

**Planning Sub Committee A - 12 July 2021**

Minutes of the meeting of the Planning Sub Committee A held at Council Chamber, Town Hall, Upper Street, N1 2UD - Islington Town Hall on 12 July 2021 at 7.30 pm.

**Present:**      **Councillors:**      Khondoker (Chair), Clarke, Jackson, Klute and Ibrahim (Substitute) (In place of Woolf)

**Councillor Roulin Khondoker in the Chair**

**179      INTRODUCTIONS (Item A1)**

Councillor Khondoker welcomed everyone to the meeting. Members of the Committee and officers introduced themselves and the Chair outlined the procedures for the meeting.

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

Apologies were received from Councillor Woolf.

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

Councillor Ibrahim substituted for Councillor Woolf.

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

There were no declarations of interest.

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

The order of business would be as per the agenda.

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

**RESOLVED:**

That the minutes of the meeting held on 4 May 2021 be confirmed as an accurate record of proceedings and the Chair be authorised to sign them.

**185      EAST-WEST COMMUNITY NURSERY ST LUKE'S OPEN SPACE (Item B1)**

Erection of a new single storey replacement modular building to accommodate Bright Start early childcare services.

(Planning application number: P2021/0613/FUL)

In the discussion the following points were made:

- A member raised concern about the sustainability of the temporary building and asked whether it could have solar panels and/or a green roof. The

planning officer stated that improvements in the design had been negotiated to improve sustainability. The applicant stated that solar panels and green roofs would not be suitable for the temporary building which would only be in place for three years. However they were working with the zero carbon team and would ensure sustainability issues were taken into account on future applications.

- A member asked why the building would be temporary and whether it could be used elsewhere once it was no longer required. The officer advised that once the 36 month permission expired, there was a requirement for the temporary building to be removed. The applicant stated that a temporary building was required as the site could be redeveloped. The applicant stated that they would look to repurpose the temporary building for use elsewhere in Islington at the end of its use by BrightStart or sell it back to the manufacturer.
- Members considered the location and number of proposed windows.

Councillor Khondoker proposed a motion to add a condition requiring options for additional windows to be explored for the temporary building, the wording of which would be delegated to officers. This was seconded by Councillor Klute and carried.

**RESOLVED:**

That following consideration of the case officer's report (the assessment and recommendations therein) and the presentation to Committee, 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.

186

**JEAN STOKES COMMUNITY HALL, COATBRIDGE HOUSE, CARNOUSTIE DRIVE, LONDON, N1 0DX (Item B2)**

Change of use of basement from ancillary estate management use to an amalgamated use with the ground floor as a community centre (Use Class F2), together with the erection of single storey ground floor extension to the front with associated external ramp, access, landscaping and ancillary facilities including bike storage, toilets, shower and changing facilities and associated alterations.

(Planning application number: P2021/1456/FUL)

In the discussion the following points were made:

- A member raised concern about the ramp being close to tree trunks and appearing to be within the root protection area. The officer advised that an arboricultural report and section drawing had been submitted and the trees team was satisfied no harm would be caused to the tree roots.
- A member asked whether a Stopping Up Order was required as some of the ramp and bicycle stands appeared to be on the highway. The officer advised that these were on estate land rather than the highway and the highways team was satisfied with the remaining width of the pavement. The applicant confirmed that there was a minimum width of 2 metres between the trees and the road. Members requested that the methodology in the arboricultural report be closely followed to ensure tree roots were not damaged.

- Ventilation in the basement was discussed. The applicant stated that the mechanical ventilation in part of the basement would be refurbished and would meet building control standards. Some of the basement would be naturally ventilated as it was currently and the officer confirmed there was a lightwell next to this part of the basement.
- A member asked about the consultation process. The officer replied that there were two rounds of consultation plus a site notice and press release. 751 letters had been sent and one letter of support and one letter of objection were received. During the consultation, revised letters were sent out as the first letters described the use as F1 when it should have been F2. The applicant stated that consultation sessions had taken place in community centres, virtually during lockdown and engagement had taken place at the Cally Festival.

