

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

THURSDAY 11 JANUARY 2024, 6:50PM

<b>Councillors Present:</b>	<b>Cllr Steve Race in the Chair</b>
	<b>Cllr Michael Desmond, Cllr Shaul Krautwirt (substitute), Cllr Jon Narcross and Cllr Jessica Webb (Vice-Chair).</b>
<b>Apologies:</b>	<b>Cllr Clare Joseph, Cllr Michael Levy, Cllr Clare Potter and Cllr Ali Sadek.</b>
<b>Officers in Attendance:</b>	<b>Gareth Barnett, South Area Team Leader Natalie Broughton, Assistant Director Planning and Building Control James Clark, Planner Mario Kahraman, ICT Support Officer Matt Payne, Conservation, Urban Design and Sustainability Team (CUDS) Deputy Manager Christine Stephenson, Specialist Planning Lawyer Gareth Sykes, Governance Officer John Tsang, Development Management and Enforcement Manager</b>
<b>Also in Attendance:</b>	<b>Cllr Simche Steinberger (speaking in support of agenda item 6).  Cllr Sarah Young (speaking in objection to agenda item 6).</b>
<b>Absent:</b>	<b>Cllr Richard Lufkin</b>

### 1 Apologies for Absence

- 1.1 Apologies for absence were received from Cllr Michael Levy (Cllr Shaul Krautwirt was attending in his place as a substitute), Cllr Clare Joseph, Cllr Clare Potter and Cllr Ali Sadek.
- 1.2 Cllr Richard Lufkin was recorded as absent.

### 2 Declarations of Interest

- 2.1 The Sub-Committee members declared an interest in relation to agenda item 6: 42 Bergholt Crescent; all the members knew fellow Hackney Ward Councillors Sarah Young and Simche Steinberger, who were speaking in objection and support respectively, of the application. Councillor Young was also a member of the Planning Sub-Committee but was speaking at the meeting on behalf of Woodberry Down residents.

**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 Sub-Committee considered the minutes of their previous Planning Sub-Committee Pre-Application meeting, held on 13 November 2023.

**RESOLVED:**

The minutes of the previous Planning Sub-Committee Pre-Application meeting, held on 13 November 2023, be approved as an accurate record of those meetings' proceedings.

**5 2022/0963: Land to the rear of 64 Middleton Road, London, E8 4BS**

5.1 The application was withdrawn from the meeting agenda at the behest of the Council's Planning Service.

**6 2023/1076: 42 Bergholt Crescent, Hackney, London, N16 5JE**

6.1 PROPOSAL: Construction of a single-storey rear extension at ground floor level, a first floor infill extension and a rear roof extension as well as the installation of windows in the side elevation, excavation of a full-depth basement with associated front and rear lightwells.

POST SUBMISSION REVISIONS: Alterations to the site curtilage, details of lightwell railing provided, changes to the internal layout, changes to the roof extension fenestration pattern, details provided to show the retention of the front boundary wall, changes to layout plan of front garden, side elevation updated to show the proposed side door, retention of the front staircase, covering letter updated to remove reference to demolition, daylight sunlight assessment amended to refer to the correct neighbouring garden.

6.2 The designated Planning Officer introduced the application report as published. During the course of the officer's presentation reference was made to the addendum. A summary of the amendments to the application report, contained within the addendum, were as follows:

Development description to be amended as follows:

Construction of a single-storey rear extension at ground floor level, a first floor infill extension and a rear roof extension as well as the installation of windows in the side elevation, excavation of a full-depth basement with associated front lightwells.

Drawing numbers:

- 21.1249/017 C to be replaced with 21.1249/017 D.

Submitted documents:

- The submitted daylight sunlight assessment has been amended to correct a minor discrepancy with the labelling of the rear gardens;
- Paragraph 3.6 - six additional comments have been submitted since the report publication date;
- Paragraph 7.13 was to be altered.

