

London Borough of Islington

Planning Sub Committee B - 1 October 2019

Minutes of the meeting of the Planning Sub Committee B held at Committee Room 4, Town Hall, Upper Street, N1 2UD on 1 October 2019 at 7.30 pm.

Present: **Councillors:** Kay (Chair), Gill, Poyser, Spall and Woolf

Councillor Jenny Kay in the Chair

1 INTRODUCTIONS (Item A1)

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

2 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE (Item A2)

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Klute.

3 DECLARATIONS OF SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS (Item A3)

Councillor Gill substituted for Councillor Klute.

4 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST (Item A4)

None.

5 ORDER OF BUSINESS (Item A5)

The order of business was as per the agenda.

6 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING (Item A6)

RESOLVED:

That the minutes of the previous meeting held on 16 July 2019 be agreed as a correct record and the Chair be authorised to sign them.

**7 CANALETTO TOWER, BLOCK A AND BLOCK B, 257 CITY ROAD, LONDON
EC1V 1AD (Item B1)**

Change of use of mezzanine level podium commercial unit (Block A) from flexible commercial use (A1/A2/A3/A4/A5/B1) to crèche (D1) and associated external buggy storage area; change of use of upper ground floor level commercial unit (Block B) from flexible commercial use (A1/A2/A3/A4/A5/B1) to crèche (D1) and creation of external covered play area at podium level, and associated works.

(Planning application number: P2019/1442/FUL)

In the discussion the following points were made:

- The Planning Officer corrected paragraph 4.3 of the report to clarify that seven objections had been received in relation to the application.
- The Planning Officer corrected Condition 6 to insert the names Charlotte Rosier and Fabienne O'Neill as the Directors of Cuckooz Nest Ltd.
- The Planning Officer provided an overview of the application and summarised objections received. Objections included the loss of office and retail space, the impact on residential amenity, air quality concerns, and matters related to the design and use of materials, such as the use of timber and the proposed location of the buggy store. The Planning Officer explained how these objections could be mitigated, including through the use of conditions.
- The Planning Officer advised that the property had been vacant since construction and therefore the change of use could be considered appropriate.
- The design of the buggy store was similar to the cycle store and was therefore considered acceptable by the Planning Officer.
- An air quality assessment had been provided by the applicant. This had been reviewed by the local authority and officers considered that air quality concerns could be successfully mitigated.
- The Sub-Committee queried the distance between the first floor balcony and the outdoor play area. In response, it was advised that the balcony did slightly overhang the play area and the Metropolitan Police had offered safety advice to the applicant.
- The Sub-Committee queried the impact on the residential amenity of nearby properties, particularly in relation to noise. In response, it was advised that the hours of operation of the outdoor space would be restricted to between 09.00 to 17.00 Monday to Friday. The property was currently designated as A3 use which would allow a restaurant to operate until 23.30 and, although the property was currently vacant, it was considered that the proposed use would generate substantially less noise than if a restaurant was operating in accordance with the existing permission.
- The applicant advised that they were content with the proposed conditions and wanted to be a good neighbour to local residents.
- The Chair indicated that she was interested in the applicant's proposals regarding affordable provision for families in nearby social housing, and in

response it was suggested that this information could be provided outside of the meeting.

The Chair proposed that the application be granted as per the recommendations in the officer's report, incorporating the corrected Condition 6 as set out by Planning Officer. This was seconded by Councillor Woolf and carried.

RESOLVED:

That following consideration of the case officer's report (the assessment and recommendations therein), the presentation to Sub-Committee, and submitted representations and objections provided, planning permission be granted subject to the conditions and informatives set out at Appendix 1 of the officer report and the corrected Condition 6 set out above.

8 GULLIVER'S HOUSE, 27 GOSWELL ROAD [INC LAND & ACCESS TO REAR ADJ TO 14 CHARTERHOUSE BUILDINGS], LONDON, EC1M 7GT (Item B2)

Refurbishment and recladding of existing office building with remodelling on the ground and 6th to 8th floors on the front elevation, a part 9 storey rear extension from lower ground to 7th floor, and an 8th floor of office accommodation instead of plant (with existing plant equipment consolidated and relocated to lower ground level), rear roof terraces (8th and lower ground floors) and associated alterations, and a change of use of part of ground floor from existing office (Use Class B1(a)) to retail (Use Class A1), together with the introduction of cycle parking and other works.

