

**APPROVED MINUTES OF THE PLANNING SUB- COMMITTEE
HELD ON
WEDNESDAY, 6 October 2021**

**THIS MEETING WAS LIVE STREAMED AND CAN BE VIEWED HERE:
<https://youtu.be/Cho2uvx1i3g>**

Chair: Councillor Vincent Stops

Councillors in Attendance: Councillor Katie Hanson (vice-chair), Councillor Brian Bell, Councillor Ajay Chauhan, Councillor Humira Garasia, Councillor Steve Race and Councillor Sarah Young

Apologies: Councillor Michael Levy and Councillor Clare Joseph

Officers in Attendance:

**Gareth Barnett, Planning Team Leader
Nick Bovaird, Senior Planner, Major Projects
Natalie Broughton, Head of Planning and Building Control
Catherine Slade, Major Projects Planner
Robert Brew, Major Applications Team Leader
James Clark, Planning Officer
Barry Coughlan, Deputy Team Leader - Major Projects
Sara Kulay, Head of Resident Participation TMOs & Cities
Ola Akinbinu, Contract Delivery Manager
Mario Kahraman, ICT Support
Matt Payne, CUDS Deputy Manager
Joe Croft , Senior Transportation Planner
Leif Mortensen, Senior Landscape and Tree Officer
Conor Keappock, Principal Urban Design Officer
Natalie Williams, Governance Service Officer
Tim Walder, Principal Conservation & Design Officer
Graham Callam, Growth Manager
John Tsang, DM & Enforcement Manager
Christine Stephenson, Planning Lawyer**

1 Apologies for Absence

- 1.1 Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Clare Joseph and Michael Levy.

2 Declarations of Interest - Members to declare as appropriate

- 2.1 Councillor Hanson declared an interest in agenda item 5 - Frampton Park Estate - as she had met with the applicant.

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. Portico City Learning Centre, 34 Linscott Road E5 0RD Application - 2021/1651 and 2021/1653

4.1 PROPOSAL:

Change of use of the building from Use Class F.1 (learning and non-residential institutions) to Use Class E(e) (commercial, business and service) for use as a health centre. Partial demolition of existing rear two storey extension (stair core) and replacement with two storey rear extension and erection of a two storey side extension with associated means of access, roof-top plant and landscaping.

4.2 POST SUBMISSION REVISIONS:

- Amendments to accessible access arrangements in north of site;
- Amendments to the car parking arrangements;
- Additional information provided in respect of the junction between the proposed extension and southern colonnade, details of staff cycle storage, parking, deliveries, waste storage and electricity sub-station and urban greening factor;

- Revision of Fabric Repair Schedule Drawings, Heritage Statement (incorporating Heritage Appraisal), demolition drawings, Transport Statement and Travel Plan;
- Submission of Building Condition Survey and Structural Inspection Report;
- Amendments to design and access statement to include the amendments and additional information set out above;
- Contribution of £10,750 towards monitoring of the Travel Plan and Construction Logistics Plan and £14,498 towards carbon offset;
- A reconsultation has been undertaken in respect of key revisions to the proposals and amended or additional information other than contributions.

4.3 Catherine Slade, Major Projects Planner introduced the planning application, as set out in the published agenda. During the course of the officer's presentation reference was made to the addendum and the amendments to the submitted report.

4.4 The objectors were invited to speak and the following concerns were raised:

- They indicated that the residents supported the concept of a new medical centre however they requested that the Sub-Committee defer the planning application to allow the applicant to review the design taking into consideration the concerns of the residents of Powerscroft Road. The application had also understated the long-term negative cumulative impact of the development on residents and local community;
- Concern was expressed about the size and height of the development, issues relating to symmetry and position within the site, impact on residential amenity of surrounding properties, loss of light, overshadowing, loss of privacy, loss of trees, rooftop plant machinery, boundary issues, close proximity to their windows and rear garden of 3.6 metres, noise and general disturbance;
- The proposed construction of a medical waste facility and electricity substation close to Powerscroft Road would have a detrimental impact on residents' health and wellbeing. It was proposed that the facility and substation could be built north of the site, which would cause minimum impact;
- They had expressed a preference for design option 3 at the pre-application stage but were advised it would be financially unviable;
- The viability survey that had been requested at the pre-application stage for the current proposal had not been submitted. There were also no viability assumptions for the alternative options or any transparency regarding the selection of the design for a publicly funded scheme; and

- They argued that other factors such as the long-term impact of the proposal on local residents and community should have been taken into consideration and not primarily the viability assessment.

