RECOMMENDATION I - Refuse for the following reasons:

1. The proposed development, by reason of its height, massing, and scale, would be unduly obtrusive and detrimental to the character and appearance of the streetscene and general locality. The proposals would be contrary to policy DM01 of the Adopted Barnet Development Management Policies, CS5 of the Adopted Barnet Core Strategy, and paragraph 64 of the National Planning Policy Framework and policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the Mayor's London Plan 2015.

2. The proposed building would appear overbearing and visually dominating as viewed from the rear gardens and windows of the properties at no.1, no.3, no.5, no.7, no.9 and no.11 Princes Park Avenue. The proposals would be detrimental to the visual amenities of the neighbouring occupiers, being contrary to policy DM01 of the Adopted Barnet Development Management Policies 2012.

3. The proposals would have a harmful impact on the visual and residential amenities of neighbouring occupiers at no.1 Princes Park Avenue by reason of the harmful overshadowing of the rear garden. The proposals would be contrary to policies DM01 and DM02 of the Adopted Barnet Development Management Policies 2012.

4. The application does not make any provision towards on-site affordable housing, contrary to policies DM10, CS NPPF, CS4 and CS15 of the Barnet Local Plan Core Strategy and Development Management Policies Document (both adopted September 2012), policies 3.12 and 3.13 of the London Plan (adopted July 2011 and October 2013), the Barnet Planning Obligations (adopted April 2013) and Affordable Housing (adopted February 2007 and August 2010) Supplementary Planning Documents and the Mayoral Housing (adopted November 2012) Supplementary Planning Guidance. It has not been demonstrated that the proposed commuted sum towards affordable housing within the Unilateral Undertaking provided by the applicant is adequate provision.

INFORMATIVE(S):

The plans accompanying this application are:
AD-00-00-06-01 PL1 ELEVATION 01
AD-00-00-06-02 PL1 ELEVATION 02
AD-00-00-06-03 PL1 ELEVATION 03
AD-00-00-06-04 PL1 ELEVATION 04
AD-00-00-06-05 PL1 ELEVATION 05
AD-00-00-06-06 PL1 ELEVATION 06
AD-00-00-06-11 PL2 E2 WITH OUTLINE
AD-00-00-06-12 PL2 E2 WITH OUTLINE
AD-00-00-06-13 PL2 E3 WITH OUTLINE
AD-00-00-06-16 PL2 E6 WITH OUTLINE
AD-00-00-06-21 PL3 SECTION 01
AD-00-00-06-21.1 PL2
AD-00-00-06-22 PL3 SECTION 02
AD-00-00-06-23 PL3 SECTION 03
AD-01-00-01-01 PL3 1ST FLOOR PLAN
AD-02-00-01-01 PL3 2ND FLOOR PLAN
AD-03-00-01-01 PL3 3RD FLOOR
AD-04-00-01-01 PL3 4TH FLOOR PLAN
AD-B1-00-01-01 PL3 BASEMENT 01 PLAN,
AD-B2-00-01-01 PL3 BASEMENT 02
AD-BM-00-01-01 PL3 BASEMENT MEZZANINE
AD-GF-00-01-01 PL3 GROUND FLOOR PLAN
AD-LG-00-01-01 PL3 LOWER GROUND FLOOR PLAN
AD-RF-00-01-01 PL3 ROOF PLAN
AD-LC-00-01-01 PL2 LOCATION PLAN
AD-ST-00-01-01 PL2 SITE PLAN
AD-ST-00-01-02 PL2 SITE PLAN DIMENSIONED
AD-06-00-01-01 PL3 UPPER PENTHOUSE PLAN
AD-UP-40-01-01-PENTHOUSE

Air Quality Assessment
Arboricultural Assessment
Archaeology, Design and Access Statement
Ecological Assessment, Energy Statement
Flood Risk Assessment sm1
Site Investigation Report
Transport Statement
Travel Plan
Utility Statement
Ventilation Strategy
Acoustic Assessment Report
Urban Landscape Design Strategy & Visual Impact Assessment
Soil Survey

2. This is a reminder that should an application for appeal be allowed, then the proposed development would be deemed as 'chargeable development', defined as development of one or more additional units, and / or an increase to existing floor space of more than 100 sq m. Therefore the following information may be of interest and use to the developer and in relation to

the appeal process itself:
The Mayor of London adopted a Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) charge on 1st April 2012 setting a rate of £35 per sq m on all forms of development in Barnet except for a £0 per sq m rate for education and health developments. This planning application was assessed as liable for a £631,015 payment under Mayoral CIL at this time.
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 were set at a rate of £0 per sq m. This planning application was assessed as liable for a £1,233,900 payment under Barnet CIL at this time.
Liability for CIL is recorded to the register of Local Land Charges as a legal charge upon a site, payable should development commence. The Mayoral CIL charge is 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.
If Affordable Housing Relief or Charitable Relief applies to this development, 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.
The assumed liable party will be sent a 'Liability Notice' providing full details of the charge and to whom it has been apportioned for payment. If you wish to identify named parties other than the original applicant for permission as the liable party for paying this levy, please submit to the Council an 'Assumption of Liability' notice; also available from the Planning Portal website.
The Community Infrastructure Levy becomes payable upon commencement of development. A 'Notice of Commencement' is required to be submitted to the Council's CIL Team prior to commencing on site; 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 any appeal being allowed, please contact us: cil@barnet.gov.uk.

