

MEETING**EAST AREA PLANNING SUB-COMMITTEE****DATE AND TIME****THURSDAY 9TH JANUARY, 2014****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
	Addendum to the Report of the Assistant Director of Planning and Development Management	

Chidilim Agada 020 8359 2037 chidilim.agada@barnet.gov.uk

This page is intentionally left blank

EAST AREA PLANNING SUB-COMMITTEE

9 January 2014

Agenda Annex

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

Finchley Reform Synagogue

F/05434/13 and F/05435/13

Pages 1-34

Recommendation III on both applications should be amended as follows: "That if an agreement has not been completed by 10/02/2014..."

Under the consultation section of both applications add:

Date of Press Notice: 12/12/2013

A number of additional responses have been received since the committee reports were written.

The following summary includes all responses received up to 2.30pm on the day of committee (this include the responses already listed in the committee papers).

A total of 280 objections have been received against application F/05434/13.

A total of 446 letters of support have been received in favour of application F/05434/13.

A total of 276 objections have been received against application F/05435/13.

A total of 429 letters of support have been received in favour of application F/05435/13.

A petition with 25 signatures against the proposals (both applications) was received.

Most of the additional correspondence received is in the form of proforma letters and emails similar to the ones received before the committee reports were written. The grounds of objection remain similar to those summarised and addressed in the committee reports.

More detailed objections have been received on amenity grounds particularly in relation to 99 Fallow Court Avenue.

Some confusion may have arisen from the definition of the side wall in the third paragraph on page 8 and first paragraph on page 26. The property at 99 Fallow Court Avenue has a staggered footprint. The third sentence of the paragraph should be clarified as follows:

The side section of the wall closest to the synagogue site does not have principal habitable room windows at ground floor level. The other windows on the side elevation of 99 Fallow Court Avenue are located sufficiently far away from the temporary structure not to cause unacceptable harm to amenity. The impact on residential amenity was considered acceptable at the time of granting the original permission. It is not considered that circumstances have changed to come to a different conclusion for the temporary retention of the structure. Officers have visited the part of the site closest to 99 Fallow Court Avenue and consider the impact of the existing structure on the amenities of occupiers of 99 Fallow Court

Avenue to be acceptable. The neighbour's property was seen again when Members of the committee visited the synagogue prior to the committee meeting.

The additional grounds of objections can be summarised and addressed as follows:

- Failure to identify all relevant planning history
 - All history of relevance to the determination of the applications has been described in the committee report.
- Inaccuracies in submission
 - All relevant documents have been submitted with the application to enable the Local Planning Authority to determine the application. Particular reference has been made to the status of the Travel Plan. The submission of a Travel Plan is the subject of the recommended legal agreement. Whilst the submission of a Travel Plan with the application is a material planning consideration and is therefore listed as a planning document in condition 1, it should be noted that school travel plans are not approved by the Planning department. The final Travel Plan will be a part of the section 106 agreement and its submission will be approved by the Traffic and Development section of Highways at a later date.
- Failure to consult appropriately
 - The Local Planning Authority has significantly exceeded statutory and local consultation requirements by consulting all properties within 100 metres of the site (as opposed to the usual 50 metres) extending this zone when it did not finish at a natural road end. The Council also sent letters to all previous objectors and supporters to the application for the wider redevelopment of the site, including those not living within the identified extended catchment area. Site notices were also erected outside the synagogue and the applications was advertised in the local press. This very high level of consultation has ensured that the Council has exceeded its consultation requirements.
 - All documents relevant to the determination of the application were made available to the public.

24A St Wilfrids Road

B/04731/13

Pages 37-50

The following additional paragraph to be inserted to the 'Planning Considerations' section of the Report:

As noted, the application site contains a warehouse building (Use Class B2/B8). In accordance with Policy DM14, the loss of B-Class use will only be permitted where it can be demonstrated to the Council's satisfaction that a site is no longer suitable and viable for its existing or alternative business use in the short, medium and long term, and a suitable period of effective marketing has been undertaken. Where this can be demonstrated the priority for re-use will be a mixture of small business units with residential use.

Evidence of marketing of the existing warehouse building was submitted as part of the previous application, and has been submitted as part of the current planning application. It is not considered that the site's circumstances have changed materially since the previous planning application. Property Services have previously advised that the information submitted demonstrates effective marketing has been undertaken, demonstrating that the site is no longer suitable and viable for its existing use. As a result, and given site circumstances have not changed, the loss of the employment generating use is considered acceptable as part of the current application.

This page is intentionally left blank