

<u>MEETING</u> CHIPPING BARNET AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE
<u>DATE AND TIME</u> WEDNESDAY 9TH DECEMBER, 2015 AT 7.00 PM
<u>VENUE</u> HENDON TOWN HALL, THE BURROUGHS, LONDON NW4 4AX

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
1.	ADDENDUM	1 - 8

Governance Service - GovernanceTeam@Barnet.gov.uk

This page is intentionally left blank

CHIPPING BARNET AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE

9 December 2015

ADDENDUM

AGENDA ITEM 12

15/03343/FUL
Pages 3-36
Elmbank, Barnet Road

For clarification, the total number of parking spaces proposed is 135. This is broken down into 129 parking spaces for the residential units, and 6 visitor spaces. This distribution is in accordance with Local Plan Policy DM17.

Two additional letters of objection received. These do not raise any objections which have not already been summarised in the Committee Report.

One further letter of objection received, submitted on behalf of 37 neighbouring households. The letter does not raise any objections which have not already been summarised in the Committee Report, however the nature of the objections is summarised below for clarity:

- Single point of access is inadequate.
- Most residents will be commuters who will rely on motor vehicles – insufficient parking is proposed.
- Proposal will exacerbate existing parking problems caused by hospital users, school open days and entrance exams, and users of the pub.
- Proposal will add to traffic congestion.
- Proposal will result in a loss of light and privacy to adjoining neighbours, and will cause noise and disturbance.
- Proposal will add to pressure on schools.
- Use of the site for residential dwellings on this scale is inappropriate.
- Currently there are no flats in Arkley.

One additional Informative to be added:

The applicant is advised that, in respect of Condition 20 (requirement to submit a Car Parking Management Plan), the details should ensure 2 parking spaces are allocated to each property with 4 or more bedrooms, and at least one space for each of the other properties, not exceeding the maximum of 1 space for 1-bedroom units and an average of 1.5 spaces for 2 and 3 bedroom units.

Condition 29 to be replaced by the following:

Notwithstanding the details shown in the drawings submitted and otherwise hereby approved, prior to the first occupation of the new dwellinghouses (Use Class C3) permitted under this consent, all units except for Units 83, 84, 85, 90, 91, 92, 97, 98 and 99 shall have been constructed to meet and achieve the relevant criteria of Part M4(2) of Schedule 1 of the Building Regulations 2010 (or the equivalent standard in such measure of accessibility and adaptability for house design which may replace that scheme in future).

Reason: To ensure the development meets the needs of its future occupiers and to comply with the requirements of policies 3.8, 7.2 and 7.6 of the London

15/06104/FUL

Pages 47-58

Land Rear Of Hampden Court, Hampden Road, London, N10 2HN

Condition 1

To be amended to read as:

The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:

The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Drawing No. RE/1, RE/2, 03 Rev F, 914212, Design and Access Statement, dated September 2015 and Confirmation Email dated 03/12/2015.

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning and so as to ensure that the development is carried out fully in accordance with the plans as assessed in accordance with Policies CS NPPF and CS1 of the Local Plan Core Strategy DPD (adopted September 2012) and Policy DM01 of the Local Plan Development Management Policies DPD (adopted September 2012).

Attach 2 informatives in relation to comments from the Council's Highways Department:-.

1. Informative:

The applicant is advised that for construction works adjacent or affecting the public highways, the Highways Authority should be contacted for any necessary Highways Licenses or any highway approvals deemed necessary.

2. Informative:

DEMOLITION AND CONSTRUCTION MANAGEMENT PLAN (DCMP) Any details submitted in respect of the Demolition and Construction Management Plan above shall control the hours, routes taken, means of access and security procedures for construction traffic to and from the site and the methods statement shall provide for the provision of on-site wheel cleaning facilities during demolition, excavation, site preparation and construction stages of the development, recycling of materials, the provision of on-site car parking facilities for contractors during all stages of development (Excavation, site preparation and construction) and the provision on site of a storage/delivery area for all plant, site huts, site facilities and materials and a community liaison contact and precautions to minimise damage to trees on or adjacent to the site.

