

LOCATION: Woodside Park 'Eruv'

REFERENCE: 15/00905/FUL

Received: 12/02/2015

Accepted: 16/04/2015

WARDS: **East Barnet,
Coppetts,
East Finchley,
Woodhouse and
Oakleigh**

Expiry: 11/06/2015

APPLICANT: Trustees of the Woodside Park Eruv Committee
PROPOSAL: Proposed amendment to approved Eruv in Woodside Park under application reference B/03356/11 dated 23/10/12. Proposals comprise seven new sites and changes to five sites at the following locations:

New locations:

1A: Footpath from Alverstone Avenue EN4 to Oakleigh Park Station (2no. 3.5m high poles and connecting wire)

4A: Footpath from Beaconsfield Road N11 to Oakleigh Park South (tunnel under railway) (2no. 1.0m high leci)

11B: Footpath to east of Strawberry Vale N2 (2no. 3.5m high poles and connecting wire)

11C: Access road at North Circular Road and High Road N2 (2no. 6.0m high poles and connecting wire)

11D: Footpath Long Lane/North Circular Road bus stop N2 (2no. 4.0m high poles and connecting wire)

31A: Footpath between 47 and 49 Walfield Avenue N20 (2no. 3.5m high poles and connecting wire)

32A: Walfield Avenue/Great North Road N20 (2no. 6.0m high poles and connecting wire)

Existing locations (changes):

7: West end of Pinkham Way Tunnel, North Circular Road N11 (2no. 1.0m high leci)

9A: Pert Close N10 footpath (relocated from Atlas Road on north side of North Circular Road) (2no. 3.5m high poles and connecting wire)

10B: Colney Hatch Lane N10, south side of road bridge and footbridge (relocated from north side of bridges) (2no. 6.0m high poles and connecting wire)

11A: Coppetts Road N10, north of Camden and Islington Cemetery rear gates (relocated from Coppetts Close on north side of North Circular Road) (2no. 6.0m high poles and connecting wire)

13: North end of Abingdon Road footbridge on the North Circular Road N3 (3.0m high poles and connecting wire)

The following (previously approved) sites are no longer required: 8, 9, 10, 11 and 32.

RECOMMENDATION

That the Assistant Director – Development Management and Building Control approve the planning application reference 15/00905/FUL under delegated powers and grant planning permission subject to the following conditions and any changes to the wording of the conditions considered necessary by the Assistant Director – Development Management and Building Control:

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

General Sites Location Plan; 871_1A; 871_4A; 871_4A.1; 871_7; 871_7.1; 871_9A; 871_10B; 871_11A; 871_11B (Rev' n A); 871_11C; 871_11D; 871_13A; 871.31A; and 871.32A

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, CS NPPF and CS1 of the Barnet Local Plan.

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. Details of the design and colour of the external surfaces of the posts (leci) and poles hereby approved shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority and approved in writing prior to the commencement of the development. Each individual pole or post hereby approved shall be implemented in full accordance with the details approved under this condition within 6 months of the erection of that particular pole or post.

Reason:

To protect the character and amenities of the sites and wider area and to ensure compliance with policies DM01, CS NPPF and CS1 of the Barnet Local Plan and 7.4, 7.5 and 7.6 of the London Plan (2015).

4. No site works or other works associated with this development shall be commenced before an Arboricultural Method Statement and Tree Works Plan, detailing the precautions to be taken to minimise damage to trees within and adjacent the sites and any works to be carried out to trees as part of the

implementation of the proposal (where relevant), in accordance with British Standards BS5837:2012 and BS3998:2010, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out in full accordance with the Arboricultural Method Statement and Tree Works Plan approved under this condition.

Reason:

To safeguard the health of existing trees which represent an amenity feature in accordance with policies DM01 and DM16 of the Barnet Local Plan and policy 7.21 of the London Plan.

5. A Construction and Maintenance Strategy, for all works hereby approved on or adjacent the Transport for London Road Network (TLRN) public highway, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, in consultation with Transport for London, prior to the commencement of the development. The Construction and Maintenance Strategy submitted shall include details on how the Eruv structure (poles, wire and Leci) would be constructed and maintained in a manner that would not compromise highway and pedestrian safety or unacceptably impact on movements on the TLRN public highway. The development shall be implemented and in full accordance with the approved Construction and Maintenance Strategy and maintained in accordance with this Strategy in perpetuity.

Reason:

In the interests of highway and pedestrian safety and to ensure that disruption to pedestrians and traffic on the TLRN road network arising from the development would be kept to a minimum in accordance with policies CS9 and DM17 of the Barnet Local Plan.

Informatives

It is recommended that the following informatives be included on the decision notice in respect of this application:

1. The erection of the Eruv structures (poles, leci, wires and any other associated works) on the highway would require a Highways Licence under the Highways Act 1980. This Licence would be subject to a number of conditions such as design, use of an approved contractor, indemnity insurance and a bond. If there are problems with any of these matters the licence would not be granted. The Highway Licence covers the proposal in terms of the positions of each pole and will check for any potential concerns, including impacts on clutter, sight lines, obstruction (this would be assessed in relation to all including the needs of disabled people), security and technical specification (including colour of poles and type of wire). The terms of the Licence require weekly inspections for the lifetime of the Eruv and the applicant must submit reports on the outcome of the inspection, any defects identified and actions taken to resolve. The Highways Group also charge an annual fee via the licence to carry out ad hoc inspections to ensure maintenance is being carried out.
2. Structures located on a footway or a footpath must allow for a minimum clearance of 1.5 metres for pedestrians. Location of any existing furniture in

the vicinity must be taken into consideration to ensure that the minimum clearance required for pedestrians is not compromised.

