

## MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE PLANNING SUB-COMMITTEE

**MONDAY 3 APRIL 2023**

The live stream for this meeting can be viewed here:

<https://youtu.be/heVolqrsQ8Q>

- Councillors Present:** Councillor Steve Race in the Chair  
Councillor Michael Desmond  
Councillor Clare Joseph  
Councillor Lee Laudat-Scott  
Councillor Jon Narcross  
Councillor Ali Sadek  
Councillor Jessica Webb (Vice-Chair)
- Apologies:** Councillor Clare Potter, Councillor Sarah Young and Councillor Michael Levy
- Officers in Attendance:** Mark Agnew, Governance Officer  
Graham Callam, Growth Team Manager  
Seonaid Carr, Central Area Team Leader  
Luciana Grave, Conservation and Urban Design Sustainability Manager  
Mario Kahraman, ICT Support  
Qasim Shafi, Principal Transportation Planner  
Christine Stephenson, Specialist Planning Lawyer  
Gareth Sykes, Governance Officer

### **1 Apologies for Absence**

- 1.1 Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Levy, Potter and Young.

### **2 Declarations of Interest**

- 2.1 Councillor Joseph declared an interest; under Hackney Council's Constitution, section 5.4 paragraph 2.5, Sub-Committee Councillors could hear applications from within their particular ward. Councillor Joseph stated that she had not been involved in any discussions with local residents about the application.

### **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 Planning Sub-Committee members approved the minutes of the previous meetings held on the following dates; 1 February 2023 and 11 January 2023.

#### RESOLVED:

**The minutes of the previous meetings, held on 1 February 2023 and 11 January 2023, were approved as an accurate record of those meetings' proceedings.**

#### 5 2020/3758: 44a to 44b Well Street, Hackney, London E9 7PX

- 5.1 PROPOSAL: Variation of condition 2 (development according to the approved plans) of planning permission 2019/3246 dated 29/04/2020 for erection of a roof extension including the extension to the existing external staircase to facilitate the creation of three self-contained flats (2x studio and 1 x 1 bed)". The effect of the variation would be to amend the set back of the roof extension and extend it to the Shore Road elevation, change materials to the roof extension and bike store and to amend the detailing of the fenestration to the elevations of the roof extension.

#### 5.2 POST SUBMISSION REVISIONS:

- The removal of glass boxes to the rear;
- Extension set back to match the existing neighbour extension of number 42;
- Reduction in height of the extension to bring in line with the original approval; and
- Detailing of the windows and doors simplified.

The above revisions were reconsulted on on 16th November 2022. A further amendment of the plans was received which removed the annotation 'Proposed extension to be set back by 100mm with No.42 Well Street.' These were received as this is incorrect the setback is 160mm, officers measured the setback of No.42 on site to confirm this. This amendment was not consulted on as the 60mm is considered non-material and would not require a further consultation.

- 5.3 The Planning Service's Central Area Team Leader introduced the planning application report as published. During their presentation reference was made to the published addendum and amendments to the following sections of the application report;

- Paragraph 5.3.5
- Paragraph 5.6.5
- Paragraph 5.8.3
- Paragraph 7.6
- Paragraph 7.8

- 5.4 The Sub-Committee heard objections from a local resident and a Hackney Ward Councillor and as well as a submission of support from the agent for the applicant. The objections covered a number of concerns, including how it was felt that the application was muddled and unclear, the lack of communication

during the planning process, management of the existing building, a shortfall in the waste provision and the structural integrity of the building. The agent for the applicant acknowledged the history of the application and the changes that the proposals had undergone since it was rejected in 2019. They explained that the applicant had come in and overhauled the plans in 2020. The extension was now set back, and the height was lowered. The material for the cycle storage had changed from glass to timber and the design of the windows had also changed from arch to rectangle.

