



# ISLINGTON

## PLANNING COMMITTEE REPORT UPDATE

Development Management Service  
Planning and Development Division  
Environment and Regeneration Department  
Islington Town Hall  
Upper Street  
LONDON N1 2UD

<b>PLANNING COMMITTEE</b>		<b>AGENDA ITEM NO: B1</b>
<b>Date:</b>	1 March 2018	<b>NON-EXEMPT</b>

Application number	P2017/2961/FUL
Application type	Full Planning Application
Ward	Bunhill
Listed building	Adjacent to Grade II and Grade II* Listed Golden Lane Estate
Conservation area	Partly within St. Luke's Conservation Area and within 50m of Hat and Feathers Conservation Area
Development Plan Context	Site Allocation BC34 'Richard Cloudesley School' Central Activities Zone (CAZ) Core Strategy CS7 - Key Area Bunhill and Clerkenwell Moorfields Archaeological Priority Area Local Cycle routes St Luke's Conservation Area (northern part of the site) Within 50m of the Hat & Feathers Conservation Area Article 4 Direction (A1-A2)
Licensing Implications	None
Site Address	Former Richard Cloudesley School, Golden Lane, EC1Y 0TZ
Proposal	Demolition of the former Richard Cloudesley School, City of London Community Education Centre; garages and substation; erection of a 3 storey building with rooftop play area (Class D1) (2300.5 SQM GEA) and a single storey school sports hall (Class D1) (431 sqm GEA) to provide a two-form entry primary school; erection of a 14 storey building (plus basement) building to provide 66 social rented units (Class C3) (6135 sqm GEA), and affordable workspace (Class B1a) (244sqm GEA), landscaping and associated works.

Case Officer	Simon Greenwood
Applicant	Corporation of London
Agent	Montagu Evans – Mr Jon Bradburn

## 1. ASSESSING A CROSS-BOUNDARY PLANNING APPLICATION

- 1.1 Duplicate planning applications for the whole development have been submitted to Islington and to the City. Islington can only formally grant permission for that part of the application that falls within its administrative boundary (which is most of its site) and the City for the small part of the site which falls within its administrative boundary. Nevertheless, members should evaluate the whole application including that part in the City.
- 1.2 Town and Country Planning Act 1990 S70 provides that in dealing with a planning application the local planning authority should have regard to the development plan, any local finance consideration and any other material considerations. Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act S38 (6) provides that where regard is to be had to the Development Plan the determination should be in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. Members should evaluate the whole application on the basis of the council's development plan with the status conferred by S38(6) and should take into account the City's development plan in respect of the whole development as material considerations along with the City's observations.
- 1.3 If both authorities grant planning permission, then each authority will grant permission for that part of the development that is within its administrative boundary and the development will be governed by the two permissions.

## 2. SUSTAINABILITY, RENEWABLE ENERGY AND ENERGY EFFICIENCY

- 2.1 Thermal Insulation and Heat Loss: The applicant has commented that the U values currently used are all at the lower end of the industry standards and that the economic and practical impact of reducing the U values further will put a further strain on the project. The current U values and design solutions deliver in excess of 40% reduction in regulated carbon emissions, however it is the unregulated carbon emissions (which we have no control over by design) that bring the overall total carbon emission down. The architects are looking to remove the combustible materials from the residential facades which presents a further challenge in relation to the U values.
- 2.2 The Council's Energy Advisor has commented that it is reasonable to proceed with the currently proposed U values for the residential building whilst the school building may still offer further opportunity for reductions.
- 2.3 District Heating and Cooling Networks: A full technical assessment of feasibility for connection to the Bunhill or Citigen District Energy Networks has not yet been completed. Details of peak heat loads have been provided but monthly heating and hot water are required in order to establish the feasibility or otherwise of connecting to the Bunhill or Citigen networks. It is therefore recommended that further information to establish the feasibility of connection is secured through the section 106 agreement. If it is demonstrated that connection is feasible then connection to a District Energy Network would be required through the Section 106 agreement and if it is demonstrated that it is not feasible then future proofing for future connection would be required (and is designed into the scheme with such a plant room located in the basement). Accordingly, it is recommended that Head of Term No. 8 within Appendix 1 (Recommendations) is amended as follows: *'Connection to a local energy network if further studies demonstrate feasibility or, if not currently feasible, future proofing for connection to a network if a viable opportunity arises in the future.'*

