

## PLANNING COMMITTEE REPORT

Development Management Service  
Planning and Development Division  
Environment and Regeneration  
Department  
PO Box 333  
222 Upper Street  
London N1 1YA

PLANNING SUB COMMITTEE B		
Date:	14 March 2016	<b>NON-EXEMPT</b>

Application number	P2015/4521/FUL
Application type	Full Planning Application (Council's Own)
Ward	Finsbury Park
Listed building	Building not Listed. Adjoining Emmanuel Church is Grade II Listed
Conservation area	Building not located within a conservation area
Development Plan Context	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Nags Head &amp; Upper Holloway Rd Core Strategy Key Areas</li><li>- Local cycle routes</li><li>- Alexandra Palace viewing terrace to St Paul's Cathedral Mayors Protected Vistas</li><li>- Site within 100m of a TLRN Road</li></ul>
Licensing Implications	None
Site Address	Pakeman Primary School, 21 Pakeman Street, Islington, London, N7 6DU
Proposal	Retention of new replacement higher fence on top of the boundary walls to Hornsey Road and adjacent to Emmanuel Church.

Case Officer	Sandra Chivero
Applicant	Islington Council
Agent	Javier Benitez

### 1. RECOMMENDATION

The Committee is asked to resolve to **GRANT** planning permission subject to the conditions set out in Appendix 1.

**2. SITE PLAN (site outlined in black)**



**3. PHOTOS OF SITE/STREET**



Image 1: Looking at new fence to the northern section of the front boundary to Hornsey Road



Image 2: Looking at new fence to the southern section of the boundary wall to Hornsey Road



Image 3: Looking at existing fence adjacent Emmanuel Church

#### 4. SUMMARY

- 4.1 The application seeks permission for the retention of new higher fence on top of the boundary walls to Hornsey Road and adjacent to Emmanuel Church. The fence was required to improve security to the school and is considered acceptable in principle.
- 4.2 The design and appearance of the new fencing is also considered not to detract from the streetscene. In addition, due to its open nature, the new fence maintains the open character of the site and does not exacerbate the apparent height increase. The fence



above the wall to the northern section of the front boundary is maintained at a lower level adjacent to a Grade II Listed church where it is more sensitive. It is therefore considered that the proposal does not significantly harm the setting of the adjoining listed building.

- 10.2 The new fence, given its location, scale and design does not prejudice the amenity of neighbouring residential properties or the surrounding area.

## **5. SITE AND SURROUNDING**

- 5.1 Pakeman School is a 1890s Victorian School of three storeys and of characteristic design, including large areas of glazing and a prominent roof form. The building is not listed nor located in a conservation area. However, the site abuts the Grade II Listed Emmanuel Church to the north.
- 5.2 The school buildings occupy about half of the site, with play areas to the north, south and west of the main building. Access is from the main entrance on Hornsey Road, and there is another access to Pakeman Street.

## **6. PROPOSAL (IN DETAIL)**

- 6.1 Planning permission is sought for the retention of a higher fence on top of the boundary walls to Hornsey Road and adjacent to Emmanuel Church. The fence is required to improve security to the school building.
- 6.2 The fence on top of the wall to the southern side of the front boundary and the fence to the front northern boundary wall adjacent Emmanuel Church is 2m. The fence on top of the wall to the northern section of the front boundary is 1.2mm high.
- 6.3 The proposal therefore resulted in a height increase of 0.2m to the southern section of the front boundary and 0.6m to the northern boundary adjacent to Emmanuel church. A section of the front boundary is maintained at the same height of as the previous chain-link fence.
- 6.4 The fence as built is a wire mesh, with an open mesh pattern comprising of 50mm x 200mm opening. It is supported by 60x60mm posts with black powder-coated finish.

## **7. RELEVANT HISTORY:**

### **PLANNING APPLICATIONS:**

- February 2015: Planning application (Ref. P2015/5278/FUL) approved at committee for Erection of a classroom pod to the rear school playground in place of a garage.
- July 2014: Planning permission (Ref. P2014/1863/FUL) Granted for the removal of the existing single storey canopy, adjacent to the Hornsey Road frontage, and the construction of a single storey extension with roof lights to provide a dedicated two year old facility for pre -nursery infants.
- September 2012: Non-material (Ref. P120236 (MA01)) Agreed for Non-material amendment of planning permission ref: P120236 dated 21/03/2012 for the: 'Erection of a single storey building in playground next to 141 Hornsey Road and 65 Arthur Road.' The minor amendment applied for is: "change of roofing material from black rubber to grey natural slate".