3. Waste Comments
Thames Water requests that the Applicant should incorporate within their proposal, protection to the property by installing for example, a non-return valve or other suitable device to avoid the risk of backflow at a later date, on the assumption that the sewerage network may surcharge to ground level during storm conditions.
Surface Water Drainage - With regard to surface water drainage it is the responsibility of a developer to make proper provision for drainage to ground, water courses or a suitable sewer. In respect of surface water it is recommended that the applicant should ensure that storm flows are attenuated or regulated into the receiving public network through on or off

site storage. When it is proposed to connect to a combined public sewer, the site drainage should be separate and combined at the final manhole nearest the boundary. Connections are not permitted for the removal of groundwater. Where the developer proposes to discharge to a public sewer, prior approval from Thames Water Developer Services will be required. They can be contacted on 0845 850 2777. Reason - to ensure that the surface water discharge from the site shall not be detrimental to the existing sewerage system.
There are public sewers crossing or close to your development. In order to protect public sewers and to ensure that Thames Water can gain access to those sewers for future repair and maintenance, approval should be sought from Thames Water where the erection of a building or an extension to a building or underpinning work would be over the line of, or would come within 3 metres of, a public sewer. Thames Water will usually refuse such approval in respect of the construction of new buildings, but approval may be granted in some cases for extensions to existing buildings. The applicant is advised to contact Thames Water Developer Services on 0845 850 2777 to discuss the options available at this site.
Thames Water would advise that with regard to sewerage infrastructure capacity, we would not have any objection to the above planning application.

Water Comments
On the basis of information provided, Thames Water would advise that with regard to water infrastructure capacity, we would not have any objection to the above planning application.
Thames Water recommend the following informative be attached to this planning permission. Thames Water will aim to provide customers with a minimum pressure of 10m head (approx 1 bar) and a flow rate of 9 litres/minute at the point where it leaves Thames Waters pipes. The developer should take account of this minimum pressure in the design of the proposed development.

Supplementary Comments
The proposed works will be in close proximity to underground water and sewerage utility infrastructure. Piling has the potential to impact on local underground water and sewerage utility infrastructure and as such Thames Water request the following condition:
Piling or any other penetrative construction method shall not be permitted other than with the express written consent of the Local Planning Authority, in liaison with the relevant utility providers and Environment Agency, which may be given where it has been demonstrated that there is no resulting unacceptable risk to below ground utility infrastructure or groundwater. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details. Reason. To ensure that the piling design is protective of below ground utility infrastructure assets and controlled waters.
The applicant is advised to contact Thames Water Developer Services on 0845 850 2777 to discuss the details of the piling method statement.

Informative: Any highway approval as part of the planning process for the alteration to the existing crossovers or new crossovers will be subject to detailed survey by the Crossover Team in Development and Regulatory Services as part of the application for crossover under Highways Act 1980. Removal or relocation of any existing street furniture or alteration to road markings or Controlled Parking Bays would be subject to public consultations and would be done at the applicant's expense, under a rechargeable works agreement, by the Council's term contractor for Highway Works.

In the case where a highway tree is present in the vicinity of the proposed access road or a crossover for the development the final approval would be subject to the detailed assessment carried out by the Highways Crossover Team as part of the crossover application. The outcome of this assessment cannot be prejudged. Information on application for a crossover could be obtained from London Borough of Barnet, Crossover Team, Development and Regulatory Services, NLBP, Building 4, 2nd Floor, Oakleigh Road South, London N11 1NP

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

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

The applicant is advised that the development is located on or will have an impact on the Strategic Road Network (SRN). The Traffic Management Act (2004) requires the Council to notify Transport for London (TfL) for implementation of construction works. The developer is expected to work with the Council to mitigate any adverse impact on public highway and would require TfL's approval before works can commence.

The applicant is also advised that Golders Green Road NW11 is Traffic Sensitive Road; deliveries during the construction period should not take place between 8.00 am-9.30 am and 4.30 pm-6.30 pm Monday to Friday. Careful consideration must also be given to the optimum route(s) for construction traffic and the Development Regulatory Services should be consulted in this respect.

The costs of any associated works to the public highway, including reinstatement works, will be borne by the applicants and may require the applicant to enter into a

278 Agreement under the Highways Act 1980. Detailed design will have to be approved by Development Regulatory Services.

The gradient for the proposed ramps leading to the underground parking areas should have a gradient not steeper than 1:10 or in accordance with the guidelines in IStructE Design recommendations for multi-storey and underground car parks 4th Edition.

The applicant is advised that the proposed development may involve alterations to the existing on-street waiting and loading restrictions. Alterations to on-street waiting and loading restrictions will be subject to a statutory consultation period. The Council cannot prejudge the outcome of the consultation process.

In complying with the contaminated land condition parts 1 and 2, reference should be made at all stages to appropriate current guidance and codes of practice. This would include:
1) The Environment Agency CLR & SR Guidance documents (including CLR11 'Model Procedures for the Management of Land Contamination');
2) National Planning Policy Framework (2012) / National Planning Practice Guidance (2014);
3) BS10175:2011 - Investigation of potentially contaminated sites - Code of Practice;
4) Guidance for the safe development of housing on land affected by contamination, (2008) by NHBC, the EA and CIEH;
5) CIRIA report C665 - Assessing risks posed by hazardous ground gases to buildings;
6) CIRIA report C733 - Asbestos in soil and made ground: a guide to understanding and managing risks.
Please note that in addition to the above, consultants should refer to the most relevant and up to date guidance and codes of practice if not already listed in the above list.

The applicant is advised to engage a qualified acoustic consultant to advise on the scheme, including the specifications of any materials, construction, fittings and equipment necessary to achieve satisfactory internal noise levels in this location.

In addition to the noise control measures and details, the scheme needs to clearly set out the target noise levels for the habitable rooms, including for bedrooms at night, and the levels that the sound insulation scheme would achieve.

