London Borough of Islington

### Planning Committee - 22 May 2023

Minutes of the meeting of the Planning Committee held at Council Chamber - Town Hall on 22 May 2023 at 7.30 pm.

Present:Councillors:North (Vice-Chair), Poyser (Vice-Chair), Clarke,<br/>Convery, Hamdache, Hayes, Jackson and Ogunro

# Cllr North in the Chair

- 40 **INTRODUCTIONS (Item A1)** Councillor North welcomed everyone to the meeting. Members of the Committee and officers introduced themselves.
- 41 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE (Item A2) Apologies were received from Councillor Klute
- 42 DECLARATIONS OF SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS (Item A3) There were no declarations of substitute members
- 43 **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST (Item A4)** There were no declarations of interest.
- 44 ORDER OF BUSINESS (Item A5) The order of business would be B2 & B1.

### 45 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING (Item A6)

#### **RESOLVED:**

That the minutes of the meeting held on 28 March 2023 be confirmed as an accurate record of proceedings and the Chair be authorised to sign them.

### 46 <u>MEMBERSHIP, TERMS OF REFERENCE AND DATES OF MEETINGS (Item</u> <u>A7)</u>

### **RESOLVED:**

- a) That the Sub-Committees be confirmed as five member Sub-Committees and that the terms of reference be noted.
- b) That the allocation of seats was determined in accordance with the advice in the report.

- c) That Councillors North, Clarke, Convery, Clarke, McHugh and Hamdache be appointed as members of Planning Sub-Committee A for the current municipal year or until their successors are appointed.
- d) That Councillors Poyser, Hayes, Jackson, Klute and Ogunro 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 North had been appointed Chair of Planning Sub-Committee A and Councillor Poyser had been appointed Chair of Planning Sub-Committee B for the municipal year or until their successors are appointed.
- f) 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.

#### 47 <u>45 HORNSEY ROAD & 252 HOLLOWAY ROAD ( AND LAND IN BETWEEN)</u> ISLINGTON N7 LONDON (Item B1)

Demolition of the existing temporary buildings and structures and erection of a 12storey building to provide flexible Class E floorspace at ground floor level and 281 student bedrooms and internal and external resident amenity spaces on upper levels, together with refurbishment of the railway arches and the existing 3-storey building fronting onto Holloway Road to provide Class E(g)(iii)/E(a)&(b) and flexible Class E floorspace, a new pedestrian route, landscaping and public realm improvements, disabled car parking, cycle parking and other associated works (Planning application number: P2022/1943/FUL)

In the discussion the following points were made:

- Meeting was advised of a number of updates, that at paragraph 6.11 on page 22 of the report, the floorspace of No.252 Holloway Road should state 57sqm; also at paragraph 10.15 on page 42, the total proposed Class E floorspace equates to 1,675sqm.
- Other updates include an additional planning obligation in paragraph 10.264 of the report and Appendix 1) requiring "the pedestrian route to be kept open at all times unless otherwise agreed with the Local Planning Authority in consultation with statutory undertakers or security services" has been included. Also planning obligation at paragraph 10.264, the wheelchair accessible parking contribution is £62k rather than £64k; that with regards to condition 14 (Appendix 1 Recommendation B): the 5No. Railway arches reserved for retail / restaurant use is expanded to include Use Class E(c) as well as Class E(a) and (b) and finally condition 44 in the report (Appendix 1 Recommendation B) should refer to a UGF on site of 0.35, rather than 0.3.
- In addition to the above, meeting was advised that officers are of the view that in line with other student accommodation within the vicinity, a condition be proposed to ensure that it is restricted for that purpose only.
- Meeting was advised that the assessment of proposed development includes its acceptability in land use terms; its design and heritage impacts; its impact on neighbouring amenity; highways and transportation impacts, including

delivery and servicing arrangements and energy and sustainability of the scheme.

