

London Borough of Islington

Planning Committee - 1 October 2020

Minutes of the virtual meeting of the Planning Committee held on 1 October 2020 at 7.30 pm.

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

Councillor Martin Klute in the Chair

195 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.

196 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE (Item A2)

Apologies were received from Councillor Ismail.

197 DECLARATIONS OF SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS (Item A3)

There were no declarations of substitute members.

198 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST (Item A4)

There were no declarations of interest.

199 ORDER OF BUSINESS (Item A5)

The order of business would be as per the agenda.

200 MEMBERSHIP, TERMS OF REFERENCE AND DATES OF MEETINGS (Item A6)

RESOLVED:

- a) That the Sub-Committees be confirmed as five member Sub-Committees and the Terms of Reference be noted.
- b) That it be noted that the allocation of seats was determined in accordance with the advice in the report.
- c) That Councillors Picknell, Poyser, Convery, Clarke and Ismail be appointed as members of Planning Sub-Committee A for the current municipal year or until their successors are appointed.
- d) That Councillors Kay, Khondoker, Woolf, Klute and Chowdhury be appointed as members of Planning Sub-Committee B for the current municipal year or until their successors are appointed.

- e) That it be noted that Councillor Picknell had been appointed Chair of Planning Sub-Committee A and Councillor Kay had been appointed Chair of Planning Sub-Committee B for the current municipal year or until their successors are appointed.
- f) That Councillor Poyser be appointed as Vice-Chair of Planning Sub-Committee A and Councillor Khondoker be appointed as Vice-Chair of Planning Sub-Committee B for the current municipal year or until their successors are appointed.
- g) That it be noted that any member who was a member or substitute member of the Planning Committee could substitute at any meetings of either Sub-Committee if they had not been appointed as a member of the Sub-Committee.

201 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING (Item A7)

RESOLVED:

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

202 196-228 YORK WAY, LONDON, N7 9AX (Item B1)

Demolition of the existing buildings and the erection of a part 3 to part 5 storey building plus double basement to provide for a total of 8,268sqm (GIA) of self-storage floorspace (Use Class B8) and 687sqm (GIA) of flexible office floorspace (Use Class B1a) along with associated access arrangements, car and cycle parking, servicing and plant area, refuse storage and ancillary works.
(Planning application number: P2019/3410/FUL)

In the discussion the following points were made:

- Application site is a corner plot located to the east side of York Way and the north side of Vale Royal which has a variety of buildings with different occupiers. The site is designated within the Vale Royal and Brewery Road Industrial site (LSIS) and is not within or adjacent to conservation area or heritage assets.
- Members were advised that during the course of the application the scheme had been revised by reducing the height, bulk, scale and massing of the building to address concerns raised by representations about the design and impact on neighbouring amenity.
- The proposal has been assessed taking into consideration its planning history, land use, design and the impact of neighbouring amenity, transport and energy.
- An application for both the site and neighbouring 22 -23 Tileyard was refused and dismissed at appeal where two reasons for refusal were upheld. The first on grounds of its height, scale and design as the building was considered to be overbearing and its failure to respect and positively respond to the

neighbouring existing buildings and the street scape. The second reason for refusal was the impact of the scheme on neighbouring amenity as it was considered to have an undue negative impact in terms of its reduction of daylight.

- In land use terms, the proposed industrial led B8 (self-storage) development is supported given the site's location within the Vale Royal/Brewery Road Locally Significant Industrial Site ('LSIS'). The proposed B1(a) (office) floorspace would total only 7.7% of the development's GIA, ensuring that the site is predominantly in industrial use, in accordance with all the pertinent land use policies with the London Plan and Islington Development Plan.
- The Planning Officer noted that although there is some adverse impact in terms of reduction of daylight to neighbouring properties this was at the lower end of the scale and that the provision of additional industrial floor space within the LSIS, improvement to the public realm and improved energy sustainability measures and planning obligations secured through s106 legal agreement outweigh concerns about the scheme.
- Since the scheme has been revised, Members were informed that no further concerns had been raised about the neighbouring amenity in terms of overlooking or loss of outlook, nor has the scheme any significant impact on traffic and parking. In addition members were advised that delivery and servicing will be able to take place safely within a dedicated on-site service yard and the level of cycle storage is considered by officers as sufficient for this type of B8 use.
- In response to a question about landscaping details and how this could be enforced, the Planning Officer reminded members of condition 6 in the report, which ensures that landscaping details are to be submitted to the Local Planning Authority and its agreement prior to occupation of the premises. A request that an informative be included if permission is granted to emphasise Members acknowledgement that it notes the Tree Officer concerns was noted by the Committee.
- In terms of the impact of the amenity of neighbouring properties, the Planning Officer acknowledged that although transgressions still remain which weigh against the scheme, members were reminded that the weight afforded to its impact is however limited by the fact that the transgressions in this instance are at a lower end of the scale.
- In terms of VSC, the Planning officer advised that in comparison to the refused scheme where there were 150 transgressions, the revised proposal has 49. On the NSL and daylight distribution, members were advised that whilst the refused scheme saw 42 rooms fail, there was 30 transgressions in this revised proposal.