3. In accordance with the general guidance given in the Traffic Signs Regulations and General Directions 2002, the applicant should ensure that structures located at the front of the kerb, on a verge or a footway should be a minimum of 0.45m away from the kerb line on borough roads and 0.6m on TLRN roads (trunk roads) to avoid damage and ensure safety.
4. The applicant is advised that any structures to be sited within or project over adopted highway will require Licences under the Highways Act 1980 in addition to planning permission. The exact location and details of these structures will be agreed as part of the licensing process. Please note that Licences under the Highways Act 1980 will be issued for structures located on areas under the Local Authority's responsibility. For structures located in other areas, the applicant should seek an agreement with the land owner. For structures impacting on adjacent boroughs, agreement must be sought from the relevant authorities.
5. The applicant is advised that on sites located on traffic sensitive routes, deliveries during the construction period should not take place during restricted hours.
6. Any and all works carried out in pursuance of this grant of planning permission will be subject to the duties, obligations and criminal offences contained in the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended). Failure to comply with the provisions of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended) may result in a criminal prosecution.
7. The applicant is advised that they would be fully responsible for the maintenance of the proposed Eruv poles, wire and leci to be placed on the public highway at all times.
8. The applicant is advised that they would be liable for the cost of any rectification work to be undertaken to rectify damages caused to the public highway resulting from construction and maintenance of the proposed Eruv structures.
9. The applicant is advised that they would be fully liable for claims and damages arising from third parties associated with the proposed Eruv poles, wire and leci to be erected on the public highway.

1. MATERIAL CONSIDERATIONS

Key Relevant Planning Policy

National Planning Guidance

National planning policies are set out in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). This document was published in March 2012 and it is a key part of reforms

by national government to make the planning system less complex and more accessible. The NPPF states that the purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development and the document includes a 'presumption in favour of sustainable development'. In March 2014 the National Planning Practice Guidance was published (online) as a web based resource. This resource provides an additional level of detail and guidance to support the policies set out in the NPPF.

The London Plan

The London Plan (March 2015) is the development plan in terms of strategic planning policy. The London Plan policies (arranged by chapter) most relevant to the determination of this application are:

3.1 (Ensuring Equal Life Chances for All); 3.2 (Improving Health and Addressing Health Inequalities); 3.16 (Protection and Enhancement of Social Infrastructure); 6.10 (Walking); 7.1 (Lifetime Neighbourhoods); 7.2 (An Inclusive Environment); 7.4 (Local Character); 7.5 (Public Realm); 7.6 (Architecture); 7.8 (Heritage Assets and Archaeology); 7.16 (Green Belt); 7.17 (Metropolitan Open Land); 7.19 (Biodiversity and Access to Nature); and 7.21 (Trees and Woodlands)

Barnet Local Plan

The development plan documents in the Barnet Local Plan constitute the development plan in terms of local planning policy. The relevant documents comprise the Core Strategy and the Development Management Policies documents (both adopted in September 2012). The Local Plan development plan policies of most relevance to the determination of this application are:

Barnet Core Strategy (Adopted 2012):

CS NPPF (National Planning Policy Framework – Presumption in favour of sustainable development)

CS1 (Barnet's Place Shaping Strategy – Protection, enhancement and consolidated growth – The three strands approach)

CS5 (Protecting and enhancing Barnet's character to create high quality places)

CS7 (Enhancing and protecting Barnet's open spaces)

CS9 (Providing safe, effective and efficient travel)

CS10 (Enabling inclusive and integrated community facilities and uses)

CS12 (Making Barnet a safer place)

Barnet Development Management Policies (Adopted 2012):

DM01 (Protecting Barnet's character and amenity)

DM02 (Development standards)

DM03 (Accessibility and inclusive design)

DM06 (Barnet's Heritage and Conservation)

DM15 (Green belt and open spaces)

DM16 (Biodiversity)

DM17 (Travel impact and parking standards)

Relevant Planning History

Woodside Park Eruv

Reference: B/03356/11

Proposal:

In connection with the creation of an Eruv* in Woodside Park, the construction of pole and wire, or wooden, gateways, or 1m high posts known as 'leci' at the following locations:

- 1: East end of pedestrian bridge over railway, to the rear of 104-106 Alverstone Avenue, EN4 8EE (2, 3.5m high poles and connecting wire)
- 2: Adjacent to 1 Beresford Avenue N20 0AD and the Electricity Sub Station adjoining the Petrol Filing Station, Russell Lane (2, 6m high poles and connecting wire)
- 3: Land rear of 47 and 49 Beresford Avenue N20 0AD (2 no., 6m high poles with connecting wire)
- 4: Bridge over railway Oakleigh Road South and junction with Beaconsfield Road N11 (2 no., 6m high poles with connecting wires)
- 5: Railway bridge Friern Barnet Road close to the junction with Station Road, N11 1ND (2 no., 6m high poles with connecting wires)
- 6: Footbridge at New Southgate Station (2 no., 1m high leci)
- 7: Under the Railway bridge at Pinkham Way A406 (1 no., 1m high leci)
- 8: North Side of Bridge over Pinkham Way A406, Pegasus Way N11 3PW (2 no., 6m high poles with connecting wires)
- 9: Footbridge at Atlas Road adjoining the A406 (3 x sets of 2 no., 6m high poles with connecting wires)
- 10: North Side of Bridge over A406, Colney Hatch Lane N11 (2 no. 6m high poles with connecting wires)
- 10A: North Side of Colney Hatch Lane Footbridge over A406 (1 no., 6m high pole with connecting wires)
- 11: Footbridge over A406 near Coppetts Close N12 0AG (2 no., 3.5m high poles with connecting wire)
- 12: Bridge Over A406 at High Road N3 2AX (2 no., 6m high poles with connecting wire)
- 13: North Side of Footbridge over A406, Abingdon Road N3 (2 no., 5m high poles with connecting wire)
- 14: Long Lane N3 under A406 (2 no., 1m high leci)
- 18: Adjacent to Frith Manor Orchard, Partingdale Lane NW7 1NX (2 no., 6m high poles with connecting wire)
- 19A: Rear of 164 and 166 Chanctonbury Way N12 7AD (3m high 'rustic' gateway constructed with 2 hardwood uprights with a hardwood beam across the top)
- Site 0: Woodside Park Club Southover N12 7JG (3 no., 6m high poles with connecting wire)
- Site 20: Footpath adjacent to 65 & 67 Michleham Down N12 7JJ (2 no., 3.5m high poles with connecting wire)
- Site 21: Footpath adjacent to Laurel Farmhouse and Beatrice Court Totteridge Green N20 8PH (3m high 'rustic' gateway constructed with 2 hardwood uprights with a hardwood beam across the top)
- Site 22A: Fronting Eagle House 42 Totteridge Village N20 8PR and Stonehaven 31 Totteridge Village N20 8PN (2 no., 6m high poles with connecting wire)
- Site 25: Access way between 92 and 94 Totteridge Lane N20 8JG (2 no., 3.5m high poles with connecting wire)

