

London Borough of Islington

**Planning Committee - 18 November 2019**

Minutes of the meeting of the Planning Committee held at Council Chamber, Town Hall, Upper Street, N1 2UD - Islington Town Hall on 18 November 2019 at 7.30 pm.

**Present: Councillors:** Klute (Chair), Kay (Vice-Chair), Picknell (Vice-Chair), Clarke, Convery, Graham, Poyser, Spall and Woolf

**Councillor Martin Klute in the Chair**

**123 INTRODUCTIONS (Item A1)**

Councillor Klute welcomed everyone to the meeting. Members of the Committee and officers introduced themselves.

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

Apologies were received from Councillor Mackmurdie.

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

There were no declarations of substitute members.

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

There were no declarations of interest.

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

The order of business would be B2 and B1.

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

**RESOLVED:**

That the minutes of the meeting held on 15 October 2019 be confirmed as an accurate record of proceedings and the Chair be authorised to sign them.

**129 CLASSIC HOUSE 174-180 OLD STREET COMMITTEE REPORT (Item B1)**

Construction of a two storey roof level extension and six storey side extension to the existing building to create 1,418 sqm GIA of additional office (Class B1(a)) floorspace, a nine storey side extension on the eastern elevation to accommodate an additional lift, reconfigured entrance to Martha's Buildings, new hard landscaping scheme on Martha's Buildings, roof terraces at seventh and eighth floors, installation of new plant equipment and provision of cycle and refuse stores. (Departure from Development Plan).

(Planning application number: P2019/2450/FUL)

In the discussion the following points were made:

- The Planning Officer informed the meeting that the application site is located on the southern side of Old Street, adjoining the western side of Martha's Buildings and not located within a Conservation Area, however the Bunhill Fields/Finsbury Square and St Luke's Conservation Area.
- Members were advised that the proposal provides an additional 1,418sqm of B1(a) office floorspace and Affordable Housing contribution of £226,880 and a contribution of £288,660 towards Affordable Workspace.
- The Planning Officer advised that the proposal will result in the height of the building being increased from 27metres to 32 metres which amounts to a tall building. Members were also advised that the proposed extensions, alterations and additions to the existing building would result in improvements to its overall appearance. The proposals also include a new hard landscaping scheme on the Martha's Buildings access road and the creation of roof terraces at seventh and eight floors for use in connection with the office accommodation.
- On the question of whether the proposed material was sympathetic with the original building, the meeting was advised that a condition would be imposed requiring details and samples of all external facing materials including windows and a sample panel of brickworks and mortar will be submitted for approval.
- With regard to sunlight and daylight loss, the Planning Officer advised that findings of the BRE report submitted confirms that overall the nature of the transgressions above the BRE guidance threshold were minimal and it only affected few units.
- On the departure from the Tall building policy, the Planning Officer advised that although the site is not located in one of the areas designated in the Finsbury Local Plan as appropriate for a tall building, it has been demonstrated that the building would not be substantially taller than its neighbours and would not significantly change the skyline and was not in conflict with the aims of the policy in relation to relative heights and was acceptable in the site's local context.
- On the suggestion to reduce the height of the building in line with the policy on tall buildings, the agent informed the meeting that having tested the proposal, working with council officers, its full consideration by the Design Review Panel and the daylight assessment with minimal digressions, not much further could be done.
- With regard the impact of the scheme on neighbouring amenity, Members were advised that the proposal would not result in unacceptable impacts on neighbouring residential nor office amenity, including any loss of daylight and

sunlight, outlook, privacy, nor would it be considered an unacceptable increased sense of enclosure.

- The meeting was informed that the applicant had consulted with the surrounding residents and the statutory consultees and that the application was advertised as a departure from the tall building policy. He also highlighted the Architect's description of the scheme as, a high quality development.
- In deliberation, members welcomed that the proposal would not harm the heritage assets and neighbouring amenity and the additional height is deemed to be proportionate in terms of the tall building policy. Concerns were raised about the proposed use of brick slips on the side extension and the chair requested that the materials condition be revised to require the use of solid brickwork on the lower more visible parts of the building, and that the condition require a sample panel of brickwork including brick type, bonding and mortar.

**RESOLVED:**

That following consideration of the case officer's report (the assessment and recommendations therein), the presentation to Committee, submitted representations and objections, planning permission be granted subject to the conditions and informatives set out in Appendix 1 of the officer report and the amended materials condition 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.

**MATERIALS CONDITION:** Details of all facing materials including samples shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to works commencing on site. The details and samples shall include:

- a) Reconstituted Stone;
- b) Sample panel of brickwork, including brick type, bonding and mortar;
- c) Concrete cladding;
- d) Windows, doors and balustrades;
- e) Roofing materials, and;
- f) Exterior lighting/illumination;
- g) Permeable paving;
- h) any other materials to be used on the exterior of the development.

The proposed nine storey side extension shall comprise of solid brickwork at ground floor level and not involve the use of brick slips.

The development shall be carried out strictly in accordance with the details and samples so approved, shall be maintained as such thereafter and no change therefrom shall take place without the prior written consent of the Local Planning Authority.

REASON: In the interests of securing sustainable development and to ensure that the resulting appearance and construction of the development is of a high standard in accordance with policies 5.3, 7.4, 7.5, 7.6, 7.8 and 7.9 of the London Plan 2016, policies CS9 and CS10 of Islington's Core Strategy 2011, and policies DM2.1, DM2.3 and DM7.4 of Islington's Development Management Policies 2013.

