

**Planning Sub Committee A - 19 December 2016**

Minutes of the meeting of the Planning Sub Committee A held at Committee Room 4, Town Hall, Upper Street, N1 2UD on 19 December 2016 at 7.30 pm.

**Present:**           **Councillors:**       Martin Klute (Chair), Tim Nicholls (Vice-Chair), Paul Convery, Una O'Halloran and David Poyser  
**Also Present:**       **Councillors:**       Diarmaid Ward

**Councillor Martin Klute in the Chair**

**232       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.

**233       APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE (Item A2)**

There were no apologies for absence.

**234       DECLARATIONS OF SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS (Item A3)**

There were substitute members.

**235       DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST (Item A4)**

There were no declarations of interest.

**236       ORDER OF BUSINESS (Item A5)**

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

**237       MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING (Item A6)**

**RESOLVED:**

That the minutes of the meeting held on 1 November 2016 be confirmed as an accurate record of proceedings and the Chair be authorised to sign them.

**238       121 MILDMAY ROAD, LONDON, N1 4PT (Item B1)**

Retrospective application in connection with the subdivision of single family dwelling house into 2 x self-contained flats (1 x 1 bedroom and 1 x 3 bedroom)

(Planning application number: P2016/2468/FUL)

In the discussion the following points were made:

- The planning officer stated that Condition 2 should have the words 'single family house' replaced with 'the two bed unit at first and second floor level' that the second

## Planning Sub Committee A - 19 December 2016

paragraph of Condition 3 be removed and that the window in Condition 5 be amended to require the obscurely glazed window to be 1700mm above the pavement level.

- In response to a question from the chair about why enforcement action referred to three flats rather than two, the planning officer advised that an additional flat had been advertised. It was understood this was in the annex but was no longer there.
- The application complied with policy.

Councillor Klute proposed a motion to add a condition to require the layout as shown on the drawings to be retained with the wording of the condition delegated to officers. This was seconded by Councillor Nicholls and carried.

### **RESOLVED:**

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

**239**

### **16-26 BANNER STREET, LONDON, EC1Y 8QE (Item B2)**

Erection of part single, part two-storey roof extension to provide 6 self contained residential flats comprised of 1 x 2 bedroom flat and 5 x three bedroom flats in conjunction with associated external alterations to the building, cycle parking, refuse storage and ancillary works.

(Planning application number: P2016/3210/FUL)

In the discussion the following points were made:

- The planning officer advised that Paragraph 4.4 of the officer report should refer to three x two bedroom flats and three x three bedroom flats and not a four bedroom flat as currently stated.
- The planning officer stated that the standard noise condition should be added.
- The application was policy compliant.

### **RESOLVED:**

That planning permission be granted subject to the conditions and informatives set out in Appendix 1 of the officer report as amended above and subject to the prior completion of a unilateral undertaking securing the heads of terms as set out in Appendix 1 of the officer report.

**240**

### **38 HILLDROP LANE, ISLINGTON, LONDON, N7 0HN (Item B3)**

Demolition of the existing house and redevelopment of the site to provide a two storey building with a setback third floor providing 9 flats with associated amenity space, landscaping and cycle parking.

(Planning application number: P2016/3134/FUL)

In the discussion the following points were made:

- The planning officer advised that Condition 14 should be removed. The planning officer advised that an additional condition should be added to prevent the second floor roof from being used as a terrace with the window details of the second floor rear facing windows conditioned and the wording delegated to officers.

