

London Borough of Islington

Planning Committee - 12 July 2016

Minutes of the meeting of the Planning Committee held at Council Chamber - Town Hall on 12 July 2016 at 7.30 pm.

Present: **Councillors:** Robert Khan (Chair), Martin Klute (Vice-Chair), Alice Donovan (Vice-Chair), Paul Convery, Tim Nicholls, David Poyser, Angela Picknell, Una O'Halloran and Nick Ward

Councillor Robert Khan in the Chair

218 INTRODUCTIONS (Item A1)

Councillor Khan welcomed everyone to the meeting. Members of the Committee and officers introduced themselves and the Chair outlined the procedures for the meeting.

219 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE (Item A2)

Apologies were received from Councillor Chowdhury.

220 DECLARATIONS OF SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS (Item A3)

There were no substitute members.

221 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST (Item A4)

There were no declarations of interest.

222 ORDER OF BUSINESS (Item A5)

The order of business would be B1, B3 and B2.

223 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING (Item A6)

RESOLVED:

That the minutes of the meeting held on 14 June 2016 be confirmed as an accurate record of proceedings and the Chair be authorised to sign them.

224 65-70 WHITE LION STREET, LONDON, N1 9PP (Item B1)

Erection of a part three, four and five storey building plus basement comprising 4,233sqm (GIA) of B1 (business) floorspace.

(Planning application number: P2015/4922/FUL)

Planning Committee - 12 July 2016

In the discussion the following points were made:

- The planning officer advised that the applicant had agreed to pay the requested financial contribution in lieu of on-site affordable workspace.
- The planning officer advised that an additional condition should be added to secure an amended Delivery and Servicing Plan to restrict servicing to between the hours of 10am and 4pm.
- The applicants confirmed that if they unable to get a global company to use the development as their headquarters, it would be possible to subdivide the space into smaller units.
- The application was policy compliant.

Councillor Klute proposed that Condition 3 be amended to require solid brickwork to be used. This was seconded by Councillor Nicholls and carried.

RESOLVED:

That planning permission be granted subject to the conditions and informatives set out in Appendix 1 of the officer report with the amendments outlined above and subject to the prior completion of a Deed of Planning Obligation made under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 securing the heads of terms as set out in Appendix 1 of the officer report.

225 76-86 (LAYDEN HOUSE), TURNMILL STREET, LONDON, EC1M 5LG (Item B2)

External refurbishment works to elevations, erection of five storey front and side infill extension to east and west; part fifth and sixth floor extension; a part two storey, part five storey rear extension resulting in 298 square metres (GIA) of additional office (B1) floor space, erection of a single storey bike store to rear and the change of use of part of the ground floor and basement from office (B1 use) to 1,148 square metres of flexible retail and restaurant (A1/A3).

(Planning application number: P2015/5260/FUL)

In the discussion the following point was made:

- The application was policy compliant.

RESOLVED:

That planning permission be granted subject to the conditions and informatives set out in Appendix 1 of the officer report and subject to the prior completion of a Deed of Planning Obligation made under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 securing the heads of terms as set out in Appendix 1 of the officer report.

226 LEROY HOUSE, 434 ESSEX ROAD, LONDON, N1 3QP (Item B3)

5 storey side extension, 5 storey Balls Pond Road entrance projection and roof level extensions to the existing building with external terraces to provide office, workshop and studio spaces (use class B1) with an ancillary café; refurbishment of existing building; internal cycle parking; and associated hard and soft landscaping including tree planting on Essex Road and pavement improvement works to Dove Road.

(Planning application number: P2015/2652/FUL)

In the discussion the following points were made:

- The planning officer advised that Condition 16 should refer to the new building over the car park only, that Condition 23 was unnecessary and should be removed, that

Planning Committee - 12 July 2016

the Heads of Terms should refer to a Green 'Performance' Plan rather than a Green 'Procurement' Plan as stated in the report and that Informative 4 should be removed.