4.5 Councillor Rathbone was invited to speak at the meeting and the following concerns were raised.

- There had been an increase in the construction of flats in the area without any consideration for the infrastructure;
- Concern was expressed that the development was within close proximity to Powerscroft Road residents' rear gardens, too large in scale and an eyesore from the rear gardens that would significantly impact on residents' daily lives;
- There was a demand for a new GP surgery in the area but this was an inappropriate site and should not be built to the detriment of residents;
- Residents of Powerscroft Road had expressed concerns about the impact of the proposal including overlooking and loss of light to the rear of the properties and that more consideration should to be given to the present day setting and enhancing rather than replicating the original footprint;
- The proposed design was unsuitable and a review was necessary to achieve a positive outcome for all parties;
- Concern was expressed that the NHS should not be burdened with the hidden cost of paying for English Heritage's maintenance costs of this site;
- The applicant had not outlined the reasons for rejecting preferred Design Option 3; and
- Concern was expressed that the building could remain on the Heritage at Risk Register under the current proposal.

4.6 The Planning Sub-Committee heard from the applicant's consultant Jonathan Bainbridge and Councillor Christopher Kennedy. The following key points were raised:

- The planning application proposed a medical facility that would allow the Lower Clapton Medical Centre to be relocated to a larger new state of the art health facility that would be inclusive and accessible to the public. It had been designed in conjunction with the doctors to meet the surgery and its patients' need for the next 30 years;
- The Portico site had been the most appropriate site geographically and also an underdeveloped inner city site that could benefit from a health facility rather than residential development;
- The design proposal had been the most sympathetic to the heritage building and the only financially viable solution due to the constraints of the listed building and NHS requirements;
- The proposal would ensure that the Portico was brought back into active use and the building maintained, and removed from the Heritage at Risk Register. It would also provide an opportunity to

inform local residents of the history of the building and safeguard its long-term future;

- The proposal was in compliance with the planning policies and the National Planning Policy Framework to deliver sustainable developments that did not adversely affect residential amenity. Any building on this site would be oppressive, however, the health centre would be of significant public benefit to the wider community;
- The proposed scheme had been designed to incorporate flexibility for future growth and would allow the surgery to focus on providing the best quality of primary care to the residents of Hackney resulting in direct and indirect benefits;
- The project was anticipated to be cost neutral, with the Council initially borrowing to build the surgery and the NHS guaranteed to occupy for 20 years. The initial scheme of repair would not be a financial burden on the NHS;
- Officers and the Design Team had worked together to minimise the impact of the proposal on the Grade II listed building;
- The applicant, the Design Team and architect had engaged with local residents to address the impact of the proposal on residential amenity and the mitigations were outlined at paragraph 6.4 of the report including reducing the visual impact of the rooftop plant and relocating the patient garden to minimise disturbance to residents. There were now no unacceptable impacts from the proposal;
- It was emphasised that 'a private right to a view' did not fall within the planning regime;
- Management plans would be produced and a manager employed to minimise disturbance from the activities to be carried out on the boundary in particular during the construction phase;

- 4.7 Timothy Walder, Principal Conservation and Design Officer, briefly summarised the history of the building, the harms caused by the proposed development and the public benefits. The Portico originally opened in 1825 as an Orphan Asylum and had many uses throughout its history. The surviving entrance portico and north and south colonnades were a fragment of a historically larger building. In terms of harm to the building, there would be no loss of historic fabric. However, the harms included an asymmetrical development (due to the nature of the site, which is narrower on the north side); the partial obstruction of views through the south colonnade by new development set behind the courtyard; and a ramp which would be installed for people with mobility issues to access the building. The public benefits included bringing the whole building back into use; this would ensure that the building would be maintained for the foreseeable future and removed from Heritage at Risk Register; and a scheme of heritage interpretation to explain the history of the building to the public. In terms of the setting, the most significant views were from the front of the building on Linscott and Lower Clapton Roads.

