

London Borough of Islington

**Planning Committee - 4 April 2022**

Minutes of the meeting of the Planning Committee held at Council Chamber, Town Hall, Upper Street, N1 2UD on 4 April 2022 at 7.30 pm.

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

**Councillor Poyser in the Chair for Item B4. Councillor Klute in the Chair for Items B1-B3.**

1      **INTRODUCTIONS (Item A1)**

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

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

Apologies were received from Councillors Picknell, Ibrahim, Williamson and Kay.

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

Councillor Wayne substituted for Councillor Khondoker.

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

There were no declarations of interest.

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

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

6      **MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING - 22 FEBRUARY 2022 (Item A6)**

**RESOLVED:**

That the minutes of the meeting held on 22 February 2022 be confirmed as an accurate record of proceedings and the Chair be authorised to sign them.

7      **MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING - 8 MARCH 2022 (Item A7)**

**RESOLVED:**

That the minutes of the meeting held on 8 March 2022 be confirmed as an accurate record of proceedings and the Chair be authorised to sign them.

8      **158-160 PENTOVILLE ROAD N19LJ (Item B1)**

Demolition of the existing building and erection of a part 4, part 5 storey building, with single basement level, comprising 487 sqm of office use (Class E(g)(i) ) at the ground and basement levels and 9 residential units on the upper levels (Planning application number: P2022/0547/FUL)

Councillor Wayne was not involved in the consideration of this item as he left after item B4.

In the discussion the following points were made:

- The presenting officer provided a committee update to the members with specific regard to an additional consultation response submitted after the publication of the committee report and some proposed changes to the planning conditions.
- Following publication of the committee report, a consultation response was received from the Islington Swift Group welcoming the inclusion of a green roof and a request for this to be a biodiverse roof as they identify that the development is in an area where swifts are currently nesting and potentially nest. The Islington Swift Group also requested a significant number of swift nest box bricks be installed near roof level.
- Officers have taken this consultation response into consideration, noting that condition 16 requires that details of the green roof are submitted to and approved in writing by the LPA. This will ensure that a biodiverse roof is used in accordance with the Islington Biodiversity Action Plan. Condition 26 is to be added requiring details of bird and bat boxes/bricks are submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.
- Other updates have been made including the triggers of conditions 4 and 8 to make trigger prior to commencement with exception of demolition works.
- Condition 14 has been updated requiring that the obscure glazing strategy is agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.
- Condition 2 has been updated to reflect the submission of revised Proposed Section AA and West Elevation.
- Meeting was informed that condition 27 is proposed to retain office use on site. This is to safeguard the vitality and viability of the Central Activities Zone.
- The development site had been occupied by a homeless charity called Rhythms of Life which used the site to store contributed food before distribution, however they were served with a Hygiene Emergency Prohibition Order in October 2021 which prohibited the site from being used to store food with the result that the Rhythms of Life charity vacated the site.
- Meeting was informed that Officers support the loss of social infrastructure in place of CAZ appropriate office floorspace as the accessibility and standard of provision of social infrastructure on the site is poor.
- It was noted that the existing structures are not appropriate for a social infrastructure use and that the former training use does not represent a flexible use.
- Site lies within the Central Activities Zone, which prioritises office floorspace and that when application (P2019/2290/FUL) was presented to the meeting

## Planning Committee - 4 April 2022

on April 2020, Committee resolved to approve the loss of social infrastructure at this site to be replaced by office floorspace.

