

London Borough of Islington

**Planning Committee - 7 September 2017**

Minutes of the meeting of the Planning Committee held at Council Chamber, Town Hall, Upper Street, N1 2UD on 7 September 2017 at 7.30 pm.

**Present:**           **Councillors:**       Donovan-Hart (Vice-Chair), Court, Picknell, Gantly, Kay and Ward

**Councillor Alice Donovan-Hart in the Chair**

**308       INTRODUCTIONS (Item A1)**

Councillor Donovan-Hart welcomed everyone to the meeting. Members of the Committee and officers introduced themselves.

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

Apologies were received from Councillors Khan, Fletcher and Nicholls.

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

Councillor Williamson substituted for Councillor Nicholls.

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

Councillor Kay declared a personal interest in Item B3, Land to the rear of 2 Melody Lane as she is a customer of the self-storage warehouse.

Councillors Kay and Gantly did not participate during the deliberation of the item nor involved in the voting.

Councillor Gantly in his capacity as a ward councillor representing his constituents spoke against the application.

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

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

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

**RESOLVED:**

That the minutes of the meeting held on 18 July 2017 be confirmed as an accurate record of proceedings and the Chair be authorised to sign them.

**314 457-463 HOLLOWAY ROAD, ISLINGTON, LONDON, N7 6LJ (Item B1)**

Change of use of Nos. 457-463 Holloway Road from office (Use Class B1) to residential (Use Class C3) to provide 14 residential units, part excavation of basement and light wells, demolition of the single storey rear extension, erection of a mews comprising 2 residential units (Use Class C3) and associated cycle and refuse storage and landscaping.

(Planning application number: P2016/3157/FUL)

In the discussion the following points were made:

- Members were informed that an updated Arboricultural report had been submitted and the Council's Trees Officer had advised that although the tree immediately adjacent to the proposed Mews unit might survive the proposed works, there was a likelihood that ongoing post-development pressure from occupants might require the need to lop the tree.
- Members were informed that concerns regarding access to the proposed scheme had been resolved as the applicant had submitted details of an easement over the access road that adjoins the site. The Officer advised that there was concern that the owner of the access road could have erected a boundary enclosure in front of windows to the Mews units resulting in daylight amenity and fire safety implications
- The Planning Officer informed Members that although the Council's Energy Advisor was still awaiting the correct carbon reduction figure to be inserted into condition 14 this information would not alter the proposed energy efficiency and renewable energy measures. Members were informed that should Members resolve to grant planning permission, the Chair's authority to update this condition with the correct figure would be sought.
- The Planning Officer advised Members that the scheme was significantly compromised in policy terms and the quality of the dwellings.
- The Agent informed Members that although it was a challenging site, the proposal would ensure that the building was brought back into use by delivering 16 residential units with a reasonable standard of internal accommodation instead of leaving a locally listed building vacant.
- In response to questions about the low financial contribution in lieu of affordable housing being proposed, the agent advised that if there was an increase in the valuation of the dwellings the Council would benefit in the future as the financial contribution received by the council would be re-calculated to reflect the market prices. Members were advised that this would be secured by a S106 legal agreement to ensure it was binding.
- Members acknowledged the challenges with the existing building, it's state of disrepair both internally and externally and the cost involved in bringing the building back to use but were concerned with the quality of the proposed dwellings and the inadequate provision of communal private amenity space.

## Planning Committee - 7 September 2017

- Concerns were also raised with regards to the siting of the bin and cycle storages in the front garden area onto Holloway Road which would be harmful to the character and appearance of the Mercer's Road Conservation Area.

Councillor Donovan-Hart proposed a motion to refuse planning permission for the following reasons;

- The proposal would represent an overdevelopment of the site which would result in an inadequate standard of residential accommodation with an unsatisfactory mix of units contrary to Policies 3.1, 3.4, 3.5 and 3.6 of the Council's Development Management Policies Document (2013) and CS12 of Islington's Core Strategy 2011
- The proposal would represent an overdevelopment of the site resulting in harm to the character and appearance of the Hilmarton Conservation area contrary to policy CS3, CS9 of Islington's Core Strategy 2011, Policies 2.1 and 2.3 of the Council's Development Management Policies Document (2013).
- The applicant has failed to demonstrate that the proposed development will provide the maximum reasonable amount of affordable housing taking account of the borough-wide strategic target of 50%, and the methodology approach to financial viability assessments as set out in the Mayor of London's Affordable Housing and Viability SPG 2017 and Islington's Development Viability SPD 2016. The proposal is therefore contrary to policy 3.12 of the London Plan 2016, policy CS12 of Islington's Core Strategy 2011.

This was seconded by Councillor Ward and carried.

### **RESOLVED:**

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

### **315 CENTRAL FOUNDATION SCHOOL, 15 COWPER STREET; 63-67 TABERNACLE STREET AND 19 [ SHOREDITCH COUNTY COURT ] & 21-23 LEONARD STREET, LONDON, EC2 (Item B2)**

Demolition of existing Block B and erection of a replacement four storey building to provide science teaching facilities; alteration and refurbishment of the Tabernacle Building; development of a partially sunken sports hall within the school courtyard; improvements and alterations to existing school buildings including listed buildings; demolition of the existing former sixth form block on Tabernacle Street and erection of an eight storey office (Use Class B1a) building (3,774m<sup>2</sup> GIA); landscaping and associated works.

