# London Borough of Islington

# Planning Committee - 18 July 2023

Minutes of the meeting of the Planning Committee held at Council Chamber, Town Hall, Upper Street, N1 2UD on 18 July 2023 at 7.30 pm.

Present: Councillors: Klute (Chair), North (Vice-Chair), Poyser (Vice-

Chair), Clarke, Convery, Hamdache, Hayes,

Jackson, McHugh and Ogunro

#### **Councillor Martin Klute in the Chair**

### 58 INTRODUCTIONS (Item A1)

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

#### 59 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE (Item A2)

There were no apologies for absence.

### 60 <u>DECLARATIONS OF SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS (Item A3)</u>

There were no declarations of substitute members.

#### 61 <u>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST (Item A4)</u>

There were no declarations of interest.

#### 62 ORDER OF BUSINESS (Item A5)

The Chair informed the meeting that item B3 will not be considered at this meeting so as to provide both officers and applicants sufficient time to address concerns notably the quality of affordable work space, implication of the Disability Discrimination Act and the life carbon assessment.

Meeting was advised that all stakeholders will be notified when the item is to be considered.

In addition to the above, the chair invited Planning Officer to update the meeting about the Local Plan.

The Planning Officer advised that the LPA announcement of changes took place on Wed 12th July after committee report publication.

Council submitted the Islington Local Plan to the Secretary of State on 12 February 2020, that the Independent Examination has now finished with the Inspectors final report issued on 5 July 2023

Meeting was advised that Inspectors found Islington's new Local Plan to be 'sound and that changes made by the Inspectors are binding on the council which means Islington's new Local Plan is legally compliant and capable of adoption. The Local Plan will be considered at Council meeting in September 2023 to be formally adopted.

Planning Officer reiterated that consideration still needs to be given to existing and new Local Plan, that the update relates to the weighting to be given and will have significant implications for determining planning applications.

Meeting was reminded meeting that the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) allows Councils to give weight to emerging Local Plans according to their stage of preparation, the extent to which there are unresolved objections and the degree of consistency with the national policy. On the basis that the Council has received the Inspectors' final report, all objections have been considered and resolved and the Plan has been confirmed as sound and therefore compliant with national policy, almost full weight can be afforded to the new Local Plan, with policies given very significant weight in decision making.

# 63 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING (Item A6)

# **RESOLVED:**

That the minutes of the meeting held on 22 June 2023 be confirmed as an accurate record of proceedings and the Chair be authorised to sign them.

# 64 34 YORK WAY (JAHN COURT), 34B YORK WAY (THE HUB), ALBION YARD AND IRONWORKS YARD, REGENT QUARTER, KINGS CROSS, LONDON N1 (Item B1)

Application to vary Condition 2 (Approved Plans), 4 (bicycle storage areas), 16 (Class E use), 35 (Fire Statement) of Planning Permission ref: P2021/2270/FUL dated 20/12/2022, and varied by P2022/4312/NMA dated 18/01/2023, which approved the following: 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 floorspace; reconfiguration and alterations of front and rear entrances to the western and eastern elevations; provision of one flexible Retail (Class E(a)), Cafe 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, plant, green roofs and other associated works. Listed Building Consent application: P2021/2360/LBC also submitted. The proposals include the following amendments: - Introduction of a life science/research and development (Class E(g)(ii)) use, through the amendment of condition 43 (Introduce research and development use) and associated design and layout amendments including:

(Planning application number: P2023/0381/S73)

Chair informed the meeting that as items B1 and B4 are linked applications,

committee will receive both presentations after which objectors and applicants were invited to make their representations.

