

WEST AREA PLANNING SUB-COMMITTEE

7 September 2011

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

Pages 42-55

H/02291/11

261 Hale Lane

- An additional request to speak from a resident was omitted from the officer's report in error.
- Amended landscaping plans have been received, and Plan HL.673.81A should be removed as it is not to be considered at this stage. Amend condition 16 to read.

The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: HL.673.12.01D, HL.673.12.02A, HL.673.12.03, HL.673.12.04, HL.673.12.05, HL.673.12.06A, HL.673.12.07C, HL.673.12.08A, 3584/TR/05, Noise impact assessment, Noise impact assessment addendum report 5194/NIA2, Arboricultural report AR/1704a/ap, Design and Access Statement, Habitat and Protected Species Assessment, BREEAM Pre-Assessment, Transport Assessment, Transport Assessment Addendum Report, 280/000, AS/SD/HA68/08/ROL Daylight and Sunlight Report. HL.673.12.7 (phasing plan).

HL.673.86K, Letter from Matt Sugden dated 24/06/2011, Design and Access Statement, Site Plan, 282/900 (Received 26/08/2011), HL.673.27D, HL.673.26B, HL.673.25B, HL.673.24A, HL.673.28C, HL.673.89A.

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

Pages 19-26

F/03019/11

29 Beechcroft Avenue

Eight further objection letters received and an existing objector would like to add further objections stating that:

- Loss of light and loss of privacy.
- Loss of amenity including overlooking, noise and disturbance, sense of enclosure.
- Possible future enforcement problems / Current works carried out without permission.

- Development contrary to adopted policies and Design Guidance.
- Development out of character with neighbouring properties.
- The development is well underway and up to the roof level – overdevelopment of application site
- The applicant was obviously hoping that he would get away with the building larger than last year's planning permission.
- No justification has been provided for the previous Withdrawal.
- If the scale of development was unacceptable in early 2010 there is no logical reason why it is now acceptable just because they have chosen to ignore their approved plans and build bigger at all levels.
- This is an entirely new application as they are proposing substantial alterations to what is already approved under planning application F/03671/10. The majority of the proposed alterations are internal and have lead to external changes.
- The rear elevation - instead of the approved plans to have a lean to above the protruding ground floor onto the back wall; the proposal seeks to bring forward the back wall so that it aligns with the approved location of the end wall on the ground floor - this proposal was also suggested in both the withdrawn applications; therefore it is obviously a detail that they have been wanting to incorporate right from that start because it will mean increase of the bedrooms slightly.
- Who is the 'site' controller - would like further information on this so as to put my mind at ease that they are developing according to the approved plan.
- Party wall issues.
- Evident from the planning history that the applicant was never going to be satisfied with existing approval and thus never built to the approved plans.
- Contrary to Design Guidance Note 5 – requires first floor extensions to be set back and set in, thus this proposal does not comply with policy.
- Repositioning of first floor window will cause issues of overlooking into neighbouring properties.
- The proposed side elevation window should be of obscured glass.
- Possible future enforcement problems / Current works carried out without permission.
- Changing the window to a door at ground floor level will cause movement along the side boundary – noise and disturbance.
- Increasing the depth of the ground floor extensions – causing issues of increased overlooking, overbearing and create an unacceptable sense of enclosure to neighbouring properties.
- Proposal fails to comply with H16 – loss of outlook and issues of overlooking, policy H17 – minimum distances between habitable room windows and boundaries, policy H27 – proposal is out of scale, design and proportion is not in keeping with immediate area.
- Not in line with revised Design Guidance Note 5 – depth of first floor more than 3m's and distance to neighbouring properties.
- Overdevelopment of application site.
- Concerned in regard to the overall height and the mass of the roof.

- No street elevation has been provided to make comparisons between neighbouring properties.
- Certainly something wrong with the drawings submitted.
- Application should be refused.

Pages 63
F/01732/11
127 Lichfield Grove

On Page 65, under 'planning considerations' the second paragraph should be referenced to number 125 instead of 129, and the third paragraph should make reference to number 129 instead of 125.

