

Planning Sub Committee B - 14 July 2020

Minutes of the virtual meeting of the Planning Sub Committee B held on 14 July 2020 at 7.30 pm.

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

Councillor Jenny Kay in the Chair

26 INTRODUCTIONS (Item A1)

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

27 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE (Item A2)

Apologies were received from Councillor Klute.

28 DECLARATIONS OF SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS (Item A3)

Councillor Convery substituted for Councillor Klute.

29 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST (Item A4)

Councillors Convery and Woolf declared a personal interest in Item B4, 89-91 Mildmay Park, N1 4NB.

30 ORDER OF BUSINESS (Item A5)

The order of business would be B1, B5,B4,B6,B7,B8,B2 and B3,
Councillor Kay informed the meeting that she would not be participating in the both the consideration and decision regarding item B4 and that Cllr Poyser will chair the item.

31 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING (Item A6)

RESOLVED:

That the minutes of the meeting held on 21 May 2020 be confirmed as an accurate record of proceedings and the Chair be authorised to sign them.

32 15-21 BENWELL ROAD,N7 7BL (Item B1)

Proposed erection of infill block side extension over the yard entrance to 11-13 Benwell and 2 storey roof extension to create six new residential units plus associated internal alterations and provision of a new communal entrance, lift core, cycle parking facilities and PV panels.

(Planning application number: P2019/3070/FUL)

In the discussion the following points were made:

- **The Planning Officer informed the meeting that although site is not within a Conservation Area, the rear of the building lies in close proximity to part of the long eastern edge of the St Mary Magdalene Conservation Area.**
- Members were advised that the proposal involves extending and altering the existing building at 15-21 Benwell Road, improving the existing communal residential facilities and increasing the number of residential units by six. The Planning Officer advised that this would require the existing building to be extended by 2 storeys at roof level resulting in an additional height of approximately 6m, consisting of a fourth floor level (2.95m in height) and fifth floor level (3m in height).
- Members were advised of the infill extension between the application site and 9 Benwell Road to the south which would infill the space for a width of 5m, depth of 14.5m and height of 9.8m, allowing a headroom height of 3,5m below to allow retention to the access yard at 11-13 Benwell Road to the rear of the site.
- In addition, the scheme proposes improvements to the front appearance, which involves ground floor alterations, the inclusion of a new canopy, glass blocks and metal doors. Internally at ground floor a new part M compliant lift would be provided, bicycle storage space, mobility storage, new dedicated residential entrance and separate refuse and recycling store.
- Members were advised that in assessing the scheme, officers had taken into consideration the land use policy, accessibility, impact of the scheme on neighbour amenity and the quality of accommodation and residential mix.
- In terms of design, layout, scale and massing of the proposed development, the Planning Officer advised that the Council's Design and Conservation Team were consulted and were satisfied that the proposed external alterations would preserve the character and appearance of the host building and the adjacent conservation area.
- Members were reminded that the site and surrounding area is in context predominantly residential in character, with some commercial uses along Holloway Road and sections of Benwell Road; the Emirate Stadium is located at the north end of the road.
- Members were advised that the site comprises a building that is in mixed use with residential units on the upper floors and commercial units on the ground floor.
- Also Members were advised that although the proposed residential use above the yard entrance of 11-13 Benwell Road is not in conflict with the Site

Planning Sub Committee B - 14 July 2020

Allocation policies, it is important that the infill development being proposed does not materially affect or prejudice the use of or operation of the adjoining site at 11-13 Benwell Road and any potential redevelopment opportunities in the future.

- In response to concerns about the loss of commercial floorspace, and the proposed intensification of the residential use of the site, the meeting was advised that the scheme is not considered to hinder the operation nor the vitality of the commercial use on the ground floor unit nor have an adverse impact on the local area.
- Members were advised that the elevational treatment and the selected materials to both the front and rear of the host building is an acceptable design response to the building within this particular mixed context.
- With regards to concerns about construction vehicles in the area designated for emergency vehicles and the recognition that there is only one access into the site, the agent informed the meeting of the Construction Management Plan which will be clear in identifying the type of construction vehicles into the site and it will be monitored.
- The agent also assured Members that the proposed infill part of the site will retain the vehicular and pedestrian access and in light of health and safety legislation there will be no safety concerns with pedestrians accessing the workshops and businesses to Benwell Yard which is at the rear of the application site.
- Members were advised that the proposed extensions are considered to be of an appropriate scale and not considered to prejudice the adjacent commercial properties and residential amenity of neighbouring properties in so far as loss of sunlight and daylight, increased sense of enclosure, overlooking, overshadowing or loss of privacy and noise and disturbance.
- Objections to the scheme included overlooking and a sense of enclosure. Loss of privacy and impact of noise levels as a result of construction on their businesses were raised. An objector was also concerned with the scale, massing and height of the scheme as it would result in loss of sunlight and daylight which was vital for the operations of his business with the result that he would have to do it somewhere else, an additional cost to his business.
- Members were advised of safety concerns to pedestrians during and after construction, reminding the Committee of the only access into site which had not been taken into consideration during the designing of the scheme. An objector reminded that in light of the present pandemic, it is important that the well being of both present and future occupiers be taken into consideration.

