

MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE PLANNING SUB-COMMITTEE 6:30PM, WEDNESDAY 27 APRIL 2022

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

> ALTERNATIVE LIVESTREAM LINK OF MEETING: https://youtu.be/5E-S8_gaECU

Councillors Present:	Councillor Vincent Stops in the Chair
	Cllr Brian Bell, Cllr Ajay Chauhan, Cllr Katie Hanson (Vice-Chair), Cllr Clare Joseph, Cllr Michael Levy, Cllr Steve Race and Cllr Sarah Young.
Apologies:	Councillor Humaira Garasia
Officers in Attendance:	Natalie Broughton, Head of Planning and Building Control Robert Brew, Major Applications Team Leader Graham Callam, Growth Team Manager, Public Realm Barry Coughlan, Deputy Team Leader, Major Projects Luciana Grave, Conservation, Urban Design and Sustainability Manager Mario Kahraman, ICT Support Leif Mortensen, Senior landscape and tree officer Matt Payne, Conservation Urban Design and Sustainability Deputy Manager Qasim Shafi, Principal Transport Planner (Development Management) Catherine Slade, Major Projects Principal Planning Officer - Woodberry Down Christine Stephenson, Legal Officer Gareth Sykes, Governance Officer

1 Apologies for Absence

1.1 Apologies were received from Cllr Garasia.

2 Declarations of Interest

2.1 A declaration of interest was made by Cllr Young in relation to the application at agenda item 5. Cllr Young recused herself from the start of the meeting and for the duration of agenda item 5.

3 To 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 Planning Sub-Committee by the Council's Monitoring Officer.

4 Minutes of the Previous Meeting

4.1 There were no minutes available for approval at the meeting.

5 2021/2732 14 to 40 Newnton Close and 456 to 484 Seven Sisters Road, Hackney, London N4 2RQ

5.1 PROPOSAL: Demolition of existing buildings and redevelopment to provide 2no. buildings, 1no.part 5-storeys, part 7-storeys and 1no. 10 storeys comprising a total of 76 no.retirement apartments and communal facilities, together with associated works and landscaping.

POST SUBMISSION REVISIONS:

- Revisions to the ground floor layouts and the materiality of the northern building
- Minor revisions to supporting documentation and additional supporting documentation

A 21 day reconsultation has been undertaken in respect of the amended and additional information, with the exception of a minor realignment of the position of the proposed blue badge parking bays and introduction of additional visitor bicycle storage.

- 5.2 The Planning Service's Major Projects Principal Planning Officer, Woodberry Down, introduced the application report. During the course of the officer's submission reference was made to the published addendum and the following changes to the application report:
 - Due to the scale of the proposal, the application was referable to the Mayor of London, and as such the recommendation summary would be amended to now read as follows:

Grant planning permission subject to conditions and completion of a S106 Legal Agreement and referral to the Mayor of London.

- As a result of the change to the recommendation summary paragraph 7.3 of the report would be amended;
- Further amendments and changes would also be made to the drawing numbers;
- Additional representations had been received;
- Amendments would be made to the wording for paragraphs 6.2.12, 8.1.3, 8.1.4 and 8.1.15 in the report;
- Amendments would be made to the wording of Recommendation B.
- 5.3 There were no persons registered to speak in objection.

- 5.4 The applicant's representatives spoke to the Sub-Committee about the planning merits of the application as well as operational matters.
- 5.5 During the discussion phase of the meeting the following points were raised:
 - On the east side of the proposed site both terraces had blank flank elevations. The only openings to the properties on that side of the development were at the front and rear. The Sub-Committee noted that direct overlooking was quite oblique;
 - The proposed development would be next to a Berkeley Homes site that is likely to be redeveloped. The Planning Service was of the view that they [Berkeley Homes] would have to accommodate those proposals, however, it was anticipated that in any event they would not be built right up to the boundary line because of existing constraints on site;
 - Two trees would be lost as a result of the proposals; they had been heavily pruned over the years and as a result no longer retained their natural shape;
 - The rent level for current tenants was the housing association target rent level. It was proposed to provide London Affordable Rent levels. Those existing tenants with a right to return would return under the existing rent level. The London Affordable Rent was set higher than the Housing Association rent level and across London the level was set out at 40% of local market value;
 - There was an error identified in the report on pages 14-15. The classification of the existing rent would be amended to read Social Rent rather than London Affordable Rent;
 - Under Hackney Council's local plan policy LP13, in terms of the types of Affordable Housing Tenures, Social Rent covered Social Rent/London Affordable Rent. As for Intermediate affordable housing, this according to LP13 covered Hackney/London Living Rent or London Shared Ownership or other genuinely affordable that the Council considers appropriate;
 - 10% of the proposed dwellings are suitable for use by wheelchair users and the remainder capable of conversion to being suitable for use by wheelchair users;
 - Some of the Sub-Committee members were against the S106 legal agreement including a car free development clause preventing future occupiers from being able to apply for parking permits; they believed that older persons should have the right to apply for a disabled parking space;
 - It was noted that the applicant's previous three developments had been car free and that they had not noted it as an operational concern that local residents could not park their cars. Hackney Council had sought to keep the development in line with the Hackney Local Plan LP33 policies in seeking a car-free development and that any residents with a blue badge would have access to a disabled car parking space. The Council also understood that the proposed units were for persons 55 years of age and over and that this was not thought to necessarily equate to issues about mobility;

