

**MEETING****WEST AREA PLANNING SUB-COMMITTEE****DATE AND TIME****WEDNESDAY 6TH NOVEMBER, 2013****AT 7.00 PM****VENUE****HENDON TOWN HALL, THE BURROUGHS, NW4 4BG**

Dear Councillors,

Please find enclosed additional papers relating to the following items for the above mentioned meeting which were not available at the time of collation of the agenda.

| Item No | Title of Report    | Pages |
|---------|--------------------|-------|
| 5.1     | ADDENDUM TO REPORT | 1 - 6 |

Paul Frost 0208 359 2205 paul.frost@barnet.gov.uk

This page is intentionally left blank

## WEST AREA PLANNING SUB-COMMITTEE

6 November 2013

AGENDA ITEM 6a

### ADDENDUM TO ASSISTANT DIRECTOR OF DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT AND BUILDING CONTROL'S REPORT

---

#### **Elm Park, Elm Terrace, Cricklewood – Tree Preservation Order TPO/CA/419**

Since the report was drafted additional discussions have taken place with the arboricultural consultant, further information (an extract from a topographical survey and Land Registry title details) has been received, and another site inspection has taken place.

It is now clear that the group of three mature trees (north-east boundary of gas building area) with trunk diameters between 80 – 90cm are not three Horse Chestnuts but actually two Horse Chestnuts and one Sycamore. The Order should therefore be modified to correct this error.

An e-mail from the arboricultural consultant dated 5<sup>th</sup> November 2013 notes “Further to our discussion and your site visit, we agreed that there are in fact two horse chestnuts, two sycamores and a cherry which you consider should be protected and the order will be amended to reflect that. We discussed briefly the condition of the horse chestnut and you have suggested that we apply for works to it as part of any planning application and it will be considered in context with the proposals.”

The proposal before Members is therefore:

**To seek authority for confirmation of Tree Preservation Order with modification – Group G1 comprising 2 x Horse Chestnut, 2 x Sycamore, 1 x Cherry**

The revised recommendation 1:

**That the Council, under Regulation 7 of the Town and Country Planning (Tree Preservation) (England) regulations 2012 confirm the Tree Preservation Order at Elm Park, Elm Terrace, Cricklewood, London NW2 NW11 with modification – Group G1 comprising 2 x Horse Chestnut, 2 x Sycamore, 1 x Cherry.**

#### **5 Grantham Close H/04122/13**

The site plan should be added to the report:



**The following conditions should be added:**

1.) A scheme of hard and soft landscaping, including details of existing trees to be retained, shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority before the development, hereby permitted, is commenced.

**Reason:**

To ensure a satisfactory appearance to the development in accordance with policies DM01 of the Adopted Barnet Development Management Policies DPD (2012) and 7.21 of the London Plan 2011 and CS5 and CS7 of the Adopted Barnet Core Strategy DPD (2012).

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 in accordance with policies DM01 of the Adopted Barnet Development Management Policies DPD (2012) and CS5 and CS7 of the Adopted Barnet Core Strategy DPD (2012) and 7.21 of the London Plan 2011.

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 in accordance with policies DM01 of the Adopted Barnet Development Management Policies DPD (2012) and CS5 and CS7 of the Adopted Barnet Core Strategy DPD (2012) and 7.21 of the London Plan 2011.

4.) The species, size and siting of the replacement tree(s) shall be agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority and the tree(s) shall be planted within 6 months (or as otherwise agreed in writing) of the commencement of the approved treatment (either wholly or in part). The replacement tree(s) shall be maintained and/or replaced as necessary until new trees are established in growth.

Reason:

To maintain the visual amenities of the area in accordance with policies DM01 of the Adopted Barnet Development Management Policies DPD (2012) and 7.21 of the London Plan 2011.

5.) Tree protection measures shall be carried out in accordance with John Cromar's tree protection proposals and methods as per the arboricultural report dated 6<sup>th</sup> September 2013.

Reason:

To safeguard the health of existing trees which represent an important amenity feature in accordance with policies DM01 of the Adopted Barnet Development Management Policies DPD (2012), CS5 and CS7 of the Adopted Barnet Core Strategy DPD (2012) and 7.21 of the London Plan 2011.

1 letter was received to withdraw 1 objection and registered support of the application was received after writing the report.

1 letter of support was received after writing the report.

The following should be added to the report:

The proposal seeks to remove an existing TPO lime tree at the rear of the site. This is considered to be acceptable given the current health of the tree subject to a suitable replacement tree. A condition has been attached to the application for details of a replacement tree.

The agent has submitted a supporting statement to address the objections which can be circulated to The Members.

### **11 Edgeworth Avenue – H/04362/13**

Amend condition 1 to include:

Letter from Christopher Wickham dated 18<sup>th</sup> October 2013.

14 letters of objection, including a joint letter with 10 signatures, were received in respect of this application. The objections may be summarised as follows:

- A 4.35m rear projection would intensify the monolithic profile appearance of the property which has a conservatory rather than a brick built extension
- Extension beyond permitted development and would further intensify the harm caused
- No 11 is set higher than no 13 and the proposal would increase the sense of enclosure
- Squaring off of bay window should not be allowed as bay windows are a feature of the street and proposal would result in significant visual harm
- Current build on ground floor still fails to comply with existing consents
- Further increase in size of the house creates a more oversized house
- Loss of light and overshadowing
- Loss of outlook
- Plans inaccurate
- Proposal should comply with guidelines
- Overbearing and unduly obtrusive
- Proposal not in keeping with character and appearance of the street scene

The issues raised by the objectors were discussed in the main report. An informative has been attached to ensure that the amendments to the ground floor plans are carried out within 3 months of the date of the previously approved plans, which equates to 12<sup>th</sup> December 2013.

### **26 Victoria Road – H/03822/13**

Amend Non standard condition to say:

The units shall only be occupied by Eva Zadah and her family/known person to her who has a responsibility of care for her. In the event that Eva Zadah no longer occupies the premises, the use shall cease and the building returned to its former use as a single family dwellinghouse within 3 months.

Reason: To safeguard the character of the area and the amenities of neighbouring occupiers in accordance with policy DM01 of the Adopted Barnet Development Management Policies 2012.

### **26 Victoria Road – H/04454/13**

2 additional objections were received after writing the report.

These were on the grounds that:

The proposals would add to parking stress within the locality

The proposals would impact sight lines on Albert Road and Victoria Road and this would be detrimental to local highway safety, causing a traffic hazard.

It is considered that these comments are addressed in the main report.

This page is intentionally left blank