### 3. NOISE

3.1 Further representations have been received from the Golden Lane Residents Association in relation to the applicant's noise survey which are detailed as follows, with the responses from the applicant's noise consultants in italics:

- The approach to assessing playground noise within the noise assessment involved establishing a background ambient noise level and we have concerns regarding the methodology. Initially the assumed ambient noise level was 65dB which did not sound realistic so we asked the noise consultants to measure it, and they measured a 55db ambient sound level outside Basterfield House over the lunchtime period, which they have used as a baseline. They then used a formula to calculate the noise impact at Basterfield House using an assumed a figure of 75dB at the perimeter of the playground, based on previous measurements made on 6 October 2017 – a day when there were unusual noise events immediately adjacent to the measuring station. The consultants claim to have made allowances for this, but since the station was not manned, there is no way that they could confirm the noise source which this puts the baseline reading open in doubt.

*Noise consultant's response: As stated in the acoustic report, full audio recordings were obtained to allow investigation of measured sound levels where appropriate. To avoid increasing measured sound levels, noise events that were deemed to be unrepresentative of the sound climate of the area were excluded from the measurements used to undertake the assessment.*

- The noise assessment advised that the consultants had previously undertaken noise measurements of schools' playground areas and compiled a database of these noise data for use in similar noise assessments. At the edge of an external play area with a similar number of pupils, noise level was found to be around 75dB. After challenging the errors in the other variables the consultants reduced this figure arbitrarily, abandoning their own measurements and database and preferring a study of a Mr Weixong Wu in New York in 2006 which reduced the noise at the perimeter to 71dB. We consider that we are entitled to rely on the consultant's own analysis, since our interpretation of the report by Weixiong Wu is that it is not directly relevant to UK primary schools.

*Noise consultants response: Prior to the issue of the revised report a detailed review was undertaken of the source sound levels (which are based on historical data from previous measurements) and compared both with those used by peers and those within the study undertaken by Mr Weixong Wu. Following this review it was determined that a level of 75 dB  $L_{Aeq,1hour}$  was likely to be too high in the context of this application. A revised level of 71 dB  $L_{Aeq,1hour}$  was therefore chosen. PBA highlight that this is on the higher side of levels measured by Mr Weixong Wu during his study and is considered representative of the likely future noise levels associated with the use of the playgrounds.*

- The assessment carried out assumed a 25m distance from the playground to the windows of Basterfield House but when measured this distance was in fact 8.8m and this was corrected in the revised Noise Assessment (October 2017) and a 6dB compensating factor was applied to account for the fact that the windows to Basterfield House are recessed under balconies and no evidence provided to justify this figure. This is also an error as the bedroom windows at Basterfield House are not recessed, but are flush with the facade of the building.

*Noise consultant's response: As playground activities are to take place during the daytime, the assessment of impact is based on noise levels outside living rooms (i.e. the room most likely to be used at this time of day) which we understand to be set back.*

- All of these identified errors combine to give an unrealistically low impression of the noise impact. Using the same methodology but substituting the correct figures produces a result 13dB higher than the ambient noise level which would result in a 'noticeable and very disruptive change' resulting in an 'unacceptable adverse impact'.

