

**AGENDA ITEM 6B**

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

**WEDNESDAY 7 APRIL 2021**

- Councillors Present:** Cllr Vincent Stops in the Chair
- Cllr Katie Hanson (Vice Chair) Cllr Brian Bell, Cllr Ajay Chaunhan, Cllr Clare Joseph, Cllr Clare Potter, Cllr Peter Snell and Cllr Steve Race
- Officers in Attendance**
- Gareth Barnett, South Team Leader  
Nick Bovaird, Senior Planner, Major Projects  
Natalie Broughton, Head of Planning and Building Control  
Robert Brew, Major Applications Manager  
Graham Callam, Growth Team Manager  
Steve Fraser-Lim, Planner, Major Applications Growth Team  
Mario Kahraman, ICT Support Analyst  
Claire Moore, Senior Planner Sustainability Deputy Manager  
Christine Stephenson, Specialist Lawyer (Commercialisation, Sustainable Procurement and Regulatory)  
Joris van der Starre, Senior Conservation and Design Officer  
Gareth Sykes, Governance Services Officer  
John Tsang, Development Management & Enforcement Manager  
Tim Walder, Principal Conservation and Design Officer  
Sam Woodhead, Planning and Regeneration Lawyer

**1 Apologies for Absence**

1.1. Councillor Levy had given his apologies for the meeting.

**2 Declarations of Interest**

2.1   There were no declarations of interest.

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

3.1 There were no proposals or questions referred to the sub-committee by the Council's Monitoring Officer.

**4 Minutes of the previous meeting**

4.1 The committee agreed the minutes of the previous meeting, held on the 3 February 2021, as an accurate record of those meeting's proceedings.

**RESOLVED, the minutes of the previous meeting, held on the 3 February 2021, were AGREED as an accurate record of those meeting's proceedings.**

**5 2020/3055 234 - 238 Mare Street, Hackney, London, E8 1HE**

5.1 **PROPOSAL:** Erection of two storey rear and single storey roof extensions to provide 9 residential units and ground floor office use (Use Class E(g)); elevational alterations and landscaping to include cycle store to rear.

**5.2 POST SUBMISSION REVISIONS:**

- Amendments to elevations, principally to the design of the mansard;
- Changes to cycle storage to provide single tier stands.

Owing to the small scale of these changes, which would not impact significantly on the neighbouring amenity, it was considered unnecessary to further consult with neighbours.

5.3 The Council's Planning Service's Senior Planner, Major Projects, presented the application report as set out in the meeting papers. During the course of the officer's presentation reference was made to the addendum and amendments in the application report to paragraphs 6.4.9, 6.4.12 and 6.4.13\*.

5.4 A local resident first spoke in objection to the application raising a number of concerns about the proposals including the negative impact on the character of the building and area, the amenity of neighbours and the potential loss of green space.

5.5 The representative for the applicant spoke next giving a brief overview of the proposals. They explained the history of the site and the proposed changes to the site. The site was believed to be well located with high transport access. A ground floor office space was included, as well as an outdoor space facing a communal courtyard.

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

- noted that the two houses facing Paragon Road should be a link block. While different, the proposed brick colour was designed to complement both the existing building and the new building adjacent to the east. The planning service added that in their view the use of integrated brick was a better option
- the application was for nine units and would not fall within the on-site affordable housing threshold. Therefore this was the reason for a payment in lieu of £450,000 towards the off-site

provision of affordable housing. The sub-committee noted that with small sites the likelihood was that no housing provider who would take on the site and provide one to two affordable housing units

- as part of the Unilateral Undertaking, there would be a carbon offset payment of £30,923, as well as other conditions being in place. The developer explained that they would seek to implement sustainability measures on site. Where the developer had not managed to get the carbon offset to zero then they would make a payment instead
- the developer explained that the office space would be Building Research Establishment Environmental Assessment Method (BREEAM) excellent. The developer explained that they would also seek to introduce air source heat pumps on site which they considered to be a more sustainable energy source. The developer added that the fabric performance meanwhile would be better in the new extension. The developer had looked at the entire scheme but where possible a carbon offset payment had to be made where they have not met the 100 per cent carbon zero target
- some of the Councillors expressed their disappointment at some measures of the scheme believing that it could have been made more sustainable if changes were made to the fabric combined with the use of air source heat pumps
- the architect explained that the wall build ups would be part of the next stage of the detailed design stage. However, the architect suggested that this was not to say that there would not be any scope to improve the fabric of the building
- the planning service confirmed that developers did not make a direct application for the carbon offset payment
- the representative for Hackney Council's Property Services explained that discussions were underway with the Council's Housing Services on how best to use the affordable housing contribution and whether to create one or two units on-site or whether there was specific use of the £450,000 that was better for Hackney Council overall
- in response to concerns raised by objectors about the lack of outdoor amenity space, the planning service replied that there was the communal courtyard as well as a private space at the back of the site for the two three-bedroom units
- the Councillors noted that the height of the mansard had been reduced and the planning service had asked to see samples of the materials to be used
- whether the units would be rented or outright sales was not a material planning issue. The representative for Hackney Council's Property Services explained that there were ongoing discussions with the Council's Housing Services on whether some of the units could be part of the London Living Rent scheme
- the Principal Conservation and Design Officer, from the Council's Conservation, Urban Design and Sustainability (CUDS) team, explained that the building was not a Georgian building. In 1906 the building was heavily altered for trams and the front gardens were reduced and the facade was moved backwards. The original