- Policy DM5.1 supports the delivery of a mix of office and residential uses within the Central Activities Zone.
- Members were advised that the proposed 9 residential units will make a positive contribution to borough housing stock and this use is appropriate within a strong residential context.
- Therefore, a mixed-use office and residential scheme is supported
- The Planning Officer acknowledged that the proposal, by reason of the number of units being delivered, is minor development and in light of the small site size and limit in terms of height that can be delivered and the required delivery of Central Activities Zone appropriate office space – 9 is the maximum number of units deliverable
- A housing contribution of £450k has been secured via S106.
- In terms of design and appearance, the meeting was advised that the proposal had benefitted from prior to submission engagement with design and planning officers. Design officers had reviewed the submitted proposal and had no objections. The proposal will be delivering an additional storey to the front part of site compared to previous committee approval for the redevelopment of the site in 2020
- It was noted that the height is considered appropriate in design terms, especially with the adjoining 5 storey height at No. 156 Pentonville Road which maintains the same height across the full depth of its plot.
- Advice from design officer states that the proposal represents a successful insertion of additional height and mass in this location.
- Members were also advised of the transition down to four storeys, which is considered to be an appropriate transition between the 5 storey built form of adjoining property, No. 156 Pentonville Road, and the adjacent 2 storeys of the Cumming Street terrace
- High quality materials such as London Stock brick, stone cladding, profiled terracotta spandrels and powder coated aluminium framed glazing will be used, and this is in keeping with the character of the area and is supported by the Council's design officer. It was noted that a condition requiring samples of these materials to be approved by the LPA has been attached.
- In terms of the impact of the scheme on listed buildings, the Planning Officer advised that the separation distance of the site from the locally listed building and the appropriate scale, height, quality of design and materiality of the development, would not detrimentally harm the significance of this locally listed heritage asset.
- The proposed ground floor will also be occupied by office floorspace and there will be two accesses off Pentonville Road, one for the office space and one for the residential units.
- The four residential floors will accommodate 9 units, comprising of 4 x 1 beds, 4 x 2 beds and 1 x 3 bed unit and as the 2 bed units are the size of the highest identified need for market housing, this is considered to represent a good mix of units.
- The Planning Officer acknowledged that in terms of the scheme's impact on neighbouring amenity, the proposal does present additional massing, that it

## Planning Committee - 4 April 2022

was important to note its context , noting the under-developed nature of the existing site which consists of a single storey building in a part of Pentonville Road which in general is characterised by buildings of up to five storeys. The proposed height/massing is comparative with the built form of Pentonville Road

- Members were informed that both the front and rear elevations of the proposed building are in line with the front elevations of Pentonville Road and Cumming Street properties which maintains outlook to properties with windows on these elevations.
- The proposal does have a lightwell which provides some relief as the building is set back from the western boundary to accommodate this lightwell and that the fifth floor is confined to the front part of building which presents a more sympathetic relationship to the lower built form of Cumming Street
- The Planning Officer reiterated that the balconies on the rear elevation have been designed to maintain privacy to the properties of Lambras House.
- Conditions have been attached securing obscure glazing to windows on the side elevation and restricting use of the roof space to maintain privacy to neighbouring properties to the west of the site.
- In comparison to social infrastructure, office and residential uses are considered to be more sympathetic to an area largely consisting of residential uses.
- The proposal was accompanied by a daylight and sunlight assessment which assesses the impact of proposal against British Research Establishment Guidelines.
- The Planning Officer acknowledged that assessment identifies that there are VSC/NSL transgressions to 162, 164C Pentonville Road and 3 Cumming Street. The level of transgression and number of windows effected is limited and therefore this impact is not unacceptable.
- The Daylight and Sunlight assessment confirms that no neighbouring windows would fail the BRE guidance criteria for sunlight, however it does identify notable overshadowing transgressions on gardens of 3 and 5 Cumming Street which will have a negative impact
- Members were advised that it is important, to note that the extent of the loss of sunlight to these gardens is so marked due to the existing significant level of overshadowing they receive from buildings of up to 4-5 storeys on Pentonville Road and that due consideration must be given to the dense, urban character of the local surroundings and for the fact that the existing site is significantly under-developed, and delivering a form and height of building which is comparable with the built form of adjoining Pentonville Road properties will lead to impacts to the gardens of 3 and 5 Cumming Street.
- Members were advised that on balance, while the impact of the proposal on overshadowing levels to these two gardens is acknowledged to be harmful and a notable negative of the proposal, this does not outweigh the benefits of effectively redeveloping this underdeveloped site to provide much needed additional office space within the CAZ and 9 residential units.

Councillor North proposed a motion to grant planning permission. This was seconded by Councillor Poyser and carried.

**RESOLVED:**

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

**9 250 CITY ROAD, LONDON EC1V 2PU (Item B2)**

Change of use of 5,288.5sqm (GEA) of existing business floorspace from Use Class B1 (office) to use classes E(g)(i) (office), E(g)(ii) (research and development), E(g)(iii) (light industrial), E(e) (healthcare) and F1(a) (education).

