

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

**WEDNESDAY 3 MARCH 2021**

<b>Councillors Present:</b>	<b>Cllr Katie Hanson in the Chair</b>  <b>Cllr Brian Bell, Cllr Michael Levy, Cllr Ajay Chaunhan (substitute), Cllr Anna Lynch (Substitute), Cllr Peter Snell and Cllr Steve Race</b>
<b>Officers in Attendance</b>	<b>Gareth Barnett, South Team Leader</b> <b>Natalie Broughton, Head of Planning and Building Control</b> <b>Robert Brew, Major Applications Manager</b> <b>Graham Callam, Acting Growth Team Manager</b> <b>Barry Coughlan, Deputy Team Leader - Major Projects</b> <b>Joe Croft, Sustainable Transport Planner</b> <b>Luciana Grave, Conservation Urban Design and Sustainability Manager</b> <b>Mario Kahraman, ICT Support Analyst</b> <b>Gerard Livett, Senior Planning Officer</b> <b>Claire Moore, Senior Planner</b> <b>Sustainability Deputy Manager</b> <b>Jack Owens, Construction Management and Logistics Monitoring Officer</b> <b>Christine Stephenson, Specialist Lawyer (Commercialisation, Sustainable Procurement and Regulatory)</b> <b>Gareth Sykes, Governance Services Officer</b> <b>John Tsang, Development Management &amp; Enforcement Manager</b> <b>Tim Walder, Principal Conservation and Design Officer</b> <b>Sam Woodhead, Planning and Regeneration Lawyer</b>

### **1 Apologies for Absence**

- 1.1. Councillor Joseph, Councillor Potter and Councillor Stops had given their apologies for the meeting.

## 2 Declarations of Interest

- 2.1 Councillor Stops briefly attended the meeting to declare an interest: his wife, Rita Krishna, was one of governors on the board for the school for consideration at agenda item 5 and was also at the meeting to answer any questions from the committee. Councillor Stops prior to the meeting, in discussion with the Vice Chair, Head of Planning and Building Control, the legal officer and the Governance Services Officer had agreed that it would be best to sit out the meeting.
- 2.2 The other sub-committee members declared an interest; they all knew Rita Krishna (Councillor Stops' wife). It was felt that this would not prevent the committee members from being impartial during the meeting.
- 2.3 Councillor Chauhan declared an interest: he was a teacher and a member of the National Union of Teachers (NUT).
- 2.4 Councillor Lynch declared an interest in relation to the 20 January 2021 Planning Sub-Committee meeting minutes: she was related to the applicant for the project discussed at that meeting.

Councillor Stops left the meeting.

## 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 meeting, held on the 20th of January 2021, as an accurate record of that meeting's proceedings.

**RESOLVED, the minutes of the previous meeting, held on the 20th of January 2021, were AGREED as an accurate record of that meeting's proceedings.**

## 5 2020/3446 New Regents College, The Former New Regents College, 28 Ickburgh Road, Hackney E5 8AD

- 5.1 **PROPOSAL:** Refurbishment of the two existing (school) buildings including the insertion of new openings and replacement of existing openings in elevations, insertion of rooflights, alterations to the roofscape, alterations to cladding, removal of existing temporary 'porta-cabin' structures and sheds, construction of a new glazed lobby, general refurbishment of internal areas and landscaping and the creation of a cycle store and the re-provision of 2 accessible parking bays.

### 5.2 **POST SUBMISSION REVISIONS:**

Whilst no revisions have been made to the proposed development, the following additional information was secured:

- The Heritage Statement, prepared by Gollifer Langston Architects was submitted on 08 February 2021. As this is a technical document (which is not

required to be submitted, but provides additional detail) the application was not re-consulted as a result of this additional information; however, a copy was forwarded to the Clapton CAAC due to their original comments.

- Details of material specifications and detail drawings; these were submitted instead of having pre-commencement conditions imposed on the recommendation, and as such details would not be consulted under an approval of details application, re-consultation was not considered necessary.

Amended landscape plan (Drawing no. 298-801 Rev A) received 19/02/2021; this removed reference to the removal of 3no. trees on the site as the trees are no longer proposed to be removed.

