#### London Borough of Islington

# Planning Sub Committee B - 2 October 2018

Minutes of the meeting of the Planning Sub Committee B held at Committee Room 4, Town Hall, Upper Street, N1 2UD - Islington Town Hall on 2 October 2018 at 7.30 pm.

**Present:** Councillors: Kay (Chair), Chapman (Vice-Chair), Khondoker, Klute

and Convery (Substitute) (In place of Woolf)

# Councillor Jenny Kay in the Chair

# 11 INTRODUCTIONS (Item A1)

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

## 12 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE (Item A2)

Apologies were received from Councillor Woolf.

# 13 DECLARATIONS OF SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS (Item A3)

Councillor Convery substituted for Councillor Woolf.

# 14 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST (Item A4)

Councillor Klute declared that in relation to Item B5, the applicant was a constituent he had done casework for regarding noise from the nearby pub.

#### 15 ORDER OF BUSINESS (Item A5)

The order of business would be B7, B1 and B2, B8, B5, B6, B3, B9 and B4.

# 16 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING (Item A6)

#### **RESOLVED:**

That the minutes of the meeting held on 17 July 2018 be confirmed as an accurate record of proceedings and the Chair be authorised to sign them.

# 17 <u>1 BERRY PLACE, ISLINGTON, LONDON EC1V 0JD (Item B1)</u>

Installation of proposed plant equipment (2 no. air conditioning units) above existing flat roof at second floor level (first floor roof) including associated screening and other works.

(Planning application number: P2018/1799/FUL)

In the discussion the following points were made:

- Concern was raised about the air conditioning units being turned on at 6.30am. The
  noise officer stated that mitigation measures would be put in place. An enclosure
  would be placed around the units and they would only be permitted to operate at
  85% capacity which would limit noise.
- Concern was raised that details of the screening had not been provided. The planning officer advised that there was a condition relating to materials, the air conditioning units were set back by 1.7m and would be partially visible but obscured.

- The applicant stated that the units were turned on at 6.30am as workers were in the building at that time due to it being an international advertising agency.
- Concern was raised about this being a retrospective planning application and about the lack of communication with residents. The applicant stated that the units had been installed and had been in operation for several months but there was currently no screening.
- In response to a question as to why air conditioning units were required, the applicant stated that they were heat pumps that provided hot water and heating but they could cool too.

Councillor Klute proposed a motion to defer the consideration of this item to enable a site visit and the applicants to provide more details on the screening. This was seconded by Councillor Convery and carried.

## **RESOLVED:**

That consideration of this item be deferred for the reasons outlined above.

## 18 1 BERRY PLACE, ISLINGTON, LONDON EC1V 0JD (Item B2)

Installation of two air conditioning units within an enclosure, located on the first floor flat roof on the eastern side of the property.

(Planning application number: P2016/4705/FUL)

In the discussion the following points were made:

- Concern was raised about the air conditioning units operating 24 hours a day, 7
  days a week. The noise officer stated that an enclosure would be placed around the
  units.
- Concern was raised that details of the screening had not been provided. The
  planning officer advised that there was a condition relating to materials, the air
  conditioning units were set back by 1.7m, would be partially visible but obscured.
- Concern was raised about this being a retrospective planning application and about the lack of communication with residents. The applicant stated that the units had been installed and had been in operation for several months but there was currently no screening.
- In response to a question as to why air conditioning units were required, the applicant stated that they were heat pumps that provided hot water and heating but they could cool too. There was a server room which had to be kept cool. A member suggested that server rooms were no longer required with modern technology.

Councillor Klute proposed a motion to defer the consideration of this item to enable a site visit and the applicants to provide more details on the screening. This was seconded by Councillor Convery and carried.

#### **RESOLVED:**

That consideration of this item be deferred for the reasons outlined above.

# 19 1-42 SALTDENE, 2 REGINA ROAD, LONDON, N4 3PR (Item B3)

Replacement of existing single glazed timber windows with UPVC double glazing.

(Planning application number: P2016/4705/FUL)

In the discussion the following points were made:

 Concern was raised that the sizes of the new window frames had not been included in the application. The applicant stated this would be done for future applications.

The application was policy compliant.

### **RESOLVED:**

That planning permission be granted subject to the conditions and informative set out in Appendix 1 of the officer report.

## 20 147 GROSVENOR AVENUE, LONDON N5 2NH (Item B4)

Erection of a full width lower ground floor extension, part width ground floor rear infill extension and a part width first floor rear extension. Conversion of the extended property into 6 residential units (1x2 bed unit, 3x2 bed units and 2x3 bed units).

(Planning application number: P2015/3543/FUL)

In the discussion the following points were made:

- In response to a member's concern that the viability report was completed a number of years ago and following a review in 2017 and 2018 had remained the same, the planning officer advised that the internal viability officer was satisfied with the independent viability report.
- The approved plans list referred to some drawings which were no longer relevant so these would be removed.

#### **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.

## 21 186A NEW NORTH ROAD, LONDON, N1 7BJ (Item B5)

Alteration to the existing 1 bedroom dwelling house located at the rear of 186 New North Road including internal alterations, construction of a new roof, provision of an internal courtyard and alterations to the façade.

