

London Borough of Islington

**Planning Committee - 29 June 2021**

Minutes of the meeting of the Planning Committee held at Council Chamber, Town Hall, Upper Street, N1 2UD - Islington Town Hall on 29 June 2021 at 7.30 pm.

**Present:**       **Councillors:**     Klute (Chair), Poyser (Vice-Chair), Clarke, Convery, Ibrahim, Jackson, North and Picknell

**Also Present:**       **Councillors:**

**Councillor Martin Klute in the Chair**

**238     INTRODUCTIONS (Item A1)**

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

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

There were no apologies for absence

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

There were no declarations of substitute members.

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

There were no declarations of interest.

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

The order of Business would be B2 and B1

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

**RESOLVED:**

That the minutes of the meeting held on 24 May 2021 be confirmed as an accurate record of proceedings and the Chair be authorised to sign them.

**244     MEMBERSHIP, TERMS OF REFERENCE AND DATES OF MEETINGS (Item A7)**

**RESOLVED:**

- a) That the Sub-Committees be confirmed as five member Sub-Committees and that the terms of reference be noted.
- b) That the allocation of seats was determined in accordance with the advice in the report.

- c) That Councillors Khondoker, Clarke, Jackson, Klute and Woolf be appointed as members of Planning Sub-Committee A for the current municipal year or until their successors are appointed.
- d) That Councillors Poyser, Convery, Ibrahim, North and Picknell be appointed as members of Planning Sub-Committee B for the current municipal year or until their successors are appointed.
- e) That it be noted that Councillor Khondoker had been appointed Chair of Planning Sub-Committee A and Councillor Poyser had been appointed Chair of Planning Sub-Committee B for the municipal year or until their successors are appointed.
- f) That it be noted that Councillor Woolf had been appointed Vice Chair of Planning Sub-Committee A and Councillor Picknell had been appointed Vice Chair of Planning Sub-Committee B for the municipal year or until their successor are appointed.
- g) That it be noted that any member who was a member or substitute member of the Planning Committee could substitute at any meetings of either Sub-Committee if they had not been appointed as a member of the Sub-Committee.

245

**20 TILEYARD ROAD LONDON N7 9AH (Item B1)**

Demolition of the existing building and the erection of a five-storey (plus basement) commercial building comprising industrial (Class E(g)(iii)/B2/B8) and Class E(g) floorspace; and the provision of associated access, cycle parking and refuse storage.

(Planning application number: P2021/1062/FUL)

In the discussion the following points were made:

- The Planning Officer presented the scheme, advising in summary that the proposal increases the amount of industrial floorspace in a sympathetically-design new building which is sensitive to surrounding occupiers. Inclusive design and sustainable design features have been incorporated as well as well considered servicing and delivery arrangements.
- The Planning Officer informed the meeting of 2 additional updates, that a contribution of £21,222.36 Highway reinstatement bond has been proposed and that condition 13 be amended to read as follows The 1,555sqm of B2, B8, E(g)(iii) Use Class floorspace - of the Schedule to the Town and Country Planning (Use Class) Order 1987 as amended 2020 (or the equivalent use within any amended/updated subsequent Order) - hereby approved, shall be limited to those uses only and for no other purpose whatsoever, without express planning consent from the Local Planning Authority first being obtained.
- In response to a question about the lack of affordable workspace in the scheme, the agent acknowledged that the scheme has been designed with

flexibility and the requirements of SME's in mind, that the floor plates are generally modest in size and that given its relatively small size and the industrial nature of the floor it is considered acceptable.

- On the brick type being proposed for the scheme, the Planning Officer advised that a condition requiring the submission of details of materials for approval is recommended prior to their use. A suggestion by Chair that the condition should make specific reference to solid brick was seconded by Councillor Convery.
- Members were advised that there is no plan to cook on the site that the applicant offers catering of cold food such as sandwiches and salad hence no need for ventilation flues
- With regard to a suggestion for the scheme to provide more vegetation and trees on the site, the meeting was advised that this would be sought through details pursuant to condition 21 whilst condition 14 requires that green/brown roofs shall be maximised across the development.

Councillor Klute proposed a motion to grant Planning permission. This was seconded by Councillor Picknell and carried.

**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.

246

**218 UPPER STREET LONDON N1 1RR (Item B2)**

Demolition of existing office building, save for retention of ground floor façade, and redevelopment to create new office three-storey/set back four-storey building with roof plant, landscaping, cycle parking and other associated works  
(Planning application number: P2020/3058/FUL)

In the discussion the following points were made:

- Planning Officer advised of two updates, that the applicant submitted supplementary information regarding the sunlight impact towards neighbouring properties at 216 Upper Street which indicates that the proposal complies with the relevant BRE guidance
- Condition 3(b) relating to materials be reworded to read 'window treatments (including sections and reveals, and details of the limestone surrounds for the upper floor windows) to a scale of at least 1:10. In addition ,condition 31 relating to flat roof will be reworded to read ' with the exception of the third floor roof terrace in relation to condition 29, the flat roofs of the development hereby approved, including the first floor rear terrace shall not be used as amenity spaces and shall not be accessed other than for maintenance
- In terms of land use consideration, the Planning Officer advised that the scheme would provide additional office floor space within the Employment Growth Area; on site affordable workspace and importantly the vacant site

## Planning Committee - 29 June 2021

would be brought back into active use, that the scheme is supported by local plan policies.

