

DRAFT MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE PLANNING SUB-COMMITTEE

WEDNESDAY 27 JULY 2022

THIS MEETING WAS LIVE STREAMED AND CAN BE VIEWED HERE:

[HTTPS://YOUTU.BE/XpBoN0k2FLG](https://youtu.be/XpBoN0k2FLG)

- Councillors Present:**
- Cllr Steve Race in the Chair**
 - Cllr Michael Desmond**
 - Cllr Shaul Krautwirt (Substitute)**
 - Cllr Lee Laudat-Scott**
 - Cllr Jon Narcross**
 - Cllr Ali Sadek**
 - Cllr Jessica Webb (Vice-Chair)**
 - Cllr Sarah Young**
- Apologies:**
- Cllr Clare Joseph**
 - Cllr Michael Levy**
 - Cllr Clare Potter**
- Officers in Attendance:**
- Gareth Barnett, South Area Team Leader**
 - Nick Bovaird, Senior Planner, Major Projects**
 - Robert Brew, Major Applications Team Leader**
 - Graham Callam, Growth Team Manager, Public Realm**
 - Seonaid Carr, Central Area Team Leader**
 - Adele Castle, Team Leader North**
 - Alix Hauser, Senior Planning Officer**
 - Ashraful Haque, Team leader - Environmental Protection**
 - Mario Kahraman, ICT Support**
 - Gerard Livett, Senior Planning Officer**
 - Leif Mortensen, Senior landscape and tree officer**
 - Matt Payne, Conservation Urban Design and Sustainability Deputy Manager**
 - Louise Prew, Major Projects Planner**
 - Qasim Shafi, Principal Transport Planner (Development Management)**
 - Christine Stephenson, Specialist Lawyer**
 - Gareth Sykes, Governance Officer**
 - John Tsang, Development Management and Enforcement Manager**
 - Timothy Walder, Principal Conservation and Design Officer**

1 Apologies for Absence

- 1.1 Apologies for absence were received from Cllrs Joseph, Levy and Potter.

2 Declarations of Interest

- 2.1 The Sub-Committee members declared an interest in relation to agenda items 5 and 7; members had received various lobbying materials in objection to the application.
- 2.2 It was noted that at item 7 the Chair and the ward Councillor who was registered to speak in objection were Councillors for the same ward in Hackney.
- 2.3 It was also noted that the Sub-Committee members all knew the Hackney Ward Councillors registered to speak at agenda items 5, 6 and 7.

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

- 3.1 None.

4 Minutes of the Previous Meeting

- 4.1 None.

5 2021/1906: De Beauvoir Estate, Downham Road, Hackney, London, N1

- 5.1 PROPOSALS; All works associated with site clearance of six sites and erection of five buildings of six storeys and a four storey row of ten terraced houses, to provide 189 mixed tenure residential dwellings (Use Class C3) and 593m² of non-residential space (Use Class E); landscaping to include residential courtyards, public realm, tree planting, the provision of play space, reorganisation of existing car parking and all associated Infrastructure.

POST SUBMISSION REVISIONS:

- Ground floor footprint reduced on corner of Downham Road and Southgate Road;
- Internal revisions to allow amended fire strategy;
- Trees retained on Downham Road;
- Pillar removed on Hertford Road;
- Development description amended to refer to 593m² non-residential space, following amended Design and Access statement.

These amendments were sufficiently minor that it had been considered unnecessary to carry out a further consultation on the application.

- 5.2 The Council's Planning Service's Senior Planner, Major Projects, introduced the application during which reference was made to the addendum and the following amendments to the application:
- The Borough's Streetscene team have requested that references to 'road safety audit' be replaced with 'safety audit'. As such, paragraph 6.5.26 should be amended;

- Accordingly, condition 44 would be amended to add further details as to what is expected by the condition;
- The Greater London Authority had requested an additional condition.

5.3 A Hackney Councillor first spoke on behalf of local residents highlighting their objections to the application.

5.4 A local ward Councillor and the Council's Head of Housing Supply Programme spoke next. They highlighted that the scheme would provide genuine affordable housing addressing the needs of local residents.

The Sub-Committee briefly examined an architectural model and samples of material provided by the applicant.