The Council's Sustainable Design and Construction Supplementary Planning Document requires that dwellings are designed and built to insulate against external noise so that the internal noise level in rooms does not exceed 30dB(A) expressed as an Leq between the hours of 11.00pm and 7.00am, nor 30dB(A) expressed as an Leq between the hours of 7.00am and 11.00pm (Guidelines for Community Noise, WHO). This needs to be considered in the context of room ventilation requirements.

The details of acoustic consultants can be obtained from the following contacts: a) Institute of Acoustics and b) Association of Noise Consultants.

The assessment and report on the noise impacts of a development should use methods of measurement, calculation, prediction and assessment of noise levels and impacts that comply with the following standards, where appropriate:

1) BS 7445(2003) Pt 1, BS7445 (1991) Pts 2 & 3 - Description and measurement of environmental noise;
2) BS 4142:1997 - Method for rating industrial noise affecting mixed residential and industrial areas;
3) BS 8223: 2014 - Guidance on sound insulation and noise reduction for buildings: code of practice;
4) Department of Transport: Calculation of road traffic noise (1988);
5) Department of Transport: Calculation of railway noise (1995);
6) National Planning Policy Framework (2012)/ National Planning Policy Guidance (2014).

Please note that in addition to the above, consultants should refer to the most relevant and up to date guidance and codes of practice if not already listed in the above list.

The applicant is advised that any development or conversion which necessitates the removal, changing, or creation of an address or addresses must be officially registered by the Council through the formal 'Street Naming and Numbering' process.

The London Borough of Barnet is the Street Naming and Numbering Authority and is the only organisation that can create or change addresses within its boundaries. Applications are the responsibility of the developer or householder who wish to have an address created or amended.

Occupiers of properties which have not been formally registered can face a multitude of issues such as problems with deliveries, rejection of banking / insurance applications, problems accessing key council services and most importantly delays in an emergency situation.

Further details and the application form can be downloaded from: http://www.barnet.gov.uk/naming-and-numbering-applic-form.pdf or requested from the Street Naming and Numbering Team via street.naming@barnet.gov.uk or by telephoning 0208 359 7294.

RECOMMENDATION II
If the members of the Finchley & Golders Green Area Planning Committee are minded to approve the application, the item shall be approved subject to the conditions in the attached appendix to the report and accompanying legal agreement.

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 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". The NPPF retains a 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 and is recognised in the NPPF as part of the development plan.

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.

The Mayor's Housing Supplementary Planning Guidance (November 2012) provides guidance on how to implement the housing policies in the London Plan.

Policies 3.3, 3.5, 5.2, 5.3, 6.1, 7.4, 7.6 are considered especially relevant.

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). BothDPDs were adopted on 11 September 2012.

Relevant Core Strategy DPD (2012): Policies CS NPPF, CS1, CS5, CS9, CS10, CS15

Relevant Development Management DPD (2012): Policies DM01, DM02, DM03, DM04, DM08, DM17.

Supplementary Planning Documents and Guidance

The Council adopted a Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) "Sustainable Design and Construction" , following public consultation. This SPD provides detailed guidance that supplements policies in the adopted Local Plan, and sets out how sustainable development will be delivered in Barnet. Part 6 of the SPD relates to generic environmental requirements to ensure that new development within Barnet meets sufficiently high environmental and design standards. The Residential Design Guidance SPD and Sustainable Design and Construction SPD are material considerations.

Relevant Planning History:

C00513W/04 – Erection of three to five-storey building (plus basement) to provide a synagogue and off-street parking at basement level, Class A1/A2 commercial floorspace at ground level and a total of 14 self-contained flats on the upper floors. Provision of associated amenity space, and vehicular access from Princes Park Avenue – withdrawn August 2004.

C00513X/04 – Erection of a part two, part three, part four storey building to provide a synagogue and car parking at basement level, Class A2 commercial floorspace at ground floor level, 1 dwellinghouse and 12 self-contained flats. Provision of amenity space and refuse storage. Formation of vehicular access onto Golders Green Road – not determined Jan 05 – Appeal dismissed Jan 2006.

C10692F/04 – Erection of a three storey block of 9 two bedroom selfcontained flats with basement parking for 15 cars 9 additional surface parking spaces, new access road and demolition of existing bridge over sewer and replacement foot bridge over sewer – withdrawn March 04.
C10692G/04 – Erection of part two storey (with accommodation in the roof) and part three storey block of nine flats with new basement car parking and associated changes to landscaping – withdrawn July 04.
C10692H/04 – Erection of part single (with accommodation in the roof) and part three-storey block of eight flats with basement parking for 14 cars. New access road from Golders Green Road. Concrete bridge over sewer to be demolished. Associated changes to landscape – refused Dec 04 – appeal dismissed May 06.
C10692K/06 – Change of use of part ground and part lower ground floor from class B1 offices to class D1 medical outpatient centre, with minor external alterations – approved Sept 06.