Site 26: Adjacent to 75 Oak Tree Drive N20 8QJ and 62 Great Bushey Drive N20 8QL (2 no., 6m high poles with connecting wire)

Site 27: Footpath Adjacent to 84 Totteridge Lane N20 8QQ (2 no., 3.5m high poles with connecting wire)

Sites 28-30: Adjacent to Dollis Valley Green Walk Between Brookmead Court and 64 -76 Totteridge Lane N20 8QG (3 no., 6m high poles with connecting wire)

Site 31: Brook Farm Open Space Bridge Over Northern Line (2 no., 3.5m high poles with connecting wire)

Site 32: Adjacent to Turners Court Great North Road EN5 1EG and 6 Great North Road EN5 1JS (2 no., 6m high poles with connecting wire)

Site 33: Netherlands Road, Between Temple Lodge and 92 Netherlands Road EN5 1BU and Stevenson Close Flats opposite (2 no., 6m high poles with connecting wires)

Site 34: Adjacent to Hall at 1 Stevenson Close EN5 1DR (2 no., 6m high poles with connecting wire)

Decision: Approved in 2012

Finchley, Golders Green and Hendon Eruv (Known as the North West London Eruv)

Eruv 1: Erection of groups of poles between which is suspended at high level a wire to designate the perimeter of a nominated "Eruv". Refused in 1993. Allowed at appeal in 1994.

Eruv 2: Installation of street furniture (comprising groups of poles connected by thin high level wire) to complete the identification of the perimeter of a defined Eruv. Refused in 1993. Allowed at appeal in 1994.

Eruvs 3 and 4: Erection of street furniture comprising groups of poles (usually 2) between which is suspended at high level a wire to designate the perimeter of a nominated Eruv. Approved in 1997 and 1998.

Stanmore/Canons Park Eruv

Reference: H/00921/09:

Proposal 9 sites around the Edgware area to complete the Stanmore/Canons Park Eruv

Decision: Approved in 2009

Mill Hill Eruv

Reference: H/01834/10

Proposal: 19 Sites in the Mill Hill area

Decision: Approved in 2010

Edgware Eruv

Reference: W13797

Proposal: Edgware Area Eruv

Decision: Approved in 2004

Consultation and Views Expressed

Public Consultation

This application has been the subject of extensive consultation with the local

community. Consultation letters were sent to a total of **843** properties in May 2015. The application was also advertised on site and in the local press at that time.

The consultation process included the issuing of letters which specifically drew attention to the potential equalities impacts of the application and the provisions of the Equality Act 2010. As part of this consultative process consultees were requested to complete a questionnaire to provide information in respect of protected characteristics as defined in the Equality Act 2010 so that these factors could be taken into consideration when the LPA is determining the application.

Number of Responses

5 responses objecting to the proposal were received. **1** objector to the application requested to speak at committee. **14** responses supporting the proposal were received. **None** supporters of the application requested to speak at committee.

Comments on the Application

The comments made in objection to the application can be summarised as follows:

- Proposal is for one group within the community and will use common areas in a way that creates a negative impact on others within the community.
- Proposal could lead to other similar requests from other communities and would set an unwelcome precedent.
- In a residential area such as this proposals need to be mindful of increased architecture which does not serve the community as a whole.
- It should be questioned why the poles are needed.
- Other existing structures should already fulfil the necessary requirements.
- The structures should be relocated to a position which has less impact on the streetscene.
- Concerned that the proposal may be erected adjacent their house.
- Concerned as to who will pay for the works.

Officers response to the grounds of objection:

In the circumstances of this case it is not considered that the cost of the works would constitute a material planning consideration or a reasonable ground for refusing planning permission. The other comments raised are responded to in the report below. In summary the proposal is found to be acceptable and compliant with the objectives of development plan policies in all relevant regards.

The comments made in support of the application can be summarised as follows:

- It would significantly improve the lives of practicing Jews in the area.
- It would enable their family to visit on a Saturday.
- It will enable them to take their children in push chairs to the synagogue and on social visits on a Saturday.
- It would enable the use of a walking stick on a Saturday where needed.
- It enables young Orthodox Jewish families in the area to participate more actively in communal life.
- It would stop members of the Orthodox Jewish community in wheelchairs from being potentially housebound or needing a non-Jewish person to push them on the Sabbath.
- It would enable them to carry water on the Sabbath.

- The proposal would have no detrimental impacts on the area and has no planning disadvantages.

Responses from Internal and Statutory Consultees and Other Bodies

Traffic and Development Team:

The Traffic and Development Team response is set out in greater detail in the report below. In summary, they have confirmed that they have no objections to the development and find the proposal to be acceptable in respect of highways related matters.

Transport for London:

Were consulted on the application and did not provide any comments.

2. PLANNING APPRAISAL

Site Description and Surroundings:

The application sites would include areas within the East Barnet, Coppetts, East Finchley, Woodhouse and Oakleigh Wards. The individual application sites are discussed in further detail in subsequent sections of this report.

Proposal:

An Eruv is a continuous boundary designated in accordance with Jewish Law. Whilst Jewish Law prohibits Orthodox Jews from carrying on the Sabbath, carrying is permitted within the defined boundary of an Eruv, as is the use of other items such as pushchairs and wheelchairs.

The Eruv boundary is formed by utilizing continuous local features, such as fences or walls alongside roads, railways or terraced buildings. However, where this continuity is not possible due to breaks in the boundary, for example roads, then this breach must be integrated by the erection of a notional 'gateway'. Such a gateway consists of posts or poles linked on top by a wire or cross bar crossing the highway.

This application seeks amendments and alterations to the 'Woodside Park' Eruv (covering the locations identified above) approved under application reference B/03356/11 in 2012. Two established Eruvs currently exist in the borough: The Edgware Eruv and the Hendon, Finchley and Golders Green Eruv (known as the North West London Eruv).

In common with established Eruvim in the borough the poles, which would have a diameter of 76mm, would be painted in a colour that best blends with the surroundings in each instance. Under the current proposal 6m tall poles and wire gateways would be installed at 4 sites, 4m tall poles and a wire gateway would be installed at 1 site, 3.5m tall poles and wire gateways would be installed at 4 sites and 3m poles and a wire gateway would be installed at 1 site. In total eight 6m high poles; two 4m high poles; eight 3.5m high poles and two 3m poles are proposed. In each case the connecting wire would be translucent and 0.5mm in diameter.

