

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

WEDNESDAY 6 SEPTEMBER 2023

THIS MEETING WAS LIVE STREAMED AND CAN BE VIEWED HERE:

[HTTPS://YOUTUBE.COM/LIVE/IDFVQf8ER\\_0](https://youtube.com/live/IDFVQf8ER_0)

- Councillors Present:** Cllr Steve Race in the Chair
- Cllr Michael Desmond, Cllr Michael Levy, Cllr Jon Narcross, Cllr Clare Potter, Cllr Jessica Webb (Vice-Chair), and Cllr Sarah Young
- Apologies:** Cllr Clare Joseph, Cllr Ali Sadek and Cllr Ifraax Samatar
- Officers in Attendance:** Gareth Barnett, Team Leader South  
Natalie Broughton, Head of Planning and Building Control  
Joe Croft, Senior Transport Planner  
Erin Glancy, Planning Officer  
Alix Hauser, Planning Officer  
Luciana Grave, Conservation Urban Design and Sustainability Manager  
Mario Kahraman, ICT Support 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 Clare Joseph, Ali Sadek and Ifraax Samatar.

### 2 Declarations of Interest

- 2.1 There were declarations of interest from Cllr Desmond and Cllr Race; both knew the applicant for agenda item 6. No objections were raised.
- 2.2 There was a declaration of interest for the entire Sub-Committee: they knew one of the objectors for agenda item 7, a fellow Hackney Ward Councillor.

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

- 3.1 None.

**4 The Terms of Reference of the Planning Sub-Committee for the Municipal Year 2023/24**

- 4.1 The Planning Sub-Committee noted their newly formatted terms of reference.

**RESOLVED:**

The Planning Sub-Committee noted their newly formatted terms of reference at appendix three of the Hackney Council constitution, as approved at the 24 July 2023 Council meeting.

**5 Minutes of the Previous Meeting**

- 5.1 The Planning Sub-Committee considered the minutes of their previous meetings held on 5 and 25 July 2023.

**RESOLVED:**

The minutes of the previous Planning Sub-Committee meetings, held on 5 and 25 July 2023 respectively, be approved as an accurate record of those meetings' proceedings.

**6 2022/1765: 449 Kingsland Road, Hackney, London, E8 4AU**

- 6.1 PROPOSAL: Redevelopment of the site, including the change of use, refurbishment and extension of the existing warehouse building, to provide 1 dwelling house (Use Class C3), 150sqm of community space (Use Class F) and 1,169sqm of commercial space (Use Class E) together with associated cycle parking and refuse and recycling facilities.

POST SUBMISSION REVISIONS: The enlargement of the mews (site) and 4 residential mews houses were removed from the application. A full period of consultation followed. Following this minor design changes to the elevation of the slot house were made.

- 6.2 The designated Planning Officer introduced the planning application as published. During the course of their presentation reference was made to a published addendum and the following amendments to the report:
- An updated Design and Access Statement was provided;
  - Additional drawings were provided; MCA585-X-02EX-270A (Existing Tram shed Short Section G-G) MCA585-X-06GA-270A (Proposed Tram shed Short Section G-G);
  - Additional objections were on a number of issues including the extent of the site location plan, ownership and the potential ramifications of this for access to the site, disruption to amenity, loss of community floorspace and proposed layout of the office;
  - The text for paragraphs 3.8, 5.7.9, 8.1.3, 8.1.5, 8.1.6, 8.1.9, 8.1.15, 8.1.21 and 8.1.22 were amended;
  - Additional conditions were included covering a noise report and the removal of residential Permitted Development Rights (PDR).