(Planning application number: P2018/0246/FUL)

In the discussion the following points were made:

- The planning officer stated that an additional objection had been received. The only new point raised in this was that granting permission would affect the nearby pub but this was not a planning consideration.
- In response to a member's question about why the prohibition order had been included with the papers, the planning officer advised this was for background information.
- In response to a member's question about implications if, after granting permission, the building was demolished and rebuilt, the planning officer advised that the land use had been established and related to the volume of the building rather than the building. The quality of the accommodation had never been assessed and the application was seeking to improve the living conditions.

# **RESOLVED:**

That planning permission be granted subject to the conditions and informatives set out in Appendix 1 of the officer report.

## 22 23 ROMILLY ROAD, LONDON, N4 2QY (Item B6)

Creation of a basement extension under the footprint of the existing house including the formation of light wells to the front and rear of the property. Conversion of the existing

single-family dwelling house into two self-contained flats (1 x 3 bedroom unit and 1x 2 bedroom unit).

(Planning application number: P2017/1670/FUL)

In the discussion the following points were made:

- A member asked the planning officer whether policy resisted the splitting up of family homes. The planning officer stated that Policy DM3.3 protected homes of less than 125sqm but this home was larger than 125sqm. The member raised concern that the original home was less than 125sqm but had been extended to over 125sqm through permitted development.
- The planning officer stated that a flooding and groundwater investigation report had been completed and it would be appropriate to defer the application to update the structural method statement accordingly. Changes to the basement design could be required.

Councillor Kay proposed a motion to defer the application to enable to structural method statement to be updated. This was seconded by Councillor Klute and carried.

# **RESOLVED:**

That consideration of this item be deferred for the reason outlined above.

# 23 440 A HORNSEY ROAD, LONDON, N19 4EB (Item B7)

Demolition of existing warehouse buildings and erection of a mixed use development comprising 490m² of commercial floorspace (Use Class B1) contained within a two storey building with basement level and a further two storey building (no basement level) to create 3 x two storey residential dwellings comprising 2 x 2 bed and 1 x 3 bed (Use Class C3), access gate, landscaping, pv panels, refuse and bike facilities and associated alterations.

(Planning application number: P2017/5001/FUL)

In the discussion the following points were made:

- The planning officer stated that Paragraph 4.6 of the officer report should state that Unit 1 would be 44sqm, Unit 2 would be 30sqm and Unit 3 would be 30sqm.
- A member raised concern that the eastern wall that would be lowered was a party wall and the adjoining owners might not agree. The planning officer confirmed that if the wall was not lowered, there would be a greater sense of enclosure.
- The daylight and sunlight implications were discussed and the planning officer stated that the neighbours' windows comfortably passed the daylight and sunlight tests
- In response to a member's question, the planning officer advised that the refuse collectors were satisfied with the refuse storage and collection arrangements.
- A construction management plan and an environmental plan were required.
- The appeal decision had focussed on poor quality residential accommodation. This had now been improved.

#### **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 contributions for affordable housing, carbon offsetting contributions and securing a car free development as set out in Appendix 1 of the officer report.

## 24 18 ½ SEKFORDE STREET, LONDON, EC1R 0HL (Item B8)

Partial demolition of the rear courtyard wall and the insertion of a new gate to access the communal garden space and associated landscaping.

(Planning application number: P2017/4174/FUL and P2017/4227/LBC)

In the discussion the following points were made:

- In response to a member's question as to why the application was recommended for approval when a similar application had been refused in 2003 and confirmed by the inspector in 2005, the planning officer advised that local and national policy had been changed and removing the 1970s part of the wall would have a heritage benefit.
- The building which had been a previous bank, was now a family home and had C3 residential use.
- The legal advisor stated that if granted permission, there was a condition that a
  relevant agreement about the access rights would be agreed between the
  landowner, who happened to be the Council and the residents of 18½ Sekforde
  Street. If no agreement was reached, the planning permission could not be
  implemented.
- In response to a question from a member, the legal advisor stated that if the planning permission was restricted to individuals, there would have to be a reason.
- The planning officer considered that the heritage benefits outweighed the creation of a door in the wall.
- A member stated that if every residential property backing on to the garden had access to it, it would be unfair not to grant access to one more residential property.

#### **RESOLVED:**

That planning permission and listed building consent be granted subject to the conditions set out in Appendix 1 of the officer report.

## 25 EASYHOTEL HOUSE, 80 OLD STREET, LONDON, EC1V 9AZ (Item B9)

Change of use of the existing ground floor Use Class A1/A3 retail/café/restaurant unit (163 square metres GIA) to Use Class C3 (hotel) to accommodate 7 additional hotel rooms and separate hotel reception area along with the creation of a new external entrance to the ground floor façade, as well as a change of use of existing ground floor hotel and office reception (Use Class B1(a)/C3) to a separate office reception area (Use Class B1(a)).

(Planning application number: P2018/1744/FUL)

In the discussion the following points were made:

- The applicant requested that the 4 months referred to in Condition 2 be extended to 7 months to enable all the works to be completed at the same time. He stated that use of the unauthorised hotel rooms had stopped.
- The planning officer stated that work should start sooner on the unauthorised rooms to ensure that they would not be used.
- The planning officer suggested that the wording of Condition 2 could be amended regarding the decommissioning of rooms and this could be delegated to officers.
- The application sought to improve the building by separating the office and hotel.

#### **RESOLVED:**

That planning permission be granted subject to the conditions set out in Appendix 1 of the officer report with the wording of Condition 2 being amended regarding the decommissioning of rooms and the wording of this to be delegated to officers.

The meeting ended at 10.35 pm

**CHAIR**