

London Borough of Islington

Planning Committee - 5 November 2020

Minutes of the Zoom meeting of the Planning Committee held on 5 November 2020 at 7.30 pm.

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

Councillor Martin Klute in the Chair

203 INTRODUCTIONS (Item A1)

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

204 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE (Item A2)

There were no apologies for absence.

205 DECLARATIONS OF SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS (Item A3)

There were no declarations of substitute members

206 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST (Item A4)

There were no declarations of interest.

207 ORDER OF BUSINESS (Item A5)

The order of business would be as per the agenda.

208 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING (Item A6)

RESOLVED:

That the minutes of the meeting held on 1 October 2020 be confirmed as an accurate record of proceedings and the Chair be authorised to sign them.

209 SITE OF HARVIST UNDER FIVES, HORNSEY ROAD, LONDON, N7 7NN (Item B1)

Erection of a new building, up to 5 storeys in height, to provide 30 flats, together with associated amenity space and detached refuse store.

(Planning application number: P2018/4131/FUL)

In the discussion the following points were made:

- The Planning Officer reminded Members that a scheme for 29 units was originally presented to the Planning committee on 18th May 2020 with a recommendation for approval subject to conditions and a Section 106 agreement.
- Members were advised that a final decision had not been issued by the Council , however applicant has taken the opportunity to submit a revised scheme to include one additional unit through the subdivision of one of the units into 2 flats.
- Members were reminded that all issues had been considered by the Committee in May which is appended to the report. No issues have arisen as a result of the minor revision.
- Meeting was advised of a correction in the report which indicated that there were 2 objectors instead of 3 and that the issues raised by the third objector are similar and had been fully addressed and considered when planning permission was granted.
- The Planning Officer advised that with the revised scheme there will be no noticeable external alterations except an increase in the width of a 4th floor terrace pillar by 10cm.
- Meeting was informed that although the revised scheme would result in the reduction of the proportion of affordable housing to 50% by unit it is still policy compliant.
- In terms of the quality of residential accommodation, the Planning Officer advised that the sub division of the 4th floor flat will result in two 1- bed units with floor space of 58sqm and 66sqm which exceeds the minimum national standard of 50sqm for a 1-bed/2 persons flat.
- In response to a question on loss of light, the Planning Officer advised that the units would be dual aspect with good access to good natural light and ventilation with the smaller flat benefitting from 6sqm of external amenity space in the form of a balcony whilst the larger unit would enjoy a balcony and roof terrace.
- A member raised concern over the use of a gas boiler in terms of carbon reduction. Officers clarified that planning policy allows the use of communal gas boilers where connection to a decentralised energy network or to a combined heating and power system is not feasible, which is the case with this application. The Planning Officer advised that no objections had been received from the Council's Energy Officer when the scheme was originally submitted in May 2020.
- On the suggestion of including an additional condition stating that notwithstanding the present energy option proposal and for the energy

strategy to be revisited in the future, the Planning Officer advised that this is included in the S106 agreement, however an informative could be included with the planning permission to reinforce the view of the committee on this issue.

- On the issue of future proofing and connection to decentralised energy network, members were advised that this is a requirement under the s106 agreement if it is proved to be feasible in the future, however at the moment there is no plan as there is no distribution network within 500m of the site.
- In addition to the above, the Planning Officer reassured members that the hierarchy options as stipulated in policy 5.3 of the London Plan Energy and Heating cooling strategy, the local network, the combined heating and power network and finally the communal heating and cooling had all been considered and assessed.
- In response to an enquiry about Air and Ground source heat pumps, the planning officer advised that the council's energy officer has stated that solar, air source and ground source and biomass were all tested but ruled out.

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 informatics 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.

210

218 UPPER STREET, ISLINGTON, LONDON, N1 1RR (Item B2)

To add 218 Upper Street to Islington's Register of Locally listed Buildings

In the discussion the following points were made:

- Officers are seeking for Committee to recommend to the Corporate Director of Environment and Regeneration that 218 Upper Street be formally adopted onto the Register of Locally Listed Buildings and Locally Significant Shopfronts.
- The Design Officer informed the meeting that the building which is located on the raised pavement of the north-western end of Upper Street directly abuts the Upper Street North Conservation Area on its southern and eastern side of the building and is within the setting of several other designated heritage assets (listed buildings) including the Grade I listed Union Chapel and the Grade II listed Compton Terrace on the upper side of Upper Street.
- 218 Upper Street has recently been a subject of pre application discussions and during the process the significance of the building was identified and

assessed. The building has consequently been treated as a non-designated asset during the pre-application stage.

