

**DRAFT MINUTES OF THE PLANNING SUB- COMMITTEE
HELD ON
WEDNESDAY, 28 July 2021**

**THIS MEETING WAS LIVE STREAMED AND CAN BE VIEWED HERE:
<https://youtu.be/8GPBaSKfz2I>**

- Chair:** Councillor Vincent Stops in the Chair
- Councillors in Attendance:** Councillor Brian Bell, Councillor Ajay Chauhan, Councillor Humaira Garasia, Councillor Clare Joseph, Councillor Steve Race and Councillor Sarah Young
- Apologies:** Councillor Katie Hanson (vice-chair) and Councillor Michael Levy
- Officers in Attendance:** Nick Bovaird, Senior Planner, Major Projects
Robert Brew, Major Applications Manager
Natalie Broughton, Head of Planning and Building Control
Graham Callam, Growth Manager
Barry Coughlan, Deputy Team Leader - Major Projects
Joe Croft, Senior Transport Planner
Adam Dyer, Conservation and Design Officer
Steve Fraser-Lim, Planner, Major Applications Growth Team
Luciana Graves, Conservation, Urban Design and Sustainability Officer
Mario Kahraman, ICT Support
Leif Mortensen, Landscape and Tree Officer
Andrew Spragg, Governance Services Team Leader
Gareth Sykes, Governance Service Officer
John Tsang, DM & E Manager
Sam Woodhead, Planning Lawyer

1 Apologies for Absence

- 1.1 Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Katie Hanson Michael Levy.

2 Declarations of Interest - Members to declare as appropriate

- 2.1 Councillors Race declared an interest in relation to the planning application under discussion at agenda item 7; Councillor Race sat on the Shoreditch Park Development Board. He would therefore recuse himself from the meeting when this application was discussed.

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. Minutes of the Previous Meetings held on 2 June 2021

- 4.1 There were no minutes for consideration at the meeting.

5 Former Hackney Police Station, 2 Lower Clapton Road and 32 St John's Church Road and adjacent land within St Johns Churchyard London E5 0PD

- 5.1 PROPOSAL: Variation of condition 30 (pupil number restriction) attached to planning permission 2019/4559 in order to allow the school to be occupied at full capacity (630 pupils).

POST SUBMISSION REVISIONS: Non-applicable (N/A)

- 5.2 The Planning Services's Deputy Team Leader - Major Projects introduced the planning application, as set out in the published meeting papers. During the course of their presentation reference was made to the published addendum and number of additions and amendments to the application under discussion. 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.

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

5.3 The Planning Sub-Committee heard from a transport consultant and the principal for the school speaking in support of the application. They spoke about the challenge of running the school across three sites and that the school's travel plan would not have a detrimental effect on the surrounding travel networks. It was stated that the number of car journeys by parents would be reduced if the application was approved. With the pupils all located at one site the need for parents to travel to multiple sites would be removed and the need to travel to multiple sites by car. There would also no longer be a need for the use of school buses currently used between the three sites. The mitigation measures in place would help to alleviate the impact of the school on the neighbouring area. The principal for the school reiterated the benefits of all the pupils being located at one school site including pupils no longer losing time travelling to multiple sites, lessons taking place in cramped and inadequate spaces and key school leadership being spread thinly across multiple sites. Since operating from the single site the school had been a good neighbour towards the local residents. The school principal concluded that the school's progress would be seriously hindered if it was to continue to operate over multiple sites.

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

- The transport statement, submitted with the published application report, detailed the pupil postcode plots for pupils at both the application site and the temporary sites. Most pupils lived within 2 kilometres of the proposed site. With the expected pupils in September they were living closer to the proposed site within a 1 kilometre radius. For those pupils outside the 2km area the transport statement demonstrated that there were adequate bus routes to connect those pupils to the school. The applicants' survey had shown that where pupils lived was not a major factor in the choice of their travel either
- Hackney Council's Senior Transport Planner explained that in terms of travel planning over the last year, the council had undertaken various site visits and a number of complaints had been received by local residents to flag up with officers a level of concern. The transport officer concurred with the transport statement but there remained concerns about the reliability of the projections made in the statement and this was why the council, in talks with the applicant, had concluded that contributions had been needed to mitigate against the continued private high car use in the area. A representative from the School Streets programme had also confirmed with the council's transport team that private car use was the highest they had seen in the borough (36% for the application

site). The officer did commend the applicant for the work that they had done over the year leading to a reduction in the catchment area to 1- 2 kilometres which could lead to greater use of sustainable transport modes. Currently there was not definitive proof that there was going to be a reduction car dependency and because of this the council had moved to getting robust measures in place to expand the School Streets programme bolstered with travel plan monitoring process

