

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

WEDNESDAY 5 JULY 2023

THIS MEETING WAS LIVE STREAMED AND CAN BE VIEWED HERE:

[HTTPS://YOUTUBE.COM/LIVE/49F1ZX-CVR0](https://youtube.com/live/49f1zx-cvr0)

- Councillors Present:** Councillor Steve Race in the Chair
- Cllr Michael Desmond, Cllr Michael Levy, Cllr Jon Narcross, Cll Ali Sadek, Cllr Ifraax Samatar, and Cllr Jessica Webb (Vice-Chair).
- Apologies:** Councillor Clare Joseph, Councillor Clare Potter and Councillor Sarah Young.
- Officers in Attendance:** Natalie Broughton, Head of Planning and Building Control  
Graham Callam, Growth Team Manager  
Adele Castle, North Area Planning Team Leader  
Joe Croft, Senior Transport Planner  
Luciana Grave, Conservation Urban Development Sustainability Manager  
Mario Kahraman, ICT Support Officer  
Gerard Livett, Senior Planner - North Team  
Catherine Nichol, Senior Planning Officer  
Christine Stephenson, Specialist Planning Lawyer  
Gareth Sykes, Governance Officer  
John Tsang, Development Management and Enforcement Manager

### 1 Apologies for Absence

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

### 2 Declarations of Interest

2.1 There were no declarations of interest.

### 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 for the previous meeting were not ready for consideration and approval at the meeting. They would be considered at the next meeting scheduled for 25 July 2023.

**5 2020/3812: 180 Bethune Road, London, N16 5DS**

5.1 PROPOSAL:

Erection of a single storey roof extension at third floor level and a single storey rear extension at second floor level to provide additional floor space for existing school (Use Class F1) with rooftop plant.

POST SUBMISSION REVISIONS:

Revised drawings with changes to the location of the bulk of the extension have been received, which were subject to a second round of consultation.

- 5.2 The Planning Officer introduced the application as published. Sub-Committee members noted that currently the Council had an enforcement case open in relation to the number of students on the site.
- 5.3 The Sub-Committee heard from local residents who raised a number of objections in relation to the application including traffic and congestions as a result of school use. There were also concerns raised about noise and disturbance from school use with the use of megaphones during playtime, loss of daylight and sunlight, overbearing and the school operating outside of permitted limits.
- 5.4 The agent for the applicant spoke to the Sub-Committee members and acknowledged those concerns raised by local residents. They highlighted that the site impact of the school had already been discussed previously at length and had been agreed at appeal. The application before the Sub-Committee was about providing more space for the school children and the open enforcement case about student numbers was a separate matter and was not under consideration.
- 5.5 Following the submissions, members of the Sub-Committee asked questions which were responded to as follows:
- In response to a query regarding the Transport Plan, the Senior Planner replied that the plan would not impact on the student numbers. As outlined in the published application report, it was acknowledged that the impact of the Transport Assessment was difficult to read however that was not under consideration at the meeting;
  - Replying to a question raised about the current enforcement action under way, the Planning Service responded that the case was currently open and no action had yet been taken. Therefore the Planning Service was able to bring this particular to the Sub-Committee for consideration. The proposal for a roof extension before the Sub-Committee was not seeking to increase

student numbers on site. Matters relating to the open enforcement case was not under consideration at the meeting;

