

London Borough of Islington

Planning Committee - 9 December 2024

Minutes of the meeting of the Planning Committee held at Council Chamber - Town Hall on 9 December 2024 at 7.30 pm.

Present: **Councillors:** Klute (Chair), Hayes (Vice-Chair), North (Vice-Chair), Clarke, Convery, Craig, Jeapes, Hamdache and Wayne

Councillor Martin Klute in the Chair

140 INTRODUCTIONS (Item A1)

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

141 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE (Item A2)

Apologies were received from Councillors Ogunro and Nanda.

142 DECLARATIONS OF SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS (Item A3)

Councillor Wayne substituted for Councillor Nanda.

143 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST (Item A4)

There were no declarations of interest.

144 ORDER OF BUSINESS (Item A5)

The order of business would be B2 and B1

145 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING (Item A6)

RESOLVED:

That the minutes of the meeting held on 14 November 2024 be confirmed as an accurate record of proceedings and the Chair be authorised to sign them.

146 48 CHISWELL STREET, LONDON, EC1Y 4XX (Item B1)

Partial demolition, recladding and refurbishment of existing building alongside erection of two storey roof extension to provide Class E(g)(i) Office floorspace, alongside Class E(a) Retail use at ground level. The proposals also comprise the delivery of cycle parking at basement level alongside the provision of landscaped roof terraces, the installation of replacement plant equipment and associated enclosure, and all associated and ancillary works. (Departure from Development Plan)

(Planning application number: P2023/3522/FUL)

Councillors Clarke and Wayne did not participate in this item and not in meeting

Planning Committee - 9 December 2024

room as they were not involved when committee took the decision to defer the item at the last meeting on 14th November.

In the discussion the following points were made:

- Chair reminded meeting that item which was considered at the November meeting and deferred for 3 reasons, that the focus of the Committee should be on whether the issues had been addressed and not on the whole application.
- Planning Officer informed meeting that since the publication of the agenda an additional objection was received however additional issues raised had been addressed.
- Members were reminded that application ref: P2023/3522/FUL was considered at the Planning Committee meeting on 14th November 2024 and deferred in order to allow for further consideration of the location of the affordable workspace offer; for further consideration of the building height and to allow for further development and clarification of the applicant's proposed contribution towards social value generating programmes.
- Meeting was advised that since the last meeting, applicant has submitted the following additional supporting documents: Affordable Workspace Options, prepared by Make, dated 25/11/2024; a Draft Social Value Plan, prepared by BEAM, dated 29/11/2024 and a Public Benefits document, prepared by BEAM, dated 28/11/2024.
- Planning Officer advised that the submitted documents outline the various locations within the development which were explored for on-site affordable workspace provision, provide an overview of the public benefits of the proposed scheme and clarify how social value would be generated from the site.
- With regard to the affordable workspace provision, the Planning Officer advised the meeting that following on from Committee's concerns about the lack of on site provision, further consideration was given to providing affordable workspace on-site. All possible locations for affordable workspace in the development were explored, in accordance with Local Plan Policy B4, Part H(i). In accordance with supporting paragraph 4.54 of the Local Plan, a policy compliant off-site contribution was agreed following engagement with the Council's Inclusive Economy team. It is, therefore, considered that the application complies with the development plan insofar as it relates to affordable workspace.
- On the building height and it's massing, meeting was advised that officers and applicants explored the possibility of amending the proposed building height with the applicant and no amendments to the height of the building have been proposed.
- The Planning Officer acknowledged that the existing building at 48 Chiswell Street is 31.82m, making it a tall building according to the definition set out in local policy and that through the proposed extension works, the building height would increase to 37.95 metres – an increase in height of 6.13 metres, or 19%.
- Planning officers advised that in land use terms the application seeking permission for a 5,134sqm increase in office floorspace is acceptable as it aligns with the Local Plan priorities for development within the CAZ and the Bunhill and Clerkenwell Area Action Plan area. It was also noted that this uplift would accord with Site Allocation ref: BC40, which identifies the site as being suitable for an intensification of office floorspace and indeed the justification for the allocation is to intensify officer floorspace.
- Meeting was advised that the proposed increase of 5,134sqm office floorspace on the site represents a c.40% uplift compared to existing. Whilst achieving this uplift would require a 19% increase in height, this uplift would make a meaningful contribution towards the identified need for business space in the borough, supporting the aims and objectives of the Development Plan in this regard.
- With regards sustainability and whole life carbon, meeting was advised that the proposed development retains 75% of existing building structure, noting that the whole life carbon score is 18% below GLA's aspirational benchmark.
- On concerns about the building height, meeting was advised that the proposed design has responded to DRP feedback, that this is achieved by the upper floors being set back to

Planning Committee - 9 December 2024

minimise impact to listed buildings, and the 'nose' element of building set-back from existing building line. It was also stated that the improved architecture would contribute to local townscape and that the building will be better neighbour to the surrounding listed buildings and cause less than substantial harm in planning balance.

