

London Borough of Islington

Planning Committee - 27 July 2021

Minutes of the meeting of the Planning Committee held at Council Chamber, Town Hall, Upper Street, N1 2UD - Islington Town Hall on 27 July 2021 at 7.30 pm.

Present: Councillors: Klute (Chair), Poyser (Vice-Chair), Khondoker (Vice-Chair), Clarke, Convery, Ibrahim, Jackson and North

Also Present: Councillors:

Councillor Martin Klute in the Chair

247 INTRODUCTIONS (Item A1)

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

248 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE (Item A2)

Apologies were received from Councillor Picknell and Woolf

249 DECLARATIONS OF SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS (Item A3)

There were no declarations of substitute members.

250 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST (Item A4)

There were no declarations of interest.

251 ORDER OF BUSINESS (Item A5)

The order of business would be B2,B4,B1 and B3

252 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING (Item A6)

RESOLVED:

That the minutes of the meeting held on 29 June be confirmed as an accurate record of proceedings and the Chair be authorised to sign them.

253 394 CAMDEN ROAD, ISLINGTON, LONDON N& 0SJ (Item B1)

Retrospective change of use from a storage and distribution warehouse (B8) to light industry B1(a) (now Class E). Retention of internal alterations including internal mezzanine floor (amended description) to provide 450 sqm of new Class E floorspace. The installation of a new roof and rooflights. Construction of new entrance canopy and provision of 20 cycle spaces.

(Planning application number: P2018/4071/FUL)

In the discussion the following points were made:

Planning Committee - 27 July 2021

- The Planning Officer advised of a correction to paragraph 11.1, that Class B8 use does not now fall under Class E and remains unchanged, however the change of use from B8 to B1 (now Class E) is supported by policy and is considered acceptable in land use terms.
- Condition 1 is to be amended, that the requirement to complete the roof by 4th February 2022 be deleted and replaced by a standard 3 year commencement condition.
- Members were advised that in order to be consistent with the enforcement notice, an additional condition is recommended stating 'that Notwithstanding condition 1 and 6, within 7 months of the date of the permission, the new roof shall be constructed in its entirety in accordance with the hereby approved plans and particulars and shall be maintained as such thereafter'
- The Planning Officer advised that site falls within the Hillmarton Conservation Area, does not comprise any Listed Buildings or fall within the setting of any Listed Buildings and lies within the Nags Head & Holloway key core area.
- The application has been submitted in response to a Council planning enforcement investigation on 17 Oct 2018, that the use of the subdivided main warehouse and the townhouse in use as 8 flexible units within Class B were in breach of planning control and required planning permission. Similarly the new felt roof is in breach of planning control.
- Members were informed that it has now been established that the change of use of the townhouse floorspace is a permitted change not requiring planning permission as detailed in paragraph 4.10 of the report
- With regards the external alterations involving the new metal roof and roof lights, meeting was advised that it is considered that it will preserve the visual appearance and character Hillmarton Conservation Area and would be acceptable in design terms
- The proposed use of the warehouse for 18 separate units represents a more intensive and efficient use of the site and supports local employment and contributes to the local economy and is supported by development plan policy
- It was noted that although the proposal is recognised as having potential to generate noise levels due to the various uses, the Council's Environmental Health Pollution officers have recommended controls through suggested conditions to mitigate any impact
- In response to a member query the applicant confirmed that a solar PV array would be installed on the roof and a £16,100 carbon offset payment was proposed to meet policy requirements in relation to sustainability and renewable energy
- In response to a question about wheelchair access, the meeting was advised that although there is no requirement to consider wheel chair access, there is already a ramp access to the building
- Members welcomed the scheme, noting that it is a successful project for small and medium enterprise and policy compliant.

Planning permission was granted subject to the amended conditions noted above and the inclusion of an additional conditions

RESOLVED:

That following consideration of the case officer's report (the assessment and recommendations therein), the presentation to Committee, submitted representations at this meeting, planning permission be granted subject to the conditions and informatives set out in Appendix 1 of the officer report and the additional condition 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 as amended above, the wording of which was delegated to officers; and subject to any direction by the Mayor of London to refuse the application or for it to be called in for determination by the Mayor of London.