- Replying to a query raised about whether there was a mechanism in place to aid communication between the school and the neighbouring properties, the Chair replied that was not part of the application under consideration. The agent for the applicant added that the school was working hard to engage with local residents to address any ongoing concerns;
- In response to a question about the student numbers at the school, the legal officer informed committee members that the application before them at the meeting was about a roof extension. The current open enforcement case was a separate matter;
- Responding to a question about the conduct of the applicant and their compliance with conditions, the Senior Planner replied that the matter was not under consideration at the meeting. Conditions were imposed and the local planning authority had powers to ensure that those conditions were complied with;
- The legal officer reminded Sub-Committee members to limit their questions to the application before them under consideration;
- Replying to a question about the loss of light and overbearing to those neighbouring properties to the North, the Senior Planner replied that the proposal would increase the bulk of the existing school building. The Officer was of the view that this increase would not have a significant impact on the light levels at those neighbouring properties identified in the report including the basement flats. There would also not be a significant overbearing appearance when compared to the existing situation;
- In response to a question about the flat roof, the Senior Planner replied that a condition had been included (as stated at paragraph 8.1.6 in the published application report) whereby the roof of the extension hereby approved shall not be used as a terrace, balcony or similar amenity area;
- Replying to a question about the management of noise levels for the plant on the roof, the Senior Planner replied that the noise level from all plant and machinery was conditioned to remain at all times 5dB(A) below background levels. This was at a standard set level;
- In response to a query about the management of noise levels during construction of the roof extension and its impact on local residents, the Senior Planner replied that for the proposals of this scale a Construction Management Plan (CMP) would not be required. The area of Amhurst Park was one of the borough's notable distributor roads and subject to heavy traffic use noise levels. Bethune Road was a wide road and hours of construction and levels of construction activity were covered by other legislation. The applicant was keen to ensure that any construction activity did not prevent the school from operating during the construction process.

Vote:

For:

Cllr Michael Desmond, Cllr Michael Levy, Cllr Jon Narcross, Cllr Steve Race, Cllr Ali Sadek, Cllr Ifraax Samatar, and Cllr Jessica Webb.

Against:

None.

Abstained: None.

**RESOLVED:**

Planning permission was granted subject to conditions.

**6 2022/1835: 51-57 Amhurst Park, London N16 5DL**

**6.1 PROPOSAL:**

Erection of a single-storey roof extension.

**POST SUBMISSION REVISIONS:**

The proposal has been revised during the assessment process to remove the rear extensions, remove the playground at roof level and amend the design of the roof extension to bring it in line with that approved at Planning Sub Committee under planning reference 2017/3454. The application now proposes a single storey extension at main roof level as well as utilising the new roof space created at fourth floor level to provide additional classroom and specialist education facilities, with no increase in pupil numbers. A Transport Statement and Travel plan have been submitted for officer consideration. Following the submission of the additional information, the application has been re-consulted upon, with the most recent consultation period expiring on 10/04/2023.

**6.2 The Senior Planning Officer introduced the application as published. During their presentation reference was made to the addendum and the following points:**

The Committee report has incorrectly stated the number of existing students is 621.

The correct number of students as existing is 802. The following should state 802; table titled 'Capacity Details'; at paragraphs 1.9, 6.1.5, 6.3.20 and 6.3.22.

Finally, Condition 5, which restricts the number of students to what is existing, should read as follows:

School numbers

No more than 802 children shall be registered on the enrollment list, at any one time, at Beis Rochel D'Satmar School, 51-57 Amhurst Park, London, N16 5DL.

REASON: To ensure the effects of any additional pupils can be managed through the planning process and reduce the impact on residential amenity and highways.

**6.3 The committee heard from a local resident who raised concerns about the application. They spoke about the noise emanating from the site, the proposed additional height, massing and scale, the loss of sunlight and daylight, overlooking and loss of privacy.**

- 6.4 The agent applicant acknowledged the concerns raised by the local resident. They emphasised how the application would benefit local residents by citing in the published addendum that the number of students would be limited to 802. It was also noted that the application was for the proposed erection of a single-storey roof extension.
- 6.5 Following the submissions, members of the Sub-Committee asked questions which were responded to as follows:
- In response to a question about the student numbers, the Senior Planning Officer replied that the number of students set at 802 was submitted by the applicant;
  - Replying to a question about why the number of students was changed in the addendum, the Senior Planning Officer responded that the number in the published report was incorrect and subsequently corrected in the published addendum;
  - In response to a question from a committee member about the difference between the previous application and the current one, the Senior Planning Officer explained that the application was the same that had been submitted and approved back in 4 July 2018 subject to the completion of the s106 legal agreement. Due to the cyber attack in October 2020, the files required to complete the s106 legal agreement were lost and the decision was never able to be issued;
  - Replying to a question from a Committee member about the possibility of improvements in community engagement between the applicant and the neighbours, the Chair reminded members that the application before them was about a roof extension;
  - Replying to a question about student numbers, the Planning Service's Development Management and Enforcement Manager replied that the 802 figure will be monitored and this can also be carried out via pupil roll numbers kept by the Office for Standards in Education, Children's Services and Skills (Ofsted).

