

**Planning Sub Committee A - 7 November 2019**

Minutes of the meeting of the Planning Sub Committee A held at Committee Room 4, Town Hall, Upper Street, N1 2UD - Islington Town Hall on 7 November 2019 at 7.30 pm.

**Present:**      **Councillors:**      Clarke, Convery and Graham

**Councillor Paul Convery in the Chair**

**83      INTRODUCTIONS (Item A1)**

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

The Chair informed the meeting that items B2, B5 and B6 will not be considered but at future date on the basis of officer advised as owners of the property are not in attendance.

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

Apologies were received from Councillor Picknell.

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

There were no declarations of substitute members.

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

There were no declarations of interest.

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

The order of business would be B1, B3 and B4.

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

**RESOLVED:**

That the minutes of the meeting held on 3 September 2019 be confirmed as an accurate record of proceedings and the Chair be authorised to sign them.

**89      137-139 ESSEX ROAD, ISLINGTON, LONDON, N1 2NR (Item B1)**

Demolition and replacement of front and rear facades (including roofing) and additions to the roof, to include a one-storey extension fronting Essex Road, and two-storey extension fronting Astey's Row (with glass box above) to accommodate 5x (1 no. 1-bedroom unit [2 person] x 2no. 2-bedroom units [3 person] x 1no. 2-bedroom units [4 person] x 1no. 3-bedroom [5 person unit) residential units; refurbishment of existing ground and first floor and creation of part basement level

## Planning Sub Committee A - 7 November 2019

Class B1 office space (166sqm) and retention of ground floor (100sqm) Class A1 retail unit fronting Essex Road.

(Planning application number: P2018/4159/FUL)

In the discussion the following points were made:

- The Planning Officer informed Members that the location plan, first floor and the basement plan be included in the list of plans in condition 2 on page 52 to be approved if permission is granted.
- Members were advised that the application site is not listed and not within a Conservation Area. The proposal will result in 5 residential units, refurbishment of existing ground and first floor and creation of basement level Class B1 office space and retention of ground floor Class A1 retail unit.
- The Planning Officer acknowledged that the proposed extensions to the Essex Road frontage will result in a front façade height of 15.1m, while the extension to the Astey's Row Frontage would result in an overall height of 13.8m. In addition, the proposal will include an excavation to create 109sqm of basement office/storage space
- The Planning Officer acknowledged that although views looking south will be interrupted, the general outlook towards Astey's Garden will still be retained. With regards to daylight and sunlight loss, the meeting was informed that assessment had been carried out and although there were some breaches, it is considered acceptable and in line with BRE guidelines.
- In response to the applicant's commitment to reduce Co2 emission by 19%, the Planning Officer informed members that the scheme is a significant revision and not a total demolition especially as some of the floors will remain. Members were reminded that considering this scheme is a mixed use development, different standards and requirements about CO2 emissions requirements.
- On the question of whether the committee could take into consideration the Council's emerging policy on carbon emission which is more stringent, members were advised that presently this is not a material consideration until it has been approved.
- In response to concerns that the proposal will result in the loss of retail space, contrary to Policy DM4.5 of the Development Management Policies, members were advised that officers have taken the view that this would not harm the retail function of the Town Centre due to the fact that the majority of the 'lost' retail space is located towards the rear of the site (Astey's Row is not a retail frontage), and a retail presence is still being maintained on Essex Road which is the key frontage. The proposal would have very little impact on the retail character of the street or the wider town centre.

## Planning Sub Committee A - 7 November 2019

- Members heard evidence from an objector. She was concerned with the erection of a high wall which is overbearing and blocks out her view. She also highlighted the loss of both sunlight and daylight and the lack of consultation following the subsequent revision to the scheme by the applicant.
- The objector indicated that although in principle she was not against the scheme but recommended the removal of the top floor at Astey's road and had concerns of how the hours of use of the terrace would be monitored.
- In response to the objections raised above, the agent informed the meeting that this scheme was an opportunity to bring back into use a derelict and abandoned building and importantly being able to provide a mixed use scheme comprising high quality retail space, office space and residential development.
- With regard to the loss of sunlight and daylight, the consultant reminded members that BRE assessment are guidelines and not the minimal expected, with an expectation that it should be applied in a flexible manner. Meeting was informed that the amendment to the scheme had taken into consideration the objectors concerns.
- On the question of any possible alterations to the scheme which would mitigate the impact of the scheme in particular to the top flat on the north west corner top floor, the consultant reiterated that the amendments to the scheme had taken into consideration objectors concerns having had a meeting with them.
- During deliberation members noted objections from the Canonbury Society and amplified at the meeting by the objector; the sunlight and daylight loss although some flexibility could be applied in this instance. The Chair also noted committee's concern about the sense of enclosure experienced by neighbouring residents and the loss of retail space.
- In response to Members suggestion about mitigating the impact of the scheme on the amenity of neighbouring residents, the applicant requested for the item to be deferred for further discussions with both the objector and planning officers.