Planning Sub Committee B - 14 July 2020

- A resident was disappointed that their feedback had not been taken into consideration, especially with officers pre-application comments, that the proposal should not hinder the operation or the vitality of existing businesses.
- Members were informed by a resident that a key consideration for choosing the site for their business was its space, its privacy and the natural light available to the building, ideal for their filming operations without any need for artificial lighting and that the scheme by virtue of its height, shape and proximity would have an adverse impact on its operations. The dwellings would overlook into offices and the studios limiting natural light. The additional storey would result in an overdevelopment of the site and impact the amenity of neighbouring residents. Objector requested that the scheme be refused planning permission.
- The agent acknowledged objectors concerns, advising the meeting that the project team had worked closely with adjoining neighbouring occupants and that a previous scheme had been withdrawn last year to ensure consultation took place. He noted the sensitivity of economic uses adjoining the site and has worked to produce a Construction Management Plan so as to minimise any impact during construction activities and reassuring residents and members that this disruption would be temporary.
- With regards to the impact of the scheme on the amenity of the present business occupiers, the meeting was informed that although the scheme has been designed with a view of ensuring there is no impact, assessment of residential amenity is different from that of commercial premises.
- The agent also informed the meeting that the scheme has an extension and an infill would not stop the overhead light still penetrating the building and therefore impacting the lighting of the building.
- On the differences between commercial and residential amenity in particular with privacy and loss of light, the legal officer advised that in general amenity for both residential and business occupiers is a planning consideration, however different weights are attached. In addition, the planning officer acknowledged that the BRE Daylight and Sunlight Guidelines predominantly relate to residential uses and in some cases other sensitive uses, and as such less weight was attached to daylight and sun,ight assessments for commercial uses. .
- In response to concerns that the larger 3 bed units upon the 3rd and 4th floors would not comply with the space standards for amenity space, the Planning Officer acknowledged that the proposal is a flatted development above existing flats that seeks to utilise the width and footprint of the existing building, without prejudging the design of the building and extensions themselves by supporting an amenity space of 30sq.m. He also noted that officers were of the view that the site is in walking distance of

Highbury Fields if there is a need to utilise a much larger open green space and that the oversized internal space would also contribute to the quality of the residential accommodation.

- On clarifying what mitigation measures of the Construction Management Plan, the agent advised that the condition will have to be agreed before work commences and it will include hours of work, maximum noise levels permitted, identifying where the vibration is occurring, dust suppression and washing down of construction vehicles as they leave the site.
- On the privacy situation in relation to Jamie Oliver's site unit and the glass, the Planning Officers advised that residential units in the infill extension will have clear glass as the separation distance is 27m and no overlooking concerns.
- A suggestion on the possibility of the Construction Management Plan be agreed in conjunction with the residents was stated.
- The Chair in summary recognised the need to protect independent businesses especially during these times from any construction noise, saying that the committee would like to see some stronger measures in the Construction Management Plan, stating that the applicant be aware that if they make things difficult for residents that the council would not hesitate to get involved.
- Members agreed that condition 4 be amended to include stronger measures sensitive to businesses nearby. It was also suggested that the Construction Management Plan be more specific stating that when the studio is carrying out voice overs or recording that there be restrictions on noise disturbance.

Councillor Woolf proposed a motion to grant Planning subject to condition 4 be amended. This was seconded by Councillor Poyser and carried.

RESOLVED:

That following consideration of the case officer's report (the assessment and recommendations therein), the presentation to Committee, submitted representations and objections provided verbally at this meeting, planning permission be granted subject to the conditions and informatives set out in Appendix 1 of the officer report and the amended condition 4 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

Planning Sub Committee B - 14 July 2020

Installation of a replacement shopfront with associated fascia, internal security shutter and internal accessibility improvements. Retention of D1 (non-residential institution) use at ground floor and B1 (office) use at upper floor levels
(Planning application number: P2020/1194/FUL)

In the discussion the following points were made:

The discussion of this application was considered in conjunction with Item B3, although votes with regard to its recommendation was taken separately. In the discussion the following points were made:

- The Planning Officer informed Members that the application site comprises a three storey mid-terrace Victorian property located on the southern side of Seven Sisters Road and that the building is not locally nor statutorily listed, nor is it located within a conservation area.
- Meeting was advised that the proposed replacement shopfront would represent a positive improvement to the front elevation of the host building, and the proposed replacement signage would not cause harm to the character or appearance of the building or the wider streetscene of Seven Sisters Road. In addition, members were advised that the proposed internal access improvements would represent a positive improvement.
- Members were informed that whilst in need of some general repairs and maintenance, the host terrace of which the building forms a part thereof, is of architectural group value as an example of a Victorian retail shopping frontage. The site is located within Nags Head Town Centre (Secondary Retail Frontage) and the Nags Head and Upper Holloway Road Core Strategy Key Area. Therefore, no concerns are raised with regard to the proposed retention of this use.
- Members were advised that the proposal seeks to ensure that proposed development responds positively to existing buildings, the streetscape and the wider context, including local architecture and character, surrounding heritage assets, and locally distinctive patterns of development.
- Meeting was informed that the existing shopfront, the majority of which is recessed, is of timber construction with significant tiled framing, however the proposed replacement timber shopfront would not be recessed from the pavement and would be more traditional in appearance incorporating a stallriser, transoms and mullions, and a fanlight above the entrance. In addition, the shopfront would be set within ceramic tiled cheeks and the existing solid metal roller shutter would also be replaced by a visually permeable 'shell' roller shutter, to be installed internally behind the new shopfront.
- The Planning Officer noted that the replacement shopfront would enhance the character and appearance of the building by re-introducing many of the features common within traditional Victorian shopfronts. The removal of the

Planning Sub Committee B - 14 July 2020

existing bulky external shutter and installation of the replacement internal 'shell' roller shutter is also a welcomed addition. Overall, the proposed shopfront and roller shutter represents a significant improvement to the character and appearance of the host building and the wider streetscene.

- Meeting was informed that the existing non-illuminated fascia signage would be replaced by a signage of the same height but with a reduced width, so it would be more discreet. The Planning Officer informed members that a condition has been recommended for the advertisement consent to ensure that the LED matrix display is static, not animated or flashing, with a maximum illuminance level of 250 cd/m².
- The Planning Officer noted that overall, the proposed replacement signage is considered to be acceptable and no highway safety concerns to pedestrians exists.
- The Planning Officer advised that condition has been recommended for hours of use from 7am-10pm, Monday to Sunday as the proposal retains the original use.
- On the issue of amenity, members were advised that although the proposed replacement signage would be minimal in size it is important to note that there are no residential properties within the application building, and the illuminated signage would not cause harm with regard to light disturbance. The proposals would therefore not cause undue harm to neighbouring amenity with regard to overshadowing, overlooking, privacy, access to natural light, over-dominance, sense of enclosure or outlook.
- The project manager (and applicant) for the affordable workspace team informed the meeting that the application is part of the GLA funded project to bring improvement to council owned buildings and an opportunity to increase the active participation of the building as it will provide training support for the youth as part of the Council's Islington Affordable Youth Project. The use of the building is vital for Islington youth funded by GLA and the Council and welcomed by the community.
- During deliberation, it was noted that this is a council owned building with Members acknowledging the opportunity to improve a building which has been in a state of disrepair. Members welcomed the replacement of the building frontage which will be in line with other traditional shop fronts in the local vicinity and importantly it will enhance the town centre landscape.

Councillor Convery proposed a motion to grant planning permission. This was seconded by Councillor Poyser and carried.

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.

34 48 SEVEN SISTERS ROAD,N7 6AA (Item B3)

Display of 1no. internally illuminated fascia sign with LED matrix panel below, and associated vinyl graphics.

(Planning application number: P2020/1264/ADV)

In the discussion the following points were made:

Installation of a replacement shopfront with associated fascia, internal security shutter and internal accessibility improvements. Retention of D1 (non-residential institution) use at ground floor and B1 (office) use at upper floor levels

(Planning application number: P2020/1194/FUL)

In the discussion the following points were made:

The discussion of this application was considered in conjunction with Item B3, although votes with regard to its recommendation was taken separately. In the discussion the following points were made:

- The Planning Officer informed Members that the application site comprises a three storey mid-terrace Victorian property located on the southern side of Seven Sisters Road and that the building is not locally nor statutorily listed, nor is it located within a conservation area.
- Meeting was advised that the proposed replacement shopfront would represent a positive improvement to the front elevation of the host building, and the proposed replacement signage would not cause harm to the character or appearance of the building or the wider streetscene of Seven Sisters Road. In addition, members were advised that the proposed internal access improvements would represent a positive improvement.
- Members were informed that whilst in need of some general repairs and maintenance, the host terrace of which the building forms a part thereof, is of architectural group value as an example of a Victorian retail shopping frontage. The site is located within Nags Head Town Centre (Secondary Retail Frontage) and the Nags Head and Upper Holloway Road Core Strategy Key Area. Therefore, no concerns are raised with regard to the proposed retention of this use.
- Members were advised that the proposal seeks to ensure that proposed development responds positively to existing buildings, the streetscape and the wider context, including local architecture and character, surrounding heritage assets, and locally distinctive patterns of development.