Vote:

For: Cllr Michael Desmond, Cllr Michael Levy, Cllr Jon Narcross, Cllr Steve Race, Cllr Ali Sadek, Cllr Ifraax Samatar, and Cllr Jessica Webb.

Against: None.

Abstained: None.

**RESOLVED:**

Planning permission was granted subject to conditions and completion of a Section 106 Legal Agreement.

**7 2021/2558: Springdale Mews, London, N16 9NR**

**7.1 PROPOSAL:**

Submission of details pursuant to conditions 4 (Detailed Drawings), 5 (Construction Management Logistics Plan), 7, (Contaminated Land), 11 (Arboricultural Impact Assessment and Method Statement) 12 (Landscaping) & 15 (Obscure Glazing) attached to planning permission 2021/2474 dated 07/03/2023.

POST SUBMISSION REVISIONS:

Revised Construction Management and Logistics Plan received. Revised facade drawings received Subsequent to the previous committee resolution the applicant has provided further details of works that would affect Springdale Mews, and revisions to vehicle moments proposals.

- 7.2 The Planning Officer introduced the application as published. During their presentation reference was made to the addendum and the following point

Additional response received from transport network managers:

In principle the number of essential trips is acceptable, as is the vehicle type. The yellow lines serve two purposes really (1) to ensure accessibility to the Mews through the restriction of parking, and (2) to enable vehicle drivers to have sufficient visibility, and swept path ability as they access and egress the Mews.

No persons were registered to speak in objection.

- 7.3 The legal representative for the applicant briefly addressed the Sub-Committee. They noted the history of the application and how details had been considered and approved at the previous Planning Sub-Committee meeting. Following that meeting steps were taken to seek further information because of the possibility of a Judicial Review. That information was sought, eventually leading to the application report before the committee at the meeting. The applicant had expressed their disappointment at this further development because the application had been approved at the June meeting, however, they diligently responded to the Planning Service's request and was keen to work with the Council and local residents. Details relating to the frequency and size of the construction vehicles and any temporary road or footway closures during construction had been provided and included in the CMP. The applicant wanted to emphasise to local residents that they were open to communication, details of which were also included in the CMP. It was also emphasised that the applicant would not require road closures and that there was also a revised site plan.

- 7.4 In a response to a question from the Chair of the Sub-Committee regarding the size of the construction vehicles, the Senior Planning Officer replied that from his understanding seven-and-a-half tonnes was the maximum size of the construction vehicles that could be accommodated in the Mews. A vehicle larger than seven-and-a-half tonnes would be too wide.

Vote:

For: Cllr Michael Desmond, Cllr Michael Levy, Cllr Jon Narcross, Cllr Steve Race, Cllr Ali Sadek, Cllr Ifraax Samatar, and Cllr Jessica Webb.

Against: None.

Abstained: None.

**RESOLVED:**

Details were approved.

**8 Delegated decisions**

8.1 The committee members noted the delegated decisions document.

**RESOLVED:**

The Delegated Decisions document was noted.

**9 Any Other Business the Chair Considers to be Urgent**

9.1 None.

**Duration of the meeting: 6.30pm - 7.55pm**

**END OF MEETING**

Date of the next meeting – 25 July 2023

Cllr Steve Race  
Chair of the Planning Sub-Committee

Contact:  
Gareth Sykes  
Governance Officer  
Email: [governance@hackney.gov.uk](mailto:governance@hackney.gov.uk)

DRAFT