- 4.8 The Senior Landscape and Tree Officer stated that the trees on the boundary including four Sycamore trees, Plane tree and the life expectancy of these trees based on grade of the tree. Grade A had a life expectancy of 40 or more years and Grade B was 20 or more years.
- 4.9 During the discussion phase of the meeting a number of points were raised including the following:
- The Chair stated in his opinion this was a folly associated with educational use. The Major Projects Planning Officer stated that the building had been used for many purposes previously and finally for educational purposes;
 - With regard to the symmetry issue and option 3, the applicant's representative stated there was insufficient space at the north site for the scale of the building to meet GPs requirements and there were two significant trees that would be impacted. Option 3 had not been feasible due to the heritage impacts, which were considered to be more harmful than the proposed design and it would also not meet the operational requirements of the NHS and GP Surgery. In addition, the additional costs would have made the project undeliverable;
 - The Chair asked whether consideration had been given to replicating the south of the colonnade to the north of the colonnade. The Principal Conservation and Design Officer replied that he had asked the applicant to explore achieving some symmetry but he had been advised that due to the clinical environment and budget constraints imposed by the NHS District Auditor option 3 would cost an additional £800,000 and destroy the viability of the scheme
 - Councillor Rathbone clarified that he believed that the proposed design was inappropriate for the site;
 - With regard to the location of the electricity substation, the applicant's representative stated this had been incorporated into the design during the design development process and was permitted under development rights. The sub station could potentially be relocated but there would be no benefits to residents as it did not cause any disturbance. The Major Projects Planning Officer added that the sub-station had been introduced as an element after the scope of the application had been finalised and its location was indicative at this stage and a planning application would be submitted following the start of works;
 - In response to concerns regarding the visual impact and noise from the rooftop plant, the Major Projects Planning Officer replied that the rooftop plant consisted mainly of air source heat pumps enclosed by attenuation screens, which had been the subject of a noise assessment undertaken by Environmental Health. Most air source heat pumps did not make much noise. She confirmed that Environmental Health had expressed no concerns regarding the noise levels at the rooftop plant or made representations to the

application. The entire rooftop plant would not be visible from the front elevation;

- The Senior Landscape and Tree Officer replied that the plane tree would be lost, which was a Grade A tree but more trees of a substantial size would be planted along the boundary and had been included at Condition 8.1.17 within the report;

4.10 The Chair expressed concern at the proposed design and in particular the symmetry issues with the design, which had not been addressed and a lack of planning considerations. The Chair proposed to defer the application to allow the applicant and architects to attend the next meeting to explain the design in planning terms including reasons for not addressing the symmetry issues in the development.

Vote:

For: Cllrs, Chauhan, Hanson, Garasia, Young and Stops
Against: Cllr Bell
Abstention: None

RESOLVED: That this item be deferred to the next meeting.

(Councillor Hanson left the Council Chambers and Cllr Race joined the meeting at this juncture.)

5 Frampton Park Estate, Frampton Park Road, E9 7PF - Application 2021/1065

5.1 **PROPOSAL:** Demolition of the existing Frampton Park Community Hall and estate cleaning depot to rear; demolition of disused parking structure on Wooldridge Way; additional works associated with site clearance. Construction of 69 mixed tenure residential dwellings within two new blocks, one of part 4 and part 7 storeys and one of 8 storeys, and within the undercroft area of Tradescant House. Landscape and public realm improvements within the site boundary including provision of play space and reorganisation of existing car parking.

POST SUBMISSION REVISIONS:

- There have been minor design amendments made to the application post-submission in order to address Secure by Design comments - these are primarily related to internal and external access arrangements.
- Some additional detail has also been added to the ground floor facade of the north elevation at Planning Sub-Committee – 06/10/2021 the Atrium building in response to officer feedback. Given the nature and extent of these amendments, a re-consultation has not been considered necessary. The amended drawings have

been available to view online in advance of the publication of this report.

- Some additional information has also been submitted in relation to the loss of the community hall, principally in relation to the hall usage and the services that were once provided. The additional information does not propose any changes to the application or the means of mitigating the loss of the hall. As such, it is not considered to warrant a re-consultation. The information has been available to view on the Council's website since its submission on 29/07/2021.