- 6.3 Local residents spoke in objection to the application raising a number of concerns including overcrowding, the impact of the design on the loss of privacy for the neighbours, and also that the proposals would affect the current owners had a right to light and air under an existing covenant.
- 6.4 The representatives for the applicant in their submission explained that they were proposing a building that was more compatible and economical compared to its original use. It would be more workable for local groups and a central atrium would be installed reflecting the original historical plans for the site. Addressing concerns raised by local residents, on the matter of the covenant, the applicant explained that that was a civil matter and therefore was not a material planning issue.
- 6.5 Following the submissions, the Sub-Committee members asked questions which were responded as follows:
- Responding to a question about the use of zinc, the representative for the applicant replied that they were used because of Photovoltaic (PV) panels. The dark colour of the zinc would hide the panels. The aim was to make the scheme as sustainable as possible and the PV panels were installed in such a way that they were both sustainable and waterproof;
  - The representative for the applicant confirmed that they had not yet undertaken a asbestos survey of the building for asbestos;
  - Replying to a query about why the height of the building was increased, the representative for the applicant responded that in order for the existing trusses to support the weight of the PV panels, insulation etc. They would have to be upgraded or replaced;
  - The representative for the applicant explained that had been given to the embodied carbon present in the building, if a floor was removed there would be a lot of disruption to the neighbours. From a construction and embodied carbon point of view that was why the existing floor level was retained;
  - The Council's Conservation and Urban Design and Sustainability (CUDS) Manager explained that in relation to the roof design, while the loss of the historic trusses was regrettable it was concluded that there was minimal harmful impact in relation to the existing roof. In terms of the use of zinc, the officer explained that it had been used in conservation areas previously and its use was not unusual in the context of the proposed scheme. The increase in height was seen as marginal;
  - Replying to a question about the issue of the covenant, the designated planning officer explained that it was not a material planning matter and therefore was not for discussion;
  - Responding to concerns raised from residents about the raised height of the proposals, the designated Planning Officer replied that the scheme would be visible but it would be slightly set back from the façade of the building. The visibility was assessed and it was concluded that it would not cause an adverse impact on neighbouring properties in light of its location and the minor increase in height;

**Wednesday 6 September 2023**

- Replying to a question about concerns raised by local residents about overlooking, the designated Planning Officer responded that this had been taken into consideration and there was a condition that all windows on all levels would use obscure glazing to a height of 1.8 metres and fixed shut;
- Responding to a question about whether alternative roof coverings were ever considered, the designated Planning Officer replied that in appearance and design terms the Planning Service had concluded that what was proposed was acceptable in relation to its impact on the surrounding conservation area. The use of zinc was not considered harmful and there was precedent of it being used in similar buildings to the one in the application ;
- Responding to question about what proportion of the scheme would have a green roof, the designated Planning Officer replied that the green roof would only be on top of the existing outrigger building;
- Responding to concerns raised about access to the green roof and the possibility of it being used as a terrace, the designated Planning Officer replied that under 8.1.20 in the application report there was a condition limiting use of the green roof for emergencies and maintenance only;
- The representative for the applicant explained that in terms of the building and neighbouring properties, they were seeking to retain the non designated asset in a conservation area and that the applicant was restricted by the constraints of the site;
- On a point of clarification the representative for the applicant explained that the external elevation of the site were not actually party walls;
- Responding to concerns raised about the loss of community space, the designated Planning Officer explained that in the case of the application, under policy LP8 of Hackney's Local Plan, there were specific circumstances where there would be a provision where better quality of floor space was being provided. In the case of the application it would be level access with better light and in a modern and sustainable setting. So while it was acknowledged there would be a loss of significant floor space, it was currently underutilised and of poor quality, the proposed replacement was considered to be better and more suitable;
- Responding to a question about the Slot House, the designated Planning Officer replied that it was slightly different to the proposals before the Sub-Committee. The Slot House had previously been extended the whole length of the site. There had been some subsequent design changes but it was still similar to the previous iteration in terms of its bulk, height and materiality.

Vote:

For: Cllr Steve Race (Chair), Cllr Jessica Webb (Vice Chair), Cllr Michael Desmond, Cllr Michael Levy, Cllr Jon Narcross, Cllr Clare Potter and Cllr Sarah Young.

Against: None.