254

LAND AT PARKVIEW ESTATE COLLINS ROAD, N5 2UD (Item B2)

Application for a minor-material amendment under S73 to vary condition 2 (approved Drawings) and condition 11 (Energy Statement) following a grant of planning permission Ref: P2017/2444/FUL dated 28/11/2017 for the construction of 40 new dwelling units comprising 8 x 1B2P units, 3 x 2B3P units, 27 x 2B4P units, 2 x 3B5P units with associated amenity space and 41.8sqm community use floorspace, provided in six new residential blocks ranging from 2 to 6 storeys in height, along with bicycle storage, improvements to the public realm, and the demolition of existing garages and storage units

The amendments sought are: Increasing affordable housing provision to 100% social rented housing; amendments to the landscaping plan, removal of an additional tree, swapping a 2-bedroom wheelchair accessible home in Block B with a 3-bedroom home from Block G, amendments to design and layout and relocation of cycle parking spaces.

(Planning application number: P2020/3313/S73)

In the discussion the following points were made:

- The Chair reminded members that the application was a S73 planning application for amendments to a planning permission so to avoid revisiting the issues considered previously that are not subject to the amendments.
- The Planning Officer informed the meeting that 10 further objections were received since the publication of the agenda, 9 of which did not raise any additional points to those addressed in the report. One representation raised questions regarding the location of Block D. The Planning Officer advised that Block D is enlarged by 0.3 square metres but would continue to be located on the boundary wall. It was advised that the originally approved Design and Access Statement incorrectly refers to the retention of this boundary wall. The Planning Officer advised that recommended condition 2 would be amended to remove reference to the relevant part of the Design and Access Statement
- The Planning Officer advised that the reference in paragraph 7.4 to paragraph 9.135 should read as paragraph 9.116.
- The Planning Officer advised of the number of signatories to an online petition

Planning Committee - 27 July 2021

- In comparison to the previously approved scheme, the Planning Officer informed members that the proposal will result in an increase in affordable housing provision from 55% to 100% social rented housing; an amendment to the landscaping plan; removal of an additional tree; swapping of a 2 bedroom wheel chair accessible home in Block B with a 3 bedroom home from Block G and amendments to design and layout and relocation of cycle parking spaces
- Key planning considerations are the increase to 100% social rented units, design and layout considerations, which are sympathetic and are of high quality, improvements to daylight levels, tree mitigation and the translocation of a mulberry tree.
- Members were advised that the amendments to the scheme will result in an improvement to daylight levels received by the flats, and that applicants have provided sufficient tree mitigation measures for the translocation of the Mulberry tree.
- In terms of design changes from the original scheme, the Planning Officer informed the meeting that it involves a minor increase in the footprint of all blocks, a decrease in the parapet height of Block E, revisions to the fenestration of blocks A, B, D and G, revisions to the materiality of some of the blocks and amendments to balconies and windows
- Members were advised that as a result of the various design amendments, the internal layouts and private amenity spaces have been affected however, all units continue to meet minimum space standards.
- The Planning Officer advised members that the proposal will result in the relocation of the mulberry tree from the north of the site despite that it was detailed to be retained in the original application, that the proposed mitigation which includes an early mature mulberry tree and the planting of another 12 trees in addition to the translocation of the existing mulberry tree will result in an uplift in tree canopy cover from the approved development.
- An updated Energy strategy has been submitted to reflect the amendments to the proposal which is to be secured by condition and a legal agreement ensuring that applicant undertakes a feasibility assessment for the location of additional PV's on the estate in order to achieve the target of 27% CO2 reductions
- A resident objected to the removal of the mulberry tree and the subsequent decision by the applicant to relocate a highly valued tree especially after applicants had reassured the community that it would be retained in its present location, that the tree represents a focal point for the community and has sentimental value to residents.
- The objector was concerned that residents had been misinformed in 2018 that the tree was dying, only to be informed that it is not infected with any fungus. Objectors asserted that the removal of the tree is contrary to the Council's declaration of climate emergency and that planning officers had not taken this into consideration. Objectors also asserted that residents have been unfairly treated throughout the whole exercise, despite having conceded a plot of land which had been previously allocated as a play area for children to build a block building.