In the discussion the following points were made:

- The Planning Officer reminded Committee that the application before committee is to amend the approved office-led scheme granted planning consent in December 2022 and varied by Non Material Amendment consent in January 2023.
- That the application seeks to introduce a research and development use as Life Sciences in addition to the consented office use which already alters and extends the existing building, resulting in a 60/40 split between research and development floorspace and office floorspace, secured by a new condition. Various external and internal alterations are proposed to facilitate the additional life sciences use.
- Members were advised that application is the first of two linked applications and Item B4 which relates to the adjacent site at Times House and Laundry Building. The applications is linked by s106 agreements referring to the provision of one combined affordable workspace.
- As an update, Planning Officer reiterated the implications of the draft local plan, however reiterating that Officers have had due regard to this change in weight, and that neither the final modifications to the new Local Plan nor the change in weight alters the officer's assessment of this application.
- In addition, meeting was advised that since the publication of the reports, two additional representations have been received from local businesses, in support of the two life sciences applications at the Regents Ouarter.
- Site is part of the Regent Quarter estate, which comprises two city blocks of buildings within the Kings Cross area. The application site is located within the city block known as 'Block C', that the the majority of the site is located within the Kings Cross Conservation Area (CA21) and a small part of the Albion Yard entrance sits within the Keystone Crescent Conservation Area (CA14). The site includes the Grade II Listed Building at 34b York Way and is located within the setting of a Grade I Listed building at Kings Cross Station, and the Grade II Listed buildings at 5-35 Balfe Street.
- It was also noted that site is located within the Central Activities Zone (CAZ), an Employment Growth Area.
- The Planning Officer advised that the current application proposes amendments to the approved office-led scheme at Jahn Court and 34b York Way granted under planning consent dated 20 December 2022 and that the key amendments to the scheme are:
- The Introduction of a Life Sciences use, (under a research and development (Class E(g)(ii))) use) in addition to the consented office use which alters and extends the existing building.
- To facilitate this additional use, internal layout changes resulting in a 60/40 split between Research and development and office use floorspace are proposed which is to be secured by an additional condition.

- The amended scheme results in a similar uplift in floorspace from the approved scheme, with minimal changes to height, massing and building facades.
- The amended scheme now proposes to provide Affordable Workspace within 34b York Way providing 388sqm which amounts to 10.4% of the uplift over both linked sites for 20 years on a peppercorn rent, which is policy compliant.
- The amendments to the scheme include some minor changes to the wording of conditions attached to the original consent, to refer to updated documents and drawings.
- The Planning Officer stated that for the avoidance of doubt, on the linked application at Times House, the consented 10 secure cycle spaces for residents continue to be provided within the basement of Times House.
- Members were advised that the changes to the approved land uses including the introduction of research and development use floorspace is approximately 60/40 split between life sciences as lab space, and office write up space.
- It was also noted that the introduction of life sciences use, retains business use floorspace which is supported by both the London Plan and Local Plan Policy in this CAZ and employment growth area location.
- In addition to the above, Planning officer informed the meeting of a minor alteration to the flexible class E use unit so as to facilitate alterations to the delivery and servicing arrangements, to enable delivery and servicing from York Way.
- On the proposed Affordable Workspace, meeting was advised that it is proposed to provide the entirety of the existing commercial unit at 34b York Way, which amounts to the provision of 388sqm of dedicated affordable workspace over three floors. The AWS provision is policy complaint at 10.4% of the uplift in business floorspace across both linked sites and would be provided at peppercorn rent for 20 years. The provision of a single larger affordable workspace is considered to provide greater social value than the two smaller consented spaces and is welcomed and supported by the Inclusive Economy Team
- Meeting was advised that in terms of planning balance, the benefits of the amended scheme continues to outweigh the less than substantial harm caused to heritage assets and the limited harm caused from the development to neighbouring amenity.
- The proposal retains business use floorspace and is accepted in land use terms and includes benefits such as uplift in commercial floorspace; contribution towards public realm improvement works in the streets immediately abutting the development site; flexible Active Use Unit and greater activation of York Way; On-site Affordable Workspace Unit relocated and combined with linked application; Façade enhancements and additional tree planting (separate to replanting removed trees)etc.
- In response to a\_resident's concerns that it would be inappropriate and dangerous for there to be any work in the proposed labs except at biosafety levels 1 & 2, it was noted that the applicant has confirmed that the labs will be designed to containment level CL2, that this is the