## Planning Sub Committee A - 19 December 2016

- Concern was raised that the viability figure was £80,000 when the policy expectation figure was £450,000. The planning officer advised that this was due to the high land value and the current property being a five bedroom house. The legal officer advised that it was accepted practice to add a premium to the existing use value.
- Concern was raised at the marketing figure of over £162,000 for the nine flats.
- The chair suggested that due to some of the flats being larger than the required size, if reconfiguration took place it might be possible to add in another flat to contribute to affordable housing. The planning officer advised that this would require a compromise of the dual aspect nature of the scheme. If the scheme had 10 flats it would become a major scheme and there would be other policies to consider.
- The planning officer confirmed that applicant had maximised the width of the building to both boundaries. At the back of the proposal there was some amenity space and cycle storage.
- Concern was raised that the second floor rear windows had been excluded from the plans.
- The loss of nine trees was of concern.
- The objector stated that a petition had been submitted to the planning department. Officers stated that they had not received one.
- Following a comment from the objector about government legislation on 10 flats as opposed to 9, the legal officer advised that government guidance about tariff style payments was a material consideration but the Local Development Plan and other material considerations were also relevant in this case. In addition to the level of need for affordable housing in the borough the development had been found to be viable with the payment. The planning officer advised that recently at two appeals, the inspector had given weight to the Local Development Plan as well as the ministerial statement and had refused the appeals.

Councillor Nicholls proposed a motion to defer the consideration of the application due to there being insufficient details in front of the committee to make a decision. Clarity was sought on 1) doubts about viability and whether 10 flats could be provided, 2) insufficient plans with windows missing, 3) whether a petition had been received and 4) whether there nine trees had to be lost. This was seconded by Councillor Poyser and carried.

### **RESOLVED:**

That consideration of the application be deferred for the reasons outlined above.

241

### **HIGHBURY FIELDS SCHOOL, 16-26 Highbury Hill, Islington, London, N5 1AR (Item B4)**

New external lighting to Highbury Fields School site.

(Planning application number: P2016/2175/FUL)

In the discussion the following points were made:

- The chair asked whether if the lighting was considered to be an amenity issue for residents, environmental health could be contacted. The planning officer advised that there were powers to control light pollution and suggested that the scheme could be approved for one year with monitoring taking place during the year.

Councillor Klute proposed a motion to amend condition 3 to require a lighting control scheme to be submitted and approved by the local planning authority and that the scheme should be approved for a year only in the first instance. This was seconded by Councillor Nicholls and carried.

**RESOLVED:**

That planning permission be approved subject to the conditions and the informative set out in Appendix 1 of the officer report plus the amended condition outlined above.

**242 LAND AT 90-92 WHITE LION STREET, LONDON, N1 9PF (Item B5)**

Erection of five storey building on the vacant site at 90-92 White Lion Street to provide A3 (restaurant) on basement and ground floor, B1 (office) on 1<sup>st</sup>, 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> floors and 1 x 3 bedroom residential unit on the top floor.

(Planning application number: P2016/0197/FUL)

In the discussion the following points were made:

- In response to a question from a member, the planning officer advised that the light to the basement would be artificial.
- Concern was raised that the plans did not show the design.
- The conservation officer advised that White Lion Street had a varied building stock and this proposal would address a gap. The top floor had now been recessed and the ground floor no longer lacked activity. All the previous conservation concerns had been addressed.
- The planning officer confirmed that the cycle stands were on the third floor.
- Concern was raised that the three bedroom unit was very large. The planning officer stated that although the space could accommodate two units, it would also have to fit in the core. The planning officer considered the space to be suitable family accommodation.
- A member raised concern that the reduction in the bulk of the building was minimal.
- A member raised concern at the lack of fenestration detail.
- Concern was raised that this design was not the right design for the site.

Councillor Klute proposed a motion to refuse planning permission 1) as the design accentuated the bulk, scale and massing of the building and 2) due to the large size of the three bedroom unit. This was seconded by Councillor O'Halloran and carried.

**RESOLVED:**

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

The meeting ended at 9.45 pm.

CHAIR

**243**      **WORDING DELEGATED TO OFFICERS**

1) Minute 238  
121 Mildmay Road, N1 4PT

Additional condition.

The layout of the two approved flats as shown in the approved drawings shall be fully implemented within a period of six calendar months from permission being granted.

Reason.

In order to ensure the layout of the flats comply with the London Plan, Islington Local Plan and Supplementary Planning Document Policies.