

WEST AREA PLANNING SUB-COMMITTEE

13TH July 2011

ADDENDUM TO ASSISTANT DIRECTOR OF PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT'S REPORT

Pages 1 - 10

F/01558/11

140-144 Hendon Way

An additional informative as been added to the recommendation:

- 1 For the avoidance of doubt the permission granted relates solely to the 'part single part two storey rear extensions' as specified on the application form and shown in the approved plans. It does not grant planning permission for any other development including self contained units or any other developments.

Pages 27-40

F/02068/11

26-28 Beechcroft Avenue

5 additional letters of objection have been received since the report was written. The objections can be summarised as follows:

- Loss of light, privacy and overlooking
- Although there are no side windows, some might added later.
- Out of character
- The description is misleading as it refers to a two building.
- Impact on drainage
- Traffic and car parking
- Loss of trees
- The proposals are an improvement on the previous application but do not overcome concerns
- The number of flats is too high
- The building is too high
- Increase in pollution
- Insufficient refuse provision
- Insufficient cycle parking
- The plans are incorrect
- Scale and bulk of the proposals
- Accommodation in the basement is not acceptable
- The design of the building is not appropriate, especially the roof
- Parking permits should be removed from future occupiers.
- The ramp could impact upon highway safety
- The basement will disturb the water table

- Overdevelopment

These comments have mostly been addressed in the body of the report. The recommendation remains as an approval.

Condition 21 should be amended to read as follows:

Before the building hereby permitted is occupied the proposed window(s) in the side elevations (except the ground floor side bedroom window of flat 3 and the above eye level part of the second bedroom of flat 6 at first floor level), including all rooflights facing 24 Beechcroft Avenue and the flats at Berkeley Court shall be glazed with obscure glass only and shall be permanently retained as such thereafter and shall be permanently fixed shut with only a fanlight opening, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason:

To safeguard the privacy and amenities of occupiers of adjoining residential properties.

On page 37 under highway comments the last sentence should read 'An informative relating to the access ramp has also been attached'.

Pages 55 - 68
F/01791/11
32 Manor View

Condition 1 on page 55 should be amended as follows:

The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Location Plan - MV32-4002; Design & Access Statement; Email from Amit Patel of Construct 360 LTD [mailto:amit@construct360.co.uk] dated 24 May 2011; Plan No's: MV32-4001A; MV32-4002H; MV32-4003F; Pedestrian Area & Domestic Driveways Details.

Reason:

For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.

The drawings were amended to alter the car parking arrangement and introduce additional landscaping.

Additional conditions that have been added to this recommendation are:

- 1 The scheme of hard and soft landscaping shown on Plans MV32-4002H & MV32-4003F shall be provided and retained.

Reason:

To ensure a satisfactory appearance to the development.

- 2 All work comprised in the approved scheme of landscaping shall be carried out before the end of the first planting and seeding season following occupation of any part of the buildings or completion of the development, whichever is sooner, or commencement of the use.

Reason:

To ensure a satisfactory appearance to the development.

- 3 Any existing tree shown to be retained or trees or shrubs to be planted as part of the approved landscaping scheme which are removed, die, become severely damaged or diseased within five years of the completion of development shall be replaced with trees or shrubs of appropriate size and species in the next planting season.

Reason:

To ensure a satisfactory appearance to the development.

The comments raised on the amendments received may be summarised as follows:

1. The understanding is that best practise is for at least one space to have a clearance of 3300mm, the proposed parking space on the plan is only for clearance of 3 metres. If you then measure from the 3m mark to the next parking space at the front, it seems to be less than 2400mm ie into the wall at the front. If the appropriate additional 30cm were included the second space would not be big enough.
2. Given that most houses on Manor View have one car length parked perpendicular to this proposal, (a Ford Galaxy is 4.8m long), the objector is doubtful whether the 5.4m parking space proposed is consistent with the flower bed and access way to the house shown in the diagram – suspect that more of the front would be taken up with parking than actually shown in the diagrams.
3. The objector doesn't think it is fair that the applicant can submit a revised plan with one days notice until the meeting - documents should be circulated at least a week in advance to give people due time to comment. The objector feels the matter should be deferred until a subsequent meeting.