Abstained: None.

**RESOLVED:**

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

**7 2022/1423: Beaumont Court, Upper Clapton Road, Hackney**

7.1 PROPOSAL: Erection of single-storey roof extension above the existing mixed-use building to create 5 residential units, a rear extension to create a new stairwell and lift core with associated works from ground floor up to the new 5th floor in association with new residential units, external alterations to the front facade, refuse and recycling provision as well as a new secure cycle enclosures.

POST SUBMISSION REVISIONS:

- Submission of proposed landscaping plan
- Revised access and servicing plan drawing which increased the recycling provision to the level required in line with guidance
- Revised Travel Plan (V2.0)
- Revised Daylight, Sunlight and Overshadowing Report
- Revised Fire Safety Statement (version V2)
- Revised Energy Sustainability Statement (version 2.0)
- Revised Design and Access Statement (revision B)

A re-consultation was undertaken on 24/01/2023 following the submission of revised documents.

7.2 The designated Planning Officer introduced the planning application as published. During the course of the officer's presentation reference was made to a published addendum and the following amendments to the report:

- There were a number of updated documents, including additional drawings (2000a ground floor plan) and a Fire Strategy Statement;
- Additional comments were received from an objectors relating to discrepancies with the floor plans;
- Following publication of the application report comments were received from the Council's Streetscene team resulting in an amendment to paragraph 4.10 Transportation and servicing;
- Paragraph 8.1.19 was added relating to the Demolition and Construction and Logistics Management Plan.

7.3 A local resident and Hackney ward councillor spoke in objection to the application. They raised a number of concerns about the proposed design which they felt was not compatible with existing building. They also commented on the poor state of the existing building and that the proposed extension was bulky and an eyesore. There were also concerns raised about the loss of light and how the proposed bike shed would significantly reduce the size, character, functionality, and outlook of the southern courtyard. The objectors also recommended a number of conditions including the re-pointing and upgrading and an extension of the existing stairwell to the sixth floor.

7.4 The representatives for the applicant spoke of how their proposals would result in a more sensitive scale with a massing that complemented the existing architecture. The proposed residential units would be dual-aspect design

principles. There were also revisions secured by condition to include an area of additional soft landscape to the entrance element at the east elevation. There would not be a loss of biodiversity as the extension would be constructed atop the existing building and a green roof to the new cycle store was also included resulting in a biodiversity net gain. There was also a Unilateral Undertaking confirming to pay the offsite contribution of £250,000 (£50,000 per unit), in line with the Hackney S106 Planning Contributions Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD).

7.5 Following the submissions, the Sub-Committee members asked questions which were responded as follows:

- Replying to a question about the concerns raised about the existing building and the suggestion of a condition in relation to repointing and upgrading, the Planning Service's Development Management and Enforcement Manager responded that any additional conditions would be outside the scope of the application before the Sub-Committee. The proposals before the members had to be considered on its own merits and not the condition of the existing building. The designated Legal Officer for the meeting added that any additional conditions brought up at the meeting needed to be based on solid planning grounds. Any further conditions needed to be necessary and relevant and have to be in accordance with the actual application;
- Sub-Committee members noted that any additional conditions proposed by the objectors to address their concerns would be a matter for building control rather than planning;
- Responding to a question about whether the conditions included in the application could address those concerns raised by the objectors, the designated Planning Officer cited the example of the central section of the building would be worked on in order to extend to the new roof extension;
- The representatives for the applicant clarified that there would be some redecoration work to allow for the proposed extension;
- Replying to a question about the balconies, the designated Planning Officer responded that because of the existing design of the building there was already an element of overlooking. They concluded that the proposals were not considered harmful above and beyond the existing situation;
- The representative for the applicants explained that the orientation of the amenity spaces was moved from the inside to the ends of the H design of the building, so any concerns about overlooking were mitigated against. The amenities were now on the narrow edge of the design of the units on the top of the proposed fifth floor;
- Responding to a question about the southern garden space, the Planning Service's Team Leader South replied that the southern courtyard was communal amenity space. Under the proposals access to this area was not denied to residents of the building and there was no discernible loss of communal amenity space. The Planning Service would seek to protect overall these types of spaces. Under the proposals there would be a relatively minor loss of a grass area along the southern perimeter and it was

highlighted that there was a courtyard to the north which would remain untouched;