- The Planning Officer advised that in land use terms, the scheme is acceptable, that site is allocated for student accommodation (NH10); that the provision of Class E floorspace, including light industrial floorspace is in accordance with Site Allocation NH10 and the NPPF was acceptable; that the new town centre uses in the railway arches to provide active uses along the new pedestrian route is supported; that a total of 5No. railway arches governed by a Lettings & Management Strategy will ensure increased social value; that an enhanced public realm and a new route through the site is in accordance with Site Allocation NH10.
- On the issue of design and heritage impacts, the Planning Officer noted that the proposed design has been commended by the Design Review Panel and is supported by the Council's Design & Conservation Team; that it is of high quality design and the materials used will be secured through conditions 3 (materials), conditions 5 (external pipework), condition 23 (obscured glazing) and condition 36 (roof-level structures); that the scheme will have a neutral impact on the adjoining St Mary Magdalene Conservation Area; and on the grade II listed Holloway Road London Underground station as well as on nearby non-designated heritage assets.
- Meeting was advised that although building is over 12 storey and about 45m high, the additional 3.35m is not considered harmful as it is within the context of the Emirates Stadium which is higher.
- In terms of quality of student accommodation, the Planning Officer noted that it has a good level of accessibility with a PTAL rating of 6A, that floor to ceiling heights of 2.6 metres is acceptable, that the storage and circulation space is acceptable.
- The Planning Officer acknowledged that limited number of student bedrooms at lower levels do not meet internal D&S requirements (1% of rooms) however this need to be taken into consideration when weighed against the benefits of the scheme.
- In terms of impact of the scheme on neighbouring occupiers, meeting was advised that there would be no adverse privacy or overlooking impacts given the distances involved between the site and neighbouring residential buildings and that in general noise and disturbance will be managed through conditions 10-12 and the submission of an agreed Student Management Plan. Light pollution is to be controlled by conditions 13 and 33; crime and antisocial behaviour is to be mitigated through conditions 19 (Secured by Design), 26 (Pedestrian route) and 33 (Lighting and CCTV).
- On-site servicing and delivery are to be managed through a Servicing & Delivery Management Plan which is to be agreed by condition 18; and construction impacts on neighbouring amenity is to be controlled and managed through condition 4.
- Meeting was advised that site has a PTAL of 6A (Excellent), that the proposal utilises sustainable transportation, that the trip generation associated with proposed uses can be accommodated within transport network, that site lies in CPZ and it is a car free development – with exception of one wheelchair

accessible parking bay. The Planning Officer noted that it is anticipated that in future there will be a potential increase in disable parking.

- The Planning Officer advised that applicants have made a contribution of £62k to secure on street blue badge parking bays, that 274 cycle parking spaces will be provided with further cycle parking details secured via condition.
- A Construction Management and Logistics Plan condition has been secured and that all repair works to footway/carriageway will be secured via S106. In addition there will be a new pedestrian route through site in compliance with site allocation
- Meeting was advised that applicant has submitted a sustainable proposal with measures that will result in a 58% reduction in total CO2 emissions; that applicants have proposed a financial contribution of £170,619 towards carbon offsetting for the remaining CO2 emissions; that there will be a significant reduction of embodied carbon beyond GLA recommendations; that scheme meets A BREEAM rating of 'Excellent' which is secured with intention to secure 'Outstanding' etc.
- The Planning Officer advised that a total of 2295 letters were sent out with 40 objections received raising a number of issues highlighted in the report such as there is a significant amount of student accommodation in the local area leading to a transient population; that design is inappropriate and building too tall in context, unacceptable loss of daylight, sunlight, outlook and privacy etc. Meeting was informed that 4 letters of support were also received.
- The Planning Officer highlighted the planning obligations as stated in the report and include the provision of 35% Affordable Student Accommodation; agreed Student Management Plan has been submitted; that a financial contribution of £30k for off-site tree planting is secured via planning obligation; that the Carbon offset contribution of £170k is to be welcomed; that there will be 16 construction placements or employment/training contribution of £80k and that the pedestrian route will be kept open at all times unless otherwise agreed with the Local Planning Authority etc.
- On the issue of the quality of students Accommodation, the Planning Officer noted that in terms of daylight and sunlight impact, 82% of habitable rooms comply with the most recent BRE Guidelines in terms of LUX levels, that all units would achieve a minimum of 1.5 hours direct sunlight, in line with latest BRE guidance.
- In terms of planning balance the planning officer acknowledged minor adverse daylight impacts as limited number of student bedrooms on lower levels do not meet minimum internal daylight levels; the scheme will result in uplift in commercial office floorspace equating to 1,675sqm (Class E) floorspace and the refurbishment of the existing railway arches; the provision of high quality student accommodation is to be welcomed; that scheme will result in an increase in employment at the site, as well as the relevant jobs and training contributions etc.
- With regards to concerns that the site not being designated industrial, and unable to deliver 50% affordable student accommodation, the Planning