- Members were reminded that the building was registered for local listing in Dec 2020, following Committee's resolution in November 2020 recognising its significance.
- The Planning Officer highlighted the 3 options that were considered during the pre advice stage and that it is agreed that the proposal before the committee would result in minimal disruption to neighbouring residents and any heritage harm following demolition of the building.
- Meeting was advised that the proposal will involve a substantial demolition of the locally listed former bank building, retaining only the ground floor shopfront, excavating and extending the basement so as to create a new three storey office building with a fourth floor set back storey and plant at roof level.
- Officers considered that the retention of the ground floor façade is acceptable, noting that whilst some of the reinstatement of features are welcome, the proposal would cause some adverse impact in the loss of one of the front bays due to the provision of access to the substation at lower ground floor.
- On the scheme's harm to heritage assets, the Planning Officer advised that the extent of the proposed demolition to the locally listed building would cause less than substantial harm to the significance of the non-designated heritage asset and that the level of harm identified would need to be weighed against the merits of the design of the replacement building, as well as the planning balance of the whole application.
- The Planning Officer acknowledged concerns about the daylight/sunlight loss to neighbouring properties of both 216 Upper Street and 18-22 Edwards Mews, that there were some transgressions however the overall impact is considered to be minor and weighed against the other planning benefits identified.
- With regard to other neighbouring amenity concerns such as outlook and overlooking from roof terraces, the Planning Officer advised that condition 31 has been recommended to address the issue.
- The Planning Officer reiterated that the scheme will comprise of 117sqm of on-site affordable workspace which is located at the lower ground floor level which represents 6.4% of the proposed GIA, which exceeds the 5% minimum requirement
- Concerns about the proposed gate accessing the substation was noted especially as it is recessed into the façade of the building and the use of metal louvres instead of glass.
- With regards to asbestos concerns in the basement of the existing building, the planning officer advised of no evidence, but reminded members that if during the demolition process if this was identified this would be addressed safely via the Construction Management Plan
- In response to a question about the rooms which failed the daylight and sunlight test and the methodology employed, the Planning Officer reiterated that although no internal layout of neighbouring properties had been provided, Officers having examined the submitted daylight/sunlight

information and the maps, that it would be reasonable to assess all the windows and rooms on the basis that they are serving as habitable rooms and not hallways or circulation areas.

- It was acknowledged that although the proposed development would result in some level of reduction of daylight, none of the windows/rooms would be severely impacted by the proposed development.
- In terms of privacy concerns, members were reminded that the 18m separation distance requirement is not applicable as the scheme is not a residential development nor does it have any habitable room. Members were informed that having reviewed the proposal and the separation distance between the site and the properties at Islington Park Mews, it is considered that there is sufficient separation distance (approximately 40m) between the buildings and that no harm would be caused.
- In response to questions about biodiversity and possibility of future plans by the applicants to provide more trees, the architect reminded members that the rear of the site was not used as a garden nor for any form of outdoor amenity when the bank was the occupier, however the applicant has submitted details of green roofs and balconies, that the proposed green roofs to the rear of the building will provide additional green coverage of the site and mitigate the loss of the undeveloped yard at rear.
- A suggestion that condition 12 be reworded was agreed, that the wording needs to be specific, requesting the applicant to explore the possibility of providing additional green and brown roofs in conjunction with the Pv panels. Wording to be delegated to the Planning Officer and agreed by the Chair
- The Chair has recommended condition 3 (material) to be amended to require the submission of the design details of the ground floor louvre/mesh screen for the access to the substation would need to be consulted with the Chair before the condition can be discharged.
- The committee has also recommended a condition to require details of screening for the rear elevation to be submitted and approved, to ensure that the proposal would not adversely affect the privacy of the neighbours at Edwards Mews. Wording to be delegated to the Planning Officer and agreed by the Chair
- A member welcomed bringing the vacant site back into active use, acknowledging its protection as a building of local significance
- In response to the lack of provision of retail use on the ground floor, the meeting was advised of constraints within the building such as the lift core with the result that the floor space is insufficient for retail use.

Councillor Klute proposed a motion to grant planning permission. This was seconded by Councillor Ibrahim and carried.

**RESOLVED:**

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

## **Planning Committee - 29 June 2021**

representations at this meeting, planning permission be granted subject to the conditions and informatives set out in Appendix 1 of the officer report and the amended conditions outlined above; 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 as amended above.

The meeting ended at 8.30 pm

**CHAIR**