

London Borough of Islington

**Planning Committee - 22 February 2022**

Minutes of the meeting of the Planning Committee held at Council Chamber, Town Hall, Upper Street, N1 2UD on 22 February 2022 at 7.30 pm.

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

**Councillor Martin Klute in the Chair**

**280      INTRODUCTIONS (Item A1)**

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

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

Apologies were received from Councillor Woolf.

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

Councillor Khurana substituted for Councillor Woolf.

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

Councillor North declared a personal interest with regards to items B3, B4 & B6.

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

The order of business would be B3, B4, B6, B2, B5 and B1

**285      14 CHARTERHOUSE BUILDINGS, LONDON, EC1M 7BA (Item B1)**

Change of use of building from Class F1 (genealogy library) to Class E (office); erection of two-storey roof extension to provide additional Class E (office) floorspace; fourth floor terrace; recladding of existing building; installation of mechanical plant; and associated works and alterations.

(Planning application number: P2021/1386/FUL)

In discussion the following points were made:

- The Planning Officer advised that site is not statutorily or locally listed nor is located within a designated conservation area, however the site is located within proximity to the Charterhouse Square Conservation Area and Hat & Feathers Conservation Area.
- The character and use of the vicinity is dense and mixed with commercial, residential and educational uses located within a close range.

## Planning Committee - 22 February 2022

- Members were advised that the existing use of the building as a genealogical library is no longer required as the nature of their work has now been digitalised.
- The existing building will be refurbished and extended to create a five storey providing a total of 1487sqm of office floor space.
- The extension would be constructed from metal and concrete cladding with glazing and that the roof space is proposed as an amenity terrace for the office occupiers with associated balustrading around the perimeter.
- The proposal includes two small/micro office units (91sqm each ) at lower ground level, which represents 12% of the floor space of the overall proposal.
- In addition, the Planning Officer advised that permission is being sought for a new façade to the front of the building to replace the existing brickwork elevation with textured concrete panels as well as metal cladding and enlarged glazing with vertical fin detailing and that at ground level, the entrance of the building is proposed as a large glazed opening with a metal finish to create an office reception area.
- The proposal will provide 19 cycle parking spaces at lower ground floor level with another separate plant area proposed to be located at roof level.
- In land use terms, the Planning Officer advised that the loss of the genealogy library is acceptable and that the proposed provision of 1478sqm of office floor space is acceptable given that it is located within multiple designated areas where the development, growth and maximisation of business floorspace is encouraged.
- In terms of neighbouring amenity, the Planning officer acknowledged that a number of objections have been received regarding loss of daylight and sunlight to their properties. Meeting was advised that although there are marginal transgressions to BRE guidance, it is considered that these transgressions are marginal and that conditions recommended will minimise the impact of the development upon neighbouring amenity such as privacy and overlooking, noise and light disturbance to an acceptable level.
- The planning reiterated both the sustainability and energy measures highlighted in the report and the planning benefits.
- The agent described the scheme as a sustainable form of development including energy efficiency measures, that it will deliver high quality accommodation in an area of high demand whilst enhancing the street scene and the character of the area.

Councillor Poyser proposed a motion to grant planning permission. This was seconded by Councillor Klute 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 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.

286

**30 BASTWICK STREET, LONDON, EC1V 3PS (Item B2)**

Demolition of existing building and construction of a four-storey building (with basement levels) comprising Office use (Class E) with associated works (Planning application number: P2021/1692/FUL) In the discussion the following points were made:

- The Planning Officer informed the meeting that since the agenda was published, a further 8 representations were received bringing the number up from 23 to 31, with no new issues raised, as they have been addressed in the report.
- The site is currently built out to a single commercial storey with a pitched roof, was historically used as a vehicle repair workshop and more recently as a temporary photographers and prop store.
- The uses surrounding the site are mixed with both commercial and residential. Commercial use is located at lower level in neighbouring nos. 26, 27 and 29 Bastwick Street and 50 Pear Tree Street and other buildings along Bastwick Street
- Members were advised that the scheme proposes to build a 4 storey building with basement levels and it comprises 1,778sqm office floor space.
- Feedback as a result of consultation has been taken on board which has resulted in revisions such as the lowering of the uppermost storey building by 0.5m from 3m to 2.5m and the partition of the occupation of the office space into five SME sized units which will all be accessed from Bastwick Street.
- Main considerations of the scheme include land use, its design and appearance, neighbouring amenity, transport and highways and energy and sustainability.
- The proposed 4 storey office building complies with the overarching land use policy as it would result in the increase business use of office floor space and the provision of SME's within the Employment Priority Area and Central Activities Zone in accordance with both Local and London Plans.
- In terms of layout the proposed ground floor level will include the main entrance and the reception lobby to the building, office floor space and the bin store accessed from Bastwick Street
- The SME's floor space will be located in the entirety of the basement level, with 4 small units measuring between 66 and 77sqm to be accessed via the main entrance and the office space and the floors above would have access to the cycle storage at the lower basement levels.
- The Planning Officer advised that natural light will be achieved through all the units for the SME's via the light wells and the stepped back light well in the front, which is a similar arrangement of the nearby basement office space in Pear Tree Street.
- Conditions/obligations have been recommended to restrict the use of the building for office use only within Class E and that the SME's will remain in perpetuity and not be amalgamated.
- In terms of the proposed 4th storey, meeting was advised that this will be set back from the principle elevation so that it would largely not be visible

from the other side of Bastwick street and although slightly visible within view of Central street, the uppermost floor of the 4th storey will be zinc clad just like the whole building. Members were advised that specific details for both brick and cladding is to be submitted for approval to planning officers as per condition 3.

