

Decisions of the Finchley and Golders Green Area Planning Committee

23 April 2018

PRESENT:-

Councillor Eva Greenspan (Chairman)
Councillor John Marshall (Vice-Chairman)

Councillors:

Councillor Arjun Mittra
Councillor Alan Schneiderman

Councillor Melvin Cohen
Councillor Shimon Ryde

Councillor Jim Tierney

1. MINUTES OF LAST MEETING

The minutes were approved as an accurate record.

2. ABSENCE OF MEMBERS (IF ANY)

There were none.

3. DECLARATION OF MEMBERS' DISCLOSABLE PECUNIARY INTERESTS AND NON PECUNIARY INTERESTS (IF ANY)

Councillor Cohen declared an interest in relation to Dingwall; an objector, Mr Elvio Gambaruto, was known to him.

Councillor Ryde noted that he had previously declared an interest in relation to item (452 Finchley Road). Because the ownership of the property had changed this no longer applied.

4. REPORT OF THE MONITORING OFFICER (IF ANY)

There was none.

5. ADDENDUM (IF APPLICABLE)

An addendum was received in relation to items 8 and

6. 129 THE VALE LONDON NW11 8TL

The Chairman reported that this item had been deferred to a future meeting at the request of the applicant.

7. 23 THORNFIELD AVENUE LONDON NW7 1LT 17/7604/HSE

The Chairman moved to defer this item to ask the applicant to produce a Basement Impact Assessment. This was duly seconded.

The vote was recorded as follows:

For (deferral) – 7

Against (deferral) – 0

Carried – the application was **deferred** for the reason above.

8. 10 MANOR HALL AVENUE, LONDON, NW4 1NX TPF/0778/17 (TREE)

The Principal Planner presented the report and addendum to the Committee.

Further to a discussion the Chairman moved to refuse the application on the grounds that the tree was of special amenity value and its loss was not justified as a remedy for the alleged subsidence damage on the basis of the information provided.

For (refusal) – 7

Against (refusal) – 0

It was **resolved** that the application was **REFUSED** for the above reason.

9. 49 BROUGHTON AVENUE LONDON N3 3EN 17/3448/RCU

The Planning Officer presented the report to the Committee.

A representation was heard from Mr Pickering against the application.

A representation was heard from Mrs Ruth Geiger against the application.

The Governance Officer read out a statement from Cllr Graham Old against the application.

The applicant was not present.

Further to a discussion the vote was recorded as follows:

For (approval) – 0

Against (approval) – 7

The fence by reason of its height, design and materials is unduly obtrusive and detrimental to the character and appearance of the general locality and views from Windsor Open Space. The proposals would be contrary to policy DM01 and DM15 of the Adopted Barnet Development Management Policies 2012.

The application was **REFUSED** for the above reasons.

10. GROUND FLOOR FLAT 18 DINGWALL GARDENS LONDON NW11 7ET 17/8219/FUL

The Planning Officer presented the report.

As the item had been deferred the objectors and applicant's agent had already addressed the Committee at the previous meeting.

Further to a discussion the vote was recorded as follows:

For (approval) – 0

Against (approval) – 5

Abstained - 2

The proposals by reason of their size, bulk, massing and siting of refuse would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the general locality, streetscene and site property and to the visual amenities of the occupiers of no.20 Dingwall Gardens, causing harmful loss of outlook and overbearing appearance. The proposals would be contrary to policy DM01 of the Adopted Barnet Development Management Policies 2012., policy CS5 of the Adopted Barnet Core Strategy, and the Supplementary Planning Document: Residential Design Guidance.

The application was **REFUSED** for the above reasons.

11. FIRST FLOOR FLAT 18 DINGWALL GARDENS LONDON NW11 7ET 17/8220/FUL

The Planning Officer presented the report.

As the item had been deferred the objectors and applicant's agent had already addressed the Committee at the previous meeting.