Councillor Graham proposed a motion to Defer the item to enable the applicants to work further on some of the key concerns including the retail frontage and quantum issues, sustainability credentials of the proposal, sunlight/daylight impacts and to address the potential adverse impact of the top floor of the proposal on the adjoining neighbours roof terrace and habitable windows in relation to increased enclosure levels, loss of outlook and dominance .This was seconded by Councillor Clarke and carried.

### **RESOLVED:**

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

**90**      **74-76 ST JOHN STREET, LONDON, EC1M 4DZ (Item B2)**

Change of use of part ground floor, basement and lower basement from Use Class B8 (storage) to flexible commercial use within Use Classes A3, A4 and D2.  
Replacement of ground floor facade and entrance doors, and fenestration to enclose existing ramp.

(Planning application number: P2018/1580/FUL)

Meeting was informed by Chair on the advice of Planning Officers that item has been withdrawn and will be considered at a future meeting due to absence of a key marketing document for the proposal not being online for consultation purposes as is required

**91**      **75 HANLEY ROAD, LONDON, N4 3DQ (Item B3)**

Erection of a ground and first floor extensions to the rear of the existing D1 building and associated external alterations including perimeter timber fencing and canopy to rear play area and associated alterations.

(Planning application number: P2018/3395/FUL)

In the discussion the following points were made:

- The Planning Officer advised that no updates had been received since agenda was published. Members were advised that property is not situated within a conservation area, nor does it contain any locally or statutorily listed buildings.
- In terms of land use, the proposal involves extensions to the rear of the property at ground floor and first floor and associated alterations to facilitate additional D1 floor space to allow for the use of the site as a children's day nursery for a total of 98 children between the ages of 0-4 years old and 25 members of staff.
- In terms of design, the Planning Officer advised that the proposed extensions will be limited to the rear of the building to a depth of approximately 1.9m at both ground and first floor levels. In terms of their width, the extensions would be sited either side of the buildings circulation core, each at approximately 6.8m. Members were advised that the extension would remain sympathetic to the overall character of Hanley Gardens and would not compromise any relationship between the host property and its surrounds.
- Members were informed that the proposal would include the installation of a canopy above the outdoor play area no.3 to the rear of the property, details to be secured by a condition in the planning permission. In addition the waste storage area will be situated to the rear of the site, details also to be

secured by a condition.

- Members heard from a neighbouring resident who had concerns about the proposal. Issues raised include over development of the site; noise disturbance from the outdoor play area 3, impact on the amenity of the existing residents of Hanley Gardens; overlooking and loss of privacy and additional parking which the scheme would attract to Hanley Gardens and surrounding streets. In addition, residents were concerned that their private road will be used as collection and refuse area.
- Objector was concerned that the provision in the area is not supported by evidence of a demand for the service and that the proposal would impact the amenity of elderly residents with a wide range of need and support.
- In response to objector's concern, the applicant informed the meeting that the provision of a nursery in the north of the borough addresses the demand of working families and caters for a wide range of children and the diverse population. Members were advised that the safety of both neighbouring residents and the children remains paramount and was taken into consideration while designing the scheme.
- With regards to amenity concerns especially noise, the meeting was advised that the erection of a canopy below the flats would mitigate any potential noise from children in the play area. On parking concerns, meeting was informed that although there is significant parking in the wider area it is envisaged that parents will be using public transport especially as the scheme does not provide parking space. In addition, the school has facilities for parents to drop off their buggies before going off to work and the drop off and pick up times will be staggered.
- In response to concerns about the use of the adjacent private road by refuse collection vehicles and delivery arrangements, the agent advised that all collections and deliveries would be from the rear of the site. With regards to the disposal of nappies, the agent indicated that this will be handled in the best and tested operational manner which occurs at its other similar operations, a system of wrapping nappies that prevents the smell being a nuisance and importantly it has arrangements for 3 collections every week.
- During deliberations, members acknowledged the parking concerns of residents of Hanley Garden especially being a private road and not subject to parking restrictions. In addition, members noted that reassurance will be required regarding the refuse and recycling collection arrangements and suggested that additional wording should be included in condition 4 stating that there should be no servicing of refuse collection other than from Hanley Road.

Councillor Convery proposed a motion to amend condition 4 regarding the refuse and recycling arrangements as stated above. This was seconded by Councillor Clarke 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 set out in Appendix 1 of the officer report.

**Reworded CONDITION 04: Details of refuse/recycling store(s) and refuse management plan shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to the first occupation of the development hereby approved.**

**The refuse/recycling store (s) and refuse management plan shall be provided strictly in accordance with the details so approved, provided/erected prior to the first occupation of the development, and maintained as such thereafter into perpetuity.**

**The refuse management plan should detail the following for approval in writing by the LPA:**

- a) **Details of the final secured refuse contractor and refuse management plan to be used by this operator at 75 Hanley Road including confirmation in writing from the applicants through any agreed contract with the refuse contractor to detail that there shall be no servicing of the site for refuse storage or collection from Hanley Gardens but only from Hanley Road.**

**REASON: To ensure adequate refuse/recycling is provided and easily accessible and to safeguard adjoining resident's amenity levels.**

92

**8 OAKLEY CRESCENT ISLINGTON, LONDON (Item B4)**

Erection of a roof top extension and new roof terrace to the existing flat roof including associated obscure glazed screening to the rear and metal railings to the front elevation. External redecoration and replacement windows to the front elevation at ground and first floor with double glazed units.