Where available an existing structure, for example bridges, over the roadway can be used in order to close a gap in the boundary. In these instances a small pole constructed out of mild steel in the form of a box section (1m in height, with a depth and width of 5mm) would act as a small symbolic doorpost attached to the side of the bridge or other structure. The leci would be screwed or otherwise attached to the vertical surface. Leci are proposed at 2 locations.

The amendments to the previously approved (under B/03356/11) Woodside Park Eruv described above include 7 new sets of poles or posts and 5 variations to previously approved poles or posts. It has also been confirmed that 5 sets of poles or posts that were previously approved will now no longer be needed.

Highways Licence:

The erection of the 'gateways' on the highway requires a licence under the Highways Act 1980. This would be subject to a number of conditions such as design, use of an approved contractor, indemnity insurance and a bond. If there are problems with any of these matters the licence would not be granted.

The Highway Licence covers the proposal in terms of the positions of each structure and will evaluate potential concerns including impacts on clutter, sight lines, obstruction (this would be assessed in relation to all including the needs of disabled people), security and technical specification (including colour of poles and type of wire) matters.

The terms of the Licence require weekly inspections for the lifetime of the Eruv and the applicant must submit reports on the outcome of the inspection, any defects identified and actions taken to resolve these. An annual fee is also charged via the licence to carry out ad hoc inspections to ensure maintenance is being carried out.

Planning Considerations:

The proposed Eruv equipment is a form of built structure which fulfils a unique religious and Orthodox Jewish communal function. It falls to be considered against the relevant development plan policies.

Policy support for the principle of the proposal is found at policy CS10 of the Barnet Core Strategy. This seeks to ensure that community facilities, including places of worship, are provided for Barnet's communities. Policy DM13, in respect of community uses, seeks to ensure that there is no significant impact on the free flow of traffic and road safety and that proposals protect the amenity of residential properties. Depending on the location of the proposed Eruv equipment different policies will apply. The policies in respect of character, design and highway matters will apply almost universally. More specific policies, such as those relating to impacts on biodiversity and Metropolitan Open Land (MOL), will depend on the precise location of the equipment. Each of the proposed locations is dealt with individually below.

Site 1A: Footpath from Alverstone Avenue EN4 to Oakleigh Park Station

Ward: East Barnet

Proposal: 2 no. 3.5m high poles and connecting wire

The proposed poles would be situated to the east of stairs on either side of an existing pedestrian footpath close to an existing lamppost and means of enclosure.

The design and siting of the proposed poles and wire is found to be acceptable. The poles and wire would not impact adversely on the character, appearance and amenity of the area or the amenity of residents. They would also not cause unacceptable visual intrusion or obstruct or have an unacceptable impact on the public highway.

Specific objections (1) received in respect of this site:

- Concerned that the proposal may be erected adjacent their house.

Comments on the grounds of objection:

- The development would be located approximately 2.5m west of the boundary with the objectors property and is found to be acceptable and compliant with the objectives of development plan policies in all relevant regards.

Site 4A: Footpath from Beaconsfield Road N11 to Oakleigh Park South (tunnel under railway)

Ward: Coppetts

Proposal: 2 no. 1.0m high leci

The proposed leci would be situated on either side of a footpath running under the railway line, through a tunnel. They would be located on the western side of the tunnel, close to the existing walls in this location.

The design and siting of the proposed leci is found to be acceptable. The leci would not impact adversely on the character, appearance and amenity of the area or the amenity of residents. They would also not cause unacceptable visual intrusion or obstruct or have an unacceptable impact on the public highway.

No site specific comments were received in respect of this site.

Site 7: West end of Pinkham Way Tunnel, North Circular Road N11

Ward: Coppetts

Proposal: 2no. 1.0m high leci

The proposed leci would be situated on either side of Pinkham Way on the western end of a bridge running over the railway line. They would be located close to the existing walls in this location. The currently proposed leci have been moved approximately 600mm westwards (closer to the bridge) of the location in which they were approved under the previous (B/03356/11) consent.

The design and siting of the proposed leci is found to be acceptable. The leci would not impact adversely on the character, appearance and amenity of the area or the amenity of residents. They would also not cause unacceptable visual intrusion or obstruct or have an unacceptable impact on the public highway.

No site specific comments were received in respect of this site.

Site 9A: Pert Close N10 footpath

Ward: Coppetts

Proposal: 2no. 3.5m high poles and connecting wire

The proposed poles would be situated on either side of a footpath and adjacent verge, close to existing means of enclosure, between Pert Close and Orion Road. The proposed structures are relocated from positions on Atlas Road (north side of North Circular) approved under the previous (B/03356/11) consent.

The design and siting of the proposed poles and wire is found to be acceptable. The poles and wire would not impact adversely on the character, appearance and amenity of the area or the amenity of residents. They would also not cause unacceptable visual intrusion or obstruct or have an unacceptable impact on the public highway. The site is located within MOL. The proposed structures are not considered to have a detrimental impact on the openness of the MOL and are found to be fully compliant with the objectives of development plan policies on MOL.

No site specific comments were received in respect of this site.

Site 10B: Colney Hatch Lane N10, south side of road bridge and footbridge

Ward: Coppetts

Proposal: 2no. 6.0m high poles and connecting wire

The proposed poles would be situated on either side of Colney Hatch Lane, just south of its junction with Orion Road and Bobby Moore Way, close to existing means of enclosure and lampposts. The proposed structures are relocated from positions on the north side of the bridge over the North Circular Road, approved under the previous (B/03356/11) consent.

The design and siting of the proposed poles and wire is found to be acceptable. The poles and wire would not impact adversely on the character, appearance and amenity of the area or the amenity of residents. They would also not cause unacceptable visual intrusion or obstruct or have an unacceptable impact on the public highway. The site is located within MOL. The proposed structures are not considered to have a detrimental impact on the openness of the MOL and are found to be fully compliant with the objectives of development plan policies on MOL.

No site specific comments were received in respect of this site.