- With regard to the east elevation, the meeting was informed that this will be lower to the neighbouring properties on 29 Bastwick Street, and the uppermost storey will be set back from the façade which is considered acceptable and will not cause harm to the wider street scape.
- In addition to the above, the Planning Officer noted that the scheme offers a better design with the street scape due to the screening of the plant and side elevations of adjoining neighbouring buildings of both no 29 and 37 Bastwick Street.
- The scheme is a car free development with no on-site car parking being proposed; drop kerbs will be reinstated on the pavement; cycle storage will be located at the lower basement level of the building with access by way of a lift; 24 long stay cycle storage spaces will be provided whilst zero short stay parking is proposed due to site constraints and as such a contribution in lieu will be secured through a S106 agreement to be used within a wider area.
- Meeting was advised that although schemes of this size will generate daily deliveries and servicing, any form of servicing and delivery for the scheme will mirror other neighbouring properties on Bastwick Street and will not worsen the existing situation.
- In terms of Energy and Sustainability, the Planning Officer noted that the proposed scheme will achieve a 53% reduction in regulated Co2 emissions and a financial contribution of £25,806 has been secured for the remaining co2 emissions; and that the scheme will achieve excellent 'BREEAM' rating.
- Furthermore, members were advised that the scheme has been future proofed for potential connection to a District Energy Network, and will be subjected to a green performance plan secured through s106 for measurable targets such as gas and energy usage
- The Planning Officer reiterated as outlined in the report, that the proposal will lead to reductions in daylight and sunlight to windows / rooms and overshadowing to gardens of neighbouring residential properties, however following careful assessment it is considered overall that the scheme is viewed as having a low adverse impact overall, and where there are transgressions, their impact is at the lower end of the spectrum.
- The proposal will provide a number of benefits in particular it will result primarily in an uplift in priority use (office floorspace) within the CAZ and EGA, and is considered to maximise the site.
- A resident living in Pear Tree Street was concerned with the scheme's mass and its impact on loss of outlook, its sense of enclosure and daylight and sunlight loss. He was also concerned that the committee report does not adequately address the impact of the scheme at the rear with the 10m distance to the neighbouring residents, simply dismissing the impact by describing it as not unduly harmful given its central London location.

## Planning Committee - 22 February 2022

- Resident was concerned that the report ignores or fails to mention where set separation distances have been applied for other developments, a key principle that was upheld by the planning inspector when No 44 Pear tree development was considered.
- Resident was concerned with the daylight and sunlight assessment, that members are not being provided with 3 dimensional imaging which shows the true impact of massing but instead officer and applicant had submitted 2 dimensional imaging, questioning how a considered decision could be taken without visualising these alternative images.
- In addition, the objector was concerned that the report erroneously focusses on percentage loss rather than actual figures, questioning the conclusion of the report when it describes the impact as minor because of its central London location. Members were advised that the proposal is not in keeping with its surrounding, requesting that the scheme be rejected so that the main concerns could be addressed
- The Chair informed the meeting that considering the meeting had exceeded its cut off time of 10.30pm, he would use his discretion under Rule 51 to extend the meeting. A member seconded the motion to proceed.
- A resident of 26 Bastwick Street requested that the application be refused, inviting committee members to a site tour to observe the close proximity of the development to both Bastwick street and 44 Pear Tree Street.
- Members were reminded of the 2 daylight/sunlight assessments carried out, the first in 2021 originally included in the application scheduled for 8 Feb 2022 and the later one that was based on an outdated design of 44 Pear Tree Street. Resident was concerned about the inaccuracies from the new survey which states that NSL results are double the BRE guidelines however officer still indicate that this is acceptable as the rooms are dual aspect when it should be applied to single aspect rooms also.
- Resident was concerned with the rooms tested in particular incorrectly stating in the report that it was a kitchen rather than a family kitchen dining area.
- Another neighbouring resident was concerned that the proposed 5 storey office block will harm resident's amenity due to its overbearing and oppressive nature, that the structure was much taller than the residential surroundings. Resident also queried the assertion by the developers that there will be no loss of light to his home as incorrect as he will be viewing a wall if scheme goes ahead. Meeting was informed that neighbours at 37 Bastwick will have their roof terraces bordered by a south west brick wall which is 2 storeys higher, a fact not acknowledged in the report
- Bastwick Street and Pear Tree Street are both thriving residential neighbourhoods and objectors claimed that filling the gaps between residential dwellings with a large office development will cause major noise pollution, concerns which they said have been disregarded by planning officers, that an amphitheatre was being created between his dwelling to the east, Bastwick Street to the south and Pear Tree Street to the North and with the previously consented scheme of 44 Pear Tree Street, that this would result in a sense of enclosure on all sides.

## Planning Committee - 22 February 2022

- Resident had concerns with noises emanating from all these buildings, plant noises from the roof, construction workers and movement of refuse vehicles, all of which have not been sufficiently addressed.
- Resident was concerned about the various omissions in the report, misleading surveys, lack of consultation with neighbouring residents and the new drawings and light surveys that suddenly came to light recently.
- Cllr Graham on behalf of residents, reminded committee that this is a small and residential area, and that with the amount of ongoing works residents have had to put up with, noting that a number of applications which had received consent had not even commenced.
- Cllr Graham invited members to undertake a site visit to Bastwick Street and listen to residents' concerns instead of taking decisions on drawings and reports which appear to be flawed especially having heard from the objectors of the various inconsistencies in the report, that this is not an application adjoining a main road but in a small street where residents have suffered a lot over a number of years.
- In response, the applicant acknowledged that the proposed 4 storey office building will provide approximately 200 jobs, that the site currently is occupied by a photographic studio employs 5 people covering a space of 500sqm.
- Members were reminded that the temporary use ceases in 2022 and the long-standing use of the site is for a car repair garage which could cause nuisance to neighbouring residents if reinstated.
- Meeting was advised that the Project Team have worked intensely with council officers since 2020, noting that the scheme has undergone numerous revisions in response to feedback received.
- In terms of land use, members were advised that the scheme is policy compliant as it increases use of office floor space and caters for dedicated SME's floor space through the provision of 4 units totally 281sqm floor space which equates to 19% in terms of net total area, therefore exceeding policy requirements.
- Members were informed that the scheme is of high quality design and will not cause harm to the wider street scape and that in comparison to the existing site and size, the scheme offers a better resolution of the street scape compared to the large single storey industrial type building from the 1950's.
- Meeting was advised that in terms of height, massing and size of the proposed building, it is keeping with rest of the buildings in Bastwick Street whilst the sufficient separation distance is considered reasonable to both the neighbouring Bastwick and Pear Tree Street properties.
- In terms of sustainability, the planning agent reiterated that the proposal will achieve BREEAM excellent and as the development is located within 60m of the Bunhill Network, it is proposed that the development will connect to this network which to be is welcomed. In addition 90sqm of Photo Voltaic Panel is proposed for the scheme.
- The agent reiterated the benefits of the scheme, an uplift in high quality modern employment business space, provision of sufficient floor space for 200 new jobs, a contribution of £312,000 towards the councils affordable

housing provision of site and sustainable transport measures and a car free development, redevelopment and intensification, of an under-utilised brown field site providing high quality office building with an enhanced internal environment for staff in the CAZ where offices should be prioritised.