Site Address: 290-294 Golders Green Road London NW11
Application Number: C00513Z/07
Application Type: Full Application
Decision: Approved subject to conditions and legal agreement
Decision Date: 06/06/2007
Appeal Decision: No Appeal Decision Applies
Appeal Decision Date: No Appeal Decision Date exists
Proposal: Construction of three storey building with basements and lower ground floors to create 62 self-contained flats and 1020sqm of health facility (D1 use) with provision for 89 cars and 80 cycle spaces with access from Golders Green Road. Associated landscaping.
Case Officer: Karina Conway

Site Address: 290-294 Golders Green Road London NW11 9PY
Application Number: C00513AA/08
Application Type: Full Application
Decision: Approved following Legal Agreement
Decision Date: 23/05/2008
Appeal Decision: No Appeal Decision Applies
Appeal Decision Date: No Appeal Decision Date exists
Proposal: Construction of five storey building with basements and lower ground floor to create 45 self-contained flats and 1020sqm of health facility (D1 use) with provision for 83 cars and 80 cycle spaces with access from Golders Green Road. Associated landscaping.
Case Officer: Karina Conway

Site Address: 290-294 Golders Green Road London NW119PY
Application Number: C00513Y/05
Application Type: Full Application
Decision: Refuse
Decision Date: 11/08/2006
Appeal Decision: No Appeal Decision Applies
Appeal Decision Date: No Appeal Decision Date exists
Proposal: New three-storey building to provide 14 self-contained flats with

basement parking.
Case Officer:

Site Address: HARVESTER RESTAURANTS, THE PRINCE ALBERT, 290-294 GOLDERS GREEN ROAD, LONDON, NW11 9PY
Application Number: 00247/08
Application Type: Full Application
Decision: Approved following legal agreement
Decision Date: 07/07/2008
Appeal Decision: No Appeal Decision Applies
Appeal Decision Date: No Appeal Decision Date exists
Proposal: Construction of a five storey building with basement and lower ground floor to create 41 self-contained flats and 1020sqm of health facility (D1 use) with provision for 83 cars and 80 cycle spaces with access from Golders Green Road. Associated landscaping.
Case Officer: Karina Conway

Consultations and Views Expressed:

Neighbours Consulted: 388 Replies: 94

Neighbours Wishing To Speak 9 (8 Against, 1 in Support)

A total of 93 letters of objection, and 1 letter of support were received to the consultation. This includes two petitions, one of 70 signatories and one of 15 signatories

The objections raised may be summarised as follows:

- Loss of light – The height and massing of the building would block out the sun.
- Loss of privacy – Rear windows and roof gardens would overlook neighbouring residential properties.
- Impact on Traffic/Parking – Proposals will heavily impact on parking available, visitor parking has not been considered. Will affect neighbouring accesses. Travel plan will not be effective.
- Flooding – neighbouring gardens will become flooded
- No need for luxury development in the area – use would overburden local facilities
- Scale and appearance of development – Scale of the building is too large for the area
- Effect on nature conservation and loss of trees – The site is home to bird species and hedgehogs. Proposed trees are small and do not replace what is being lost. It has not been clarified whether current trees bordering the rear of the properties on Princes Park Avenue are to be retained.
- Noise and disturbance resulting from the use – Noise from the number of people on the site as well as machinery would be detrimental to neighbouring residents.
- Impact on local security - no provision to fence in the new apartments and prevent access to neighbouring properties
- Impact on stability of land and risk of subsidence
- Land Covenants
- Noise pollution and disturbance form 75 flats
- Emissions of petrol and carbon monoxide

- Noise from machinery such as air conditioning
- Pathway at rear of property would be used by all residents and would cause noise and disturbance.
- Lack of security is inappropriate
- Pathways and patios would provide no security
- Access via ramp would have to be gate locked
- Borders of site need to be fenced off
- Security lights are needed to patios, pathways and staircases.
- Area is relatively low density
- Proposals do nothing to address danger from corner of Princes Park Road and visibility
- Rodent infestation

The letter of support can be summarised as follows:

The proposed development will enhance the local area and bring much needed family housing to the area.

The item has been referred to the Finchley & Golders Green Area Committee at the request of Councillor Old as the site has been of major local concern for many years and to enable Councillors to be given a chance to debate the future of the site.

Internal /Other Consultations:

Historic England - Have confirmed that they have no objection.
• Urban Design & Heritage - Object to the proposals and comments are incorporated below.
• Thames Water – Have made comments and suggested conditions regarding petrol interceptors and piling methodology.
• Environment Agency - No comments received. The proposals fall within Standing advice.
• Traffic & Development – No objection
• Environmental Health – Requested additional clarifications regarding air quality issues. This has been provided and they have no objections to the proposals.
London Fire Brigade – No comments yet received.

Date of Site & Press Notice: 20 August 2015

2. PLANNING APPRAISAL

Site Description and Surroundings:

The site is the former Harvester site addressed 290-294 Golders Green Road.
The site forms an area of approximately 0.4 hectares.

There is a tree preservation order on the site that covers a number of individual and group trees. It appears that historically some of these trees

have been cut down, though this appears to have been done a considerable period of time ago.

This application relates to an L-shaped, gap site located on the north-eastern side of Golders Green Road. The plot includes the former site of the Harvester Restaurant and part of the car park which served the Roman House office building immediately adjacent to the site.

The site is situated between Princes Park Avenue to the south-east and Golders Green Road to the south-west. This part of Golders Green Road consists of a mixture of commercial and residential buildings of varying heights, with traditional, suburban housing on the side streets and to the rear of the site. Princes Park Avenue is a residential street comprising of a mix of detached and semi-detached dwellings, which are predominantly two-storeys in height, with pitched roofs.

The site is adjacent to the four-storey commercial office block, Roman House which was built in the 1990's and to the other side, across the junction with Princes Park Avenue, is a three-storey purpose built residential block of flats known as Phildor Court. To the front of the site, Golders Green Road is characterised by commercial premises at ground floor with elements of residential accommodation above.

Opposite the site (on Golders Green Road) is a parade of three-storey buildings known as Princes Parade. Decoy Brook defines the rear boundary of the site and separates it from the neighbouring flatted development at James Close.