Planning Committee - 27 July 2021

- Another resident objected to the ever changing reasons provided to justify its decision to remove the tree since the scheme was approved, reminding the meeting that its removal would require the use of a large equipment, that it was a risky operation and that there is no guarantee of the tree survival in its new location. He was concerned with what he asserted was the developers numerous attempts to undermine the health of the tree in order to justify its removal. The objector questioned how a young mulberry tree could be described as adding value when it is well known that the value of any tree is in its age.
- In response, the agent acknowledged the sentimental value of the tree to residents but reminded members decision to relocate the tree was not taken lightly, that in light of the ongoing complex groundworks, to the tree cannot be retained in its present location, that a tree radar survey was carried out which indicates that the roots are in the way of the development. Members were advised that conditions have been recommended to ensure that both its removal and care are properly managed.
- In response to Chair's concerns about the numerous minor amendments to the originally agreed scheme, the Planning Officer advised that according to a high court decision, changes that do not affect the description of the scheme can be regarded as minor.
- The Chair acknowledged resident's frustration especially having been initially informed that the tree would remain when application was approved but reminded members that as planning authority, it is important that members decide on whether it is reasonable for the tree to be relocated to another section of the estate.
- Members agreed that although the removal of a tree can be viewed as expensive, the urgent demand for housing for Islington residents is paramount in this instance.
- A Member questioned the reasons for the removal of the tree noting the unanimity of the committee when the scheme was approved 3 years ago, that the tree was a selling point. Member suggested the possibility of inviting the architect or project manager to explain why the tree cannot be retained.
- The Chair reiterated the above concerns but informed the meeting that having viewed the plans, it was obvious that a significant proportion of the tree roots would lie deep under the proposed building footprint, concluding that the tree would unlikely survive in its present location, that the option to relocate the tree seems more suitable, noting the amount of work carried out and the cost involved.
- Councillor Khondoker moved a motion on the possibility of strengthening a recommendation to recognise residents cherished memories by designing the hard landscaping in the area where the tree had previously stood in such a way as to mark the area that it had occupied. This was seconded by the Chair.
- The Chair noted conditions 24 and 25, requesting the possibility of modifying condition 12 with an informative which will help identify the relocated tree

Councillor Klute proposed a motion to grant planning permission subject to amending the above condition. 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 amended 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.

255

LAND AT YORK WAY ESTATE YORK WAY LONDON N7 (Item B3)

Demolition of existing community centre building and MUGA and the erection of four blocks of between four and seven storeys (Buildings A, B & C - part six and part seven storeys and Building D - four storeys) to provide a total of 91 x Class C3 units (17 x studios, 25 x 1-bed, 21 x 2-bed, 25 x 3-bed & 3 x 4-bed), a community centre and estate office, estate-wide play space and landscaping. Alterations to vehicular, service and pedestrian access from North Road, York Way and Market Road, pedestrian footpaths and ramps, car and cycle parking and other associated works including landscaping; amenity space; and refuse storage.

(Planning application number: P2021/0969/FUL)

In the discussion the following points were made:

- The Planning Officer highlighted a correction within the report which incorrectly states that the site is within Caledonian ward instead of Holloway ward
- Meeting was advised of two updates, an additional condition is being recommended which will require further details of future proofing to connect to a DHP potential energy network connection and secondly on page 151 of the report, reference is made to a contribution of £60,000 towards transport and highway improvement, that a section 278 highway agreement has to be agreed prior to commencement.
- Site is an existing housing estate and consist of four residential blocks separated by relatively large areas of open grassland and hardstanding and the estate currently includes 275 dwellings with a range of unit sizes and tenures.
- Site is not within a conservation area and does not contain any designated heritage assets, however there is a grade II listed building (the old 'Lion' pub)
- Members were advised that in land use terms, the scheme involves the re-provision and improvements to community infrastructure and 91 new high quality affordable housing units, all of which will be made available for social rent which is policy compliant
- Although the scheme will result in the reduction of amenity grassland, members were advised that there will be an overall increase in green space including a well considered landscape proposal with high quality playspace provision.

