

London Borough of Islington

Planning Sub Committee B - 17 July 2018

Minutes of the meeting of the Planning Sub Committee B held at Committee Room 4, Town Hall, Upper Street, N1 2UD - Islington Town Hall on 17 July 2018 at 7.30 pm.

Present: **Councillors:** Kay (Chair), Chapman (Vice-Chair), Khondoker, Klute and Convery (Substitute) (In place of Woolf)

Councillor Jenny Kay in the Chair

1 INTRODUCTIONS (Item A1)

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

2 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE (Item A2)

Apologies were received from Councillor Woolf.

3 DECLARATIONS OF SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS (Item A3)

Councillor Convery substituted for Councillor Woolf.

4 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST (Item A4)

There were no declarations of interest.

5 ORDER OF BUSINESS (Item A5)

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

6 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING (Item A6)

RESOLVED:

That the minutes of the meeting held on 30 April 2018 be confirmed as an accurate record of proceedings and the Chair be authorised to sign them.

7 32-54 KEIR HARDIE HOUSE, 1-12 ARTHUR HENDERSON HOUSE, HAZELLVILLE ROAD, LONDON, N19 3BX (Item B1)

Replacement of existing single glazed timber/plastic coated windows and doors with double glazed UPVC.

(Planning application number: P2017/4951/FUL)

In the discussion the following points were made:

- Concern was raised that there were no drawings showing the comparison between the proposed and existing thicknesses of the window frames.
- A member asked for clarification as to whether the window frames were chamfered as the report stated they were not but the sample was chamfered. The applicant stated that the proposed windows were chamfered and not flush. They had the same profile as that currently being installed in the other blocks on the estate.
- The report stated that the window frames were 70mm wide when they were actually 60mm wide.

Planning Sub Committee B - 17 July 2018

- The windows to be replaced were believed to be over 25 years old. They were no longer manufactured and the glazing was held in place by rubber gaskets which made them insecure.
- In response to a question from a member as to why the window replacement for all the blocks was not submitted under one planning application, the applicant stated that this was due to capital maintenance cycles and leaseholder charges. The work had been divided into phases.
- The application was policy compliant.

RESOLVED:

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

8 BASEMENT AND GROUND, 37-39 EXMOUTH MARKET, ISLINGTON, LONDON, EC1R 4QL (Item B2)

Change of use from A2 (Financial and Professional Services) at ground and basement levels, to A3 (Restaurants and Cafes) at Ground Floor Level and A4 (Drinking Establishments) at basement level.

Reason for reconsultation: addition of extractor ducts, plant equipment and acoustic screening at rear and provision of further noise report and management plan.

(Planning application number: P2017/1262/FUL)

In the discussion the following points were made:

- The planning officer stated that Condition 11 should be amended to state that prior to implementation details of the flues/extraction scheme should be submitted and approved through an Approval of Details (AOD) with the wording delegated to officers.
- A member raised concern that the drawing submitted in relation to flues/extraction did not take into account the three floors above the ground floor. The planning officer advised that standard practice was for the flue to rise one metre above the nearest roof.
- The planning officer stated that the drawing showed generic extract proposals that did not satisfy planning officers and therefore the AOD was required. As part of this, consultation with neighbours and relevant officers was necessary.
- In response to a member's question about the land use types, the planning officer advised that approximately 75% was A1, A3 and A4.
- Concern was raised about the change of use and whether this was in line with policy. The applicant advised that the premises had previously been a bookmakers and this meant its use was not A2 but sui generis.

Councillor Convery proposed a motion to defer the consideration of the application to enable officers to clarify whether a change of use was required, to enable the applicant to submit details of the flue/extraction scheme as well as a scheme for equipment, plant and servicing and to enable reconsultation with neighbours. This was seconded by Councillor Klute and carried.

RESOLVED:

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

9 CLARISSA BALDWIN HOUSE, 17 WAKLEY STREET, LONDON, EC1V 7RQ (Item B3)

Planning Sub Committee B - 17 July 2018

Removal of second floor roof terrace and erection of single storey extension at second floor level to create additional office floorspace. Replacement of existing plant equipment and provision of new plant equipment in connection with the new development. Installation of new ramp access to main building and associated changes to main entrance doors. Installation of new secure cycle parking.