5.5 The meeting entered the discussion phase where a number of points were raised including the following:

- The tenure mix was policy compliant. The private sale homes would pay for the affordable homes element of the development. No more affordable housing could be provided because of the lack of government funding. The majority of the blocks in the development were of a mixed tenure, however the Balmes Road block was different in that it would contain social rented units due to an earlier commitment made by the Council to local residents;
- The design of the proposed blocks was respectful of the existing architectural landscape of the area;
- The Council's external consultants had examined the scheme and they had determined that it was above the 35% beyond building regulations minimum carbon reduction. Both the Planning Service and the external consultants were satisfied with the proposals and did not see any areas of concern regarding the sustainability of the scheme, subject to carbon offset payment. Air Source Heat Pumps (ASHPs) were to be used as they were seen as the most energy efficient option. Some of the homes to the north of the site would have issues with noise and therefore the occupants would have to close their windows. For these units 'trim heating' would be applied - a small amount of air would be pumped into the building to keep it air-cooled;
- There was a more designed frontage proposed for the north of the site which was set slightly more forward;
- The Council's transport team were satisfied that under the scheme the pavements were wide enough and suitable for pedestrians;
- Blocks with less than 30 units would have installed individual rather than communal ASHP systems;
- Energy Performance Certificates (EPCs) were not a measurement used in planning. It was noted that an energy and sustainability statement had been included and there was also a carbon offset payment to be made of £298,965 as part of the conditions;
- There were proposed class E units on the ground floor along Hertford Road which would allow for greater flexibility. A condition was included against primary cooking, therefore a restaurant, for example, could not be sited in those ground floor units because they would require internal flues, which would result in the floor above the unit being used;

- The terrace houses that would sit in front of St Laurence Court and adjacent to 81 Downham Road would be set slightly back from the line of the larger blocks. These houses would be provided with a front garden with private secure bicycle and bin storage;
- The community space was provided through a small back garden and a terrace on the first floor;
- The existing community hall was outside of the development boundary and would be retained;
- No issues had been identified with the proposed single doorways;
- The proposals did meet the requirements of the Council's child-friendly play space requirements;
- The proposals did not meet the policy requirement LP48 on open spaces. In response a condition was included for a payment in lieu to be spent on open space and the inclusion of a landscaping condition;
- Recent legal opinion on Controlled Parking Zones was not material planning issue;
- The Committee was disappointed at the level of two tier cycle parking proposed. The applicant explained that in order for the scheme to meet various requirements, as set out in the London Plan and the Hackney Plan, and to achieve the proposed level of affordable housing, they had to opt for two tier cycle parking. Steps were currently being taken to examine the specifications for those cycle racks and the possible installation of a hydraulic mechanism to enable ease of use;
- Closed Circuit Television (CCTV) would be installed in the cycle parking areas. There was internal access to the cycle parking area along with some visitor spaces. There was also an internal visitor space on 81 Downham Road. No area of the proposed scheme did not have access via a gated or security fob entry;
- The Downham Road East, Hertford Road and Balmes Road blocks would provide long stay visitor cycle parking within the footprint of the building behind locked doors. These entrances were internal-facing away from the main roads.

Vote

For: Cllr Desmond, Cllr Krautwirt, Cllr Laudat-Scott, Cllr Narcross, Cllr Sadek, Cllr Race, Cllr Webb and Cllr Young.

Against: None.

Abstention: None.

RESOLVED:

Planning permission was granted subject to conditions, Unilateral Undertaking, no issues arising from consultation with the Health and Safety Executive, and referral to the Greater London Authority

6 2021/3456: 34 Colvestone Crescent

6.1 PROPOSAL: Retrospective permission for the erection of rear extension at lower ground floor level and part ground floor level, the enlargement of the front lightwell and alterations to the rear elevation.

POST SUBMISSION REVISIONS: Basement was removed from the plans, the lightwell enlarged to show what previously existed on site and minor alterations to the front and rear elevations to accurately reflect the pre-existing, existing and proposed site conditions. Re-consultation was carried out in the form of letters to surrounding occupiers and objectors, erection of a site notice and publication of a press notice post submission of revised drawings.

- 6.2 The Planning Officer introduced the planning application as set out in the published report.