- equivalent to a university laboratory, and that all CL2 labs are governed by various UK/British standards and that the proposed fume cupboards would mitigate emissions in line with British Standards.
- In addition, meeting was advised that the Council's Environmental Health department has been consulted extensively on the applications including Public Health strategist, Environmental Health Officer and Commercial Environmental Health officer and no objections have been received.
- With regard to concerns about air quality, noise impacts and increased light pollution from the proposals, planning officer acknowledged that the Council's Environmental Pollution Policy & Projects officer has reviewed the submitted details and has not raised any objections subject to the addition of conditions which are detailed in the report.
- Objector requested that item be deferred due to a break down in trust between developers and residents, that within a short period the proposal had been changed from office use to a laboratory use, details of which had not been shared with neighbouring residents and issues around bio safety levels need to be undertaken so as to enforce laboratory safety guidelines considering it to be sited in close proximity to residents.
- Another objector was concerned about the uncertainty around its occupiers, that there was inadequate resident engagement regarding the change of use; that describing the changes as minimal was incorrect and reminding committee that previously residents had raised a number of issues at the last committee with issues such as the plant on the roof and its associated noise levels, light spillage which will have an impact on the amenity of neighbouring residents.
- In response applicant reiterated the benefit of the life sciences industry, that it will result in employment opportunities for Islington and UK as a whole. Applicant highlighted numerous engagements and presentations with residents since the original consent was granted and its willingness to continue engaging with residents throughout the process.
- Applicant reassured members that resident's concerns with regards to bio safety has been taken on board, that with its years of experience on safety and its operations in laboratories in Boston USA, this will be implemented on this proposed site, that it will work with Health and Safety Executive to ensure that there is low to medium risk to the community.
- Members were reminded that the proposed life science laboratory will be similar to those in university laboratories and that containment levels will be between CL1 and CL2.
- On the concern about the removal of trees, meeting was informed that
  officers are proposing to add an additional head of terms with regards to
  the planting of the trees that had been removed because the consented
  scheme of December 2022 had a condition which requires a Tree
  Management plan to be submitted to the Local Planning Authority.
  Members were reminded any changes will require applicants bring it back
  to committee for consideration.

- In response to the cost associated with creating a Pitt lane on York way and safety concerns, planning officer advised that the Construction Management Plan shows that adequate width is to be retained for pedestrian footway.
- With regards to change of use from office to laboratory science, the
  applicant acknowledged that following consent granted in December,
  applicant developed a strategy for Regents Quarter to become an
  ecosystem based around life science land use as it recognises that it is an
  important part of King cross and close to Knowledge quarter.
- On the issue of safety, the applicant informed committee that this is paramount, that the team will be bringing some of the innovation that has been implemented in Boston USA, initiatives such as PH Neutralisation where all the water used in the building is neutralised before sending it into water ways. In addition meeting was advised that there will be advanced iteration within the building in terms of air change and that the laboratories will continue to be CL1 and CL2 which is common in university.
- Meeting was reassured that the building is designed to the highest standard and will be governed by all the necessary obligations of the Health and Safety Executive and as well as British Standard regulations.
- With regard to noise concerns from the plant on the roof, applicant reiterated that the plants will not be operational 24hrs, that only one Air source pump will be and it will be compliant with the background noise levels. In terms of light pollution, conditions agreed with the consented scheme are still in place to address, that there is a lighting strategy which will be in line with what is expected of an office use and that it will continue to work with its residents. Members were reminded that a condition has been secured with regards to its design prior to its occupation.
- On the air quality concerns expressed by objectors, meeting was advised that a condition has been secured, that there will be a further quality assessment once the occupier is identified and that the proposal will comply with British Standards and not have an adverse impact on the neighbouring residents.
- In response to a question on biological safety, the planning officer reiterated that there are no proposals to limit the laboratories to CL2 levels that any changes to the levels will be likely to require planning permission.
- In response to a member's question, planning officer advised that on a sliding scale of contamination levels it runs from CL1 to CL4, that CL2 is being proposed for the laboratories.
- Member was concerned that considering life sciences is new industry, that applicant has not providing sufficient information, acknowledging resident's scepticism with its use and potential occupiers.
- In response, the Planning Officer reminded Committee that this is a land use consideration with a variety of potential occupiers, that we don't have control on.