(Planning application number: P2017/1046/FUL & P2017/1049/LBC)

In the discussion the following points were made:

- The Planning Officer advised Members that an additional Section 106 Heads of Term had been recommended to secure 8 hours a week community use of the proposed sports hall.

## Planning Committee - 7 September 2017

- Members were informed that conditions Nos. 3 (external materials), 11 (lighting) and 22 (Delivery and Servicing Plan) had been duplicated in order that the details could be approved separately with regards to the commercial building.
- Members were advised of Part 16 of the Planning and Listed Buildings Act 1990 which stated that in considering whether to grant listed building consent for any works the local planning authority or the Secretary of State shall have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses.
- The Planning Officer informed Members that although the Council's Energy Advisor was still awaiting the correct carbon reduction figure to be inserted into condition 12 this information would not alter the proposed energy efficiency and renewable energy measures. Members were informed that should Members resolve to grant planning permission, the Chair's authority to update this condition with the correct figure would be sought.
- With regards to the lack of affordable housing from the scheme or any off site financial contributions, the Planning Officer advised that the scheme was experiencing a significant funding shortfall and that the 8 storey office block which was being proposed on the school's land would assist in bridging the shortfall.
- Members welcomed the proposed scheme as it would deliver significant improvements to the quality, accessibility and functionality of the existing school.
- In response to the lack of affordable housing, Members acknowledged that in this instance, the need for educational provision represented a higher priority.

Councillor Ward proposed a motion to grant. This was seconded by Councillor Court and carried.

### **RESOLVED:**

1. That planning permission be granted subject to the conditions 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.
2. That listed building consent be granted subject to the conditions in the report.

### **316 LAND TO THE REAR OF 2 MELODY LANE, LONDON, N5 2BQ (Item B3)**

Demolition of existing buildings and construction of 7 residential dwellings (Use Class C3) and new 3 storey (plus basement levels) 1,419sqm self-storage building (Use Class B8), with landscaping, access and associated works.

(Planning application number: P2016/1344/FUL)

In the discussion the following points were made:

## Planning Committee - 7 September 2017

- The Planning Officer advised members that paragraph 10.119 on page 279 of the Committee Report should state the distances as 11.7-13.6m, consistent with the rest of the report.
- The Planning Officer advised members that paragraph 10.159 on page 284 of the Committee Report should state that the wheelchair parking spaces may also be used by resident blue badge holders, and should omit the reference to business use. The Planning Officer clarified that condition 20 is recommended to ensure that accessible parking spaces are available to those who need them.
- The Planning Officer advised Members that an additional letter objecting against the scheme had been received. The letter raised issues which had been addressed in the published papers, including a request to limit construction times.
- The Planning Officer advised Members that an additional letter had been received from a legal firm representing residents, which requested clarification to Members that each house at 6-22 Melody Lane (even nos) has 4 bedrooms, 2 of which overlook the site and would be affected.
- A resident raised objections regarding the height of the proposed building and stated that the houses at Aberdeen Park are over ground and first storey with additional rooms in the roofspace; that the top floors of the proposed houses should be set into the roofspace; and that the proposed scheme was not visually subordinate to the existing Mews.
- A resident stated that the scheme was inappropriate to the existing character of the area; that the proposed building would obscure views; and that it would be and harmful to the setting of the listed building and adjoining conservation area.
- A resident raised concerns with the safety of young children as the development would result in additional service vehicles for the new houses and that there was insufficient spaces for refuse collection vehicles.
- A resident stated that there should be an alternative route to the site for lorries.
- A resident stated that there had been no consideration of views from the houses at Aberdeen Park, that the development would result in overlooking to the properties at Aberdeen Park, and that there is a house at Aberdeen Park which is only 6m away from the proposed houses which has not been considered in the Committee Report.
- Councillor Gantly spoke in opposition to the scheme, and stated that as a result of developments over time young children at the adjacent properties were growing up on a building site. The Councillor also questioned the report, the plans and the consultation undertaken, and requested Members to defer the item until after a site visit had been undertaken as there were issues around proximity and loss of privacy that needed clarification.
- The applicant informed Members that the proposal would result in redevelopment of the self-storage facilities and that the scheme had been developed in conjunction with Planning Officers, was policy compliant and a financial contribution to off-site affordable housing has been provided.
- Members stated that they welcomed the scheme in principle as it was policy compliant but were concerned with the discrepancy between the objectors'

## **Planning Committee - 7 September 2017**

comments and what was stated in the report as to the distances between the homes at Aberdeen Park and the proposed scheme.

- The Planning Officer stated that the houses at Aberdeen Park were well over 18m from the application site, but that they had ancillary outbuildings within their gardens which are closer to the site boundary. The Planning Officer stated that the impacts on the houses were considered of greater importance than the outbuildings and that impacts on residential amenity to the houses at Aberdeen Park were not considered unacceptable.
- A resident stated that the building close to the rear boundary of 136 Aberdeen Park is a house.

Councillor Donovan Hart proposed a motion to defer so as to carry out a site visit to the objector's property and to investigate whether the building at the rear of 136 Aberdeen Park is a separate house or an outbuilding; and to clarify the distance from the nearest habitable room window of that property to the proposed scheme. This was seconded by Councillor Picknell and carried.

The meeting ended at 9.15 pm

**CHAIR**