- The representative for the applicant added that the main area for the bicycles would result in the demolition of a hard standing and redundant boiler room;
- One of the objectors replied that the redundant boiler room was currently used as a communal decking space and garden area by residents;
- Some of the Sub-Committee members expressed their disappointment that the applicant was not present at the meeting particular in light of the number of objections received;
- Replying to a query about the amenity space, the representative for the applicant responded that that could consider reconfiguring the proposed bin and bike area to push that into the stair area;
- The Sub-Committee noted that there would be conditions to include flower beds to the rear of the site and also and also the inclusion of the green roof to offset the loss of the small area of the garden;
- Sub-Committee members noted that a landscaping condition was included to offset the loss of the strip of land due to the cycling parking provision. There was a biodiversity gain and as previously mentioned there was an offer to the northern end of the site;
- Replying to a question about the communal roof terrace, the representative for the applicant stated that they were content to accept any related condition relating to deck access such as preventing access or adding a green roof. The Planning Service clarified that there were communal walkways with five proposed residential units and there was an expectation that there would not be an increase in the population that would occupy the roof. Due to the restraints of the roof, the likelihood of gatherings on the roof would be minimal. An additional condition installing fencing may be possible. Any additional structure added to the roof area it was noted would require separate planning permission;
- The representative for the applicant clarified that was no communal roof terrace other than the walk way up from the lift and the stairs;
- Responding to a question about whether the floor space on the plan was not currently partitioned off, the two horizontal sections at the bottom H shape design (as indicated on the published drawings), the representative for the applicant replied that the private flats would have terraces and would have a boundary of 1.1 metres. An additional condition was suggested that only allowed access for maintenance purposes only or could become green roofs to ensure residents did not have access beyond their existing terrace. The representatives for the applicant suggested added additional details to the proposed landscaping condition;
- The Planning Service's Team Leader South explained that they could look at extending the green roof condition to be extended to the other areas of the room deemed where necessary;
- Responding to a question about biodiversity and green space, the Planning Service's Team Leader South replied that there was

garden area to the north of the site already, however, there was a condition for additional landscaping, so there was a net increase in biodiversity and green space. Currently the existing site was on an area of hard paving so there was not a net loss;

- Sub-Committee members were reminded that any issues around the structural stability and integrity of the existing building was not a material planning matter;
- Responding to a question about the integration of the proposals into the existing building, the CUDS manager replied that the proposals were in keeping with the existing architecture . While it was accepted that it was not an exact match, it was acknowledged a number of changes had taken place over a number of years, e.g. the installation of new PVC window, therefore it would prove difficult to get an exact match;
- Replying to a question raised about concerns raised about segregation as a result of the proposals, the Planning Service's Team Leader South explained that the new stairwell and lift core had to adhere to fire safety specifications. The representative for the applicant added that they could look at extending the staircase and that there would be normal access for residents on site;
- The representative for the applicant clarified that their plans had factored in any extension of the existing stairwell. The designated legal officer added that if the applicant was willing to agree in principle to a condition, securing the extension the stairwell, then this could be deemed acceptable;
- Replying to a suggestion about extending of the existing lift to the new proposed extension, the Planning Service's Development Management and Enforcement Manager responded that if the proposals did not show the extension of the existing lift then it would have to form part of a entirely new planning application;
- The designated Planning Officer explained that the new stairwell and lift core would extend to the fifth floor only and would not serve the existing floors;
- Replying to a question about why a new lift was being installed, the representatives for the applicant responded that the size of the lift needed to be bigger to comply with current building regulations and be a firefighting lift and they could not be achieved with the existing lift shaft. They added that any extension of the existing lift shaft would create more disruption. It was felt that concerns expressed previously about segregated access of floors were already mitigated against with amendments to the stairwell;
- The new lift was only servicing the sixth floor because of the layout of the existing building; the new lift was located in an area with no windows and was not expected to cause any disruption to existing tenants. With this proposals any construction work would only impact on a corridor rather than a residential unit;
- Sub-Committee members were reminded by the planning service that any extension of the lift would lead to additional structures and mass on the roof which was outside the scope of the application;