·In response to committee's concerns that the proposed additional benefits, as set out in the Heads of Terms, were hypothetical and too vague for it to be considered within the planning balance, the Planning Officer informed meeting that the applicant has worked closely with the Council to develop a draft 'Local First' Social Value Plan, which sets out how the agreed programmes would directly relate to the proposed development, and which quantifies the amount of social value that would be generated through the implementation of the plan.

·Planning Officer stated that the draft Social Value Plan, outlined in the addendum report would be secured through condition 2 and a final document would be secured through an obligation in the S106 agreement.

·Meeting was informed that the draft Social Value Plan sets out the developer's commitment to ensuring the development generates social value from the site to the benefit of local residents and enterprises. To ensure that the social value generated from the development is maximised and to ensure that the plan is directly related to the tenant business and responds closely to local needs, the S106 legal agreement will secure adherence to a final Social Value Plan, which the applicant would be required to submit for approval six months ahead of payment of the first instalment of the Social Value Plan Contribution. The s106 agreement will require consultation with elected Members to take place prior to the approval of the Plan. This will include consultation with the Executive Member for Inclusive Economy and Jobs and Ward Councillors.

·Meeting was advised that through the submission of a Social Value Plan and the applicant's contribution towards its implementation, the proposed development would generate £1,835,036.40 in additional social value in the local area over a three-year delivery period, and should be considered as a significant public benefit, which is considered to help mitigate the identified harm in the planning balance.

·The final Social Value Plan shall confirm how social value generated from the site is maximised through the delivery of a programme of activities directly aligned with local needs. The final Social Value Plan shall also confirm how tenant businesses shall be encouraged to participate in social value generation. Approval of the final Social Value Plan would be subject to consultation with the Ward Councillors and the Executive Member for Inclusive Economy and Jobs.

·The applicant would be required to submit an annual report for the duration of the implementation of the Social Value Plan based on quarterly monitoring updates.

·In terms of planning balance, the Planning Officer acknowledged the impacts of the development, especially that the proposed 6m height increase would result in a tall building on a site with no tall building allocation, will result in minor level of less than substantial harm caused to neighbouring heritage assets and neighbouring amenity impacts relating to daylight, sunlight and overshadowing.

·The Planning Officer reiterated the numerous benefits of the development having good sustainability credentials achieving BREEM Excellent and improving upon the GLA's aspirational Whole Life Carbon score by 18%. In addition it was noted that the scheme would result in a considerably improved architectural treatment and materiality; improved public realm provision; removal of all on site car parking and securing a 'Local First' Social Value Plan of £1,835,036.40.

·A neighbouring resident requested that Committee refuse planning permission on two grounds namely loss of privacy and loss of sunlight which will impact their amenity. Objector reminded members that application was deferred to address a number of issues, one of which was the two floors which has not been addressed, that the building being proposed remains a tall building in a residential area, and that there is an assumption that affected windows were bedrooms.

·A second objector acknowledged the engagement of the applicant team since the last meeting on potential noise emanating when roof terrace when in use and light pollution

concerns. Objector stated that on the overlooking concern from the terrace, applicant had suggested that this will be addressed at the detail design stage, that this should be secured with a condition in case the site is sold on in the future. In addition the objector requested that the request for an automated blind to address light pollution from the office be delivered in the first section of the office building which is opposite the bedroom.

·In response, the applicant stated that following the application being deferred, the team in conjunction with the Council's inclusive Team have now produced a draft Social Value Plan with clear details, that an off- site contribution towards the provision of affordable workspace has been offered. On the issue of height, the applicant reiterated the set-backs that have been introduced on some of the elevations having taken into consideration DRP comments that the massing in those particular areas were having an impact on heritage assets.

·The Chair in summary noted the acceptance of the Inclusive Economy Team of the off- site contribution towards addressing the lack of affordable workspace. Chair acknowledged that the Draft Social Value Plan is to be welcomed as more specific details have been included, however there still remains the issue of the building height, which has not been addressed, noting applicants efforts by introducing set back, however concerns raised by council officers during the pre-advice stage and comments by the Design Review Panel is difficult to ignore as the tall building is a departure from the Local Development Plan.

