



ISLINGTON

Development Management Service
Planning and Development Division
Environment and Regeneration Department
PO Box 333
Town Hall
LONDON N1 2UD

PLANNING COMMITTEE REPORT ADDENDUM

PLANNING COMMITTEE		AGENDA ITEM NO:
Date:	21 July 2020	Item B1
Application number	P2019/3481/FUL	
Site Address	Regents Wharf, 10, 12, 14, 16 and 18 All Saints Street, Islington, London N1 9RL	
Proposal	Redevelopment of the site at 10 - 18 All Saints Street including the refurbishment and extension of 10-12 All Saints Street (including part roof extension and installation of rooftop plant and enclosure) to provide additional Class B1 business floor space with ancillary flexible Class A1/A3 (retail/restaurant) and flexible Class A1/B1/D1 (retail/office/non-residential institutions); demolition of 14, 16 and 18 All Saints Street and erection of a part 5 (ground plus 4) and part 6 (ground plus 5) storey building with basement and rooftop plant and enclosures providing Class B1 office floor space and flexible Class A1/A3/B1/D1/D2 (retail/restaurant & cafe/business/non-residential institutions/assembly & leisure) floor space at ground floor; and associated hard and soft landscaping.	

1. UPDATE

Further Representations Received

- 1.1. Since the publication of the Planning Committee Agenda and Addendum Report on 13 July 2020, 46 further representations have been received on the application. The points raised within the representations are summarised as follows:

- Concerns over reductions to neighbouring daylight and sunlight [Officer comment: Please refer to paragraphs 11.201 to 11.241 of the original report (pages 156 to 166 of this agenda)];
- No consultation has taken place on the revised drawings submitted. Insufficient time for residents to digest and review revised plans and comment accordingly [Officer comment: Given the nature of the revisions made since 23 June, there is no requirement to undertake a further round of consultation. The Council needs to be proportionate in its approach to consultation and efficient with the handling of planning applications. In this case officers consider that the extent of changes made (which reduce impact rather than worsen the situation) is not such as to warrant a further round of consultation];
- Loss of privacy to neighbouring properties through overlooking [Officer comment: Please refer to paragraphs 11.250 – 11.253 (pages 168 and 169 of this agenda) and condition 8];
- The proposed building ‘towers’ over neighbouring properties causing loss of outlook and sense of enclosure [Officer comment: Please refer to paragraph 11.246 (page 167 of this agenda)];
- Increased noise and disruption to neighbouring residents from deliveries, servicing, increased footfall/users of the site and during construction and the operation of café’s etc [Officer comment: Please refer to paragraphs 11.262 – 11.267 (page 172 of this agenda) together with conditions 17 and 43];
- Environmental and biodiversity damage [Officer comment: Please refer to paragraphs 11.152 – 11.163 (page 148 to 151 of this agenda).];
- Light spill will adversely impact ecology and residential amenity [Officer comment: Please refer to paragraphs 8.53 and 8.56 (page 114 and 115 of this agenda) and conditions 29 and 30);
- The revised plans fail to address the reasons for deferral on the application, with no meaningful improvements to the proposal, and as such object on the same grounds as previously reported: [Officer comment: The response to the deferral reasons is discussed in the Addendum report which starts at page 19 of the committee agenda);
- Members can vote for a refusal or deferral on daylight amenity harm and that the Inspector’s decision on the previous Appeal is not a benchmark prohibiting a deferral or refusal on daylight issues [Officer comment: The planning history is an important material consideration in this case, it would be unreasonable not to take this into account];
- The grey colour on All Saint’s Street doesn’t offer an acceptable transition to the existing building [Officer comment: The Council’s Design and Conservation Officer’s comments are at paragraph 3.12 of this agenda (see page 24)];
- The uplift in business floor space does not outweigh the harm to amenity and heritage assets [Officer comment: The planning balance is considered in section 12 of the report (page 192). In this case, given the planning history benefits are considered to outweigh harm];
- Residents have been ignored [Officers comment: The views of residents have not been ignored, considerable attention has been paid to resident concerns];
- The Applicant has not come to agreement with residents about what is on the roof [Officer comment: The applicant has reduced roof height and removed lift overruns, done to address reasons for deferral];
- Residents ask for tighter conditions relating to noise with more restrictions. The reason for imposing condition 28 should be expanded to refer to protecting residential amenity [Officer comment: Subject to the changes set out in the second dispatch of 23 June, conditions are considered sound];

Canals and River Trust:

- 1.2. The Canals and Rivers Trust (CRT) advised that they don't want to create an unwitting precedent, or dissuade other developers not to consider using the canal as part of an energy strategy on other applications.
- 1.3. At present the water flow regime through this stretch of canal would limit it to only being able to be used by the Applicant for 40% of the time.
- 1.4. In order for the canal to be used as part of the energy strategy for the proposal 100% of the time, the water flow through the canal would need to be substantially increased.
- 1.5. Officers approached the CRT to ask what sort of works would be required in order to increase the water flow sufficiently to allow the canal to form part of the energy strategy. The CRT advised that they were not sure that it would be feasible to do this.
- 1.6. Feasibility studies would be needed to test whether it is possible to increase the flow regime of the canal, and what sort of costs would be involved. The CRT were clear they are not objecting to the absence of feasibility testing by the Applicant.
- 1.7. Officers note that there is no policy requirement to use the canal and that there are clear difficulties using it given the existing flow regime. The Council's energy officer has confirmed that the proposed solution of air source heat pumps is in full compliance with Development Plan policy.

2. OTHER MATTERS

- 2.1. The Council's Inclusive Economy Team have requested a change to the affordable workspace head of term, so that they have the option to seek either on site affordable workspace or an equivalent off site contribution.
- 2.2. All the changes to conditions set out in the 'second dispatch' issued on 23 June 2020 are still relevant and are to be incorporated into any consent.