**Wednesday 6 September 2023**

- The Chair of the Sub-Committee was of the view that the members could not defer making a decision on the application simply on the basis that the existing lift shaft was not being extended to the roof, particularly in mind that the representative for the applicant had already agreed to a condition to amend access to the stairwell;
- The designated legal officer reminded Sub-Committee members that the applicant was not present at the meeting and therefore careful consideration needed to be given to any additional conditions put forward. The application before the members related to the fifth floor;
- Replying to a question about the installation of the Air Source Heat Pumps and PV panels, the representative for the applicant confirmed that these features were just for the five proposed residential units..

Vote:

For: Cllr Michael Levy, Cllr Steve Race and Cllr Jessica Webb.

Against: Cllr Michael Desmond.

Abstained: Cllr Jon Narcross, Cllr Clare Potter and Cllr Sarah Young.

**RESOLVED:**

Planning permission was granted subject to conditions and completion of a legal agreement.

**8 2023/0899: 108 Blurton Road, Hackney, London, E5 0NH**

8.1 PROPOSAL: Erection of a single-storey ground floor rear extension.

POST SUBMISSION REVISIONS: Plans amended to reduce the depth of the proposed extension.

8.2 The designated Planning Officer introduced the planning application as published. During the course of the officer's presentation reference was made to a published addendum and the following amendments to the report:

Additional Drawings Provided:ZAAVIA/108BR/109 Rev A (Proposed Section AA)

No persons had registered to speak in objection. The applicant was unable to join the meeting remotely due to a poor internet connection.

8.3 Following the submissions, the Sub-Committee members asked questions which were responded as follows:

- Responding to a question about objections received about the application, the designated Planning Officer explained that a number of revisions had been received changing its design. The Planning Service had concluded that the additional massing would not cause any adverse amenity impact;
- Replying to a question about concerns expressed about the loss of green space, the designated Planning Officer responded that

**Wednesday 6 September 2023**

they had concluded that the proposals would not significantly impinge on the garden space;

- Responding to a question raised about the lack of details as to the location of waste pipes and drainage, the designated Planning Officer replied that those details were not included as part of the application. They added that there was PDR for the installation of pipes, for example. They highlighted that the existing kitchen was under the outrigger, there appeared to be no reason to install pipes in the extended area. The additional floor space was for the extension of the kitchen..

Vote:

For: Cllr Steve Race (Chair), Cllr Jessica Webb (Vice Chair), Cllr Michael Desmond, Cllr Michael Levy, Cllr Jon Narcross, Cllr Clare Potter and Cllr Sarah Young.

Against: None.

Abstained: None.

**RESOLVED:**

Planning permission was granted subject to conditions.

**9 Delegated Decisions documents**

9.1 The Planning Sub-Committee to note the delegated decisions documents for the following period s13 July 2023 to 24 August 2023 and 23 June 2023 to 12 July 2023.

**RESOLVED:**

The delegated decisions document for the following periods be noted:

- 13 July 2023 to 24 August 2023
- 23 June 2023 to 12 July 2023

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

10.1 Sub-Committee members noted that their next meeting was on 11 October 2023 and also that a pre-application meeting was proposed for 13 November 2023.

END OF THE MEETING

**Duration of the meeting:** 6.30pm - 8.44pm

Date of next meeting: 11 October 2023

Councillor Steve Race  
Chair of the Planning Sub-Committee

Contact:

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