5.2 Barry Coughlan, Senior Planner of Major Projects, introduced the planning application as set out in the published agenda. During the course of their presentation reference was made to the published addendum, which outlined amendments to the residential mix table, conditions, additional objections and responses to objections. The Community Uses Report had demonstrated that the Frampton Park Community Hall(Community Hall) was underused and on average was in use three and a half hours a week. Details were also provided in relation to spare capacity at nearby Pitcairn and Elsdale Halls. The proposal before members was to relocate activities from Frampton Park Community Hall to Elsdale Hall as it had sufficient capacity and was close to the proposal site. A contribution of £250,000 was also to be secured towards repairing, renovating and extending the hall.

5.3 Councillor Clare Joseph, objector, was invited to speak at the meeting and her objection was set out the addendum and summarised below:

- This proposal contradicted the policy at 5.1.5 in The London Plan regarding the loss of community infrastructure having a detrimental effect on a community and on this basis the application should be refused;
-
- Referring to paragraph 6.09 within the report, it was argued that Community Hall was in daily use by Hackney Quest and bingo club and it was not an unused space. The underuse had been due to residents no longer being able to book the hall as it had been removed from the online list, the telephone booking number on the main entrance was not answered or residents were told the hall could not be booked due to noise complaints and finally the rise in hire rates to £376 a day;
-
- Before demolishing the building, the Council should consider bringing underused facilities back into use as stipulated in the London Plan and by reducing hire rates more interest could be generated in the Community Hall;
-
- Elsdale Hall was approximately 100 sq metres in comparison to the Community Hall, which was 451 sq metres. The hall also had issues with asbestos, vermin, a poorly designed entrance, could not

hold more than one event at a time and was inappropriate for youth activities. The £250k funding to refurbish the hall would be insufficient to develop Elsdale Hall into a comparable community hall and no measurements of the Elsdale Hall had been provided in the report. The estate had more than 3,000 residents and proper facilities were needed to guard against the unnecessary loss of valued facilities and services;

- Concern was expressed that the Council had not actively marketed the Community Hall for a year and the hall was needed in an area that experienced problems with youth crime and exploitation;
- She disagreed that there were no equality issues and argued that the most underprivileged members of society that could not access or afford the new shops and bars in the borough relied on this community provision and the loss would affect community members with several protected characteristics in Hackney;
- A further concern had been the design of the Atrium building and the 13 metres separation distance from the neighbours, which would spoil the character of the estate. It would be self-enclosed and a gated open space that other residents would not be able to use or enjoy;
- It was highlighted that as the population at Frampton Park increased as result of this development there would be more demand for community spaces in the future. It had been very rare for a TRA to strongly object to a council led scheme; and
- It was suggested that the applicant return with an increased offer for a replacement community facility.

5.4 Councillor Penny Wrout, objector, was invited to speak at the meeting and her objection was set out the addendum and summarised below:

- Frampton Park was Victoria Ward's largest estate and had seen a lot of housing expansion over the last decade causing disruption to residents. This application went part way towards an overarching improvement plan for Frampton Park estate but failed in the provision of the Community Hall, which was necessary for the long-term well-being of a thriving community;
- She expressed concern whether the application truly met the standards required by the policies in the Local Plan and London Plan regarding community facility replacement and challenged the claims justifying the loss of the Community Hall in the Community Uses Report as incorrect. It had been difficult to gauge actual demand as bookings to the Community Hall had been restricted. Since Hackney Quest had left the Hall in 2018 the youth activity on the estate had reduced from every weekday night to just Friday nights at the Baptist Church. The report also did not consider the day-time activities that Hackney Quest had run such as the popular lunch clubs for the elderly;
- All three community halls on the estate had been historically underused and not fit for purpose. The Frampton Park Community

Hall had an inaccessible main space with no lift and the Elsdale Hall was cramped, run down and damp. Pitcairn was dark and sited in the basement of a large block where noise and safety issues restricted its use;

- The £250,000 towards renovating the Elsdale Hall would be insufficient for the works needed and would leave Frampton Park with one functional smaller community space for an expanding community. The construction of 69 extra flats would result in significant population growth on the estate and increased demand for community space. A modern eco-friendly space like Morningside Hall was needed which could accommodate more than one activity at a time; and
- She had worked with the Council to look at options including a new building and the costs ranged from £450,000 to £1.3m depending on the size with alternative funding sources from the TRA and Council money as match-funding to provide an appropriate community space. The TRA could assist with funding for outdoor works.

