

MEETING

EAST AREA PLANNING SUB-COMMITTEE

DATE AND TIME

WEDNESDAY 6TH NOVEMBER, 2013

AT 7.00 PM

VENUE

HENDON TOWN HALL, THE BURROUGHS, NW4 4BG

TO: MEMBERS OF EAST AREA PLANNING SUB-COMMITTEE (Quorum 3)

Chairman: Councillor Andreas Tambourides (Chairman)

Vice Chairman: Councillor Bridget Perry (Vice-Chairman)

Councillors

Alison Cornelius

Arjun Mittra

Barry Rawlings

Alan Schneiderman

Stephen Sowerby

Andrew Strongolou

Joanna Tambourides

Jim Tierney

Substitute Members

Richard Cornelius

Rowan Quigley Turner

Pauline Coakley Webb

Anne Hutton

David Longstaff

Kath McGuirk

Alison Moore

Robert Rams

Lisa Rutter

Brian Salinger

You are requested to attend the above meeting for which an agenda is attached.

Andrew Nathan – Head of Governance

Governance Services contact: Chidilim Agada 020 8359 2037

chidilim.agada@barnet.gov.uk

Media Relations contact: Sue Cocker 020 8359 7039

ASSURANCE GROUP

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Item No	Title of Report	Pages
1.	Minutes	
2.	Absence of Members (If any)	
3.	Declaration of Members' Disclosable Pecuniary interests and Non Pecuniary interests (If any)	
4.	Public Question Time (If any)	
5.	Members' Items (If any)	
	Report of the Acting Assistant Director of Planning and Development Management	
	High Barnet Ward	
6.	14 Cavendish Road, Barnet, Herts, EN5 4DZ - B/03292/13	1 - 8
	Oakleigh Ward	
7.	11 Oakleigh Park North, London, N20 9AN - TPO/00511/13/B	9 - 18
	Woodhouse Ward	
8.	39 Churchfield Avenue, London, N12 0NS - F/04079/13	19 - 30
9.	Any item(s) the Chairman decides are urgent	

FACILITIES FOR PEOPLE WITH DISABILITIES

Hendon Town Hall has access for wheelchair users including lifts and toilets. If you wish to let us know in advance that you will be attending the meeting, please telephone Chidilim Agada 020 8359 2037 chidilim.agada@barnet.gov.uk. People with hearing difficulties who have a text phone, may telephone our minicom number on 020 8203 8942. All of our Committee Rooms also have induction loops.

FIRE/EMERGENCY EVACUATION PROCEDURE

If the fire alarm sounds continuously, or if you are instructed to do so, you must leave the building by the nearest available exit. You will be directed to the nearest exit by uniformed custodians. It is vital you follow their instructions.

You should proceed calmly; do not run and do not use the lifts.

Do not stop to collect personal belongings

Once you are outside, please do not wait immediately next to the building, but move some distance away and await further instructions.

Do not re-enter the building until told to do so.

AGENDA ITEM 6

LOCATION: 14 Cavendish Road, Barnet, Herts, EN5 4DZ

REFERENCE: B/03292/13 **Received:** 26 July 2013
Accepted: 26 July 2013

WARD(S): High Barnet **Expiry:** 20 September 2013

Final Revisions:

APPLICANT: Mr & Mrs Hill

PROPOSAL: Part single, part two storey side/rear extension including alterations to the front porch. Roof extension including side and a rear dormer windows and a rooflight to facilitate a loft conversion.

RECOMMENDATION: Approve Subject to Conditions

- 1 The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Site Location Plan 01 (Rev B), Block Plan 02 (Rev A), Design & Access Statement, 2013/01-3/3 (Rev C), 11/01-1/05 (Rev L)

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 DM01 of the Adopted Barnet Development Management Policies DPD (2012) and CS NPPF and CS1 of the Adopted Barnet Core Strategy DPD (2012).

- 2 This development must be begun within three years from the date of this permission.

Reason:

To comply with Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act, 2004.

- 3 The materials to be used in the external surfaces of the building(s) shall match those used in the existing building(s).

Reason:

To safeguard the visual amenities of the building and surrounding area in accordance with policies DM01 of the Adopted Barnet Development Management Policies DPD (2012), CS NPPF and CS1 of the Adopted Barnet Core Strategy DPD (2012).

- 4 The roof of the extension hereby permitted shall only be used in connection

with the repair and maintenance of the building and shall at no time be converted to or used as a balcony, roof garden or similar amenity or sitting out area.

Reason:

To ensure that the amenities of the occupiers of adjoining properties are not prejudiced by overlooking in accordance with policy DM01 of the Adopted Barnet Development Management Policies DPD (2012).

- 5 Before the building hereby permitted is occupied the proposed first floor and second floor dormer window(s) in the northern flank elevation facing no. 16 Cavendish Road shall be glazed with obscure glass only and shall be permanently retained as such thereafter and shall be permanently fixed shut with only a fanlight opening.

Reason:

To safeguard the privacy and amenities of occupiers of adjoining residential properties in accordance with policy DM01 of the Adopted Barnet Development Management Policies DPD (2012).

- 6 Notwithstanding the provisions of any development order made under Section 59 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (or any Order revoking and re-enacting that Order) no windows, other than those expressly authorised by this permission, shall be placed at any time in the northern flank elevation, of the extension(s) hereby approved, facing no. 16 Cavendish Road.

Reason:

To safeguard the privacy and amenities of occupiers of adjoining residential properties in accordance with policy DM01 of the Adopted Barnet Development Management Policies DPD (2012).

INFORMATIVE(S):

- 1 i) In accordance with paragraphs 186 and 187 of the NPPF, the Council takes a positive and proactive approach to development proposals, focused on solutions. The Local Planning Authority has produced planning policies and written guidance to guide applicants when submitting applications. These are all available on the Council's website. A pre-application advice service is also offered.
- ii) In this case, no formal pre-application advice was sought prior to submission of the application however amended drawings were submitted by the applicant which resulted in the scheme being made acceptable.

1. MATERIAL CONSIDERATIONS

National Planning Policy Framework

The determination of planning applications is made mindful of Central Government advice and the Local Plan for the area. It is recognised that Local Planning Authorities must determine applications in accordance with the statutory Development Plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise, and that the planning system does not exist to protect the private interests of one person against another.

The 'National Planning Policy Framework' (NPPF) was published on 27 March 2012. This is a key part of the Governments reforms to make the planning system less complex and more accessible, and to promote sustainable growth.