- 6.3 The Planning Sub-Committee noted that in a previous iteration of the rear elevation that had been published by the Planning Service showed an measurement of 2.8 metres at the height of the boundary. Some scale measurements were then subsequently taken by the Planning Service and it was discovered to be three metres. There was now a revised rear elevation. As a result of this the Planning Service decided not to re-consult because they felt that it would prejudice any planning considerations at the Planning Sub-Committee meeting. The overall height and scale of the site was unchanged, there was just a factual correction to the rear elevation.
- 6.4 A Mr Clyde Williams, a local resident, addressed the Sub-Committee speaking in objection to the application.
- 6.5 Hackney Ward Councillor Sarah Young, representing residents of Woodberry Down, addressed the Sub-Committee, speaking against the application.
- 6.6 Mr Shulem Posen, of Eade Planning Ltd, addressed the Sub-Committee, speaking in support of the application.
- 6.7 Hackney Ward Councillor, Simche Steinberger, addressed the Sub-Committee, speaking in support of the application.
- 6.8 During a discussion on the application the following points were noted:
- The application before the Sub-Committee was a new application incorporating elements that had previously been approved;
  - In the event of approval of the application a condition would be included stating that the materials to be used would match the existing materials on site;
  - The proposed roof extension would be slightly visible, and in order for it to be compliant with Hackney Council's under Special Permitted Development (SPD) policy it would be set back 0.3 metres from the partition wall. The Planning Sub-Committee noted that this should slightly reduce the roof extension's visible prominence. It was slightly higher than the originally approved permitted development application, however, it was still a setback one metre from the ridgeline. The Planning Service had concluded that the extension would not be harmful to the wider area. It was noted that similar extensions had already been approved in the area;
  - Any discussions around the refurbishment of the rest of the house was not a material planning issue;

**Thursday 11 January 2024**

- Regarding scaling and massing, the Sub-Committee noted that some elements of the application would be reduced and some would be more visibly prominent. The application had changed in scale, the infill extension, for example, was slightly setback from the rear elevation of the outrigger which was changed from a previous application that had been approved. This was a later addition that was subservient to the host building which though visible from the street it would not result in a substantial alteration to the dwelling and the wider area;
- The Planning Service was supportive of basement extensions. In the case of the application before the Sub-Committee this was focussed on a front lightwell. This feature had already been approved at some other properties on Bergholt Crescent and also part of a previous approved application. The Planning Service also had to ensure a standard of accommodation wherein all rooms benefited from sufficient light and outlook. Those rooms included as part of the proposed basement were not considered by the Planning Service to be habitable and therefore did not have the same requirements and standards normally for those types of rooms. In relation to the impact on drainage the Planning Service could offset this by putting in place a standard drainage and groundwater condition. If the application was approved a
- report would have to be produced to show the impact of that aspect of the proposals;
- The issue relating to a party wall, as mentioned by one of the objectors, was part of a previous application and the wall was no longer present on site. Planning Sub-Committee members were reminded that party walls were not considered a material planning issue;
- On the matter of daylight/sunlight, an assessment report had been submitted by the applicant that demonstrated that the proposal would not lead to an adverse loss of light to any neighbouring windows or outdoor amenity spaces. Planning Officers were satisfied that the roof extension would result in no loss of light or outlook for neighbouring dwelling house;
- No new lines of sight would be created from the ground floor rear extension, however, in the event of approval a condition would be attached ensuring that the roof extension was not used as a roof terrace. Windows would be placed on the rear elevation;
- On a suggestion from the Sub-Committee that whether a green roof could be imposed by condition, the Planning Service replied that such a condition would only apply to major applications. The application under consideration was a minor condition and therefore such a condition was not applicable.

Prior to the vote Cllr Young left the Chamber.

Vote:

For: Cllr Michael Desmond, Cllr Shaul Krautwirt, Cllr Jon Narcross, Cllr Steve Race (Chair) and Cllr Jessica Webb (Vice-Chair).

Against: None.

Abstained: None

**RESOLVED:**

Planning permission was granted subject to conditions.

**7 Delegated decisions**

7.1 The Sub-Committee considered the delegated decisions document.

**RESOLVED:**

The delegated decisions document was noted.

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

8.1 The Sub-Committee noted that their next meeting was on 7 February 2024 and that a pre-application was also scheduled for 13 February.

CLOSE OF MEETING

**Duration of the meeting:** 6.50pm - 7.43pm

Date of the next meetings – 7 February 2024 and 13 February 2024 (pre-application)

Cllr Steve Race, Chair of the Planning Sub-Committee

Contact:

Gareth Sykes, Governance Officer

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