The topography and site levels vary, sloping down towards the North Circular Road (A406) to the north-west and Decoy Brook to the north; and upwards to Golders Green to the south-east. The ground levels therefore drop from the corner of the site at its junction with Princes Park Avenue to where it meets its western boundary with Roman House and from the front of the site bordering Golders Green Road to the rear boundary with Decoy Brook.

Proposal:

The proposals are for the erection of a part two, part six, part seven storey building with lower ground floor and basements providing 67 residential flats with ancillary resident's spa facility; associated car and cycle parking, landscaping and associated other works with access from Golders Green Road.

Dimensions

The proposed front block would have a width of approximately 60m, and would extend backwards a depth of approximately 57m.

Measured from the front elevation to Golders Green Road, the building would be 19.8m high with a further 2.2m high roof level.

The roof level would be set back some 2.5m to either side, and from the front of the building.

In relation to the previously refused scheme there have been the following changes:

- There has been a reduction in the number of flats from 75 to 67.
- A floor has been removed to the front block facing Golders Green Road.
- The rear blocks have reduced in height by 2.2 metres
- The rear blocks have been shifted by 600mm towards Roman House and away from the rear gardens of Princes Park Avenue.
- There are 107 cars parking spaces proposed compared with 118 spaces in the previous scheme.
- There are 122 cycle spaces proposed compared with 138 spaces in the previous scheme.
- All three basement levels have been redesigned
- The façade of the building has been changed from stone and render and replaced with brick
- The external cornice detail has been removed to reduce the bulk of the building.
- The façade of the penthouse floor has been changed from stone and render and replaced with glass.

Planning Considerations:

Planning History:

In June 2007, consent was given for the construction of a three-storey building with basements and lower ground floors to create 62 self-contained flats and 1020sqm of health facility (D1 use) with provision for 89 cars and 80 cycle spaces with access from Golders Green Road (Application Reference C00513Z/07).

In May 2008 consent was given for the construction of a five-storey building with basement and lower ground floor to create 45 self-contained flats and 1020sqm of health facility (D1 use) with provision for 83 cars and 80 cycle spaces with access from Golders Green Road (Application Reference C00513AA/08).

In July 2008, consent was given for the construction of a five-storey building with basement and lower ground floor to create 41 self-contained flats and 1020sqm of health facility (D1 use) with provision for 83 cars and 80 cycle spaces with access from Golders Green Road (Application Reference F/00247/08). This proposal was similar to the consented scheme of May 2008 however there were a number of changes including the slight relocation of the PCT (Health Care Facility) to accord more with the original consent of 2007; a re-adjustment to the location of the D1 floorspace; and a subsequent reduction in the number of residential units from 45 to 41. These changes had no bearing on the physical form of the building.

In February 2015, an application was refused by the Planning Committee for '*Erection of a part two, part six, part seven storey building with lower ground floor and basements providing 75 residential flats with ancillary resident's spa facility; associated car and cycle parking, landscaping and associated other works with access from Golders Green Road.*'

This followed pre-application discussions with the Local Planning Authority.

This application was refused for the following reasons:

1. *The proposed development, by reason of its height, massing, materials used, and scale, would be unduly obtrusive and detrimental to the character and appearance of the streetscene and general locality. The proposals would be contrary to policy DM01 of the Adopted Barnet Development Management Policies, CS5 of the Adopted Barnet Core Strategy, and paragraph 64 of the National Planning Policy Framework.*

2. *The proposed building would appear overbearing and visually dominating as viewed from the rear gardens and windows of the properties at no.1, no.3, no.5, no.7, no.9 and no.11 Princes Park Avenue. The proposals would be detrimental to the visual amenities of the neighbouring occupiers, being contrary to policy DM01 of the Adopted Barnet Development Management Policies 2012.*

3. *The proposals would have a harmful impact on the visual and residential amenities of neighbouring occupiers at no.1 Princes Park Avenue by reason of the harmful overshadowing of the rear garden. The proposals would be contrary to policies DM01 and DM02 of the Adopted Barnet Development Management Policies 2012.*

4. *The proposed development does not provide a legal undertaking to monitor the required residential travel plan in association with the development. In the absence of this the proposals would be contrary to policy DM17 of the Adopted Barnet Development Management Policies and policy 6.1 of the Mayor's London Plan.*

5. *The application does not make any provision towards on-site affordable housing, contrary to policies DM10, CS NPPF, CS4 and CS15 of the Barnet Local Plan Core Strategy and Development Management Policies Document (both adopted September 2012), policies 3.12 and 3.13 of the London Plan (adopted July 2011 and October 2013), the Barnet Planning Obligations (adopted April 2013) and Affordable Housing (adopted February 2007 and August 2010) Supplementary Planning Documents and the Mayoral Housing (adopted November 2012) Supplementary Planning Guidance. It has not been demonstrated that the proposed commuted sum towards affordable housing within the Unilateral Undertaking provided by the applicant is adequate provision.*

The main issues associated with this planning application are considered to be:

- Whether the principal of the development is acceptable
- Whether the proposals would have an acceptable impact on the character and appearance of the streetscene, general locality and local townscape
- Whether the proposals would have an acceptable impact on neighbouring amenity and the amenities of future residents
- Whether the proposals would have an acceptable impact on trees of special

amenity value
- Whether the proposals would have an acceptable impact on highway and pedestrian safety
- Whether the proposals make adequate provision for affordable housing
- Whether the proposals would comply with sustainability and energy requirements
- Whether the proposals would harmfully increase local flood risk
- Whether there are any other material planning considerations that would outweigh harm caused by the development

Whether the principal of the development is acceptable

Land Use

The site formerly had a public house and restaurant that was demolished some time ago. It is now occupied for the purposes of car storage though it does not appear that this use benefits from planning permission.