The London Plan is recognised in the NPPF as part of the development plan.

The NPPF states that "good design is a key aspect of sustainable development, is indivisible from good planning, and should contribute positively to making places better for people."

NPPF retains presumption in favour of sustainable development. This applies unless any adverse impacts of a development would "significantly and demonstrably" outweigh the benefits.

The Mayor's London Plan July 2011:

The London Development Plan is the overall strategic plan for London, and it sets out a fully integrated economic, environmental, transport and social framework for the development of the capital to 2031. It forms part of the development plan for Greater London.

The London Plan provides a unified framework for strategies that are designed to ensure that all Londoners benefit from sustainable improvements to their quality of life.

Relevant Local Plan (2012) Policies:

Barnet's Local Plan is made up of a suite of documents including the Core Strategy and Development Management Policies Development Plan Documents (DPD). Both DPDs were adopted on 11th September 2012

Relevant Core Strategy DPD (2012): Policies CS NPPF, CS1, CS5.

Relevant Development Management DPD (2012): Policies DM01, DM02.

Supplementary Planning Documents and Guidance

The Council's Residential Design Guidance SPD 2013 and Sustainable Design and Construction SPD 2012 are now material considerations.

Relevant Planning History:

**Site history for current land parcel :
68045 - 14 Cavendish Road, Barnet, Herts, EN5 4DZ
Case Reference: B/03292/13**

Planning applications picked up in spatial search

Site Address: 14 Cavendish Road Barnet
Application Number: N03067
Application Type: Full Application
Decision: Approve with conditions
Decision Date: 10/01/1972
Appeal Decision: No Appeal Decision Applies
Appeal Decision Date: No Appeal Decision Date exists
Proposal: **single storey rear extension**
Case Officer:

Site Address: 14 Cavendish Road Barnet Herts
Application Number: N03067A
Application Type: Full Application
Decision: Approve with conditions
Decision Date: 01/07/1974
Appeal Decision: No Appeal Decision Applies
Appeal Decision Date: No Appeal Decision Date exists
Proposal: **Front porch.**
Case Officer:

Site Address: 14 Cavendish Road, Barnet, Herts, EN5 4DZ
Application Number: B/01105/13
Application Type: Householder
Decision: Not yet decided
Decision Date: Not yet decided
Appeal Decision: No Appeal Decision Applies
Appeal Decision Date: No Appeal Decision Date exists
Proposal: **Part single, part two-storey side and rear extension. Extension to roof including side and rear dormer window to facilitate a loft conversion.**
Case Officer: Ciaran Regan

Site Address: 14 Cavendish Road, Barnet, Herts, EN5 4DZ
Application Number: B/03292/13
Application Type: Householder
Decision: Not yet decided
Decision Date: Not yet decided
Appeal Decision: No Appeal Decision Applies
Appeal Decision Date: No Appeal Decision Date exists
Proposal: **Part single, part two storey side/rear extension including alterations to the front porch. Roof extension including side and a rear dormer windows and a rooflight to facilitate a loft conversion.**
Case Officer: Malachy McGovern

Consultations and Views Expressed:

Neighbours Consulted: 17 Replies: 11

Neighbours Wishing To Speak 1

The objections can be summarised as follows:

1. Out of character with the surrounding area
2. Loss of light
3. Overlooking and loss of privacy
4. Risk of structural damage
5. Out of scale and appearance with neighbouring properties
6. Boundary walls compromised
7. Further pressure on parking

The scheme has been revised on three occasions with the final proposal having a side and rear dormer of different design and reduced size, and a side extension with a set-back of 50cm from the front building line. The final proposal is considered below.

2. PLANNING APPRAISAL

Site Description and Surroundings:

The application site comprises a two-storey, semi-detached dwelling house located on the eastern side of Cavendish Road.

The neighbouring property no. 12 Cavendish Road benefits from a two storey side extension with hipped roof form similar to that being proposed by the applicant.

The property is not a Listed Building and is not located within a Conservation Area.

Dimensions:

The proposed two-storey side addition would be 2.5 metres at ground level, and would run the entire depth of the main building with an additional 3 metre rear projection incorporated into the ground floor rear addition. At first floor level, the side addition would be 1.5 metres wide so as to leave a 1 metre gap from the neighbouring boundary.

The proposed ground floor rear extension would be the full width of the resultant building and approximately 3 metres deep with a flat roof.

The proposed side dormer would be approximately 1.9 metres wide and 1.4 metres high. The proposed rear dormer would be 2.4 metres wide and 1.7 metres high. Both additions would be positioned centrally within their respective roof slopes.

Planning Considerations:

The main issue in this case are considered to be covered under two main areas:

- The living conditions of neighbouring residents;
- Whether harm would be caused to the character and appearance of the area and street scene, having regard to the size and siting of the proposal.

The Council's approach to extensions as set out in Policy DM01 is to minimise their impact on the local environment and to ensure that occupiers of new developments as well as neighbouring occupiers enjoy a high standard of amenity.

Policy DM01 of the Development Management Policies (Adopted) 2012 states that all development should represent high quality design and should be designed to allow for adequate daylight, sunlight, privacy and outlook for adjoining occupiers.

Policy DM02 states that where appropriate, development will be expected to demonstrate compliance to minimum amenity standards and that development makes a positive contribution to the borough. The development standards set out in Policy DM02: Development Standards are regarded as key for Barnet to deliver the highest standards of urban design.

The Council's Residential Design Guidance SPD 2013 states that extensions should normally be subordinate to the original house, respect the original building and should not be overly dominant.

The proposals would comply with the aforementioned policies and Council Design Guidance on Extensions to Houses and would be a proportionate addition to the dwelling house. It would have an acceptable impact on the character and appearance of the street scene, site property, general locality and the residential amenity of neighbouring occupiers.

Design:

The proposed side extension would be less than half the width of the original house, set in approximately 1 metre from the neighbouring boundary at first floor level and set back 50 cm from the front building line at first floor level to match the adjoining semi. The addition would have a matching hipped roof set 0.4m below the ridge of the main building. The extension is of an appropriate scale and form and is acceptable in design terms.

The proposed ground floor rear extension would be the full width of the resultant house and 3 metres deep incorporating the ground floor side element. The extension would rise to a maximum height of 2.8 metres with a flat roof which is acceptable.