- The officer acknowledged that with programmes like School Streets there would be some level of displacement, this was why the council was looking to research and determine which streets were most appropriate to expand the School Streets zone on to. Similar measures, introduced in the past, had shown that over time there would be some evaporation of car use rather than displacement
- Regarding condition 8.2.1, currently St Johns Church Road was an operational School Streets zone but it did not have a tangible method of enforcement. The idea was to install an Automatic Number Plate Recognition (ANPR) camera as soon as possible, ideally in September 2021.
- The expansion of the school streets programme to other areas, such as Clapton Square and Sutton Place, would be subject to traffic surveys and research. The Council would begin this work as soon as possible in the coming academic year
- The School Streets programme was so integral to the council's policies that they would seek to consult on them taking into account objections from the local residents but it was understood that School Streets was very much supported. If the programme was not to be expanded to Clapton Street for example, instead it would be extended to a street with heavy traffic
- The existing Management Plan and Travel Plan required marshals to be on the streets to enforce the measures included in the Travel Plan. It would be technically possible to extend those measures if the applicant agreed to those measures
- The school would have staggered times for the pupils entering the building - 630 children would not enter the site all at all at the same time. There would also be four staggered exit times
- The Chair of the committee would write to Hackney Council's Cabinet Member for highways to act on the School Streets programme.

Vote:

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

RESOLVED, that planning permission was GRANTED subject to conditions and completion of a Legal Agreement.

6 Former St Michael and All Angels Church, Mark Street, London, EC2A 4QX

6.1 PROPOSAL:

Erection of five storey (plus basement) building (Use Class E(g)) on land to north of the former church; works to former church including removal of existing internal structures and erection of new partial mezzanine floor and new entrances.

POST SUBMISSION REVISIONS:

- More single tier cycle parking provided;
- Improved quality of Affordable Workspace.

6.2 The planning service's Senior Planner, Major Projects introduced the published application 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:

- Paragraphs 4.7.2 and 6.5.9 would also be amended
- A new condition was to be inserted - 8.1.28 Waste Management for Former Church
- An additional condition has been agreed - Public Access to the Former Church Building
- Paragraph 6.3.18 to be amended
- Correction of typographical error at Paragraph 6.5.4
- Conditions were amended to reflect phasing of the development - 8.1.16 - Cycle Parking, 8.1.24 Bird and Bat Bricks, 8.3.5 Details to be approved and 8.3.7 Structural Survey.

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

6.3 The representatives for the applicant did not formally speak at the meeting but would answer any questions put to them by the Planning Sub-Committee members.

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

- There were a number of conditions attributed to listed building consent including removing everything that was inside the

premises, assessing what was there and repairing what was necessary. The first phase of the development would be high to medium risk. At the next stage there would be further details provided on where the contents of the interior would go and it was acknowledged that there was a lot inside that could not be seen because of all the partition walls