officer advised that matter was explored and according to site allocation policy, pending any other agreed local plan it is non industrial.

- On the specific operating hours of use for the terrace, meeting was advised that condition 12 ensures that an Operation Management Plan provides details of access to and management of the roof-top amenity space. A suggestion on whether operating hours should be limited from 8am to 6pm was mooted but it was agreed that this should be left to negotiations between the different stakeholders.
- A member raised concerns in particular around match days, as site is close to the stadium, library and the use of the arches and enquired whether there had been any thought given to its management of traffic flow and potential anti- social behaviour.
- With regards to the 5 proposed dwellings that have been identified as experiencing BRE transgression and what type of tenure, meeting was advised it was both social and market rent.
- In response to a question on the railway arch reserved for public toilet and its management and accessibility for public, meeting was advised that there are no plans for public use but will be for users of the commercial units, however if members are minded a condition regarding it being open to the public can be included.
- On the question of the student accommodation and number of students living there having no local connection, the meeting was advised that S106 legal agreement, ensures that there is sufficient letting arrangements for applicants to work with the Council and that local carers will be given priority via nomination rights.
- In response to a question if the railway arches would be leased out at preferential rates and for a long duration, the Planning Officer advised that extra wording in the legal agreement could be included to state these rates are offered.
- In response the agent welcomed the proposal, that it has been 3 years of hard work with Islington Officers, GLA and TFL, that DRP has welcomed its design and it has been an opportunity to bring back into use a derelict site, open up the public realm.
- Agent acknowledged that commercial units operating within the arches will manage the toilets, that a condition is included for the management for the general use of the arches.
- A member enquired if it was possible to ensure that 5 dwellings identified as impacted by loss of sunlight and daylight are not designated for social housing.
- In response to a question on whether the management plan conditions 18 (refuse and service delivery) and 42(railway arches) could be strengthened, as there will be different units, the Planning Officer advised that wording could be looked into.

Councillor Convery proposed a motion to grant planning permission. This was seconded by Councillor North 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 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.

#### 48 <u>LINDSEY MEWS PLAYGROUND, LINDSEY MEWS, LONDON N1 3EG (Item</u> <u>B2)</u>

The construction of 13 new dwelling units comprising 2 x 1B2P units, 3 x 2B3P units, 2 x 2B4P units, 3 x 3B4P units, 2 x 3B5P units and 1 x 3B6P units with associated amenity space, provided in three new residential blocks ranging from 1 to 4 storeys in height, along with provision of bicycle storage and refuse and recycling facilities, improvements to access, landscape, and public realm, and the demolition of external storage facilities.

(Planning application number: P2022/4295/FU)

In the discussion the following points were made:

- Planning Officer advised that one representation was received since agenda was published however no further issues had been raised that the report had not covered.
- Site comprises of two adjacent plots, the larger plot located within the grounds of the Lindsey Mews Estate and the smaller plot sits between 142 and 128 Elmore Street. The Estate comprises 18 parking spaces and shared amenity spaces consisting of a grassed area and paved open spaces, alongside storage facilities.
- Site has no listed buildings, not within a conservation area although site is bound by the East Canonbury Conservation Area.
- Meeting was advised that proposal is a council owned application by the New Build Team, that issues taken into consideration include land use, its design & Conservation; landscaping, the quality of accommodation, impact on neighbouring amenity; transport and highways and energy & sustainability
- With regards to land use policy meeting was advised that the scheme will result in a 62% provision of affordable housing, that the housing size mix is broadly in line with the priorities set out in local policy
- Members were advised that the scheme will result in loss of estate open spaces, that there will be a decrease in hardscaping and an increase in soft landscaping and an increase in building footprint
- In terms of landscaping of the scheme, the Planning Officer stated that there will be a provision of 96sqm playable features and a play space of 27sqm, a total of 123sqm play provision which is to be welcomed. It was also noted

that 2 Category C trees and 1 Category U tree is to be removed, however 10 new trees are to be planted.

