

Planning Committee - 9 February 2016

Minutes of the meeting of the Planning Committee held at Council Chamber - Town Hall on 9 February 2016 at 7.30 pm.

Present: **Councillors:** Robert Khan (Chair), Kat Fletcher (Vice-Chair), Martin Klute (Vice-Chair), Jilani Chowdhury, Paul Convery, Tim Nicholls, David Poyser and Marian Spall

Councillor Robert Khan in the Chair

172 INTRODUCTIONS (Item A1)

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

173 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE (Item A2)

Apologies were received from Councillor Donovan.

174 DECLARATIONS OF SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS (Item A3)

There were no substitute members.

175 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST (Item A4)

There were no declarations of interest.

176 ORDER OF BUSINESS (Item A5)

The order of business would be B2, B3, B1 and B4.

177 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING (Item A6)

RESOLVED:

That the minutes of the meeting held on 19 January 2016 be confirmed as an accurate record of proceedings and the Chair be authorised to sign them.

178 112-116 OLD STREET, LONDON, EC1V 9BD (Item B1)

Two storey roof level and single storey basement extensions to existing B1 office building; remodelling and extension to rear/side façade, replacement windows and shopfront to front façade and various interval alterations.

(Planning application number: P2015/4651/FUL)

In the discussion the following points were discussed:

- Discussions had taken place with the Design Review Panel about whether the original windows would have had crittal or wooden frames as currently there was a mixture. All parties had decided crittal would be best for the proposed window frames.
- The application was consistent with policy.

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.

179

119 FARRINGDON ROAD, LONDON, EC1R 3DA (Item B2)

Demolition and redevelopment of the existing office building (Class B1) to provide an 8 storey (plus lower ground floor), building with office use (Class B1) at part lower ground, part ground and upper floors and flexible commercial uses (Class A1, A3, D1) at part lower ground and part ground floor level along with associated landscaping and a new area of public realm.

(Planning application number: P2015/4143/FUL)

In the discussion the following points were made:

- The planning officer reported that Camden Council had objected to the application on design grounds as the proposed development would be seen from the nearby conservation area.
- The planning officer also reported that the council's Highways Officer had reviewed the amended pavement layout in front of 2-3 Crawford Passage and considered it to be safe and to accord with Highways' design requirements.
- The planning officer also advised that an additional planning condition was recommended to stipulate that no refuse vehicles or emergency vehicles should enter the application site's service yard.
- The number of years that peppercorn rent would be charged for the affordable workspace was considered. The officer stated that 10 years was the minimum outlined in Policy DM5.4. Following discussion with the applicant, the applicant confirmed this figure would be increased to 20 years.
- The removal of trees was discussed. The tree conservation officer supported the application. There would be an increase in the canopy and the replacement trees would be more mature than those proposed in the previous application.
- The addition of a pavement extension was welcomed.
- The increase in affordable workspace provision was welcomed.

Councillor Klute proposed a motion to include the pavement extension in the Section 106 agreement. This was seconded by Councillor Khan and carried.

Councillor Convery proposed a motion to increase the length of time peppercorn rents would be charged for the affordable workspace from 10 years to 20 years. This was seconded by Councillor Klute and carried.

RESOLVED:

That planning permission be granted subject to the conditions and informatives set out in Appendix 1 of the officer report plus the amendments and updates set out within the report and the additional condition outlined above; 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 as amended above, the wording of which was delegated to officers; and subject to any direction by the Mayor of London to refuse the application or for it to be called in for determination by the Mayor of London.

180 **139A AND 139B GROSVENOR AVENUE, LONDON, N5 2NH (Item B3)**

Demolition of the existing 2-storey semi-detached houses in multiple occupation (HMO – use Class C4) and the construction of a new 5 storey (including lower ground floor) building providing 10 residential dwellings (C3) consisting of 10 x 2 bedroom units with bin storage area to the front, cycle storage area to the rear and associated landscaping.

(Planning application number: P2015/2917/FUL)

In the discussion the following points were made:

- The application had previously been deferred on affordability grounds.
- It had been demonstrated that the site could support 10 units which was the council's on-site affordable housing threshold.
- The alternative use of the properties as two single houses was accepted.
- It was noted that the previous appeal did not assess viability but simply concluded that the site was capable of accommodating 10 units, therefore being subject to on-site affordable housing provision policies.
- It was stated during discussions that sales values of second hand properties were circa £7,000sqm. This figure multiplied by the 308sqm of the two houses together would lead to a bottom end valuation of £2.15million. This differed from the assessment which suggested that the comparative evidence was flawed and the assessment incorrect.
- Concern was raised that the alternative use was overvalued as the 1950s semi-detached houses had been compared to non-comparable Georgian houses.

Councillor Klute proposed a motion to refuse the application as the valuation was inconsistent with policy on affordable housing and the alternative use had been overvalued. This was seconded by Councillor Poyser and carried.

RESOLVED:

That planning permission be refused for the reasons set out above, the wording of which was delegated to officers in conjunction with the chair.

181 **PART OF MASON'S PLACE, LONDON, EC1V (Item B4)**

Stopping up of an area of existing highway under Section 247 of the Planning Act 1990 to enable redevelopment of the King Square Estate.

(Planning application number: P2016/0025/FUL)

RESOLVED:

That the starting of the stopping up process be approved subject to the applicant entering into an indemnity agreement to pay all the council's costs in respect of the stopping up.

WORDING DELEGATED TO OFFICERS

MINUTE 179

119 FARRINGDON ROAD, LONDON, EC1R 3DA

Additional condition: Refuse and emergency vehicles not to enter site: No emergency vehicles or refuse vehicles shall be permitted to enter the application site.

Reason: The design of the exit from the site had not been designed with sufficient radius to accommodate the exiting of vehicle of this size without compromising the safety of pedestrians using the footway outside 2-3 Crawford Passage. In this regard, the refuse collection arrangements would remain as existing and the occurrence of emergency vehicles attending the site was considered to be infrequent and to have limited impact on the free-flow of traffic within the highway.

MINUTE 180

139A AND 139B GROSVENOR AVENUE, LONDON, N5 2NH

Reason for refusal: The inappropriate sales comparisons used to generate the valuation of an Alternative Use Value (AUV) for this site resulting in an overestimation of the Site Value for the development. This in turn resulted in a development that failed to reasonably maximise the provision of affordable housing, taking account of the borough-wide strategic target of 50% and the financial viability of the proposal. The scheme would fail to provide housing which adequately responded to the identified housing need in the borough. The proposal was therefore contrary to policy 3.4 (Optimising Housing Potential), 3.8 (Housing Choice), 3.9 (Mixed and Balanced Communities), 3.12 (Negotiating Affordable Housing), 3.13 (Affordable Housing Thresholds) of the London Plan (2015); policy CS 12 (Meeting the Housing Challenge) of the Islington Core Strategy (2011); and Islington's Development Viability SPD (2016).

The meeting ended at 8.50 pm

CHAIR