The proposed side dormer and rear dormers would be proportionate additions which would sit comfortably within the roof slopes, being approximately half the height and width of the roof plane. The additions would be of an appropriate scale and form and are acceptable in design terms.

The applicant has not indicated the choice of external materials however materials to match the existing building can be secured by condition.

Neighbouring Amenity:

It is not considered that the proposed extensions would cause any material reduction in light or outlook given the marginal scale and separation distance from neighbouring properties. The proposed first floor side addition would be set in one metre from the neighbouring dwelling no. 16 at first floor level and a 2 metre gap would remain between the properties. The proposed ground floor rear extension would be a similar height as the addition to the adjoining semi which is acceptable.

The proposed first floor flank window and flank dormer window should be obscure glazed to overcome any privacy concerns and this can be secured by condition.

3. COMMENTS ON GROUNDS OF OBJECTIONS

Generally addressed above however it is advised that concerns regarding potential construction damage to neighbouring properties or encroachment of development are private civil matters and not planning matters which can be considered by the Council.

It is not considered that the proposal would have any adverse impact on street parking as suggested as there would be no intensification of the existing residential use.

4. EQUALITIES AND DIVERSITY ISSUES

The proposals do not conflict with either Barnet Council's Equalities Policy or the commitments set in our Equality Scheme and supports the council in meeting its statutory equality responsibilities.

5. CONCLUSION

Having taken all material considerations into account, it is considered that subject to compliance with the attached conditions, this proposal complies with the Adopted Barnet Local Plan policies and guidance and would be in keeping with the character and appearance of the surrounding area. It is not considered to have a detrimental impact on the residential amenities of neighbouring occupiers. This application is therefore recommended for APPROVAL.

SITE LOCATION PLAN: 14 Cavendish Road, Barnet, Herts, EN5 4DZ

REFERENCE: B/03292/13



Reproduced by permission of Ordnance Survey on behalf of HMSO. © Crown copyright and database right 2013. All rights reserved. Ordnance Survey Licence number LA100017674.

COMMITTEE REPORT

LOCATION: 11 Oakleigh Park North, London, N20 9AN

REFERENCE: TPO/00511/13/B **Received:** 15 August 2013
WARD: Oakleigh **Expiry:** 10 October 2013
CONSERVATION AREA None

APPLICANT: Marishal Thompson and Co

PROPOSAL: 1 x Horse Chestnut (T2 Applicant's Plan) – Remove. Standing in Group G60 of Tree Preservation Order.

RECOMMENDATION:

That Members of the Planning Sub-Committee determine the appropriate action in respect of the proposed felling of 1 x Horse Chestnut (applicant's ref T2), Standing in Group G60 of Tree Preservation Order, either:

REFUSE CONSENT for the following reason:

The loss of the tree of special amenity value is not justified as a remedy for the alleged subsidence damage on the basis of the information provided.

Or:

APPROVE SUBJECT TO CONDITIONS

1. The species, size and siting of the replacement tree(s) shall be agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority and the tree(s) shall be planted within 12 months 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 1 new tree(s) are established in growth.

Reason: To maintain the visual amenities of the area.

2. Within 3 months of the commencement of the approved treatment (either wholly or in part) the applicant shall inform the Local Planning Authority in writing that the work has / is being undertaken.

Reason: To maintain the visual amenities of the area.

Consultations

Date of Press and Site Notices: 26th September 2013

Consultees:

Neighbours consulted: 9

Replies: 0

MATERIAL CONSIDERATIONS

Relevant Recent Planning History:

TREN09629B - Horse Chestnut - 30% crown density thin and lifting lower branches clear of footpath.

- Conditional approval 17th November 1993

N09629C/99/TRE - Horse Chestnut - Thinning by 20%, standing in G60 of Tree Preservation Order.

- Conditional approval 31st January 2000

N09629D/00/TRE - Horsechestnut - Thin by 20%.standing in group G60 of TPO.

- Withdrawn 17th March 2000

N09629E/05/TRE - Horse Chestnut - Reduce by approx 20-25%, thin out, deadwood, reshape, remove epicormic growth. Standing in Group G60 of Tree Preservation Order.

- Conditional approval 14th December 2005

TPO/00509/13/B - 1 x Horse Chestnut (T2 Applicants Plan) - Reduce to most recent previous points of reduction and lift to 5M. Standing in Group G60 of Tree Preservation Order

- Conditional approval 24th October 2013

PLANNING APPRAISAL

1. Introduction

This application has been submitted by Marishal Thompson and Co acting as agent on behalf of Infront Innovation a "subsidence claims management company" dealing with a case of alleged subsidence at 11 Oakleigh Park North, London, N20 9AN.

The application was initially submitted on the 20th May 2013. However, it was incomplete and additional supporting documentation/clarification was requested by the Council. All of the mandatory information was received on the 15th August 2013 and the application was therefore registered on that date.

The Tree Preservation Order was made on the 12th June 1969 and includes 4 trees at 11 Oakleigh Park North - 1 group (designated G60) consisting of 1 Thorn and 1 Horse Chestnut and 2 individually designated trees, 1 Crab Apple (T92) and 1 x Horse Chestnut (T93). Of the four TPO trees originally growing at the property only the subject Chestnut remains.

In addition to submitting this current application for the removal of the Chestnut (T2 of the applicant's plan), the agent (Marishal Thompson and Co) also submitted a separate application to reduce the tree to the most recent previous points of reduction and lift to 5M – which was granted conditional approval on the 24th October 2013 (TPO/00509/13/B).

2. Appraisal

Trees and Amenity Value

The subject Chestnut stands adjacent to the left hand (when viewed from the roadway) corner of the front boundary. Oakleigh Park North does not have any street trees and as such the large roadside trees growing within the front gardens of the residential properties (such as the subject Chestnut, which is one of the largest trees adjacent to the road) contribute significantly to the character and appearance of the area by helping to screen and soften the urban appearance of the dwellings. The subject Chestnut is highly visible and prominent from along the roadway and an estimate of its age suggests that it predates the construction of the house at 11 Oakleigh Park North and would have formed part of the original landscaping for the site.

About 15/16 metres in height it is a mature tree. The tree has been previously pollarded at about 6/7 metres and there has been significant regrowth from this treatment with the tree having grown out of that pollarding regime. The tree has been subsequently lifted, thinned and reduced and there has been vigorous regrowth. The tree has dense foliage – which is browning due to infection by Horse Chestnut Leaf Miner. Ivy growing up the trunk to a height of about 6/7 metres made close inspection of the trunk difficult (as did the dense regrowth from previous lifting treatment). However, there did not appear to be any major structural faults apparent.