- 5.3 The Planning Service's Senior Planner introduced the application as set out in the report in the published meeting papers. During the course of their presentation reference was made to the addendum, referencing the publication of the London Plan (2021) and the impact of this on the recommendation in addition to a number of amendments to the report including amendments to paragraph 4.1, 4.1.1, 4.5, 4.5.1, 4.5.3, Section 5.0, paragraph 5.10.1 and the inclusion of a new condition under paragraph 7.1.8\*.
- 5.4 The sub-committee noted that there were no persons registered to speak in objection to the application.
- 5.5 The client project manager for Hackney Council's education department gave a brief introduction. The site had been used for special needs education and a recent government grant had been received which had given the Council to expand the site.
- 5.6 The architect for the project briefly spoke echoing the comments made by the previous speaker. They spoke of the history of the site and how it involved two different buildings; Block A being a 1960s probably LCC special school and Block B being steel-framed for example. The streamline facade had been completely removed apart from the top section and it was hoped that could be returned to its former glory. With limited means it was hoped that what was already there could be kept and restored and address those crucial issues such as the end of life roof finish of both buildings. The developer was seeking to remodel the buildings internally in a limited fashion. It was hoped that the site could be dealt with sensitively.
- 5.7   The committee discussed the application and the following points were raised:
- the heritage status of Block B was discussed, with questions asked of the Council's Principal Conservation and Design Officer. He clarified that the building is not currently listed or locally listed, but is regarded as a Non Designated Heritage Asset, principally because it was an early work by Foster and Partners, with the late Wendy Foster as the lead architect. It was an early and interesting example of a purpose built special needs school, at a time when there was a shift from a medical to an educational approach to young children with special needs. The building is also interesting as a pioneering example of the use of prefabricated industrial materials to an education building. Although now somewhat altered, elements of interest remain. The Council's intention is to propose the building for local listing.

The scheme had been designed with the building's interest in mind and generally was not harmful to the significance of the building.

- there was a small area of timber cladding on site. Block A originally had timber and plywood as its main materials. In those limited areas oil-based finishes that can be applied to timber. The developer felt that they had good provisions in place and fits well with the buildings and keeps them different. It was felt that there was good longevity through use of those materials
- Larch was the timber that had been used on site. That area in particular was only four metres long. It would be stained to match the existing timber cladding of the ceilings of the buildings, which was a major characteristic of the site and would hopefully all blend inside and out
- the CAAC were reassured by the proposal that had been put forward
- the proposed roof lights were seen as a necessary and justified part of the proposals.

Vote:

For: Councillors Hanson, Bell, Chauhan, Levy, Lynch, Snell and Race

Against: None

Abstention: None

**RESOLVED, planning permission was GRANTED subject to conditions.**

**6 2020/3086 Worship Square, 65 Clifton Street, Hackney, London, EC2A 4JE**

**6.1 PROPOSAL:**

2020/3086:

Discharge of condition 18 (Construction Management Plan) attached to planning permission 2019/0462 granted 30/06/2020

**6.2 POST SUBMISSION REVISIONS:**

Document amended following officer feedback.

6.3 The planning service's Deputy Team Leader - Major Projects introduced the proposals as set out in the published papers. During the course of their presentation reference was made to the addendum and a number of amendments including an additional representation had been received from the agents representing the Lyceum School. The revised CMP has been noted as an improvement and no objection has been raised. Paragraph 5.2 was amended with reference to London Plan 2016 and the suite of relevant policies being removed and replaced with details relating to the London Plan 2021.

6.4 The committee discussed the application and the following points were raised:

- the school were initially consulted on the process and the discussions that had taken place between them and the developer had informed the submitted document. The school was informed about the revised document and they confirmed they had no objections. The school was happy with what was in the revised plan and agreed that in some instances it had gone

- beyond what they initially considered to be acceptable.
- on the routes in and out of the site, the intention was that construction traffic would come in from the west, leaving Worship Street and heading up curtain road and then on to the strategic highway and north on to great eastern street
  - the proposed entrance to the site in the first phase was to be from Clifton Street. There would be hoarding on site which would prevent dust and debris during the demolition phase
  - in terms of the construction phase, this would be serviced from a Pit Lane on Worship Street. This phase was due to finish in 2023. Currently conversations were under way on detailed plans for maintaining a high standard on the adjacent public realm. The ramifications from the pandemic would be integral to those conversations
  - Councillor Race raised concerns in relation to the impact of construction vehicles on the nearby cycle route. Officers advised that the CMP includes measures which take into account cycle safety. A robust monitoring process was also in place, which includes a newly appointed dedicated CMP monitoring officer, and any issues that arise in relation to the nearby cycle route would be addressed through this process
  - Transport officers confirmed that specific regard would be had for this matter as the CMP is monitored
  - the committee was reminded that the application before the committee was not for planning permission but was for discharge of conditions only. If the members felt that they did not have sufficient information to discharge the condition then it should not be approved. The committee could not add an additional condition.

