

DRAFT MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE PLANNING SUB-COMMITTEE

WEDNESDAY 1 DECEMBER 2021

THIS MEETING WAS LIVE STREAMED AND CAN BE VIEWED HERE:

<https://youtu.be/GVxuRnHSnec>

Chair:	Councillor Vincent Stops
Councillors Present:	Councillor Humania Garasia, Councillor Steve Race and Councillor Sarah Young
Apologies for Absence	Councillor Brian Bell, Councillor Ajay Chauhan, Councillor Katie Hanson, Councillor Clare Joseph and Councillor Michael Levy
Officers in Attendance:	Rob Brew, Major Application Team Leader Nick Bovaird, Senior Planner, Major Projects Graham Callam, Growth Team Manager James Carney, Affordable housing viability Officer Joe Croft, Senior Transport Planner (Development Control) Adam Dyer, Conservation and Design Officer Luciana Grave, Conservation Urban Design and Sustainability Manager Mario Kahraman, ICT Support Analyst Conor Keappock, Principal Urban Design Officer Jennifer Miller, Business Support Officer, Legal Services John Tsang, Development Management & Enforcement Manager Andrew Spragg, Governance Services Team Leader Gareth Sykes, Governance Services Officer Christine Stephenson, Legal Officer

1 Apologies for Absence

- 1.1. Apologies for absence were submitted from Councillors Brian Bell, Ajay Chauhan, Katie Hanson, Clare Joseph and Michael Levy.

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/questions referred for consideration.

4 Minutes of the previous meeting

- 4.1 The minutes of the previous meeting, held on the 3 November 2021, were agreed, subject to amendments, as an accurate record of those meetings' proceedings.

RESOLVED, that the previous meeting, held on the 3 November 2021, were AGREED, subject to amendments, as an accurate record of that meeting's proceedings.

5 2020/1461: 144 - 164 Homerton High Street, Bison House and 7 Sedgwick Street, 84-90 Digby Road, London, E9 6JA

- 5.1 **PROPOSAL:** Demolition and redevelopment of the site for a mixed-use development comprising buildings ranging in height from 4 to 17 stories containing 245 residential units (Class C3, reduced from 264), 4,489m² of commercial floorspace (reduced from 4,532m²) including 402m² A1 & 327 m² of A3/A4/A5 uses, including vehicle access from Sedgwick Street and Digby Road into basement service area, roof terrace external amenity spaces, publicly accessible open space and landscaping, plant and all other associated works.

5.2 POST SUBMISSION REVISIONS:

Revisions include: reductions in scale and massing to some buildings; reduction in amount of residential and commercial floorspace; changes to elevation appearance of some buildings, including architectural approach, materials, and design of ground floor frontages to commercial units; change to plan layouts, including residential and commercial unit layouts and simplified ground floor residential entrances; change to design of proposed central courtyard; proposed canopy at the entrance to building A adjacent to Sedgwick Street; introduction of 4 on site disabled car parking spaces; increase in proportion of affordable housing. A 21 day re-consultation on this information has been carried out (see consultation section).

- 5.3 Hackney Council's Planning Service's Senior Planner introduced the planning application as set out in the published meeting papers.