Site 11A: Coppetts Road N10, north of Camden and Islington Cemetery rear gates

Ward: Coppetts

Proposal: 2no. 6.0m high poles and connecting wire

The proposed poles would be situated on either side of Coppetts Road, between its junctions with Joint Road and Bobby Moore Way, close to existing means of enclosure and signage poles. The proposed structures are relocated from positions on Coppetts Close on the north side of the North Circular Road, approved under the previous (B/03356/11) consent.

The design and siting of the proposed poles and wire is found to be acceptable. The poles and wire would not impact adversely on the character, appearance and amenity of the area or the amenity of residents. They would also not cause unacceptable visual intrusion or obstruct or have an unacceptable impact on the public highway. The site is located within MOL. The proposed structures are not

considered to have a detrimental impact on the openness of the MOL and are found to be fully compliant with the objectives of development plan policies on MOL.

No site specific comments were received in respect of this site.

Site 11B: Footpath to east of Strawberry Vale N2

Ward: East Finchley

Proposal: 2no. 3.5m high poles and connecting wire

The proposed poles would be situated on either side of a footpath and area of public open space, north-west of Strawberry Vale, South of the North Circular Road and east of the High Road. The proposed poles would be located close to existing means of enclosure.

The design and siting of the proposed poles and wire is found to be acceptable. The poles and wire would not impact adversely on the character, appearance and amenity of the area or the amenity of residents. They would also not cause unacceptable visual intrusion or obstruct or have an unacceptable impact on the public highway.

No site specific comments were received in respect of this site.

Site 11C: Access road at North Circular Road and High Road N2

Ward: East Finchley

Proposal: 2 no. 6.0m high poles and connecting wire

The proposed poles would be situated on areas of verge on either side of a slip road for the North Circular, east of East Finchley High Road.

The design and siting of the proposed poles and wire is found to be acceptable. The poles and wire would not impact adversely on the character, appearance and amenity of the area or the amenity of residents. They would also not cause unacceptable visual intrusion or obstruct or have an unacceptable impact on the public highway.

No site specific comments were received in respect of this site.

Site 11D: Footpath Long Lane/North Circular Road bus stop N2

Ward: East Finchley

Proposal: 2 no. 4.0m high poles and connecting wire

The proposed poles would be situated on either side of a pedestrian footpath, north of Font Hills and south of the North Circular Road, to the east of Long Lane. The poles would be located close to existing means of enclosure.

The design and siting of the proposed poles and wire is found to be acceptable. The poles and wire would not impact adversely on the character, appearance and amenity of the area or the amenity of residents. They would also not cause unacceptable visual intrusion or obstruct or have an unacceptable impact on the public highway.

No site specific comments were received in respect of this site.

Site 13: North end of Abingdon Road footbridge on the North Circular Road N3

Ward: Woodhouse

Proposal: 3.0m high poles and connecting wire

The proposed poles would be situated at the base of the stepped and ramped pedestrian access routes over the North Circular Road, to the east of Abingdon Road and to the west of the North Circular Road. The poles would be located close to existing means of enclosure, lighting columns and the bridge structure.

The design and siting of the proposed poles and wire is found to be acceptable. The poles and wire would not impact adversely on the character, appearance and amenity of the area or the amenity of residents. They would also not cause unacceptable visual intrusion or obstruct or have an unacceptable impact on the public highway.

No site specific comments were received in respect of this site.

Site 31A: Footpath between 47 and 49 Walfield Avenue N20

Ward: Oakleigh

Proposal: 2 no. 3.5m high poles and connecting wire

The proposed poles would be situated on either side of a pedestrian footpath running east to west between numbers 47 and 49 Walfield Avenue. The proposed structures would be located close to existing buildings and means of enclosure.

The design and siting of the proposed poles and wire is found to be acceptable. The poles and wire would not impact adversely on the character, appearance and amenity of the area or the amenity of residents. They would also not cause unacceptable visual intrusion or impacts in the streetscene or obstruct or have an unacceptable impact on the public highway. The site is located adjacent the Green Belt (which is situated to the west). The proposed structures are not considered to have a detrimental impact on the openness of the Green Belt and are found to be fully compliant with the objectives of development plan policies on proposals adjacent Green Belt.

Specific objections (2) received in respect of this site:

- Proposal is for one group within the community and will use common areas in a way that creates a negative impact on others within the community.
- Proposal could lead to other similar requests from other communities and would set an unwelcome precedent.
- In a residential area such as this proposals need to be mindful of increased architecture which does not serve the community as a whole.
- It should be questioned why the poles are needed.
- Other existing structures should already fulfil the necessary requirements.
- The structures should be relocated to a position which has less impact on the streetscene.

Comments on the grounds of objection:

- The proposal is found to be compliant with the objectives of the relevant development plan policies and does not result in any unacceptable adverse

impacts. In such circumstances it is not considered that a refusal of planning permission would be justified on any of the grounds of objections raised.

- Approval of the proposal would not set a precedent as each planning application must be considered on the basis of its individual planning merits and circumstances.

Site 32A: Walfield Avenue/Great North Road N20

Ward: Oakleigh

Proposal: 2 no. 6.0m high poles and connecting wire

The proposed poles would be situated at the junction of Walfield Avenue, High Road and Great North Road. The wire would span from the footpath on Walfield Avenue (adjacent 1 Great North Road) across to the footpath in front of 2b and 2b Great North Road. The proposed structures would be located close to existing buildings and means of enclosure.

The design and siting of the proposed poles and wire is found to be acceptable. The poles and wire would not impact adversely on the character, appearance and amenity of the area or the amenity of residents. They would also not cause unacceptable visual intrusion or impacts in the streetscene or obstruct or have an unacceptable impact on the public highway.

Specific objections (2) received in respect of this site:

- Proposal is for one group within the community and will use common areas in a way that creates a negative impact on others within the community.
- Proposal could lead to other similar requests from other communities and would set an unwelcome precedent.
- In a residential area such as this proposals need to be mindful of increased architecture which does not serve the community as a whole.
- It should be questioned why the poles are needed.
- Other existing structures should already fulfil the necessary requirements.
- The structures should be relocated to a position which has less impact on the streetscene.

Comments on the grounds of objection:

- The proposal is found to be compliant with the objectives of the relevant development plan policies and does not result in any unacceptable adverse impacts. In such circumstances it is not considered that a refusal of planning permission would be justified on any of the grounds of objections raised.
- Approval of the proposal would not set a precedent as each planning application must be considered on the basis of its individual planning merits and circumstances.

