

London Borough of Islington

Planning Committee - 7 June 2018

Minutes of the meeting of the Planning Committee held at Council Chamber, Town Hall, Upper Street, N1 2UD - Islington Town Hall on 7 June 2018 at 7.30 pm.

Present: **Councillors:** Klute (Chair), Picknell (Vice-Chair), Kay (Vice-Chair),
Convery, Graham, Nathan, Khondoker, Chapman,
Cutler and Woolf
Also Present: **Councillors:** Ward

Councillor Martin Klute in the Chair

1 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.

2 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE (Item A2)

There were no apologies for absence.

3 DECLARATIONS OF SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS (Item A3)

There were no declarations of substitute members.

4 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST (Item A4)

There were no declarations of interest.

5 ORDER OF BUSINESS (Item A5)

The order of business would be as per the agenda.

6 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING (Item A6)

RESOLVED:

That the minutes of the meeting held on 23 April 2018 be confirmed as an accurate record of proceedings and the Chair be authorised to sign them.

7 APPOINTMENT OF PLANNING SUB-COMMITTEES (Item A7)

Members noted the tabled paper proposing the memberships of the Planning Sub-Committees.

RESOLVED:

- a) That the Sub-Committees be confirmed as five member Sub-Committees and the Terms of Reference be noted.
- b) That it be noted that the allocation of seats was determined in accordance with the advice in the report.
- c) That Councillors Picknell, Cutler, Convery, Nathan and Graham be appointed as members of Planning Sub-Committee A for the current municipal year or until their successors are appointed.

Planning Committee - 7 June 2018

- d) That Councillors Kay, Chapman, Klute, Kondoker and Woolf be appointed as members of Planning Sub-Committee B for the current municipal year or until their successors are appointed.
- e) That it be noted that Councillor Picknell had been appointed Chair of Planning Sub-Committee A and Councillor Kay had been appointed Chair of Planning Sub-Committee B for the current municipal year or until their successors are appointed.
- f) That Councillor Graham be appointed as Vice-Chair of Planning Sub-Committee A and Councillor Chapman be appointed as Vice-Chair of Planning Sub-Committee B for the current municipal year or until their successors are appointed.
- g) That it be noted that any member who was a member or substitute member of the Planning Committee could substitute at any meetings of either Sub-Committee if they had not been appointed as a member of the Sub-Committee.

8 N1 CENTRE AND CAR PARK [BASEMENT], PARKFIELD STREET, LONDON, N1 (Item B1)

Removal of the Angel Wings sculpture and kiosk, erection of a new kiosk and first floor bridge/outdoor restaurant seating area, and extended first floor balcony. Conversion of existing 100 space basement car park and reconfiguration of ground and basement level floorspace to provide a mix of retail units, including additional 1945sqm of flexible retail (A1) and leisure (D2) floorspace, retaining 27 parking spaces. Conversion and extension to first floor retail unit 5A (A1) to provide restaurant/café (A3). Partial demolition of 2 external staircases. Installation of first floor awnings. Partial external terracotta cladding and projecting windows to west elevation. Replacement hard and soft landscaping and associated works.

(Planning application number: P2017/2964/FUL)

In the discussion the following points were made:

- The planning officer advised of the following updates:
 - Condition 5 to be amended to enable details of (b) soft landscaping to be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to the commencement of external works
 - Condition 8 to be deleted;
 - Condition 26 to be amended to read,
“The public toilets within the development shall be open and available for use for the duration of the opening hours of the A1 (shops).”
 - Condition 29 to be deleted as the aspects were covered by Condition 15.
- In response to the chair’s question as to whether the scheme had been back to the Design Review Panel (DRP) since amendments were made, the planning officer advised that it had not been back, as the changes requested by the DRP were straight forward and were supported by planning and design and conservation officers.
- The planning officer confirmed that the outside space was designated as open space but was private land. The S106 required public access to be maintained but the space and Angel Wings sculpture belonged to the owners of the site.
- Members asked if the art work was required to be replaced with equivalent art work. This could be in terms of value, impact and quality. The planning officer advised that this could be a relevant factor and that the original agreement was sought to be amended which required a 1% spend of that original (1998) permission of the value of that development.
- The planning officer confirmed that officers had negotiated with the applicant on the Heads of Terms and the ones in the report had been agreed between the applicant and officers. However, the S106 had not yet been signed and could be amended.

