

5.4 The committee heard from representatives for the applicant who began with a brief overview of the site and the changes that had taken place. The proposed development was seen as a simple Transport for London (TFL) standard gating and ticketing enclosure behind an entrance pergola facing the street. Behind the enclosure, there would be steps leading up to the platform with capacity for the installation of a lift at a later date. Also the development would seek to undertake public realm improvements within the site, including the creation of a cycle hub, a new coffee kiosk, water taps/fountains and general landscaping e.g. tree planters.

5.5 The Planning Sub-Committee members raised a number of questions and the following points were raised:

- The Council's Planning Statement of Community Involvement (SCI) would not affect this particular application. The recent amendment to the SCI was to remove the requirement to notify objectors of planning committee decisions, however, the planning service would still continue to notify objectors of decisions. This was a temporary measure because of the recent cyber attack on the Council
- Some of the committee members stressed the need for the Construction Management Plan (CMP) to do everything it could to minimise any disruption to Graham Road during the construction
- The proposals would result in a proper station entrance with a totem pole and would be part of the public realm. The station design had been formulated in a way to address the immediate need of congestion. Network Rail and TFL would

be working together to look at future opportunities for the site and a bigger development. The proposals under consideration were not a stop gap but were a solution for now

- On the design of the application, the Hackney Council's Conservation, Urban Design and Sustainability (CUDS) team were not involved in the pre application process for the application but other parts of Hackney Council were. The Council's planning service eventually wanted to see a substantial development on site
- The application had been designed in way that it was not only lightweight and dismantlable but also of a high quality in the short term so that a future substantial development would not be ruled out
- The installation of water taps/fountains was welcomed. It was suggested that for in the future, for certain planning applications, that there was included a commitment to make the installation of drinking fountains a requirement
- Some of the committee members preferred that the application, in particular the entrance, was made step free if possible
- The application report did include a commitment to wheelchair access signage along the route to the station entrance
- The Planning Service confirmed that there was a requirement for there to be an unobstructed route from the Graham Road entrance to the Amhurst Road entrance. However, this was not part of planning permission
- Installation of a lift had been preferred but because of the cost implications, this idea had to be future proofed and looked again if additional funding became available
- Under the new local plan there was a policy to look at the installation of free water fountains as part of commercial developments in major town centres
- The Planning Service confirmed that a Equality Impact Assessment (EIA) was not a requirement for this application because it was not a major development. The Department for Transport (DFT) however, had considered the EIA implications as part of their work on these proposals
- The Council's planning service did consider whether the site should be temporary but it was felt due to the operational nature of the development the application was felt to be appropriate. There was an element, separate from the application, that would ensure that the site would be part of any future larger scheme
- There was nothing the Planning Sub-Committee could do to make sure that the development was not in place for any longer than 15 years. Then Senior Planner added that temporary did not necessarily mean 15 years. The Council's Regeneration team were working with Network Rail and TFL to look at a long term solution along the northern side but for this to be considered the second entrance would be needed because, depending on what shape those future plans would take, there may be disruptions on the northern side necessitating use of the southern side entrance. The council-Network Rail-TFL partnership was being written up in the form of a Memorandum of Understanding and would be signed as part of development of the southern entrance
- Regarding disabled car parking space on site, it was noted that there was an inherent challenge with Graham Road, in that because in terms of providing on street disabled car parking bays it was something that was not possible but the fact that blue badge holders were able to park free of charge in Amhurst Road then and access the station via that entrance was considered an appropriate solution. An accessible disabled car parking bay, nearer to the site, was preferred but the planning service could not see that opportunity being close to

Wednesday, 2nd December, 2020

Mare Street as well. It was not clear how many blue badge car parking spaces were in the Amhurst Road car park but blue badge holders could park in any of the bays free of charge. It was noted that under the draft London Plan standards there should be at least one disabled car parking bay on the street or on site and should be made available for development, however, it was not possible to apply that standard to the locality of the proposed site under consideration at the meeting

- Planning controls would not apply to the Amhurst Road car park because it was not within the red line boundary
- The Planning Service confirmed that they would not have the ability to control the disposable cups used by the coffee kiosk on site. It was confirmed that waste and recycling facilities would be provided on site
- There had been lengthy discussions around whether to install tree planters or street trees. Mayor Glanville had indicated that he was not in favour of large trees because at some point they would have to be taken out. Internal discussions about this issue were continuing
- The Planning Service had received reassurances from the applicant that disruption to the site during the construction phase would be minimal. Therefore it was considered not necessary for the CMP to come back to the Planning Sub-Committee
- The Planning Service were currently looking at a potential work site for storing materials and welfare facilities across the road in Marvin Street
- The vast majority of construction would take place on site and because the materials to be used were pre-fabricated it would make it a much more seamless integration process. Minimal disruption on the carriageway was expected
- The construction project taking place on 221 Graham Road would be managed through the CMP process
- The Planning Service noted members' concerns over the use of two tier cycle stands and in the consultation they had stated that they do not usually recommend them. However, contextually Hackney Station had been identified as not having enough capacity for cycling parking. The application proposed the installation of a cycle hub; the cycle hub would provide 48 spaces within the enclosed area (via two tier stands). There were seven Sheffield stands, providing space for 14 bicycles (see paragraph 6.4.2.2). The cycle hub expanded the cycle provision in Hackney and it was a hub that was more intended for medium term cycle storage. They were based on more capacity and volume and therefore two tier cycle storage would have to be used. Both the London Plan and the Council's own guidance stated that these type of cycle stands would have to be of a high standard. Conditions would also be in place to ensure that the cycle stands would be appropriately spaced to minimise the chance of someone banging their head and to allow effective access by the public

Due to IT-related issues Councillor Bell had to unexpectedly leave the meeting. He did not participate in the final vote.

Vote:

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

RESOLVED, planning permission was granted subject to conditions, and completion of a legal agreement.

6 Delegated Decisions document

6.1 The committee noted the delegated decisions document.

Duration of the meeting: 18:30 – 19:20

Signed:

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

Contact:

Gareth Sykes
gareth.sykes@hackney.gov.uk

*The planning application report and the addendum can be viewed in full by accessing the meeting papers at <https://hackney.gov.uk/council-business> and scrolling down and clicking on the Planning Sub-Committee meeting section on the Hackney Council website.