- On the question of if the Operational management plan especially with regards to future tenants was robust enough, the planning officer acknowledged that any changes from any consented use would require planning permission.
- In response to whether the assessment of the present proposal would have differed from the consented scheme, the Planning Officer stated that the current applicant had been reassessed in terms of land use, its design, its amenity impact on neighbouring resident and that there is an extant permission in place. He also informed the committee that having revisited all aspects of the application, added conditions where necessary to mitigate areas of concerns, it remains a business use within CAZ and it is policy compliant.
- Cllr Klute acknowledged that although it is slightly unknown territory, he
  is slightly persuaded with the idea about setting CL2 as the limiting
  factor, welcoming applicant's decision that there is potential for
  engagement with the inclusive economy team and that removed trees
  will be replaced.
- It was noted that life science is a valuable industry with potential jobs to Islington residents and beyond apprenticeship places in construction work but beyond, that life science being an egalitarian industry provides opportunities not only for those with degrees but for school leavers to become laboratory technicians and prospects of career promotion which is to be welcomed.
- Councillor Convery proposed a motion that the Construction Management Plan S278 arrangement retain an east side continued pedestrian walkway to ensure safety of pedestrian. This was seconded by Councillor Klute.
- A member welcomed the suggestion of strengthening the Operation Management Plan condition especially in relation to prospective tenants after the end of life science use. Member also suggested the continued engagement between applicants and residents so as to alleviate their concerns on the use of the laboratory.
- A member welcomed the proposal, that it was interesting to note that there will be an offsite contribution to support the local economy towards skill development and training opportunities.
- It was agreed to limit the use of the development hereby approved to either containment level either CL1 or CL2 by the addition of a condition.
- In addition to the above, it was required to add a condition requiring the submission and approval of an Operational Management Plan prior to occupation of the development hereby approved. The OMP shall include details of the tenants and the proposed uses.

Councillor Klute 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 provided verbally at this meeting, planning permission be granted subject to amended conditions stated above 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.

# 65 45 HORNSEY ROAD & 252 HOLLOWAY ROAD (AND LAND IN BETWEEN) (Item B2)

Demolition of the existing temporary buildings and structures and erection of a 12-storey building to provide flexible Class E floorspace at ground floor level and 281 student bedrooms and internal and external resident amenity spaces on upper levels, together with refurbishment of the railway arches and the existing 3-storey building fronting onto Holloway Road to provide Class E(g)(iii)/E(a-c) and flexible Class E floorspace, a new pedestrian route, landscaping and public realm improvements, disabled car parking, cycle parking and other associated works.

(Planning application number: P2022/1943/FUL)

Councillors Klute and McHugh stepped aside and did not participate in the deliberation as they were not originally involved when the item was considered on May 2023.