- The scheme also provides a building capable of multi-let occupation to support local small businesses size firms specifically 4 SME units within the site, totally 19% and importantly the scheme removes the risk of the existing unit reverting back to the car repair business which could cause nuisances to nearby businesses
- The proposal provides a stable office building and responds to its contexts, and conditions have been recommended to mitigate concerns such as daylight and sunlight.
- In response to objectors comments about the recent submitted drawings and plans, meeting was advised that since December following discussions with officers on detailed amendments to the fire strategy to changes to the doors, stair wells and fire mitigation measures, that the changes did not require further consultation.
- In response to concerns from the adjoining residents, the agent informed members that having worked with council officers, revisions have resulted in further reductions and cutback to the scheme, noting that the site is in a central London location and that most uses especially in Bastwick Street is commercial in nature.
- In terms of report accuracy, the daylight and sunlight consultant confirmed to committee that the design of the scheme has been fully assessed and it has been done with or without the future development of 44 Pear Tree Street to assess its cumulative impact
- In terms of pictures provided, the consultant confirmed that it has been accurately assessed, acknowledging that there are isolated shortfalls of BRE guidelines to a number of properties particularly at 45 -56 Pear Tree Street and 37 Bastwick Street and also the garden shortfall at 45 Central Street.
- Members were reminded that although there are isolated shortfalls to a few windows and rooms, it is important to note that mitigation measures have been taken into account in designing the scheme.
- On assessing the cumulative impact of daylight and sunlight loss from the scheme and from other proposed development when built up, the consultant noted that there would be none and the assessment exercise had taken everything into consideration.
- With regard the noise levels from the fixed plant on the roof and delivery and servicing arrangement, meeting was advised that condition 4 addresses this issue
- In response to a question on whether conditions be included to restrict the use of roof terraces, the officers advised that no roof terraces were proposed. Clarified that condition can restrict and mitigate against internal light pollution. Officers advised a restriction to office hours was not considered to be required in this case.
- On whether condition 11 regarding servicing and delivery times could be tightened up as it appears vague, meeting was advised that any

arrangements will adhere to existing arrangements and that there is an expectation that it will 1-2 deliveries per day.

- On the question of the possible removal of a top floor to address overshadowing and light pollution concerns, the planning officer acknowledged that for the scheme to be BRE compliant a certain extent of the top floor and the second floor of the front and back of the building will have to be removed.
- During deliberations, the Chair acknowledged that most of the noise and light concerns could be addressed with conditions and that in general the area is both mixed commercial and residential use. He also noted that with regard to the overall massing concerns of the building, that it is no different from other buildings in the area, however the area is congested in the immediate vicinity and that the main issue is whether the daylight and sunlight assessment is sufficient.
- A member acknowledged residents' concerns about the disruption to their lives with the amount of ongoing works, but felt that similar to the 44 Pear Tree Street development when the same questions were asked if the developer had done enough to mitigate the daylight and sunlight loss, that in this instance he is minded to agree that the site massing has been reviewed as far as it can and policy compliant.
- A member indicated that having considered the diagrams and noted officers explanation on the possibility of removing a floor to make the building BRE compliant, a motion was moved for the item to be deferred.

Councillor Khondoker proposed a motion to defer this item. This was seconded by Councillor Poyser and carried.

**RESOLVED:**

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

287

**34 YORK WAY (JAHN COURT), 34B YORK WAY (THE HUB), ALBION YARD AND IRONWORKS YARD, REGENT QUARTER, KINGS CROSS, LONDON N1 (Item B3)**

Refurbishment of existing building; 5 storey partial infill extension to eastern elevation, single storey extension to northern elevation and two storey roof extension with roof terrace to provide additional Office floorspace (Class E(g)(i)); reconfiguration and alterations of front and rear entrances to the western and eastern elevations; provision of one flexible Retail (Class E(a)), Café Restaurant (Class E(b)), Fitness (Class E(d)) and Office (Class E (g)(i) unit at ground floor level; provision of cycle store and associated facilities at basement level and plant at basement and roof level with green roofs and other associated works. Listed Building Consent application: P2021/2360/LBC also submitted.  
(Planning application number: P2021/2270/FUL)

**Item was taken in conjunction with item B4 which is seeking listed building consent**

In the discussion the following points were made:

## Planning Committee - 22 February 2022

- Meeting was advised that since the publication of the report officers have received additional comments from 9 residents and that Officers consider that no new material planning issues have been raised.
- Planning Officer highlighted a correction to paragraph 6.14 of the report, that the fourth floor roof extension to Jahn Court is recessed by 2.5 metres from the eastern elevation rather than 2.7 metres.
- Meeting was advised that on further review of the daylight assessment, officers would like to make the following minor corrections to the total figures in the daylight assessment in the officer's report as follows:
  - At paragraph 10.244 on page 227, 149 rather than 102 rooms were assessed;
  - That 42 instead of 40 windows and 12 rooms and not 9 as stated in the report would fail the BRE guidance criteria, so 15.1% of the windows would fail to meet the BRE Guidance rather than 14.4% and 8.0% of rooms would fail BRE guidance rather than 8.8%.
  - In addition a correction to paragraph 10.248 on page 229, that in the Ironworks, 40 windows rather than 42 would meet the BRE guidance and 11 rather than 14 rooms would meet the BRE guidance with the result that 54.7% rather than 57.5% of windows passing and 61.1% of rooms rather than 77.8%
- Meeting was informed that site is part of the Regents Quarter which comprises two city blocks of building and lies within Kings Cross Area and is within the designated Central Activities Zone and Employment Growth Area.
- The Planning Officer advised the meeting that the key material considerations are principle of development, land use, affordable workspace, design, conservation and heritage, neighbouring amenity, biodiversity, energy and sustainability, highways and transport, safety and security and fire safety.
- Meeting was advised that the existing building was consented as part of a redevelopment approved in 2002 and that the proposal would primarily increase the floor space and improve the quality and efficiency of the existing floor space within the building as well its flexibility of use and is acceptable in principle.
- With regards land use, members were advised that Jahn Court has an existing Class E(g)(i) office use and that the provision of additional class E office use within the Kings Cross Employment Growth Area and the Central Activities Zone is policy compliant.
- That the inclusion of flexible Class E office, retail, café/restaurant or fitness unit on the ground floor seeks to provide active ancillary uses to the predominant office use, whilst ensuring quiet frontages to the Ironworks Yard to respect the residential character of this part of Regent Quarter.
- The proposal would redevelop the site to provide a building that comprises 10,286.2sqm (GIA) of commercial floor space and that it is estimated that the proposed development would generate approximately 156 additional full time jobs on site a significant uplift from the existing 460 jobs.
- The Planning Officer informed the committee that through the use of appropriate planning conditions 15, 16 and 17, the Council would be able to

retain control over any subsequent change of use of the site and prevent any unacceptable change of uses within Class E which would result in significant loss of office and employment floor space.