The application

This application submitted by Marishal Thompson and Co was registered on the 15th August 2013. The reasons given for the proposed removal of this Horse Chestnut (T2 of the applicant's plan) cited on the application form are:

- 1. The tree works are proposed to stop the influence of the tree(s) on the soil below building foundation level and provide long term stability.*
- 2. Estimated costs of repair to the building are £50,000 if the influence of the tree(s) remain and £4,500 if the proposed tree works are allowed to proceed. Granting permission will limit these costs. In the event of a refusal we, or our clients, will seek to secure compensation for the additional costs incurred through Section 202(e)*
- 3. It is the expert opinion of both the case engineer and arboriculturalist that on the balance of probabilities the supporting information demonstrates the influence of the tree(s).*

The agent has submitted various documentary evidence in support of this application. In addition the owner of the property has also submitted a "Preliminary Structural Engineering Report on Alleged Subsidence Damage" dated January 2011 by Halstead Associates in support of the application. All of this information has been assessed by the Council's Structural Engineer who has commented as follows:

Trees

The Marishal Thompson report shows the locations trees of around the property. Their report shows; the Horse Chestnut tree T2 at a distance of 11m from the building and 19m high, the Ivy CG1 next to the building and 3m high, three Cypress trees TG1 at a distance

of 6.42m from the building and 10.5m high, Ash tree T1 approximately 27m from the building and 21m high.

The other trees indicated are Ash TG3 and Cypress TG2.

The Cypress trees TG1 were removed on the 16/8/11.

The Horse Chestnut tree is noted as being significantly older than the building.

Damage

The damage is to the rear left hand side corner. The damage was first discovered in 1997, a Leyland tree was removed and 50% reduction to a yew tree following which the building stabilised and superstructure repairs were undertaken.

There is no Yew tree on the latest plan therefore this also appears to have been removed.

Damage re-occurred in December 2010.

The damage consists of cracks up to 4mm wide and is classified as category 2 damage in accordance with BRE Digest 251.

Subsoil investigations

Mat Lab carried out a subsoil investigation on 11/3/11. This consisted of a trial pit and borehole to the left hand side of the property.

Results of the investigation were as follows;

1. The foundations are 1000mm deep.
2. Firm/stiff brown Clay was encountered for the full depth of the borehole.
3. Roots extend to 4.0m depth.
4. Horse Chestnut and Cypress tree roots identified to 4.0m depth.

Soil Testing

The soil analysis results indicate the clay soil to have a medium to high shrink potential and the soil tests are not conclusive with regard to desiccation.

A ground heave prediction has not been undertaken however according to the oedometer test results the surface heave potential at the borehole location is 0mm to 20mm.

Monitoring

Level monitoring has been carried out from 14/10/11 to 2/4/13. An independent stable datum has not been used, instead location 1 on the front right hand corner has been relied upon to compare movement in the rest of the building. Location 1 is unlikely to be fully stable as the adjacent monitoring point 14 exhibits 4mm of movement.

Between 4/10/11 and 30/8/12 the monitoring indicates a significant upward movement along the left hand side flank wall, up to 12mm at the rear corner. This appears to be recovery (ground heave) of the soil following the removal of the Cypress trees opposite the flank wall. Thereafter the movement is relatively small, 2mm to 3mm.

The monitoring results are not consistent with seasonal movement and appear to reflect ground heave to the left hand side of the house following removal of the Cypress trees. The small movement recorded after 30/8/12 may be due to the minor effect of other nearby vegetation and/or not using an independent stable datum.

Drainage

No drain survey was provided, however the drains were re-lined as part of the 1997 repairs and the trial pit and borehole was dry.

Conclusion

The site investigation results indicate recovery of the soil (ground heave) to the left hand side of the house following removal of the Cypress trees.

The small movement recorded after 30/8/12 may be due to the minor effect of other nearby vegetation and/or not using an independent stable datum.

Roots have been found below the foundations and were identified as Cypress and Horse Chestnut roots. Although no roots from the Ivy were identified beneath the foundations, it is possible that these and the Horse Chestnut tree are having a minor influence on the foundations.

The fact that the focal point of the damage is the rear corner of the house and the Horse Chestnut is located opposite the front of the house would suggest the tree is a contributory factor in the damage, otherwise more damage would be observed at the front of the house.

Given that the Horse Chestnut tree T2 significantly predates the property, a heave assessment of all properties within the influence zone of the Horse Chestnut tree should be undertaken before the tree is considered for removal."

The damage consists of cracking in the flank wall of the rear left hand side (when viewed from the roadway) of the property. The reports submitted in support of this application note the cracks to be between 2 and 5mm in width – which corresponds to category 2 damage in accordance with the BRE Digest 251.

BRE Digest 251 *Assessment of damage in low-rise buildings* includes a 'Classification of visible damage to walls with particular reference to ease of repair of plaster and brickwork or masonry'. It describes category 2 damage as "*Cracks easily filled. Recurrent cracks can be masked by suitable linings. Cracks not necessarily visible externally; some external repointing may be required to ensure weather-tightness. Doors and windows may stick and require easing and adjusting. Typical crack widths up to 5mm.*" The BRE Digest concludes "Category 2 defines the stage above which repair work requires the services of a builder. For domestic dwellings, which constitute the majority of cases, damage at or below Category 2 does not normally justify remedial work other than restoration of the appearance of the building. For the cause of damage at this level to be accurately identified it may be necessary to conduct detailed examinations of the structure, its materials, the foundations and the local clear ground conditions. Consequently, unless there are clear indications that damage is progressing to a higher level it may be expensive and inappropriate to carry out extensive work for what amounts to aesthetic damage."

The Council's Structural Engineer has noted that "*The soil analysis results indicate the clay soil to have a medium to high shrink potential and the soil tests are not conclusive with regard to desiccation.*" It should be noted that the report containing the soils analysis

is dated 8th April 2011 and that the soil sample(s) that were tested date were taken on the 22nd March 2011.

The report by Marishal Thompson Group dated 10th May 2013 (submitted by the agent in support of this application) notes that a group of Cypress trees listed as TG1 of the applicant's plan and growing adjacent to the area of damage was removed on the 16th August 2011.