Density

The proposed development would be in an area of PTAL rating 3-4, as the site falls on the boundary of these areas. The development would be at a density of 163 units per hectare. The site is considered to be an urban location, and the proposals would be within the London Plan thresholds.

Whether the proposals would have an acceptable impact on the character and appearance of the streetscene, general locality and local townscape

Layout/Siting

Taking into account the size and location of the plot and considering the topography of the Golders Green area, this is a highly prominent site, which if developed, is likely to be visible from much of the surrounding area. The design of the building is therefore of highest importance.

In comparison to the refused scheme, the building has been set closer to Roman House, and further from the boundary with residential properties on Princes Park Avenue by approximately 0.6m-0.8m.

Scale & Massing

The proposals comprise of front block of 5-6 stories externally, with two blocks joined by a recessed element. The top floor would manifest itself as a glazed roof level recessed from the lower stories.

This application follows the refusal of planning permission for a previously similar development of 6-7 stories. The revised scheme represents a reduction in approximately 2.2m-2.8m though this is approximate as heights vary across the development.

It should also be noted that there have been previous approved planning applications on site, the most recent of these under reference F/00247/08. This scheme was for a five storey (Including set back glazed roof level) building with basements and lower ground floor. The previous scheme was for 45 flats and a medical centre. The permission has now lapsed.

It is acknowledged that the reduction in height is something of an improvement in respect of the impact on the character and appearance of the streetscene. However there are still concerns regarding the height and unbroken massing of the proposed building. This is particularly in terms of the relationship to 1 Princes Park Avenue from the taller parts of the building, although it is acknowledged that the previous scheme was in part closer although smaller in height.

The principal areas of concern are the height of the proposed building, which at six storeys is considered to relate poorly with neighbouring buildings, especially those on Princes Park Avenue, and the unbroken massing of the building, which would contribute to the building appearing bulky within the local streetscape.

Whilst it should be noted that the previously approved scheme was closer to neighbouring buildings on Princes Park Avenue, it was significantly lower in height; the increase in height from the approved scheme would result in an especially awkward relationship with the neighbouring two-storey dwellings on Princes Park Avenue.

When considering the scale of the development, it is noted that there are some similarly tall buildings in the locality, most notably Melvin Hall which is part 7 and part 8 storeys. However, this does not share a similar relationship with the immediately adjacent buildings, which is the main concern in relation to the proposals. Furthermore, the site is particularly prominent and as such the additional height of the replacement would be more prominent than that of Riverside Drive or Melvin Hall.

The proposed development is significantly larger, than that which was approved previously. There is concern that the proposed development, would appear in stark contrast to the two-storey dwellings at the rear and the three storey buildings adjacent to and opposite the site. It is also located at a higher ground level than the more modest developments to the north and west and would therefore stand out as a highly prominent and visually obtrusive feature, harmful to the character and appearance of the wider area. The location and size of the building would also mean that all elevations would be either entirely or partially visible from the surrounding area.

The proposal consists of one large, 5-6 storey, L-shaped block, which extends along the front boundary at a width of 60.2m and the north-western (side) boundary at a width of approximately 57m. The failure to sufficiently break up this large block, further exacerbates the visual impact of the development and increases its presence and visual dominance within the street scene. This needs to be considered in conjunction with the height of the building.

For these reasons, the proposed development is considered harmful to the character and appearance of this part of Golders Green, contrary to policy DM01 of the council's Local Plan Development Management Policies DPD,

which requires development proposals to be based on an understanding of local characteristics, to preserve or enhance local character and to respect the appearance, scale, mass and pattern of surrounding buildings and spaces. Paragraph 2.2.1 of the Development Management Policies DPD states that "The council will not accept designs for new development that are inappropriate to their context or do not take opportunities to improve the character and quality of an area."

It is considered that the proposed development would fail to respect the scale of neighbouring buildings, appearing out of scale and overly bulky as a result of its massing and failing to relate adequately to local context.

External Appearance

The applicant has modified the proposed materials from the previously refused scheme. The proposed materials now encompass brick and glazing as opposed to the stone which was a feature of the previous scheme. This choice of material would be more in keeping with the surrounding area and acceptable, notwithstanding the above comments.

Landscaping

The applicant has provided a landscaping scheme with the proposed application. This was drawn up in conjunction with the previous planning application and is shown on plan 1094 A2 01. It comprises of a mixture of hard and soft landscaping. This includes a mixture of soft and hard landscaping. Furthermore, the applicant has expressed a willingness to provide additional mature trees to provide screening to the boundary of properties on Princes Park Avenue.

Whether the proposals would have an acceptable impact on neighbouring amenity and the amenities of future residents

Neighbouring amenity

As discussed previously in the report, the revised scheme represents an overall reduction in height of approximately 2.2m-2.8m. Furthermore, the building has been sited approximately 0.6-0.8m further from the rear boundary of properties on Princes Park Avenue.

The proposed rear block would be located 13m to the rear boundary of 1 Princes Park Road. This increases further to the north to 7 Princes Park Avenue 17.5m. This then decreases to 11.1m to the rear of no.9 where it is at its closest point.

Loss of light

It is acknowledged that there is potential for the development to cause loss of light to nearby buildings given its massing, height and siting and relationship to buildings on Princes Park Avenue to the east.

It is acknowledged that no.1 Princes Park Avenue has been extended and

has utility and kitchen windows facing Golders Green Road to the south.