**RESOLVED:**

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

187

**WEST LIBRARY, 107 BRIDGEMAN ROAD, ISLINGTON, LONDON, N1 1BD**  
**(Item B3)**

Refurbishment of the West Library vacant first floor room (135sqm) into a youth employment and support hub, including lift access, toilets and associated works.

(Planning application number: P2021/1470/LBC)

In the discussion the following points were made:

- In response to a member's question about whether the whole building was listed, the officer confirmed that the entire building was listed in 1994.
- A member asked about energy efficiency improvements and was advised that these would be made. The reading room would be refurbished. Possible energy efficiency measures might include secondary glazing, shutters, underfloor heating and more energy efficient lighting. Condition 5 included a schedule of works for the first floor to be approved.
- A member asked about the proposed materials for the lift. The officer stated that the details of the materials would have to be approved. It was likely that glass and metal would be used as timber and glass could detract from the lobby. The glass should not be a problem with the visually impaired.
- The officer outlined the four options considered for the lift as follows:
  - Option A was the continuation of the platform lift that was there at the moment. Although this would be an ideal access point, the lift would result in a large box on the outside of the library which had remained almost the same as when it was built.
  - Option B was an external lift in the rear yard. Lift users would have to go into the library to use the lift and part of some windows would be lost. In general, external lifts had more maintenance issues.

## Planning Sub Committee A - 12 July 2021

- Option C had the lift located in the reading room. This had been discounted as this would remove a circulation function from the lobby. It was proposed that the top hub room could be used for events as well as meetings and the lift being used could cause disruption to the events.
- Option D was the proposed option being presented to members for consideration. The location of the lift would be in the entrance lobby.
- A member asked whether option D aligned with potential future uses of the first floor and the officer advised that it did and if the lift was in the reading room, the users of the first floor would be disturbed.
- A member stated that to have the building back in full use was welcomed and supporting young people into work was vital.
- In response to a member's question about the status of the lobby, the planning officer advised that the lobby was classified as "of moderate significance" whereas the whole building was classified as "of high significance". The harm to the entrance lobby of installing the lift there would be "less than substantial".
- A member raised concern about the damage and harm which would be caused to the entrance lobby and stated that the disruption caused to events on the first floor would be minimal. He considered that the alternative options required more consideration.
- The planning officer stated that putting the lift in the reading room would be a major change to the plan form with a service and circulation use put in space that should be library space. There was a adult library on one side of the building, a children's library on the other side and the circulation space in the middle of the building.
- The member stated that the majority of users would not use the lift and so there would be a small increase in circulation.
- A member expressed concern about children having to enter the adult library to use the lift and potential embarrassment of lift users when entering an event.
- A member suggested that partitions could be used. The planning officer stated that modern partitions could be used but there was concern about not including those with mobility issues in the main circulation space.
- A member suggested an alternative proposal which involved putting a doorway between the lobby and the reading room and putting the lift in the reading room but with the lift entrance in the lobby.
- A member suggested that a site visit could take place.

Councillor Klute proposed a motion to defer the consideration of the application for more consideration of the options available by the applicant. This was seconded by Councillor Clarke and carried.

### **RESOLVED:**

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

**WORDING DELEGATED TO OFFICERS**

**MINUTE 185**

**EAST-WEST COMMUNITY NURSERY ST LUKE'S OPEN SPACE**

**ADDITIONAL CONDITION:** Notwithstanding the details shown on the plans hereby approved, detailed plans of the final fenestration pattern to the front elevation facing Mitchell Street shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to any superstructure work commencing on site.

The development shall be carried out strictly in accordance with the details so approved and shall be maintained as such thereafter into perpetuity.

**REASON:** In the interest of achieving good quality architectural design and reasonable levels of light and outlook to future occupants.

The meeting ended at 9.30 pm

**CHAIR**