- Members were advised that the entirety of the existing commercial unit at 34b York Way which amounts to the provision of 388sqm will be dedicated affordable workspace for the council to subsequently lease to a council approved operator, secured by S106 Agreement.
- The Planning Officer advised that with this application, it will amount to an uplift of 2,315.7sqm of guaranteed office floor space and that the linked application at Times House and Laundry Buildings will bring an uplift of 1,427.2sqm of office floor space.
- Members were advised that taking the current and emerging local plan into account it is considered that an on-site affordable workspace unit based on a 10.4% of the uplift of guaranteed office floor space across the two applications (Jahn Court and Times House and Laundry Buildings) at peppercorn rent for 10 years would be acceptable and support was received from the Council's Inclusive Economy Team.
- The Planning Officer advised that the proposed development would create additional height and massing on site and would inevitably increase the visual prominence of the buildings within the site
- In addition, the meeting was advised that having carefully assessed the visual and heritage impact, it is considered that the proposed development would not cause a large degree of harm to the character and appearance of the area.
- Meeting was informed that in design terms, the proposed extensions and alterations to the existing building would result in improvements to its overall appearance and its relationship to the wider public realm.
- Meeting was advised that Officers have considered that any harm to heritage assets should be weighed in its planning balance with its public benefits.
- The proposal includes energy and sustainability measures such as the creation of green/blue roofs, installation of 73no. solar panels, attenuation tanks and future proofing for connection to a district energy network to ensure that the proposal would maximise energy efficiency and the sustainable design of the site.
- With regards the impact of the scheme on residential properties in terms of loss of privacy, overlooking or noise impacts, the meeting was advised that it is not considered to have an unacceptable impact and conditions have been imposed to mitigate any concerns that might have raised.
- Members were advised that it is a car free development and would be secured by condition.
- In summary, Planning Officer noted that in the overall planning balance, the public benefits as listed in the report outweigh the limited harm caused from the development to neighbouring amenity in relation to loss of daylight (VSC) and loss of sunlight to properties in the Iron Works and to the character and appearance of the Kings cross Conservation Area.
- In response to a question on whether the demand for office space is based on pre or post pandemic projections, members were reminded that the

## Planning Committee - 22 February 2022

council's current policy requirements state that office space is required in the area.

- In response to a question about the proposed affordable work space offer for 34B York Way and in particular the 10 year lease at peppercorn rent and 50% service charge, the planning officer stated that the offer is policy compliant as the scheme offers 10% which exceeds the requirement of 5%.
- On the issue of more animation to the York Way frontage especially to its courtyard and walkways which at the moment is relatively sterile, the meeting was advised that a flexible active use unit has been introduced within Jahn Court on the ground floor which brings forward a number of uses such as cafe, restaurant, gym, office. In addition the alterations to the glazing facing York way to the windows and the amended entrance have been introduced to increase animation and it is important to note that the scheme is restricted as it is within a Conservation Area.
- A resident requested that the committee refuse the application, questioning the committee report attempts to justify every failing and then concluding that the benefits from the scheme outweighs its harms. Resident questioned the notion that the scheme will allow 125 cyclist to pass through the development despite its current prohibitions which is currently not being enforced, that this will result in an increase in anti-social activities. Resident noted that in light of post covid working arrangements that there is no evidence of a demand for office space especially as there is an increase of empty office floor spaces in the area and queried if the proposed £312,000 could be regarded as a substantial affordable housing construction.
- Resident also had concerns with the proposed 9 cycle parks in the public realm area, as this could not be regarded as a replacement for the secured lock cycle parks for residents which will be removed from Block B. Concerns about plans to invite local schools into the development would result in the increase in the number of people traffic passing through the area thereby affecting residents amenity.
- An Iron Works resident had concerns with the proposal, noting its impact due to its close proximity to nearby heritage assets and 52 flats. He indicated that the Jahn building is too tall, twice the height of other buildings resulting in the reduction of lights to flats and its adverse impact on the contextual heritage assets. He queried the loss of 34.5% VSC and 43% skyline loss to bedrooms and light reduction of 28.7% in hallways, stating that this is not acceptable.
- Resident was concerned that despite the scheme being described as a place to visit and work, nothing in the report makes any reference to residents and its impact on those who live in one bedroom flats. Resident was concerned with officers claim that any loss of light is acceptable as it only affects bedroom describing it as minor, reminding the meeting that amenity of residents should be protected by the Council. Resident also had concerns about the height and mass of the building especially as this will result in loss of privacy and overlooking concerns. Additional concern raised by resident was the impact of the building on heritage assets as it is in close proximity to Kings Cross and St Pancras, reminding members of concerns raised by Islington Society.

## Planning Committee - 22 February 2022

- Another Iron Works resident reminded the meeting that when consent was granted in 2002, residents were assured that the scheme will protect the amenity of existing residents within a mixed use area and heritage areas, that Jahn Court is a tall building an increase in height within a low setting urban area which contravenes policy D3 of the local plan. He disagreed with Officers comment that it does not exceed the 30m requirement.
- He was also concerned that due to the size of the building, multiple properties within the area will lose light exceeding BRE guidelines, that within Iron works alone 95% of the windows tested failed and that due to the scheme's design, between 50-90% of the flats will be energy inefficient. He also queried why considerate weight should given to the benefits despite the harms already identified to residents amenity and local heritage assets.
- An Albion Yard resident was concerned that despite the fact that Jahn Court is surrounded by listed buildings and sited within the Kings Cross Conservation area, there appears to be no consideration been given to the impact of the scheme, noting the external works being proposed to be carried out to Jahn Court, reminding the meeting of objections from Islington Society.
- Members were reminded that Jahn Court will overlook the rooms of neighbouring homes, that the proposal will result in a radical alteration from its original intention. Meeting was informed that the building will stand out and not in line with the Kings Cross Area, that that the chimney of 34 B York way will no longer be prominent along the skyline and that the proposed Victorian brick materials used would be a break from the other neighbouring property and it will distract.
- Councillor Hyde on behalf of Caledonian ward residents welcomed the attempt to re enliven some of the heritage and listed buildings, however had concerns of lack of engagement with residents noting that right from its commencement in December 2020, developers did not engage with residents until July 2021. Councillor Hyde was concerned with the reports description as the area being commercial and importantly its failure to recognise non-designated assets which need to be protected. She noted that despite revisions to the scheme, the proposed extension to Jahn Court is too tall with the additional proposed floor an increase of 10m or 60% of what is there at the moment, that it is not only unsympathetic and monolithic in scale and massing, it is inappropriate and will have an adverse impact on the immediate Conservation Area.
- Councillor Hyde acknowledged the corrections to BRE levels, but was concerned that only 54.7% of windows in IronWorks and 67 windows in Albion Yard met BRE guidelines.
- Members were reminded that the area is a tranquil area, that the item should be deferred for further consideration, an opportunity to allow applicants and officers to work in collaboration with residents and produce a scheme that is in harmony with locally listed buildings, that developers could bring back a smaller, congruent and sympathetic scheme that benefits both the residents and the community.
- On the question of possible improved offer for the local schools instead of non- paid work experience jobs secured under s106, the agent informed the

meeting that recently they have been engaging with local schools on partnership offers with primary school. In addition the agent stated that although non paid and work experience is secured through s106, there is scope for more paid jobs for young people.

