

Planning Sub Committee A - 30 October 2018

Minutes of the meeting of the Planning Sub Committee A held at Committee Room 1, Town Hall, Upper Street, N1 2UD - Islington Town Hall on 30 October 2018 at 7.30 pm.

Present: **Councillors:** Picknell (Chair), Cutler, Convery and Nathan

Councillor Angela Picknell in the Chair

25 INTRODUCTIONS (Item A1)

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

26 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE (Item A2)

Apologies were received from Councillor Graham.

27 DECLARATIONS OF SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS (Item A3)

There were no declarations of substitute members.

28 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST (Item A4)

There were no declarations of interest.

29 ORDER OF BUSINESS (Item A5)

The Chair informed the meeting that Item 6, Prior Weston Primary School, EC1Y 8JA would not be considered at this meeting. The order of business would be B1,B2,B3,B5 and B4.

30 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING (Item A6)

RESOLVED:

That the minutes of the meeting held on 6 September 2018 be confirmed as an accurate record of proceedings and the Chair be authorised to sign them.

31 179 HORNSEY ROAD, LONDON, N7 6RA (Item B1)

Partial demolition of the former school building and structures, conversion and change of use of one of the retained buildings (Block B), including the erection of a 3 storey rear extension and the erection of a new detached 4-storey building to provide 9 residential units (Use Class C3, 4no. 2 bed, 5no. 3 bed), retention and refurbishment of a second retained building to provide replacement Class D1/ D2 community use (148sqm (GIA)) and associated landscaping.

(Planning application number: P2018/1452/FUL)

In the discussion the following points were made:

- The Planning Officer informed the meeting that due to formatting issues with paragraph 8.3, each bullet point is to be amended to read as-

Planning Sub Committee A - 30 October 2018

- The demolition and building works would affect the operation of the site at 97-101 Seven Sisters Road, particularly in terms of noise and the duration of the construction (para. 10.57)
- The proposal would have a detrimental impact on neighbouring residents in terms of noise and disturbance (para. 10.57)
- The proposed design has no respect to the architectural quality of the surrounding buildings, as well as unsympathetic materials (para. 9.22 – 9.39)
- There will be a loss of privacy due to increased overlooking (para. 10.52 – 10.54)
- The proposal would lead to an unacceptable loss of daylight and sunlight, and increasing sense of enclosure to neighbouring residential occupiers as well as overshadowing of the residents' garden (para. 10.28 – 10.51)
- The application would result in an unacceptably high housing and population density (para.9.22 – 9.31)
- The proposal would have a negative impact to the air quality of the area (para. 10.94 – 10.96)
- Request integrated swift nest box bricks/blocks are installed near roof level which would protect the swifts and improve the local biodiversity (para. 10.97 – 10.99)
- In addition the Planning Officer advised that a plan stated within condition 2 which should be deleted from the report.
- Planning Officer advised that the proposal is not considered to have an unacceptable impact on neighbouring residential amenity in terms of loss of daylight, sunlight, outlook, privacy, noise and disturbance or an increased sense of enclosure.
- Issues raised by a neighbouring resident included loss of privacy and overlooking concerns and its impact on their amenity. In addition there were concerns about the quality of the proposed materials for the external part of the building as it would be out of character of the neighbouring area.
- In response to objectors concerns, the applicant advised that bringing the building back into use would be beneficial for the area considering that it had been left vacant for a number of years after many unsuccessful attempts to market the building. In addition the applicant advised that following consultation with planning officers, both building A and the rear extension of Building B would comprise of terracotta cladding as the main external material.
- In response to concerns about the expected use of the community building and its long term sustainability, the agent advised that this would be disposed and not part of the charity's plans.
- With regards to the marketability of the building, the meeting was advised that the condition of the building and the size of the D1/D2 unit were considered to be disadvantages to attracting prospective users/occupiers as smaller sized units were

preferred.

- In response to concerns that the community building could be converted into another use in the future, Members were advised that condition 3 had been included to prevent changes from D1/D2 use by using permitted development rights.
- In response to concerns that the applicant had not provided specific management plans with regards to the D2 use, a suggestion that the D2 element of the proposal be removed was agreed.

Councillor Convery proposed a motion to grant planning permission subject to the removal of the D2 use element from the description of development due to concerns over future management. This was seconded by Councillor Nathan and carried.