3.2 A further response was received from the Golden Lane Residents Association which is summarised as follows, with the Noise Consultant's response in italics:

- No explanation given as to why the detailed review was required after the first Noise Assessment was prepared and we consider that it was because we had pointed out the errors in the first report. There are a number of similar schools nearby (Morelands, Prior Weston) with a similar, relevant acoustic environment which could have been used to take measurements rather than produce figures from an obscure overseas source, which is not directly comparable, to artificially improve their case.  
*Noise consultant's response: We undertake a continuous review of the sources and data on which we base our assessments to ensure consistency and accuracy in all of the work we undertake. A study which we had not previously been aware of indicated source noise levels which we considered to be more representative than those used in the original assessment. The assessment was therefore updated on this basis. Obtaining access to schools to undertake surveys not associated with an application is, in our professional experience, usually rejected by the school on safeguarding grounds. It is also standard practice across the industry to base assessments on sound level measurements undertaken by others, particularly where these are well documented and have been detailed in papers presented at industry conferences. We therefore stand by our results as an accurate and industry standard approach to calculating the noise impact that is likely to be generated by the continued use of the site as a school.*
- The balconies are unlikely to have any ameliorative effect on the noise reaching the windows. The balconies themselves provide no acoustic attenuation and in the majority of cases, and certainly for all but the highest storey, the noise from the playground is line-of-sight to the windows - recessed or not. If anything, the hard soffit of the balconies is likely to reflect noise towards the recessed windows.
- The applicants have provided no calculation to support their claim that the balconies reduce the noise reaching the windows by 6dB and if the applicants intend to continue to rely on this figure they should carry out site testing to establish the technical basis of this claim. In any case the majority of the windows are not recessed. We do not believe it is correct to rely on the design of neighbouring buildings for mitigation and it is primarily the responsibility of the applicants to prove that the noise emanating from their proposed development will not cause an unacceptable adverse effect.  
*Noise consultant's response: With respect to the loss provided by the balconies and the sketch provide by GLERA whilst we do not consider it to be strictly necessary, if concerns remain with respect to noise impact on the residents the boundary fence to Basterfield Road surrounding the main play area could be made imperforate. There is already a draft condition relating to the provision of a suitable acoustic screen to the Skygarden play areas and it is considered that this could be amended to include the main play area. (Officer note: it is not recommended that an acoustic barrier along*

*the southern boundary of the site be secured through a condition. Whilst an acoustic barrier would mitigate some of the noise there is a balance to be struck between noise mitigation and other impacts upon residential amenity. A 2m high acoustic barrier, for example, may mitigate some noise to the ground floor kitchens within Basterfield House but the noise would still be expected to carry upwards to accommodation on the upper floors. A higher acoustic barrier would have implications in terms of outlook from the Basterfield House flats and the daylight amenities of these dwellings.)*

- The suggestion that the impact of noise from the playground is only relevant to living room windows has no planning policy basis. Working hours are no longer 9-5 and many residents are on shift work patterns or work partly from home. Many, if not the majority of our residents are elderly, or disabled and are at home all day long. The design of the flats and maisonettes at Golden Lane are largely open-plan which was an intentional part of the original plan form. It is not possible to limit noise from spreading throughout the entire flat and the implication would be that parts of our homes would be no-go zones at certain times of the day.
- For ventilation purposes the windows of Basterfield House were designed with permanent ventilation gaps all round them that cannot be closed entirely. They are single glazed. There is no way to prevent whatever noise comes from outside from entering our homes. It would be possible to replace the windows facing the site with sealed double-glazed units to reduce the effect of the noise, but we understand this is not something that the applicants have offered to do. It would have been possible for the applicants to have sited the playground away from the homes, or to have proposed acoustic mitigation measures, or increasing the vestigial landscaping provision, but they have not done so.
- We wrote to the Environmental Health Officer at the City of London in connection with this application and asked him to review the acoustic report, but he has not done so, which is disappointing as there is no independent review of the technical merits of the report. Given the numerous errors to date, the rather crude method of calculation and the repeated attempts to manipulate the results we have no confidence that the report by Peter Brett Associates has provided an accurate assessment of the impact of the school playground on the adjacent residential properties, and what evidence it does provide, proves that the impact of the noise will have an unacceptable adverse effect.
- Measurements should be taken at one of the comparable nearby two-form entry primary schools to establish a baseline for noise levels at the perimeter of the playground and acoustic computer modelling of the environment should be undertaken to assess the impact of the noise from the playground on all the homes adjacent to the proposed development.