- On the lack of consultation on conservation concerns and impact of scheme on heritage assets, the agent reminded members that both the heritage design officers and residents views had been taken on board for example with regards to the changes which have been focussed on the contemporary elements of the scheme, the heritage element such as the listed building, the hub building and the adjacent Jahn building to the south have been respectively refurbished with minimal changes and also with the contemporary glass entrance which does not sit well with the brick entrance have been replaced and there have been some setbacks so that they don't dominate the heritage assets to the front and the additional height 5th floor has been set 18.5m from York way
- On the question of provision of 600 jobs and 1 million GVA, the agent acknowledged that they are net jobs, that the net increase will see an increase of 150 additional employees.
- On the question of a locked bike park being removed, the agent advised that this is related to an existing cycle storage which is not actually on the application site in block B, that it will be removed, that the proposal is a 6 bicycle stand which is to be installed on a public way.
- The Chair in summary acknowledged that although it is a complicated scheme, that the removal of cycle park seems unfair, concerns still exist regarding the public realm, further animation to the frontage, that it appears that the height of Jahn Court appears to be the overriding concern.
- A member welcomed the proposals attempt to reposition the building and the offer of affordable workspace but had questions on the impact due to the height of Jahn Court, that it was too big, that issues with the transgressions of 20% plus of BRE guidance was too much. On the issue of affordable workspace and the peppercorn rent for 10years member felt this was inadequate. He was particularly concerned with the impact of the scheme to both the listed Kings Cross station and St Pancras and would want the contribution to affordable housing revisited. Member questioned the promise of 626 jobs, that there is no net additional jobs, that this was more or less between 20-30 net additional jobs.
- In terms of harm, massing and scale, Member noted that heritage impacts are very profound and although NPPF has changed over the years, putting up a large building in an area of a relatively low Victorian urban landscape right next to Grade I Kings Cross and St Pancras Stations does not sit well so suggested that the scheme be refused.
- Another Member acknowledged the light loss, that it is debatable given its urban context, however there are some positives in terms of design however would request a deferral.
- A member suggested the application be deferred as it appears that applicants have not listened to the issues raised by residents.

- The Chair noted that having viewed the drawings he agrees that the building is a floor too high and that a removal of a floor would give better proportion and reduce daylight and sunlight concerns.
- Member agreed that the benefits of the scheme have been overstated and although no objections have been received from both the design and heritage officers, he felt that an improved affordable workspace, possibly with an extended lease from 10 to 20 years would be welcomed.
- The Chair reiterated most of the above concerns, noting that in this case, design is a material consideration especially with the size of the building, that although committee are keen to get to a resolution with the application, there still remain concerns about the height and for the applicant to improve the scheme benefits.

Councillor Clarke proposed a motion to defer. This was seconded by Councillor North and carried.

**RESOLVED:**

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

288

**34 YORK WAY (JAHN COURT), 34B YORK WAY (THE HUB), ALBION YARD AND IRONWORKS YARD, REGENT QUARTER, KINGS CROSS, LONDON N1 (Item B4)**

Listed Building Consent application in connection with external works to parts of Jahn Court at 34 York Way, which adjoin the exterior of the Listed Building at 34B York Way, comprising of the removal of paving and railings and structures/fixtures for the glazed front entrance and skylight to Jahn Court; and the re-provision of a new front entrance structure adjoining the listed building, and replacement paving and associated works, adjoining the listed building, and replacement of entrance door with glazed door. Associated planning application ref: P2021/2270/FUL. (Planning application number: P2021/2360/LBC)

In the discussion the following points were made:

- This item was considered with item B3 which is a linked application for a full planning permission ( see details above )

Councillor Clarke proposed a motion to Defer. This was seconded by Councillor North and carried.

**RESOLVED:**

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

289

**NEW RIVER HEAD, LAND REAR OF 28 AMWELL STREET, AMWELL STREET, LONDON, EC1R 1XU (Item B5)**

## Planning Committee - 22 February 2022

Change of use and conversion of Grade II listed buildings known as the Engine House, Boiler House, Coal Store and Windmill Base from Class E (Commercial, Business and Service) to Class F1 (Learning and Non-Residential Institution) for gallery, exhibition and education use with ancillary shop, cafe and office uses. Occasional use as an events venue for private hire. Partial demolition of North Stores and single and two storey extension in two locations at eastern and western end. Construction of foyer link between North Stores and main buildings. Provision of cohesive landscaping scheme and associated public realm enhancements and creation of permissive pedestrian route through the Site. Reconfiguration of new vehicular and pedestrian access into the site from Amwell Street. Pedestrian and servicing access to the Site will be provided from Myddelton Passage. (Listed building consent also submitted ref: P2021/1553/LBC).

(Planning application number:P2021/1545/FUL&P2021/1553/LBC)

Cllr Khurana leaves prior to the consideration of this item and was not involved in the deliberations at all.

In the discussion the following points were made:

- Site is within the New River Conservation Area and contains various Grade II listed buildings and that the proposal includes development to various buildings across the site, the North Store is being extended to the west and a secondary storey introduced to the east. In addition, the meeting was advised that a linking foyer building is to be introduced in the Northern courtyard area between two existing buildings House as well as a new stair and lift. Also a café and raised terrace is proposed to the south of the site that requires various openings in the listed buildings and the scheme proposes a new pedestrian pathway that links Amwell Street with Myddelton Passage that requires an alteration to site levels to achieve appropriate levels of access.
- Meeting was advised that in land use terms, the proposed change of use of the site to an art gallery Use Class F1, to be occupied by the House of Illustration is policy compliant , that it includes ancillary office accommodation, and cafe use.
- Members were advised that occasional private hire events will be controlled by an Operational Management Plan.
- Meeting was advised that the site is addressed by the New River Head and Claremont Square Planning Brief (2013) which outlines various long held aspirations for the site and that the application is considered to be able to meet these requirements to varying degrees. In addition a heritage interpretation strategy forms part of the application and this includes information boards across the site and installations in the Boiler House Cafe with QR codes providing access to further detailed information and history relevant to the site. The windmill base will also provide a permanent heritage interpretation space.
- There is a desire for public access and to operate between 9.30am to 5.30pm, Tuesday to Sunday with potential for extending the hours of operation via S106 agreement.

