

Public Document Pack

London Borough of Islington

Planning Sub Committee A - 10 November 2020

Minutes of the virtual meeting of the Planning Sub Committee A held on 10 November 2020 at 7.30 pm.

Present: **Councillors:** Picknell (Chair), Poyser (Vice-Chair), Clarke, Convery and Ismail

Councillor Angela Picknell in the Chair

138 **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.

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

There were no apologies for absence from members of the sub-committee. Apologies were received from Councillor Hyde, a ward councillor, in relation to Item B1.

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

There were no declarations of substitute members.

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

There were no declarations of interest.

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

The order of business would be B1, B3, B2 and B4.

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

RESOLVED:

That the minutes of the meeting held on 7 September 2020 be confirmed as an accurate record of proceedings and the Chair be authorised to sign them.

144 **334-340 CALEDONIAN ROAD, LONDON, N1 1BB (Item B1)**

Erection of a combined roof extension above nos 334-340, to facilitate the creation of 1 no. additional 2bed/4person flat.

(Planning Application Number: P2020/0568/FUL)

In the discussion the following main points were made:

- Concern was raised about overdevelopment. The planning officer confirmed there were 14 units at basement level, four on the first floor and four on the second floor.
- Concern was raised that some of the units did not have planning permission. The planning officer stated that 100s of units along the Caledonian Road had been regularised which meant they had been granted planning permission if they had been there for more than four years. It was not known why five units in these premises had not been included.
- Concerns were raised about the poor management and quality of the accommodation.
- Objectors raised concern about drainage problems within the units which could be worsened by the addition of an additional unit.
- A member commented that the design of the proposed extension was described in the report as 'undesirable' by the conservation officer.
- A member expressed concerns about the roofline being harmed by the extension.

Councillor Convery proposed a motion to refuse the application for the following reasons: 1) overdevelopment and 2) causing harm to the conservation area, the wording of these grounds to be delegated to officers in conjunction with the Chair. This was seconded by Councillor Poyser and carried.

RESOLVED:

That planning permission be refused for the reasons outlined above, the wording of which was delegated to officers in conjunction with the Chair.

145

9-11 NORTHBURGH STREET, ISLINGTON, LONDON, EC1V 0AH (Item B2)

Erection of a fifth floor infill extension to link a separately proposed roof extension [P2020/1515/FUL] and adjoining roof extension at No, 50-56 Great Sutton Street.

(Planning Application Number: P2020/1542/FUL)

In the discussion the following main points were made:

- A member asked whether auto-blackout blinds could be required in order to address residents' concerns about light pollution. The planning officer stated that the condition did not state which means of light control should be used but the applicant would need to provide a document stating how they would meet the condition. The sub-committee could amend the condition if minded to do so.
- A member expressed concern that the consideration of the application had previously been deferred to ask the applicant to liaise with residents about light pollution and deal with existing light issues and it was not clear that this had been done.
- The Chair stated that although the application had previously been deferred to provide the opportunity for the applicant to liaise with residents about light pollution and deal with existing light issues it was not possible to require them to do this.

- A member raised concern that the applicant was not liaising with residents and requested that officers ask the applicant to work harder with residents.

RESOLVED:

That planning permission be granted subject to the conditions set out in Appendix 1 of the officer's addendum report.

[Councillor Clarke requested that it be recorded that she voted against the planning permission being granted].

146 **9-11 NORTHBURGH STREET, ISLINGTON, LONDON, EC1V 0AH (Item B3)**

Erection of single-storey roof extension to provide 350sqm of additional office floorspace; alterations to elevations to include re-cladding, window replacement; removal of vehicle access and new ground floor shopfront; installation of mechanical plant at lower ground and fifth floor level; and the removal and replacement of the existing ramp together and associated alterations to building.

(Planning application number: P2020/1515/FUL)

In the discussion the following main points were made:

- There was an extant planning permission that would expire on 1 May 2021. The application being considered was identical but if planning permission was granted it would include an additional condition in relation to light control.
- Concerns were expressed by residents about light pollution.
- A member expressed concern that the consideration of the application had previously been deferred to ask the applicant to liaise with residents about light pollution and deal with existing light issues and it was not clear that this had been done. The Chair asked the applicant to clarify this. The applicant stated that Sutton Yard was owned by a different company within the same group of companies as 9-11 Northburgh House and therefore the applicant had no control over Sutton Yard. As far as he was aware, the owners of Sutton Yard had liaised with residents. He also stated that lights were the responsibility of the tenants.
- The planning officer advised that the sub-committee could only assess the application in front of them.
- The light control condition had been accepted by the applicant.
- The Chair stated that although the application had previously been deferred to provide the opportunity for the applicant to liaise with residents about light pollution and deal with existing light issues it was not possible to require them to do this.
- The Chair stated that granting permission with the additional lighting control condition could be preferable to the applicant using the extant permission which did not have the additional lighting control condition.

RESOLVED:

That planning permission be granted subject to the conditions set out in Appendix 1 of the officer's addendum report.

[Councillor Clarke requested that it be recorded that she voted against planning permission being granted].

147 WIDNES HOUSE, PALMER PLACE, LONDON, N7 8DG (Item B4)

Replace three No. antennas, one No. 300mm dish and one no. equipment cabinet with six No. new antennas, three No. 300mm dishes, one No. equipment cabinet and development ancillary.

(Planning application number: P2019/0516/FUL)

In the discussion the following main points were made:

- The application conformed to safety standards.
- The visual impact would be minimal.
- A member stated that this was part of vital national infrastructure and proper notice had been paid to the public health advice.

RESOLVED:

That planning permission be granted subject to the conditions set out in Appendix 1 of the officer report.

The meeting ended at 9.30 pm

CHAIR

WORDING DELEGATED TO OFFICERS IN CONSULTATION WITH THE CHAIR

MINUTE 144

334-340 CALEDONIAN ROAD, LONDON, N1 1BB

Wording of the reason for refusal agreed with Chair:

The proposed development by reason of its inappropriate detailed design, prominent siting, height, massing bulk and form would form dominant and discordant additions to the host properties and wider terraces predominantly unaltered existing roofline. The development would clearly disrupt the predominantly unaltered and rhythmic roof line and would be visible from both the surrounding public and private realm leading to an overdevelopment of the site. The proposal is therefore considered to adversely affect the special character and appearance of the host buildings, wider terrace setting and the surrounding Barnsbury Conservation Area. The works would, therefore cause harm to the significance of the Conservation Area contrary to paragraph 196 of Chapter 16 (conserving and enhancing the historic environment) of the National Planning Policy Framework 2019, Policies 7.4, 7.6 & 7.8 of the London Plan 2016, policy CS9 of Islington's Core Strategy 2011 and policies DM2.1 and DM2.3 of Islington's Development Management Policies 2013, Barnsbury CA guidance and guidance within Islington's Urban Design Guide 2017.

This page is intentionally left blank