buildings dated from circa 1850, with substantial changes and a new facade in 1906. The building was not listed, probably because of the later date of the original build and the impact of the 1906 alterations. As the building was not listed Hackney Council did not have planning control over the internal features of the building. The scheme had been redesigned during discussions to conserve two of the three staircases, the chimney breasts and the plan form, as far as possible

- the planning service's Senior Planner explained that early on in the planning process there was an intention to get rid of the entire office space as it was not considered attractive as an office. The auxiliary offices above were not considered adequate but the planning service were keen to see some office space on the ground floor to compensate for the loss of office space on the upper floor. The building was not in a priority office area and on balance the planning service took the view that it was a better option to lose the upper floor office space but retain the good office space on the ground floor
- the architect explained that the design principles for the site were that anything that was new on-site would be articulated as new in design. The infill between the new and old parts of the site would be seen as a transition piece. The architect was of the view that the red brick did not marry with the grey brick building as the proportions were completely different. The CUDS officer added that it was a transitional link block that was complementary to the bricks on either side but would also be distinctive and high quality. It was noted that the brick colour was subject to approval by condition
- clarification was sought on the wording of the recommendation and whether it was subject to a legal agreement or a unilateral undertaking. The legal officer replied that he was of the view that he was content with the wording of the recommendation and that it was clear enough that the sub-committee could make a decision on it.

Vote:

For: Councillors Stops, Hanson, Chauhan, Potter, Bell, Race, and Snell

Against: None

Abstention: Councillor Joseph

**RESOLVED, that planning permission was GRANTED subject to conditions and a legal agreement.**

The sub-committee took a ten minute break.

**6 2021/0406 19 Great Eastern Street and 9 Hewett Street, London, EC2A 3RP**

6.1 **PROPOSAL:** Demolition of existing office building and erection of new office building of 8 storeys (plus basement) with roof plant enclosure and erection of building for use as a hotel and associated restaurant facilities of 12 storeys (plus basement) with roof plant enclosure, public realm and other associated works.

6.2 **POST SUBMISSION REVISIONS:** Submission of additional information with regard to transport, sustainability and fire strategy.

6.3 The planning service's Planner, Major Applications Growth Team, introduced the planning application as set out in the meeting papers. During the course of their presentation reference was made to the addendum and amendments to the following: the parking details table, paragraph 4.14, conditions 8.1.11, 8.1.23, paragraph 8.2 Head of term 1 and paragraph 8.2 the Head of term 8\*.

No requests were received to register to speak in objection to the application.

The representative for the applicant was present at the meeting and decided to not speak but they would answer questions from the Councillors.

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

- the application included an archaeology condition which called for a written scheme of investigation and for the planning service to consult with Historic England's Archeology Service. As part of the condition details would have to be given on how the investigation would be undertaken during the construction phase. Once a report was submitted Historic England would be consulted again and if they were content with this then the condition would be partly discharged and then construction could continue, while the recording of any findings would be made at the same time, and then a final report would be produced and submitted. If anything of archeology interest was found on site there would be a watching brief and the site would be monitored. If anything was found on-site construction would be stopped and the findings would be excavated in a way deemed most appropriate by the Museum of London
- the representative for the applicant expected that nothing of archeological significance would be found on-site
- under the proposals the existing four storey element would be demolished
- the Planning Services's Senior Conservation and Design Officer explained that the site had been reviewed by the Design Review Panel (DRP) several times. It was concluded that the scheme fitted well into the local context although it would be slightly higher than some of the historic buildings in the area. The context of the area was very diverse and the proposals were modest in comparison to other adjacent buildings
- analysis of the level of hotel need in the area was based on data from the Greater London Authority (GLA). This latest data was based on projected demand, the completions that had happened as well as other schemes with planning permissions in the area. The GLA had also various scenarios regarding how many hotel rooms would be lost as a result of redevelopment up to 2041. Using that data the planning service could see that there was still a surplus in the borough. There was 908 hotel rooms to fill before Hackney reached its level
- the planning service acknowledged that recently there had been a number of hotel applications in the immediate area, but they

were of the view that given the character of the area (a mixed use zone) it was felt there would not be an over concentration of hotels

