

**MEETING****PLANNING COMMITTEE****DATE AND TIME****THURSDAY 27TH NOVEMBER, 2014****AT 7.00 PM****VENUE****HENDON TOWN HALL, THE BURROUGHS, LONDON NW4 4BQ**

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
7.	ADDENDUM TO THE REPORT OF THE ASSISTANT DIRECTOR OF PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT AND BUILDING CONTROL:	1 - 4

Maria Lugangira  
020 8359 2761  
maria.lugangira@barnet.gov.uk

This page is intentionally left blank

**PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING**

**Thursday 27<sup>th</sup> October 2014, 7.00PM**

**AGENDA ITEM 7**

**ADDENDUM TO REPORT OF THE ASSISTANT DIRECTOR OF DEVELOPMENT  
MANAGEMENT AND BUILDING CONTROL**

---

**Pages 7-41**

**Reference: H/04672/14**

**Address: Building F1, F2, F8, F9, Beaufort Park, Aerodrome Road,  
NW9**

**Amend condition 1 – Approved Plans [Page 9]**

**Add drawing reference: 30213-A-F1-F9-05-E1-A-02**

**Amend condition 2 – Car Parking Management Plan (CPMP) [Page 9]**

Delete part 'f' of the condition requiring details of parking controls, it being noted that the car park entrance has already been approved as part of the application for Block F3-F7, ref: H/05373/13.

**Report section 2.1 Site Description and Surrounding [Page 17]**

First Paragraph: The planning reference number should read "H/0573/13", not "H/05373/14".

**Report Section 3.10 Landscaping and biodiversity [Page 36]**

Erratum to 'Current application' section: Whilst there are no green roofs atop the perimeter blocks, it is noted that the soft landscaping areas of the two podium level amenity terraces constitute green roofs.

Pages 63 -76

Reference: B/04041/14

Address : Cottage Farm, Mays Lane, Barnet, EN5 2AQ

Amend "Neighbours Wishing to Speak" from "0" to "2"

The Applicant's agent has submitted further information in support of the application.

Their summary and conclusion in support of the proposal is set out below:-

### “Summary

The table below is a summary response to

1. “the justification why this application was referred to the Main Committee”
2. and the “Recommendation to Refuse”.

Page No / Point No	Planning Officer	Our response
64 / 1.2	Borough wide implication..	<p>Each planning application should be evaluated on it’s merit and facts, thus there should be no fear of precedent.</p> <p>Furthermore if it does set a precedent, it is a good precedent, and should be supported and actively encouraged</p>
67 / 1	<p>Recommendation : Refuse</p> <p><i>No very special circumstance have been demonstrated</i></p>	<p>This is not correct. We have based our application on very special circumstances. We have listed some of the very special circumstance below, and the rest of them are in the body of our application:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. We are seeking to make a Brownfield site more green</li> <li>2. We will make the site more open, by removing 9 large building and replacing them with 3 buildings, open space, trees and foliage which will blend into the “countryside”</li> <li>3. We are working with UK Power Networks to remove the overhead power cables, “telegraph posts” and overhead distribution points, thereby             <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. improving the safety of the residents living vicinity of the overhead power cables,</li> <li>b. making the wider area, not just our site more open</li> <li>c. and reducing the risk of power outages for the residents of Barnet</li> </ol> </li> <li>4. The current designated use and the alternative uses for the site are more harmful, socially, economically and environmentally.</li> <li>5. ... etc</li> </ol>
67/2	<p>Recommendation : Refuse</p> <p><i>Application does not include affordable housing</i></p>	<p>We sought Pre-planning advice and have shared with the Officers the area we intend to develop, see page 4 of the document on Councils Planning documents site, <a href="https://publicaccess.barnet.gov.uk/online-applications/files/7433DD1A695E8C976D369A1EBE8233FB/pdf/B_04041_14-MP_413_SiteREDUCED.pdf-2568499.pdf">https://publicaccess.barnet.gov.uk/online-applications/files/7433DD1A695E8C976D369A1EBE8233FB/pdf/B_04041_14-MP_413_SiteREDUCED.pdf-2568499.pdf</a></p> <p>You can clearly see that the area is 3574m<sup>2</sup> which is under the 0.4 hectare (4000m<sup>2</sup>) threshold whereby affordable housing needs to be included.</p> <p>At least four planning officers have accepted this fact, since our first meeting with the council in 30 Jan 2014 to 21<sup>st</sup> Oct 2014:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Adam Ralton</li> <li>2. Clive Townsend</li> <li>3. Mumtaz Shiek</li> <li>4. and Tanusha Naidoo,</li> </ol>

