

London Borough of Islington

**Planning Committee - 5 March 2019**

Minutes of the meeting of the Planning Committee held at Council Chamber - Town Hall on 5 March 2019 at 7.30 pm.

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

**Councillor Martin Klute in the Chair**

**61      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.

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

Apologies were received from Councillors Chapman and Graham.

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

Councillor Lukes substituted for Councillor Chapman.

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

Councillor Nathan declared that he was a Trustee of Clerkenwell Charities. Councillor Woolf declared that as he was the PCC Secretary of St Stephen's Church, he would leave the room for the consideration of Item B2.

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

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

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

**RESOLVED:**

That the minutes of the meeting held on 8 January 2019 be confirmed as an accurate record of proceedings and the Chair be authorised to sign them.

**67      ELTHORNE ESTATE: SUNKEN PLAY PITCH IN BETWEEN ST JOHN'S WAY AND DUNCOMBE ROAD (SITE 1); ST JOHN'S COMMUNITY CENTRE, HOLLAND WALK AND ADJACENT CARETAKERS LODGE, NICHOLAY ROAD (SITE 2); ZOFFANY PARK (SITE 3), HOLLAND WALK, LONDON, N19 (Item B1)**

The demolition of the sunken play pitch (site 1), community centre and adjacent caretaker's lodge (site 2) and the construction of a new community centre [282.42 sqm GIA] (site 2) and 46 new dwellings (private and affordable) in four blocks (sites 1 and 2) ranging in height from two to six storeys with associated amenity space, bicycle parking spaces and improvements to the public realm (including to Zoffany Park, site 3).

Additionally, stopping up of an area of existing highway to the north and west of Duncombe Road and land immediately west of 158-178 St Johns Way under Section 247 of the Planning Act 1990 to enable redevelopment of Site 1.

(Planning application number: P2018/2269/FUL)

In the discussion the following points were made:

- The addendum report set out consultation responses received since the report was published and members read these and the officers responses to them. Additional costs such as the new community centre were noted by members. These costs meant the scheme had a lower level of affordable housing provision than would normally be expected in a council scheme. Members noted concerns about parking, but also that the parking capacity study identified that even with the development, parking would be adequate.
- In response to a member's question, the planning officer advised that three of the units had one aspect onto a lightwell with restricted outlook. This was due to there being a lower ground floor on one side of the building due to the topography of the site. These units had outside amenity space and planning officers considered the arrangements acceptable.
- The planning officer confirmed that the scheme had twice been to the Design Review Panel and had been revised to respond to the panel's comments. The only compromise was a change in the roof line of one element on site 1, which helped to facilitate four units being delivered and assisted with the overall viability of the scheme, helping to maximise affordable housing provision.
- The planning officer confirmed that the Stopping Up requirement was due to some of the land to be landscaped or built over being adopted highway (e.g. footpath). This had to be de-designated before building could begin.
- The planning officer stated that the NPPF quoted on page 23 of the officer report should be 2019 and not 2018.
- Members considered that the scheme would improve a redundant part of the Elthorne Estate and the upgrades to the public realm and a new community centre were welcomed.
- A member highlighted the fact that the scheme was not simply a housing scheme but also delivered upgrades to the wider estate, including a new community centre, play facilities and public realm enhancements and that this was a benefit of the scheme.

**RESOLVED:**

- 1) That following consideration of the case officer's report (the assessment and recommendations therein), the presentation to Committee, and in the absence of any objections, planning permission be granted subject to the conditions and informatives set out in Appendix 1 of the officer report and conditional upon the prior completion of a Directors' Agreement securing the heads of terms as set out in Appendix 1 of the officer report.
- 2) 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.

**68 ST STEPHEN'S CHURCH, 17 CANONBURY ROAD, LONDON, N1 2DF (Item B2)**

Solar panel installation to the east roof slope of the main worship space.

(Planning application number: P2018/2142/FUL)

Councillor Woolf who had declared an interest in this item, left the room for the consideration of the item.

In the discussion the following points were made:

- The planning officer drew members' attention to the council's statutory duty to preserve, meaning to do no harm to heritage assets, and advised that officers had been mindful in placing great weight on this in the planning balance.
- The planning officer highlighted the special interest of the listed building and where the solar panels would be located. The impact on the roof and fixing were discussed, along with locations where the panels could be seen. Officers considered that the location of the panels and the fact that they could not be seen from key views limited harm to less than substantial.
- The cumulative effect to the heritage asset had been considered by officers and it was not considered that there would be any substantial harm caused by cumulative impacts.
- Planning officers reiterated that they were mindful of the need to place great weight on the need to do no harm in undertaking the planning balance. Officers still considered that the public benefits of the scheme would outweigh the harm (which was at the lower end of less than substantial harm).
- The solar panels were demountable and technological advances might mean they could be removed in time and any harm to the heritage asset would be removed.
- In response to a member's question, the planning officer advised that the roof was aluminium and was rebuilt in 1957 after a bombing in the war.
- The planning officer confirmed that it was not possible to see the solar panels looking from the north of the conservation area.

Members agreed there would be less than substantial harm to the setting and special interest of the church, and the character and appearance of the conservation area. They did not consider the cumulative impact would result in substantial harm. They noted the fact that any harm being caused meant they must place great weight on this in the planning balance.

