

	<h2>Planning Committee</h2> <h3>28 January 2015</h3>
<p style="text-align: right;">Title</p>	<p>108 Holden Road, London, N12 7EA – B/05282/14</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Report of</p>	<p>Head of Governance</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Wards</p>	<p>Childs Hill</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Status</p>	<p>Public</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Enclosures</p>	<p>Appendix A - Report to Chipping Barnet Area Planning Committee</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Officer Contact Details</p>	<p>Faith Mwende Governance Officer faith.mwende@barnet.gov.uk 020 8359 4917</p>

Summary

Agenda Item 7 (Planning permission (reference B/05282/14)) of the Chipping Barnet Area Planning Committee on 12 March 2015 was referred up to Planning Committee by two members in accordance with the Constitution. Planning Committee is therefore requested to consider the recommendations and take a decision on them.

Recommendations

1. That Planning Committee consider and vote on the recommendations contained in the report previously considered by Chipping Barnet Area Planning Committee on 12 March 2015

WHY THIS REPORT IS NEEDED

- 1.1 The Constitution allows a certain number of members of a Committee or Sub-Committee to refer any decision of the Committee or Sub-Committee up to the next practicable meeting of the relevant Committee to which it reports, by indicating immediately after the decision is taken that they require the decision to be referred up. The report to the relevant Committee to which the Committee or Sub-Committee reports on the referral shall set out the reasons for the referral.
- 1.2 The attached report was considered by the Chipping Barnet Area Planning Committee on 12 March 2015. The Committee resolved to refuse the planning permission for the reasons set out below:
 - 1.2.1 The proposed conversion, by reason of the number of units proposed, would result in an over intensive use of the application building resulting in increased comings and goings resulting from the additional households within the building, to the detriment of the character and appearance of the area as well as creating levels of noise and general disturbance detrimental to the amenities of the occupants of the adjoining semi-detached single family dwelling, no. 110 Holden Road. The proposal would be contrary to Policies CS NPPF, CS1 and CS5 of the Local Plan Core Strategy (adopted September 2012), Policy DM01 of the Development Management Policies DPD (adopted September 2012) and the Residential Design Guidance SPD (adopted April 2013).
 - 1.2.2 The proposal would result in the loss of a large single family house and the provision of units not considered to be of high priority size for the borough. The proposal would therefore not comply with Policy DM08 of the Development Management Policies DPD (adopted September 2012).
 - 1.2.3 The proposed rear extension, by reason of its height and width, would subsume the rear elevation of the existing building, would not appear subordinate to the existing building and would dominate the existing building. It would constitute an overdevelopment of the site detrimental to the character and appearance of the building and the wider locality as well as detracting from the amenities of neighbouring resident contrary to Policies CS NPPF, CS1 and CS5 of the Local Plan Core Strategy (adopted September 2012), Policy DM01 of the Development Management Policies DPD (adopted September 2012) and the Residential Design Guidance SPD (adopted April 2013).
- 1.3 **REASON FOR REFFERAL:**
 - 1.3.1 Immediately following the decision, two members of the Committee supported a referral of the decision to the Planning Committee, because it was considered that given the recent planning history in respect of the site, particularly the appeal decision in respect of planning application ref B/00061/14 and the subsequently approved scheme, ref B/02498/14, that the reasons for refusal could not be substantiated at appeal and as such would put the Council at risk of an award costs.

2. REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS

2.1 As set out in the substantive report.

3. ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED AND NOT RECOMMENDED

3.1 As set out in the substantive report.

4. POST DECISION IMPLEMENTATION

4.1 As set out in the substantive report.

5. IMPLICATIONS OF DECISION

5.1 Resources (Finance & Value for Money, Procurement, Staffing, IT, Property, Sustainability)

5.2 As set out in the substantive report.

5.3 Legal and Constitutional References

5.3.1 Constitution, Responsibility for Functions- Paragraph 6- Members Rights to Refer Matters to Parent Body states that:

“A specified number of Members of a Committee or Sub-Committee may require that any decision of the Committee or Sub-Committee is referred up to the next practicable meeting of Full Council or the relevant Committee to which the Committee or Subcommittee reports, by indicating immediately after the decision is taken that they require the decision to be referred up. The report to Full Council or the relevant Committee to which the Committee or Sub-Committee reports on the referral shall set out the reasons given for the referral.”

5.4 Risk Management

5.5 As set out in the substantive report.

5.6 Equalities and Diversity

5.7 As set out in the substantive report.

5.8 Consultation and Engagement

5.9 As set out in the substantive report.

6. BACKGROUND PAPERS

6.1 None