

London Borough of Islington

Planning Sub Committee B - 28 June 2016

Minutes of the meeting of the Planning Sub Committee B held at Committee Room 4, Town Hall, Upper Street, N1 2UD on 28 June 2016 at 7.30 pm.

Present: **Councillors:** Alice Donovan, Robert Khan, Una O'Halloran, Angela Picknell and Nick Ward.

Councillor Alice Donovan in the Chair

222 INTRODUCTIONS (Item A1)

Councillor Donovan welcomed everyone to the meeting. Members of the Sub-Committee and officers introduced themselves. The Chair explained that the Sub-Committee would deal with the determination of planning applications and outlined the procedures for the meeting.

223 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE (Item A2)

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Chowdhury.

224 DECLARATIONS OF SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS (Item A3)

Councillor O'Halloran substituted for Councillor Chowdhury.

225 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST (Item A4)

There were no declarations of interest.

226 ORDER OF BUSINESS (Item A5)

The order of business was B2, B1, B5, B3 and B4.

227 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING (Item A6)

RESOLVED

That the minutes of the meeting held on the 10 May 2016 be confirmed as an accurate record of proceedings and the Chair be authorised to sign them.

228 35-53 BRITANNIA ROW, LONDON, N1 8QH (Item B1)

Creation of eight new residents units (3 x 3 bed, 5 x 2 bed) comprising of new third and fourth floors including roof terraces at fourth floor and the addition of 440m² (B1) office floor space in a part 2, part 3 storey extension over the existing yard area and the excavation of a basement for service facilities for the building and associated external alterations. (P2015/3451/FUL)

Noted the officer comment that there was a typing error in the report at paragraph 10.20, page 24, line 8 and the sentence should read 'the proposal would not result in detrimental impact.

It was also noted that the s106 would allow basement parking for the commercial element of the development and not the residential element.

In the discussion the following points were made:-

- Noted that the terrace over the mission hall was for commercial use and the applicant agreed to accept a condition to have no opening windows on the side to prevent public nuisance.
- Noted the previous permission approved in 2013 and that this scheme did not change overlooking from the permission already granted.
- The development would not provide affordable workspace as planning policies did not apply in this instance.
- It was considered that, given the scale of the development and distances to adjoining properties, together with the orientation of the building, a sunlight/daylight report was not required.

RESOLVED

1. That planning permission be granted subject to the conditions, informatives and s106 as detailed in the report including basement parking to be for commercial use only and an additional condition requiring non-opening windows to the flat roof area of the mission hall. Wording to be delegated to officers and appended to the minutes.
2. That future reports detail the reasons why affordable workspace is not applicable when necessary.

229

98A SEVEN SISTERS ROAD, LONDON, N7 6AE (Item B2)

Erection of a first floor full width rear extension and formation of roof terrace at rear first floor level with associated aluminium ballustrades. (P2016/0336/FUL).

In the discussion the following points were made:-

- A full width extension was situated at 100-102 Seven Sisters Road which did not have planning permission but was lawful under the four year rule for enforcement action. This should be a consideration in the determination of the application although the Committee could consider that this existing extension was harmful in visual terms.
- The extension did not maintain a distance of 18m from neighbouring properties which was against planning policy.
- The concerns of the objectors regarding overlooking and any screening used on the terrace would need to be 1.8 m in height which would add to the bulk of the extension.

Councillor Ward proposed a motion to refuse the application which was seconded by Councillor Khan.

RESOLVED that planning permission be refused for the reasons of scale and bulk and overlooking, drafted by officers and agreed in consultation with the Chair.

230

JUNCTION ROAD (LAND OPPOSITE 12 JUNCTION ROAD), JUNCTION ROAD, LONDON, N19 5QT (Item B3)

Installation of a freestanding internally illuminated advertisement display panel (6 sheet) on the pavement opposite 12 Junction Road. (P2015/5098/ADV)

In the discussion the following points were made:-

- The display panel would be in line with the existing telephone box.

- A number of conditions had been agreed with TfL.
- Contracts would require that there would be only appropriate advertising on display.

RESOLVED that advertisement consent be granted subject to the conditions and informative set out in the report.

231 LAND AT INTERSECTION OF CALEDONIAN ROAD, HILMARTON ROAD AND NORTH ROAD, 42 NORTH ROAD, LONDON, N7 (Item B4)

Installation of a freestanding internally illuminated advertisement display panel (6 sheet) on the pavement at the corner of Caledonian Road, Hillmarton Road and North Road.
(P2015/4852/ADV)

In the discussion the following points were made:-

- There was a distance of three metres from the advertising hoarding to the kerb.

RESOLVED that advertisement consent be granted subject to the conditions and informative set out in the report.

232 UNIT 10, ROMAN WAY INDUSTRIAL ESTATE, 149 ROMAN WAY, LONDON, N7 8XH (Item B5)

Retention of four boiler flues and seven silencers to the roof of the commercial unit.
(P2015/3131/FUL)

In the discussion the following points were made:-

- This was a retrospective application as silencers had been installed to reduce noise emissions from the ventilation equipment.
- Planning permission was not required for the use of the laundry as the lawful use of the premises was light industrial but was required for the unauthorised silencers..
- There had been no restriction of hours on the original consent for light industrial use.
- If the silencers were removed, action would be required for the noise nuisance.
- The comment by the objectors that, although the noise nuisance had decreased with the installation of some silencers, the premises were operating 18 to 20 hours per day and there was a constant hum of noise throughout the night which caused disturbance.

Councillor Khan proposed a motion that was seconded by Councillor Donovan.

RESOLVED that this application be deferred for officers to explore alternative options.

The meeting ended at 9.00 pm

CHAIR

233 WORDING DELEGATED TO OFFICERS (Item)

Minute 228

35-53 Britannia Row, N1 8QH

Additional condition.

Notwithstanding the hereby approved plans, no permission is granted for the creation of a roof terrace at second floor level to the Old Mission Hall Building as outlined on approved plan numbers: 317/A 104/G and 317/A108 G.

The flat roof area shall not be accessed by any openable windows and shall not be used as any form of amenity space or sitting out space in relation to the commercial use of the property into perpetuity.

Reason- In order to safeguard the amenity levels of adjoining occupiers.

Minute 229

98 Seven Sisters Road, N7 6AE

Reasons for refusal.

Reason: The proposed first floor rear extension and rear first floor roof terrace and associated ballustrades by reason of their excessive design, scale, bulk and massing is considered to form an overdominant and visually detrimental feature when seen from the surrounding private realm. The addition would fail to be a subservient and harmonious addition to the host building and wider terrace setting. The proposed development is considered to have a clear detrimental visual impact and is therefore considered to be contrary to London Plan 2015 Policies 7.4 & 7.6, CS policy 8 & 9, DM policy 2.1 and Islington's Urban Design Guidance 2006.

Reason: The proposed design, scale, footprint and prominent location of the proposed first floor rear roof terrace is considered to give rise to an unacceptable detrimental amenity impact on the rear habitable windows of adjoining properties behind the site along 18 to 28 Mayton Street in terms of loss of privacy and overlooking incidences. The proposed development is considered to be contrary to DM policy 2.1 and Islington's Urban Design Guidance 2006.