The Council's Structural Engineer has noted that the level monitoring results between 4th October 2011 and 30th August 2012 show a significant upward movement which *"appears to be recovery (ground heave) of the soil following the removal of the Cypress trees [TG1 of the applicant's plan]... The small movement recorded after 30/8/12 may be due to the minor effect of other nearby vegetation and/or not using an independent stable datum."*

Roots analysis of the soil sample(s) taken on the 22nd March 2011 found Cypress and Horse Chestnut tree roots below the depth of the foundations. The group of Cypress (TG1 of the applicant's plan) have since been removed. The Council's Structural Engineer has advised that *"it is possible that these [roots from adjacent Ivy] and the Horse Chestnut tree are having a minor influence on the foundations."*

As noted above there is an extant consent to undertake pruning treatment to the Horse Chestnut. Given the importance of the Chestnut, it may be considered appropriate to undertake the treatment consented under application TPO/00509/13/B then monitor the impact of the action prior to assessing whether further action such as cyclical pruning or felling the Chestnut would be justifiable / necessary.

Given that the monitoring data indicates a recovery following the removal of the Cypress (TG1 of the applicant's plan) and that the relatively small movement measured thereafter could be due to *"not using an independent stable datum,"* and that the damage is assessed as BRE Category 2, it may be questioned whether the proposed removal of the TPO Chestnut at this juncture is excessive / premature.

3. Legislative background

Government guidance advises that when determining the application the Council should (1) assess the amenity value of the tree and the likely impact of the proposal on the amenity of the area, and (2) in the light of that assessment, consider whether or not the proposal is justified, having regard to the reasons put forward in support of it. It should also consider whether any loss or damage is likely to arise if consent is refused or granted subject to conditions.

The Town and Country Planning (Tree Preservation) (England) Regulations 2012 provide that compensation is payable for loss or damage in consequence of refusal of consent or grant subject to conditions. The provisions include that compensation shall be payable to a person for loss or damage which, having regard to the application and the documents and particulars accompanying it, was reasonably foreseeable when consent was refused or was granted subject to conditions. In accordance with the 2012 Regulations, it is not possible to issue an Article 5 Certificate confirming that the tree is considered to have

'outstanding' or 'special' amenity value which would remove the Council's liability under the Order to pay compensation for loss or damage incurred as a result of its decision.

In this case the applicant has indicated that "the estimated repair costs are likely to vary between £4,500 and £50,000 depending upon whether the tree can be removed or has to remain."

The Court has held that the proper test in claims for alleged tree-related property damage was whether the tree roots were the 'effective and substantial' cause of the damage or alternatively whether they 'materially contributed to the damage'. The standard is 'on the balance of probabilities' rather than the criminal test of 'beyond all reasonable doubt'.

In accordance with the Tree Preservation legislation, the Council must either approve or refuse the application i.e. proposed felling. However, it may be noted that consent has recently been granted for pruning of the tree.

If it is considered that the amenity value of the tree is so high that the proposed felling is not justified on the basis of the reason put forward together with the supporting documentary evidence, such that TPO consent is refused, there may be liability to pay compensation. It is to be noted that the Council's Structural Engineer suggests that upward movement may be heave following the removal of the Cypress trees (TG1 of the applicant's plan), but that the Horse Chestnut may have "*a minor influence on the foundations.*" The Council's Structural Engineer has also raised concern that a stable datum was not used for the level monitoring.

The compensation liability arises for loss or damage in consequence of a refusal of consent or grant subject to conditions - a direct causal link has to be established between the decision giving rise to the claim and the loss or damage claimed for (having regard to the application and the documents and particulars accompanying it). Thus the cost of rectifying any damage that occurs before the date of the decision would not be subject of a compensation payment.

If it is concluded that the pruning treatment approved under reference TPO/00509/13/B would address the problem, or if the damage was attributable to other causes; it may be argued that loss or damage would not be in consequence of a refusal of TPO consent to fell.

However, if it is concluded on the balance of probabilities that the Horse Chestnut's roots are the 'effective and substantial' cause of the damage or alternatively whether they 'materially contributed to the damage' and that the damage would only be addressed by the tree's removal, there is likely to be a compensation liability (the applicant indicates repair works would be an extra £45,500 if the tree is retained) if consent for the proposed felling is refused.

COMMENTS ON THE GROUNDS OF OBJECTION

N/A.

EQUALITIES AND DIVERSITY ISSUES

The Equality Act 2010 (the Act) came into force in April 2011. The general duty on public bodies requires the Council to have due regard to the need to eliminate discrimination and

promote equality in relation to those with protected characteristics such as race, disability, and gender including gender reassignment, religion or belief, sex, pregnancy or maternity and foster good relations between different groups when discharging its functions.

The Council have considered the Act but do not believe that the application would have a significant impact on any of the groups as noted in the Act.

CONCLUSION

This application is for the proposed removal of the Horse Chestnut because of its alleged implication in subsidence damage to that property.

The proposed felling of the Horse Chestnut would be significantly detrimental to the streetscene.

The Council's Structural Engineer has assessed the supporting documentary evidence and has noted that the level monitoring results suggest that upward movement may be heave following the removal of the Cypress trees (TG1 applicant's plan), but that the Horse Chestnut may have a minor influence, although *"the small movement recorded after 30/8/12 may be due to the minor effect of other nearby vegetation and/or not using an independent stable datum."*

Bearing in mind the potential implications for the public purse, as well as the public amenity value of the tree and its importance to the character and appearance of Oakleigh Park North, it is necessary to consider whether or not the proposed felling is justified as a remedy for the alleged subsidence damage on the basis of the information provided, particularly in the light of the Structural Engineers' concerns about the recovery noted following the removal of the Cypress trees and the extant permission to undertake pruning treatment to the Horse Chestnut subject of this application.

The Council must decide whether it is prepared to refuse consent to the proposed removal of the tree and face a possible compensation claim potentially in excess of £45,500 or allow the removal of the tree subject to replacement planting.

This page is intentionally left blank

AGENDA ITEM 8

LOCATION: 39 Churchfield Avenue, London, N12 0NS
REFERENCE: F/04079/13 **Received:** 09 September 2013
WARD(S): Woodhouse **Accepted:** 09 September 2013
Expiry: 04 November 2013

Final Revisions:

APPLICANT: Redshaws Ltd.