Planning Sub Committee B - 14 July 2020

- Meeting was informed that the existing shopfront, the majority of which is recessed, is of timber construction with significant tiled framing, however the proposed replacement timber shopfront would not be recessed from the pavement and would be more traditional in appearance incorporating a stallriser, transoms and mullions, and a fanlight above the entrance. In addition, the shopfront would be set within ceramic tiled cheeks and the existing solid metal roller shutter would also be replaced by a visually permeable 'shell' roller shutter, to be installed internally behind the new shopfront.
- The Planning Officer noted that the replacement shopfront would enhance the character and appearance of the building by re-introducing many of the features common within traditional Victorian shopfronts. The removal of the existing bulky external shutter and installation of the replacement internal 'shell' roller shutter is also a welcomed addition. Overall, the proposed shopfront and roller shutter represents a significant improvement to the character and appearance of the host building and the wider streetscene.
- Meeting was informed that the existing non-illuminated fascia signage would be replaced by a signage of the same height but with a reduced width, so it would be more discreet. The Planning Officer informed members that a condition has been recommended for the advertisement consent to ensure that the LED matrix display is static, not animated or flashing, with a maximum illuminance level of 250 cd/m².
- The Planning Officer noted that overall, the proposed replacement signage is considered to be acceptable and no highway safety concerns to pedestrians exists.
- The Planning Officer advised that condition has been recommended for hours of use from 7am-10pm, Monday to Sunday as the proposal retains the original use.
- On the issue of amenity, members were advised that although the proposed replacement signage would be minimal in size it is important to note that there are no residential properties within the application building, and the illuminated signage would not cause harm with regard to light disturbance. The proposals would therefore not cause undue harm to neighbouring amenity with regard to overshadowing, overlooking, privacy, access to natural light, over-dominance, sense of enclosure or outlook.
- The project manager (and applicant) for the affordable workspace team informed the meeting that the application is part of the GLA funded project to bring improvement to council owned buildings and an opportunity to increase the active participation of the building as it will provide training support for the youth as part of the Council's Islington Affordable Youth Project. The use of the building is vital for Islington youth funded by GLA and

the Council and welcomed by the community.

- During deliberation, it was noted that this is a council owned building with Members acknowledging the opportunity to improve a building which has been in a state of disrepair. Members welcomed the replacement of the building frontage which will be in line with other traditional shop fronts in the local vicinity and importantly it will enhance the town centre landscape.

Councillor Convery proposed a motion to grant advertisement consent. This was seconded by Councillor Poyser and carried.

RESOLVED:

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

35 89-91 MILDMAY PARK, N1 4NB (Item B4)

Erection of a part four/part five storey building (following demolition of existing single storey building (165sqm use D1 (clinic)) to allow for the creation of 7x self-contained residential flats (use C3) (3x 1bedroom units and 4x 2bedroom units) and ground floor (154sqm) chiropody/dental clinic (use D1).

(Planning application number: P2020/0937/FUL)

Councillor Kay left the meeting during consideration of this item and therefore did not take part in the discussion or vote on this item

In the discussion the following points were made:

- The Planning Officer advised that site is not listed but is located immediately south of the Newington Conservation Area. The proposal introduces a part four, part five storey building to the site which is in close proximity to the south facing windows of the residential properties in Hathersage Court.
- The Planning Officer reminded members that in January 2019, planning permission was granted for Hathersage and Beasant Court (ref: P2018/1970/FUL) and a separate application to committee in July 2019 was refused on grounds of inappropriate massing, poor quality design and the impact of the scheme on the character and appearance of the conservation area which the present application seeks to address.
- With regards to land use consideration, the Planning Officer acknowledged the net loss of 11sqm of D1 floorspace, however the re-provision of high quality D1 floorspace in the scheme measured at 154sqm complies with

Planning Sub Committee B - 14 July 2020

policy DM 4.12 of the Islington Development Management Policy 2013. Members were reminded that the provision and continued use of the chiropodist and dental surgery is considered as providing both social and economic benefit to the community.

- Meeting was advised that in terms of design and conservation concerns, the scheme is considered acceptable by the Design Officers. On the issue relating to form, bulk, and size of the new proposal, the Planning Officer acknowledged that it was similar to block K of an extant planning permission of 2018.
- The Planning Officer noted that concerns regarding the elevations have now been addressed, that with the front elevation, the design is acceptable and with the rear elevation balconies and terraces are to be sited further away from the neighbours.
- In terms of neighbouring amenity, a daylight sunlight assessment was submitted which indicated that 8 windows closest to the proposed development has transgressions in excess of BRE guidelines, however this correlates with the findings for Block K which has planning permission.
- A neighbouring resident was concerned with the size of the building as it towers over the neighbouring block of Victorian properties.
- In response, the agent informed the meeting that following the refusal of its previous application in July 2019, the team contacted planning team and submitted a pre-application proposal, taking on board the concerns raised which has now resulted in a well designed and acceptable mixed use development of high quality which retains sufficient D1 floor space and a new residential floorspace to create 7 new units. In addition, members were reminded that the application would secure the requisite financial contribution towards affordable housing.
- In response to objections about the scale of the building, the agent reiterated that this was a smaller building in comparison to the building that was granted planning permission in January 2019 and reminding members that this is to be considered within an urban site.