(Planning application number: P2021/3078/FUL)

Councillor Wayne was not involved in the consideration of this item as he had left after item B4.

In the discussion the following points were made:

- The Planning Officer advised the Committee that no physical changes are being proposed to the existing building.
- That Office use will be retained but consented uses to be widened to include healthcare and education uses.
- Meeting was advised that for over 24 months, marketing was carried out without success.
- The remaining uses in the wider City Forum development, including affordable workspace, to be retained.
- The potential loss of office floorspace is not considered to unduly compromise the operation of the wider area.
- Meeting was advised that no neighbour objections were received.

Councillor Poyser proposed a motion to grant planning permission. This was seconded by Councillor North 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 received at the 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.

At the end of this item, Councillor Klute moved a motion on whether the Committee were minded to delegate to a Sub Committee scheduled for 19 April especially as there is no Planning Committee meeting scheduled till June 2022. This is in relation

to item - **P2021/3255/FUL** - William Martin Court, 65 Margery Street, London, WC1X 0JH. Members voted in favour of item being delegated.

**10 30 BASTWICK STREET, LONDON EC1V 3PS (Item B3)**

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)

Councillor Wayne did not participate in this item as he left after the consideration of item B4.

In the discussion the following points were made:

- The Chair reminded the meeting that item was deferred at the meeting on 22 February following concerns raised regarding daylight and sunlight transgressions to neighbouring properties and also objectors request for a site visit to understand the impact of the scheme. The Chair noted that he was able to visit the site.
- Also Members had requested that the applicants review the massing of the building and seek betterments to the daylight and sunlight reductions.
- The Planning Officer advised that since the last meeting further representations had been received bringing the new total to 35, noting that no new material considerations had been raised from those which had been addressed within the 22 February Committee report.
- Further, the meeting was advised that the Applicant submitted amended plans and an updated daylight sunlight report since the 22 February meeting and that revisions to the proposal include the stepping back of part of the upper most floor and the introduction of a pitched roof to the rear of the This has led to a 20sqm reduction in floor area (GIA floor space has reduced from 1,788sqm to 1,758sqm).
- The Planning Officer acknowledged that amendments to the mass of the proposed development has led to betterments, albeit marginal to daylight and sunlight reductions to neighbouring properties.
- The Planning Officer highlighted a number of amended conditions that were recommended in the 22<sup>nd</sup> February 2022 Committee Report, that Condition 2 has been amended to include the revised drawings, condition 11 has been amended to include restricted hours for deliveries and servicing of the building so that they do not disturb standard nighttime/sleeping hours (between 2300 and 0700); and Condition 12 has been amended to restrict demolition and construction to weekdays only (no Saturday, Sunday or Public Holidays).
- An objector requested that the application be deferred, as the minimal reductions to the massing makes a mockery of the committee's reasons for deferral, as it would not address the issues raised by the neighbouring residents, stating that the scheme would need to be reduced in line with the residential properties on each side so as to preserve the open spaces and mitigate light loss. He was concerned with the terraces, roof gardens and balconies as it would result in privacy loss and overlooking, noting that the main roof should be a green roof. The objector acknowledged a potential

## Planning Committee - 4 April 2022

light loss to his property but not a 100% light loss as it would be detrimental to his amenity.