PROPOSAL: Demolition of existing building and erection of a two-storey building with 5 self-contained flats. Associated amenity space and refuse store. (Outline application)

RECOMMENDATION: Approve Subject to Conditions

- 1 The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 258.ST.01 rev A, 258.P.01, 258.P.02 rev E and Design and Access Statement.

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 DM01 of the Adopted Barnet Development Management Policies DPD (2012) and CS NPPF and CS1 of the Adopted Barnet Core Strategy DPD (2012).

- 2 Application for the approval of the reserved matters must be made before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.

Reason:

To comply with Section 92 of the Town and Country Planning Act, 1990.

- 3 The development to which this permission relates must be begun not later than two years from the final approval of the reserved matters or, in the case of approval on different dates, the final approval of the last such matter to be approved.

Reason:

To comply with Section 92 of the Town and Country Planning Act, 1990.

- 4 Details of landscaping shall be approved by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be implemented in accordance with such details as approved.

Reason:

To ensure that the proposed development does not prejudice the appearance of the locality, the flow of traffic and conditions of general safety

on the adjacent highway or the enjoyment of neighbouring occupiers of their properties.

- 5 Before this development is commenced, details of the levels of the building(s), road(s) and footpath(s) in relation to adjoining land and highway(s) and any other changes proposed in the levels of the site shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be implemented in accordance with such details as approved.

Reason:

To ensure that the development is carried out at suitable levels in relation to the highway and adjoining land having regard to drainage, gradient of access, the safety and amenities of users of the site, the amenities of the area and the health of any trees or vegetation in accordance with policies DM01 and DM04 of the Adopted Barnet Development Management Policies DPD (2012), CS NPPF, CS1, CS5 and CS7 of the Adopted Barnet Core Strategy DPD (2012) and 7.4, 7.5, 7.6 and 7.21 of the London Plan 2011.

- 6 Before the development hereby permitted commences, details of the materials to be used for the external surfaces of the building(s) and hard surfaced areas shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be implemented in accordance with such details as approved.

Reason:

To safeguard the character and visual amenities of the site and wider area and to ensure that the building is constructed in accordance with policies DM01 of the Adopted Barnet Development Management Policies DPD (2012), CS NPPF and CS1 of the Adopted Barnet Core Strategy DPD (2012) and 1.1, 7.4, 7.5 and 7.6 of the London Plan 2011.

- 7 Before the development hereby permitted is brought into use or occupied the site shall be enclosed except at the permitted points of access in accordance with details previously submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason:

To ensure that the proposed development does not prejudice the appearance of the locality and/or the amenities of occupiers of adjoining residential properties and to confine access to the permitted points in the interest of the flow of traffic and conditions of general safety on the adjoining highway in accordance with policies DM01, DM03, DM17 of the Adopted Barnet Development Management Policies DPD (2012), CS NPPF and CS1 of the Adopted Barnet Core Strategy DPD (2012).

- 8 Before the development hereby permitted commences, details of enclosures and screened facilities for the storage of recycling containers and wheeled refuse bins or other refuse storage containers where applicable, together with a satisfactory point of collection shall be submitted to and approved in

writing by the Local Planning Authority and shall be provided at the site in accordance with the approved details before the development is occupied.

Reason:

To ensure a satisfactory appearance for the development and satisfactory accessibility; and to protect the amenities of the area in accordance with policies DM01 of the Adopted Barnet Development Management Policies DPD (2012) and CS14 of the Adopted Barnet Core Strategy DPD (2012).

- 9 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 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 Adopted Barnet Development Management Policies DPD (2012).

- 10 Before the development hereby permitted is occupied, details of the subdivision of the amenity area(s) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, implemented and retained as such on site thereafter.

Reason:

To ensure that the development does not prejudice the amenity of future occupiers or the character of the area in accordance with policies DM01 and DM02 of the Adopted Barnet Development Management Policies DPD (2012).

- 11 The property shall be used as self-contained units as shown on the hereby approved drawings under Class C3 (a) and no other purpose (including any other purpose in Class C3 or C4 of the Schedule to the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 1987, or in any provision equivalent to that Class in any statutory instrument revoking and re-enacting that Order, with or without modification).

Reason:

To enable the Local Planning Authority to exercise control of the type of use within the category in order to safeguard the amenities of the area.

- 12 Prior to the occupation of the units, copies of Pre-completion Sound Insulation Test Certificates shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority, confirming compliance with Requirement E of the Building Regulations 2010 (or any subsequent amendment in force at the time of implementation of the permission).

Reason:

To protect the amenities of future and neighbouring residential occupiers in

accordance with policy DM02 and DM04 of the Adopted Barnet Development Management Policies DPD (2012).

- 13 The dwelling(s) shall achieve a Code Level 4 in accordance with the Code for Sustainable Homes Technical Guide (October 2008) (or such national measure of sustainability for house design that replaces that scheme). No dwelling shall be occupied until a Final Code Certificate has been issued certifying that Code Level 4 has been achieved and this certificate has been submitted to and approved by the local planning authority.

Reason:

To ensure that the development is sustainable and complies with Strategic and Local Policies in accordance with policy DM02 of the Adopted Barnet Development Management Policies DPD (2012), the adopted Sustainable Design and Construction Supplementary Planning Document (June 2007) and policies 5.2 and 5.3 of the London Plan (2011).

- 14 All new residential dwellings within the development hereby approved shall be constructed to meet and achieve the 'Lifetime Homes' standard.

Reason:

To ensure the development meets the needs of its future occupiers and to comply with the requirements of policy DM02 of the Adopted Barnet Development Management Policies DPD (2012) and policies 3.8 and 7.2 of the London Plan 2011.

INFORMATIVE(S):

- 1 i) In accordance with paragraphs 186 and 187 of the NPPF, the Council takes a positive and proactive approach to development proposals, focused on solutions. The Local Planning Authority has produced planning policies and written guidance to guide applicants when submitting applications. These are all available on the Council's website. A pre-application advice service is also offered. The Local Planning Authority has negotiated with the applicant / agent where necessary during the application process to ensure that the proposed development is in accordance with the Council's relevant policies and guidance.
- 2 The Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) applies to all 'chargeable development'. This is defined as development of one or more additional units, and / or an increase to existing floor space of more than 100 sq m. Details of how the calculations work are provided in guidance documents on the Planning Portal at www.planningportal.gov.uk/cil.