In the discussion the following points were made:

- The Planning Officer informed committee of 2 updates, one relating to the final draft local plan, that in assessing this application it had no material impact and secondly changes to the last 2 paragraphs of Appendix A as highlighted, that it reads as follows: That, should the Section 106 Deed of Planning Obligation not be completed within 13 weeks from the date when the application was made valid or within the agreed extension of time, the Service Director, Planning and Development / Head of Service – Development Management or, in their absence, the Deputy Head of Service may refuse the application on the grounds that the proposed development, in the absence of a Deed of Planning Obligation is not acceptable in planning terms. ALTERNATIVELY, should this application be refused (including refusals on the direction of The Secretary of State or The Mayor) and appealed to the Secretary of State, the Service Director, Planning and Development / Head of Service – Development Management or, in their absence, the Deputy Head of Service be authorised to enter into a **Deed of Planning Obligation under** section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 to secure to the heads of terms as set out in this report to Committee.
- Members were reminded that application was considered at the Planning Committee on the 22nd May 2023 and was granted approval subject to conditions, s106 agreement and direction by the Mayor of London. However, subsequently it was identified that the application had not been advertised as a departure from the development plan, which is required under Part 3, Article 15 of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015.

- Further to the previous consultation, the application was re-consulted upon, noting that it represented a departure from the development plan. Letters were sent again to occupants of 2,295 adjoining and nearby properties on 9th June 2023.
- At the time of drafting the report, 7 additional representations had been received since the previous report was drafted, 4 of which were from neighbouring residents who had already responded during the previous consultation. This results in a total of 42 objections and 4 letters of support.
- Planning Officer advised that reasons for the item before the committee is
  firstly that the Draft Local Plan states that buildings of more than 30 metres
  only acceptable in-principle on sites identified as suitable for tall building;
  that 12 storeys in height is in line with emerging Site Allocation NH10,
  however it was noted that building exceeds the height stipulated in metres
  within the Site Allocation, which is 37m.
- Meeting was advised that when taking the roof-top plant and pergola into account, the building rises to 43.375m; that the application was advertised as departure from Development Plan and that as previously reported to Committee, the design is of a high quality and height acceptable in townscape terms
- The Chair, Councillor North reminded members that all aspects of the application had been considered thoroughly at the Committee meeting and was only back to address the issue of it being a departure of policy and not being reconsulted.

Councillor North proposed a motion to grant planning permission. This was seconded by Councillor Convery 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 at this meeting, planning permission be granted subject to the conditions and informatives set out in Appendix 1 of the officer report and the additional condition outlined above; and subject to the prior completion of a Deed of Planning Obligation made under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 securing the heads of terms as set out in Appendix 1 of the officer report as amended above, the wording of which was delegated to officers; and subject to any direction by the Mayor of London to refuse the application or for it to be called in for determination by the Mayor of London.

# 66 <u>CASTLE HOUSE, 37 - 45 PAUL STREET, FITZROY HOUSE - 13-17 EPWORTH</u> STREET AND 1-15 CLERE STREE LONDON (Item B3)

Demolition of the existing buildings and construction of a part 5, part 6 and part 7 storey building with basement, comprising Class E(g)(i) Office floorspace, including the provision of affordable workspace, alongside Class E(a) Retail, Class E(b) Food and Drink and Class E(d) leisure uses at ground, lower ground, and basement levels. The proposals also comprise the delivery of a dedicated off-street servicing

yard and the delivery of cycle parking alongside the provision of landscaped roof terraces and wider public realm works at grade, and all associated and ancillary works (Departure from Development Plan)

(Planning application number: P2022/2893/FUL)

Item was not considered -

The Chair informed the meeting that item B3 will not be considered at this meeting so as to provide both officers and applicants sufficient time to further address the quality of affordable workspace, the whole life carbon assessment and a consideration of the impacts to protected characteristics. It was considered that these aspects of the scheme have the potential to go to the heart of the design of the scheme and could result in fundamental design changes once addressed. The committee therefore felt unable to consider the scheme.

The Chair stated that all those who'd made representations will be notified when the item will be considered by the Committee.

Councillor Klute proposed a motion to defer consideration of the entire scheme, in order for the impacts of the above mentioned issues to be fully assessed. This was seconded by Councillor Poyser and carried.