Comments on objectors:

It is considered that the planning related concerns raised on this application were not considered to constitute a reason for refusal. The Highways Team have commented that the proposal is acceptable on highways grounds. These additional points are considered to have been covered in the committee report

and the landscaping introduced to the proposal can only add value to the development.

Pages 110 - 116

F/02370/11

The Bungalow, Village Road

The 'Internal /Other Consultations' comment from the Traffic & Development Team on page 114 has been included in error. The team only commented on the planning application F/02062/11 which accompanied this application. Therefore, these comments should be omitted from this planning application.

Pages 145 – 150

H/00980/11

56 the Burroughs

Proposed amendment to condition 5:

“This permission shall be for a limited period only, expiring on 13/07/2012 when the use shall be discontinued and the building(s) and works carried out under this permission shall be removed and the land reinstated in accordance with details approved by the Local Planning Authority in writing before this time.

Reason: The introduction of a commercial use of this nature is acceptable only on a temporary basis, to ensure that the character and appearance of the building and this part of the conservation area and the amenities of residents of neighbouring properties are safeguarded.”

Proposed amendment to condition 6:

“The proposed use shall only operate in the areas highlighted on plans MDL/56B/01 Site plan as existing and MDL/56B/02 and the maximum number of cars to be kept at any one time is eleven.”

One additional letter of objection has been received from the Middlesex University. The objections can be summarised as follows:

- The University should have been formally consulted about this application
- University is keen to support appropriate high quality development, refurbishment and environmental improvements along The Burroughs and is funding public realm enhancements , the first phase of which is outside the former White Bear. As such the University is a directly involved stakeholder and should have been consulted
- Unauthorised use of the premises car park and forecourt has persisted for many years despite an Enforcement Notice being served
- The operator has previously ignored planning controls and the proposed conditions will be very difficult to enforce
- The use is unlikely to be confined to the rear car park as a used car dealer relies on a clearly visible presence
- It will be difficult to refuse requests to extend the permission

- The very generous hours of use condition could be easily breached
- The use will cause harm to the conservation area. The existing building makes a positive contribution to the conservation area, as recognised by the Council. No proper heritage assessment has been submitted
- Use will adversely affect the cultural value of the site ie it's use as a public house or restaurant
- May be significant issues arising from customer activity. They are likely to come by car to the site, parking on adjoining streets and will test drive cars resulting in cars leaving and returning during business hours
- The University supports the objections raised by local residents

These issues are mainly addressed in the report.

- The Council carried out consultation in accordance with its normal procedure.
- The University was consulted on a previous application on this site because of the scale of that proposal.
 - The Council has to consider the use proposed ie the use of the rear car park only
 - It is considered that any breaches of condition are enforceable. The use of the remainder of the site is subject to an extant enforcement notice
 - Given only eleven cars can be parked on the application site, the level of activity associated with visitors is unlikely to be so significant as to cause harm to residential amenity or to result in parking or movements on the public highway detrimental to highway safety or the free flow of traffic
 - The temporary nature of the permission will allow the Council to re-consider the relevant issues in a year's time, if an application to extend the period is submitted.

Pages 151

H/01912/11

14 Raleigh Close

Additional Informative

The applicant is reminded that the proposal is for the retention of the front façade of the building with extensions to the rear and side.

One additional letter of objection was received. The comments can be summarised as follows –

- Overlooking
- Loss of privacy
- Harms to the balcony areas

Pages 159 - 163
H/02077/11
Traffic Location, Mill Hill Circus

One additional letter of objection was received from Mill Hill Preservation Society. The objections can be summarised as follows:

- Signs would be visually obtrusive on the roundabout. The proposal would add to street clutter. Issue of street clutter is expected to be taken up in the awaited Localism Bill where local amenity groups will be able to remove much of it.
- Signs will be a traffic hazard on this extremely busy junction as they would distract motorists.
- They would urbanise this area which has recently been improved by the granting to Simmonds Mead of Village Green status.

These comments have mostly been addressed in the body of the report. The application site was not granted Village Green status, this refers to a piece of land to the north of the application site.

Pages 173
H/01705/11
Rear of 181 West Hendon Broadway

Condition 1 should read:

The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Design and Access Statement; Proposed Sheds; 1108_L_001; 1108_L_011; 1108_L_021 rev C; Palisade Fencing.

Reason:

For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.