- 5.4 There were two persons registered to speak in objection to the application. During their submission they raised a number of concerns about the proposals including the loss of daylight and sunlight for the existing ground floor artist studios and the proposed building dwarfing the existing buildings in the vicinity leading to overdevelopment. The proposals were seen as another example of ‘the relentless gentrification of East London’ and they stated that the demolition of places of worship and small businesses would severely impact on the diverse nature of the area. They also felt that the proposals would create an unnecessary environmental burden, suggesting that it would have a large carbon footprint and would require large amounts of energy to run. They added that the proposals were not designed with the local community in mind and that there was simply not enough space in the location for another tall building. There were also concerns raised about the wind speeds and the impact of the proposals on the existing trees and the flood risk to the area.
- 5.5 The applicant gave a brief overview of the development of the proposals as well as highlighting the challenging aspects of the site and addressing those concerns raised by existing local residents. They emphasised how their ambition was to deliver a state-of-the-art light industrial space with the emphasis on a hub of innovation and a policy compliant work space component. Every effort had been made to accommodate the needs of the existing local residents and it was noted that the three Plane Trees on Sedgwick Street would be retained and that the planting of 34 new trees was proposed. The applicant added that an assessment of the impact of wind had been undertaken by the applicant. Regarding the existing places of worship on site, the applicant explained that two of the places of worship had confirmed that they no longer wished to use the space while another had not been using the space for approximately 20 months. Another place of worship was understood to be still being used. The Planning Officer noted that these areas were not authorised for use and it was highlighted that there were available in the local area other authorised places of worship.
- 5.6 The Planning Sub-Committee raised a number of questions and the following points were raised:
- The Council’s Planning Service acknowledged that there was a shortfall in the playspace in the proposals but this was mitigated by the public realm contribution of £500k. The Planning Service deemed this to be acceptable despite it not meeting the policy requirement. The applicant added that the proposed playspace on the roof terraces was accessible to all residents in the development. This was for residents with younger children. Older children already had access to established playspaces in the local area
 - The applicant highlighted that the proposed building with the majority of social housing would have direct access to the playspace on the first floor. It was also the block with the most roof terraces and it also provided access to the third floor roof space running along Sedgwick Street
 - Landscaping and play spaces were of identical quality across all of the site

- The Planning Service outlined the steps it had taken to contact the existing places of worship on site and how they understood from the applicant that they had not heard back from two of the places of worship and the applicants had stated they were no longer in use. Approximately two weeks before this meeting the Planning Service had heard from another of the places of worship. The Planning Service had then responded but there was no subsequent reply from the recipient. Aside from this, the Planning Service had concluded that, as a Priority Industrial Area, these unauthorised uses should not be accommodated within the proposal scheme. The Council's Regeneration Team would be interested in holding talks with these places of worship in respect of their relocation, should they choose to get in touch.
- The Planning Service had worked closely with the applicant to improve the offer and it was felt that the planning application was now acceptable. On the issues of cycle security this would be scrutinised as part of the further work on the conditions. There would be a cycle parking management plan that would need to be in line with the London cycle design standards
- The applicant's architect stated that in terms of cycle parking the emphasis for them had been on the quality and the convenience of the parking space. It was right next to the entrances and it was accessible from the street. As recommended by Hackney Council, the applicant had provided more Sheffield cycle stands to accommodate both cargo and larger bicycles. The cycle parking areas had also been made larger at the expense of some loss of commercial space but it was recognised that the applicant could not go far from the requirements for the site
- Some of the Planning Sub-Committee members stressed the need for secure cycle parking inside the building
- The Planning Officer explained that under the proposals there was nothing in the building that would stop light industrial use from functioning and at the same time there was nothing that would result in too much of an amenity impact to the existing and future residents
- As the site was light industrial and surrounded by residential areas, workshops that undertook metal work, for example, would not be a suitable fit for the site. The committee recognised that some heavy industry was being lost to light industry but the application was creating a different type of industrial use but it was not to say that the former could not be located somewhere else in the borough
- The proposals would see 16 stories above ground
- The archaeology condition in the published report had been drafted to address concerns that had been raised
- The Chair of the committee wished for the pre-commencement details of the changes to Sedgwick Street to return to the committee for the members' consideration. The Planning Officer replied that the £500k contribution would be a section 106 agreement which essentially meant that this would be agreed by Hackney Council at Cabinet level, so it would not come back to the Planning Sub-Committee