Matters relevant to all sites:

Each of the above sites was considered carefully in respect of the scope for potential unacceptable impacts on trees and biodiversity and non-compliance with development plan policies on tree and biodiversity matters. In each case the proposal was found to be acceptable and compliant with the objectives of development plan policy on tree and biodiversity matters with the conditions recommended.

3. EQUALITIES AND DIVERSITY ISSUES

The Equality Act 2010 (the Act) came into force in April 2011. The general duty on public bodies is set out in Section 149 of the Act. The duty requires the Council to have due regard to the need to eliminate discrimination and promote equality with regard 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.

Equality duties require public authorities to demonstrate that any decision it makes is reached in a fair, transparent and accountable way, considering the needs and the rights of different members of the community. This is achieved through assessing the impact that changes to policies, procedures and practices could have on different protected groups. Section 149 provides:

(1) A public authority must, in the exercise of its functions, have due regard to the need to -

(a) eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other conduct that is prohibited by or under this Act;

(b) advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it;

(c) foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it.

(2) Having due regard to the need to advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it involves having due regard, in particular, to the need to-

(a) remove or minimise disadvantages suffered by persons who share a relevant protected characteristic that are connected to that characteristic;

(b) take steps to meet the needs of persons who share a relevant protected characteristic that are different to the needs of persons who do not share it;

(c) encourage persons who share a relevant protected characteristic to participate in public life or in any other activity in which participation by such persons is disproportionately low.

(3) The steps involved in meeting the needs of disabled persons that are different from the needs of persons who are not disabled include, in particular steps to take account of disabled persons' disabilities.

(4) Having due regard to the need to foster good relations between persons who share relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it involves having due regard, in particular, to the need to -

(a) tackle prejudice, and

(b) promote understanding

(5) Compliance with the duties in this section may involve treating some persons more favourably than others; but that is not to be taken as permitting conduct that would otherwise be prohibited by or under this Act.

(6) The relevant protected characteristics are-

· age;

· disability

· gender reassignment

· pregnancy and maternity

· race

· religion or belief

- sex
- sexual orientation

There has been extensive consultation on the equalities impacts of this proposal. An equalities questionnaire was sent to all consultees, requesting information on equalities impacts and to gather evidence for the council of the views of different groups when assessing the responses. Officers have also considered information held by the council on protected groups in the borough and the experience of other Eruvim which currently operating in Barnet. Officers recognise that not everyone will respond to a consultation but consider that the consultation carried out provided the relevant parties who are potentially affected by the proposal with an adequate opportunity to engage. The Equalities Impact Assessment based on those responses and information held by the council is set out below.

It is considered that the following protected groups could potentially be affected by the proposal:

- Jews
- Other faith groups Bahai, Buddhist, Christian, Hindu, Jain, Muslim, Sikh
- Secular Groups – Agnostic, Atheist, Humanist
- Disabled people
- Elderly Jews
- Young children and parents of young children who are Jewish
- Jewish women (on the assumption that these have greater childcare responsibility)

Before analysing the potential impact of the proposal on each of these groups it must be acknowledged at the outset that monitoring and assessing religious equality or equality between people with different beliefs can be difficult. Varying levels of commitment to particular religious or beliefs can make it difficult to interpret the information gathered. For example, in this case there may be significant differences between someone who loosely identifies themselves as culturally Jewish but does not practice the Jewish faith and an orthodox Jew who observes the Sabbath and refrains from “carrying” on that day except within an eruv.

(Orthodox) Jews:

As referred to elsewhere in the report, in the absence of an Eruv, it is forbidden under Jewish law to carry (which includes pushing and pulling) in a public thoroughfare on the Sabbath) and on the Day of Atonement. Clearly the impact of this prohibition will vary between persons depending how observant they are of the Jewish Laws. The applicant has submitted a statement confirming that the Woodside Park Synagogue is an Orthodox Jewish Community. As such it is reasonable to assume that its members observe Jewish Law. The Jewish Community composes approximately 15% of Barnet’s population.

The prohibition identified above has the following adverse impacts on the very young, the very old and the disabled members of the Jewish Community who observe the Sabbath: Parents cannot utilize a pram or pushchair to take their baby/young child with them to the synagogue or anywhere else such as to visit friends or relations. In effect this means that children aged two and under may be housebound as will at least one of their parents, a situation that would continue to exist until all the children in a family are able to walk to synagogue and back. The

elderly will often walk with the aid of a walking stick or some other form of aid, this cannot be done on the Sabbath without transgressing Jewish law. Disability takes various forms and those who require an appliance such as wheelchair, walking stick, Zimmer frame to get out and about cannot make use of such equipment in a public thoroughfare without transgressing Jewish Law on the Sabbath. The prohibition also applies to the carrying of medication such as pills and nebulisers unless the absence of such medication were life threatening. Less obviously Jewish Law also prevents the carrying of reading glasses whilst walking. The introduction of the Eruv would directly benefit these members of the Jewish community who are adversely affected as outlined above. Indirectly other members of the Jewish community would benefit from the lifting of this restriction on their friends and family members thus enabling all to socialize and worship together on the Sabbath.

Information provided by the applicant, based on the membership of the Synagogue indicates that there are 370 members aged 70 or over and 100 children up to 4 years of age. The applicants have estimated that with the inclusion of the children's parents the number of persons who would directly benefit from the proposed eruv would be some 600. The overall membership of the synagogue was estimated to be 1382.

Other faith groups:

The groups which fall within this section include Bahai, Buddhist, Christian, Hindu, Jain, Muslim, and Sikhs comprise a combined 73% of the borough's population. Of the total of 2 questionnaires that were returned completed 1 was completed by persons who declared themselves to be a member of these groups (Christian). This response expressed objections to the proposal, but not on grounds relating to their religious belief.

