

London Borough of Islington

Planning Committee - 10 December 2018

Minutes of the meeting of the Planning Committee held at Council Chamber - Town Hall on 10 December 2018 at 7.30 pm.

Present: **Councillors:** Picknell (Vice-Chair, in the Chair), Graham, Khondoker, Chapman, Cutler, Woolf and Williamson (Substitute) (In place of Kay)

Councillor Picknell in the Chair

46 INTRODUCTIONS (Item A1)

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

47 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE (Item A2)

Apologies were received from Councillors Kay and Klute.

48 DECLARATIONS OF SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS (Item A3)

Councillor Williamson substituted for Councillor Kay.

49 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST (Item A4)

There were no declarations of interest.

50 ORDER OF BUSINESS (Item A5)

The order of business would be as per the agenda.

51 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING (Item A6)

RESOLVED:

That the minutes of the meeting held on 8 November 2018 be confirmed as an accurate record of proceedings and the Chair be authorised to sign them.

52 HATHERSAGE COURT, 1 NEWINGTON GREEN; BESANT COURT, 104 NEWINGTON GREEN ROAD; 89-91 AND HEALTH CENTRE [93] MILD MAY PARK, LONDON, N1 (Item B1)

The demolition of 154sqm Use Class D1, the demolition and relocation of the sub-station, the re-use of two existing residential units for bicycle storage, the construction of 45 new dwelling units with associated amenity space for affordable and private homes, provided in seven new blocks ranging from 2 to 6 storeys, bicycle parking spaces, improvements to the public realm, and the provision of 293 sqm of flexible Use Class D1/B1.

(Planning application number: P2018/1970/FUL)

Planning Committee - 10 December 2018

In the discussion the following points were made:

- The planning officer stated that the design and conservation officer's full comments had been circulated to members. The comments stated that harm to the conservation area would be caused by Block K and Block H. The design and conservation officer had provided clarification that a mistake had been made and it was Block F, not Block H which caused harm.
- The planning officer advised that Paragraph 10.21 of the officer report should refer to Paragraph 194 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and Paragraph 10.28 of the officer report should refer to Paragraph 196 of the NPPF.
- The planning officer stated that the committee was required to consider whether harm was caused to the outlined heritage assets, assess the degree of harm and give considerable weight to the fact harm was caused when balancing the harm against the planning benefits. Paragraph 10.29 to 10.36 of the officer report outlined the heritage assets. The design and conservation officer considered that the harm was less than substantial and at the lower end of the scale. Planning officers were mindful of the duty to preserve and enhance and put great weight on the harm in approaching the planning balance. Officers considered that the increase in D1 floorspace, improved landscaping, public realm, play facilities, amenity space and delivery of much needed housing (including affordable housing), improved security and safety, along with improvements to existing buildings were compelling benefits and notwithstanding the great weight placed on the fact harm would be caused, the benefits were considered to outweigh the harm caused to the heritage asset from Blocks F and K.
- In response to a question from a member, the planning officer stated that an example of substantial harm would be if a listed building was to be demolished. An example of less than substantial harm could be if there was an adverse impact to the character and appearance of part of a conservation area, for example by virtue of the height and scale of a new building, as was the case with this scheme, where Block K would affect views to and from the green.
- In response to a question from a member the planning officer explained that reducing the size of Block K could reduce its visual impact, and harm. Members asked if a reduction might affect the scheme viability. The planning officer explained that the reduction in built form would impact on the number of units able to be provided and this would affect viability. It was explained that there were a number of exceptional costs, such as improved play space, which did not generate revenue, and reducing the built form (and the overall residential units) would mean there would be less cross subsidy from the residential units and less ability therefore to fund affordable housing or landscaping and the like.
- The planning officer explained that reducing the number of units would reduce built form, and potentially reduce the harm to the heritage assets. However, depending on the reduction this could make the scheme unviable, albeit that this had not been tested.
- The planning officer stated that there would be some impact on sunlight to some lower and upper ground floor rooms. However, the impacts were to a limited number of flats and NPPF and the GLA Housing SPD stated that the BRE guidelines should be applied flexibly on this type of larger scheme.
- The planning officer stated that there were currently 60 trees on the site, 30 of which would have to be removed for the development. It was proposed that these would be replaced with 40 trees. These trees would provide more canopy coverage after 10 years than the current trees provided.
- The planning officer stated that the ball court was derelict and overgrown and anti-social behaviour took place there and consultation with residents on the estate indicated that residents did not use the space as they considered it to be unsafe. The proposals would provide better quality, safer play space.

Planning Committee - 10 December 2018

- In response to objections from the users of the existing commercial units about the healthcare services they provided being lost, the applicants stated that they had been in contact with the owners since 2016 and had offered them long term leases. There were ongoing discussions about rental figures and there was an intention to work with both the podiatrist and dentist.
- In response to a question from a member, the planning officer advised that the commercial units would be re-provided and the space, size and approved use class would be made suitable for the current providers. The planning officer stated that it would not be appropriate to make the permission personal to the current occupiers. It was highlighted that Bullet Point 8 of Recommendation A in Appendix 1 of the officer report stated that there would be a requirement for the applicant to provide a relocation strategy for the relocation of the occupiers of the existing commercial space.
- The applicant stated that it was proposed that the dentist would be relocated in one move to a unit that would be to the dentist's specification. It was more complicated to move the podiatrist and there would be a need for temporary accommodation. This would be as close to Hathersage Court as possible to retain passing trade.
- In response to concern from objectors that the scale of Block K breached planning policy, the planning officer stated that the planning policy referred to by the objector related to the redevelopment of Hathersage Court rather than the infill as proposed.
- The scheme would provide improvements to landscaping, the public realm, safety, security, enhanced play facilities, enhancements to the existing buildings, new and better quality commercial space, provision of housing including affordable housing.
- The committee considered that as Block K was next to a taller building, it was not out of scale and this helped to limit impact.
- The development would provide better quality accommodation for healthcare providers.
- The Committee discussed Blocks K and F and how the size, scale and height impacted the character and appearance of the conservation area. Members considered that the parapet at Block F had an impact but it was less of an impact when compared to Block K. Members considered that less than substantial harm would be caused to the heritage assets. Members discussed the need to place great weight on the fact harm was caused, as well as the benefits of the scheme. A member cited the various benefits of the scheme and advised that while she was very mindful of the importance that need to be placed on the fact that harm was being caused, the benefits were such that they outweighed that harm.

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 subject to the prior completion of a Directors' Letter securing the heads of terms as set out in Appendix 1 of the officer report.

53

PACKINGTON ESTATE: LAND BOUNDED BY DAME STREET, RHEIDOL TERRACE, ST PAUL STREET, PACKINGTON SQUARE, PREBEND STREET, RECTOR STREET, UNION SQUARE AND BEVAN STREET, LONDON, N1 (Item B2)

Stopping up order of existing highway comprising part of the passageway to the south east of Rheidol Terrace, extending to the rear of 37 Allingham Street, under Section 247 of the Planning Act 1990 to enable the redevelopment of the Packington Estate (Phase 4).

Planning Committee - 10 December 2018

(Planning application number: P2018/3689/FUL)

RESOLVED:

That the starting of the stopping up process be approved subject to the applicant entering into an indemnity agreement to pay all the council's costs in respect of the stopping up.

The meeting ended at 8.50 pm

CHAIR