5.5 Samantha Lloyd and Kristina Sackett the objectors, were invited to speak at the meeting and their objection was summarised below:

- There had been no consultation with residents about the demolition of the Community Hall and it had not been explained how the hall had been selected as it was not underused, derelict or structurally unsafe. The Community Hall provided help and support to the local people including young, disadvantaged and elderly residents. The proposed hall would be inadequate for the residents on the estate and it was a requirement of the Housing Supply Programme to replace community infrastructure with like for like or better facility;
- The proposed development would have a detrimental impact on the residents living in the vicinity of the flats including a loss of light, social exclusion and division in the community from the gate development, a 24 hour play street would encourage anti-social behaviour and adverse impact on health and wellbeing; and
- The upgrading of existing facilities and community provision across the estate was necessary to maintain community cohesion and the proposed contribution should be replaced by a commitment to provide a larger community facility for the residents on the estate to share with future residents from the development.

5.6 Chris Trowell, Director of Regeneration, the applicant's representative was invited to speak in support of the application. In 2021, 16 families living on the Frampton Park Estate had moved into newly built social rent homes and many families in urgent need of alternative homes were waiting for the same opportunity. Despite the challenges of the pandemic and Brexit, the Council would be delivering on its affordable housing commitment within the Housing Supply Programme and had undertaken an extensive consultation

exercise with residents and stakeholders on the proposed development. The loss of social infrastructure such as the Frampton Park Community Hall may be permitted under the London Plan and a justification for the loss had been set out within the Community Uses report including underuse. The proposals for Elsdale Hall would ensure an improved and better quality community space for local residents. The Frampton Park estate also benefited from five community facilities within 500 metres of the site including three community spaces on the estate with Elsdale Hall being approximately 140 metres from the Community Hall. Elsdale would provide all the activities offered at the Community Hall and the £250,000 investment would be used to improve the existing spaces and make the hall fit for purpose.

- 5.7 The Chair expressed concern that the proposed funding would be insufficient to cover the full cost of the proposed works for Elsdale Hall.
- 5.8 Judith Loesing, the applicant's architect outlined the proposal for upgrading the Elsdale Hall including extending the floorspace in the hall from 40.7sqm to 64.3sqm, garden from 339.2sqm to 525.4sqm and larger offices, upgrading the kitchens, and better insulation of the premises. The applicant's representative added that the proposal for the hall submitted at the meeting had been practical in terms of fulfilling the functional requirements of the space, costed and deliverable within budget. The actual costs would be known when the contract was being tendered.
- 5.9 The Chair indicated that a stronger planning obligation was needed to ensure delivery of the scheme presented at the meeting rather than a monetary contribution.
- 5.10 The Senior Planner of Major Projects Officer confirmed that the head of term could be amended to specifically list the works described in the plan presented at the meeting and incorporated into the legal agreement to ensure works undertaken within a specified timeframe. The applicant's representative indicated that further consultation on the plan would have to be undertaken with residents, which had been a challenge due to the pandemic.
- 5.11 During the discussion phase of the meeting a number of points were raised including the following:
 - With regard to the gated nature of the Atrium building, the Senior Planner of Major Projects Officer clarified that restricted access did not necessarily turn the development into a gated community and that access had been restricted due to the nature of the building and police's concerns relating to crime in the building. To achieve the Secure by Design Accreditation there had to be controlled access to the shared amenity space and access point in the atrium

of the building, which was also intended to generate positive community spirit. There would be significant provision of public realm elsewhere within the development;