130

**PAUL ANTHONY HOUSE, 724 HOLLOWAY ROAD, LONDON, N19 3JD (Item B2)**

Two storey roof extension to the existing building to create additional office space (B1a Use Class) along with associated refurbishment and external alterations.

(Planning application number: P2018/3191/FUL)

In the discussion the following points were made:

- The Planning Officer reminded the meeting that following Committee's consideration of the item at its meeting in September, a decision was taken to defer the item in order to allow officers and the applicant to have further discussions with TfL and consult with neighbouring residents on seeking revised delivery and servicing arrangements in consultation with TfL and neighbouring residents.
- Members were informed that following the meeting on 24 September 2019, the applicant met residents, subsequently sent emails and completed a letter drop to invite neighbouring residents and ward councillors to discuss their main concerns. In addition, planning and highway officers undertook a site visit with TfL representatives to observe existing operations and discuss potential alternative options for deliveries and servicing.
- The Planning Officer acknowledge that revised plans for both the ground floor of the building and transport statement had been submitted by the applicant which addressed amenity concerns raised by objectors at the September meeting.
- In response to the delivery and servicing arrangements around the scheme, the TfL representative present advised that considering it is a red bus route, creating a loading bay on Holloway road would impact on bus operations in terms of bus journey time, raise issues of highway safety as buses would need to travel out of the designated bus lanes, which effectively introduces a number of additional hazards.
- The TfL representative informed members that loading bays in that area would be difficult to enforce by TfL as it was considered highly likely that it would also be used for both drop off and pickups associated with the nearby station, and other local activities, with the result that the bay would potentially not be available to commercial vehicles legitimately attempting to service the building. Members were reminded that with this particular location, siting a loading bay in that vicinity would be challenging especially, with the additional attraction of being in close proximity to Upper Holloway

Station.

- On the suggestion of possible relocation of the bus stop on Holloway Road during construction work, members were reminded that considering this is a lesser scheme than the previous two applications, TfL would not agree to the temporary closure of the bus stop.
- TfL also highlighted the number of bus journeys which take place every day on this stretch of road and contrasted it with the number of deliveries expected to the premises in question.
- On the possibility of restricting personal deliveries to the occupants of the office development especially with online shopping and deliveries, the agent advised that although this would be difficult to enforce, the applicant would be willing to work with officers if an exact wording of the restriction, to be included as an informative.
- The Planning Officer informed that the delivery and service management plan to be finalised through condition stipulates hours of operation and that the refuse and recycling collections will align with the collection day of the neighbouring residential properties on Fairbridge Road to secure highway safety, local residential amenity and mitigate the impact of the development.
- Members heard representations from 3 objectors who were concerned with the delivery and refuse collections from Fairbridge Road with its subsequent impact on the amenity of neighbouring residents. Members were reminded that the scheme is contrary to the recent Council motion about climate emergency and its policy on healthier streets. Residents were concerned that the applicant had not robustly consulted with TfL since the item was deferred at the meeting in September.
- In response to the objectors concerns, the agent apologised for not consulting residents at the onset as it naively believed that this was a relatively small scheme, however since the item was deferred in September it had met residents to discuss their concerns, facilitated a site meeting with TfL representatives and Highway Officers to consider alternative options.
- The applicant's agent noted that despite detailed discussion with TfL, the position had not changed, that deliveries and servicing should not operate from Holloway Road. In addition Members were advised that the scheme would not impact the Play Streets arrangements which is held once a month on Sunday from 11am to 1pm as there is a condition with the planning permission which restricts deliveries and servicing to between Monday to Friday only.
- In response to objectors concerns that the applicant had not robustly engaged with TfL, the applicant's agent informed the meeting that the applicant had employed specialist consultants working on the project from

## Planning Committee - 18 November 2019

the onset and a 54 page document produced and had discussions with TFL, however TfL were not prepared to change their position.

- Members were also advised following the meeting in September and concerns about noise and disturbance to neighbouring residents, the proposed refuse and recycling enclosure has been relocated deeper within the building so that it is no longer directly below a residential unit at 2A Fairbridge Road.
- In response to concerns that TfL had not made any concession about the scheme, its lack of flexibility and its refusal to budge, the transport officer acknowledged the possibility of temporarily closure of the bus stop on Holloway Road so that construction vehicles could operate from Holloway Road rather than Fairbridge Road.
- Members were reminded that at present the servicing arrangements still exist and could operate on Fairbridge Road for the existing B8 use and Holloway Road is owned and managed by TfL, and that if the owner of the building chose to continue to operate it unaltered, there would be no bar to servicing from Fairbridge Road continuing as it had done prior to the building falling out of use. The chair observed that under these circumstances any changes to servicing arrangements that moved deliveries onto Holloway Road would be a "nice-to-have" rather than a planning requirement.
- During deliberation, it was suggested that further discussion with TFL should be explored. The TfL representative reminded members that it was not likely that TfL will change its stance as it strategically is very inflexible with their red routes.
- The Service Director for Planning for planning was invited to comment, and suggested that she thought there may be further scope for discussions with TFL.
- The Chair advised members of the two available options: to grant planning permission and leave the issue of contention to be resolved between the agent and TfL, and the option to defer the item for the applicant to continue their discussion on resolving the delivery and servicing arrangements with the involvement of planning officers.

Councillor Klute proposed a motion to Defer. This was seconded by Councillor Clarke and carried.

The Chair reminded members that if and when the item is brought back to Committee it would only consider the single issue around the servicing and deliveries and not the other considerations.

### **RESOLVED:**

**Planning Committee - 18 November 2019**

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

The meeting ended at 9.30 pm

**CHAIR**