Planning Committee - 27 July 2021

- The Planning Officer advised that Blocks A & B will be built on existing green space with some landscaping interventions while blocks C will be around where the existing community centre is located and Block D will be on the site of the existing MUGA
- Members were advised that following consultation with residents and an audit of the surrounding areas, it was agreed that there is a generous provision of playspace in and around the area, including extensive football facilities.
- Meeting was advised that Block A which is a part 6/7 storey building will provide 22 new dwellings, Block B will provide 23 new dwellings and Block C with a larger footprint will provide 29 dwellings. In addition, provision for larger families and wheel chair accessibility which is block D which is 4 storey high will accommodate 17 new dwellings
- A new space is proposed on the podiums at the centre of the estate defined by play and fitness opportunities, meeting the social spaces and new planting and trees. The existing MUGA and play area would be replaced by two play areas on the eastern and western podium
- Members were advised that all new dwellings will be for social renting with Islington council having nomination rights for 45 units and the remaining units will be for City of London.
- In terms of design, conservation and heritage considerations, the Planning Officer informed the meeting that the well-designed buildings will mediate successfully between the architecture of the existing estate and the built form of the surrounding streetscape.
- 952 letters were sent to neighbouring occupiers of which 36 objections were received. At the initial stage of the proposed scheme an online petition was initiated.
- One of the issues raised by existing residents was the impact of the scheme on neighbouring amenity, however the daylight and sunlight report concludes that 96% of all rooms will meet BRE guidelines for daylight distribution and 92% of windows will meet the VSC test as detailed in the report. With regards to the height and massing of the three blocks of the scheme, the Planning Officer advised that it is broadly accepted in principle, that the irregular size and shape of the buildings are sculpted to the specific conditions of their locations so as to allow views into the estate from York Way and ensure that the large greens are still visible, maintaining the estate's sense of openness and to avoid direct overlooking and reduce overshadowing of existing buildings. Members were advised that the shape of the buildings also allows for all new units to be dual aspect.
- The Planning Officer reiterated that special regard has been given to the desirability of preserving the setting of the listed building and surrounding heritage assets and it is considered that the proposal would conserve the significance of surrounding heritage assets by being sympathetic to the assets significance and appreciation within their surroundings
- In terms of noise and pollution concerns, members were advised that although no objections have been received from the Council's protection team, conditions 11-14 has been recommended to mitigate any noise and pollution impact as a result of the scheme.

Planning Committee - 27 July 2021

- In addition, the Planning Officer noted that as the development is car free except for the wheel chair accessible units, the impact on local highway network or increase in air pollution would be minimised.
- In terms of noise during construction works, members were advised that a Construction and Management Plan has been submitted and approved as recommended in condition 5
- Members were advised that there are no concerns about the overdevelopment of the site and that it is accepted that it is not a significant issue
- In terms of anti-social behaviour and security concerns, meeting was advised that the proposal will result in an improvement to pedestrian routes and increase to passive surveillance. In addition, the Council officer has made submission and recommended condition 31
- Meeting was informed of a contribution of £83,812 towards offsetting carbon reduction and £60,000 towards highway improvements
- In response to a question on the requirements for mechanical ventilation for some of the units, the Planning Officer noted that this would be for some of the units fronting the busy York way and the south facing windows, that an assessment was undertaken on the requirement and a condition has been recommended to address this issue
- In response to a question regarding the dwellings allocated to Islington residents, the Planning officer informed that meeting that for the 45 units, this will be 1 x 4bed, 13x 2 bed, 14 x 3 bed and 17 x 1 bed
- Play spaces on the eastern podium will be for younger children up to 8 years while the western podium will be for all ages, that the indicative layout shows a combination of swings, table tennis, gym equipment and other further details will be conditioned.
- Members were advised that the hard standing in the south eastern side of the estate which is currently used for car parking will be turned into landscape community garden and the other one on the central part of the estate will be converted into a playspace for all ages with a lot of soft landscaping interventions including planting of trees and shrubs.
- In response to the net loss of existing car parking on the estate, meeting was advised that no car parking will be provided, that a condition has been recommended removing the eligibility of new residents from being able to obtain new parking permits on the estate and the surrounding streets
- The meeting was advised that the development maximises the amount of permeable surfaces as stated on page 105 of the report, that condition 7 has been recommended which requires the applicant to demonstrate what more can be done to increase the permeable surfaces.
- In response to an enquiry on whether officers had taken into consideration the need to improve the existing buildings and to integrate the proposal more successfully into the existing estate, the Planning officer advised that although the landscaping improvement provides a form of integration, officers have recommended condition 34 which require improvements to the existing building's entrances with a view to improving them aesthetically and functionally.

Planning Committee - 27 July 2021

- In addition to the above, meeting was informed that City of London will be making significant improvements to the scheme which has been delayed due to Covid, that these improvements are not highlighted in the report being considered
- A member pointed out that the existing MUGA is a basketball facility, which sport is far less well provided for in the area.
- In response to a question why applicants had not taken the opportunity of re-providing the same games facilities in particular the basketball court or hoops, the agent acknowledged that this can be reviewed as part of the landscaping of the area. The chair proposed that the landscape condition be amended to include exploring the option to include a basketball hoop as part of the play facilities.
- On the question of the benefit of the scheme, the meeting was advised that funding of this application was for provision for new social housing, and in terms of the existing residents, this is provided in the improvements to the public realm. Further estate-wide improvements including refurbishments of the existing building are planned in the coming year, but are part of a separate budget, and are not covered by the current application.
- On future works being communicated to residents, the meeting was advised that timelines of work are communicated via Newsletter and with any updates when work commenced.
- A member enquired whether the provision of refurbishment works to the existing housing on the site could be tied by condition to the construction of the new blocks. legal advice was that this would not be technically possible from a legal perspective.