- The applicant's representative stated that the budget had been based on the Quantity Surveyor's estimated costs for the scheme of works proposed for Elsdale Hall;
- In relation to fewer larger social rent accommodation on the estate, the applicant's representative replied that very few four-bedroom social rent accommodations were being built in the country partly due to the government tax on these properties. The Council's housing figures had been affected by the cyber attack and the figures would be revised again before the scheme was completed. The Council would be mapping the proposed need against the housing needs on the estate to ensure properties were allocated to social tenants at the top of the waiting list. ;
- A Member enquired whether the Council had considered increasing the social rent accommodation by reducing shared ownership. The applicant's representative replied that social rent was the most expensive accommodation to deliver in terms of viability and the scheme presented could not be delivered if the number of social rented units were increased. There were 14 households classed as being in urgent need of alternative accommodation with two tenants requiring a four-bedroom property, one tenant a five bedroom and seven requiring one bedroom accommodation;
- With regard to the suggestion to build a new bigger and better community hall from additional funding raised through the TRA and other sources, the applicant's representative stated that it may not be feasible and also the scope being unclear may make it unachievable;
- In response to a question about the number of community spaces on the estate, the Head of Resident Participation TMOs & Communities confirmed that there were five community halls within 500 metres of the development. The Pitcairn, Elsdale and Frampton Park community halls were on the estate and council owned, and the New Kingshold and Gascoyne Community Halls were not on the estate;
- The Head of Resident Participation TMOs & Communities explained that Frampton Park Community Hall was large with capacity to hold weddings and large parties. However, due to the persistent noise nuisance complaints from local residents relating to dispersal and music and the failure of measures in reducing noise levels the decision had been taken for the hall in the evenings. This had made it unattractive for people to hire the hall and the current activities included exercise classes and coffee mornings that attracted a maximum of 25 people;
- Kristina Sackett highlighted that Hackney Quest had used this Community Hall to offer youth services and events for youths and vulnerable people on the estate including food kitchen and coffee

mornings. The Council's lack of monitoring those hiring the hall had led to an increase in noise complaints and subsequent restrictions had resulted in the hall being underused. It was emphasised that the proposals were for improving and not replacing the demolished hall. The Senior Planner of Major Projects Officer added that evidence had been submitted of Hackney Quest's use of the hall before their departure due to the introduction of the Council's charging fee policy for halls, which had made it financially unviable for them to remain. The Council officer added that the policy had been introduced to offset the cost of operating and maintaining the Council's 58 community halls and 23 community flats and rooms costing £900,000 per annum. The fees for private use of the hall were £30 per hour and meeting rooms £10-15 per hour. The Council had supported and facilitated Hackney Quest's transfer to Baptist Church following the introduction of the policy;

- With regard to providing security for the cycle store, Joe Croft the Senior Transport Planner advised that he would be reviewing the proposal as part of the Cycle Management Plan to ensure the cycle parking was adequately spaced, accessible, and the locking provided a safe and secure provision. As part of the review he would also look at installing CCTV cameras under LP42 - to provide a safe and secure cycle parking. The applicant's representative advised that they had agreed to provide ducting for future CCTV installation; and
- Councillor Penny Wrouth requested that consideration be given to focusing the £250,000 funding on making the indoor space fit for purpose and working with the TRA to raise funds for the outdoor space.

- 5.12 The Chair requested the Head of Term related to the extension and renovation of Elsdale hall be amended to set out the works to be undertaken rather than the budget to be allocated.

Vote:

For: Cllrs Chauhan, Bell, Race, Young and Stops
Against: None
Abstention: None

RESOLVED: That planning permission be GRANTED subject to conditions.

(Councillor Hanson returned at this juncture of the meeting.)

6 1-10 Purcell Street, N1 6RD Application-2021/1385

6.1 PROPOSAL:

Replacement of the existing timber windows with UPVC windows on the front and rear elevations.

POST SUBMISSION REVISIONS:

The proposed elevations and design and access statement were modified to clarify that the proposed replacement windows will be Rosewood in colour to match the existing brown windows. No further consultation letters were sent given the lack of material changes to the proposal.

6.2 The Planning Officer James Clark introduced the report as set out in the published agenda and indicated that the application had been deferred from the previous meeting. During the Planning Officer's presentation the following points were made:

- The surrounding area of the proposal comprised mixed dwellings including mainly post war housing blocks;
- It was proposed that the timber windows would be replaced with UPVC Veka Matrix 70 tilt and turn windows;
- The communal windows and doors would not be replaced with UPVC as this would not be appropriate for a building with no significant architectural merit or within a conservation area; and
- There were no issues with the loss of light, overlooking or privacy.

6.3 Hugo Ray, the objector was invited to make a statement and the following concerns were raised:

- The windows formed part of a large timber structure that also had wooden doors and external cladding. It would not be possible to replace the timber windows without replacing the surrounding structure and the current proposal would defeat the purpose of heat retention within buildings;
- The proposals would result in a mixture of wood and plastic, and the UPVC windows would not fit the aesthetics of the building;
- The replacement windows could not be flipped to clean them from inside the flats;
- It was unclear whether the apertures of the replacement windows would impact on the light coming in the flats;
- Concern was expressed regarding the negative environmental impact of replacing functioning windows with UPVC;
- The residents within the block and neighbouring blocks were also opposed to the proposal.