RESOLVED:

That following consideration of the case officers 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 (as amended) and 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

32

29 WINDSOR ROAD, LONDON, N7 6JG (Item B2)

Conversion of single family dwelling house into 3 self-contained residential units (1x3 bed, 1x studio and 1x 2 bed) plus the excavation of basement, front lightwell and rear courtyard erection of basement, ground and first floor rear extensions and roof extension, proposed bin and bicycle storage to the garden and associated alterations.
(Planning application number: P2017/4766/FUL)

In the discussion the following points were made:

- Members were advised that item was deferred at the committee's meeting of 19 June as the applicant was not available to respond to objectors questions or address issues on the ADF levels to the proposed basement rooms.
- The Planning Officer advised that since the last meeting amendments to the previous proposal had been submitted. The proposed front lightwell had been enlarged and widened so as to create a larger outlook and open space for the proposed basement bedroom unit and a daylight and sunset study including ADF calculations had been submitted to address concerns about the outlook.
- The Planning Officer advised that the proposed development is considered to be acceptable in land use, design and visual terms and would offer good quality accommodation without adversely affecting the amenity levels of adjoining occupiers.
- On the issue of refuse storage facilities, Members were advised that a condition had been included to ensure appropriate refuse and recycling storage facilities are designed so as to prevent cluttering in front of properties.
- With regards to concerns about the impact of basement extension on the structural stability of adjoining buildings, the Planning Officer advised that a Structural Method

Planning Sub Committee A - 30 October 2018

Statement (SMS) must be submitted in line with the Basement SPD and a condition has been attached requiring that a certified professional endorsing the scheme is retained for the duration of the construction works.

- The Planning Officer acknowledged that although studio units are generally not supported unless there are exceptional circumstances, the proposal overall complies with the aim of re-providing a family unit in accordance with DM3.3 and so is acceptable in this instance especially in the context of the constraints of an existing building.
- In response to questions about the roof extension, Members were advised that Islington's Urban Design Guide accepts scope for introducing well designed decisions roofs outside of conservation areas.
- Notable objections include the impact of the proposal on neighbouring amenity; the quality of the proposed accommodation and concerns of structural damage to adjacent properties. In addition, the objector indicated that the proposed development would result in an overdevelopment of the site contrary to council policy and that issues raised regarding the lightwell had not been sufficiently addressed.
- In response to objectors concerns, the meeting was advised by the applicant that the scheme had been revised to address the concerns raised at the previous meeting of the Committee and followed guidance and advice with the Council's planning officer. The applicant informed members that the proposed development was consistent with the policies of the London Plan, the Islington Core Strategy and that a small off site affordable housing contribution of £100,000 will be provided.
- Members were concerned with the quality of the accommodation especially with the studio unit and that in general it falls short of the Council's standard. Members agreed that a redesign of the building layout would have resulted in two sufficiently family size dwellings instead of the 3 separate dwellings especially the amenity space of the prospective occupiers is compromised as a result of the design.
- Members were concerned with the overdevelopment of the site, lack of amenity space, the quality of accommodation within the basement and the provision of a studio unit.
- Councillor Convery proposed a motion to refuse planning permission on grounds stated above. This was seconded by Councillor Nathan and carried.

RESOLVED:

That following consideration of the case officers report (the assessment and recommendations therein), the presentation to Committee, submitted representations and objections provided verbally at this meeting, planning permission be refused for the reasons set out below, the wording of which was delegated to officers in conjunction with the chair.

REASON 01: The proposed studio unit is considered to provide sub-standard accommodation representing an overdevelopment of the site whilst directly undermining the quality of outlook to the basement unit, and there are no exceptional circumstances to justify this provision within the overall proposed housing mix, contrary to Policy 3.5 (Quality and design of housing developments), 3.9 (mixed and balanced communities) of the London

Plan 2016, The Housing SPD March 2016; policy CS12 (meeting the housing challenge) of Islington Council's Core Strategy 2011; policies DM2.1 (Design), DM3.1 (Mix of housing sizes) and DM3.4 (Housing standards) of Development Management Policies 2013.

REASON 02: The proposed basement front bedroom is considered to provide a poor standard of accommodation due to compromised outlook and enclosure levels to this habitable room space. This would create a poor living environment for occupiers of the ground/basement residential unit contrary to CS policy 12 (meeting the housing challenge) and DM policies 3.3 (Residential conversions and extensions) & 3.4 (Housing standards), London Plan Policy 3.5 and the NPPF 2018.

REASON 03: The proposed development fails to provide adequate and functional amenity space for each of the residential units thereby creating poor living environments for these units. The proposal is therefore considered to be contrary to CS policy 12 (meeting the housing challenge) and DM policy 3.5 (Private outdoor space), London Plan Policy 3.5 and the NPPF 2018.

33

2A REGINA ROAD, LONDON, N4 3QH (Item B3)

Replacement of all the buildings main elevations single glazed timber windows with uPVC double glazed casement windows.

(Planning application number: P2018/1955/FUL (Council's own))

In the discussion the following points were made:

- The Planning Officer advised that this was a Council owned property and permission is being sought for the replacement of existing single glazed timber windows with white double glazed casement UPVC windows.
- Members were advised that the proposed UPVC windows and the provision of double glazing is sustainable and improves the thermal efficiency of the residential units.
- In response to concern that no consideration has been given to the disposal of UPVC window frames especially after the end of its life span, the applicant advised that the type of UPVC window chosen was of high quality, high performance and contains a large percentage of recycled materials.
- Members were advised that information provided regarding the use of UPVC windows was general guidance and that decision to the use of either UPVC, timber or aluminium window was based on factors such as the location of the building, its visual appearance, sustainability and sound insulation especially if building is adjacent to a busy road.
- Members welcomed the proposal, and that the use of UPVC frame would not be substantially different to those existing in the building.