Councillor Poyser proposed a motion to grant planning permission. 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 Committee, submitted representations and objections provided verbally at this meeting, planning permission be granted subject to the conditions and informatives set out in Appendix 1 of the officer report and subject to the prior completion of a Deed of

36 MOORE COURT, ANDERSON SQUARE, LONDON, N1 2TF (Item B5)

The construction of two new residential units on the existing flat roof of Moore Court, forming a 4th storey to the existing building, as well as an additional refuse store and associated cycle parking facilities.

(Planning application number: P2019/0031/FUL)

In the discussion the following points were made:

- The Planning Officer informed the meeting that since the agenda was published a further 4 objections had been received and included concerns about notices not being served by the landlord about the development description, disturbance from refuse vehicles, construction noise and the use of cladding materials.
- Members were advised that if committee was minded to grant planning permission an additional condition 13 preventing the use of the flat roof area as an amenity space would be required.
- The Planning Officer informed the meeting that the site currently forms part of the modern residential estate situated between Essex Road and Upper Street in the Angel Town Centre Area and that the proposal to erect a single storey extension on the roof of the block will provide two residential units.
- Members were advised that the proposal will result in an increase to the height of Moore Court from 10.3m to 12.9m, it will have also have two terrace areas which will face Anderson Square Gardens.
- The Planning Officer informed the meeting that the application had been assessed on issues such as land use policy, amenity, design and energy and efficiency and its impact on conservation areas.
- Members were advised that in light of concerns about lack of refuse of storage and issues about capacity, a further condition is proposed regarding its final design to ensure that it is accessible for use by all it's residents.
- On the legal position about a revised Certificate B notice not being served on leaseholders, the Legal Advisor informed the meeting that under the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) Order 2015, Article 13, the applicant has a requirement to give notice to leaseholders and residents if there is any development but not required to re notify a second time if the description of the application changes.
- In response to a concern that the applicant had not addressed issues raised by the Design Team, the Planning Officer informed the meeting that although the issues were raised with the applicant, they are not expected to submit details.

Planning Sub Committee B - 14 July 2020

- A resident informed the meeting that following an initial meeting of both residents and leaseholders early in the year where there was an overwhelming majority against the scheme, all agreed that the scheme was on the edge in terms of density and height. This comment mirrored those raised by the initial architect involved, requesting that the scheme be refused. In addition, the resident was concerned of how the applicant had taken an advantage while carrying out some general works been able to insert a clause which allowed this proposal to include 2 floors on the roof.
- Another resident was concerned with the daylight and sunlight assessment submitted by applicant as incomplete as it does not include its impact from the terraces and the garden or communal areas. There was also concern that during this period of lockdown, erecting 2 flats on top of a block and its associated construction noise could not be viewed as a proportionate consideration.
- A leaseholder who had bought her flat since 2007 was concerned with the use of ACL cladding material and officers comment in the report that it is compliant. The resident acknowledged that loss of value is not a valid reason to object, however consideration should be given to issues such as fire risks especially with the narrow door on the ground floor exiting the building. The objector was concerned with the proposal of building two residential units on the roof of a block which has light walls.
- Members were reminded that with the expected recession following the Covid pandemic, consideration should be given to the well being of present occupiers especially if the construction activities on the roof of Moore Court is left uncompleted and abandoned due to economic uncertainties.
- In response to a question on why the applicant was not available, the Planning Officer acknowledged that the applicant was aware of the meeting date and was in regular contact with the applicant by correspondence in the last two weeks and had not received any notification that he would not be attending.
- On the issue of the applicant not in attendance, the Legal Officer informed the meeting that there is no requirement for the applicant to attend, however if Members were satisfied on the information provided in the reports it could make a determination, however if Members need clarification on some issues from applicant and officers are unable to assist, the item could be deferred should Members make this decision.
- In response to concerns that officers had agreed to recommend approval in light of the issues raised by the objectors and the lack of consultation, the Planning Officer advised that issues such as clauses between owner and occupiers, fire risk, structural stability are not planning considerations, however the scheme having been assessed on issues such as daylight and sunlight loss, design and impact on conservation area, it was considered

acceptable.