·Another member welcomed the details provided in the draft Social Value Plan but was concerned that the loss of sunlight to neighbouring residents should not be disregarded as that will impact on their quality of life.

· The member was concerned that applicants had not provided a modelling to demonstrate that a compliant scheme would be affected by reducing the height of the building and that application be deferred for applicant to address the issue of height of the building and massing.

·Councillor North proposed a motion to defer the application. This was seconded by Councillor Hayes and carried.

RESOLVED:

That consideration of the application be deferred for the reasons outlined above.

147 18-20 TILEYARD ROAD, LONDON N7 9AH (Item B2)

The demolition of the existing buildings and redevelopment of the site to provide a five-storey building plus basement and set-back roof-level plant for light Industrial (Use Class E(g)(iii)) at ground level and flexible labs/R&D/light industrial (Use Class E(g)(ii-iii)) on the upper levels along with waste storage, cycle parking, associated plant, landscaping and other necessary works.

(Planning application number: P2024/1461/FUL)

In the discussion the following points were made:

·The site is located on the south side of Tileyard Road within the Vale Royal / Brewery Road Locally Significant Industrial Site (LSIS). The LSIS comprises predominantly light industrial and warehouse / storage uses interspersed with commercial & cultural uses, mainly focused around Tileyard Studios.

·Planning Officer advised that No. 18 Tileyard Road comprises a two-storey building which has previously provided 1,747sqm of floorspace for Rapha Racing Limited and No.20 which currently is a two-storey building (787sqm GIA), occupied by a catering company (Sands

Planning Committee - 9 December 2024

Catering) for light industrial use (Class E(g)(iii) and immediately to the south comprises the artist studios of Sir Anthony Gormley.

·With regards the primary street northern elevation, meeting was advised that scheme has been designed to maximise the active frontage to the street with a light industrial floor space occupying the majority of the ground floor. The rear southern elevation, planning officer stated that it continues the modular principle with strong emphasis with less glazing and the 4th floor is set back and provides terrace planting to reduce massing and visibility from vale royal road and the Artist Studios to the rear.

·Meeting was advised that the proposed development will provide 1298sqm of light industrial floor space at ground floor level which includes associated ancillary floor space at basement and roof levels and the rest of the building from 1st to 4th floor is flexible R&D/light industrial floor space totalling 5794sqm.

·Scheme has a main entrance accessed from Tileyard Road which leads to reception, lobby and lift, stair- case and service entrance and serving the light industrial space only.

·It was noted that the Service core connects directly to the external delivery area including the proposed inset loading bay and another loading bay area of a neighbouring land.

·Meeting was informed that the upper floor provides flexible research and development light industrial floor space as well as access to the core, bathrooms, toilet facilities and other ancillary floor space.

·Submitted plans indicate how the floor space can be subdivided into smaller units suitable for SME's and for laboratory accommodation and write up space.

·Planning Officer advised that the industrial floor space is considered to be well conceived and that an integral part of the scheme is its well generous floor to ceiling heights and convenient located loading bay dedicated service .

·Meeting was advised that the design to the front elevation has been refined since the initial proposal to reduce the impact of massing.

·Planning Officer advised that in response to the Council's notification letter 3 objections have been received raising issues of height, bulk, sense of enclosure and the rear of the site overlooking daylight and construction impact.

·In terms of overlooking and loss of primary, meeting was advised that a number of measures have been introduced to reduce overlooking with windows being obscured and landscaping introduced behind the parapet on the 4th floor

·In terms of daylight and sunlight impact, meeting was advised of no loss to neighbouring and residential properties however there is impact to some commercial properties in particular no 4 Tileyard Road and the artist studio to the rear. Planning Officer stated that affected windows are rooms that have dual aspect and are not affected in terms of daylight distribution

·A number of green landscaping interventions have been introduced to achieve the greening factor required for commercial buildings.

·With regards to delivery and servicing, the Planning Officer advised that the application proposes to make alterations to the highway in order to create an in-set servicing / delivery bay and in addition, the application proposes to utilise the consented off-street loading bay at 22-23 Tileyard Road, which is a site that is also owned by Kadans, the same applicant who owns both sites ;and that these two servicing bays combined would cater for the servicing needs of the development. Meeting was advised that details of this would be agreed in relevant section 106 and section 278 agreements in the event of planning permission being granted, with the principle of the loading bay being agreed with the Council's Highways Team.