Notwithstanding the lack of objections found in responses received, set against the adverse impacts which members of other faith groups could perceive that the proposed Eruv would have on their religion or belief are the following considerations:

- The proposed Eruv equipment comprising poles, lechi, gateways and wire do not display or carry any Jewish or any other overtly religious symbolism that would allow them to be identified as being of any religious significance.
- The proposed poles would be up to 6m high and connected in places by relatively thin wire. Officers consider that they would appear as part and parcel of the variety of street furniture with no discernible religious significance. In addition, the poles and equipment will be located, where possible, at the back edge of the pavement so as not to stand out or draw undue attention in the general street scene.
- The physical impacts of the proposed Eruv equipment have been considered on a site by site basis earlier in this report. Officers have concluded that that the proposed siting of the Eruv equipment would not result in visual obtrusions to such a degree as to warrant refusal and would be readily assimilated into the general street scene.

There are already a number of Eruvim in existence in Barnet and elsewhere. The operation of these Eruvim provides useful evidence as to the likely potential impacts of the scheme on protected groups and is therefore relevant to the consideration of the current application. In the process of the consideration of this application officers

have visited the Eruvim in Barnet. Officers consider that if an observer were to make a deliberate attempt to locate the Eruv equipment then they will be seen but otherwise they are part and parcel of the general street scene and there is nothing that identifies them as having any religious significance. Officers accept that the proposal could have a potential adverse impact on those of other non-Jewish faith groups who feel it impinges on their beliefs. Officers nevertheless consider that these concerns are mitigated by the experience of the form and operation of other Eruvim in the borough where no evidence has been forthcoming to support these concerns. The potential adverse impact of the proposal in these protected groups is outweighed by the positive outcomes that the proposal will have through enabling the very young, elderly and disabled members of the community to be able to worship at the Synagogue on the Sabbath and the Day of Atonement. In reaching this conclusion officers have given weight to the impact that the proposals would have on the identified protected groups, however the harm is outweighed by the other considerations identified.

Secular groups

This group includes Athiests, Agnostics and Humanists and they are a protected category under the Equality Act 2010. None of the completed questionnaires were received from members of these communities. Members of secular groups and non-religious persons comprise 13% of Barnet's population.

Despite the responses received members of this group may (based on responses to previous applications) have concerns that the proposal would raise secular tensions, promote inequality and imposes religious beliefs on other persons. It is considered that these potential perceived adverse impacts are mitigated by the following:

- The successful operation of existing Eruvim elsewhere in this borough and in neighbouring authorities where there is no evidence that an Eruv gives rise to tension between secular and religious groups.
- The Eruv equipment does not carry any Jewish symbolism and is usually seen as part and parcel of the normal street furniture in a suburban location.

The harm that members of secular groups perceive could arise from the proposal is significantly outweighed by the advantages that the proposal will bring to the very young, elderly and disabled members of the Jewish Community.

Disabled people

None of the questionnaires were completed and returned by disabled persons. According to information from central government sources, there are 11,280 disabled persons in Barnet represent 3.2% of the borough's population.

It is conceivable that concerns could be raised in respect of the potential impact that the proposed equipment could have on partially sighted/blind persons whereby the equipment could be a trip/collision hazard. However, the proposal would significantly and positively benefit disabled members of the Jewish community in that it would enable them to attend the synagogue for worship on the Sabbath as well as generally being able to leave their houses to socialise with friends and family on those days. It would in effect give them the same opportunity to join in the spiritual and social life of their community, as well as the wider community on the Sabbath.

Whilst the proposal would benefit disabled members of the Jewish community officers accept it is a reasonable concern that the proposed eruv equipment could create a hazard to disabled persons using the highway. Officers consider however that the design of the structures and the sites for the equipment have been carefully chosen so as to prevent such situations arising to any significant degree. The Eruv poles themselves are 76mm in diameter so are relatively thin structures that can often be sited at the back edge of the pavement, so as to minimise intrusion onto the footway. Eruv poles are considerably smaller than many items of street furniture that can be erected without the need for any planning permission. The location of the eruv poles has also had regard to existing street furniture in the area and the relationship with other equipment so as not to be prejudicial to highway or pedestrian safety.

The Council's Highways Group, who are directly responsible for highway and pedestrian safety on the Borough's roads have been consulted throughout the process and have no objections to the proposal. The impact of street furniture on the safety of all road users, including disabled members of the community is a paramount consideration for them. Similarly TfL have been consulted and have not raised any objections to the proposal.

In addition to planning permission being necessary, the equipment also needs to be licensed by the appropriate highway authority. This is a separate procedure to the planning process and if, in consideration of these licences the authority have concerns in respect of safety then the licence will not be issued. Officers also find that having visited the individual sites and having considered the proposed siting of the Eruv equipment, that any concerns in respect of the safety of disabled members of the community would be mitigated by the combination of the size and design of the equipment and its location.

The impact of the existing eruvim on the health and safety of disabled members of the community should also be taken into account when considering these issues. There is no evidence that there have been any incidents of eruv equipment constituting an obstruction to free passage or a hazard to disabled people.

Whilst officers accept that the uncontrolled provision of Eruv equipment on the public highway could result in a hazard to members of the public in general or disabled persons in particular that is not the case with this proposal. Each site has been carefully assessed and the design and siting of the Eruv equipment would not adversely impact disabled members of the community.

Given the above and the careful consideration given to the siting of the individual poles and leci, officers consider that the health and safety of disabled persons would not be prejudiced by the proposal in the normal course of events. Officers consider that the potential limited adverse impacts of the proposal on disabled members of the community are outweighed by the positive benefits that would accrue to the disabled members of the Jewish community.

Elderly People

There is a degree of overlap between the potential benefits and negative impacts of the proposal on elderly people and those persons who are disabled. Elderly persons

may need to use walking aids such as a walking stick in order to feel more confident and safe when walking. They may also need the help of spectacles for reading and need to take medication at frequent and regular intervals. Without the introduction of an Eruv they would be prohibited from carrying these items on the Sabbath and as such would be housebound, unable to take part in religious services at the synagogue. The introduction of the eruv would remove this prohibition and similar benefits would accrue to the elderly as for the disabled.

Information provided by the applicants indicated that there are some 370 members aged 70 years or older who would potentially benefit from the proposal. Of the 2 questionnaires returned none were completed by persons over 65. However, as previous sections of this report identify, several parties who responded to the application supported the benefits the proposed eruv would bring to elderly members of the Jewish community.

Whilst no specific objections were raised in respect of any potential negative impacts that the eruv would have on elderly, of whatever belief, it is nevertheless considered that similar negative impacts could arise to those found in respect of disabled persons. However, it is considered that the eruv would bring significant benefits to elderly members of the Jewish community, as described in the previous section. The proposal would have clear and significant benefits for elderly member of the Jewish community which outweigh the potential limited harm to elderly members of the community arising from the installation of the proposed equipment.