Planning Committee - 7 June 2018

- In response to a member's question about landscaping, the planning officer stated that the site had limitations as it was above a car park so there were not many opportunities for new soft landscaping. It was proposed that planters would be used.
- A member asked whether wooden panels had been considered as a cladding material and the planning officer advised that a number of materials had been considered by the applicant and design officer. As timber and render did not age well, they were generally not supported on a large scale proposal. Terracotta was being proposed as it was a natural material.
- In response to a member's question about car parking accessibility, the planning officer reported that the proposals were based on a survey of existing use. At any time, no more than two accessible parking spaces were used. This figure was being doubled and £20,000 was being provided to improve accessibility elsewhere.
- The planning officer stated that the bridge would promote circulation, provide seating and mean the current dead end would be removed. The existing spiral staircase would be kept with the shape slightly amended.
- In response to a member's question about the DRP amendments regarding light, the planning officer advised that there had been a significant reduction in the width of the bridge and the overbearing, solid, unwelcoming kiosk would be replaced with a glazed kiosk. These measures would provide the outside space with more natural light.
- In response to a member's question, the planning officer advised that the proposed scheme would have more toilets than there were currently.
- A member raised concern that it was not known what the daylight/sunlight impact would be of the art work that would replace the Angel Wings. The planning officer advised that the proposed art work was subject to a separate planning application and this would be considered then.
- The applicants advised that they were trying to relocate the Angel Wings sculpture to another building in the Angel. They were currently unable to provide more information due to commercial sensitivity but would do their utmost to relocate the sculpture and would report progress to the council on a regular basis under one of the Heads of Terms.
- In response to a question from the chair about the meaning of "appropriate scale" in relation to the art work, the applicant's representative from the Contemporary Arts Society stated that the artist had been briefed to reference the existing halo artwork at the front of the shopping centre facing Upper Street. The artist was a renowned contemporary artist and the budget would be of a similar scale to the Angel Wings.
- In response to a member's question as to whether artificial grass would still be laid out in the summer, the applicant advised that it would continue to be laid out for events.
- The Chair stated that overall he considered that the development offered positive improvements. The committee had to consider whether the level of safeguarding for the Angel Wings sculpture was sufficient.
- The removal of car parking spaces was policy compliant.
- The proposed visual changes were good.
- A member raised concern that the design of the existing spiral staircase was not being changed and queried whether the bridge was required. He raised concern that the proposed art work seemed more like advertising than a piece of sculpture and suggested that the applicant could investigate whether it would be possible to raise the Angel Wings sculpture by 3 or 4 metres and put it on a building.
- The Angel Wings sculpture was perceived as a public landmark, had provided an identity for the Angel in the 20 years it had been in place and the sculpture was a striking, architectural piece with cultural significance. Objectors to the schemes wanted it retained on site or close by. The loss of the wings would undermine the sense of place of the Angel Town Centre.

Planning Committee - 7 June 2018

- More structural survey evidence should be provided as to why the Angel Wings sculpture could not be maintained on site.
- Evidence of the locations within the town centre that the applicant had examined with other landowners should be presented to the council.
- A mechanism should be sought to ensure that the Angel Wings sculpture was retained on site or near the site.
- The actual S106 wording regarding protection for the wings should be presented to the Planning Committee when this item was brought back for consideration.

Councillor Convery proposed a motion to defer the application. This was seconded by Councillor Klute and carried.

RESOLVED:

That consideration of the application be deferred for the following reasons:

- 1) To enable further investigation into the retention of the wings and structural evidence that demonstrated that the bridge could not be provided with the wings remaining
- 2) To require an agreement from applicants that the wings would not be removed until an alternative permanent location within the Angel area was identified
- 3) To enable the detailed wording of the S106 to be provided within the officer report (or the agreement appended in support of the application) when the scheme was next presented to the committee.
- 4) To address the following concerns:
 - There was concern that the existing Angel Wings was a local landmark for the area and had obtained a level of cultural significance. They supported the identity and permanent sense of place for the Angel Town Centre that the Angel Wings brought to the site. Their loss would undermine the sense of 'place' and identity established over the 20 years they have been in place. There was additional concern that the original legal agreement secured 1% of development value on public art and that the level of equivalence was not demonstrated by the alternative art strategy. In the event that the Wings were justified to be moved (into an alternative location within the Angel) a degree of equivalence of quality of art was currently lacking. Obligations should reflect the requirement for equivalence.

The meeting ended at 9.00 pm

CHAIR