- March 2012: Planning permission (Ref. P120236) Granted for the erection of a single storey building in playground next to 141 Hornsey Road and 65 Arthur Road.
- April 2012: Planning permission (Ref. P080073) Granted for the erection of a bicycle shelter.
- July 2006: Planning permission (Ref. P060854) Granted for the adaptation of ground floor forming new structural opening. Relocation of toilet and main entrance.
- December 2004: Planning permission (Ref. P042531) Granted for Addition of a first floor mansard roof extension to existing single storey play centre annexe.
- June 1997: Planning permission (Ref. 970599) Granted for Installation of a new entrance ramp to main school building.

7.1 **Pre-application Advice (Informal):** Discuss held regarding height and design of fence.

## 8. CONSULTATION

### Public Consultation

- 8.1 Letters were sent to occupants of 37 adjoining and nearby properties at Pakeman Street, Hornsey Road, Roden Street and Arthur Road, on 10 February 2016. A site and press notice was displayed on 18 February 2016. The public consultation of the application therefore expired on 25 December 2015, however it is the Council's practice to continue to consider representations made up until the date of a decision.
- 8.2 At the time of the writing of this report no responses had been received from the public with regard to the application.

### External Consultees

- 8.3 **The Crime Prevention Officer:** does not object to the construction of the additional fence as it improves the security of the site.

### Internal Consultees

- 8.4 **The Design and Conservation Officer:** The new fence to the Hornsey Road frontage is considered acceptable. However, it is stated that the new fence between the school and the church should ideally step down in line with that fronting Hornsey Road.

## 9. RELEVANT POLICIES

- 9.1 Details of all relevant policies and guidance notes are attached in Appendix 2. This report considers the proposal against the following development plan documents.

### National Guidance

- 9.2 The National Planning Policy Framework 2012 seeks to secure positive growth in a way that effectively balances economic, environmental and social progress for this and future generations. The NPPF is a material consideration and has been taken into account as part of the assessment of these proposals.
- 9.3 Since March 2014 Planning Practice Guidance for England has been published online.

### **Development Plan**

- 9.4 The Development Plan is comprised of the London Plan 2015 (Consolidated with Alterations since 2011), Islington Core Strategy 2011, Development Management Policies 2013, Finsbury Local Plan 2013 and Site Allocations 2013. The policies of the Development Plan that are considered relevant to this application are listed at Appendix 2 to this report.

### **Designations**

- 9.5 The site has the following designations under the London Plan 2015, Islington Core Strategy 2011, Development Management Policies 2013, Finsbury Local Plan 2013 and Site Allocations 2013:
- Nags Head & Upper Holloway Rd Core Strategy Key Areas
  - Local cycle routes
  - Alexandra Palace viewing terrace to St Paul's Cathedral Mayors Protected Vistas
  - Site within 100m of a TLRN Road

### **Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) / Document (SPD)**

- 9.6 The SPGs and/or SPDs which are considered relevant are listed in Appendix 2.

## **10. ASSESSMENT**

- 10.1 The main issues arising from this proposal relate to:

- Principle
- Design
- Neighbouring Amenity

### **Principle of the development**

- 10.2 It is proposed to retain a higher fence on top of the boundary walls to Hornsey Road and adjacent to Emmanuel Church. During the pre-application discussion the head teacher stated that the school has problems with theft. The higher fence is required to prevent intruders accessing the school and improve security to the school. The fencing is considered to maintain the open character of the site and is therefore considered acceptable in principle.
- 10.3 The proposal is for the retention of new higher fencing and is not considered to raise any land-use issues.

### **Design**

- 10.4 The fence on top of the wall to the southern side of the front boundary and the fence to the front northern boundary wall adjacent Emmanuel Church is 2m. The fence on top of the wall to the northern section of the front boundary is 1.2m high.
- 10.5 The previous chainlink fence on top of the wall to the southern side of the front boundary was 1.8m high and the previous chainlink fence to the front northern boundary wall adjacent to Emmanuel Church was 1.2m. The proposal therefore resulted in a height increase of 0.2m to the southern section of the front boundary and 0.6m to the northern

boundary adjacent Emmanuel church. The section of the front boundary is maintained at the same height of 0.2m as the previous chainlink fence