- During deliberation the Chair proposed a motion to defer the item as it would be difficult to proceed as the applicant was not available to respond to issues such as the bin storage, the narrow hallways, consultation process etc. Another Member requested for the item to be refused on grounds of design, the impact of the scheme on the 3 adjoining conservation areas, loss of light, reminding members that this was a site that has always been sensitive in planning terms.
- Councillor Kay proposed a motion to Defer. This was seconded by Councillor Poyser and carried.

RESOLVED:

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

37

ARMOURY HOUSE, CITY ROAD, LONDON, EC1Y 2BQ (Item B6)

Proposed erection of stables and tack room adjacent to the existing rugby pitch (for a temporary period of 2 years, 6 months), together with permanent internal alterations to the listed 'Specials' office within the mezzanine floor of the west wing of Armoury House.

(Planning application number: P2019/2369/FUL)

Discussion with this application was considered in conjunction with Item B7, although votes with regard to its recommendation was taken separately. In the discussion the following points were made:

- The application site relates to the Grade II* Listed Armoury House (Finsbury Barracks) and large private playing field. Finsbury Barracks has a site area of approximately 2.6 hectares situated between City Road (directly east), Bunhill Row (directly west) and Chiswell Street (directly south).
- Members were advised that the surrounding area is predominately office/commercial space within the Central Activity Zone and that the nearest residential properties are situated to the east along City Road with No's , 12, 16 and 18 having apartments in the upper floors that project onto the site.
- Meeting was advised that works to the main building would be located close to the frontage of the property at the 'Specials' office within the mezzanine floor of the west wing of Armoury House and that the proposed alterations would include the removal of a modern partition wall, and introduction of a new wall to rationalise the office accommodation and that the works are on a permanent basis.
- Sports England was consulted and their comments regarding the restoration and relocation of the cricket net facility following the removal of the temporary facilities was agreed by the applicant. The applicant has agreed to

Planning Sub Committee B - 14 July 2020

provide temporary practice nets elsewhere on the margins of the cricket pitch which could be removed when not required.

- A resident who lives in close proximity to the site was concerned about the smell and noise levels from the stable. In addition concerns with the number of restaurants in the vicinity of the proposal, public health of users had not been in to consideration and finally as she lives immediately above this proposal will impact the value of her property.
- With regards to noise concerns, the Planning Officer informed the meeting that it is a well managed facility and applicant have offered details of a contact to the Council if any disturbance arises.
- In a response to a question on the numbers of horses on the site, the agent acknowledged 6 horses in the 6 stables.
- On the question of what type of insulation and ventilation was being proposed for the stable, the Planning Officer advised that stables will open during the day and be closed at night and an acoustic report submitted has no concerns that will arise from the activities there during use.
- The agent advised Committee that the proposed stables area is considered necessary to facilitate the closure and decommissioning of Wood Street, the City of London Police's Mounted Unit which requires alternative accommodation.
- The agent in response highlighted the public benefit as it enables the Police to ensure effective response times and the ability to mobilise the Unit in close proximity to the City in response to operational needs and requirements for effective Services within the City of London (within 5 minutes). The operational risk of locating the Unit outside of the City is considered to be impractical and poses operational risks. The location also allows for deployment to other parts of London.
- Meeting was advised that although the proposed stables area would be solely visible from private views within the offices/commercial and residential properties that surround the site on City Road, with limited visibility of the stables from the entrance along Finsbury Street when the temporary marquees to the southern boundary are not in place, this would not impact the wider conservation area given its temporary nature and its overall distance from the listed building.
- The Planning Officer advised that although the site forms part of the Bunhill & Clerkenwell Conservation Area, and the application building is listed, the impact towards the character and setting of the conservation area and Listed Building has been considered.

Planning Sub Committee B - 14 July 2020

- On the issue of the impact on the conservation area, meeting was advised that given the temporary nature and its positioning (set away from public views and away from the listed building), and acceptable timber clad design, the proposal would not have a detrimental impact on the setting of the listed building nor detract from the character and appearance of Bunhill & Clerkenwell Conservation Area subject to conditions.
- Members were advised that the stables are not considered harmful to neighbouring amenity with regards to outlook when considering the surrounding high boundary walls some of which extend up to 3m, whilst the stables by virtue of their single storey height and timber clad design would not appear prominent structures, additionally the setback proposed is approximately 4m-5m.
- In addition, the proposal has been assessed by Public Protection Officers in relation to noise and also with regards to the welfare of the animals on site. Officers do not consider the stabling of horses to be a noisy activity and any noise from corporate events and historic artillery practices upon the field are unlikely to cause issue given the training of the horses to deal with noisy environments when they do occur. There is no objection to the typical hours of use for the facility and the daily muck out of stables proposed that would mitigate adverse odours. The agent advised that a condition will be placed upon the permission to request that the contact details of the site manager are shared with the Local Authority prior to use of the stables to ensure contact can be made should issues arise from the proposed development in regards to noise, odour or the welfare of the horses.
- During deliberation, members acknowledged the noise concerns raised by residents but were confident that the welfare of horses will be of paramount importance to the City of London Police. Members noted that the number of horses as stated by the agent would not cause any adverse disruption to the amenity of neighbouring residents.
- On the insulation and ventilation concerns, a member proposed a condition requesting that the details for sound insulation be submitted. This was seconded and agreed. Wording of additional condition to be delegated to the Planning Officer.
- A suggestion to amend condition 9 regarding the contact, to be residents instead of the Council's Protection Team was noted
- Members agreed that overall, the proposal would not have a detrimental impact on noise and disturbance, odour, outlook, privacy and overlooking and Daylight and Sunlight and would therefore be in compliance with policies DM2.1 of the Development Management Policies 2013.

