

# Public Document Pack

London Borough of Islington

## Planning Sub Committee A - 6 September 2021

Minutes of the meeting of the Planning Sub Committee A held at Council Chamber, Town Hall, Upper Street, N1 2UD - Islington Town Hall on 6 September 2021 at 7.30 pm.

**Present:**      **Councillors:**      Khondoker (Chair), Woolf (Vice-Chair), Clarke, Jackson and Klute

**Also Present:**      **Councillors:**      Convery, Hyde and O'Halloran

### Councillor Roulin Khondoker in the Chair

#### 188      **INTRODUCTIONS (Item A1)**

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

#### 189      **APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE (Item A2)**

Apologies for lateness were received from Councillor Clarke.

#### 190      **DECLARATIONS OF SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS (Item A3)**

There were no declarations of substitute members.

#### 191      **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST (Item A4)**

There were no declarations of interest.

#### 192      **ORDER OF BUSINESS (Item A5)**

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

#### 193      **MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING (Item A6)**

##### **RESOLVED:**

That the minutes of the meeting held on 12 July 2021 be confirmed as an accurate record of proceedings and the Chair be authorised to sign them.

#### 194      **19-20 GREAT SUTTON STREET, ISLINGTON, LONDON, EC1V 0DR (Item B1)**

Single storey roof extension to allow for additional office accommodation and creation of rear roof terrace. Creation of lift overrun. Installation of plant equipment at roof level. External alterations to front and rear elevations including new shopfront. Interior renovation and re-configuration of the existing building including partial loss of existing public house and other associated alterations.

(Planning application number: P2020/2129/FUL)

Councillor Clarke arrived during the officer presentation and therefore did not take part in the discussion or decision making in relation to this item.

In the discussion the following points were made:

- The planning officer stated that paragraph 6.1 of the officer report should read 180sqm instead of the 182.1sqm stated.
- A member commented that the application site was in a Central Activities Zone (CAZ) and asked whether there was a policy to protect office use in this area. The officer advised that the policy which protected office use in this area was the Finsbury Local Plan BC8.
- The height of the proposed roof extension was considered in relation to the adjoining roofs.
- The breaches to daylight and sunlight BRE guidelines were outlined by the officer. They were considered to be unfortunate but acceptable.
- In response to a member's question about accessibility, the officer advised that the proposal had been assessed by the Inclusive Design Officer.
- In response to a question from a member about the roof terrace and potential overlooking, the applicant advised that the fire escape and planters near the edge of the roof terrace prevented people from looking down on to the terrace next door and there was a condition that the roof terrace could only be used between 9am and 7pm Monday to Friday. There was also a condition requesting that details of the balustrades be submitted to any approved by the Local Planning Authority.
- Members considered the design of the proposal to be acceptable.

Councillor Klute proposed a motion to amend Condition 9 to reference Finsbury Local Plan BC8. This was seconded by Councillor Khondoker and carried.

**RESOLVED:**

That following consideration of the case officer's report (the assessment and recommendations therein), the presentation to Committee, submitted representations and objection provided verbally at this meeting, planning permission be granted subject to the conditions and informatives set out in Appendix 1 of the officer report with Condition 9 being amended as above.

**195**     **MARTIN LUTHER KING CENTRE, 3 SHERINGHAM ROAD, LONDON, N7 8PF**  
**(Item B2)**

Erection of a new single-storey building for use in connection with the adventure playground and other community uses with associated works.

(Planning application number: P2021/1860/FUL)

In the discussion the following points were made:

- In response to a member's question about sustainability, the planning officer advised that that a Sustainability Plan was required to be submitted and approved by the Local Planning Authority as one of the conditions. The

applicants advised that they were looking at using air source heat pumps, natural insulation and sustainable materials. They were also looking to have sustainable drainage, there would be a biodiverse roof and inside natural paint would be used.

- In response to a question about opening hours, the planning officer advised that the adventure playground would be open until 7pm and the community centre could be open until 10pm.
- A member raised concern about an objector's concern in relation to anti-social behaviour. The planning officer advised that the police had been consulted about the application and had not commented and also that there was a boundary fence and wall around the site. The applicant stated that the site would be secure and inaccessible when closed. It was also overlooked by properties and it was anticipated that having increased activity on site would deter anti-social behaviour.
- In response to a member's questions about materials to be used, the applicant advised that the decisions had been made following consultation with the local community including children. Workshops had been held with children to look at materials, textures and colours. Durability and maintenance had also been considered before deciding to put corrugated metal at the base and decorative panels, which could be cut to size and came in a range of colours, on top. The materials had good sustainability credentials.
- In response to a question from a member about why solar panels were not being included, the applicant stated that the building would have a thermally efficient envelope and solar panels might not be required. A member suggested that if solar energy could be produced and benefit others and if this was in the scope of the application, this would be useful as well as interesting for children to see.

Councillor Klute proposed a motion to amend the sustainability condition to require the building to have BREEAM excellence. 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 and submitted representations, planning permission be granted subject to the conditions and informatives set out in Appendix 1 of the officer report with the sustainability condition amendment as outlined above.

196

**WEST LIBRARY, 107 BRIDGEMAN ROAD, ISLINGTON, LONDON, N1 1BD**  
**(Item B3)**

Refurbishment of the West Library vacant first floor room (135sqm) into a youth employment and support hub, including lift access, toilets and associated works.

(Planning application number: P2021/1470/LBC)

In the discussion the following points were made:

## Planning Sub Committee A - 6 September 2021

- The officer outlined the options considered since the deferral of this item at the last meeting and the potential impacts of each option.
- In response to a member asking if all three rooms at the library were listed and asking about the heritage significance, the officer stated that all the rooms were listed. The building was designed to be a library and although the lobby was visually attractive, it was circulation space rather than library space. Both the fabric of the building and its use had to be considered.
- In response to a question about Option E being more disruptive than Option D, the officer advised that with Option D, the library could still be used during construction works whereas with Option E, all the books would have to be removed from the adult library.
- Councillor Hyde, ward councillor, stated that there had been no public objections following public consultation and the proposal would mean space that had been out of use for decades would be reinstated. Option D had the support of the community. Ward councillors had concerns about Option E.
- In response to a member's question about Option E potentially costing £100,000 more than Option D, the applicant advised that the lift would need to be bigger and would cost £20,000 more than the one proposed, partitions would be required and the ground floor library would need to be reconfigured.
- It was reported that the Library Service wanted to keep the functionality of the library space.
- In response to a question from a member about the length of time Option E would take to be constructed, the applicant advised that it was anticipated that this would take 3 months.
- A member raised concern about the cost of Option E and the loss of library space.
- A member raised concern about the fabric loss involved in Option D, considered that the lift being located in the lobby would damage the heritage asset and that boarding off areas would overcome the construction dust issues in the library with Option E. The member considered Option E to be more sympathetic and that cost should not be a material consideration when protecting heritage.

### **RESOLVED:**

That following consideration of the case officer's report (the assessment and recommendations therein), the presentation to Committee and the ward councillor's comments provided verbally at this meeting, listed building consent be granted subject to the conditions and informatives set out in Appendix 1 of the officer report.

The meeting ended at 9.15 pm

**CHAIR**



This page is intentionally left blank