- A further objector was concerned with the format of the meeting especially as residents don't have the right to reply during Council and Planning meetings, with the result of the risk of council being misled by the Applicant.
- The objector highlighted a number of inconsistencies for example in discussions about the Daylight/Sunlight report, the Planning agent comments describing the 'isolated violations of BRE criteria' when in fact, 50% of Pietra Lara's south facing windows on floors 1 & 2 suffer daylight experience losses in excess of BRE criteria.
- Another correction was highlighted by the objector, with regards to a statement that the "majority of window failures at Pietra Lara were only just over the 20% threshold", noting that this is true of windows (VSC), but not of rooms (DD/NSL), that the failures for rooms are 29, 24, 34, 39, 49 and 53%.
- The objector was also concerned with the Planning Agent's statement that "there were no losses larger than 30%", when in fact the largest loss for a window is 32% (window 243) and the largest room is 53% (room 240)
- The objector was further concerned with another assertion by the Planning Agent that the room uses listed, noting that this was wrong for example in Pietra Lara every room described was described as a kitchen when it was actually a living room kitchen diner, and every residential flat in 26/27 Bastwick described as 'unknown or non-domestic' were in fact all living room kitchen diner or bedrooms.
- The objector stated that the assertion that all windows were tested is disingenuous, which creates a false impression that the transgressions are not as bad for residents as it really is.
- The objector noted that all these misleading inaccuracies quoted in the report and representations would have become apparent if a planned site visit had gone ahead.
- The Meeting was informed that in light of concerns about the highlighted errors in the applicant's submitted Daylight/Sunlight report, objectors commissioned their own experts which concluded that with regard to the sunlight analysis of neighbouring properties that only 62% of windows assessed will comply with both the annual and winter assessment criteria. Many of these reductions are substantial and well in excess of the BRE Guideline.
- In addition the assessment noted that the reductions recorded were in breach of the BRE Guidelines and could therefore be considered to present an overly dominant obstruction to the access of light to the residential properties at 37 Bastwick Street and 39 to 45 Central Street.
- In conclusion, the objector advised members that information in the Applicant's submitted Daylight/Sunlight report is unsound, urging the committee to reject the proposal, stating that if the proposal is to progress further, any design must be restricted to Class E(g) use only, as is the case with 44 Pear Tree Street.
- Councillor Graham requested that the item be deferred as resident's concerns had not been sufficiently addressed. He acknowledged an expected light loss

but not a total loss of light, and requesting that developers go back and allow residents to participate in the whole process. Councillor Graham queried the suggestion that there is a demand for additional office space in the area.

- In his response, the Applicant's architect informed the meeting that the team carried out an exercise on how to reduce and mitigate any sunlight and daylight loss in conjunction with council officers, noting that suggestions about a cutback to the rear was not correct as this was where it had the greatest impact reminding members that for the building to be BRE compliant, the top floor would have to be removed, noting that the scheme provided office space which is policy compliant.
- Green roofs have been provided in various areas across the site, extensive consultation was carried out with residents and their feedback have been taken on board for example the refuse storage has now been incorporated into the ground level space
- On the issue of daylight/sunlight assessment, the Applicant's consultant responded to the objectors comments that room uses had not been correctly identified, stating that an extensive online search of room uses of neighbouring properties was undertaken and where impossible, it took a prudent approach by treating the rooms as either habitable or unknown.
- The daylight and sunlight consultant reiterated the submitted daylight/sunlight assessment noting that in terms of daylight tests, of all the windows tested of the neighbouring properties for VSC only 5 habitable rooms fell short of the recommended guidelines. Similarly for daylight distribution tests only 8 rooms fell short of the recommendation of which 5 were marginal.
- With regards to concerns about the loss of light to the garden of 45 Central Street, the meeting was advised that prior to the proposal, the garden already exhibited a 30% loss, so was poorly lit, however officer noted that assessment carried out on 21<sup>st</sup> March which is the average of light for the year, it is believed that in the summer months it will receive more direct sunlight which is rare given its urban setting and it being surrounded by taller buildings.
- In response to the residents assertion that different base line surveys were carried out in comparison to other developments in the area, the consultant informed the meeting that base line surveys changes with different scenarios, that this is based on the amount of light that a neighbouring property receives prior to the development being built and when it is built so it is never the same base line.
- The Chair indicated that during his site visit, whilst standing on the roof terrace and looking out onto the site he could see the roof line of the existing building as this is not clear from the revised diagram submitted as it appears that the extension is higher. He stated that the amendments being put forward by the applicant did not appear to make any progress on the reasons why the committee requested for deferment.
- A member felt that having asked for the item to be deferred initially he was not agreeable to it being deferred once again unless the applicant is specifically advised on what changes the committee requires , noting that applicant had already made some amendments albeit marginal.