- Members were advised that design officers having identified the building which used to be occupied by Nat West Bank on Upper Street possesses local architectural and heritage significance have requested for it to be added to the Register of Locally Listed Buildings and Locally Significant Shopfronts in recognition of their value as irreplaceable heritage assets which contribute to the quality of the local built environment, enhance the local street and sustain a sense of Islington's local distinctiveness.
- The Design Review Panel have advised that the building has an inherent architectural quality in that it is both elegant and possesses notable decorative details. It was also noted that the building contributes positively to the setting of the conservation area and that considering the building was the first bank branch to be rebuilt after the Blitz, it has both historic and communal value.
- The Register of Locally Listed Buildings and Locally Significant Shopfronts is a list of buildings, structures and shopfronts in the borough which whilst not listed by the Secretary of State for their national importance, the Council recognises to be of local importance due to their architectural, historical or environmental significance.
- The purpose of the Local list is to ensure that care is taken over decisions affecting the future of those identified as heritage assets, including alterations proposed through the planning process. Members were advised that considering locally listed buildings are not statutory listed there is no requirement for Listed Building Consent to carry out works to locally listed buildings.
- The Officer informed the meeting that as part of the process, the Council applied to Historic England for the building to be listed but was refused on grounds that it did not meet the high bar for listing in the national context but they did acknowledge that the building possesses claims to local interest.
- On the question of low windows, meeting was advised that local listing would not preclude any works to the façade or interior of the building, that under paragraph 197 of the NPPF any alterations that are proposed under the planning process would be assessed by its impact on the significance of the building as part of the planning process
- In response to a question on whether the building was designed by architect Sherren, the officer advised that this was based on 2 sources of information, a narrative provided by the archivist from the Royal Bank of Scotland who confirmed that Sherren was the in-house architect of the provincial bank and an article from the builder which is appended to committee report. Officers advised that even if Sherren wasn't the actual architect, he was the lead

architect for the Bank and would have had string hand in the design.

- On the issue of whether the building merits its heritage status, the officer advised that heritage is an expanding field and as time goes on what is considered to have architectural merit today may not be in the future, for example 20th architecture that was once derided is now appreciated for its significance.
- On why the building was not in the conservation area, the officer suggested that considering the conservation area was only designated in 1985 when the building would only have been only 33 years old, it would likely have been too early to consider its heritage significance.
- Lauren Ayers of Lichfields, acting as heritage consultant to the owner of the did not consider that the building should be included on the list as it does not have any architectural significance. The objector indicated that there is no significance of the 1850's building as it is not mentioned in any notable literature, nor does it reflect the quality of works carried out by architect Sherren. In addition, the current survey of 20th century buildings undertaken by the Council does not mention the building.
- With regards to the historical significance of the building, the objector noted that this was not the first provincial of any bank in London and not the first of its type. The objector also stated that considering the building had lost its bank signage and not registered as a bank it has no historical significance as a former bank.
- In terms of its inclusion into the conservation area, the objector indicated that considering other buildings with similar façade had not been included in the conservation area, there is nothing that makes 218 upper street building unique to deserve its inclusion.
- With regard to officers comment that the building should be included on the list due to its age, rarity and integrity, the objector reiterated that the building had been altered both externally and internally, that there were other 19th century buildings not on the list which were more distinguished with post war architecture such as the Roman Catholic Church and the Astro Primary school, so the building should be listed as a non-designated heritage asset in planning decisions.
- In response to an enquiry on why the building merits listing when there were other 1950 buildings in the area, the officer clarified that the objector was referring to other buildings on the list and not with those in the surrounding area. For example, there is a 1950's building at 40-42 upper street, which officers consider to be of less interest, with a more paired back design and has a slightly less attractive shop front and not of the same quality of architectural design in comparison to 218 upper street.

- Members were advised that the local list had not been reviewed since 2010, and the fact that more post-war buildings were not on the list was not representative of the fact that no other post-war buildings meet the criteria for inclusion, rather it was indicative of the fact that the list had not been reviewed recently.
- In response to a question on whether the views about the building should be restricted to local residents, the legal officer advised that this was not a planning application where it is relevant, that members were not making decisions but providing views and comments which the Corporate Director will take into consideration when taking a decision on whether to include it on the register list.
- Members had a number of viewpoints about including the building on the Register list.
- The Chair noted the extent and effort the agents had gone into detailing their reasons why they believe that the building was not worthy of listing, however inviting members to take note of 3 issues in the report, the viewpoint that 20th century architecture has evolved since the conservation area and the list were put together, advice of the council's Design Review Panel who have suggested that it is worthy of inclusion on the local list and finally Historic England's comment at the end of its decision when refusing council's application for a national listing, that the building possess claims to local interest.
- A member acknowledged the essence of the Register as unfortunately Islington over the years has witnessed buildings scheduled for listing were subsequently demolished or altered by developers before it was up for consideration but was concerned that the supporting information document before members which sets out a case prepared by officers was weak. Member was particularly concerned that Alec Foreshaw's definitive book of 20th century buildings in Islington made no reference to the building.
- Other member disagreed with these comments and echoed the comments of the Chair regarding a clear steer from the Design Review Panel, Officers, from Historic England, and expressed that the building does have merit and that more 20th century buildings being added to the local list should be welcomed. Member recommended that that the building should be added to the local list.
- Member commented that as a rare example of a bank branch that is not neo-classical which replaced an earlier bank branch, it was worthy of local listing.
- A Member acknowledged the advice of the Design Review Panel but commented that they found the upper floors, internal areas and rear façade to be of lesser interest, however, they supported its inclusion onto the local

list due to the interest and quality of the shopfront and decorative features.

- Member supported the addition of the building to the local list and welcomed the future plans to rejuvenate and renovate the building, putting it back into use, noting that this could be achieved in conjunction with preserving in its present state.

RESOLVED:

That the Corporate Director of Environment and Regeneration formally adopt 218 Upper Street onto the Register of Locally Listed Buildings and Locally Significant Shopfronts.

The meeting ended at 9.00 pm

CHAIR