Members considered that the position of the panels helped mitigate impacts and that other factors like the panels being demountable meant that the harm might not be permanent. Members considered that there were public benefits that would be delivered, and that the benefits were such that on balance they outweighed the less than substantial harm to the church and conservation area.

**RESOLVED:**

That following consideration of the case officer's report (the assessment and recommendations therein), the presentation to Committee and in the absence of any further objections being provided verbally at this meeting, planning permission be granted subject to the conditions set out in Appendix 1 of the officer report.

**69 ST JAMES'S CHURCH, 51 CLERKENWELL CLOSE, LONDON, EC1R 0EA (Item B3)**

Installation of photovoltaic solar panels on the south roof below the parapet wall.

(Planning application number: P2018/2952/FUL)

- The planning officer drew members' attention to the council's statutory duty to preserve, meaning to do no harm to heritage assets, and advised that officers had been mindful in placing great weight on this in the planning balance.
- The planning officer highlighted the special interest of the listed building and where the solar panels would be located (behind a parapet and not visible from street level).
- An exercise had been undertaken to set out the location of the panels to test where they could be seen from and the position revised so that they could not be seen from street level.
- The impact to the roof was discussed, along with locations where the panels could be seen (being from upper levels of nearby buildings, effectively private views). The impact to the listed building was considered to be less than substantial.
- The planning officer highlighted the key aspects of the conservation area and that views of the panels were limited from the conservation area (i.e. from upper levels of nearby buildings, not public views). Officers considered that the location of the panels and the fact that they could not be seen from key views limited harm to less than substantial.
- The cumulative effect to the heritage asset had been considered by officers and it was not considered that there would be substantial harm caused by cumulative impacts.

- Planning officers were mindful of the statutory duty to do no harm, but considered that the public benefits of the scheme would outweigh the less than substantial harm.
- The solar panels were demountable and technological advances might mean they could be removed in time and any harm to the heritage asset would be removed.
- Members discussed the roof being made of slate and commented that although this was a heritage asset, slate tiles would usually be replaced over time, for example when broken.
- While members acknowledged that there would be less than substantial harm to the setting of the church, they noted the fact that any harm being caused meant they must place great weight on this in the planning balance.
- Members considered that public benefits would be delivered and that the benefits were such that on balance, members considered that the benefits outweighed the less than substantial harm to the setting and special interest of the church and character and appearance of the conservation area.

**RESOLVED:**

That following consideration of the case officer's report (the assessment and recommendations therein), the presentation to Committee, and in the absence of any objections, planning permission be granted subject to the conditions and informative set out in Appendix 1 of the officer report.

70

**KINGS CROSS TRIANGLE SITE, BOUNDED BY YORK WAY, EAST COAST MAIN LINE AND CHANNEL TUNNEL RAIL LINK, LONDON, N1 (Item B4)**

Revised reserved matters in relation to landscaping and public realm pursuant to outline planning permission granted on appeal for mixed use development of part of the former railway lands within the Camden Kings Cross Opportunity Area and an Islington Area of Opportunity approved under outline planning permission ref: P041261. The revised reserved matters relate to Zone W Landscaping and Public Realm and comprise revisions to the hard and soft landscaping approved under consent ref: P2016/3637/RMS and include the provision of an additional loading bay within the Northern Gateway.

(Planning application number: P2018/4062/RMS)

In the discussion the following points were made:

- The planning officer confirmed that these revisions added more land to the habitat area application.
- The reduction in size of the larger units was welcomed as was the increase in the ground floor amenity space.

**RESOLVED:**

That following consideration of the case officer's report (the assessment and recommendations therein), the presentation to Committee, and, in the absence of any objections, approval of reserved matters be granted subject to the conditions

and informative set out in Appendix 1 of the officer report and approval of the outline conditions be granted.

**71 KINGS CROSS TRIANGLE SITE, BOUNDED BY YORK WAY, EAST COAST MAIN LINE AND CHANNEL TUNNEL RAIL LINK, LONDON, N1 (Item B5)**

Revised reserved matters relating to Buildings W1 and W2 comprising 12 to 17 storeys of mixed use accommodation comprising 218 residential units; four retail units at lower ground floor and podium levels (flexible class A1-A4); and associated cycle and disabled car parking, loading bay, refuse stores, storage, plant areas provided within the shared lower ground floor/basement area.

The revisions to the reserved matters granted approval under application ref: P/2016/1030/RMS include: changes to internal layouts including revision to unit mix; an increase in total GEA of 190 square metres; minor changes to building elevations; an increase in green roof area; a revised retail service strategy; and the removal of 6 no. car parking spaces.

(Planning application number: P2018/3844/RMS)

In the discussion the following points were made:

- The planning officer stated that an additional condition should be added as the council's Environmental Health team required a written code for noise emergency plant equipment to be submitted.
- The planning officer confirmed that these revisions added more land to the habitat area application.
- The reduction in size of the larger units was welcomed as was the increase in the ground floor amenity space.

**RESOLVED:**

That following consideration of the case officer's report (the assessment and recommendations therein), the presentation to Committee, submitted representations and, in the absence of any objections, approval of reserved matters be granted subject to the conditions and informative set out in Appendix 1 of the officer report with the additional condition outlined above and approval of the outline conditions be granted.

The meeting ended at 8.40 pm

**CHAIR**