

**Planning Sub Committee A - 14 January 2020**

Minutes of the meeting of the Planning Sub Committee A held at Committee Room 4, Town Hall, Upper Street, N1 2UD on 14 January 2020 at 7.30 pm.

**Present:**      **Councillors:**      Picknell (Chair), Clarke, Convery, Graham and Mackmurdie

**Councillor Angela Picknell in the Chair**

**95      INTRODUCTIONS (Item A1)**

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

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

There were no apologies for absence.

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

There were no declarations of substitute members.

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

There were no declarations of interest.

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

The order of business would be B6,B1,B3, B4 and B5.

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

**RESOLVED:**

That the minutes of the meeting held on 7 November 2019 be confirmed as an accurate record of proceedings and the Chair be authorised to sign them.

**101     5, 7-11& 13 GEORGES ROAD, LONDON, N7 8HD (Item B1)**

The demolition of the existing buildings and structures on the site and the erection of a building comprising an Office B1 unit and five residential dwellings (4 x three-bed and 1 x one-bed), with associated landscaping, cycle parking and refuse facilities, solar panels and roof terraces.

(Planning application number: P2019/1923/FUL)

In the discussion the following points were made:

- Members were informed that since the publication of the agenda, additional information was received from objector regarding the separation distances

between their properties and the proposed scheme.

- The Planning Officer advised that site is in close proximity to Holloway Road and although predominantly residential, there are some mixed uses. The existing buildings on site are not statutory listed but located within St Mary Magdalene Conservation Area.
- The Planning Officer informed members that the application represents a resubmission of similar scheme which had been refused planning permission by the committee on grounds of design and scale; neighbouring amenity issues; poor quality residential accommodation and failure to provide the necessary financial contribution to affordable housing.
- Meeting was informed that an appeal by the applicant was subsequently dismissed by the Planning Inspectorate for reasons such as poor quality outlook from the proposed ground floor level rear facing windows; insufficient provision of defensible space to the proposed front garden areas of the scheme and the resulting unacceptable harm to the living conditions of the occupants of St James House Flat no 1, overlooking from the roof top terrace of flat no 5 and an increase sense of enclosure.
- Members were advised that the revised scheme incorporates a defensible space at the main entrance of each proposed dwelling; omits the roof terrace from proposed House No. 5 in order to overcome looking and the primary living spaces are now on the upper floor levels to address Planning Inspector's concerns about the poor quality outlook of the units.
- Objectors raised concerns about the use of the flat roof which has been described as 'for maintenance only' as a potential area for noise disturbances; overshadowing of St James School flats; loss of privacy and the need for windows to be obscure glazed to alleviate concerns about privacy and overlooking, a sense of enclosure, loss of sunlight and daylight and lack of consultation.
- Members were reminded that although the reasons for dismissal by the Inspector did not include design/conservation issues, the applicant amended the proposals to ensure a high quality design finish is accomplished, and that all dwellings have been altered so that bedrooms are located at first floor and key living areas at second floor.
- Members heard evidence from neighbouring residents about their concerns, which included proposal being too large and tall, out of character with the street scene, overlooking and overshadowing.
- An objector was concerned that conditions stipulated in the report would not mitigate overlooking concerns into the first floor windows especially as the separation distance between the properties and the proposed scheme was less than 18m which is contrary to policy of DM2.1. An objector requested

## Planning Sub Committee A - 14 January 2020

that were the committee minded to grant planning permission, a condition to have glazed windows to protect privacy will be welcomed.