Councillor Kay proposed a motion to grant planning permission subject to amending condition 9 to change the contact details and add a condition requiring details of noise insulation to be submitted (wording delegated to officers). This was seconded by Councillor Convery and carried.

RESOLVED:

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

- 38 **ARMOURY HOUSE, CITY ROAD, LONDON, EC1Y 2BQ (Item B7)**
Proposed erection of stables and tack room adjacent to the existing rugby pitch (for a temporary period of 2 years, 6 months), together with permanent internal alterations to the listed 'Specials' office within the mezzanine floor of the west wing of Armoury House.
(Planning application number: P2019/2411/LBC)

Discussion with this application was considered in conjunction with Item B6, although votes with regard to its recommendation was taken separately. In the discussion the following points were made:

- **The application site relates to the Grade II* Listed Armoury House (Finsbury Barracks) and large private playing field. Finsbury Barracks has a site area of approximately 2.6 hectares situated between City Road (directly east), Bunhill Row (directly west) and Chiswell Street (directly south).**
- **Members were advised that the surrounding area is predominately office/commercial space within the Central Activity Zone and that the nearest residential properties are situated to the east along City Road with No's , 12, 16 and 18 having apartments in the upper floors that project onto the site.**
- **Members were informed that works to the main building would be located close to the frontage of the property at the 'Specials' office within the mezzanine floor of the west wing of Armoury House and that the proposed alterations would include the removal of a modern partition wall, and introduction of a new wall to rationalise the office accommodation and that the works are on a permanent basis.**
- **Meeting was informed that Sports England was consulted and their comments regarding the restoration and relocation of the cricket net facility following the removal of the temporary facilities was agreed by the applicant. The applicant has agreed to provide temporary practice nets elsewhere on the margins of the cricket**

pitch which could be removed when not required.

- **A resident who lives in close proximity to the site was concerned about the smell and noise levels from the stable. In addition concerns with the number of restaurants in the vicinity of the proposal, public health of users had not been in to consideration and finally as she lives immediately above this proposal will impact the value of her property.**
- **With regards to noise concerns, the Planning Officer informed the meeting that it is a well managed facility and applicant have offered details of a contact to the Council if any disturbance arises.**
- **In a response to a question on the numbers of horses on the site, the agent acknowledged 6 horses in the 6 stables.**
- **On the question of what type of insulation and ventilation was being proposed for the stable, the Planning Officer advised that stables will open during the day and closed at night and an acoustic report submitted has no concerns that will arise from the activities there during the day or night.**
- **On the insulation and ventilation concerns, a member proposed a condition requesting that the details for sound insulation be submitted. This was seconded and agreed. Wording of additional condition to be delegated to the Planning Officer.**
- **The agent advised Committee that the proposed stables area is considered necessary to facilitate the closure and decommissioning of Wood Street, the City of London Police's Mounted Unit which requires alternative accommodation.**
- **The agent in response highlighted the public benefit as it enable the Police to ensure effective response times and the ability to mobilise the Unit in close proximity to the City in response to operational needs and requirements for effective Services within the City of London (within 5 minutes). The operational risk of locating the Unit outside of the City is considered to be impractical and poses operational risks. The location also allows for deployment to other parts of London.**
- **Meeting was advised that although the proposed stables area would be solely visible from private views within the offices/commercial and residential properties that surround the site on City Road, with limited visibility of the stables from the entrance along Finsbury Street when the temporary marquees to the southern boundary are not in place, this would not impact the wider conservation area given its temporary nature and its overall distance from the listed**

building.