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

- 6.3 A local ward Councillor spoke in support of the application. They recognised that there were ongoing concerns from local residents and it was hoped these could be resolved.

- 6.4 The applicant also spoke briefly about the history of the scheme and how they felt that, if approved, it would bring back into use an empty property.

The agent for the applicant declined to speak.

- 6.5 The Committee noted that the application was seeking retrospective permission and that the plans were reflective of other similarly approved designs in the local area.

No further questions were raised by the Sub-Committee members.

Vote

For: Cllr Desmond, Cllr Krautwirt, Cllr Laudat-Scott, Cllr Narcross, Cllr Sadek, Cllr Race, Cllr Webb and Cllr Young.

Against: None.

Abstention: None.

RESOLVED:

Planning permission was granted subject to conditions.

- 7 2021/3204: Land at Bishopsgate Goods Yard, Bethnal Green Road, London E1 6GY**

- 7.1 PROPOSAL: Temporary planning permission for the erection of an additional storey at 2nd floor level to provide 658 sqm of external seating space together with 175 sqm of internal space for flexible Class E (a) retail, (b) restaurant and (d) indoor recreation use with ancillary storage/WCs/facilities space, until 31st May 2023.

POST-SUBMISSION REVISIONS: There have been minor design amendments at roof level post-submission in order to address officer feedback. Some additional information has also been submitted in relation to transport. A reconsultation exercise has been undertaken following the submission of this additional information.

- 7.2 The officer from the Planning Service's Major Applications Team introduced the planning application as set out in the published report. During the course of their presentation reference was made to the addendum in which it was noted that since the publication of the report one additional objection has been received from a local resident.
- 7.3 A local ward Councillor and two residents spoke in objection to the application raising concerns about the application's potential to increase incidents of Anti Social Behaviour (ASB) and noise.
- 7.4 The applicants spoke next giving a brief overview of the benefits of the scheme and also addressing those objections raised. They had submitted two additional images for consideration at the meeting. These were circulated to all meeting participants.
- 7.5 A discussion took place where a number of points were raised including the following:
- The previously granted planning permission for Bishopsgate Goods Yard was considered useful as background information to help frame the proposals under consideration;
 - Planning officers noted that this was a finely balanced recommendation. The possibility of increased amenity impacts was noted, but this needed to be considered in the context of the surrounding environment and it was hard to determine that increased impacts from this one use would necessarily be harmful;
 - The applicants were in an ongoing dialogue with residents on Shoreditch High Street. There were 52 objections received but the applicants stressed that it was important to distinguish between complaints about the whole site and objections to their specific application. The applicants felt that they had done all they could to reduce noise breakout in response to the objections received;
 - The additional images submitted showed the proposed structure both with and without the roof. The roof would be movable and when closed would provide extra noise protection;
 - The Planning Service acknowledged that the proposals, if granted, could see an increase in footfall to the area, however, they had concluded that given the temporary nature of the proposals and subject to mitigation, it was not considered that the cumulative impact would be such that it would warrant refusal of the application;
 - The applicants confirmed that there would be a manager on site to respond to any complaints raised by local residents;
 - Wider issues relating to licensing were not a material planning issue;
 - The applicants highlighted that they were just a small part of a much larger site with several other late night premises in the immediate vicinity.

Vote

For: Cllr Desmond, Cllr Krautwirt, Cllr Laudat-Scott, Cllr Narcross, Cllr Sadek, Cllr Race, Cllr Webb and Cllr Young.

Against: None.

Abstention: None.

RESOLVED:

Conditional planning permission was approved subject to conditions.

8 2021/0275: Yetev Lev Boys School, 111 - 115 Cazenove Road, Hackney, London, N16 6AX

8.1 PROPOSAL: Erection of a single storey roof extension to provide an additional 7 classrooms at third floor level for existing students; rooftop playground and balustrade above including increase in brick wall at second floor level to allow extension of eastern core to provide access to playground; extension of central lift shaft to provide roof access; raised parapet; 15 air conditioning units on roof with enclosure; and access ramp with balustrade and stairs to provide ground floor access.

POST SUBMISSION REVISIONS: Noise Impact Assessment, Construction Logistics Plan and revised plans were received Consultation was carried out on these documents.