- The Sub-Committee noted on the A3 plans a storage area for electric-powered buggies. It appeared the proposals did include a provision for those residents who did not have a blue badge;
- Concerns raised by the Stoke Newington Conservation Advisory Committee had been addressed in the addendum;
- All the single aspect units were south west facing and all north facing units were dual aspect. The latter were round the corner units;
- The applicant explained that if 100% dual aspect units had been proposed they would not have been able to provide the number of homes currently proposed. Having two buildings rather than one would maximise the dual aspect homes. In turn this would take advantage of natural daylight and also help to create a central green space;
- The applicant had noted the concerns about solar gain in the south west units of the site but the applicant was of the view that this was mitigated by residents' access to natural daylight and the use of recess balconies. Testing had been undertaken and along with the installation of mechanical ventilation it was accessed that the issue was not a concern;
- On the Seven Sisters Road side of the proposed site there would be planters included as part of the frontage. There was a footpath along the New River way;
- The Chair of the Sub-Committee recommended a condition that the applicant undertake best endeavours to look at the use of non-cement based mortar In order to allow recycling and reuse of bricks at the end of the life of the building. The applicant explained that they had looked into its use and had determined that currently, due to supply issues, non-cement based mortar was limited in its availability on the scale needed for the proposed development;
- Sub-Committee members were reminded that the process of right to return for existing residents was not a material planning matter.

Vote:

For:Cllr Bell, Cllr Chauhan, Cllr Hanson, Cllr Levy, Cllr Race and Cllr Stops.Against:None.Abstention:Cllr Joseph.

RESOLVED:

Planning permission was granted subject to conditions, completion of a S106 Legal Agreement and referral to the Mayor of London.

At the conclusion of item 5 Cllr Young joined the meeting.

- 6 2022/0694: Worship Square, 65 Clifton Street, Hackney, London, EC2A 4JE2
- 6.1 PROPOSAL: Submission of details pursuant to condition 3a (Materials) attached to planning permission 2019/0462.

POST SUBMISSION REVISIONS: N/A

- 6.2 The Deputy Team Leader, Major Projects, introduced the application report as published.
- 6.3 There were no persons registered to speak in objection.
- 6.4 Representatives for the applicant were present at the meeting to respond to any questions from the Sub-Committee.
- 6.5 No questions were asked by the Sub-Committee members.

<u>Vote</u>:

For: Cllr Bell, Cllr Chauhan, Cllr Hanson, Cllr Joseph, Cllr Levy, Cllr Race, Cllr Stops and Cllr Young.
Against: None.
Abstention: None.

RESOLVED:

The details were approved.

7 Delegated decisions document

7.1 The Sub-Committee noted the Delegated Decisions document.

RESOLVED:

The Delegated Decisions document was noted.

8 Any Other Business

- 8.1 Cllrs Bell, Chauhan, Hanson and Stops were thanked for all their years of service sitting on the Sub-Committee.
- 8.2 Cllr Hanson thanked Cllr Stops for all his years of service as Chair of the Sub-Committee.

9 Dates of next meetings

9.1 Provisional meeting dates were listed on the Hackney Council website and would be subject to approval at the 25 May 2022 Council meeting.

END OF MEETING

Duration of the meeting: 6:30pm – 7:40pm.

Chair for the meeting: Cllr Vincent Stops.

Contact: Gareth Sykes, Governance Officer governance@hackney.gov.uk