- Chair suggested item be deferred in order for the first floor rear extensions to be pulled back from the boundary, as he felt these would lead to an unacceptable sense of enclosure. Chair also requested the applicant provide better drawings, as this could help clarify the configuration of the rear wall and its relationship to the existing roof terraces as the submitted drawings are not clear.
- Members agreed for application to be deferred for the betterment of the sunlight impact and to see the possibility of the first floor extension be pushed back
- Councillor Klute moved a motion to defer the item. This was seconded by Councillor North.

**RESOLVED:**

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

**11 FORMER HOLLOWAY PRISON PARKHURST ROAD, LONDON N7 0NU (Item B4)**

Phased comprehensive redevelopment including demolition of existing structures; site preparation and enabling works; and the construction of 985 residential homes including 60 extra care homes (Use Class C3), a Women's Building (Use Class F.2) and flexible commercial floorspace (Use Class E) in of buildings of up to 14 storeys in height; highways/access works; landscaping; pedestrian and cycle connection, publically accessible park; car (blue badge) and cycle parking; and other associated works.

(Planning application number: P2021/3273/FUL)

Councillor Klute was not in the meeting room nor involved in the consideration of this item. Councillor Poyser chaired the Committee for this item.

In the discussion the following points were made:

- This application has been brought back to the Committee in order to comply with a resolution by the Committee on 8 March 2022 to secure a mid-stage viability review mechanism and a further resolution requiring that details of that mechanism be brought back for approval.
- Planning permission has been granted subject to any direction by the Mayor of London to refuse the application or for it to be called in and conditional upon the prior completion of a Deed of Planning Obligation made under section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.
- In addition, the resolution to grant planning permission imposed an additional obligation on the developer to appoint a fundraiser with regards the Women's building and a further requirement on the developer to secure a £2.9 million contribution to the fit out of the Women's Building.
- The Service Director, Planning and Development informed the meeting that the reason for the item being brought back before Members is to approve the wording of the Head of Terms in relation to the mid stage review mechanism as set out in paragraph 3.60 of the Case Officer's report and the associated details as set out in Appendices One and Two of the report.

## Planning Committee - 4 April 2022

- Members were reminded that Peabody has agreed that upon commencement of Phase 3 of the Development, it would conduct a bespoke mid-stage viability review to be secured in accordance with Appendix Two of the Case Officer's report and if the review was to indicate a surplus, this will be used to convert some of the proposed shared ownership homes in Phase Three to London Living Rent homes.
- The conversion of shared ownership homes to London Living Rent homes, would be capped at 50% of the total shared ownership floorspace. The officer noted that if this conversion could be achieved through grant funding the requirement for a mid - stage review mechanism would fall away.
- Members were advised that the proposed 985-home development provides 60% affordable housing, which exceeds the 50% strategic affordable housing target of both GLA and Council policies, that it delivers the affordable housing provision at a policy compliant affordable housing tenure split of 70% social rent and 30% London Shared Ownership in accordance with Policy CS12 Part G.
- The Service Director of Planning and Development informed the meeting that as set out in the report, it is clear that the scheme faces viability challenges and would not be able to afford to deliver any London Living Rent housing at present, however they noted that an early stage viability review mechanism has been secured in line with GLA policy.
- Members were informed that following the Committee's request for the mid stage review mechanism to comply with the GLA formula, discussions with GLA officers have indicated that there is no precedent for a mid stage review mechanism for a scheme that delivers a policy compliant level of affordable housing because mid-stage review mechanisms are reserved only for schemes where the developer is failing to meet the affordable housing targets when planning permission is granted
- Members were advised that Policy H3 of the Council's Emerging Local Plan which states that the majority of intermediate tenure housing should be London Living Rent can be given moderate weight in securing the Mid-Stage Review Mechanism.
- The Mid Stage Review Mechanism would be triggered upon the commencement of Phase 3 of the development which includes the delivery of 321 homes of which 108 are shared ownership
- Meeting was advised that in line with the standard GLA formula, the proposed mid-stage review formula includes a deficit of £38.5 million. This is not the full deficit put forward by the applicants.
- Members were advised that the above obligation falls away if grant or other funding is secured to meet the same objective.
- The Service Director advised the Committee that because the current proposal is policy compliant in terms of social rented housing, the formula does not incorporate the ability to convert homes to social rented homes if there is a surplus.
- With regard to the Women's building, the Committee was advised that on the 24<sup>th</sup> of March 2022, the Executive agreed to underwrite the £2.9 million Cat B fit out costs.