3. Informative:

Unobstructed access needs to be provided to the refuse vehicle on the day of the collection. The development access needs to be designed and constructed to allow refuse vehicles to access the site. Alternatively, the dustbins will need to be brought to the edge of public highways on collection days. Otherwise refuse collection points should be located within 10 metres of the Public Highway. Any issues regarding refuse collection should be referred to the Cleansing Department.

4. Informative:

The applicant should apply for a Habitual Crossing License for construction vehicles to use the existing crossover. An application for this license could be obtained from Barnet House, 11th Floor Highways, 1255 High Road Whetstone London N20 0EJ.

5. Informative:

The Highway Authority will require the applicant to give an undertaking to pay additional costs of repair or maintenance of the public highway in the vicinity of the site should the highway be damaged as a result of the construction traffic. The construction traffic will be deemed "extraordinary traffic" for the purposes of Section 59 of the Highways Act 1980. Under this section, the Highway Authority can recover the cost of excess expenses for maintenance of the highway resulting from excessive weight or extraordinary traffic passing along the highway. It is to be understood that any remedial works for such damage will be included in the estimate for highway works.

14/07166/FUL
Pages 59-66
7B High Street, Barnet

One additional condition to be added:

No construction work resulting from the planning permission shall be carried out on the premises at any time on Sundays, Bank or Public Holidays, before 8.00 am or after 1.00 pm on Saturdays, or before 8.00 am or after 6.00pm pm on other days.

Reason: To ensure that the proposed development does not prejudice the amenities of occupiers of adjoining residential properties in accordance with policy DM04 of the Development Management Policies DPD (adopted September 2012).

One objector, who requested to speak at the meeting, has sent the following additional representations which they intend on presenting to Members if they are able to attend the meeting:

I would like point out that I consider the Chipping Barnet Town Centre to start at Barnet Church and continue as far as the junction with St Albans Road which takes you round to the Waitrose end of The Spires! I cannot accept that where this proposal is sited is part of the Town Centre!

I would also point out that 5 High Street was advertised as office space but did not get any applicants and so after a certain time Barnet Council said it could be used as flats; we did oppose this at the time but without success! It poses the question is there any need for more office space in Barnet. There are still several empty shops in Barnet High Street that could be refurbished.

The first floor of 7b High Street has always been inappropriate considering the age of the other buildings surrounding it and this proposal is intending to increase the size of the eyesore!!

On the issue of it being sufficient distance from other properties except 7C & 7A, I would like to point out that from our gardens in Bedford Mansions we have the pleasure of some sky in the corner where this floor is proposed to be erected and this will eliminate that pleasure. Because we are now so closed in by buildings we have problems with a lack of airflow in our gardens to dry washing and difficulties making a garden grow because of lack of light, this construction will just add to those difficulties!

Parking is impossible in Bedford Avenue sometimes; there have been occasions when we have had to find a parking space in Normandy Avenue! I know it has been recognised that there are good transport facilities, but those who take up the proposed office space, will they be required to use public transport? We very much doubt it! One extra occupied parking space is too much for Bedford Avenue!

Amend plans informative by adding “ – 3 Rev A” to Drg no. 436015
Letter received from applicant dated 4th December 2015.

BISHOPS

11 Sunset View, Barnet, Herts EN5 4LB

tel: 020 8441 8844

Email: info@bishopshomebuilders.co.uk

4th December 2015

Councillor Wendy Prentice
London Borough of Barnet
North London Business Park
Oakleigh Road South
London N11 1NP

Dear Councillor Prentice

Garden Nursery, Barnet Road Arkley EN5 3JX – Erection of a Detached House Ref: 15/06152/FUL

I am writing to you as the applicant for the above proposal which will be considered by the Chipping Barnet Area Sub Committee on 9 December.

The application is recommended for refusal as an inappropriate development in the Green Belt, notwithstanding that national and local Green Belt policy allows for the redevelopment of brownfield land such as this - providing there is no greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt. The scheme would consolidate development into one building and the existing volume and floor space (as well as significant areas of hardstanding) of buildings across the site would be reduced. By doing so, encroachment of built development into the countryside would be decreased, with a consequent increase in the openness of the Green Belt. However, your officers despite acknowledging that they are in a poor state of repair, consider that that the existing buildings are unobtrusive and that the proposal would appear significant in comparison.