- 10.6 The previous fence was chain link mesh in poor condition, supported on L-shaped stanchions. All materials were painted black. The fence as built is wire mesh, with an open mesh pattern comprising of 50mm x 200mm openings. It is supported by 60x60mm posts with black powder-coated finish.
- 10.7 Boundary walls are an important part of the character of the area, and their maintenance, good repair and appearance is vital to the enhancement of the area. There was previously a low and fence on top of the front boundary wall and side boundary walls but these were removed in November 2015 due to concerns with intruders gaining easy access to the site. The installation of new fencing is therefore considered acceptable in principle at this location. The new fencing respects the original design and character of the host Victorian School building.
- 10.8 The height increase of 0.2m to the southern end of the front boundary is not considered to have a significant impact on the appearance of the school or the adjacent properties. The new fence is open in design and is therefore considered not to be visually intrusive. The fence above the wall to the northern section of the front boundary is maintained at a lower level adjacent to the listed church. Whilst the Design and Conservation Officer would prefer a lower fence, given the fence is required to prevent unlawful access into the school site a balance has been struck on the height and the open design nature of the fence and in this instance it is not considered to cause harm to the setting of the listed building. It is therefore considered that the proposal would not significantly harm the setting of the adjoining listed building.
- 10.9 The design and appearance of the new fencing is considered not to detract from the streetscene. In addition, due to its open nature, the new fencing maintains the open character of the site.
- 10.10 Overall, the proposal is considered to be acceptable and does not harm the character and appearance of the surrounding area. The proposal is therefore considered to be in accordance with policy DM2.1 of the Development Management Policies 2013, policies CS8 and CS9 of the Core Strategy 2011 and the guidance contained within the Islington Urban Design Guide.

### **Neighbouring Amenity**

- 10.11 The new fencing, given its location, scale and design does not result in overshadowing, loss of privacy, loss of light, over-dominance, increase sense of enclosure or loss of outlook to neighbouring residential properties. The proposal therefore accords with policy DM2.1 which requires development to safeguard the residential amenity to neighbouring properties.

### **SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION**

- 10.12 The new fence is considered to be appropriate in this context and maintains the open character of this section of Hornsey Road.
- 10.13 The new fence does not result in any adverse impact on the amenity of nearby residents including no. 141 Hornsey Road.
- 10.14 Overall, the proposal is considered to accord with all relevant policies.

## **Conclusion**

- 10.15 It is recommended that planning permission be granted subject to conditions for the reasons and details as set out in Appendix 1 - RECOMMENDATIONS.



## APPENDIX 1 – RECOMMENDATIONS

### RECOMMENDATION A

That the grant of planning permission be subject to **conditions** to secure the following:

#### List of Conditions:

<b>1</b>	<b>Approved plans list</b>
	<p>DRAWING AND DOCUMENT NUMBERS: The development hereby approved shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:</p> <p>(E) 02 Rev. X, (E) 03 Rev. X, (P) 01 Rev. X, (P) 02 Rev. X, (P) 03 Rev. X; Photo-Sheets,</p> <p>REASON: To comply with Section 70(1) (a) of the Town and Country Act 1990 as amended and the Reason for Grant and also for the avoidance of doubt and in the interest of proper planning.</p>

#### List of Informatives:

<b>1</b>	<b>Positive Statement</b>
	<p>To assist applicants in a positive manner, the Local Planning Authority has produced policies and written guidance, all of which is available on the Council's website.</p> <p>A pre-application advice service is also offered and encouraged.</p> <p>Whilst no pre-application discussions were entered into, the policy advice and guidance available on the website was followed by the applicant.</p> <p>The applicant therefore worked in a proactive manner taking into consideration the policies and guidance available to them, and therefore the LPA delivered a positive decision in a timely manner in accordance with the requirements of the NPPF.</p>

## **APPENDIX 2: RELEVANT POLICIES**

This appendix lists all relevant development plan policies and guidance notes pertinent to the determination of this planning application.

### **1. National Guidance**

The National Planning Policy Framework 2012 seeks to secure positive growth in a way that effectively balances economic, environmental and social progress for this and future generations. The NPPF is a material consideration and has been taken into account as part of the assessment of these proposals.

Since March 2014 Planning Practice Guidance for England has been published online.

### **2. Development Plan**

The Development Plan is comprised of the London Plan 2015, Islington Core Strategy 2011, Development Management Policies 2013, Finsbury Local Plan 2013 and Site Allocations 2013. The following policies of the Development Plan are considered relevant to this application:

#### **A) The London Plan 2015 - Spatial Development Strategy for Greater London, Consolidated with Alterations since 2011**

##### **3. London's people**

Policy 3.18 Education facilities

##### **7 London's living places and spaces**

Policy 7.4 Local character

Policy 7.5 Public realm

Policy 7.6 Architecture

#### **B) Islington Core Strategy 2011**

##### **Spatial Strategy**

Policy CS6 (Nag's Head and Upper Holloway Road)

Policy CS8 (Enhancing Islington's Character)

##### **Strategic Policies**

Policy CS9 (Protecting and Enhancing Islington's Built and Historic Environment)

#### **C) Development Management Policies June 2013**

##### **Design and Heritage**

DM2.1 Design

### **7. Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) / Document (SPD)**

The following SPGs and/or SPDs are relevant:

#### **Islington Local Plan**

- Urban Design Guide