#### **RESOLVED:**

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

# 67 <u>TIMES HOUSE AND LAUNDRY BUILDINGS, LAUNDRY YARD AND PART OF CALEDONIA STREET, REGENT QUARTER, KINGS CROSS, LONDON N1</u> (Item B4)

Application to vary Condition 2 (Approved Plans), 4 (bicycle storage areas), 16 (Class E use), 17(Flexible Class E Uses), 35 (Fire Statement) of Planning Permission ref: P2021/2269/FUL dated 20/12/2022 and varied by P2022/4314/NMA dated 18/01/2023, which approved the following: 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 one storey roof extensions to provide additional 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 flexible Food and Drink (Class E (b)) and/or Bar/Drinking Establishment (Sui Generis) units, and Retail (Class E (a)) units at ground floor level; provision of outdoor terraces, cycle storage and associated facilities, green roofs, plant, public realm works to Laundry Yard and infrastructure and related works, and new cycle parking on Caledonia Street.

(Planning application number: P2023/0382/S73).

This item was taken in conjunction with item B1 as they are both on the same site and are linked applications.

In the discussion the following points were made:

- The Planning Officer reminded Committee that the application before committee is to amend the approved office-led scheme granted planning consent in December 2022 and varied by Non Material Amendment consent in January 2023.
- That the application seeks to introduce a research and development use as Life Sciences in addition to the consented office use which already alters and extends the existing building, resulting in a 60/40 split between research and development floorspace and office floorspace, secured by a new condition. Various external and internal alterations are proposed to facilitate the additional life sciences use.
- Members were advised that application is the first of two linked applications and Item B4 which relates to the adjacent site at Times House and Laundry Building. The applications is linked by s106 agreements referring to the provision of one combined affordable workspace.
- As an update, Planning Officer reiterated the implications of the draft local plan, however reiterating that Officers have had due regard to this change in weight, and that neither the final modifications to the new Local Plan nor the change in weight alters the officer's assessment of this application.
- In addition, meeting was advised that since the publication of the reports, two additional representations have been received from local businesses, in support of the two life sciences applications at the Regents Quarter.
- Site is part of the Regent Quarter estate, which comprises two city blocks of buildings within the Kings Cross area. The application site is located within the city block known as 'Block C', that the the majority of the site is located within the Kings Cross Conservation Area (CA21) and a small part of the Albion Yard entrance sits within the Keystone Crescent Conservation Area (CA14). The site includes the Grade II Listed Building at 34b York Way and is located within the setting of a Grade I Listed building at Kings Cross Station, and the Grade II Listed buildings at 5-35 Balfe Street.
- It was also noted that site is located within the Central Activities Zone (CAZ), an Employment Growth Area.
- The Planning Officer advised that the current application proposes amendments to the approved office-led scheme at Jahn Court and 34b York Way granted under planning consent dated 20 December 2022 and that the key amendments to the scheme are:
- The Introduction of a Life Sciences use, (under a research and development (Class E(g)(ii))) use) in addition to the consented office use which alters and extends the existing building.
- To facilitate this additional use, internal layout changes resulting in a 60/40 split between Research and development and office use floorspace are proposed which is to be secured by an additional condition.