- Members were advised that in addition to the revisions, after negotiations between applicants and council officers, the applicants has agreed financial contributions of £200,000 towards affordable housing and £7,500 for carbon offset if the scheme is approved.
- In terms of the impact of the proposal on the conservation and nearby historic buildings, meeting was informed that officers having successfully negotiated amendments to the scheme, securing high quality architectural design it is considered that the scheme will demonstrably enhance the character of the St Mary Magdalene conservation area and sympathetic to the surrounding heritage assets whilst improving the living conditions of House No 5 and quality of office accommodation.
- In response to objectors concerns raised above, the applicant indicated that the roof terrace is not intended to be used by residents, acknowledging the full height window. The agent reiterated the number of revisions to the scheme reminding members that concerns regarding the height of the scheme had been considered by the Planning inspectorate and dismissed. The Agent informed the meeting that this was a constrained site and it had to be creative in addressing the amenity concerns.
- The Planning Officer acknowledged that consideration had been given to the impact of the scheme on overlooking and privacy to the neighbouring property at Nos 4,8 and 10 Chillingworth Road, located at a distance of between 16m to 22m away with the exception of the rear of No 6 Chillingworth Road which has a rear extension resulting in a reduced distance to windows of habitable rooms.
- On the concerns about the outlook and sense of enclosure, the meeting was informed that given the separation distance, the height of the proposed dwellings, it is not considered to have a harmful impact on the neighbouring residential properties especially those on Chillingworth Road.
- On the decision to depart from Council policy of 18m separation distance, the meeting was reminded that as noted in the appeal decision any overlooking or privacy concerns could be addressed with conditions relating to the windows of the new scheme.
- With regards to overlooking concerns into windows between the scheme and neighbouring residents flat, the Planning Officer clarified that in planning terms the 18 separation distance only applies with direct overlooking and not where the angle is oblique.
- In response to consultation concerns raised by the objectors, the applicant acknowledged that letters had been sent out and a public meeting which was

convened to discuss the scheme only attracted between 7-8 people. Councillor Ward, the ward councillor noted that the last time any consultation was carried out was in 2015.

- In response to a suggestion on possible amendments to the scheme, to mitigate its impact on the neighbouring residents, the applicant reiterated that most of the objectors concerns had been addressed in the revised scheme. The meeting was informed that House 5 was amended to allow a larger outdoor amenity area to the rear, that all dwellings have been altered so that bedrooms are now located at first floor and key living room at second floor.
- During deliberations members acknowledged the narrowness of the site, the revisions to the scheme, financial contributions towards affordable housing and carbon offsetting, acknowledging that in light of the Planning Inspectors comments conditions could be imposed to mitigate against the amenity concerns.
- Members agreed that the rewording of a condition to replace the door with a window leading to the roof terrace be delegated to the Planning Officer and the Chair.
- Members agreed that applicant to submit further details to prevent direct views of Chillingworth Road to Houses 1 and 2.
- Councillor Graham requested that his vote against the application be recorded.

**RESOLVED:**

That following consideration of the case officer's report (the assessment and recommendations therein), the presentations 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 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.

**102**

**74-76 ST JOHN STREET, LONDON, EC1 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 that item has been withdrawn for consideration.

103

**ISLINGTON CENTRAL LIBRARY, 2 FIELDWAY CRESCENT, ISLINGTON, LONDON, N5 1PF (Item B3)**

Refurbishment of the ground and first floor of the building reinstating the public foyer from Holloway Road entrance to provide a link to the main library at ground floor level. Change of use of the north western portion of the building at ground and first floor levels in association with the creation of a rehearsal room/ theatre (D2) and associated office at ground and first floor levels. Work includes demolition of internal partitions and mezzanine floor, minor structural alterations to form new doorways, new partitions at ground and first floor level and installation of a new ventilation fan with an accompanying external louvre window which would replace the existing sash window above the loading bay doors at ground floor level upon the Fieldway Crescent Elevation. Installation of a ramp to the side elevation of the Holloway Road entrance to provide inclusive access to the building.

(Planning application number: P2019/2576/FUL and P2019/2605/LBC)

In the discussion the following points were made:

- The Planning Officer informed Committee of proposed changes to conditions 4 and 7 especially if members were minded to grant planning permission. Conditions 4 related to hours of operation especially as the front of the Library opens on to Holloway Road. Hours of operation to be Monday to Sunday and bank holidays from 10.00am to 6.00pm with all visiting members of the public vacating the building 30 minutes prior to closing time. In addition, a request that Condition 7 regarding the sound insulation be reworded was noted.
- The Planning Officer advised that in light of the proposed works which include alterations to the external appearance of the building and more extensive alterations to the internal appearance of the building, the Council Design and Conservation Officer has raised concerns of some harm to the historic fabric of the listed building especially as site lies within St Magdalene Conservation Area. The Planning Officer advised that the harm would need to be weighed against the public benefits of the scheme which includes outreach programme.
- Members were advised that the proposed works would result in the change of use of the North Western portion of the building, currently 189.6 sqm of library space to a rehearsal room/theatre (D2 use). The proposed space is to be occupied by Tall Stories, a charity theatre company which specialises in story telling performances for all ages and creates large and small touring shows.
- Members were informed that no planning permission is required for the internal works and this will comprise the demolition of internal partitions and mezzanine floor, minor structural alterations to form new doorways , new partitions at ground floor . In addition it will involve the refurbishment of the ground and first floor of the Grade II listed library building to reinstate the