- 6.4 The Chair sought further clarification regarding the replacement windows. Ola Akinbinu, Contract Delivery Manager explained that the timber windows had been installed in 1988 and following representation from the tenants living on the top floor, the Council had considered many replacement options including timber, aluminium and UPVC windows. It was more cost effective to replace the windows with UPVC, which also required less maintenance by leaseholder as well providing energy efficiencies for leaseholders/tenants heating bills. The UPVC windows would be in Rosewood colour so that the appearance of the buildings did not contrast with the remaining timber structures and windows.
- 6.5 The Chair asked about the concerns relating to the aesthetics, in particular the combined timber and UPVC in the external areas and other elements of the building. The Planning Officer replied that there had been a slight increase in the dimensions of the UPVC window but this was not expected to result in any substantial loss of light.
- 6.6 The Chair enquired about the sustainability issues and the Planning Officer emphasised that the use of UPVC would be regarded as more sustainable due to the increase in thermal efficiency in the development and improved heating inside the buildings. In addition, there would be cost savings from not having to regularly maintain the timber windows such as repainting and scaffolding.
- 6.7 The Planning Officer confirmed that the proposed windows could be cleaned.

Vote:

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

RESOLVED: That planning permission be GRANTED subject to conditions.

7 Legrave Street, Off Chatsworth Road, E5 9QX - Application 2021/1747

7.1 PROPOSAL:

Submission of details pursuant to condition 3 (Materials, Detail drawings, boundary treatment and play area) of planning permission 2014/4092 dated 15/08/2016.

POST SUBMISSION REVISIONS:

Amendments have been made to the detailed drawings of the balconies and louvred oriel windows in response to officer feedback. This led to a

re-consultation with Design Officers but not with neighbours, since this type of application does not require neighbour consultation.

7.2 The Planning Service's Major Projects Planner Nick Bovaird introduced the report as set in the published agenda and reported that the minutes of the meeting of the Planning Sub Committee held in 2014 were unavailable due to the Council's cyber attack. During the course of the presentation reference was made to the published addendum and the following points were highlighted:

- Paragraph 2.1 incorrectly stated that the site was not located within a conservation area but the site was located within the Lea Bridge Conservation Area, which had been extended on 24th February 2020. The site had been outside the conservation area at the time of the 2016 consent and therefore paragraph 2.1 should be amended to read: 'The site is located within the Lea Bridge Conservation Area but does not lie within the setting of a listed building.'
- An additional paragraph 6.8 to be inserted to read:
'In all respects, the materials and submitted details are considered to preserve the character and appearance of the conservation area.'
- The balcony details submitted showing glass balustrades to the south western elevation of the proposal had been changed to railings following recent changes to the Building Regulations in respect of fire safety. Therefore paragraph 6.4 should be amended to read:
'Following amendments to improve the detailing of the balconies during the course of this application, including the substitution of glass balustrades for railings on the south west (Chatsworth Road) elevation, these are considered acceptable.'
- The boundary treatment was also considered acceptable and the proposed material and detailing were high quality and in compliance of the original consent.
- Three pieces of play equipment would be provided for the play area on the western side of the development and the paving would be hard wearing basalt laid in a herringbone pattern and this was considered acceptable.
- The projecting bays had a slightly thicker surround than the approved design. This amendment had been required due to the support and insulation for the bays and the amended design was accepted.

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

7.4 The Chair sought clarification regarding the boundary treatment and the Major Projects Planning Officer explained that the boundary wall would have gates in various places.

Vote:

For: Cllrs Bell, Chauhan, Hanson, Race and Stops

Against: None

Abstention: None

RESOLVED: That the condition be discharged.

8. Delegated Decisions

8.1 The Planning Sub-Committee noted the document.

RESOLVED: That the Planning Sub-Committee noted the delegated decisions document.

Duration of the meeting: 18:30 - 22:00 hours

Chairperson for the meeting: Councillor Vincent Stops

Contact:

Rabiya Khatun

Governance Services Officer

Rabiya.khatun@hackney.gov.uk