## Planning Committee - 22 February 2022

- On the harm to heritage assets, the planning officer advised that as it includes a Grade 11 listed building with all the interventions such as the new use, new floor being installed at second floor level, the installation of lift access and the windows being covered by a screen to hang the art on the wall.
- Inclusive design has been incorporated across the site and there will be level access provided and that some of the floor cobbles will be reset of various types to enable access.
- In terms of energy and sustainability, heat source pump will be used and green roof will be provided on the education studio and further green roof will be in the heat air source pump, there will be carbon off setting contribution of £11,040 and green performance plan for the site.
- The Planning Officer advised that 3 Disabled Parking bays will be provided to the west of the site with 46 visitor cycle parking spaces of which 4 will be for staff and there will be an independent access arrangements to Thames Water Facility from the south.
- The Planning Officer advised that less than substantial harm has been identified to the significance of the listed buildings (including their setting) as well as the wider conservation area due to the interventions required to enable the use of the site for F1 purposes, however, careful consideration has been given to the relative importance of the heritage asset and this has been weighed against the heritage benefits and public benefit delivered by the proposals.
- Members were advised that the harm identified is considered to be outweighed by the heritage and public benefit that would be delivered.
- The use of the site as an art gallery is the optimum viable use of the statutorily listed buildings, which is significant heritage benefit for these listed buildings that have been vacant for over 30 years and is given significant weight in the overall planning balance.
- Members were reminded that the site has a complicated history of both refused and approved schemes with no viable scheme being implemented.
- That the proposal with the new cultural use will bring further socio economic. Benefits to the borough and beyond all those captured in S106.
- Members were reminded that this was a combined report seeking full planning permission and listed building consent, however the conditions with the permission are separately noted in the report.
- A neighbouring resident had concerns with the proposal especially as her bedroom shares a party wall with the North Stores. She discounted the claim in the committee report that stated that on average houses in the mews were 12.6m away from the site when her back wall is 9m.
- In addition the objector requested that considering she works occasionally from she requested a condition that electronic blinds be installed so as to ensure there is no light spillage from the foyer which is 9m from the back of her house throwing up a lot of light into the sitting room. The resident also requested a condition which will ensure that future occupiers do not remove the covering over the windows which is presently used to hang art during exhibitions as it protects any overlooking.

## Planning Committee - 22 February 2022

- Another concern raised was the noise levels when events are carried out and requested that the projected 24 events be reduced to 20 and possibly scheduling 2 events a month as it will impact her amenity and others, that a condition should be attached restricting construction activities on Saturdays considering she works from home.
- Another local resident was concerned with the close proximity of his house to the 2 storey building, that allowing a commercial building so close to his property should be given due consideration. The resident had concerns with both the loss of light and privacy to his building, that his dwelling will be overshadowed suggesting that the developer could have a 4-5m set back on the top floor of the building to address these concerns. Resident also had concerns with the positioning of the proposed disabled toilet especially as it will be about 4-5 feet away from the common wall and had concerns with having to hear toilet sounds and users regularly opening and closing the toilet door.
- The applicant informed the meeting that via Illustration use of the site and its activities will bring substantial benefits to the borough as it will bring curriculum to life, an opportunity to provide a voice to the marginalised people in the community.
- Members were reminded that in balancing the public benefits and the heritage harm, that opening up the building and giving local access was significant, that it is a scheme that has gone through a long period of consultation and planning with both residents and Islington officers.
- The proposal is not a commercial development, that the proposal has looked very closely at the optimum configuration of the site and the whole of the North stores has sound insulation in it.
- Members were informed that options in terms of the light from the foyer and noise have been looked into and that any construction team will have signed up to the Considerate Construction Scheme which respectively responds to noise concerns of neighbouring residents.
- On the issue of events held previously and associated noise levels, meeting was advised that House of Illustration is not aware of drinks reception taking place outdoors instead of indoor as most activities will be indoors.
- With regard to light spillage concerns from the gallery, the architect advised that blinds could be installed to roof lights and to the glazing which will be linked to the light switching so as to ensure minimal light spillage.
- On the potential construction disturbance meeting noises, meeting was advised that the work carried out on the section of the single building North Store, which is being retained is to be done to repair its roof structure and it will involve erecting hoardings to protect nos 1 and 2 and adjoining houses in the mews from the works , that a screening will be used to mitigate noise concerns.
- On the issue of limiting the number of events held, meeting was advised that events are essential to facilitate funding activities
- During deliberations, Members agreed that construction activities should not be carried out on Saturdays and that conditions should be amended to ensure that future occupiers of site do not remove the covering over the window which presently protects any overlooking

- In response the planning officer acknowledged that the above concerns can be addressed by amending the relevant conditions
- With regard to concerns about the location of the disabled toilet and its close proximity to a residents wall, the Architect reassured the meeting that it will have no impact on their amenity as there is a 9 inch brick wall of the side of the building and another lining wall in between and that the cavity will be acoustically insulated and that all pipe work will be surrounded so will not be an issue. The Planning Officer acknowledged that no objections were received from the Council's Environmental officer on this issue as it is a solid wall.
- Members commended the proposal and agreed that this would be of benefit to the community.
- The Chair acknowledged that a lot of work had been carried out by all parties to the scheme, noting that most of the objectors concerns could be addressed via the Construction and Management Plan and that issues relating to daylight and sunlight and noise concerns would have to be agreed by planning officers before works is allowed to commence, requesting that construction activities on Saturday be removed from the Construction Management Plan.
- Members were reminded that both planning permission and listed building consent were being considered.

Councillor Poyser proposed a motion to grant planning permission and listed building consent be granted. This was seconded by Councillor Klute 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 and listed building consent 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.

290

**TIMES HOUSE AND LAUNDRY BUILDINGS (4-6 BRAVINGTONS WALK, 8 CALEDONIAN STREET AND PART GROUND FLOOR AREA OF 3 BRAVINGTONS WALK) LAUNDRY YARD AND PART OF CALEDONIA STREET, REGENT QUARTER, KINGS CROSS, , LONDON, N1 9AW (Item B6)**

Refurbishment of existing buildings; partial demolition and infill extensions to the southern, northern courtyard and western elevations at ground, first, second, third and fourth floor level and part one, part two storey roof extensions to provide additional Class E(g)(i) Office floorspace at Times House; removal of plant room and entrance, alteration to the elevations and enlargement of existing windows to Laundry Building; further works include the provision of one flexible Retail (Class E(a)), Café Restaurant (Class E(b)), Fitness (Class E(d)) and Office (Class E (g)(i)

unit, three flexible Food and Drink (Class E (b)) and/or Bar/Drinking Establishment (Sui Generis) units, and four Retail (Class E (a)) units at ground floor level; provision of outdoor terraces at first, fourth and fifth floor levels, basement cycle storage and associated facilities, green roofs, plant at basement and roof level; public realm works to Laundry Yard and infrastructure and related works, and new cycle parking on Caledonia Street.