## Planning Sub Committee A - 14 January 2020

public foyer from the Holloway Road entrance.

- On the loss of library floor space and its replacement with the theatre (D2) floor space, members were advised that considering First Steps Learning centre formed part of the Library's Adult Education Offer but now relocated to the second floor of the Library, the proposal would not result in undermining the use of the building as a library.
- The Planning Officer informed members that no objections had been received, alternative sites had been considered, the site has a high PTAL (Public Transport Accessibility Level) of 6b and the benefits of the scheme highlighted on page 152 of the agenda.
- Members were informed that key to the application is the substantial public benefits such as free performances for over 880 Islington residents, free tall stories provided by actors to over 300 residents (reading campaign) and a commitment by Tall stories to facilitate workshops and exhibitions at both Central and Islington libraries.
- Other benefits highlighted by the Planning Officer included a commitment from Tall Stories to undertake extensive work with schools by facilitating 3 assembly talks per calendar year and the improvement to the Holloway Road entrance which will improve accessibility into the library building.
- With regard to the impact of the scheme on the heritage assets, members noted the concerns of the design and conservation officers, but acknowledged that the reorganisation of the subdivision of the room moving the existing mezzanine floor from the northern to the southern side of the room would have a neutral or marginally beneficial impact on the historic fabric of the listed building.
- In terms of the impact of the scheme on preserving the character and appearance of the St Magdalene Conservation Area, the Planning Officer advised that although the external alterations would cause some harm, the harm would be less than substantial and should be weighed against the public benefits arising from the development.
- In response to concerns on how the public benefits associated with the scheme is to be monitored, the Director, Employment, Skills and Culture informed committee that there will be a Service Level Agreement (SLA) between both parties and the applicants have agreed to have quarterly and annual meetings with Council officers to measure performances.
- With regard to monitoring of Tall Stories commitment's, the Planning Officer advised that this could be incorporated into the SLA, the exact wording to be delegated to both the Planning Officer and the Chair if members were minded.

- Members were advised that although Council policy states that proposal of more than 8sqm of D2 floor space is best located within town centres, where site is unavailable, this can be located at local shopping areas if its use does not undermine the predominant retails and service function of the Lower Holloway Local shopping area.
- Members welcomed the proposal, noting the partnership arrangement between Tall Stories, Islington Schools, Library Services and in particular the imaginative manner in ensuring that the library is kept open. Members acknowledged the benefits that will be beneficial to Islington residents.

**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 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.

104

**TELEPHONE KIOSKS OUTSIDE 23 CALEDONIAN ROAD N1 (Item B4)**

Full planning permission is sought for the Removal of 3 existing telephone booths and replacement with 1 no. InLink unit telephone kiosk and associated alterations.

(Planning application number: P2019/1782/FULL)

In the discussion the following points were made:

- The Planning Officer advised that the installation of a free standing telecommunications structure is to be located within the Kings Cross Conservation Area and Kings Cross Local Shopping Area.
- Members were informed of objection letter received which raised two issues regarding condition 4 of the planning permission. Objector indicated that condition 4 will not be effective as this implies that the Police are not confident that the algorithmic call blocking system will be effective at reducing calls to those that are connected to crime or anti-social behaviour. In addition the objector was concerned that the condition removes the functionality to make calls to mobile phones for a minimum period of three months.
- Objector noted that the kiosk could not be considered in any way as BT meeting its universal service obligation for public call boxes but more of an advertisement structure.
- Members were informed that although the proposed structure and advert display was not desirable in planning and visual terms it would not materially harm the character and appearance of the street scene or the conservation area as the current proposal will replace the established and historical

existing booths on site which are visually dominant harmful.