- In terms of inclusive design, meeting was advised that two units in Building C do not meet M(2) accessibility requirements, however this is considered acceptable on balance when weighed against benefits of providing two additional family sized units.
- With regards to the impact of the scheme on neighbouring amenity ,the planning officer advised that the scheme is sufficiently set away from neighbouring residential properties so no overlooking and privacy concerns and that subject to conditions requiring overlooking mitigation on key elevations.
- Noise mitigation measures have been considered acceptable subject to conditions, that in terms of daylight VSC,10 windows see reductions beyond BRE and NSL, 11 rooms see reductions beyond BRE.
- Meeting was advised that adequate provision for cycle parking has been provided on site for occupiers.
- In terms of energy and sustainability, the proposal will result in a reduction in regulated CO2 emissions and 57% reduction in total emissions; Carbon Offset contribution of  $\pounds$ 7,912 for remaining 8.6 tonnes.
- In terms of Planning Balance, Planning officer acknowledged that although there is a degree of conflict with local policies DM2.1 and DM3.4, relating to amenity impacts and accessibility however the Planning benefits outweigh the negative such as the provision of 13 much need new homes, including 8 affordable units; enhancements to the shared amenity space at Lindsey Mews with an uplift in biodiversity and a strong urban greening score, the introduction of an improved site layout which would reduce opportunities for anti-social behaviour, improvements to the streetscape along Elmore Street.
- In response to a question on why the scheme had not made provision for solar panels on the sloping and flat roofs and for not harvesting the use of grey water, the meeting was advised that the scheme is policy complaint, that if members are minded condition can be included for applicants to explore the use of these measures.
- A resident in Northchurch objected to the scheme on grounds of the size of the buildings as it is significantly taller than existing buildings, that it had a domineering effect and was out of character of the surrounding area. In addition he had concerns about loss of light to his dwelling referring members to officers report acknowledging that some rooms fell short of BRE guidelines especially in habitable rooms. Objector had concerns about loss of privacy, with the proposed balcony at the rear of building C and the potential noise especially when in use.
- The applicant advised that windows in building C have been assessed in detail and that mitigation measures are proposed, that in areas where there is loss of light, these are designated for commercial purposes and not relevant for assessment which would have been the case if it is designated for residential use.
- With regards the provision of cycle hangar storage on site and in particular if it would be accessible to existing residents, the applicant acknowledged that there are council owned hangers provided within the vicinity of the site,

however if there are spaces available on site, existing residents will be allowed to apply.

- On the lack of solar panels on the flat roof, applicant informed the meeting that the scheme has delivered sustainable homes and falls within the red line boundary so is limited but will be prepared to look at again with the Council's housing team.
- The Chair in summary welcomed the scheme noting the constrained nature of the site and recognising the need for affordable homes. He also noted the significant challenges of the scheme in terms of its impact on neighbouring amenity but also welcomed the mitigation measures, that in terms of planning balance the benefits outweigh any impact.
- A Member noted the development of housing on brownfields, that although not perfect, the use of car parking spaces is to be welcomed.
- Councillor Clarke moved a motion to include a condition for applicant to explore the possibility of solar energy supply for existing residents and the harvesting of grey water. Councillor North seconded the motion.
- Chair suggested that officers and applicant look at the balustrade and screening option around the balcony at the rear of building C so as to address privacy concerns.
- Councillor Hamdache proposed a motion to grant planning permission. This was seconded by Councillor North 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 Directors' Agreement securing the head of terms set out in Appendix 1

The meeting ended at 10.30 pm

CHAIR