Reason for reconsultation: Amended daylight/sunlight report.

(Planning application number: P2017/2887/FUL)

In the discussion the following points were made:

- A member asked the distance between the back elevation of the proposed development and the back elevation of the properties on City Road. The planning officer advised that it was 11m.
- A member asked for the planning officer to clarify why the report stated that light loss to the four windows that did not meet the BRE guidelines was negligible. The officer stated that this was incorrect and the light loss was not negligible.
- The application was policy compliant apart from four windows failing the BRE guidelines. The planning officer advised that the BRE guidelines should be applied flexibly. It was difficult to meet the target in dense urban locations. The daylight requirements for bedrooms were lower than for living rooms but it was not known whether the windows affected were bedrooms or living rooms.
- Concern was raised about the amount of building work being undertaken in the area which was so close to residents' homes.

Councillor Kay proposed a motion to restrict construction hours to prevent construction work from taking place on Saturdays and that the construction management plan be changed accordingly. 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 with the additional condition as set out 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.

10 MICROTRON HOUSE, 338 CITY ROAD, LONDON, EC1V 2PY (Item B4)

Erection of a single storey roof extension at third floor level to create a 1 bedroom residential flat, external alterations including creation of lift shaft to rear, and creation of front roof terrace fronting Wakley Street.

Reason for reconsultation: Revised design of roof extension, revised drawings and Design and Access Statement and submission of daylight and sunlight report.

(Planning application number: P2017/2243/FUL)

In the discussion the following points were made:

- The planning officer stated that Paragraph 10.74 of the officer report should not have referred to a failure in the BRE test as it was compliant.
- The planning officer advised that the cumulative impact of this application and Item B3. Clarissa Baldwin House had been considered and the windows would still pass the BRE tests if both developments took place.

Planning Sub Committee B - 17 July 2018

- Concern was raised that the roof area facing on to City Road could be used as a roof terrace. The applicant stated that the existing balustrade was part of the original building. It was not high enough or with narrow enough gaps between the bars to meet the requirements for a roof terrace. He confirmed that the area would not be used as a roof terrace and would only be accessed for maintenance. The roof area facing onto Wakley Street would be used as a roof terrace and the balustrade would have a glass panel behind the original balustrade to ensure it met current regulations.
- In response to a member's question about the materials to be used, the planning officer replied that there was a proposed a condition on materials. The materials used on the front of the building would match the existing materials. Regarding the back of the extension, the planning officers would generally discourage render and promote the use of bricks. The design and conservation officer would be consulted when the materials were submitted for approval. The applicant confirmed that the materials used at the front and back of the extension would match the existing materials.
- In response to a member's question about an emergency exit in the event of a fire, the applicant advised that there was a staircase and all building regulations would be met, including those in relation to fire and accessibility.
- Concern was raised that the obscurely glazed window at the back of the extension could be changed to clear glazing in time. The planning officer advised that it could be conditioned that the obscurely glazed window be non openable and retained in perpetuity.
- Objectors were advised that if there were any breaches to conditions, they could report it to the council.

Councillor Klute proposed a motion to add a condition that there be inward opening doors onto the roof area facing on to City Road with a Juliet balcony preventing access to the roof area. This was seconded by Councillor Chapman and carried.

Councillor Convery proposed a motion that the details of the Juliet balcony should be submitted to the local planning authority for approval. This was seconded by Councillor Chapman and carried.

Councillor Klute proposed a motion that Condition 3 be amended to state that the materials and detailing should reflect and replicate the existing materials. This was seconded by Councillor Chapman and carried.

Councillor Klute proposed a motion to add a condition that the obscurely glazed window to the rear of the extension be non-openable and retained in perpetuity. This was seconded by Councillor Chapman and carried.

RESOLVED:

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

The meeting ended at 9.40 pm

CHAIR