- **The Planning Officer advised that although the site forms part of the Bunhill & Clerkenwell Conservation Area, and application building is listed, the impact towards the character and setting of the conservation area and Listed Building has been considered.**
- **On the issue of the impact on the conservation area, meeting was advised that given the temporary nature and its positioning (set in from the highway and away from the listed building), and acceptable timber clad design, the proposal would not have a detrimental impact on the setting of the listed building nor detract from the character and appearance of Bunhill & Clerkenwell Conservation Area subject to conditions.**
- **The stables are not considered to be harmful to neighbouring amenity in regards to outlook when considering the surrounding high boundary walls some of which extend up to 3m, whilst the stables by virtue of their single storey height and timber clad design would not appear prominent structures, additionally the setback proposed is approximately 4m-5m**
- **The proposal has been assessed by Public Protection Officers in relation to noise and also in regards to the welfare of the animals on site. Officers do not consider the stabling of horses to be a noisy activity and any noise from corporate events and historic artillery practices upon the field are unlikely to cause issue given the training of the horses to deal with noisy environments when they do occur. There is no objection to the typical hours of use for the facility and the daily muck out of stables proposed that would mitigate adverse odours. The details are considered acceptable, and a condition will be placed upon the permission to request that the contact details of the site manager are shared with the Local Authority prior to use of the stables to ensure contact can be made should issues arise from the proposed development in regards to noise, odour or the welfare of the horses.**
- **During deliberation, members acknowledged the noise concerns raised by residents but confident that the welfare of horses will be of paramount importance to the City of London Police. Members noted that the number of horses as stated by the agent would not cause any adverse disruption to the amenity of neighbouring residents.**
- **A suggestion to amend condition 9 regarding the contact, to be residents instead of the Council's Protection Team was noted.**

- **Members agreed that overall, the proposal would not have a detrimental impact on noise and disturbance, odour, outlook, privacy and overlooking and Daylight and Sunlight and would therefore be in compliance with policies DM2.1 of the Development Management Policies 2013.**

Councillor Kay proposed a motion to grant listed building Consent. This was seconded by Councillor Convery and carried.

RESOLVED:

That following consideration of the case officer's report (the assessment and recommendations therein), the presentation to Committee, submitted representations and objections provided verbally at this meeting, listed building consent be granted subject to the conditions and informatives set out in Appendix 1 of the officer report.

39 DAVINA HOUSE, 137-149 GOSWELL ROAD, LONDON, EC1V 7ET (Item B8)

Replacement of existing antennas, dish and cabinet with 6 no. new antennas, 1 no. dish and 2 replacement equipment cabinets. Removal and replacement of 3 x Remote Radio Units.

(Planning application number: P2019/0778/FUL)

In the discussion the following points were made:

- The application property is a six-storey office building located at the junction of Goswell Road, Lever Street and Percival Road. It is not listed; however, it is located within the Hat and Feathers Conservation Area. The area is a mixture of residential and commercial properties of varying designs ranging from tower blocks to terraced properties.
- The proposal will replace the existing 3 no. antennas, 1 no. dish, 3 Remote Radio Units and 1 equipment cabinet (all permitted under P111738). The Planning Officer mentioned that the proposal will result in an uplift of 3 no antennas and 1 equipment cabinet overall and an increase in height when compared to existing of 2cm, which will still be below the taller existing equipment on the roof used by other operators. Members were reminded that the essence of the installation is to provide additional 5G coverage along with the existing 4G coverage.
- Members were advised that The building is on a prominent corner at a road junction and has a large amount of existing roof top equipment including a mast and antennas on the Percival Street elevation that is approximately 5m in height. There are no listed buildings or locally listed buildings within the immediate context of the application site, which is in the Hat and Feathers Conservation Area.

Planning Sub Committee B - 14 July 2020

- Meeting was advised that although the Design and Conservation Team consider the antennas to be visible from the public realm, there would be a neutral impact on the character and appearance of the conservation area and visual amenity generally.
- The Planning Officer advised members that the main issues arising from this proposal relate to its design, harm to the conservation area, neighbouring amenity and public benefit.
- The proposal has been amended during the course of the assessment of the application with the proposed equipment being moved back from the edge of the building so as to not overhang the parapet line. It is not possible for the equipment to be moved any further back from the edge, as this would impact on the effective operation of the antennas.
- With regard to the impact of the proposal on the amenity of neighbouring amenity, the Planning Officer reminded Members of Paragraph 116 of the Framework, that the need for the telecommunication system should not be questioned, nor should health safeguards be determined if the proposal meets International Commission guidelines for public exposure.
- The application had been submitted with an appropriate Declaration of Conformity by way of the ICNIRP evidencing that the antenna and cabinets do not require noisy mechanical plant such as condensing units or cooling fans. Meeting was advised that in this instance there is no requirement for a noise assessment of the impact or for any conditions to control noise from the installation.
- In terms of health risks from the proposal, Members were advised that an ICNIRP Declaration was submitted with the application confirming that the proposed antennas would not generate electromagnetic radiation above thresholds that would pose a risk to the general public or workers responsible for maintaining the equipment.

Councillor Kay proposed a motion to grant planning permission. This was seconded by Councillor Poyser and carried.

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.

The meeting ended at 10.30 pm

CHAIR