The Mayor of London adopted a CIL charge on 1st April 2012 setting a rate of £35 per sq m on all forms of development in Barnet except for education and health developments which are exempt from this charge. Your planning application has been assessed at this time as liable for a £5,656 payment under Mayoral CIL.

The London Borough of Barnet adopted a CIL charge on 1st May 2013 setting a rate of £135 per sq m on residential and retail development in its area of authority. All other uses and ancillary car parking are exempt from this charge. Your planning application has therefore been assessed at this time as liable for a £21,816 payment under Barnet CIL.

Liability for CIL will be recorded to the register of Local Land Charges as a legal charge upon your site payable should you commence development. Receipts of the Mayoral CIL charge are collected by the London Borough of Barnet on behalf of the Mayor of London; receipts are passed across to Transport for London to support Crossrail, London's highest infrastructure priority.

If affordable housing or charitable relief applies to your development then this may reduce the final amount you are required to pay; such relief must be applied for prior to commencement of development using the 'Claiming Exemption or Relief' form available from the Planning Portal website: www.planningportal.gov.uk/cil.

You will be sent a 'Liability Notice' that provides full details of the charge and to whom it has been apportioned for payment. If you wish to identify named parties other than the applicant for this permission as the liable party for paying this levy, please submit to the Council an 'Assumption of Liability' notice, which is also available from the Planning Portal website.

The Community Infrastructure Levy becomes payable upon commencement of development. You are required to submit a 'Notice of Commencement' to the Council's CIL Team prior to commencing on site, and failure to provide such information at the due date will incur both surcharges and penalty interest. There are various other charges and surcharges that may apply if you fail to meet other statutory requirements relating to CIL, such requirements will all be set out in the Liability Notice you will receive. You may wish to seek professional planning advice to ensure that you comply fully with the requirements of CIL Regulations.

If you have a specific question or matter you need to discuss with the CIL team, or you fail to receive a 'Liability Notice' from the Council within 1 month of this grant of planning permission, please email us: cil@barnet.gov.uk.

1. MATERIAL CONSIDERATIONS

National Planning Policy Framework

The Mayor's London Plan: July 2011 3.4 and 3.5

Core Strategy (Adoption version) 2012 CS NPPF, CS1, CS5

Development Management Policies (Adoption version) 2012 DM01, DM02, DM04,

DM08, DM17.

Supplementary Planning Document (2013) Residential Design Guidance and Sustainable Design and Construction

Relevant Planning History:

Application:	Planning	Number:	F/00556/13
Validated:	15/02/2013	Type:	APO
Status:	DEC	Date:	03/04/2013
Summary:	REF	Case Officer:	Jo Dowling
Description:	Demolition of existing house and erection of a two-storey building comprising 5x self-contained flats. Associated amenity space and refuse store. (Outline application - landscaping reserved)		

Application:	Planning	Number:	F/03792/12
Validated:	11/10/2012	Type:	APO
Status:	APD	Date:	19/08/2013
Summary:	DIS	Case Officer:	Jo Dowling
Description:	Demolition of existing house and erection of a two-storey building comprising 5x self-contained flats. Associated amenity space and refuse store. (Outline application - landscaping reserved)		

Consultations and Views Expressed:

Neighbours Consulted: 73 Replies: 5
Neighbours Wishing To Speak 0

The objections raised may be summarised as follows:

- Changing the property from a single family dwelling to flats will cause problems on this busy road which is used as a cut through.
- No parking is proposed and up to 10 cars could be trying to park on the road. In the evening there are not enough parking spaces.
- Disruption from demolition and construction.
- There are a number of disabled residents.
- Out of character.
- Contrary to Policies DM01(h) and DM01(i).

A petition of 95 signatures has been received objecting to the proposal on the following grounds:

- Overdevelopment of the site.
- Loss of a single family dwelling unit detrimental to the prevailing character of this locality and would be harmful to the amenity of the area.
- It would exacerbate existing parking problems on the street.
- The street is used by children to reach schools and nearby colleges, the additional traffic will cause a hazard to these users.
- There are regular incidence's of road rage in the street due to the narrowness of the road.
- Increase in noise and disturbance.

The Finchley Society has made the following comments:

- Two flats at 51sqm and two flats at 53sqm are against the LBB minimum of 50sqm and indicates overcrowding.
- Flats will be unpleasant to live in.
- No parking means that the residents cars will be on the road.

Internal /Other Consultations:

Traffic and Transport - No objection

Date of Site Notice: 19 September 2013

2. PLANNING APPRAISAL

Site Description and Surroundings:

39 Churchfield Avenue is a two storey, double fronted end of terraced property located on the north side of Churchfield Avenue close to the junction with Woodhouse Road. The property has a single storey side extension that forms a garage for the property. The property is in a poor state of repair with the front and rear garden overgrown and the garage beginning to decay. The property is currently a 3 bed, single family dwelling unit.

Churchfield Avenue is characterised by Edwardian terraced properties which are predominantly family homes. Due to the short front garden depths, with the exception of no. 45 which has a return frontage, there is no off street parking in the road. A Controlled Parking Zone operates in the area.

Due to its proximity to North Finchley town centre the site has a PTAL rating of 3.

Proposal:

The application is an outline application for the demolition of the existing property and replacement with a two storey building comprising 5 self contained flats. Associated amenity space and refuse store.

The only matter reserved for consideration is landscaping.

The proposed building would extend across the full width of the plot and would be set 0.2m off the boundary with No.41. The proposed building would line through with the front elevation of No.37 and project rearward 9m. A two storey central projecting element is proposed on the rear elevation. This would be set 2.3m off the boundary with No.37 and 2.6m off the boundary with No.41. Dormer windows are proposed in the rear roofslope and rooflights in the front roofslope. A ridged roof with gable end is proposed.

5, one bedroom flats are proposed of the following sizes:

Unit	Floorspace
A	51sqm

B	51sqm
C	53sqm
D	53sqm
E	59sqm

A rear garden would provide shared amenity space of 72sqm which would be accessed directly from the bedrooms of flats A and B and from a communal rear door for the remaining three flats.

5 individual bin stores would be located adjacent to the entrance from the street.

No off street parking is proposed, 5 cycle parking spaces are proposed in the rear garden.

Planning Considerations:

The main consideration in determining this application is the difference between the current scheme; the previous refusal and the direction given by the Inspectors decision letter.