- With regards to the impact of the proposal on public safety, the meeting was advised that the structure would be set away clear and acceptable distance from adjacent commercial and residential properties.
- On the question of crime prevention, the Planning Officer advised that although the site is in an area of high Anti-Social Behaviour or 'Crime risk area', the Council's Design Out Crime Officer has not objected to the siting of the InLink within this location subject to a suitably worded condition.
- Members acknowledged that although the units are not generally desirable additions to streetscene, in this instance the direct removal of 3no. telephone boxes and being replaced with a smaller 1 no InLink within the same location would significantly declutter the existing streetscape.

**RESOLVED:**

That following consideration of the case officer's report (the assessment and recommendations therein), the presentation to Committee, submitted representations and objections planning permission be granted subject to the conditions and informatives set out in Appendix 1 of the officer.

105

**TELEPHONE KIOSKS OUTSIDE 23 CALEDONIAN ROAD N1 0RU (Item B5)**

Advertisement Consent is sought for the 1 no. InLink unit telephone kiosk and associated 2 LED digital display/advertisement panels and associated alterations.

(Advertisement Consent number: P2019/1799/ADV)

In the discussion the following points were made:

- The Planning Officer advised that the installation of a free standing telecommunications structure is to be located within the Kings Cross Conservation Area and Kings Cross Local Shopping Area.
- Members were informed of objection letter received which raised two issues regarding condition 4 of the planning permission. Objector indicated that condition 4 will not be effective as this implies that the Police are not confident that the algorithmic call blocking system will be effective at reducing calls to those that are connected to crime or anti-social behaviour. In addition the objector was concerned that the condition removes the functionality to make calls to mobile phones for a minimum period of three months.
- Objector noted that the kiosk could not be considered in any way as BT meeting its universal service obligation for public call boxes but more of an advertisement structure.
- Members were informed that although the proposed structure and advert display was not desirable in planning and visual terms it would not materially



harm the character and appearance of the street scene or the conservation area as the current proposal will replace the established and historical existing booths on site which are visually dominant harmful.

- With regards to the impact of the proposal on public safety, the meeting was advised that the structure would be set away clear and acceptable distance from adjacent commercial and residential properties.
- On the question of crime prevention, the Planning Officer advised that although the site is in an area of high Anti-Social Behaviour or 'Crime risk area', the Council's Design Out Crime Officer has not objected to the siting of the InLink within this location subject to a suitably worded condition.
- Members acknowledged that although the units are not generally desirable additions to streetscene, in this instance the direct removal of 3no. telephone boxes and being replaced with a smaller 1 no InLink within the same location would significantly declutter the existing streetscape.

**RESOLVED:**

That following consideration of the case officer's report (the assessment and recommendations therein), the presentation to Committee, submitted representations and objection, advertisement consent be granted subject to the conditions and informatives set out in Appendix 1 of the officer.

106

**NATIONAL YOUTH THEATRE , 443-445 HOLLOWAY ROAD, N7 6LW (Item B6)**

Single storey entrance and studio pavilion with associated landscaping. Additional window to south elevation and automatic opening vents (AOVs) to windows to comply with fire regulations.

(Planning application number: P2019/2469/FUL)

In the discussion the following points were made:

- The Planning officer provided a number of updates. That a 18 month period has been agreed to demolish the front extension if the scheme is discontinued or the public benefits is not realised. Also there is ongoing discussions between NYT and the Director of Employment, Skills and Culture to prioritise Islington residents in securing NYT programmes.
- The Planning Officer highlighted the revisions to the proposed extension which included two flat roofed adjoining and connecting blocks; reception block projecting 11.5m beyond the front building line with a width of 54m and a height of 4.9m providing an internal floor area of 48sqm. In addition the adjoining and connecting 'studio' block would project 101m beyond the front building with a width of 91m and a height of 4.2m providing an internal floor area of 80sqm- the combined front extension which would be viewed as

## Planning Sub Committee A - 14 January 2020

two adjoining masses would have a width of 146m and an internal floor area of 128sqm.