- The site was in a priority office area and the planning service had identified in the Local Plan the need for office space. With the proposals the question was also raised about what the Church site could best be used for bearing in mind that it was a grade 1 listed building. The proposals would provide high quality office space and would bring a vacant building back into use
- The conservation work that was to be undertaken as part of the proposals would feed into the public benefit of the site
- Any grade 1 listed building being vacant was of a concern to the planning service. Having an occupier of that building would ensure its long term maintenance. The proposals would allow the building to function
- The public would be able to access the building four times a year
- The harmful interventions to the site included the mezzanine and the demolition of the late-victorian lean to building. These would not impact on the grade 1 listed status of the building.
- The mezzanine would be introduced with pits and fins to distribute its weight evenly
- It was highlighted that the glazed area and the lift would also cause some harm to the structure. The former would be able to open the church and also add showers and toilets. The lift meanwhile would be fully conditioned to ensure it fitted into the building and allow the mezzanine to function for the occupants. The lift was a platform lift sitting as a standalone structure and would be braced by the mezzanine above. The lift was inside the building and would be for disabled use only
- A small amount of structural work had taken place to determine whether or not the spirelet could be reinstated but further works needed to be done. Some ground work had been undertaken to see if it was quantifiable for to be examined at a later stage. The applicant concurred that some work had been done but further investigation was required. The details of that work had been submitted but it was not part of the application before the sub-committee
- The phasing of the development was the applicant's prerogative. The viability work that the planning service had undertaken had determined that the church phase of the work was entirely viable on its own

- Addressing Hackney Society's criticisms about the height of the proposals, the planning service had looked at buildings in the Shoreditch area and a lot of Victorian warehouses with a strong vertical emphasis. The proposals were largely a modern reinterpretation of the same details but in a modern way
- Anyone who was in the building would want to look after it and the building was quite robust. A lot would depend on how the building was used by the occupants and the council had done what it could in terms of the planning process
- Any future proposed increase in office space on site would require a separate new planning application
- The Chair of the committee reminded sub-committee members that they had to taken the application before them at face value and compare them to the council's policy
- Regarding paragraph 6.6.2 in the report and the impact on daylight and sunlight at 75 Leonard Street, it was acknowledged there was an issue but there was not many residential properties in the immediate area, therefore the planning service considered the loss of light to be acceptable
- The location of the site was in an office priority area and therefore retail was not considered an option. Policies did not encourage active frontage but office space
- The management plan would contain details of how the public would access the site but arrangements would ultimately be determined by the occupant. An informative would was agreed to that effect
- The mezzanine had been included to encourage office use and also enhance the views inside the church
- The planning service could make the proposals step free. A ramp would be included as part of the next stage
- Cycle parking would be placed on the carriageway
- The affordable work space element would be approximately 51% above ground level and approximately 49% at basement level in the new building

Vote

For: Councillors Stops, Bell, Chauhan, Young and Race
Against: Councillor Joseph
Absentation: None

Councillor Humara Garasia left the meeting before the vote took place and therefore was unable to participate in the vote for item 6.

RESOLVED, that planning permission was GRANTED subject to conditions and completion of a Legal Agreement.

Councillors Humara Garasia and Steve Race left the meeting at the conclusion of agenda item 6.

7 Shoreditch Park, Bridport Place, Hackney, London, N1 5DX

7.1 PROPOSAL:

Works of enhancement and improvement to Shoreditch Park including new sports facilities, ball courts, children's play area, ecological improvements and hard/soft landscaping; Demolition of existing play hut building and construction of new play hut building to the west of the existing hut. New play hut building to include office, welfare facilities, cycle storage and multi-faith facilities.

POST SUBMISSION REVISIONS:

No revisions have been submitted.

7.2 The Planning Service's Planner, Major Applications Growth Team 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 8.1.11 Landscaping condition being reworded and a proposed new condition 8.1.13 Painting of adventure playground building.

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

The representatives for the applicant decided not to give a formal presentation but were available to answer any questions from the sub-committee.

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

- Toilets were available to Britannia Leisure centre and sand play would also be available to children
- Lots of timber would be used in the park which did not overheat in the summer. The timber would be off the ground
- The park would be open to the public at all times but there would be some arrangements with local schools for the use of the adventure playground
- There were no plans to lease the Multi Use Games Area (MUGA) it would be open to the public
- The adventure play hut would be a universal and flexible play setting and would be managed by Young Hackney, a council service for all young people aged 6-19 and up to 25 with additional needs. Currently 500 young people were registered to use the playground and several of the features on site were a result of feedback from young people in the borough
- The Chair of the committee suggested that the planning service consider using plane trees on site

- The application was seeking to create a central meeting point with seated areas, planting (shrubs and trees) and logging

Vote

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

RESOLVED, that conditional planning permission was GRANTED.

8. Delegated Decisions

8.1 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:

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