

Planning Sub Committee A - 5 January 2016

Minutes of the meeting of the Planning Sub Committee A held at Committee Room 4, Town Hall, Upper Street, N1 2UD on 5 January 2016 at 7.30 pm.

Present: **Councillors:** Kat Fletcher (Chair), David Poyser (Vice-Chair), Jilani Chowdhury and Robert Khan
Also Present: **Councillors:** Osh Gantly and Caroline Russell

Councillor Kat Fletcher in the Chair

144 INTRODUCTIONS (Item A1)

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

145 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE (Item A2)

Apologies were received from Councillor Spall.

146 DECLARATIONS OF SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS (Item A3)

There were no declarations of substitute members.

147 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST (Item A4)

In relation to Agenda Item B2, Councillor Poyser declared that he was a member of the Highbury Fields Association.

148 ORDER OF BUSINESS (Item A5)

The order of business would be as per the agenda.

149 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING (Item A6)

RESOLVED:

That the minutes of the meeting held on 1 December 2015 be confirmed as an accurate record of proceedings and the Chair be authorised to sign them.

150 16 DOVE'S YARD, LONDON, N1 0HQ (Item B1)

The construction of a rear, single storey extension.

(Planning application number: P2015/4201/FUL)

In the discussion the following points were made:

- The planning officer advised that the designations outlined on page 22 should replicate those on page 9 of the officer report i.e. the site was in the Barnsbury Conservation Area, was in an Article 4.2 Area and was a local cycle route.
- The planning officer advised that the height of the proposed extension was 2.65m and not 3.65m as stated in the officer report.
- The planning officer advised that the roof of the proposed extension would be 0.3m higher than the boundary wall with Number 17 and the boundary wall would be increased to 2.5m in height.

Planning Sub Committee A - 5 January 2016

- The applicant outlined his personal circumstances and explained the proposed extension would provide additional living space to help meet the needs of his disabled sons.
- The planning officer confirmed that the permitted development rights were removed when the development was granted permission in 1993. This house was the first in the development to apply for planning permission for an extension.
- The previous application was for an extension the full depth of the garden. Although part of the reason for refusal was the height of the extension and the height remained the same in the current application, it was considered that the reduced depth of the extension meant that the height had less of an impact.
- The legal officer confirmed that exceptional personal circumstances could be taken into account and the sub-committee could decide what weight to give them.
- In response to concerns from objectors, the planning officer advised that if the hours of working exceeded those conditioned, residents could contact the council and enforcement action could be taken if necessary.
- In response to concerns from objectors about possible impact on the structural stability of the wall, the objector was advised this would be protected by the Party Wall Act.
- The planning officer advised that if the height of the extension was reduced in line with the suggestion of the objector, it could make the internal height of the extension too low and could cut across the existing door height.
- The application was policy compliant.
- The proposed extension was modest.
- Concern was raised about the unbroken nature of the terrace.
- The applicant's need was compelling.

RESOLVED:

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

[Postscript to Bullet Point 3 as agreed by the sub-committee at the meeting on 23 February 2016:

The measurements quoted in committee were inaccurate and the correct measurements of the north elevation were 2.6m (a combination of 2.4m wall and 0.2m roof segment) and that the south and rear elevation measured a maximum of 2.65m (a combination of 2.4m and 0.25m).]

151

HIGHBURY POOL, HIGHBURY CRESCENT, ISLINGTON, LONDON, N5 1RR (Item B2)

Single storey extension with pitched roof. Flat roof draught lobby box to the front. Double height extension sitting above the existing gym, spa and plant areas on Eastern side elevation.

(Planning application number: P2015/0386/FUL)

In the discussion the following points were made:

- The sub-committee considered the advice of the planning and design officers and the conservation officers that light coloured bricks should be used to give a lighter visual appearance to the first floor and also considered the objectors' suggestion that polyester powder coated aluminium should be used instead.
- In response to concerns from an objector, the planning officer confirmed that there was a condition that a landscaping scheme must be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Planning Sub Committee A - 5 January 2016

- An objector suggested that all doors on the plinth should be painted in colour RAL7032.
- The application was policy compliant.

Councillor Fletcher proposed a motion to amend condition 4 part i) to include the words "including bund". This was seconded by Councillor Khan and carried.

Councillor Fletcher proposed a motion to condition that all doors on the plinth should be painted in colour RAL7032. This was seconded by Councillor Khan and carried.

RESOLVED:

That planning permission be granted subject to the conditions and informatives set out in Appendix 3 of the officer report as amended by the conditions on pages 35 and 36 of the officer report and the conditions outlined above, the wording of which was delegated to officers.

WORDING DELEGATED TO OFFICERS

MINUTE 151

HIGHBURY POOL, HIGHBURY CRESCENT, ISLINGTON, LONDON, N5 1RR

Amended Condition 4 part i)

Any other landscaping feature(s), including bund, forming part of the scheme

The meeting ended at 8.25 pm

CHAIR