(Planning application number: P2021/2269/FUL)

Cllr Picknell leaves prior to the consideration of this item and was not involved in the deliberations at all

In the discussion the following points were made:

- Meeting was advised that since the publication of the report, 2 additional comments from residents have been received and that no new material planning issues have been raised.
- The Planning officer highlighted a number of following corrections to the report, that at paragraph 10.23 of the report, the Affordable Housing Contribution should read as £229,813 rather than the £234,413.33 stated in the report and the height of the plant structure on the top of the west wing of Times House would rise to 24.3m rather than 24.8m and the top of east wing plant structure to Times House would rise to 24.85m rather than 21.85m.
- Meeting was advised that following further review of the daylight assessment, a number of corrections need to be made to the total figures, that at paragraph 10.269 on page 522 of the report, 84 rather than 80 windows were assessed and 54 rather than 51 rooms were assessed.
- It was also noted that minor reductions in the number of rooms that would fail the BRE Guidance is down to 5.56% rather than 5.9%.
- Also on paragraph 10.276 of page 524 of the report, at 11 Caledonian Road, 6 windows and 6 rooms were assessed rather than 3 windows and 3 rooms, and that 5 out of the 6 windows would meet the BRE guidance rather than 2 of 3 windows.
- Meeting was advised that site is part of the Regents quarter estate and located within the city block known as Block and comprises of Times House which is a mixed use building on the eastern and southern elevations to Laundry Buildings which is also a mixed use buildings located on the northern and western elevations.
- Site is located within the Kings Cross Conservation Area and lies adjacent to the Keystone Crescent Conservation Area to the east and the St Pancras Conservation Area which is located to the west of the site. The site boundary sits adjacent to the Grade II Listed Building at 7 Caledonian Road and within the setting of Grade I listed Building at Kings Cross Station.
- Members were advised that the Laundry Buildings is Locally Listed Grade B and there are numerous locally listed buildings surrounding the site on York way, Caledonian Road and Pentoville Road.

## Planning Committee - 22 February 2022

- Site is located within the Central Activities Zone and is in an Employment Growth Area.
- The proposal involves various extensions, alterations and changes of use to the commercial units Laundry Yard and will create 1,723.6sqm of additional office (g)(i) through extensions and internal alterations to Times House. This is largely provided through the combination of partial demolition, infill extension and roof terraces to create additional office floor space at first to fifth floor levels , with roof terraces at first, fourth and fifth floors under Class E (to the alteration of the existing building to Times House and creation of roof terraces to first floor and fifth floor levels and creation of green roofs.
- External alterations is proposed to the Laundry Buildings and that internally, change of use is proposed to both resulting in mixed uses in class E and Sui Generis.
- With the proposed affordable work space, a separate s106 agreement would be attached to the permission if granted however in light of the the committee to defer the earlier application, this provision will be on this site.
- Members were advised that based on the head of terms, if the application was refused, 5% of the affordable workspace provision is to be secured for this site which would be policy compliant within this particular application site.
- In terms of Land use as the scheme will result in additional office floor space within the King Cross Economic Growth Area and Central Activities Zone both of which promote office floor space.
- The inclusion of flexible class E office retail, cafe restaurants finish uses on ground floor of Laundry Building will seek to provide additional active ancillary uses to the predominantly office use.
- Members were advised that whilst the flexible commercial uses do not generate same level of employment as the office floor space it is welcomed for the functionality of the CAZ and will point positively to economic growth.
- The proposed alterations will also add flexible office space to the ground floor and this accords which accords with the council land use policies.
- In terms of design the scheme, the Planning Officer informed committee that the scheme has undergone a detailed design assessment including a series of design workshops at pre application stage and two presentations to the Design Review Panel who have express their support for the scheme.
- In addition to the design review panel comments, officers have given consideration to the design,height, mass and scale of the scheme and on balance the scheme would cause less harm than substantial harm to the Kings Cross conservation area and the adjacent heritage assets including the grade 1 kings cross station and the grade 2 listed building at 7 Caledonia road.
- Members were advised that officers have therefore taken a balancing exercise to weigh the less substantial harm against the public benefits.
- In terms of neighbouring amenity, meeting was advised that a detailed assessment on daylight and sun light loss , outlook enclosure ,privacy and overlooking have been undertaken.

## Planning Committee - 22 February 2022

- Meeting was advised that quantitatively a small number of windows and rooms will fail to meet BRE Guidance and that those that fail are minimal which officers consider acceptable due to the central urban context.
- Conditions are proposed to mitigate the impacts on neighbouring amenity in terms of light spillage or noise from plant equipment noise and that there is an operational management plan for the plant and for the use of the roof terraces and restrictions have been proposed to the hours of operations.
- The scheme will provide 105 secured cycle spaces and associated facilities in the basement of Times House, visitor parking is provided in terms of 25 short stay cycle stands comprising of 9 stands within Times House and Bravington's walk, 12 on Caledonia street and 4 additional stands on Caledonian Road.
- In terms of security within the block B, the existing gates are consented to be opened to Caledonian street and York way between hours as stated in the report. Cycling is prohibited within the courtyard
- In terms of energy and sustainability the proposal brings in a number of measures such as a 45.8% reduction in regulated CO2 emissions and a contribution of £145,176 towards offsetting the remaining CO2 emissions.
- The scheme meets a BREEAM rating which is to be secured by a condition and another condition is recommended requiring further exploration of potential improvements to ensure energy efficiency and another condition stating that the scheme to connect to a District Energy Network when available, and finally the scheme seeks to use Air source pumps rather than gas boilers.
- In terms of planning balance, meeting was advised that although officers note the less than substantial harm to the heritage assets, it is noted that the scheme does bring forward a number of public benefits as outlined in the report in particular the uplift in commercial floor space to support growth and development in the borough, the provision of a flexible active use unit fronting onto York way, substantial affordable housing contributions and contribution towards public realm.
- Planning obligations as detailed in the report include working with local schools and energy improvements so officers consider that in overall planning balance terms that the scheme public benefits outweigh the less than substantial harm to the adjacent listed building and the conservation areas.
- On the question about the Affordable workspace, that it was dependent on permission being granted for the other site (Jahn Court), the Legal officer clarified that presently the head of terms require that for both applications, the one previously deferred and this present application, the affordable workspace will be provided at 34b York Way. As the other deferred application had not yet been granted alternative provision generated by this application could potentially be made within this site rather than on the other site. The legal Officer acknowledge that it is unusual to have the provision of affordable workspace for one application site provided on another site, but not unheard of.
- In response to a question on whether the 10% uplift of the provision of Affordable floor space is available on both sites, the planning officer stated that the 10% uplift is across both sites.

