

MEETING FINCHLEY AND GOLDERS GREEN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE DATE AND TIME TUESDAY 21ST OCTOBER, 2014 AT 7.00 PM VENUE

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	
	Reports of the Assistant Director of Development Management and Building Control		

HENDON TOWN HALL, THE BURROUGHS, LONDON NW4 4BQ

Andrew Charlwood andrew.charlwood@barnet.gov.uk 020 8359 2014



FINCHLEY AND GOLDERS GREEN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE

21st OCTOBER 2014

Agenda Annex

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

Order of Business

Page: 87-132 Ref: F/02808/14

The Wren Academy, Hilton Avenue

Since the committee report was written the Council has received 1 further objection letter which raised the following additional areas of concern:

- Traffic
- Overlooking and loss of privacy from the proposed option B extension to the kitchen – request for improved boundary treatment.

Officers Response

The issue of the impact of traffic has been previously raised by other objectors and has been considered in the report. However, the following specific responses can be made:

- The current proposals would result in the Warnham Road access being for servicing and deliveries only. All pupils and staff would be required to access the site via the new entrance on Woodhouse Road. The proposals are therefore considered to address traffic and parking pressures currently occurring in Bramber Road.
- The proposed 'option B' extension would be single storey and 4m deep in-filling the current access stairs. The extension serves the kitchen and not an area used by pupils. The proposed extension would exceed the minimum residential back to back distances and therefore overlooking and loss of privacy is not considered to result from the proposal. A means of enclosure condition is already recommended.

With regard to recommendation 1, the monitoring costs for the School Travel Plan should form a separate head of term.

Page: 9-18 Ref: F/04587/14 11 Dollis Park

An additional objection was received by the Finchley Society on the following grounds:

'I am writing to object on behalf of the Finchley Society to this application for the construction of a rear outbuilding for use as a gym at 11 Dollis Park. (The website would not accept comments, though the closing date is to-day.) This is inappropriate over-development of the property, contrary to Design Guidance 5, and it would harm the character and appearance of the area. If permission were granted there would have to be strict and enforceable conditions preventing the building from being used for any purpose other than as a gym.

I understand that there may still be outstanding issues relating to an earlier planning application in respect of this property. If that is so, the Council should decline to consider this application until they have been resolved.'

Page: 141-152 Ref: F/04267/14 73 Avondale Avenue

The plans have been amended to remove the dormer windows on the building and reduce the rearward projection on the building.

An additional objection was received on the following grounds:

- 1. There is the possibility for the roof of the dining room area to be used as a patio. This would be unacceptable due to overseeing / privacy issues. It is requested that a condition be applied to exclude this now and in the future.
- 2. The bin storage would be better in an enclosure as they will all be viewed from the street
- 3. The access from Avondale Avenue to the proposed ground floor does not take account of the difference in level. It is unlikely that the properties will be fully accessible to people who have mobility issues
- 4. The off street car parking does not indicate the retaining walls need to facilitate this. Without the off street parking there will be addition pressures put on the already overstretched parking in Avondale Avenue
- 5. The removal of the existing Leylandii tree would be appreciated as it is currently a new and eyesore and does not prevent overseeing

These are generally considered to be addressed in the main report.

Page: 19-28 Ref: F/04345/14 130 Hendon Lane

The applicant has written to the Council querying the need for a School Travel Plan. The Council follows Transport for London Thresholds for the requirement for a Travel Plan. Furthermore this requirement is consistent with that on the previous application and concerns regarding highway issues have previously been raised by objectors. It is therefore considered that it should remain.

Page: 29-40 Ref: F/03911/14 69A Park Hall Road

An additional submission was received on 17/14/2014, addressing the content of the Council Report for this application. It advised that an incorrect version of their submission was referred to in the Report. The submission requested that points: 13,14,16,17,18 and 19 originally discussed in section 3 'Comments on the grounds of objections' be omitted from the Report.

- 13 The original planning consent in 1988 included a condition relating to the provision of two parking spaces
 - <u>Council response</u>: Amended plans were submitted to retain the existing parking at the rear of the property.
- 14 Loss of parking on the site would not be desirable with the CPZ in operation in the street, and there is considerable pressure on parking in this area

<u>Council response</u>: The development retains parking.

16 Exacerbated sound travel and disturbance from the roof space adjoining the internal walls of the upper flat.

<u>Council Response</u>: The proposed development is not inconsistent with other residential extensions that are common in the municipality. It is considered that the scope of works will not result in detrimental sound and disturbance impacts to nearby residential occupants.

- 17 The property is a converted house with flats on leasehold ownership, and there are legal obligations to maintain the house on a common basis. The development may complicate the legal ownership between the units.
 - <u>Council Response</u>: With regard to varying legal obligations and complications relating to leasehold and maintenance matters at the site, are matters which are civil and between owners, and are not planning matters of consideration.
- 18 The application is made in the context of rapid house price inflation and demographic trends that put intense pressure on living space in the neighbourhood.

<u>Council Response</u>: House price inflation is not a planning material consideration.

19 Concerns that non-resident freeholders who are not directly affected by the development, gain an added value in the property Council Response: This is not a planning material consideration.

Page: 57-64 Ref: F/04664/14

10 Park Drive, London, NW11 7SH

Please be advised that the text within Section 3 of the Council Report that currently reads:

The planning matters raised have been discussed in the appraisal.

With regard to the concern that the development may have an impact on the environment and wildlife, it is noted that the development is not within or adjacent to a Site of Importance for Nature Conservation and is an urban residential area. The owners are reminded however of their obligations under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended), and it is advised that all works carried out in pursuance of this consent / notice will be subject to the duties, obligations and criminal offences contained in the Act and failure to comply with the provisions of the Act may result in a criminal prosecution. Normally the LPA would not require an ecological survey on such a site, as this would be unreasonable and environmental impacts would be limited.

Is to be altered to the following:

The planning matters raised have been discussed in the appraisal.

Having regard to section 9 of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended), a person is guilty of an offence if they intentionally or recklessly disturbs bats / newts while it occupies a structure/place for shelter or protection or if they obstruct access to that place (s9(4)(b)& (c)). Normally the LPA would not require an ecological survey on such a site, as this would be unreasonable and environmental impacts would be limited. In the absence of such a survey the provisions of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 will apply.

Page: 65-86 Ref: F/05593/13

290-294 Golders Green Road

It is recommended by officers that this item is withdrawn from the agenda pending the receipt of further viability information.