- the planning service were of the view that the proposed new building was unlikely to create a wind tunnel effect as it was a mid rise building similar in height to the adjacent Arnold building. The stage building would have much more of a wind impact
- the nearest residential properties to the site were at Fairchild Place about 40-50 metres away
- the representative for the applicant explained that the proposals would complete the urban block making a positive contribution to the area
- the GLA had recently commissioned a piece of work on the impact of Covid19 on the Central Activity Zone (CAZ) and it had reported that the CAZ was well placed for a recovery, however, it did not include much details regarding the projections for hotels
- the GLA data in the application report was the most up to date available
- there was a brief overview of the Pre Application Process process and the role of the DRP. The DRP would not overrule the PAP; it was a second opinion that was taken into account during the planning process. The planning service would have the final say and generally they would bring schemes to the PAP stage to bring about any changes the planning service decided which applications would go to the DRP
- the curve design for the building originated from the architects and had been developed between the first and second DRP meetings
- the site was in a priority office area and the planning service were aiming to get a high proportion of office space as possible in the mixed use developments. For this particular application the policy target was 60 per cent office and 40 per cent alternative uses, however in this scheme there was more hotel space than office space. It was noted that there was a lot of office space in the adjacent buildings.

Vote:

For: Councillors Stops, Hanson, Bell, Chauchan, Potter, Snell and Race

Against: None

Abstention: None

Councillor Joseph was temporarily unavailable for this part of the meeting and therefore the Councillor agreed to withdraw and not participate in the vote.

**RESOLVED, that conditional planning permission was GRANTED subject to completion of a Legal Agreement stage II approval from the Greater London Authority (GLA).**

## **7 2021/0323 111 Clapton Common, Hackney E5 9AB**

**7.1 PROPOSAL:** Continued use of the building as a large House in Multiple Occupation (HMO) (sui-generis) and retrospective permission for alterations to the existing chimney.

### **7.2 POST SUBMISSION REVISIONS:**

- The applicant has confirmed that the floor area of 80m<sup>2</sup> referred to in section 13 of the application form is incorrect, and this should state 399.31m<sup>2</sup>.
- Drawing no. SC0001 Rev B; demonstrating provision of cycle storage in the front garden
- Sheffield Stand specifications
- BC Centurion bike shelter specifications sheet (10x bikes)
- Car park management statement, dated March 2021
- Drawing no. SC002-A (proposed dedicated parking for 2 vehicles)

As these details would often be considered via an Approval of Details application, consultation upon the receipt of the additional documents was not considered to be necessary.

**7.3** The planning service's Senior Planner presented the application as set out in the meeting papers. During the presentation reference was made to the addendum and the following amendments to the application report: site/application details on page one to include the reference number and validation date, a document titled 'BDS Centurion Cycle Shelter' added to the drawing numbers/documents list and post submission revisions list on page one. Paragraph 6.2.6 and 6.2.7 would be amended as well as adding a condition relating to soft landscaping at 8.1.8\*.

No requests were received to register to speak in objection to the application.

The representative for the applicant was present at the meeting and decided to not speak but they would answer questions from the Councillors.

**7.4** The committee discussed the application and the following points were raised:

- the applicants had informed the planning service that their records for the building had been lost as a result of the cyber attack. The planning service understood that the building had been used as a care home facility in the past and a House in Multiple Occupation (HMO)
- the representative for the applicant explained that the building had historically been managed by Hackney Council's Property Services. Working with Housing Services attempts were made to establish what historic records were held on the building, but as previously mentioned, because of the cyber attack, no records were unearthed
- the Council had inherited the site and it had been an ongoing project over a number of years
- the application had arisen after the Council had recently changed the providers who were running the HMO and shifting to a new charity and they had enquired about the whereabouts of the lawful use of the building

- the Head of Planning and Building Control reiterated that it was the applicant's records that were missing, not the planning records.

Vote:

For: Councillors Stops, Hanson, Bell, Chauhan, Joseph, Potter, Snell and Race

Against: None

Absentation: None

**RESOLVED, that planning permission was GRANTED subject to conditions, and completion of a unilateral undertaking pursuant to section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and other enabling powers.**

## **8 Delegated Decisions**

8.1 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 – 20:34 hours**

**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>