A number of residents have expressed concern about potential loss of light. It is considered that there needs to be greater analysis of the potential impact on the visual amenities of neighbouring residents and this would have to show that there is not a harmful impact, given that it would seem likely that overshadowing of rear gardens would result from the development.

In order to justify the proposals in relation to this issue, the applicant has provided an Hours in Sun Overshadowing Report.

The report references the BRE Guidelines 'Site Layout Planning for Daylight and Sunlight – A Guide to Good Practice (2011). The guidelines state that a reduction in 20% is likely to be noticeable.

It should be noted that the previously refused planning application was similarly accompanied by a report. This report stated that there would be a 41% (major) adverse overshadowing to the garden of no.1 Princes Park Avenue.

The report for the current application states that there would be a loss of 31% light to the garden of no.1 Princes Park Avenue. There is a moderate adverse loss of light to 1 Prince Park Avenue (31% compared to 41%). Given the nature of the impact identified it is considered that this would still represent a harmful reduction in the sunlight available to the residents of this property. The report also states that this impact is forecast on March 21st, and that summer months would be less affected. Whilst this may be the case, it is contended that sunlight in the winter months would still be of importance to residents.

The report goes on to state that it is not unusual where proposed developments are envisaged on undeveloped sites in close proximity to neighbouring amenity spaces to cause loss of light. However it is considered that the impact would be significant enough to cause material harm to the amenities of no.1 Princes Park Avenue.

The BRE guidelines do not define what a moderate adverse impact is, but the report states that '*an area of amenity space which by virtue of its pattern of usage has a reasonable expectation of sun on ground for most of the year; and is unable to satisfy guidance'.*

The BRE guidelines are not a representation of policy, though represent an expert analysis of the overshadowing issue. Consequently they are given some weight in considering this issue.

In addition to this the Hours in Sun Report does not analyse the impact of the proposals on the windows of neighbouring properties.

It is considered that the proposals would result in harmful overshadowing of the garden of no.1 Princes Park Avenue.

Visual Impact & Outlook

There is concern regarding the potential visual impact as perceived from the rear windows of no.1 Princes Park Avenue. At a distance of 10.3m from the side boundary with no.1 Princes Park Avenue, the building would for the most part be closer to the boundaries of the site with neighbouring properties on Princes Park Avenue. The impact is specifically a concern with regard to the rear windows on no.1 Princes Park Avenue, given that the rear wall of the proposals would be closer on this side.

The approved scheme did not have a continuous façade running along the rear gardens of these properties. It is considered that the proposals would appear overbearing, visually dominating from the rear gardens and windows of properties at 1-11 Princes Park Avenue. Whilst the applicant has sited the proposed building further from the boundary with no.1 than the approved scheme, it is not considered that this has addressed concerns regarding the visual appearance of the development. Though the previously approved building would have had a certain degree of presence, these took the appearance of linked blocks. The proposals are for the most part closer, taller and more massive. It is considered that the proposed development would appear overbearing and visually dominating to the detriment of neighbouring visual amenity.

The changes within the revised scheme from the previously refused scheme would not be sufficient to address the previous concerns identified in terms of the overbearing appearance of the development and the sense of enclosure as perceived from 1-11 Princes Park Avenue. Officers note that the scheme still involves a continuous building running across the site. The replacement of the stone with brick would give the building a somewhat less heavy appearance but at the proposed height and proximity to neighbouring windows and gardens it would have considerable presence. The reduction in height and set back help somewhat but it is still considered that the proposed massing of the building would result in a development that would appear oppressive as perceived from neighbouring residential properties.

Loss of privacy

The proposals would broadly comply with the standards set out in the Council's Supplementary Planning Document: Residential Design Guidance, which specifies that there should be a minimum distance of 10.5m to neighbouring gardens and 21m to windows in habitable rooms.

The proposed building is sited 10.3m from the boundary with neighbouring residents. It is considered on balance that the proposals would not result in harmful overlooking given that this is not materially below the figure quoted in the Supplementary Planning Document and that in part the windows are slightly at an angle to the rear windows on Princes Park Avenue. Windows and balconies have been sited in such a way that they would not harm neighbouring amenity through overlooking, however details of screening for the balconies would be required but could be secured by condition.
The development would have an acceptable impact in terms of privacy on the windows of Roman House, as the proposals are no closer than the previously

approved scheme, and that Roman House is in use as a medical centre.

Future Amenity

The size of all units would comply with the Mayors London Plan. The applicant has considered whether windows could be obscure glazed however this would provide a poor level of outlook to habitable rooms and is considered undesirable. The proposed flats would have access to communal amenity areas through communal accesses. It is not considered that the layout would give rise to a poor level of privacy through use of the amenity areas.
The proposals would provide approximately 3000 square metres of amenity space, which would comply with standards in Supplementary Planning Document: Residential Design Guidance which requires 5 square metres per habitable room.

Whether the proposals would have an acceptable impact on trees of special amenity value

The proposals would result in the loss of two trees under Tree Preservation Order, namely tree T3 and T4. (Referred to as trees G3 and T6 in the order) Furthermore the proposals would result in the loss of category C trees T21, T22 T23, T24, G25, G38, and B grade tree T10. However it should be noted that the removal of these trees was shown on the landscaping plans associated with the previous approval reference F/00247/08.
The proposals would leave limited scope for future landscaping. The applicant has agreed if the application was to be approved that a condition could be attached to ensure tree screening to the boundaries with properties on Princes Park Avenue and James Court prior to construction. Landscaping would be provided as part of the development and secured by condition.