- The Planning Sub-Committee was provided with further details about the process of the allocation of the contribution. While the design of the proposals could be part of the section 106 agreement to try to make the details of the allocation too specific would make the eventual spend allocation quite challenging
- The Chair of the Sub-Committee took the view that the committee should see the scope of the expenditure. The Planning Officer, referring to the published drawings for the proposals, outlined the changes as far as was known. The Planning Service would continue to feed into the process. The Chair of the Sub-Committee recommended an informative on how the £500k contribution was going to be spent
- The Chair of the Sub-Committee commented that for the future he wanted the Planning Sub-Committee to see the report to refer to the Local Plan guidance of viability testing for schemes below 50% Affordable Housing, rather than the fast track route at 35% referred to in the London Plan. For the public route through the site, gates would be installed and as part of a condition, opening times were to be arranged at the next stage of the planning process. The Sub-Committee's preference was for a minimum of dawn to dusk opening times. The applicant agreed to this, along with a requirement that the gates would be left open at these times
- The materiality for the proposals had changed recently and the Planning Officer explained that it was typical at this stage of the planning process to not have available all the details, for example the brick work for the tower
- The Chair of the Sub-Committee recommended that all the details of the materials should be discharged
- On the landscaping aspect of the proposals there was a condition in place and the Planning Service were of the view that it was detailed enough at this stage
- The Chair of the Sub-Committee took the view that the sub-committee should also see further details on landscaping when they were available.
- In terms of the density of the scheme, the Planning Service, with the Hackney Society's comments, for example in mind, had adopted a holistic approach to the proposals, in line with the Local Plan and the London Plan. The scheme, as a design-led approach, was deemed by the Planning Service to be acceptable
- On the daylight and sunlight impact for existing residents of the proposals, the Planning Officer cited the comments from the applicant raised earlier about the overhang of their building. Such was its configuration that any development on the opposite side of the road would lead to some sort of impact on daylight and sunlight
- The Sub-Committee acknowledged that the Planning Service as part of its work had taken into consideration the impact of the proposals on the existing residents on the street. The Building Research Establishment's Environmental Assessment Method (BREEAM) guidance had set out that the Planning Service must consider the impact, for example, on the existing balconies. In

relation to the other aspects of the proposals, the Planning Service was of the view that they were acceptable

- In accordance with Hackney Council policy, a review mechanism had been agreed as part of the affordable housing offer of the proposals. The Sub-Committee noted that the Greater London Authority (GLA) wanted to see the details of the section 106 agreement so that they could examine the early and late stage reviews prior to stage two
- The Council's Viability Officer explained that the agreed Gross development value (GDV) for the proposals would be £128 Million. As the scheme was a mixed tenure scheme with both private and affordable residential, as well as commercial accommodation, the Council and applicant's consultant both targeted separate profit margins for each individual component of the development. It was 17.5% GDV on the private rented accommodation, 6% GDV on the affordable housing and 15% GDV on the commercial space. In the published papers, details were provided on how much profit the scheme was currently forecast to make. The Council's appraisal of the agreed position, reflected an aggregate profit margin of £18,618,855 (reflecting 14.51% on GDV), which was less than the agreed blended aggregate profit requirements of £20,234,459 (reflecting 15.77% on GDV). When asked if the GLA agreed with the agreed final position between the Council and the applicant, the Viability Officer stated he understood this to be the case. He also highlighted that the agreed profit margins were generally in accordance with those seen across London in viability assessments at present for similar schemes, and were also in accordance with the levels the GLA typically adopts for schemes of this size
- The Planning Sub-Committee agreed that the material details would return to the committee and an informative was to be written highlighting the deficiencies in the play space in the proposals. The Chair of the Sub-Committee agreed to liaise with the Planning Service over the wording of the informative
- The Planning Sub-Committee agreed to the landscaping condition being returned to the committee for discharge

Vote*:

For: Councillor Stops, Garasia and Race.

Against: None

Abstention: None

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

*Councillor Young had joined the meeting after agenda item 5 had started and therefore under the Council's constitution was not eligible to participate in the discussion and the vote on the application.

6. Delegated decisions

6.1 The Planning Sub-Committee noted the delegated decisions document.

RESOLVED, the Planning Sub-Committee noted the delegated decisions document.

Duration of the meeting: 18:30 - 19:35 hours

Chairperson for the meeting: Councillor Vincent Stops

**Gareth Sykes, Governance Services Officer
Contact: gareth.sykes@hackney.gov.uk**