Young Children and parents of young children in the Jewish Community

Without the introduction of an eruv young children, more specifically those that have not reached walking age or are only capable of walking short distances, would not be able to leave their home on the Sabbath to go to the synagogue to worship or go out for any other activity.

At least one parent of young children would be effectively housebound by having to look after their children who cannot walk to the synagogue, local park, friends, grandparents etc. Furthermore, it is likely that mothers would have a greater childcare responsibility and are therefore likely to be disproportionately affected. The introduction of the Eruv would enable the use of pushchairs, prams etc for taking children out on the Sabbath. This will not only increase equality of opportunity for the children themselves but also their carers. In addition there would be indirect benefits to the wider family groups and community from being able to include all members in the communal activities. The number of children and children's parents who are currently adversely affected by the absence of an Eruv is estimated to be in the region of 230.

None of the questionnaires returned were specified as being from persons with young families. No noteworthy potential adverse impacts on members of this group have been highlighted or drawn to officer's attention through the consultative process.

Other matters

Fostering good relations between different religious/ethnic groups, S149 (5) of the Act, requires that the Council:-

“(5) having due regard to the need to foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it involves having due regard, in particular, to the need to “Tackle prejudice and promote understanding”.

It is considered that the planning application itself provides an opportunity for inter faith and religious understanding to be promoted. The application itself outlines the role of the Eruv thus giving more insight to the wider community of certain aspects of the Jewish faith. Additionally, the planning process involved an active consultation exercise by the LPA, in this case some 843 local residents were written to individually. The consultation letters included a brief description of the Eruv and what it is for. The application itself gave more information. More generally it is considered that the experience of the successful operation of Eruvim in Barnet continues to foster good relations between Jews and non Jews.

Overall conclusion on equalities impacts

This planning application falls to be considered on its planning merits but, given the nature of the application, in reaching its decision the LPA must have regard to the provisions of the Equality Act 2010. This Act requires the LPA to demonstrate that any decision it makes is reached in a fair, transparent or accountable way considering the needs and rights of different members of the community.

Officers consider that the proposal has the potential to generate a number of negative and positive impacts on groups with the protected characteristics of age, disability, religion or belief. The potential impacts, both positive and negative, of the proposal on the different groups have been identified and weighed against each other. As evidenced by the report this is not an easy task particularly when assessing the impact of the proposal on the religion/beliefs of different groups.

The development proposed would not prevent walking along the pavement, driving or change the behaviour of any groups who do not currently observe the Sabbath. The development would not change the use of the land nor impose any changes in behaviour on others. Also the evidence from other Eruvim suggests that it would not necessarily lead to a change in the demographics of the area nor threaten community cohesion between different faith and ethnic groups.

The application comprises pieces of street furniture, cylindrical poles joined at the top by thin wire and 1m high posts known as Leci. The poles resemble lamp posts without the lamp fittings. Other than the ‘gateway’ constructions proposed, there are no physical manifestations delineating the Eruv boundaries. The ‘gateways’ would not display any signage or religious symbol. Fears that the development would alter the character of the local area by incentivising members of a particular minority to settle in the area encompassed by the Eruv have not been borne out in the parts of the borough which currently have Eruvim and it is considered that the benefits to the identified protected groups would outweigh the perception of harm. No one group would be significantly directly disadvantaged by the Eruv, however those Jews who observe the Jewish Law against carrying on the Sabbath would benefit significantly.

There would be benefits from the proposals to groups with protected characteristics, including parents and grandparents of young children, the disabled and their

families, and the elderly. Officers consider that the benefits to these protected groups would outweigh the potential harm to members of other protected groups as previously addressed.

4. CONCLUSION

The NPPF identifies that the purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development, which it advise has three dimensions; economic, social and environmental. It is considered that this application is promoted by the social dimension in that it reflects the community's needs and supports its health, social and cultural well being. The environmental dimension of sustainable development is also relevant in respect of the need to protect and enhance the natural, built and historic environment when considering this application.

The application is found to be supported by the London Plan, in particular policy 3.16, which seeks the protection and enhancement of social infrastructure. It is also supported by the policies of the Barnet Local Plan.

Each individual Eruv equipment site has been assessed in detail and in each case it is considered that the proposal would be acceptable in terms of its impact on the amenities of the area and the amenities of neighbouring residents. The proposal is also found to be adequate in terms of its impacts on MOL, the Green Belt, trees and biodiversity.

The siting and design of the proposed equipment on the public highway has been carefully considered in respect of highway safety in general, the potential for causing of obstructions and the potential impact the development could have on the ability of disabled persons to use the public highway. Officers consider that the proposal is acceptable in these regards.

The potential impacts of the proposal on persons with characteristics that are protected by the Equality Act 2010 have been taken into account in the consideration of this application. It is found that no one group would be significantly directly disadvantaged by the proposed Eruv, however those Jews who observe Jewish Law against carrying on the Sabbath would benefit significantly. There would be benefits from the proposals to groups with protected characteristics, including parents and grandparents of young children, the disabled and their families, and the elderly. Officers consider that the benefits to these protected groups would outweigh the potential harm to members of protected groups.

Eruvim already exist elsewhere in the borough and officers have visited these to assess the impact that the equipment has on the character and appearance of those areas. Officers consider that the Eruv equipment has no adverse impact and readily assimilates into the street scene. Similarly there is no evidence that the proposal would have an adverse impact on protected groups from these visits.

Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires the Council to determine any application in accordance with the statutory development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. All relevant policies contained within The Mayor's London Plan and the Barnet Local Plan, as well as

other relevant guidance and material considerations, have been carefully considered and taken into account by the Local Planning Authority in their assessment of this application.

For the reasons set out in the previous sections of this report it is concluded that the proposed development generally and taken overall accords with the relevant development plan policies and constitutes a sustainable form of development. It is therefore considered that there are material planning considerations which justify the grant of planning permission. Accordingly APPROVAL subject to conditions is recommended, as set out in the Recommendation section at the beginning of this report.

SITE LOCATION PLAN: Woodside Park Eruv

REFERENCE: 15/00905/FUL