Councillor Klute proposed a motion to grant planning permission subject to including an additional condition. 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 additional condition 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 as amended above, the wording of which was delegated to officers; and subject to any direction by the Mayor of London to refuse the application or for it to be called in for determination by the Mayor of London.

256

WILLEN HOUSE 8-26 BATH STREET, LONDON EC1V 9DX (Item B4)

Extension, alteration and refurbishment of the existing building to provide re-modelled student accommodation comprising 212 student bedrooms (with 10% wheelchair accessible) with ancillary amenity spaces and secure cycle parking (sui

Planning Committee - 27 July 2021

generis use), together with retention and extension of existing office units (Class E) at ground floor and new landscaping at basement level, installation of pavement lightwells, removal of access ramp and replacement with platform lift (Planning application number: P2021/0616/FUL)

In the discussion the following points were made:

The Planning Officer highlighted a number of updates and amendments listed below:-

- That description of the proposal be amended to state that 'Access ramp will now be provided to the front of the building rather than a platform lift'
- A number of responses received from objectors following the third consultation phase on June 2021 be included, although all issues raised have been addressed in the report
- Amend Condition 26 to ensure that it secures a method of evacuation for the ambulant disabled.
- To amend the BREEAM (New Construction) Condition 14 -to change the reference from BREEAM (New Construction)(2018) to BREEAM "Bespoke"
- To include condition on hours of use for the external courtyards, that it shall not be used between the hours of 2300 and 0700 and
- To modify the bird and bat boxes condition, details shall be submitted including the number, design, specification and location prior to the commencement of work.

In the discussion the following points were made:

- The Planning Officer advised the meeting that application site comprises Willen House, a 7 storey building which is a non-designated heritage asset located within the Moorfields Conservation and is not situated within the setting of any designated listed or locally listed buildings
- Meeting was advised that building was converted into student halls of residence following planning consent in 2007, initially with 142 bedrooms and with a rear extension it has increased to 157 for post graduate students in City University
- In land use terms, the Planning Officer advised that the scheme proposes the intensification rather than the provision of new student accommodation which is not constrained by adopted and emerging policy
- 35% of the bedrooms in the uplift will be provided as affordable bedrooms.
- The accommodation is tied to higher education institutions and existing bedrooms are upgraded and retaining the commercial floor space on the ground floor
- 50 additional student accommodation units will be provided within the development to make it 207 in total
- Members were advised that the front elevation will be materially and thermally upgraded and the rear elevation will be reconstructed in brick and cladding with new fenestration to make it more sympathetic to surrounding areas and having minimal impact on conservation area
- In terms of land use consideration, the Planning Officer advised that the scheme proposes the intensification rather than the provision of new student accommodation, that the scheme provides 35% of the uplift as affordable bedrooms, provides for student bursary payments at £22000 pa at the policy compliant rate of 2.4%