8.2 The Planning Service's Major Projects Planner introduced the planning application as set out in the published report. During the course of the officer's presentation reference was made to the published addendum and the following amendments to the application report:

- Comments were received from two objectors outlining their previous comments following publication of the report. The comments raised have been addressed in the officer's report;
- Additional paragraphs were added at paragraphs 3.15 and 4.2.3;
- An additional condition, 8.1.15 Air conditioning units, was added.

No persons were registered to speak in objection to the application.

8.3 The agent for the applicant spoke giving a brief overview of the scheme and its benefits.

8.4 A discussion took place where a number of points were raised including the following:

- Concerns raised by local residents about excessive noise were being addressed by the Council's Environmental Health team;
- A condition had been included to ensure that the rooftop playground had been designed with an acoustic boundary;
- The playground would be restricted to 60 children at any one time, Mondays to Fridays. The playground was set down into the roof which would allow sound to travel upwards mitigating against noise breakout;
- The application had been submitted on the assumption that there would not be an increase in the number of students on site. The inclusion of additional classrooms were to allow those students already on the school roll to have smaller class sizes. The planning application allowed Hackney Council to cap the number of students at the school's current total number. The school was made up of a number of different buildings and that the cap only applied to the development of site under consideration at the meeting;

- If there was a breach of condition regarding the cap the Council could use its enforcement powers;
- The Committee noted taking away 60 children from the ground floor to use the rooftop playground would reduce the amount noise coming out of the ground floor;
- The proposed mansard would be taller due to the rooftop playground. Overall though the Planning Service found the design acceptable;
- The surrounding area was varied in nature with school buildings, low terraced houses and other flat developments with different heights;
- On the issue of amenity impacts, the buildings to the north were sufficiently set away from the main school building and would not be impacted by loss of light or overlooking. The building to the east, 117 Cazenove Road, had north and south facing windows and the building line on the southern elevation in particular was even with the existing building and that the Planning Service had concluded that there was no impact. On those concerns raised about the amenity impact on the north-facing building, the planning service had concluded that it was already experiencing overshadowing, the proposals would not make a noticeable difference;
- Zinc standing seam materials were proposed and would be conditioned.

Vote

For: Cllr Desmond, Cllr Krautwirt, Cllr Laudat-Scott, Cllr Narcross, Cllr Sadek, Cllr Race, Cllr Webb and Cllr Young.

Against: None.

Abstention: None.

RESOLVED:

Planning permission was granted subject to conditions and a Section 106 legal agreement.

9 2021/3106: 184 Evering Road, London, E5 8AJ

9.1 PROPOSAL: Submission of details pursuant to conditions 4c and 4d (detailed drawings of cycle and refuse stores) and part of condition 8 (landscaping to the front garden) attached to planning permission 2019/2907 dated 11/11/2019.

POST SUBMISSION REVISIONS: None.

9.2 The Senior Planning Officer introduced the application report as set out in the published papers.

No persons were registered to speak in objection or support of the planning application.

9.3 The Sub-Committee noted that the application had been reviewed by the Council's Conservation and Design officers and they had concluded that the proposals were acceptable.

No further questions were raised by the Sub-Committee members.

Vote

For: Cllr Desmond, Cllr Krautwirt, Cllr Laudat-Scott, Cllr Narcross, Cllr Sadek, Cllr Race, Cllr Webb and Cllr Young.

Against: None.

Abstention: None.

RESOLVED:

Details were approved.

10 Delegated decisions

10.1 Committee members noted that there were issues with the formatting of the document. The document would be amended and resubmitted for publication.

Due to formatting issues the delegated decisions document was not approved by the Sub-Committee.

11 Future meeting dates

11.1 Committee members noted their future meeting dates:

2022

7 September
28 September
2 November
7 December

2023

11 January
1 February
22 February
3 April
3 May

12 Any other business

12.1 The Committee wished the Planning Service's Principal Conservation and Design Officer, Timothy Walder, all the best for the future as he was shortly to leave Hackney Council.

END OF MEETING

Duration of the meeting: 6:30pm – 10:10pm

Chair of the meeting: Councillor Steve Race

Contact:

Gareth Sykes

Governance Officer

gareth.sykes@hackney.gov.uk