Pages 97-107
F/02524/11
19 Dollis Avenue

There is a typographical error in the last line of the first paragraph of the 'Proposal' section appearing on page 102 which should read:

All flats will have access to the rear garden (as shown on drawing no. 2105/9A and the email from Michael Burnand dated 22 August 2011).

Pages 108-116
F/02888/11
174 Regents Park Road

To be included under Planning Considerations section:

The associated alterations relate to the changes on the rear and side elevation. On the side elevation there will be the removal of windows and a door and an insertion of a new window at first floor level. On the rear elevation, the agent has confirmed that the existing first floor external staircase will be removed and there will be changes to the windows and patio doors on first and ground floor level. The alterations are considered to bring an improvement to the fenestration property which are not considered to harm the property or the amenities of neighbouring occupiers.

Pages 220-224
H/02939/11
18 Allington Road

An additional comment has been made by an objector:

- The objector would like it to be noted that the raised patio is 1.35m above the garden level at 16 Allington Road.

Pages 188-200

H/02203/11

Peacehaven Hotel, 94 Audley Road

Amendment to condition 1 "The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:

Design and Access Statement; 1053/S-01; 1053/S-02; 1053/S-03; 1053/S-04; 1053/AP5-01 rev B; 1053/AP5-02 rev A; 1053/AP5-03 rev B; 1053/AP5-04.

Reason:

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

Pages 168-179

H/02966/11

Tudor Cottage, 64 Marsh Lane

- It is noted that the site plan on the report submitted is larger than submitted with the application. This reflects the land under the applicant's ownership rather than the site itself and is corrected on the presentation.
- The applicant has submitted sections showing the proposed development. Amend condition 1 to read: The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Design and Access Statement, P/01, P/02 Revision A, P/06 Revision A, P/07 Revision A, P/07.1, P/08 Revision A, P/09, P/10 Revision A, P/11, P/12 Revision A, P/13 Revision A, P/14 Revision A, P/11A House 1 Section, P/11A House 2 Section. Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.
- An objection from Councillor Hart to the application has been received but after the consultation period had expired.

Pages 180-187

H/00273/11

Pillar of Fire, Brent Street

Amendment to condition 2:

"The vehicular access hereby approved shall only be used for fire, police or ambulance vehicles in the event of an emergency, or when Brent Street or Brent Green is closed to vehicular traffic at the point of access to the site by traffic order or instruction from the police."

Pages 68-76

F/01839/11

72 Lichfield Grove, N3 2JP

Four further objection letters received, stating that:

- There needs to be a significant S106 contribution before any further considerations of this application.
- Do not wish to have 3 car parking spaces for one house. We have far too few as it is, since the introduction of the CPZ here.
- Is it now a legal requirement for there to be a parking space with each 'dwelling' (in this case, flat)? Or is this just the owner trying to get the most he can get?
- 3 off-street parking spaces will necessitate the loss of one on-street parking space.
- Would like the current position with only 1 length of dropped kerb to remain.
- Some residents do not have off-street parking as they choose to leave their front gardens as gardens for aesthetic pleasure.
- Rear bay will create issues of overshadowing and loss of light.
- Proposal is not sympathetic to neighbouring properties.
- Cars parked outside will be visually unpleasing.
- Do you as a planning department confirm that the new living space will not extend at the back beyond the existing building boundary (currently the existing kitchen and toilet). If so, the plans are acceptable.

Pages 117-122

F/03075/11

Finchley Manor Club

Three further objection letters received, stating that:

- Opening times for the shelter 8am until 11pm - when it will be used for storage, justification for the opening and closing times needs to be provided.
- Use of the shelter and supervision of activity during 8am to 11pm, 7 days a week within the shelter.
- Will there be any functions held?
- Not a direct replacement of the previous building as the scale of this proposed building is much larger.
- Shelter appears to be quite larger than the old structure.
- What arrangements will be made for opening and closing the shelter?.
- Use of shelter after 22.00 as floodlights are switched off at 22.00 – any electrical lightening for the timber building?
- Noise and disturbance from the club.
- Traffic, access and parking – speeding, dangerous driving, inconsiderate parking – blocking of driveways.