3.3 The Council's Public Protection Officer has provided a further response as follows:

*'People noise is more difficult to model than say an item of mechanical plant which is lab tested and emits a certain sound pressure level. There are a number of variables such as number of people, age, gender, type of activities undertaken, layout etc which will all affect the overall sound level at a certain location. The sound level will vary from day to day. For an assessment of the impact we would look for a model based upon valid data and assumptions. There is no direct guidance on assessment of people noise or playground usage such as a British Standard. There is guidance produced by the Institute of Acoustics/Association of Noise Consultants but this is targeted at providing a suitable acoustic environment for children to learn ("Acoustics of Schools: A design guide") in line with Building Regs.*

The PBA report is based upon the data from the “Development of Noise Assessment Method for School Playground Noise” Weixiong Wu paper (Inter-Noise 2006). This paper has been used as a basis for other reports and in the absence of a guidance document appears a reasonable approach to adopt. The study was undertaken at schools in New York with the following values at the boundary of the playground attributed to different age group facilities:

School Types	Leq dB(A)
Early Childhood Center	71.5
Elementary School	71.4
Intermediate School	71.0
High School	68.2

Source: Weixiong Wu, AKRF Inc., Development of Noise Assessment Method for School Playground Noise, December 2006.

This is further broken down into an hour by hour approach reflecting the changes over the day, with the table reproduced in Table 8.3 of the report.

Looking at the impact, the report has used Table 8.2, taken from the IEMA guidance (and from HS2) below. This looks at impacts over a 16 hour day or 8 hour night.

Change in Sound Level (dB)	Magnitude of Impact	Perception from Increase	Increasing Effect Level
0	No Change	Not Noticeable	No Observed Effect
0.1-2.9	Negligible	Noticeable and not intrusive	No Observed Adverse Effect
3-4.9	Minor	Noticeable and intrusive	Observed Adverse Effect
5-9.9	Moderate	Noticeable and disruptive	Significant Observed Adverse Effect
10+	Major	Noticeable and very disruptive	Unacceptable Adverse Effect

In terms of the impact, the impact for the residents to the west, south and east vary over the day, with the highest impact during the lunch time break when all pupils will be outside (weather permitting). The stated changes and effect descriptions are based upon a 16 hour day and 8 hour night. With the summary of assessment results in Table 8.5 of the report it is noted that these comparisons are against the one hour ambient sound level. This has to be taken in context - the one hour time period will not take into account the shortened school day (and term holiday times). It is also noted that the site has been a school previously and some school activity noise would have been part of the soundscape here.

The Golden Lane Estate Residents’ Association comments of 12<sup>th</sup> February, using their own calculations, state that sound levels at Basterfield House would be 13dB higher than the ambient noise level. Again this is looking at a one hour period during the noisiest school activity (i.e. the lunch time break) rather than looking at the whole day period. In the case of the residential properties adjacent to the playground there will be periods when noise levels



*exceed the ambient sound levels, however when considered in context, short periods of noise above these thresholds is normally considered acceptable given that these are for limited periods during weekdays only and only occurring during term time. This will be the case with many school sites in urban areas. Officer note: an additional condition is recommended to prevent out of hours use of the school playground.*

*The Basterfield House flats are two storey maisonettes with the entrance door and kitchens on the lower floor and bedrooms/bathrooms on the upper floor facing onto the site. Living rooms and balconies/garden spaces, where the ordinary resident would be during the day, face onto the internal courtyard. The flats have full balconies for the kitchens and partial balconies for the bedrooms, as indicated below. This will provide some screening of the school playground noise. The report uses a 6dB figure. It's difficult to put a number on this as it will depend on the position but a common rule of thumb is a 5dB reduction for a screen that partially obscures the line of sight to the noise source. Where the bedroom window is flush then no reduction should be assumed.*

Basterfield House northern elevation



*Sounds must also be considered in their context rather than purely as a decibel figure. Some sounds due to their character are more likely to annoy people than others. We have had complaints in relation to a number of MUGAs in Islington used for private hire five a side football (shouting, screaming, swearing, balls slamming against fences, anti-social behaviour etc.) outside of school times in the evening and at weekends. I'm not aware of any complaints listed against typical school playground usage. The 1993 BRE paper "Effects of environmental noise on people at home" described the typical reaction to the sound of children and laughter as "enjoyed, appreciated or welcomed".*

- 3.4 Having regard to the above, the conclusions relating to noise at paragraphs 11.308-11.310 of the committee report remain applicable.