Page No / Point No	Planning Officer	Our response
		<p>since neither of them have brought this to our attention in</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. the Pre Planning Report</li> <li>2. or the initial report presented to the Chipping Barnet Area Planning Committee</li> </ol> <p>Hence, we ask you:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. why did it take over 8 month to come up with a new point to support a recommendation to refuse,</li> <li>2. were the council officers being negligent in not including this point in the initial advise. The advice was paid for thus there has to be a duty of care, and if such an important point was omitted we would like to know if this duty was breached and what redress is available.</li> </ol> <p>I think you will agree that is not a genuine point to support a refusal, and as such should be “conditioned” as per our discussions with the Planning Officer, Tanusha Naidoo.</p>
67 /1	Informative Ecological Assessment	<p>You will note that the Planning Officers have acknowledged that a full Ecological Assessment has been performed and thus have removed this as a “reason for refusal” from the report you have been asked to review.</p> <p>One could be lead to conclude that the 2<sup>nd</sup> reason for refusal, above, was “created” to provide “weight” to a recommendation which is based on emotional, subjective and historical argument and not the facts and merits of the application.”</p>

## “Conclusion

### The use is appropriate

Agricultural use for this site was suitable in the 1800s and 1900s. The Greenbelt was created to prevent urban sprawl, to protect the countryside and maintain permanent green spaces for those to enjoy.

This application has the neighbours’ full support of the proposal.

If the greenbelt is put into place to enhance the standard of living for those who live within or adjacent to it, it does not make sense to ignore the local input. Listen to those who will actually be affected by this demure proposal.

Local people who live adjacent to the proposed project are urging you to listen to them and approve this application.

## **Openness of the Green Belt is enhanced**

The proposal has been designed carefully to ensure that the openness of the greenbelt is enhanced. We have focused on views through the site. There is a positive improvement from both the street scene and also the views from Partridge Close's neighbours.

## **The site is Brownfield**

As per the NPPF – The regeneration and recycling of Brownfield sites is encouraged. National Government is helping people to do this with Permitted Development rules enabling the conversion into residential units. Do not continue to allow this derelict, horrendous site to continue to fall into disrepair.

Our proposal will regenerate the area. It will improve the visual appeal of the surrounding land.

## **The design is exemplary**

The proposal has been carefully designed to be as sensitive to the local environment as possible. These two ecologically advanced and self-sufficient homes will be a fantastic attribute to Barnet Council and the local community.

The contemporary designs reflect not only the mixed housing within the North London suburbs, but they also marry traditional and semi-rural buildings with modern materials and cutting edge technology.

## **Very special circumstances**

This proposal provides very special circumstances.

- Residential use of the site, which is currently part Sui Generis (use for dog kennels) is appropriate in these very special circumstances.
- The existing use is unneighbourly, uneconomical, unsustainable.
- It is detrimental to the local environment and ecologically its contributions are negative.
- No alternative proposed use of the site has been suggested as appropriate or acceptable.
- The proposal greatly improves the site.
- Noise and smell pollution (of which complaints have been recorded) will be removed.
- Traffic will be significantly reduced.
- The semi-rural site will be returned back to green, with the removal of large expanses of hard landscaping and sprawling, low quality buildings being removed.
- The removal of the electrical wires will be a positive contribution to the whole area and all of the residents along Mays Lane.
- The visual amenity will be drastically improved.
- The openness of the site will be improved.

Due to its location, proximity to adjacent residents and strong local support this application should be approved, upon its planning merits and the very special circumstances as outlined above.

Many thanks for your time in reading this and we look forward to seeing you at the committee meeting.”