

London Borough of Islington

Planning Committee - 9 October 2018

Minutes of the meeting of the Planning Committee held at Council Chamber, Town Hall, Upper Street, N1 2UD - Islington Town Hall on 9 October 2018 at 7.30 pm.

Present: **Councillors:** Klute (Chair), Picknell (Vice-Chair), Kay (Vice-Chair), Convery, Graham, Khondoker, Chapman, Cutler, Nathan and Woolf
Also Present: **Councillors:** Heather and Webbe

Councillor Martin Klute in the Chair

30 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.

31 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE (Item A2)

There were no apologies for absence.

32 DECLARATIONS OF SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS (Item A3)

There were no declarations of substitute members.

33 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST (Item A4)

There were no declarations of interest.

34 ORDER OF BUSINESS (Item A5)

The order of business would be B2 and B1.

35 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING (Item A6)

RESOLVED:

That the minutes of the meeting held on 10 September 2018 be confirmed as an accurate record of proceedings and the Chair be authorised to sign them.

36 240 SEVEN SISTERS ROAD (INCLUDING 240A, 240B AND 240C,) ISLINGTON, LONDON, N4 2HX (Item B1)

Demolition of existing buildings and redevelopment of the site to provide a building of 8 storeys (ground plus 7 upper storeys) accommodating a 192-bedroom hotel (C1 use), ground floor bar/restaurant (A4/A3 use) together with ancillary hard and soft landscaping, cycle parking, refuse storage, and related works.

(Planning application number: P2017/3429/FUL)

In the discussion the following points were made:

- A ward councillor raised concern that the development of a hotel at the site would mean a lost opportunity in terms of providing affordable housing. The case officer explained that the proximity to the railway line and Seven Sisters Road meant the site was not suitable for housing.
- The planning officer reported that a planning obligation in relation to training and employment opportunities for local people would be added as the applicant had agreed to provide these and for this to be included within the S106 agreement. The applicant would work with Job Centre Plus and the councils' iWork team to provide these.
- The planning officer advised that Condition 4 (o) of the officer report should be reworded to read, "Confirmation that construction traffic is not to attend the site during periods of peak network congestion (7-10am and 4-7pm) unless otherwise agreed by TfL".
- In response to a question from a member, the planning officer stated that he could not say how many jobs would be provided if the development was an office but that the proposed hotel would generate approximately 80 full time equivalent positions.
- A member raised concern as to whether there were enough servicing bays and the planning officer replied that current usage of the bays had been considered and it was anticipated that the bays could accommodate the proposed development. TfL were satisfied with the servicing and delivery plans.
- The planning officer confirmed that the proposed development would be set back from Seven Sisters Road and Isledon Road.
- A member asked whether there would be a designated person responsible for safeguarding and the planning officer stated that this was not one of the recommendations made by the police. The applicants stated they would be willing to have a designated safeguarding person and this could be added to the S106 agreement.
- A member raised concern about the lack of active frontages. The planning officer stated that the bar and restaurant would be separate to the hotel, although it could be operated by the hotel and would make up for the loss of the two cafés/takeaways that had been there and had been bought by the applicant. The hairdressers which had been there had been relocated 50m away at the expense of the applicant. There were two more units which had not been bought by the applicant and would remain. The council had not suggested that the applicant buy these units.
- In response to a member's question about an affordable housing contribution, the planning officer stated that in this case no contribution was required.
- The affordable workspace team had stated that they did not consider the site to be appropriate to provide affordable workspace and so the affordable workspace contribution had been calculated. This figure was just over £946,000. A member suggested that this could be reserved for use in the Finsbury Park area.

- A member raised concern about a potential concentration of budget hotels in the vicinity. The applicant stated that research had shown the hotel would be busy throughout the year.
- In response to a members' concern about the use of the site for a hotel, the planning officer stated that policy referred to concentrations but there was not an overconcentration in this area. There were 1,400 rooms per 500m and at the Angel it was 2,600 rooms per 500m. He stated that this was not the best place for permanent housing and whilst an office use would have been acceptable, it was not being proposed. The site was an acceptable location for a hotel.
- The design of the building was considered.
- The application was policy compliant.

RESOLVED:

That planning permission be granted subject to the conditions and informatives set out in Appendix 1 of the officer report as amended 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; 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.

37

LASER HOUSE, 132-140 GOSWELL ROAD, LONDON EC1V 7DY (Item B2)

Partial demolition of rooftop structured and retention of the existing building along with the construction of a three-storey extension (including plant areas) to the existing building and new three-storey infill building to the corner of Goswell Road and Pear Tree Street resulting in a part 3, part 4, part 5, part 6 storey building including internal reconfiguration and refurbishment of the existing facades to provide for 8,146 square metres (GIA) of office floorspace (Use Class B1(a)) including 481 square metres (GIA) of floorspace for small and micro enterprises (SME), and 671 square metres (GIA) of flexible retail/office floorspace (Use Class A1/B1(a)) along with associated access arrangements, cycle parking, refuse storage and ancillary works.

(Planning application number: P2018/1578/FUL)

In the discussion the following points were made:

- The planning officer reported that since the report was published, three additional objections had been received, although these were from people who had already objected. There had also been an objection from Councillor Webbe and 3 further letters of support.
- The planning officer advised that the applicant had agreed to put automated blinds on the windows on the Pear Street elevation and rear elevations fronting Bastwick Street. These would be on a timer and shut between 8pm and 7am. In response to a question from the Chair, the applicant confirmed that this could be 7 days a week.

Planning Committee - 9 October 2018

- The planning officer stated that paragraph 10.71 of the officer report should be amended to state 10 rather than 9 rooms, the figure for Third Floor – W8 in the table in Paragraph 10.68 should refer to a reduction of 22%.
- The planning officer stated that Paragraphs 10.76, 10.86 and 10.88 should be amended to state that the annual and winter probably figures proposed would all meet the BRE tests.
- The planning officer stated that Condition 6 should be removed and would be secured under a legal obligation.
- In response to questions from a member, the planning officer advised that the cycle space provision was now compliant with GLA standards and the proposed materials for the building were included in an approved document.
- In response to a question from a member about affordable workspace, the applicant confirmed that although the scheme had been reduced in size, the affordable workspace had slightly increased. The applicant stated that the scheme was compliant with policy and the scheme was below the threshold size for providing affordable workspace but was still providing it. An affordable housing contribution would also be provided. The previous scheme had a gallery at first floor level but this had been removed prior to committee. In the current application there was a flexible ground floor space that could be used as a gallery.
- Daylight and sunlight was discussed and the planning officer advised that there were three tests assessed under BRE guidance. A transgression across all three was worse than a transgression against just one.
- The application was policy compliant.

Councillor Kay proposed a motion to condition that the automated blinds on the windows looking on to Pear Street and Bastwick Street be shut between 8pm and 7pm 7 days a week. This was seconded by Councillor Chapman and carried.

RESOLVED:

That planning permission be granted subject to the conditions and informatives set out in Appendix 1 of the officer report as amended 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 with the points covered in deleted Condition 6 included.

The meeting ended at 9.30 pm

CHAIR