

**DRAFT MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE PLANNING SUB-COMMITTEE
WEDNESDAY 11 JANUARY 2023**

THIS MEETING WAS LIVE STREAMED AND CAN BE VIEWED HERE:

<https://youtu.be/YAc9tjUxPcE>

Councillors Present:

Cllr Steve Race in the Chair

Cllr Michael Desmond

Cllr Michael Levy

Cllr Jon Narcross

Cllr Ali Sadek

Cllr Lee Laudat-Scott

Cllr Jessica Webb (Vice-Chair)

Cllr Sarah Young

Apologies:

Cllr Clare Joseph and Cllr Clare Potter

Officers in Attendance:

Gareth Barnett, South Area Team Leader

Natalie Broughton, Head of Planning and Building Control

Graham Callam, Growth Team Manager

James Clark, Planning Officer

Joe Croft, Senior Transport Planner

Luciana Grave, Conservation, Urban Design and Sustainability Manager

Mario Kahraman, ICT Support

Natalie Kokayi, Governance Officer

Catherine Slade, Major Projects Principal Planning Officer

Christine Stephenson, Legal Officer

Gareth Sykes, Governance Officer

1 Apologies for Absence

- 1.1 Apologies for absence were received from Cllr Joseph and Cllr Potter and apologies for lateness were received from Cllr Levy and Cllr Sadek.

2 Declarations of Interest

- 2.1 Cllr Young would recuse herself from the meeting for the duration of agenda item 5: the Councillor works for Anchor Housing who were the applicant housing association for the Newton Close development.

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 The minutes of a previous pre-application meeting, held on 14 November 2022, were agreed as an accurate record of those meetings' proceedings.

RESOLVED:

The minutes of a previous pre-application meeting, held on 14 November 2022, was agreed as an accurate record of those meetings' proceedings.

Cllr Young left the meeting for the duration of agenda item 5.

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;
- Additional climate change, sustainability and energy information has been submitted in response to changes to Greater London Authority (GLA) Planning Guidance.

A 21 day reconsultation had been undertaken in respect of the amended and additional information.

5.2 The Major Projects Principal Planning Officer introduced the application as published. During the course of their presentation reference was made to the published addendum which outlined a number of amendments including the following:

- The list of drawing numbers and supporting documentation should refer to an Air Quality Assessment ref 91339 rev D dated 10/11/2022 (Aval Consulting Group);
- The GLA have requested amendments to the wording of conditions 27 (Circular economy) and 28 (Whole life-cycle carbon), and the introduction of an additional circular economy condition. These amendments were considered by the Planning Service to be reasonable and necessary, and that the conditions should be amended accordingly;
- At paragraph 8.2 under Recommendation B, the Carbon Offset Payment should be amended should read £69,437.

The application was referred back to the Sub-Committee. This was due to the provision of additional information pertaining to climate change, energy and sustainability as a result of negotiations between the applicant, London Borough of Hackney and GLA following publication of Mayoral planning guidance.

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

5.3 Representatives for the applicant briefly spoke outlining the history of the application. They explained that the proposals were for the 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.

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

- On a point of clarification, it was confirmed that the original building, proposed for demolition, was constructed in 1976;
- Communal Air Source Heat Pumps (ASHPs) would be installed on site. They were seen as being more carbon neutral than gas and more economical to run by occupants in the homes;
- The applicant had met the Secured by Design Officer before the application had been submitted to seek their advice. That advice had been included as part of the design of the building;
- It was confirmed that a condition had been included as part of the application which required the installation of swift bricks on site.

Vote:

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

Against: None.

Abstention: None.

RESOLVED:

Planning permission was granted subject to conditions and completion of a S106 Legal Agreement.

Cllr Young returned to the meeting.

6 2022/2003: Beis Malka Girls School, 93 Alkham Road, Hackney, London, N16 6XD

6.1 PROPOSAL:

Construction of a single storey extension to existing teaching block along part of the southern boundary of the site.

POST SUBMISSION REVISIONS:

Amendment to the application form.

6.2 The Planning Officer introduced the application as published. During the course of their presentation reference was made to the published addendum outlining amendments to the published application report. In the addendum it

was noted that the plans had been slightly amended to better show the variation in height of the boundary wall. The amendments also showed the existing boundary wall more accurately. The officer explained that this did not materially affect the proposed development or the merits of the application, and did not therefore require further consultation.