Planning Committee - 1 October 2020

- With regard to Camden council's objections that the scheme was not sympathetic to neighbouring properties, meeting was advised that objections were not received from Islington Council's Design Officers and that the proposed brick work and its finishing is in line with both the Fitzpatrick building and the Tileyard building north of the site. Members were informed that no further comments had been received by Camden since the revised scheme had been fully re-consulted.
- In terms of TFL objections to the number of car parking spaces being proposed for the site, the Planning Officer advised that this was due to TFL applying the general parking standards for B8 uses strictly, which does not take into consideration the nature of a self-storage facility where customers will be expected to drive in to the site to store their goods or tradesmen storing their tools and that this is not a warehouse distribution centre type of business. The number of car parking spaces being proposed will ensure that it minimises cars waiting to enter the site to offload their personal goods, idling and the potential of users parking on local roads and then walking with their goods into the storage facility.
- In response to a question about the proposed brick being used for the scheme, the Planning Officer acknowledged that solid brick was being used and not brick slip.
- On the sustainability of the scheme, the Planning officer referred members to the drawings submitted with the application that shows approximately 50% of the building roof will have solar panels installed, and the Council's Energy Services Officer accepted the submitted Energy Strategy.
- With regards to the amount of floor space being proposed and concerns in particular of the potential of increasing the floor space from 8,268sqm to 15,769sqm by erecting other floors described as 'demountable mezzanines' and its impact on vehicular movement, the Planning Officer advised that the scheme had been tested in terms of vehicle generations and its modelling exercise had taken into consideration the two different scenarios, i.e. the minimum and the maximum floor space and that officers were satisfied with the servicing arrangements of the facility.
- The Planning Officer requested that if members are minded to grant planning permission, the wording of condition 24 will need to be strengthened to ensure that only self-storage within the B8 use class is permitted and not to allow amalgamated uses; that the use for self-storage; and office space cannot be changed through permitted development rights.
- The Legal Officer in clarifying the legal position of the scheme, advised that the applicant is able to apply for the amount of floor space as advertised in the report within planning rules, knowing that in future there may well be an option to increase the amount of floor space, reminding members that committee can only consider what is before them. In addition to the above

Planning Committee - 1 October 2020

advice, the legal officer reiterated to members that the scheme had been assessed on the basis of the greater amount of floor space potentially available in the future.

- The Legal Officer reminded members that additional floors in terms of mezzanines is regarded as permitted development which does not require further consent.
- In response to members concerns about the alley way to the rear, the agent indicated that this is a fire escape route and benefits the building and the adjoining 22-23 Tileyard Road and they will continue to be have a right to the egress.
- On the operation of the actual floor space, the agent advised that it is a similar arrangement with its 83 self-storage facility around the country describing it as the most efficient way for the business and importantly energy efficient. Members were reminded of the unusual nature of the building with its basement level and different floors and that the erection of mezzanine provides opportunity for future uses and internal layout. Members were advised that the dismantlable mezzanines could be removed if not required and that having solid floors alone renders the business unsuitable.
- The transport consultant explained to the meeting that a survey was carried at its other storage facilities, studying vehicular movements and number of parking spaces occupied at different times of the day, confirming that the proposal would prevent waiting, idling and the avoidance of parking on the local roads.
- The agent acknowledged that the Community Levy Infrastructure will be based on the proposal for 8268sqm instead of 15,678sqm and that the demountable mezzanine was an element of future use for the building.
- During deliberation, members welcomed the solar panels, that trees will be protected and the proposed landscape and the public realm improvement.
- A request to the applicant on the possibility of installing electric charging points in the car parking spaces was agreed by the agent. The Chair requested that an additional recommendation be included as a condition in the planning permission, wording to be delegated to officers. Also that condition 3 ensures that solid bricks is to be used in the scheme.
- Councillor Clarke proposed a motion to include an informative which addresses the landscaping concerns raised by the Council Tree Officer. This was seconded by Councillor Klute and carried.

RESOLVED:

Planning Committee - 1 October 2020

That following consideration of the case officer's report (the assessment and recommendations therein), the presentation to Committee, submitted representations, 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 Planning Obligation made under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 securing the heads of terms as set out in Appendix 1 of the officer report.

The meeting ended at 8.50 pm

CHAIR