## 4. FIRE SAFETY

4.1 The application is accompanied by a Fire Strategy File Note which includes the following points:

### Residential building

- The evacuation strategy for the residential accommodation will adopt a 'stay put' or 'defend in place' approach. This is where a stand-alone detection and alarm system is proposed within each flat and every individual flat has an independent means of escape (irrespective of a fire occurring in a neighbouring flat or any other flat within the residential building). All other ancillary areas within the residential building are to be evacuated simultaneously.
- The 'stay put' approach is in accordance with current legislation under Approved Document B as well as BS9991. The benefits of this are as follows:
  - High level of compartmentation is a requirement as part of the 'stay put' approach and aids in either containing the fire or allowing it to burn out.
  - Without the 'stay put' policy, we would expect the whole building to evacuate which would be disruptive and impractical as the building would need to be designed to cater for this evacuation strategy.
  - Fire service intervention would be hindered as the fire service may clash with those attempting to leave the building. The building serves floors >18m and thus a fire-fighting shaft (inclusive of a fire main) is required to help with fire service access in getting to higher floor levels more quickly. The building serves floors >30m and thus a form of Automatic Water Fire Suppression systems (AWFSS) are required.
- The base requirement for insulation in buildings in excess of 18m is limited combustibility, however we will be strongly recommending that the insulation be non-combustible.
- The provision of a single stair core is in line with all current guidance and considered reasonable based on the points above including extensive compartmentation, balcony approaches and ventilation to the fire-fighting lobby & stair.

### School

- The guidance of BS 9999 where the only fire-engineering involved is fire service vehicle access to the school – this does not mean there is no access into the site, it is just not in accordance with the tender reversing distance of 20m (currently measured to be 53m) which is mentioned within all guidance documents. This is to be discussed with the Statutory Approvers at the next stage of design.
- There is no requirement to provide sprinklers within the school building but these are being proposed.

4.2 The Golden Lane Resident's Association have made a representation raising concerns in relation to the Fire Strategy. The applicant has provided a response which provides the following additional clarification regarding the evacuation strategy:

*'The evacuation strategy for the residential accommodation will adopt a 'stay put' or 'defend in place' approach. This is where a stand-alone detection and alarm system is proposed within each flat and every individual flat has an independent means of escape (irrespective of a fire occurring in a neighbouring flat or any other flat within the residential building). All other ancillary areas within the residential building are to be evacuated simultaneously.'*



*The current single stair is designed as part of the firefighting shaft. This staircase will also be used for means of escape, where it is expected only the fire affected residential flat to evacuate and escape. This strategy is uses BS 9991:2015 in complying with Building Regulations Part B and has followed the guidance within this document.'*

4.3 Specific comments made by the Golden Lane Resident's Association and the response from the applicant is detailed as follows:

- GLERA note that the Design and Access Statement Addendum (October 2017) states that the design is 'in line with BS9991' - we would hope that the design was fully compliant with BS9991  
*Applicant response: The residential accommodation is in line with guidance of BS 9991:2015 whilst the School is in line with BS 9999: 2017 - both British Standard guidance documents serves to satisfy Building Regulations Part B, where there are deviations from the guidance these have been highlighted within the report and fire engineered justifications have been given (fire engineering is an alternative approach in satisfying Building Regulations Part B for which approvals from the approving bodies is required, where fire engineering is used is often to provide flexibility to the design).*
- Internal layout: There is no door on the kitchen within the flats - they have an open plan layout. Application mentions that there has had to be fire engineering for this but no details are provided. The maisonettes should have a protected staircase under BS9991 2015.  
*Applicant response: Internal Layouts will be required to achieve Building Control sign off and will therefore include door separation between corridor/kitchen areas and corridor/living room areas. Officer note: is recommended that these measures are secured through an additional condition.*
- Basement: A common staircase should not be extended down to a basement - there should be a separate stair down to the basement. BS9991 2015: 30.2 Single stair buildings: 'If a stair forms part of the only escape route from an upper storey or part thereof, the stair should not continue down to the basement'.  
*Applicant response: The proposed break in the staircase on ground floor level allows for adequate separation in breaking the staircase. This solution is recognised within the new BS 9999:2017 where there would be a 0.4m<sup>2</sup> permanently ventilated lobby approach into the staircase on basement level. These provisions significantly reduce the spread of smoke from the basement affecting the final means of escape and upper levels.*
- Automatic Opening Vent (AOV): The stair lobby would need an AOV at each level, and this should be on the opposite side from the deck access. However, since the deck access swaps to different sides of the building at the upper levels there is a risk that the AOV on the first floor would discharge beneath the access deck on the upper floors, which would not be a good idea.  
*Applicant response: The fire-fighting shaft requirements include a ventilated lobby – however in this case the open-deck arrangement provides a ventilated approach to the stair lobby in which the stair-lobby is treated as a sterile area, just as the staircase is treated as a sterile area. The addition of an AOV Window can be made to the stair lobby, however please note the main fire risk is associated with that of a flat – and all of these are approached via an open deck with no to little risk of any smoke being drawn into the stair lobby. The common areas i.e. stair lobby of the building is assumed to be kept sterile, we are not able to design for when this is considered not*

to be the case – as then one can say the same for a small single stair building (<11m in height) which is a code compliant situation where the single stair is treated as being non-sterile, this is just not something that can be designed for.

- **Wheelchair escape:** 10% of the flats (seven presumably) are designed as wheelchair accessible. Consideration should be given to the location of these flats as they may not be able to duck down beneath the windows of adjacent flats to pass them.  
*Applicant response: The current guidance documents in satisfying Building Regulations Part B does not recognise escape of disable occupants within a residential building. This is based on the 'defend in place' strategy, should there be a fire on the single escape route of the open deck approach – It is expected only the fire affected flat to evacuate. It should be noted there is no acknowledgement in the guidance documents in associating the action or someone's ability to 'ducking down' with the 1.1m fire rating requirement.*
- **External Storage:** No store or other fire risk should be erected externally on a balcony. In the current scheme the first floor maisonette still have bicycle storage outside on the deck. The Fire Strategy Draft Report has not been provided; only a summary. This leaves open questions regarding the means of escape and it is not clear what compromises may have been made in the design. We also question the wisdom of pushing ahead with a single staircase tower at this point, when building regulations in precisely this area are being actively reviewed by Dame Judith Hackett.  
*Applicant response: The basement cycle storage room has the capacity to store all of the bikes associated with the residential development. This will mean that the areas in front of the duplex units at level 1 will not be needed and are therefore not a designated storage area in any form. The space in front of the duplex units is designated as garden space, a break between the front door and the main access walkway.*

## 5. TRANSPORTATION AND HIGHWAYS

### 5.1 Cycle parking: paragraph 11.436 of the committee report is corrected as follows:

The cycle provision for the school/nursery has been based on an occupancy figures 420 students and 50 staff. The London Plan cycle parking standards identify nurseries in the same category as primary and secondary schools. However, nursery children have been excluded from the occupancy for the purposes of assessing cycle parking requirements on the basis that any bicycles used by Under 5s would likely be unsuitable for standard cycle racks or stands.

Islington's cycle parking standards for schools (generically) detailed at Appendix 6 of the Development Management Policies Document seek 1 per 7 staff and 1 per 10 students, which equates to 42 spaces for students and 7 spaces for staff and therefore a total requirement of 49 spaces.