## Planning Committee - 22 February 2022

- An objector living in Joiners yard which is directly adjacent to the proposed east site of Times house acknowledged the objections raised with the Jahn Court application and was concerned that a huge developer could buy properties so as to maximise the office space, that the interests of the neighbouring residents was not taken on board and not part of the process until at a later stage. Objector questioned the need for additional office space ,as there were numerous buildings that had vacant and empty offices.
- The additional floors were huge and there were concerns around the daylight and sunlight impact on neighbouring residents, loss of privacy and disruption. Concerns within the committee report which states that the development is less than 15m away from residential properties and the argument that development can be permitted if it across the highway is not applicable.
- The proposed improvement to the public realm is welcomed, however the massing in the area is unwelcome as it is huge.
- Another objector speaking on behalf of residents was concerned with the height and its impact and the false drawings. Noted that considering the vision for the developments states that it will cater for the needs of local residents and business and visitors, there has not been any community engagement demonstrated.
- Residents were only allowed a short period of engagement and presented with lots of documentation which have addressed none of the resident's concerns, that this is not a recipe for good design outcomes. The proposal does not address concerns of local businesses struggling after 3 years of Covid pandemic with the result that some have gone bust with empty offices for over two years
- Objector questioned how small independent restaurant businesses on the Caledonian Road were going to compete with equity firms and chain restaurants, that this is not a level playing field
- A resident was concerned that considering the huge number of people traffic in the area, and the entrance being difficult to see with no line of sight visible from the station, that it will be difficult to attract people to the inner courtyards and importantly challenging for retail or other business ventures to survive within the block
- Resident was also concerned that the proposal will plunge the place into darkness and feel less welcoming and unsafe, that this public amenity space will be lost for ever.
- Another resident representing the residents of Keystone objected to the scheme on the grounds of its unsympathetic design to the extension, that the opening of the development is less than 30 m from neighbouring residential grade 2 listed building. Members were reminded that this is a designated conservation area and the scheme makes no attempt to fit in with the surrounding Victorian built area in character or design
- Neighbouring resident was concerned that the design of the building is overbearing and overshadows nearby residential homes and therefore affecting the character or the area
- There was concern that this scheme will result in an the increase in footfall and furthermore attract anti-social behaviour and associated noise, traffic

## Planning Committee - 22 February 2022

and disturbances will increase in the area with the increasing number of food and drink outlets in the area

- Concerns that the noise plan associated with the scheme had not been thought out properly as the scheme would impact the amenity of neighbouring residents
- In response , the meeting was informed by the applicant that members should consider the scheme to be a well-designed one, that the scheme will result in the repositioning of the building, reflect the dramatic change across the Kings Cross area in the last 15 years . Members were advised that the scheme will address the vacant building after the previous tenant Euro Star left the premises and that one of the reasons is the lack product design which the scheme aims to address.
- Meeting was advised that a wide range of public consultation has been carried out throughout the process via notifying the residents, website launch to inform the public of the proposals and regular newsletter were provided. In addition webinars were hosted, Q&A sessions were held and 4 public meetings were scheduled on site and 25 one to one meetings were held for residents to discuss concerns of residents. In addition residents were also provided with bespoke daylight sunlight reports to consider their individual impacts
- In terms of wider consultation the team met with wide range of community groups including the learning and knowledge quarter and local schools . The consequences of these public consultations changes have resulted in changes to the scheme and certain commitments which include reducing the height of Times House by 0.5m, reducing the 5th floor elevation of Caledonian street by 3.3m , providing an active frontage and street improvements to York way which will be facilitated by a financial contribution of £75k to widen the pavement along York way and also consider other improvements to lactive the frontage. Also a mixed unit has been introduced to the scheme on York way
- Other commitments include to work with security consultants to review the security measures on site and will be taking forward a number of community initiatives
- In terms of overlooking windows of the third floor north side of the building facing Joiners yard, meeting was advised that as part of the proposal, windows around that particular elevation will be positioned further away and obscured which will be an improvement to the current position
- In terms of daylight impact, assessment has been undertaken and it is evident that with regard to Times and Laundry building results show that in terms of BRE guidelines, they are good in policy terms and that breaches are minor and slightly above 20%
- In terms of sunlight impact, meeting was advised that there are no transgressions and are within BRE standards and that the same position and situation in terms of the courtyard, that any loss is negligible and comply with BRE standards
- In terms of public benefits , the agent reiterated that the scheme will be bringing forward significant benefits that will outweigh any significant harm to the heritage assets in the area and they include an increase in 1723 sqm

of floor space provided within CAZ which optimises office floor space . Also there will be a commitment to contribute provide affordable work office space , noting that the applicant is willing to commit to the delivery of 10% office floor space on this the site in lieu of it being provided on the Jahnn site if possible

- Also there will significant CIL contributions and S106 contributions of £850k contribution towards offsite affordable housing
- In terms of building materials, meeting was advised that this is primarily in Times House which is a contemporary building, that it will retain the existing structure as much as possible for sustainable reasons , introducing a new permeable ground floor and introducing an articulated green metal cladding to complement the red brick.
- On the lack of consultation with residents and in particular concerns about the schemes impact on heritage assets, the agent advised that in heritage terms it is notable that on site there are 2 locally listed buildings which are being retained sensitively refurbishing with minimal changes and where there is an attempt to improve, it is about improving ground floor permeability and removal of railings to York way and re cladding of the glass entrance block to give it more of a contextual and significant entrance to that block.
- In addition meeting was advised that with regards to height of building, although there is an increase in height, there is significant step back to minimise the street view and to reduce the wider impact of the eastern block with the plant being set back by 40m from Caledonian street.
- On the 10% uplift being proposed the agent acknowledged that it would be across both sites, that overall the scheme will be delivering 400sqm of floor space and that with the provision of the hub, that it would be 10% from each site, that the equivalent on this site would be 220sqm.
- The Chair indicated that members find themselves in the similar situation to the previous Jahn Court application as they are closely interrelated and have similar issues.
- A suggestion to defer the application was agreed, that committee would like some of the issues raised be assessed, that the applicants need to moderate the excess of the height, and that it was being deferred on a design basis and not just the impact on a conservation basis.

Councillor Convery proposed a motion to Defer. This was seconded by Councillor Klute and carried.

**RESOLVED:**

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

The meeting ended at 0.25 am

**CHAIR**