## Planning Committee - 4 April 2022

- The s106 Heads of Terms agreed by the Planning Committee on the 8 March 2022 included an additional obligation on the applicant to employ a fund raiser to secure funding for the fit out/operating costs of the Women's Building and that the applicant must also demonstrate to the council's satisfaction that it has done everything that it practically can to secure this funding by other means before the funding is paid to Peabody.
- Meeting was advised that the proposed mid stage review mechanism will not therefore provide a contribution towards the fit out costs of the Women's Building if a surplus can be demonstrated as this would be duplicating an existing obligation.
- The Council received 3 further representations on the application since the Committee met on the 8<sup>th</sup> March 2022. Camden Council raised no concerns. Another representation expressed significant disappointment at the Committee's resolution to grant planning permission on 8 March 2022 specifically in relation to the proposals for the Women's Building. Community Plan for Holloway requested that the s106 agreement should secure: equitable access to the resident's space; commercial spaces to be made available to young people at a peppercorn rent; conversion of shared ownership homes to London Living Rent; fit out costs for the Women's Building and a mid-stage review mechanism to be secured.
- Nikki Gibbs, representing CPH4 Women's Building Working Group, Reclaim Holloway was concerned that the needs of women were still not been addressed, suggesting that both the Council and Peabody must consider CPH4's alternative proposal as it will deliver social housing for the council, provide ground-breaking facilities for the youth, surplus for Peabody and a building for women. Nikki Gibbs suggested that as Block E2 is entirely private, CPH4 would want to raise money to buy private block E2.
- Nikki Gibbs reminded members of earlier representations at previous meetings concerning the need to provide a befitting women's building, reiterating that the current proposal will not deliver a building for traumatised women, however noting that CPH4 are willing to work with all parties to ensure the building is delivered.
- Linda Clarke reminded the meeting that Peabody received a huge amount of grant and public money so should fund the fit out of the women's building, supporting the Council's deficit assessment statement rather than the applicants.
- In response to questions regarding profit, surpluses and viability, the Peabody project manager reminded the meeting that the figures put forward have been agreed by both the Council and the applicants viability experts.
- On whether Peabody had made any further concessions beyond the heads of terms, the Peabody project manager indicated that in addition to securing the mid stage review mechanism which is unprecedented considering that the scheme is policy compliant, Peabody has agreed to employ a fund raiser in relation to the women's building.
- Meeting was advised that for the scheme to generate a surplus, the value of the private homes will have to increase and/or the construction costs will have to fall below their current levels.

## Planning Committee - 4 April 2022

- Member queried the omission of the £2.9m fit out costs for the women's building from the draft s106 and had concerns that the employment of the fund raiser was specifically targeted towards the running costs rather than the capital cost which is contrary to what was agreed by the Committee at the previous meeting. The Service Director noted that the fundraiser would be tasked to raise funds for both.
- With regards to the provision of affordable broadband cost for all residents, the Peabody project manager advised that free public wifi will be available in the public park and the residents facility and that discussions were underway to ensure that residents on low incomes and universal credit will have access to low cost wifi.
- During deliberations, a member noted that although not perfect he welcomed the head of terms, that any further delay to the commencement of the scheme would not be beneficial to Islington residents who require genuinely affordable homes.
- Another member noted that although it is clear that Peabody's approach to the scheme has not been encouraging especially in terms of its relationship with residents, its provision of social housing and the scheme being policy complaint in terms of affordable housing holds it in good stead.
- A member expressed his disappointment, that the scheme fell short of expectations. He acknowledged residents' objections regarding loss of light, pollution concerns for residents facing the busy road and the excessive heights of the tall buildings in an area of high density which is contrary to the council policy on Tall buildings and stated that he would not be supporting the proposed Head of Terms.
- Councillor Wayne moved a motion to support the approval of the Head of Terms. This was seconded by Councillor North

### 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, that both the wording of the Head of Terms in relation to the mid stage review mechanism as set out in paragraph 3.60 of the report and the associated details as set out in Appendices One and Two of the report be approved.

The meeting ended at 11.00 pm

**CHAIR**