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

- Sub-Committee members were reminded that they were considering a variation to an erection of a roof extension to an application that had been approved on 29 April 2020;
- Concerns raised about the structural integrity of the existing building and its ability to support the extension was not a material planning issue and therefore was not under consideration at the meeting;
- The Council's Conservation, Urban Design Sustainability (CUDS) team was of the view that there was already enough variety of colour schemes used by the existing neighbouring buildings in the immediate area that the tone of the proposed materials' would not stand out;
- The agent for the applicant reiterated that the changes to the window size and design and the Council's Planning Service had concluded that this would not significantly depart from the design, character and appearance of the rest of the Classic Mansion buildings;
- The brick parapet remained unchanged;
- Sub-Committee members were reminded that the proposals under consideration were based on published detailed drawings and the contents of the published application report and addendum and not any Computer Generated Images (CGIs), which are for information and illustration only;
- On a point of clarification, the Council's Legal Officer stated that concerns raised by the objectors over management of the existing Classic Mansion Building was not a material planning issue;
- In the addendum it was stated that a condition had been amended in the proposals to state that the walkway to the rear of the extension was not to be used as an outdoor amenity space. It would only be used for access purposes, leaving only the terraces shown on the plans as amenity spaces;
- A number of neighbouring buildings to 44a to 44b Well Street already had roof extensions on their upper levels. The Planning Service had concluded that because of this they did not have concerns about amenity space;
- The Planning Service had not supported the 2019 application because the proposed extension was further forward, impacting on the window design and its relationship to the elevation. It was also seen as being much bulkier;
- The Planning Service stated that wider issues around combustible cladding and the position of the external staircase, particularly in light of the changes introduced post-Grenfell Fire were not applicable in the case of the proposals because the existing building was not over 30 metres in height;

**Monday 3 April 2023**

- Though not under consideration at the planning meeting, the agent stated that they would pass on to the applicant details of those concerns raised by the building occupants about the management of the Classic Mansions building;
- Sub-Committee members were reminded that they were considering and voting on the amendments and variation application and not on wider issues around the design of the internal layout of the proposed three units. These had been previously agreed by committee in 2020;
- On the loss of daylight/sunlight, the Planning Service explained that the number of openings for the application had not changed. The windows were now dual aspect with the light into the three units remaining the same. Also because there was no increase in the height of the plans it was deemed not necessary for the applicant to submit a daylight/sunlight report;
- As there were no changes to the overall unit mix for the extension the Planning Service could not request any changes to the waste disposal and collection area;
- The Planning Service recognised that it was not ideal having a first floor bicycle storage area, however this was in the originally approved application so there were limitations on what could be changed. There had been a reduction in the bicycle spaces, decreasing from ten to six. The Sub-Committee noted that the applicant was only required to provide four spaces so it they were exceeding their requirement.

Vote:

For: Councillor Michael Desmond, Councillor Jon Narcoss, Councillor Steve Race, Councillor Ali Sadek, Councillor Lee Laudat-Scott and Councillor Jessica Webb.

Against: Councillor Clare Joseph.

Abstained: None.

**RESOLVED:**

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

**6 Delegated Decisions**

6.1 The Planning Sub-Committee noted the delegated decisions for the following periods:

1. Delegated Decisions 10 February 2023 to 19 March 2023
2. Delegated Decisions 20 January 2023 to 9 February 2023
3. Delegated Decisions 21 December 2022 to 19 January 2023

Councillor Desmond would contact the head of Planning and Building Control about whether further details could be added to the delegated decisions documents, for example, a brief summary of the reason why a planning application was refused.

**RESOLVED:**

The Planning Sub-Committee noted the following documents:

1. Delegated Decisions 10 February 2023 to 19 March 2023
2. Delegated Decisions 20 January 2023 to 9 February 2023
3. Delegated Decisions 21 December 2022 to 19 January 2023

## **7 Any Other Business the Chair Considers to be Urgent**

7.1 None.

## **8 Dates of future meetings**

8.1 The Planning Sub-Committee noted the following future meeting dates:

Confirmed:

- 3 May

Proposed:

### 2023

- 8 June (moved from 7 June)
- 5 July
- 6 September
- 11 October
- 1 November
- 6 December

### 2024

- 11 January
- 7 February
- 6 March
- 3 April
- 1 May

**Duration of the meeting: 6.30pm - 7.28pm**

**END OF MEETING**

**Chair of the meeting: Councillor Steve Race**

**Contact:**

**Gareth Sykes, Governance Officer**

**Email: [governance@hackney.gov.uk](mailto:governance@hackney.gov.uk)**