- The Planning Officer highlighted the comments from the London Review Panel, which welcomed the revised designs to the scheme and in particular the improvement to the glazing to the north elevation.
- The meeting was informed that site is locally listed at Grade B and lies within the Mercers Road/Tavistock Terrace Conservation Area and approximately 50m to the north west of the Grade II listed Odeon Cinema at the junction of Holloway Road and Tufnell Park Road.
- The Planning Officer informed members that the proposal seeks to enhance the level of accessibility to the building through the provision of a level entrance pavilion and studio. In addition internal upgrades including the installation of a platform lift to gain access to the primary ground floor level
- Members were advised that were members minded to grant planning permission, this will be subject to planning obligations which secures the NYT public benefits and also ensures the demolition of the front extension in the event that the NYT benefits secured by planning obligations ceases to be provided.
- The Planning Officer advised that applicant had been submitted alternative options to the proposed erection of a front extension during the design development stage and officers were satisfied that the applicant's assertion that the erection of an extension upon the front forecourt was the only viable option for the expansion of the building.
- With regard to design, planning officer acknowledged that the proposed front pavilion would project beyond the established predominant building line along the section of Holloway Road and visible in public sight lines. In addition, the Planning Officer highlighted concerns with the bulk and scale of the proposed front extension which would conceal the entirety of the existing ground floor façade by matching the height of the raised ground floor level and the harm the scheme would cause to the Mercer's Road/Tavistock Terrace Conservation
- The Planning Officer advised that although the site is within the root protection area of 2no. protected street trees, no objections has been received by the Council's Tree Officer, as information provided shows that root growth is limited into the development area, however a condition securing tree protection was requested if planning permission is to be granted.
- The agent noted that the proposal complies with Council Policy DMS.12 in that it would allow the D1 facility to be enlarged so as to maximise the use of the property in providing recreational and community uses, and complement

## Planning Sub Committee A - 14 January 2020

the existing use. In addition the scheme would enhance the overall character of the area without any adverse impact on the surrounding area with the building still being retained for art/cultural uses at the present site which was to be welcomed.

- In response to options considered, the architect informed the meeting that following a full analysis of the various options highlighted on page 226 of the report, the erection of an extension upon the front forecourt of the building was the most viable method to expand the building.
- On concerns about the impact of the extension, the architect informed the meeting that as a landmark building, NYT currently lacks an adequate public presence within the street scene and will be improved as a result of the extension.
- With regards to concerns about the overall height and depth of the extension, Members were advised that applicant had submitted a revised scheme with reduced height and although officers still had concerns with the overall bulk of the proposed extension it is recognised that the site is constrained; accessibility is inadequate; the building is at capacity and the NYT programme has very little room for expansion at the current location.
- Members were informed that as a charity, National Youth Theatre having occupied the building since 1987, earning and raising all its income annually with only 9% of the income coming from public subsidy, this proposal would enable it to remain at its present location. Members were reminded that the building requires a lot of works to be carried out, it's commitment to continue providing arts and culture to the community and having just signed a 999 year lease and taken on a mortgage, the proposal would only be viable with planning permission being granted for the front extension, ie studio 7.
- The Planning Officer highlighted a number of benefits that will arise from the scheme as listed in the report not only specific to the residents of Islington and that the proposal represents improvements to the accessibility of the building.
- On the impact of the proposal on the heritage assets, The Planning Officers reminded Committee of it's statutory duty to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the heritage assets and place great weight on this.
- Members were of the view that the proposed public benefits although linked to the use of the building outweigh any substantial harm to the character and appearance of the heritage assets.
- In response to a suggestion that the applicant use the services of local firms during construction especially with regards to the brick works, the Planning Officer advised that this could be an informative encouraging the use of local

## Planning Sub Committee A - 14 January 2020

firms.

- Members agreed that the rewording of condition 5 be delegated to the planning officer and the Chair as there is no reference to the use of blinds.

### **RESOLVED:**

That following consideration of the case officer's report (the assessment and recommendations therein), the presentation to Committee, submitted representations, 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 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.

The meeting ended at 10.15 pm

**CHAIR**