Two similar applications (our ref: F/03792/12 and F/00556/13) were refused planning consent for the following reasons:

1. The proposed development by reason of the number and type of units proposed would represent an overdevelopment of the site and result in the loss of a family dwelling unit detrimental to the prevailing character of the locality, harmful to the amenity of the area and contrary to policies DM01, DM02 and DM08 of the Adopted Development Management Policies 2012 and Draft Supplementary Planning Document Sustainable Design and Construction and Residential Design Guidance.
2. The proposal would result in an intensification of the use and noise generating activities at the site such as residents entering and exiting the site and parking on the surrounding road network that would result in an increase in noise and activities that would be out of character with the surrounding area to the detriment of the amenity of occupiers of the adjoining residential properties contrary to Policies DM01 and DM04 of the adopted Local Plan.
3. The proposal would provide substandard accommodation which would be detrimental to the amenity of future residents and fails to meet the requirements of the adopted Local Plan contrary to Policy DM02.

The applicant appealed F/03792/12 and the Inspector dismissed the appeal.

The Inspector highlighted three areas for consideration:

- The character and appearance of the area, having regard to the loss of a family size dwelling and the type and number of units proposed;
- the living conditions of neighbouring residents having regard to the use of the building and associated activities, and
- whether or not acceptable living conditions would be provided for the intended future occupiers of the proposed flats having regard to their size and outlook.

Dealing with each of these in turn:

Character and Appearance

The Inspector concluded that although the proposal would result in the loss of a single family dwelling unit given the character of the area and the presence of other converted properties within the street the proposal would not prejudice the objectives of Policy DM08 of the Local Plan. They also concluded that the proposed flats and bin storage area would not be harmful to the character and appearance of the area as the proposed new building has been designed to reflect other properties within the street and that the street was characterised by small front gardens where bins were stored. As a result they felt that there would be no conflict with the objectives of Policy DM01 of the Local Plan which requires proposals to preserve or enhance the local character. Moreover, the proposal would not undermine the core principles of the NPPF. They concluded that the building would sit comfortably within the streetscene, so avoiding harm to the character or appearance of the area.

The current scheme is the same as was previously submitted and as a result given the conclusions reached by the Inspector it is not considered that the application could be refused on the basis that it would be out of character with the surrounding area.

The proposal is considered to be in accordance with the NPPF and policy DM01 of the adopted Local Plan.

Living conditions for existing residents

The Inspector concluded that the use of the flats and future vehicle movements associated with them would not be harmful to the living conditions of neighbouring residents and therefore found no conflict with Policies DM01 and DM04 of the adopted Local Plan. As the layout and number of units would remain the same as that considered at appeal the proposal is not considered to adversely impact on the amenity of adjoining residents for the reasons outlined by the Inspector to such a level as to warrant a refusal.

Living conditions for future occupiers

Although the appeal scheme was for the same number of units, the proposed units were smaller and fell below the minimum floorspaces standards required by the London Plan. The current scheme amends the layout of the flats so that they all have a GIA of over 50sqm and are thus considered to comply with the requirements of Policy 3.5 of the London Plan.

The Inspector also raised concerns about the layout of the top floor flat (flat E) as although it did comply with the London Plan space standards it was laid out in such a way that the main living accommodation was located at the front of the property and would have been served by three rooflights. As a result the Inspector considered that the outlook for future occupiers of this unit was unacceptable. The layout of the top floor flat has been redesigned so that the living accommodation would be at the

rear of the property and would have the benefit of two dormer windows which would provide both outlook and light to the living room and kitchen.

The proposals are therefore considered to provide suitable living conditions for future residents and would be in accordance with Policy 3.5 of the London Plan and Policy DM02 of the adopted Local Plan. Furthermore, the proposal would be in accordance with the core principles of the framework relating to a good standard of amenity being provided for future occupiers of the land.

Community Infrastructure Levy and other contributions

The proposal will result in the provision of more than 100sqm of additional floorspace and as a result the applicant will be required to pay both the Mayoral and Barnet CIL. The former has a rate of £35 per sqm whilst the local rate is £135 per sqm. It is estimated that the contributions will be approximately £5,656 for mayoral CIL and £21,816 for Barnet CIL.

Policy DM10 of the local Plan states that all new sites providing 10 or more units or covering an area of 0.4 hectares would be required to provide an element of affordable housing. as the site is less than 0.4 hectares and only 4 units are proposed this policy is not considered relevant and affordable housing is not required.

3. COMMENTS ON GROUNDS OF OBJECTIONS

The majority of these have been considered in the report. However, the following specific responses can be made:

- The proposal is for demolition of the existing house and construction of 5, one bedroom flats. No off street parking is proposed. The proposal is not in accordance with the parking standards set out in the Local Plan. Any vehicles associated with the occupancy of the flats would have to be parked on-street. Churchfield Avenue is located within a Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ). However, the Councils Traffic and Transport section consider that subject to future residents of the site being exempted from purchasing permits to park then on balance the proposal is considered to be acceptable on highways grounds. The Inspector considered this matter further at appeal and concluded that whilst flat owners may place further demands on the 'on street' parking spaces, which may inconvenience existing residents, in isolation and having regard to the existing vehicle movements along the road, the vehicle movements of the flat owners would be insufficient to unacceptably disturb neighbouring residents. They did not consider it necessary to exempt future residents from purchasing permits to park. On this basis it is not considered that the impact on on-street parking would form a sustainable reason for refusal.
- If Members are minded to approve the application a condition controlling the hours of working is recommended in order to protect the amenity of existing residents from the noise and disturbance during construction.

4. EQUALITIES AND DIVERSITY ISSUES

The proposals do not conflict with either Barnet Council's Equalities Policy or the commitments set in our Equality Scheme and supports the council in meeting its statutory equality responsibilities.

5. CONCLUSION

The proposed flats are not considered to be harmful to the character and appearance of the area. The proposed flats would not adversely impact the amenity of existing residents or future residents of the proposed units. The proposal is therefore considered to be in accordance with Policy 3.5 of the London Plan and Policies CS1, DM01 and DM02 of the adopted Local Plan. Accordingly, subject to a number of conditions approval is recommended.

SITE LOCATION PLAN: 39 Churchfield Avenue, London, N12 0NS

REFERENCE: F/04079/13



Reproduced by permission of Ordnance Survey on behalf of HMSO. © Crown copyright and database right 2013. All rights reserved. Ordnance Survey Licence number LA100017674.