Vote:

For: Councillors Hanson, Bell, Chauhan, Levy, Lynch and Snell  
 Against: None  
 Abstention: Councillor Race

**RESOLVED, discharge condition 18 (Construction Management Plan) attached to permission 2019/0462.**

**7 2020/0501 184 Evering Road, London E5 8AJ**

**7.1 PROPOSAL:** Submission of details pursuant to condition 4 (Detailed drawings) attached to planning permission 2019/2907 dated 11/11/2019.

**7.2 POST SUBMISSION REVISIONS:** Revised details received. Consultation for approval of details not required.

**7.3** The planning service's senior planning officer presented the application as set out in the published papers. During the course of the officer's presentation reference was made to the addendum and a number of amendments to the application including paragraph 5.1 being amended to remove reference to the London Plan 2016 and the suite of relevant policies should be replaced with reference to the London Plan 2021. Relating to this there would be a new

section inserted at paragraph 5.1.1 and paragraph 5.5, 5.5.1 - 5.5.3, relating to the emerging planning policy, would be deleted.

- 7.4 The committee heard from local residents objecting to the application. There were a number of objections to the development including a suggestion that the application was not mindful of wheelchair users, it did not provide any affordable housing unit and the constructed bike units and bin storage broke the architectural consistency of the building. Concerns were also raised about the type of the windows used - the objectors were of the view that the style used had changed to wood grain effect. It was felt that this diminished the building and the character of the area. It was also argued that the pictures presented at the meeting were not accurate and the height of the wall was not 1.5 metres and there was a brick wall in place rather than a front rail. It was felt that the committee had insufficient information to make a decision on the application.

The applicant declined to speak and instead would answer any questions from the committee.

- 7.5 The committee discussed the application and the following points were raised by the meeting participants:

- some of the committee members were concerned that they were being asked to consider an application that did not appear to be accurately reflected in the pictures and illustrative material presented at the meeting
- the planning service explained that the application before the committee was for the discharge of conditions attached to a previous grant of planning permission. If the development is not in accordance with the approved drawings, then that would be a matter for the Council's enforcement team. The design details and the photos used in the presentation were indicative of the type of work that had been undertaken on the site
- the chair of the committee reminded the committee that if there was found to be a discrepancy between what had been agreed previously and what had been actually built that this was matter for the enforcement team not the planning sub-committee
- the objectors were not satisfied with the explanation given. They were of the view that there was no excuse for the plans for not being in order. They added that they had not been given a proper chance to respond to the application after it previously was withdrawn twice from planning committee meeting agendas
- the planning service understood that the windows used on site were timber framed windows with double glazing which were constructed on site. The windows had a 16mm profile. The planning service concluded that the window details were acceptable. The committee noted that the original application submitted had proposed wood grain effect pvc windows,. What was now proposed was timber framed windows instead
- the height of the cycle storage area was 1.1 metres from pavement level. It was a brick enclosure with a cedar roof
- if the timber framed windows were changed to pvc windows that would be a breach of conditions
- the committee were reminded that they were being asked to make a decision to discharge details pursuant to condition 4 not what

had been built on site. Any issues with what had been built was an enforcement issue

- some of the committee members said that they had insufficient information to make a decision on the application
- the applicant clarified that there was no uniformity in properties in the area. The site originally had a garage in the basement and there was a driveway to that garage. The pavement dropped where there was the car ramp access. when the wall was constructed it had to be made from the pavement where it was going over the driveway the wall would be slightly higher. Measuring it from that point would be from street level as opposed to pavement level
- committee members were reminded that they were making a decision to discharge the conditions only
- the height of the bike storage was deemed to be an acceptable height. If what had actually been built on site did not match the approved detail, as previously mentioned, it would be an issue for enforcement
- the photos that had been submitted were illustrative examples of what had been built on site
- the committee could not defer making a decision on the application. Members were reminded that the application before the committee was not for planning permission but was for discharge of a condition only. Therefore members can discharge the condition if satisfied with the details before them. If members felt that they did not have sufficient information to discharge the condition then the condition should not be discharged.

Vote:

For: Councillors Hanson, Chauchan, Levy and Race

Against: Councilors Bell and Lynch

Absentation: Councillors Snell

**RESOLVED, discharge condition 4 (detailed drawings) attached to planning permission 2019/2907.**

## **8 Delegated Decisions**

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

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

**Signed:**

.....  
**Chair of Planning Sub-Committee, Councillor Katie Hanson**

**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>