- Concern was raised about the design of the proposed development.
- A member queried why the original design had been amended a number of times rather than having being redesigned. The planning officer advised that the original scheme had been amended following the Design Review Panel's comments.
- The planning officer advised that further changes had been made since the Design Review Panel had commented on the scheme e.g. a reduction in built form. The proposal had not been back to the Design Review Panel following the amendments.
- A member raised concern that office space was being prioritised over all other matters, and that design, impacts on neighbouring amenity and on heritage impacts were also important.
- A member noted that that the exposed structural detail detracted from the appearance and was only required because of the additional development proposed at the upper level.
- A member queried why the applicant had the option of delivering an Employment and Training initiative through a third party called XLP. The planning officer advised that the applicant had worked with XLP on other projects and this alternative would have to be of at least an equal value to the contribution of £26,290 which would otherwise be paid.
- The planning benefits were highlighted by the planning officer and members welcomed the employment and community benefits of the scheme. Members also stated that these did not outweigh concerns relating to the design, impact on heritage assets and residential amenity.

Councillor Klute proposed a motion to refuse planning permission due to concerns over the design and appearance, as well as the impact of the development on the setting of heritage assets and the impact on the amenity of neighbours due to a loss of light. Also, the building was at a prominent intersection on two roads and lacked architectural merit, the comments of the Design and Conservation Officer were noted as was the site allocation which stated that there should be a high quality design. This was seconded by Councillor Nick Ward and carried.

RESOLVED:

That planning permission be refused for the reasons outlined above with the wording of the reason for refusal to be delegated to officers in consultation with the chair.

WORDING DELEGATED TO OFFICERS IN CONSULTATION WITH THE CHAIR

MINUTE 226

LEROY HOUSE, 434 ESSEX ROAD, LONDON, N1 3QP

Reasons for refusal:

Design and appearance

The proposed development, by reason of the size, height, bulk, scale and poor quality of design (including the external structural elements, roof top plant, the external appearance and poor relationship between the existing and new built form) would represent an incongruous and visually intrusive form of development which would be harmful to the character and appearance of the original building, and to the character and appearance of the street scene and the surrounding area, the proposal also fails to provide a high quality design appropriate to the site's prominent location at the junction of the busy Essex and Balls Pond Roads, and is contrary to London Plan (2015) policy 7.6, Islington's Core Strategy (2011) policy CS9, Islington's Development Management Policies (2013) policy DM2.1, Islington's Local Plan Site Allocations (2013) Site O13, and the Islington Urban Design Guide SPD. The benefits of the scheme are not considered to outweigh this harm."

Impact on setting of Heritage Asset

The proposed development by reason of its bulk, scale, design and proximity to St Paul's Church (Grade II*) and other Grade II listed buildings on Balls Pond Road, would result in an overly dominant feature that is harmful to the setting of the Grade II and Grade II* listed buildings and their special interest and the setting of Canonbury Conservation area and failing to be sympathetic in form and scale to the local identity. The harm is not outweighed by public benefits and as such the development is contrary to London Plan (2015) policy 7.8, Islington's Core Strategy (2011) policy CS9, Islington's Development Management Policies (2013) policy DM2.3, Islington's Local Plan Site Allocations (2013) Site O13, and the Islington Urban Design Guide SPD.

Amenity impact

The proposed extensions to the building by virtue of the excessive height and positioning would result in substantial loss of daylight, sunlight to the windows of dwellings in Canonbury Heights and The Pinnacles and as such would unacceptably harm the amenities of residents of these dwellings. This harm makes the proposal contrary to policy 7.6 of the London Plan (2011), policy DM2.1 of the Development Management Policies (2013) as well as BRE 'Site layout planning for daylight and sunlight: a guide to good practice'. The benefits of the scheme are not considered to outweigh this harm.

The meeting ended at 8.40 pm

CHAIR