(Planning application number: P2018/3231/FUL)

In the discussion the following points were made:

- The Planning Officer summarised the application. It was advised that two additional conditions had been proposed:
 - ADDITIONAL CONDITION 1: The development hereby permitted shall be constructed to achieve a 19% reduction in regulated CO2 emissions, compared to compliance with the Building Regulations 2013. No occupation of the approved additional office floorspace shall take place until details of how these measures have been achieved have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority.
REASON: In the interest of securing sustainable development and to ensure that the resulting appearance and construction of the development is of a high standard.
 - ADDITIONAL CONDITION 2: Notwithstanding the approved drawings, full details of evacuation lifts and provision of 2 no. refuge on all of the floors, above ground floor level, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to the development being operational. A report from a suitably qualified engineer shall be provided that

demonstrates the feasibility of the lifts being converted to be used as evacuation lifts in the case of an emergency.

REASON: To ensure the safe egress of those with mobility difficulties in the case of an emergency.

- It was advised that the applicant was content with the proposed additional conditions.
- The application site was within the setting of the Charterhouse Square and Hat and Feathers conservation areas. The Planning Officer advised that the planning authority's Design and Conservation Officer had concluded that the application did not present any harm to nearby heritage assets.
- The Planning Officer advised that a Daylight/Sunlight assessment had been carried out and concluded that the development would result in some loss of light to neighbouring properties in excess of BRE guidelines. However, despite this loss, the properties' retained levels of light would still be considered to be very good for a central London location.
- The Planning Officer advised that a condition had been proposed to ensure that the development would be subject to twice weekly refuse and recycling collections.
- The Planning Officer advised that the application included works to improve the accessibility of the building, including the provision of accessible toilets, lifts on all floors, and the removal of the revolving entrance door.
- In response to a question, the Planning Officer confirmed that the Corporation of London and Charterhouse had not submitted objections to the application.
- The Sub-Committee queried if the materials proposed for the exterior of the building would adversely impact on the streetscene. In response, the planning officer advised that the materials had been debated in pre-application discussions and the Planning Authority had secured amendments to the colour, materials, window design and other aspects. It was advised that the Design and Conservation Officer considered that the original design presented marginal harm to nearby heritage assets, however no harm was associated with the revised design.
- A member of the public spoke in objection to the application, stating that the development would overlook her property and would result in a loss of light to her home. Following a discussion between the Planning Officer, the objector and the applicant, the location of the objector's property was established and it was concluded that the development would not overlook this property as there were no windows in the flank wall of the proposed roof extension, and there would be no adverse impact on daylight receipt.
- The applicant addressed the Sub-Committee and summarised key aspects of the application, including the environmental and sustainability improvements that would be secured through the application.
- The Sub-Committee considered the use of materials on the exterior façade of the building, including the yellow exterior feature column. The Sub-Committee noted that the Design and Conservation Officer had not expressed concern in relation to this aspect of the development, however it was requested that the officer look again at the design and colour of the feature column as well as review the paleness of the concrete finish of the

Planning Sub Committee B - 1 October 2019

building prior to the materials being approved by the Local Planning Authority in accordance with Condition 3.

The Chair proposed that the application be granted as per the recommendations in the officer's report, including the two additional conditions proposed by the Planning Officer, with an amendment to Condition 3 to secure a review of the paleness of the concrete and the colour of the feature column before materials are approved by the Local Planning Authority. The final wording of the conditions and informatives would be delegated to officers. This was seconded by Councillor Woolf and carried.

RESOLVED:

That following consideration of the case officer's report (the assessment and recommendations therein), the presentation to Sub-Committee, submitted representations and objections provided verbally at this meeting, planning permission be granted subject to the conditions and informatives set out at Appendix 1 of the officer report, the additional conditions described by the case officer (CO2 reduction and access for escape) and the amendment to Condition 3 set out above.

The meeting ended at 8.30 pm

CHAIR