Table 6.3 of the London Plan indicates that one long stay cycle parking space should be provided per 8 staff and one long stay space per 8 students which equates to a requirement for 6.25 spaces for staff and 52.5 spaces for which is a total of 59 spaces. One long stay space per 100 pupils is also required and this equates to a requirement for 4 short stay spaces. The ground floor plan indicates 60 spaces for the school use comprising 6 Sheffield stand hoops (12 spaces) at the school building entrance on Baltic Street East and 24 Sheffield stand hoops (48 spaces) at the pick-up/drop-off area inside the Golden Lane

entrance to the school. The provision of 60 spaces is in excess of Islington's requirements and the long stay requirements of the London Plan. Four Sheffield stand hoops (8 spaces) are proposed on the Golden Lane pavement which will provide some short stay provision for all of the proposed uses on the site.

- 5.2 Refuse arrangements: The Council's Waste Advisor has now reviewed the proposed refuse collection arrangements and advises that they are considered acceptable.
- 5.3 Controlled Parking Zone: It should be noted that Controlled Parking Zone C which covers Golden Lane has recently been changed and now enforces parking restrictions 24 hours per day with the exception of midnight to 6am on Sundays.
- 5.4 Car Free Development: Core Strategy Policy CS10(H) requires that new development is car-free which means that means that occupiers will have no ability to obtain car parking permits, except for parking needed to meet the needs of disabled people, with the exception of Islington residents who have held a permit for the previous 12 months. As noted at paragraph 11.421 the proposed development would be car free and this would be secured through recommended Head of Term No. 18 detailed in Appendix 1 (Recommendations) of the committee report.
- 5.5 The applicant's highways consultant has advised that the garages on the site which are presently being used for vehicle parking would be addressed as part of a review of an estate wide review of parking provision.
- 5.6 Disabled Car Parking: The Council's Traffic and Safety Manager has observed that the existing 'School Keep Clear' markings are approximately 55 metres in length along Golden Lane whilst the proposed school frontage on Golden Lane would be significantly reduced in width. Accordingly, there is capacity to reduce the extent of the 'School Keep Clear' marking to provide space for two Blue Badge disabled parking bays on Golden Lane in front of the residential block. The Council's Highways Officer has indicated that this approach is considered acceptable and that provided a minimum 29m 'School Keep Clear' marked area is retained, the provision of the disabled bays is implemented in such a manner as to cause no obstruction to the road, no increased danger to vulnerable road users or any decrease sight lines. The applicant's Transport Consultant has prepared a plan to indicate the location of the proposed Blue Badge parking bays and these would be secured through Head of Term No. 15 indicated at Appendix 1 (Recommendations) to be re-worded to state:
- Provision of 2 accessible (Blue Badge) parking bays with all costs to be borne by the developer with works to be carried out by the Council, including any TMOs.
- 5.7 The two existing disabled parking spaces within the garages on the application site will need to be provided within proximity of the residential unit. As such, the applicant's transport consultant has suggested that some spaces on Golden Lane (City side) could be converted to disabled parking, with other permit holders provided spaces elsewhere within the Estate, if needed. Accordingly, an additional Head of Term is recommended to require 'The relocation of two parking bays elsewhere within the Golden Lane Estate car parking areas'.
- 5.8 Servicing: The Council's highways engineer has commented that deliveries and refuse collections should be made outside of school start and finish times (i.e. between 10am and 3pm). The Council's highways engineer has also advised that no vehicles larger than a 7.5

tonne box van should service the school from Baltic Street West and that a banksman must be required to supervise 3 point turns on Baltic Street West by servicing vehicles. These measures and arrangements can be secured through the delivery and servicing plans which it is recommended be secured by condition and amendments to that condition wording to include these provisions are recommended. It is also recommended that measures to address cyclist safety during these vehicular movements are secured through the Delivery and Servicing Plan.