Further to a discussion the vote was recorded as follows:

For (approval) – 0

Against (approval) – 4

Abstained – 3

The proposals by reason of their size, bulk, massing and siting of refuse would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the general locality, streetscene and site property. The proposals would be contrary to policy DM01 of the Adopted Barnet Development Management Policies 2012., policy CS5 of the Adopted Barnet Core Strategy, and the Supplementary Planning Document: Residential Design Guidance.

The application was **REFUSED** for the above reason.

12. 452 FINCHLEY ROAD LONDON NW11 8DG 18/0726/FUL

The Planning Officer presented the report.

A representation was heard from Miss Aarti Wadhvani in objection to the application.

A representation was heard from Mr Michele del Vicario in objection to the application.

Mr Nigel Dexter, agent of the applicant, addressed the Committee on behalf of the applicant.

Further to a discussion Cllr Shimon Ryde moved to **REFUSE** the application and was seconded by the Chairman.

For (refusal) – 7
Against (refusal) – 0

Carried - the application was refused.

The reasons for refusal were discussed and the vote was recorded:

The proposed additional storey by reason of its massing, siting and design would visually dominating and obtrusive and be detrimental to the character and appearance of the streetscene, general locality and the local townscape. It would be contrary to policy DM01 of the Adopted Barnet Development Management Policies 2012, policy CS5 of the Adopted Barnet Core Strategy, and policy 7.4 and 7.6 of the Mayor's London Plan (MALP) 2015.

The Committee unanimously **refused** the application for the above reasons.

13. 39 NETHERCOURT, LONDON N3 1PS

The Planning Officer presented the report to the Committee.

Mr Christopher Athanasi spoke to the Committee in objection to the application.

Mr Mark Springthorpe, agent of the applicant, spoke to the Committee.

Further to a discussion the vote was recorded as follows:

For (approval) – 0
Against (approval) 6
Abstained - 1

The proposed extension by reason of its size, bulk, design and siting would be cause harmful loss of outlook and light to neighbouring occupiers and appear overbearing. The proposals would be detrimental to neighbouring residential and visual amenity, being contrary to policy DM01 of the Adopted Barnet Development Management Policies 2012.

The application was **REFUSED** for the above reasons.

14. 592 FINCHLEY ROAD LONDON NW11 7RX 17/7949/FUL

The Planning Officer presented the report to the Committee.

A representation was heard from Mr Howard Freeman in objection to the application.

Ms Beth Evans, agent of the applicant, addressed the Committee.

Further to a discussion the vote was recorded as follows:

For (approval) – 3

Against (approval) 4

Cllr Shimon Ryde moved to refuse the application and was duly seconded.

The proposed outbuilding by reason of its size, design, siting and proposed use would result in harmful noise and disturbance from associated general activity, resulting in a harmful loss of residential and visual amenity to neighbouring occupiers including the upper flats. The proposals would be contrary to policy DM01 of the Adopted Barnet Development Management Policies 2012.

The vote was recorded as follows:

For (refusal) – 4

Against (refusal) 3

Resolved that the application was **REFUSED** for the reasons above.

15. 72 HENDON LANE LONDON N3 1SL 18/0220/FUL

The Planning Officer presented the report to the Committee.

The applicant was present but did not address the Committee.

Further to a discussion the vote was recorded as follows:

For (approval) – 6

Against (approval) – 0

Abstained – 1

Resolved - that the application was **APPROVED**.

16. 707 HIGH ROAD LONDON N12 0BT 18/0782/FUL

The Planning Officer presented the report to the Committee.

The applicant was not present.

The vote was recorded as follows:

For (approval) – 4

Against (approval) – 3

Resolved – that the application was **APPROVED**.

17. 1B AND 1C SNEATH AVENUE LONDON NW11 9AJ

The Planning Officer presented the report to the Committee.

The agent for the applicant spoke to the Committee.

Further to a discussion the vote was recorded as follows:

For (approval) – 4

Against (approval) – 1

Abstained – 2

Resolved that the application was **APPROVED**.

18. ANY ITEM(S) THE CHAIRMAN DECIDES ARE URGENT

None.

The meeting finished at 8.05pm