·Assessment of the proposal includes acceptability of land uses; design and appearance; impact on neighbouring amenity; highways and transportation impacts; including delivery and servicing arrangements; energy and sustainability and planning balance.

·In terms of land uses, the meeting was advised that the proposal is deemed to meet the aspiration of the development local Plan and Policies which supports the protection and

Planning Committee - 9 December 2024

intensification of the industrial area. It was also noted that the development also makes a significant contribution towards the Council's Affordable Work Space programme.

·With regards the design and appearance, the proposal is considered to be of high quality design, with a more active frontage, a better relationship with the street and improved public realm.

·Members were advised that the proposal has no impact on neighbouring amenity or on surrounding highways network, the off-site delivery and servicing is secured by conditions and a S106 agreement with a neighbouring land co-owned by the applicant.

·It was also noted that although there are concerns with regards to the energy and sustainability, meeting was advised that a condition (no 31) will seek measures to improve this shortfall.

·In terms of the whole life carbon and adaptive design, meeting was advised that a suitable justification has now been provided for the existing buildings demolition and redevelopment of the site and that the GLA benchmark for whole-life carbon would be met in part with further improvements will be sought through condition 31 and welcome the use of materials from recycled in line with Policy.

·On the schemes' energy and sustainability measures, meeting was advised that there in light of a 30.9% reduction in regulated CO2 emissions applicants have provided a carbon offset contribution of £96,900 for the remaining CO2 emissions and that a condition 27 has been secured for applicant to secure further reductions.

·On the issue of planning obligations, Planning Officer advised that an agreed Employment & Training Strategy has been submitted, an off-site contribution of £1.39m has been provided towards Affordable Workspace, there will be significant enhancements in biodiversity and a UGF of 0.3; a carbon offset contribution of £96k in light of a shortfall in carbon emission; 4No. construction placements or employment / training contribution of £20k; Employment and training contribution for local residents of £21k; Accessible Transport Contribution of £8k; Section 278 agreement to ensure public realm improvements and the submission of an agreed Green Performance Plans and Travel Plans.

·Member welcomed the applicant's proposed rain water harvesting which will be recycled for use in the building.

·In terms of planning balance, meeting was advised that although the scheme underperforms on regulated and total carbon emission targets, the benefits of having a co-location of R&D floor space with industrial and its intensification will contribute towards the economic function of the LSIA as an industrial area. In addition scheme will deliver suitable and employment training benefits including AWS contribution secured through s106; increase in employment at the site; a high quality new building; new landscaping which provides an enhanced public realm and improved relationship to the street and no impact on neighbouring residential amenity.

·Members were reminded of minor conflicts with planning policy, notably the proposal's failure to meet specific energy and sustainability targets, including the operational energy and consequent carbon emissions reductions, which do not meet policy expectations.

·However, it is considered that sufficient justification has been provided that the energy intensive use proposed renders the targets unachievable in this instance and that non-compliance with policy here is outweighed by the benefits outlined above and in the main body of this report. The planning application is also considered to comply with relevant standards and requirements relating to transport, inclusive design, safety and security.

·Studio Director of Anthony Gormley Studio raised concerns about the proposed colour of the render to the rear of the building, its visual impact on the surrounding area particularly when viewed from the studio. The Director stated that a colour that is too dark or overly bright risks creating a stark contrast and diminishing the coherent visual appeal and attraction of the area, requesting that if Committee was minded to grant planning permission that as part of the proposed review that a lighter colour is considered so as to mitigate the visual impact.

·In response the applicant acknowledged the meetings with the studio representatives on a number of issues such as massing, set back and the colour and that a range of colours and

Planning Committee - 9 December 2024

materials were considered and the terracotta colour was considered better rather than light brick as it is the predominant colour in the area.

·A member was concerned with the brick colour of the building next to the proposed development is what the entire neighbourhood looks like and that condition 3(e) be amended which will ensure that the pre-cast concrete slabs that faces the building is more sympathetic to the yellow brick which dominates most of the area.

·Committee agreed to amend condition 3e taking into consideration the views from the Anthony Gormley Studios.

Councillor Klute proposed a motion to grant planning permission. This was seconded by Councillor Convery and carried.

RESOLVED:

That following consideration of the case officer's report (the assessment and recommendations therein), the presentation to Committee, submitted representations and objections provided verbally at this meeting, planning permission be granted subject to the conditions and informatives set out in Appendix 1 of the officer report and the amended condition stated 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.

The meeting ended at 9.10 pm

CHAIR