- 6.3 The Sub-Committee heard from local residents who raised a number of concerns about the application. These included disunity between the plans provided, noise and artificial light disturbance, loss of natural light to neighbouring rear properties and how the proposals might lead to further school expansion and an increase in student numbers.
- 6.4 The applicant explained that the application was for a modest set of proposals. They acknowledged that previously there had been some discrepancies but these had now been corrected. They added that the proposed new building would be built within the existing confines of the site.
- 6.5 During the discussion phase a number of points were raised including the following:
- Five roof lights were proposed. They were considered not to have significant impact as they would be small and would not produce a significantly greater impact relative to the existing windows in the south elevation of the host building. Also they would only be used during school hours compared to a residential dwelling which would produce more light during the day. It was also highlighted that several existing residential dwellings in the immediate vicinity already had installed roof lights;
 - On a point of clarification, when reference was being made to rooflights the planning service were referring to windows where light could potentially escape through;
 - It was noted that there would be no changes to the existing west elevation;
 - The proposed extension would not exceed the height of the existing boundary wall along the southern boundary of the site;
 - If approved a Construction Management Plan would be added as part of the proposals to ensure there would be no impact upon neighbouring properties and surrounding highways during construction;
 - The proposals would not lead to an increase in student numbers on site. The Planning Service were assured that the proposed new building would not be used for extra curricular activities outside of school hours;
 - It was clarified that the area under discussion as part of the application was not part of the play space provision;
 - Local residents' concerns were noted over the integrity of the boundary wall and the impact of construction upon it, however, it was not a planning matter. Under the proposals no modifications would be made to the boundary wall. Issues around the structural integrity of the boundary wall and construction was for the school to resolve;
 - The inclusion of a condition to ensure the school turned off lights outside of school hours would not meet the statutory test. It would be seen as unnecessary in terms of making the proposals acceptable in relation to planning;
 - The applicant highlighted that with previous school-based projects they had submitted an Operational Management Plan (OMP) which included

a section on lighting which referred to timers. If the committee was minded to approve the proposals the applicant would agree to a condition to include an OMP;

- In terms of materiality, a condition was included that would ensure that the proposed extension's roof in the same material as the existing school building;
- It was noted that one of the two drainage conditions required a Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SUDs) feature to be included in the proposals. The applicant confirmed they would be happy to include a green roof to be secured by condition;
- It was reiterated that the structural integrity of the boundary wall was not a planning matter and therefore the Planning Service could not comment on the impact of construction work upon it. If an issue was to arise it would be a building regulations issue.

The Sub-Committee noted:

Condition 4 (SUDS) would be amended as follows:

Prior to the commencement of the relevant part of the work, the applicant shall submit, and have approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, a detailed layout, cross sections (scale 1:20), full specifications and a detailed management and maintenance plan of the biodiverse roof with a minimum substrate depth of 80mm, not including the vegetative mat. Further details associated with the green wall should also be submitted. The development shall not be carried out otherwise than in accordance with the details thus approved and shall be fully implemented before the premises are first occupied.

REASON: To ensure that the proposed green roof is of sufficient quality to contribute towards flood mitigation.

A new Operational Management Plan (Condition 7) would be included:

Prior to the occupation of the approved extension the applicant shall submit, and have approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority an Operational Management Plan confirming the hours of use of the approved extension and details of the proposed lighting arrangements.

REASON: To ensure that the use of the approved extension does not cause disturbance to neighbouring residential uses.

Cllr Levy and Cllr Sadek arrived at the meeting during the discussion on agenda item 6. Therefore they would not participate in either the remaining discussion or the vote for the application.

Vote:

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

Against: None.

Abstention: None.

RESOLVED:

Planning permission was granted, subject to conditions.

7 2022/2626: Portico City Learning Centre, 34 Linscott Road, Hackney, London, E5 0RD

7.1 PROPOSAL:

Submission of details pursuant to condition 3 (materials - brick only), 4 (sample panel) and 5 (details - parts (i) details of all new and replacement windows and doors; and (ii) details of the new windows behind the South Colonnade and their reveals; and (iv) details of all rainwater goods; and (v) details of all parapet coverings) attached to listed building consent 2021/1653 dated 04/04/2022.

POST SUBMISSION REVISIONS:

Additional information provided.

7.2 The Major Projects Principal Planning Officer introduced the application as published. During the course of their presentation reference was made to the published addendum outlining that representations that had been received from both a Hackney Ward Councillor and the occupier of a neighbouring property raising objection to the detail of the windows submitted. The Planning Service was of the view that the details were adequate to safeguard the amenity of neighbouring occupiers, and reflected the discussion in the reports to the Planning Sub-Committee meetings and the relevant conditions set out in the 2021/1651 application decision notice.

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

The representatives for the applicant decided not to speak for the allocated five minutes. They stated that they were available to respond to any questions from the Sub-Committee.

Members briefly considered samples of brick work provided by the applicant.

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

- The materials provided at the meeting were in line with those that had been proposed under the previously agreed application;
- Further samples of materials and details were expected to come back to committee at a later date for members' consideration as the submission in respect of conditions 3 and 5 attached to 2021/1653 were partial with further details to be submitted in due course.

Vote:

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

Against: None.

Abstention: None.

RESOLVED:

Details were approved.

8 Delegated Decisions

8.1 The Sub-Committee noted the delegated decisions document.

RESOLVED:

The delegated decisions document was noted.

9 Any other business

9.1 None.

10 Future meeting dates

10.1 Sub-Committee members noted the following future meeting dates:

2023

1 February
22 February

3 April
3 May

END OF MEETING

Duration of the meeting: 6:30pm – 7:35pm

Chair of the meeting: Cllr Steve Race.

Contact:

Gareth Sykes

Governance Officer

Email: gareth.sykes@hackney.gov.uk