- 5.9 The Council's highways engineer does not raise any particular concerns in relation to the servicing arrangements for the proposed residential block on Golden Lane.
- 5.10 Baltic Street East school frontage: The Council's highways engineer has observed that the Baltic Street East entrance will serve the nursery and a guardrail and new 'School Warning' signs will be required on Baltic Street East/West. It is suggested that the existing motorcycle parking bay on Baltic Street West be removed and re-provided elsewhere in the vicinity to facilitate the provision of an informal crossing point to serve the nursery. These works would be secured through a Section 278 agreement.
- 5.11 Travel Plan: The Council's Traffic and Safety Manager has commented that the School Travel Plan is considered acceptable from a highway and pedestrian safety point of view.
- 5.12 Transport Assessment: The applicant's transport consultant has provided a response to comments from objectors stating that the Transport Assessment should be based upon real data for existing pupils at COLPAI rather than modelling data. The existing school is at Rheidol Terrace and therefore doesn't represent the travel patterns that are predicted for this site. It is therefore stated that the consultants reviewed Travel in London (TfL data source) Islington travel for education purposes in Islington and modified it based on the proposed site conditions. It is also state that a full trip generation for residential purposes will be conducted as part of the conditioned Delivery and Servicing Plan.

## **6. DAYLIGHT AND SUNLIGHT TO PROPOSED RESIDENTIAL ACCOMMODATION**

- 6.1 The applicant has submitted a Daylight and Sunlight to Proposed Dwellings report to demonstrate the daylight and sunlight amenity within the proposed residential units. The report identifies that, despite the presence of the balconies, the daylight results are good. All living/dining rooms, shallow Lounge-Kitchen-Diners (LKDs) and 95% of bedrooms met the relevant Average Daylight Factor (ADF) target. The deep LKDs with their kitchen areas at the rear of the rooms would not meet their ADF target, but when the living dining areas are tested in isolation, 24 of the 26 rooms met the relevant ADF target.
- 6.2 The availability of sunlight is affected by the presence of balconies and orientation. The west elevation faces south of due west so has better potential for sunlight availability than the east elevation. The majority of main living areas have been located on the west side of the building and meet the BRE targets for winter Annual Probable Sunlight Hours (APSH), falling short of the total APSH targets due to the shading effect of the balconies.
- 6.3 Overall, it is considered that the report demonstrates that the proposed residential units will benefit from satisfactory levels of daylight and sunlight amenity which would contribute towards an overall high standard of residential accommodation.

## **7. FURTHER REPRESENTATIONS**

- 7.1 4 further objections and 4 further representations in support have been received which reiterate comments detailed within the committee report. One objection criticises the committee report in relation to the assessments of children's play space, the need for the school, the siting of the school hall and the layout of the residential building. A representation in support of the proposal advises that it has been submitted on behalf of 100+ parents of the school and reiterates comments regarding high quality design of the proposal, the need for the school and housing, the success of the school to date, the efficient use of the site and the implications of a delay in the delivery of the school.

## **8. REVISED PLANS**

- 8.1 The Golden Lane Estate Resident's Association identified errors on the application plans relating to the staircases to the residential block which do not line up between the ground floor and the first floor. The applicant has commented that there are three flights of stairs from the ground floor to first floor and two flights of stairs from the first floor upwards. Revised plans were received on 16 February 2018 to correctly indicate this arrangement.

## **9. COMMUNITY EDUCATION CENTRE**

- 9.1 Appendix 1 (Recommendations) indicates that an update will be provided in relation to Head of Term No. 5 securing the relocation of the Community Education Centre facilities. The City of London have confirmed that works to deliver the re-provided facilities within the Golden Lane Community Centre will be completed in April 2018. Advice regarding a timescale for the facilities within the business library has not been received at the time of writing. Accordingly, it is recommended that the re-provided facilities are secured through the Section 106 agreement. In the event that the replacement facilities are delivered prior to the completion of the Section 106 agreement this requirement will fall away.

## **10. DAYLIGHT AND SUNLIGHT ASSESSMENT**

- 10.1 A formatting error has occurred after paragraph 11.280 of the committee report and the images are correctly presented below.

North facing elevation –  
Hatfield House



Bedroom windows – flush (not obstructed) each serving different flats.

Bathroom windows – do not require assessment

Kitchen windows – recessed beneath projecting balconies

South facing elevation -  
Hatfield House



Bathrooms (don't require testing)

Bedrooms

Reception rooms  
(projecting pillars and recessed)