It is inevitable that when consolidating development on a site, the resulting building will be larger than any single building it replaces. However I would ask you to balance any perceived impact of the proposal against the clear Green Belt benefit of the resulting increase in open land that such consolidation achieves. I would also ask you to consider where any visual impact would be felt. In this respect:

- Public views from within the Green Belt are both distant and indirect. The surrounding Green Belt land to the south and east is in private ownership with no public access.
- Views from the south to the principal elevation in my view would be less obtrusive than the current situation where large greenhouses dominate the southern boundary.
- Views from land to the east would be seen against the backdrop of adjoining development.
- Views from the adjoining development to the west are limited by screening and existing structures.
- There are no public objections to the proposal.

Cont/...

Finally I would ask you to consider the impact of the proposed house against the impact of the nursery, which is not an appropriate Green Belt use. When it last operated, 100% of the site was being used for a combination of open storage (compost, sand, soil etc.), sales counters and customer parking.

I am a local housebuilder and Barnet resident of long standing. I have owned the site since 1982 and have only sought to redevelop it now, as it has been marketed for two years without any firm expressions of interest for any form of use compatible with the location (a marketing report was submitted in support of the application). I can only conclude that there is no reasonable prospect of the site attracting a tenant in the foreseeable future and that only a residential use, for which there is a clear demand, will bring about the much needed improvement of the site and its surroundings and deliver the following environmental benefits:

- The increase in open land mentioned above will allow the introduction of new planting with native species where buildings and hard-standings exist, improving both the visual amenity of the area and bio-diversity.
- There will be improvements to residential amenity through the introduction of a less intensive non-commercial use.
- There will be a contribution, albeit a small one, to housing delivery.

I do hope you will take these points into consideration when you determine the application and I would urge you to visit the site. I have sent this letter to all members and substitute members of the Sub-Committee.

Yours sincerely



Mike Bishop

15/06216/HSE
Pages 67 – 73
73 Lullington Garth, N12

P71 – 5.3 Assessment of Proposals

Whether harm would be caused to the character and appearance of the existing building, the street scene and the wider locality

Amend second sentence of second paragraph to read as follows:-

“The extension is subordinate to the original house and it is considered that the proposal would not materially harm the character and appearance of the existing building, the street scene and the wider locality.”

A neighbouring resident has submitted the following comments in respect of the proposal and the officer’s report:-

“Dear Members of the Chipping Barnet Area Planning Committee,

We write to you as neighbours to the above property, whose owners have applied for permission for a side extension on a driveway that we share with them at 75 Lullington Garth, London N12 7BL, and whose application you will be discussing tomorrow.

Despite strong objections, the officer's report has recommended approval. We are afraid the officer has made a number of significant errors. We enclose a Briefing Note in Response to the Officer's Assessment which brings to light the officer's errors and omissions.

You will see from the photos, plans, and other evidence enclosed in our responses that:

1. The officer has not provided a single precedent on Lullington Garth where shared driveways between semi-detached houses are used for a side extension. The officer refers to no. 83 and 88. In fact, no. 83 has not built a side extension, and no. 88 has an independent and separate driveway.
2. The applicant's plans are not internally consistent, as they assume three different boundary lines in the same shared driveway between no.73 and 75. This makes it impossible to verify that the minimum required 1m gap from the boundary of 75 is maintained. The officer's report is completely silent on this point.
3. The access to the shared driveway is only 4.93m wide, which will be filled up with two cars parked there. This makes safe entry to this shared driveway for no.75 practically impossible on this traffic busy bus route.
4. The applicant's site plan suggests that 9.8m of the length of the driveway will be available for parking up to the new doors of the extension. When measured on site this was less, i.e. c 9.35m. This is whilst for two cars to tandem park a minimum of 9.6m is the standard European requirement.
5. The officer underestimates the significance of surface water run-off (i.e. drainage).

In short, if this application is permitted, it will set a very undesirable precedent in all respects. The officer notes under 5.3 para 2 in his/her assessment that: "the proposal would materially harm the character and appearance of the existing building, the street scene and the wider locality."

We agree entirely with this latter conclusion of the officer, and are surprised by his recommendation."

This page is intentionally left blank