- The amended scheme results in a similar uplift in floorspace from the approved scheme, with minimal changes to height, massing and building facades.
- The amended scheme now proposes to provide Affordable Workspace within 34b York Way providing 388sqm which amounts to 10.4% of the uplift over both linked sites for 20 years on a peppercorn rent, which is policy compliant.
- The amendments to the scheme include some minor changes to the wording of conditions attached to the original consent, to refer to updated documents and drawings.
- The Planning Officer stated that for the avoidance of doubt, on the linked application at Times House, the consented 10 secure cycle spaces for residents continue to be provided within the basement of Times House.
- Members were advised that the changes to the approved land uses including the introduction of research and development use floorspace is approximately 60/40 split between life sciences as lab space, and office write up space.
- It was also noted that the introduction of life sciences use, retains business use floorspace which is supported by both the London Plan and Local Plan Policy in this CAZ and employment growth area location.
- In addition to the above, Planning officer informed the meeting of a minor alteration to the flexible class E use unit so as to facilitate alterations to the delivery and servicing arrangements, to enable delivery and servicing from York Way.
- On the proposed Affordable Workspace, meeting was advised that it is proposed to provide the entirety of the existing commercial unit at 34b York Way, which amounts to the provision of 388sqm of dedicated affordable workspace over three floors. The AWS provision is policy complaint at 10.4% of the uplift in business floorspace across both linked sites and would be provided at peppercorn rent for 20 years. The provision of a single larger affordable workspace is considered to provide greater social value than the two smaller consented spaces and is welcomed and supported by the Inclusive Economy Team
- Meeting was advised that in terms of planning balance, the benefits of the amended scheme continues to outweigh the less than substantial harm caused to heritage assets and the limited harm caused from the development to neighbouring amenity.
- The proposal retains business use floorspace and is accepted in land use terms and includes benefits such as uplift in commercial floorspace; contribution towards public realm improvement works in the streets immediately abutting the development site; flexible Active Use Unit and greater activation of York Way; On-site Affordable Workspace Unit relocated and combined with linked application; Façade enhancements and additional tree planting (separate to replanting removed trees)etc.
- In response to a\_resident's concerns that it would be inappropriate and dangerous for there to be any work in the proposed labs except at biosafety levels 1 & 2, it was noted that the applicant has confirmed that the labs will be designed to containment level CL2, that this is the

- equivalent to a university laboratory, and that all CL2 labs are governed by various UK/British standards and that the proposed fume cupboards would mitigate emissions in line with British Standards.
- In addition, meeting was advised that the Council's Environmental Health department has been consulted extensively on the applications including Public Health strategist, Environmental Health Officer and Commercial Environmental Health officer and no objections have been received.
- With regard to concerns about air quality, noise impacts and increased light pollution from the proposals, planning officer acknowledged that the Council's Environmental Pollution Policy & Projects officer has reviewed the submitted details and has not raised any objections subject to the addition of conditions which are detailed in the report.
- Objector requested that item be deferred due to a break down in trust between developers and residents, that within a short period the proposal had been changed from office use to a laboratory use, details of which had not been shared with neighbouring residents and issues around bio safety levels need to be undertaken so as to enforce laboratory safety guidelines considering it to be sited in close proximity to residents.
- Another objector was concerned about the uncertainty around its
  occupiers, that there was inadequate resident engagement regarding the
  change of use; that describing the changes as minimal was incorrect and
  reminding committee that previously residents had raised a number of
  issues at the last committee with issues such as the plant on the roof and
  its associated noise levels, light spillage which will have an impact on the
  amenity of neighbouring residents.
- In response applicant reiterated the benefit of the life sciences industry, that it will result in employment opportunities for Islington and UK as a whole. Applicant highlighted numerous engagements and presentations with residents since the original consent was granted and its willingness to continue engaging with residents throughout the process.
- Applicant reassured members that resident's concerns with regards to bio safety has been taken on board, that with its years of experience on safety and its operations in laboratories in Boston USA, this will be implemented on this proposed site, that it will work with Health and Safety Executive to ensure that there is low to medium risk to the community.
- Members were reminded that the proposed life science laboratory will be similar to those in university laboratories and that containment levels will be between CL1 and CL2.
- On the concern about the removal of trees, meeting was informed that
  officers are proposing to add an additional head of terms with regards to
  the planting of the trees that had been removed because the consented
  scheme of December 2022 had a condition which requires a Tree
  Management plan to be submitted to the Local Planning Authority.
  Members were reminded any changes will require applicants bring it back
  to committee for consideration.

