

**Planning Sub Committee B - 13 June 2023**

Minutes of the meeting of the Planning Sub Committee B held at Council Chamber, Town Hall, Upper Street, N1 2UD on 13 June 2023 at 7.30 pm.

**Present:**      **Councillors:**      Poyser (Chair), Hayes, Klute, Jackson and Ogunro

**Councillor Dave Poyser in the Chair**

**9      INTRODUCTIONS (Item A1)**

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

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

None.

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

None.

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

None.

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

The order of business changed so that item B2, Land adjoining Collingwood House, Mercers Road, N19 4PJ, was presented first. Item B3, New River College, Elthorne Road, N19 4AB, was presented second. Item B1, Canonbury ATE, Highbury Grove, N5 1HJ, was presented last.

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

**RESOLVED:**

That the minutes of the previous meetings held 18 April 2023 and 15 December be signed by the Chair as a correct record.

**15     LAND ADJOINING COLLINGWOOD HOUSE, MERCERS ROAD, N19 4PJ (Item B2)**

Proposed redevelopment of existing car park by constructing 6x two storey plus basement mews houses (3 x 2 bed, 4 person and 3 x 3 bed, 5 person units) together with landscaping, cycle parking, vehicle parking and associated works.

(Planning application number: P2021/2840/FUL)

The planning officer introduced the case and explained condition 24 (page 97 of the Agenda) should read: Notwithstanding the terrace areas approved and shown on the approved plans, all other flat roof areas of the dwellings shall **not** be used as a terrace or any other form of private amenity space into perpetuity.

## Planning Sub Committee B - 13 June 2023

In response to questions from the Sub-Committee the officer explained all drawings provided in the planning applications were to scale, using scale bars on each drawing. All plans are required to have a scale bar but there was no requirement to have measurements on plans. Therefore if, for example, the height was contested, it would be possible to go back and look at the drawing to scale this up properly. In response to questions surrounding the car park, the Officer explained there would also be restrictions on parking and this had been set out in the planning and transport statements provided, it would also go into a legal agreement along with any carbon offset contributions and affordable housing the scheme would need to provide. Councillors had queries on the basement bedrooms, the officer explained the light wells were increased to gain more daylight into these bedrooms.

Objectors raised concerns around the basement bedrooms stating these would not have been ideal for children and the basements were too extensive. The double sliding doors had also been surrounded by 3-metre-high walls. They also voiced worries that the first-floor dwellings compromised privacy and felt the proposal was poor and had been rushed with no real benefit to the Islington community and a lack of care for the conditions added. The objectors also spoke to environmental concerns and the carbon emissions building these dwellings would produce.

The Applicant explained they wanted to meet ambitions to create more housing on unused back land/brown field sites and this would have been a housing development with high standards of design. They further explained they had made the affordable housing contribution. This would have been a car-free development with energy efficient buildings. They wanted to benefit Islington by optimising and regenerating the area on what was currently an unsustainable car parking site. They also explained that they had adhered to all building and carbon regulations and if these were to change, they would adhere to the new building regulations.

In response to questions from the Sub-committee around access to the site, the applicant explained that while being a car-free site there would be access for emergency vehicles. They also further replied to concerns around basement rooms explaining there had been a long design process to ensure the quality of sunlight these received was good. They had also had tree officers to the site and all reasons for the removal of certain trees were justified in the report. The applicant explained they were open to exploring new materials with recycled content to mitigate more environmental impact.

Councillor Hayes proposed a condition relating to the feasibility of further improvements of the environmental impact of the project. Councillor Klute Seconded.

### **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, the planning permission be granted subject to the conditions and informatives set out in Appendix 1 (page 89-98 of the Agenda) of the officer report and an addition of the further condition set out above.

**16** **NEW RIVER COLLEGE, ELTHORNE ROAD, N19 4AB (Item B3)**

Partial demolition of existing school buildings, refurbishment of the retained parts and erection of a single storey wraparound extension to provide additional education/training facilities with associated external landscaping including new entrance gate.

(Planning application number: P2023/0296/FUL)

The Planning Officer introduced the case and explained there had been a lot of support from the Better Archway Forum. In response to questions from the Sub-Committee, the officer explained the building had been unused for a number of years and would be used in the same capacity as when it was in use. He further explained there was a school on site for a considerable amount of time before and environmental health had consulted on noise levels. There had been no objections in regard to the ground source heat pump. There were no objectors present.

The applicant explained the school would have been made up of different component parts, one aspect being for young people that had been excluded from school. This had originally been housed at Elthorne Road. The medical site was for students with physical and mental health issues who could not attend a mainstream school. They explained prior to the Covid-19 pandemic there had been 6 students with moderate-severe issues, and this was now 50 and still rising, therefore they needed new site to accommodate these students. The site had planned to accommodate these students across all key stages. The current structure was dilapidated and falling apart and therefore they wanted to refurbish. This provided a great opportunity to provide the correct accommodations to help those students with Special Education Needs (SEN).

In response to questions from the Sub-Committee the applicant explained they would have been upgrading the internal acoustics including noise absorbing panels to reduce the noise levels. They explained the project was planned to finish by the end of 2024.

Councillor Hayes moved the recommendation. Councillor Jackson Seconded.

**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, the planning permission be granted subject to the conditions and informatives set out in Appendix 1 (page 124-127 of the Agenda) of the officer report.

**17** **CANONBURY ATE, HIGHBURY GROVE, N5 1HJ (Item B1)**

Installation of telecommunications equipment including 6No. Antennas (on 4No. new replacement tripods & support poles), 4No. Dishes, 2No. GPS Antennas, 5No. Equipment Cabinets and ancillary apparatus (following removal of existing equipment including 4No. Existing Antennas, 2No. Existing Cabinets, and Ancillary Apparatus)

(Planning application number: P2022/2151/FUL)

The Planning Officer presented the report and answered questions from the Sub-Committee. The officer explained that this was the 'least worst' option of creating an 'eyesore' in the area and street polls would have been a worse option and there was also long views vs short views to contend with.

The Objectors aroused concern that there does not seem to have been any real changes made since the previous application. This was a residential area with low level buildings that

## **Planning Sub Committee B - 13 June 2023**

would be greatly affected by the erection of telecommunications equipment. They explained they would have preferred an option where these are put at roof height not on level with people's living spaces. The objector also raised concerns over the height of the equipment and thought this had been measured wrong.

The Applicant explained that the height difference was 2.5 metres and the 19.4 metre figure was the median level not the highest point, which was 21 metres. They further explained that while visual impacts were important, technical and operational impacts needed to be considered. If the equipment was lowered this could cause safety implications such as radiation and therefore the antenna needed to be raised to a certain height.

The Sub-Committee discussed the above points and explained that the application had already been deferred to look at the height issue. Therefore, there was limited option as to what the Sub-Committee could do. The guidance stated that existing sites should be used instead of the creation of new ones and all other options had been explored.

Councillor Klute moved the recommendation. Councillor Jackson seconded.

### **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, the planning permission be granted subject to the conditions and informatives set out in Appendix 1 (page 20 of the Agenda) of the officer report.

The meeting ended at 8.50 pm

### **CHAIR**