(Planning application number: P2019/1292/FUL)

In the discussion the following points were made:

- The Planning Officer informed the meeting that page 5 of the report erroneously states the number of objectors to be 5, but should state 6 objections were received from 5 different specific addresses/households. Members were advised that all issues raised by the objectors had been addressed in the report.
- Members were informed that the site is within the Duncan Terrace/Colebrook Row Conservation Area and it is not a listed building. Members were reminded that the application was refused planning permission on grounds of overlooking, its design, unacceptable sense of enclosure and material loss of

## Planning Sub Committee A - 7 November 2019

outlook to the rear of adjoining properties at the committee meeting on 26 November 2018.

- The Planning Officer advised members that the proposed roof extension had been setback from the rear parapet by 1m and covers the southern section of the existing roofspace. Additionally it has been designed to vary in scale, with a maximum height of approximately 0.7m when measured 1m from the rear parapet and an overall height of 2m.
- Objector was concerned that considering the area is densely developed, the proposal would only worsen the situation. Members were reminded of the impact of the scheme on listed buildings and its detrimental impact to the heritage asset, and the essence of the terrace dwelling was to act as a buffer zone to the conservation area.
- The objector was concerned with the officer's observation that the light loss is acceptable, reminding members that this affects playrooms and bedrooms of 4 children and the window of an elderly resident whose only source of light will be affected by this new development. Members were informed that residents had a sense of enclosure especially as the development would impact the outlook from 17 windows.
- With regard to objectors not being notified of the meeting, the Planning Officer acknowledged that the 5-day rule had been adhered to and that relevant documents and information about the proposals had been published on the council website. On the claim that objectors had not been consulted following further revisions to the scheme, the Planning Officer advised that this would only be required if there is significant revisions, reminding the meeting that the proposal before the committee addressed objectors concerns.
- The agent informed the meeting that following discussions with objectors and planning officers and design officers, the roof extension had been set back from the parapets thereby minimising visual impact as it will be harmful to the setting of the listed terrace to the rear of the site. In addition, members were advised that the wall had been significantly reduced and windows will only exist on one side of the building.
- In response to the possibility of mitigating some aspects of scheme, the agent reminded the meeting that the proposal had been reduced in comparison to the previous scheme had adequately addressed objectors concerns.
- The Planning Officer informed the meeting that condition 3 which relates to materials needs to be reworded as the north elevation does not face city road. In addition, the officer advised that condition 5 on page 150 of the report should be corrected to read as condition 4.

- Members agreed that the rewording of condition 4 be delegated to the Planning Officer and the Chair.

**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 amended condition 3 as stated above.

**Condition 3 (Materials):**

**MATERIALS (COMPLIANCE):** The development shall be constructed in accordance with the schedule of materials noted on the approved plans and within the Design and Access Statement. 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 securing sustainable development and to ensure that the resulting appearance and construction of the development is of a high standard.

Correct the numbering of C5 to state C4 concerning window glazing details to say the following:

**CONDITION 04:** Details of all new windows shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to their installation. The details shall include materials, profile, reveal depth and detailing. Upvc double glazing units with unsympathetic/inappropriate proportions and will not be considered acceptable.

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

**REASON:** In order to safeguard the special architectural or historic interest of the heritage asset.

**93     BRAITHWAITE HOUSE, BUNHILL ROW, ISLINGTON, LONDON, EC1Y 8NE  
(Item B5)**

The installation of 65 no. small antennas pole mounted on 13 no. free-standing support frames upon the roof of the building, the installation of 2 no. equipment cabinets within an existing plant room and development ancillary thereto.  
(Planning application number: P2018/4275/FUL)

Meeting was informed by Chair on the advice of Planning Officers that item has been withdrawn from the agenda as the council were not yet in receipt of comments from the councils housing section and will be considered at a future meeting.

**94     MICHAEL CLIFFE HOUSE, SKINNER STREET, LONDON, EC1R 0WW (Item  
B6)**

**Planning Sub Committee A - 7 November 2019**

The installation of 86 no. small antennas pole mounted on 10 no. free-standing support frames upon the roof of the building, as well as one equipment cabinet.

(Planning application number: P2018/4282/FUL)

Meeting was informed by Chair on the advice of Planning Officers that item has been withdrawn from the agenda as the council were not yet in receipt of comments from the councils housing section and will be considered at a future meeting.

The meeting ended at 9.30 pm

**CHAIR**