- In response to the cost associated with creating a Pitt lane on York way and safety concerns, planning officer advised that the Construction Management Plan shows that adequate width is to be retained for pedestrian footway.
- With regards to change of use from office to laboratory science, the applicant acknowledged that following consent granted in December, applicant developed a strategy for Regents Quarter to become an ecosystem based around life science land use as it recognises that it is an important part of King cross and close to Knowledge quarter.
- On the issue of safety, the applicant informed committee that this is paramount, that the team will be bringing some of the innovation that has been implemented in Boston USA, initiatives such as PH Neutralisation where all the water used in the building is neutralised before sending it into water ways. In addition meeting was advised that there will be advanced iteration within the building in terms of air change and that the laboratories will continue to be CL1 and CL2 which is common in university.
- Meeting was reassured that the building is designed to the highest standard and will be governed by all the necessary obligations of the Health and Safety Executive and as well as British Standard regulations.
- With regard to noise concerns from the plant on the roof, applicant reiterated that the plants will not be operational 24hrs, that only one Air source pump will be and it will be compliant with the background noise levels. In terms of light pollution, conditions agreed with the consented scheme are still in place to address, that there is a lighting strategy which will be in line with what is expected of an office use and that it will continue to work with its residents. Members were reminded that a condition has been secured with regards to its design prior to its occupation.
- On the air quality concerns expressed by objectors, meeting was advised that a condition has been secured, that there will be a further quality assessment once the occupier is identified and that the proposal will comply with British Standards and not have an adverse impact on the neighbouring residents.
- In response to a question on biological safety, the planning officer reiterated that there are no proposals to limit the laboratories to CL2 levels that any changes to the levels will be likely to require planning permission.
- In response to a member's question, planning officer advised that on a sliding scale of contamination levels it runs from CL1 to CL4, that CL2 is being proposed for the laboratories.
- Member was concerned that considering life sciences is new industry, that applicant has not providing sufficient information, acknowledging resident's scepticism with its use and potential occupiers.
- In response, the Planning Officer reminded Committee that this is a land use consideration with a variety of potential occupiers, that we don't have control on.

- On the question of if the Operational management plan especially with regards to future tenants was robust enough, the planning officer acknowledged that any changes from any consented use would require planning permission.
- In response to whether the assessment of the present proposal would have differed from the consented scheme, the Planning Officer stated that the current applicant had been reassessed in terms of land use, its design, its amenity impact on neighbouring resident and that there is an extant permission in place. He also informed the committee that having revisited all aspects of the application, added conditions where necessary to mitigate areas of concerns, it remains a business use within CAZ and it is policy compliant.
- Cllr Klute acknowledged that although it is slightly unknown territory, he
  is slightly persuaded with the idea about setting CL2 as the limiting
  factor, welcoming applicant's decision that there is potential for
  engagement with the inclusive economy team and that removed trees
  will be replaced.
- It was noted that life science is a valuable industry with potential jobs to Islington residents and beyond apprenticeship places in construction work but beyond, that life science being an egalitarian industry provides opportunities not only for those with degrees but for school leavers to become laboratory technicians and prospects of career promotion which is to be welcomed.
- Councillor Convery proposed a motion that the Construction Management Plan S278 arrangement retain an east side continued pedestrian walkway to ensure safety of pedestrian. This was seconded by Councillor Klute.
- A member welcomed the suggestion of strengthening the Operation Management Plan condition especially in relation to prospective tenants after the end of life science use. Member also suggested the continued engagement between applicants and residents so as to alleviate their concerns on the use of the laboratory.
- A member welcomed the proposal, that it was interesting to note that there will be an offsite contribution to support the local economy towards skill development and training opportunities.
- It was agreed to limit the use of the development hereby approved to either containment level either CL1 or CL2 by the addition of a condition.
- In addition to the above, it was required to add a condition requiring the submission and approval of an Operational Management Plan prior to occupation of the development hereby approved. The OMP shall include details of the tenants and the proposed uses.

Councillor Klute 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 provided verbally at this meeting, planning permission be granted subject to amended conditions stated above 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.

The meeting ended at 9.50 pm

**CHAIR**