RESOLVED:

That following consideration of the case officers 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.

34 **469 HORNSEY ROAD, , ISLINGTON, LONDON, N19 3QL (Item B4)**

Demolition of existing two storey building and erection of 4 storey building plus set back roof addition and part basement to provide office 226sqm (B1 use) at ground and part basement floor and 7 self-contained resident units (6 x 2 beds & 1 x 3 bed) over second to fourth floor levels plus cycle parking and associated refuse, removal of existing cross over and on street servicing and associated alterations.

(Planning application number: P2016/4928/FUL)

In the discussion the following points were made:

- Members were advised that application was deferred from the previous Committee meeting on 20 June 2017 as a result of unresolved objections from Network rail, which had now been addressed as a result of a number of revisions. Members were informed that due to the revisions, the development front has been moved such that there is now a 1metre clear distance between the building wall and the boundary fence to Network Rail. Conditions 11 and 12 has been amended and condition 24 has been included at the request of Network rail.
- The Planning Officer advised that a new sunlight and daylight assessment provided by the applicant demonstrated that the residential properties at 212 Fairbridge road will not lose an unacceptable level of sunlight and daylight.
- Objections include loss of sunlight and daylight; potential overlooking from upper level windows at the proposed site and concerns about the overdevelopment of the site and parking.
- Councillor Picknell proposed a motion to defer as the applicant was not available at the meeting to respond to issues raised by the objectors. This was seconded by Councillor Cutler and carried.

RESOLVED:

That following consideration of the case officers report (the assessment and recommendations therein), the presentation to Committee, submitted representations and objections provided verbally at this meeting, item was deferred as the applicant was not available.

35 **57 - 65 RANDELL'S ROAD, LONDON, N1 0DH (Item B5)**

Demolition of single-storey workshop. Construction of 5 storey plus basement building with B1 accommodation (253 sq metres) at basement and ground floor level and residential use above (5 x 2-bed flats, 1 x 3-bed flat, 1 x 1-bed flat) and associated bin and bicycle storage and associated alterations.

(Planning application number: P2017/4485/FUL)

In the discussion the following points were made:

- Members were informed that an extant planning permission exists for a mixed use development and although the proposed revised scheme would result in a further storey to a portion of the approved roof, and an increase in the amount of B1 floor space officers considered that it would not have an unacceptable impact upon the surrounding visual amenity, nor cause harm to the setting of the listed building sited opposite of the site.

Planning Sub Committee A - 30 October 2018

- The Planning officer advised that the mass and volume of the scheme had been designed to allow a continuous and active ground floor frontage and above this the two wings of the block was designed to provide a central location for the staircase and lift core for the residential units which serves a practical function but also a point of distinctiveness for the building, with the full height glazing providing a strong feature and focal point.
- In response to a question, the Planning officer acknowledged that flats on the right side on the 3rd floor are single aspect.
- There was concern that the proposal is out of scale with the prevailing character of the area impacting the residential amenity of nearby properties and a loss of privacy to the occupants. In addition there were concerns about the affordable housing contributions; officers confirmed that the contributions were a flat fee per unit regardless of the size or location within the building that it corresponded to.
- Members was concerned that although the proposal was only for the North Eastern 10% of the entire Allocation site (KC4), by erecting an additional storey a precedent would be set for future developments on the remaining site thereby compromising future development.
- Members were concerned with the design quality especially with the alterations to the staircase and extensions. Concerns were raised about the materials as being unsympathetic to the surrounding area.
- Issues such as the scale and massing of the proposed development, inclusive design issues raised in paras 9.10 not being sufficiently addressed, the scheme not meeting category 3 housing and the single aspect of the dwellings were raised.

Councillor Convery proposed a motion to refuse planning permission on the grounds above. This was seconded by Councillor Nathan and carried.

RESOLVED:

That following consideration of the case officers report (the assessment and recommendations therein), the presentation to Committee, submitted representations and objections provided verbally at this meeting, planning permission be refused for the reasons set out above, the wording of which was delegated to officers in conjunction with the chair.

36

PRIOR WESTON PRIMARY SCHOOL GOLDEN LANE CAMPUS, 101 WHITECROSS STREET, LONDON EC1Y 8JA (Item B6)

Installation of 4 no. floodlights attached to existing columns associated with the use of the existing Multi Use Games Area, to provide an outdoor playspace for children until 8:00pm Monday to Friday.

(Planning application number: P2016/1803/FUL)

Members were informed that above item had been withdrawn for consideration at this meeting.

The meeting ended at 9.20 pm

CHAIR