Planning Committee - 27 July 2021

- Members were reminded that the accommodation is tied to higher education institutions ie City university, that the existing commercial floor space on the ground floor is retained and all the existing bedrooms are upgraded and that 10% of the whole development will be wheel chair accessible bedrooms.
- Scheme has been subject to a number of iterations over the course of its submission to the council so as to mitigate the impact of the scheme from sunlight and daylight loss, height has been reduced so that occupiers of Merino and that all units have passed BRE guidelines
- On the issue of daylight and sunlight loss , the planning officer advised that the new scheme is compliant
- In terms of design, meeting was advised that scheme does not have any significant impact on locally listed buildings, that council design officers have not submitted any objections.
- With regards to height and massing concerns, meeting was informed that the proposed increase in height is considered acceptable, that it is a building with proportionate comfortable contextual fit. In addition it was noted that the proposed elevational treatment is considered successful, and that the proposed changes of the rear of the building will enrich the appearance of the building overall
- A number of key amenity considerations as highlighted in the report include, an updated student management plan which will be secured through legal agreement; curfew hours between 2300- 0800 will be introduced with associated disciplinary procedures in place; an on-site concierge and facilities management will be put in place.
- Further to the above it was noted that single bedrooms is only available for post graduates and foreign students; that conditions are recommended to prevent the use of flat roof as amenity spaces and operating hours for external courtyards will be introduced. Air quality report has been submitted and conditions have been recommended to limit noise impacts from plant.
- Members were advised that as the proposal is fundamentally refurbishment and extensions, which prevents harmful release or embodied carbon, for the CO2 reductions target to be met, a carbon offset contribution of more than £213000 has been secured.
- In addition to the above, PV panels will be provided and connections to the District Heat Network is proposed which will be secured through S106
- Other measures include a green procurement plan secured through condition with a commitment for green procurement and the installation of a bio diverse brown and green roof
- In response to a question on whether all the units will have access to natural and daylight, especially as some of the previous studio flats had no access, the planning officer advised that all units above ground floor will have windows, however with units particularly close to Merino Court, these will be glazed units to protect due to its proximity.
- On the question of whether there is any material difference between units described as affordable bedrooms and the other bedrooms, the Planning Officer advised that the scheme proposes a variety of room sizes ranging from 16-27sqm floor space so prices will be charged at different market rates.

Planning Committee - 27 July 2021

- In terms of daylight and sunlight loss, the planning officer reiterated that the revised scheme has resulted in significant reductions to the quantity of daylight received in the units, acknowledging that there were some units that fails in terms of BRE daylight distribution of VSC. Members were reminded that with the reduction of the height of the rear building, it is noticeable that the degree of losses has now reduced from 20 to 4 units
- Members were advised that following a number of revisions and negotiations with applicant, a suitable compromise has been reached not only in reducing daylight and sunlight losses but also to ensure that the scheme has no harmful effect on the conservation and streetscene
- On the definition of affordable rent, the Planning officer referred to page 203 paragraph 9.2 of the report which states that an affordable student bedroom is provided at a rental cost for the academic year equal to below 55% of the maximum income of a new full time student studying in London and living away from home.
- A Neighbouring resident had concerns with the daylight and sunlight assessment results as presently 4 flats completely fail VSC, that the figures of 97 % in the report are questionable. Objector also had concerns that the assessment was based on a small sample and only assessed windows of living room and bedrooms especially in this period of covid when lots of people are likely to be working from their bedrooms if working at home
- The objector highlighted health and safety concerns as he lives in a designated red zone especially with dust and noise pollution from construction activities, that this had not been taken into consideration.
- The objector was concerned that issues raised within the contamination pollution report such as possible asbestos risk and unexploded ordinances had not been assessed in the officer's report. He also queried the Air quality report that was submitted with the scheme, indicating that it is flawed as it claims that the BIS figures should be used rather than Defra figures. Additional concerns included loss of privacy, the visual appearance of the building, increase in levels of traffic and noise as a result of ongoing construction activities, all not fully addressed in the report.
- In response, the agent acknowledged the daylight sunlight impact on Merino Court, that the scheme has been amended to mitigate the loss, acknowledging the tight relationship between the site and Merino court, that applicant has been working closely with officers to strike a planning balance between enhancing the building, reducing its massing so as to have slight impact on neighbouring amenity
- Members were advised that a dust assessment has been submitted and with conditions to address pollution and that there are no issues of unexploded bomb on the site as it is a post war building. Agent stated that the Air quality report is not flawed. On the issue of loss of privacy a proposed condition has been recommended
- In response to an enquiry about removing the two storey building from the scheme, the agent noted that although a viability assessment was not a requirement for the scheme, any further loss of room will make it unviable, that the extra rooms at the back is essential for the viability of the scheme

Planning Committee - 27 July 2021

- The agent reminded the members that with this new scheme , there is a marginal loss of sunlight if there is no two storey building and the loss of 8 rooms out of the 50 extra rooms is quite a lot.
- The Chair noted the difficulty of the site and close proximity to other buildings; that construction noise and plant noise and other issues have been addressed in the report.
- Cllr Khondoker moved a motion to remove the two storey extension from the scheme. Motion was not seconded.

Councillor Klute 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 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 additional condition 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 as amended above, the wording of which was delegated to officers; and subject to any direction by the Mayor of London to refuse the application or for it to be called in for determination by the Mayor of London.

The meeting ended at 10.00 pm

CHAIR