Whether the proposals would have an acceptable impact on highway and pedestrian safety

The site is located on Golders Green Road at its junction with Princes Park Avenue. The site is outside the one hour Brent Cross Station Control Parking Zone (CPZ). The CPZ operates from Monday to Friday between 11am and 12pm. There are also Pay by Phone bays on Golders Green Road in the vicinity of the development which operate from Monday to Sunday during 9am-5.30pm.

A ramped vehicular access is proposed for the development from Golders Green Road. A 1:10 gradient would need to be provided otherwise the ramp design would need to be in accordance with the Design Recommendations for multi-storey and underground car parks by The Institution of Structural Engineers. A condition would need to be attached to any grant of planning permission in order to ensure that the ramp is built to such standards.

Parking

107 parking spaces are proposed within a two storey basement level.

The assessment of parking provision for a residential development is based on Public Transport Accessibility Levels (PTAL) Score. For higher PTAL of say 5/6 a parking requirement at the lower end of the council's parking policy range would be considered acceptable. However, for a PTAL Score at the lower end (say of 1 or 2) parking provision at the higher end of the council's parking policy range would be required. The PTAL Score for the site is calculated as 3-4. Barnet's Local Plan Development Management Policies approved in September 2012 sets out Parking Standards as follows for the residential use:
For 4 or more bedroom units - 2.0 to 1.5 parking spaces per unit
For 2 and 3 bedroom units - 1.5 to 1.0 parking spaces per unit
For 1 bedroom units - 1.0 to less than 1 parking space per unit
Based on the above parking standards the parking requirement is calculated as follows:
10x1b = a range of (0.0 - 1.0) = 0.0 – 10.0 parking spaces required
13x2b = a range of (1.0 - 1.5) = 13.0 - 19.5 parking spaces required
18x3b = a range of (1.0 - 1.5) = 18.0 - 27.0 parking spaces required
26x4b = a range of (1.5 - 2.0) = 39.0 - 52.0 parking spaces required
This equates to a range of parking provision of 70 to 108.5 spaces to meet the Barnet Local Plan parking standards contained in the Development Management Policies approved in September 2012. The maximum parking provision would be more appropriate in an area with the lowest Public Transport Accessibility Level (PTAL) for the site. The PTAL for the above site is 3-4.
The proposed parking provision of 107 parking spaces is in accordance with the parking standards as stated in Barnet Local Plan, Delivery Management Plan. 10% of the parking provision is proposed for disabled use.
Electrical Charging Vehicle points would be provided in accordance with the London Plan Parking Standards and will be conditioned.

122 cycle parking spaces are also being provided which is acceptable for a development in this location. The site is accessible by bus services: 83, 183, 210, 232 and 240. The site also has access to London Underground Northern Line services from Brent Cross Station.

The Transport Assessment (TA) has been submitted with the application and revised from the previously refused scheme.

This includes an assessment of the trip generation associated with the scheme and the potential safety implications of the scheme. The data demonstrate that the majority of the accidents do not share a common cause but majority of the accidents involving cars have been due to driver error/careless driving. It was concluded in the analysis that the highway layout does not present any defects that would raise a safety concern. Therefore, the small increase in traffic resulting from the proposed
development is unlikely to have any detrimental impact on the highway safety.

No information has been provided in the TA with regards to the refuse collection arrangement. A condition will need to be placed on the application

to ensure that adequate arrangement in place in accordance with the Council's refuse collection policy.

A robust construction management plan needs to be provided and careful consideration must be given to the optimum route(s) for construction traffic and the Development Regulatory Services should be consulted in this respect.

A signed unilateral undertaking has been provided which makes provisions for a residential Travel Plan.

Whether the proposals make adequate provision for affordable housing

Policy DM10 of the Development Management Policies states that 'Having regard to the borough-wide target that 40% of housing provision should be affordable, the maximum reasonable amount of affordable housing will be required on site, subject to viability, from all new sites providing 10 or more units gross or covering an area of 0.4 hectares or more.'

The applicant has not provided a viability appraisal of the current scheme. However, an appraisal was provided in relation to the previous similar scheme that was refused. An excerpt from the Deloitte report is included below:

- Development Plan Policy DM10 states that 'Having regard to the borough-wide target that 40% of housing provision should be affordable, the maximum reasonable amount of affordable housing will be required on site, subject to viability, from all new sites providing 10 or more units gross or covering an area of 0.4 hectares or more'. It is quite clear from this wording that the ability or otherwise of a 'site' to viably deliver affordable housing is a crucial question for Local Planning Authority when assessing an application.

- Deloitte Real Estate have independently evaluated this matter very carefully and have concluded that an alternative scheme to that proposed at the site, which addresses the relevant planning policy requirements, could viably deliver an on-site contribution to affordable housing provision.

- Deloitte Real Estate have been unable to agree your suggested Benchmark Land Value (BLV) for the site. It is considered that the figure put forward has not been adequately justified and this is not the case at present. The onus is on your advisors to adequately justify whatever figure is proposed in this regard.

- Given the above position the Officers are of the view that it is likely that the application site could viably make an on-site contribution to affordable housing provision in the borough. The information provided to date as part of the submission has not demonstrated that the site cannot make a viable contribution to affordable housing provision in the borough

It is acknowledged that the changes made to the current scheme are unlikely to make the scheme more viable than the refused scheme. However, the issues identified in the above report still stand and therefore the lack of affordable housing provision is considered unacceptable.

Whether the proposals would comply with sustainability and energy Requirements

The applicant has provided an energy statement which advises that it is envisaged that the proposals would achieve a 40% reduction in carbon dioxide emissions. The proposals would achieve this through use of air source heat pumps and photovoltaics. A condition could be attached securing these if the scheme was to be approved.

The scheme would need to comply the Supplementary Planning Document on Sustainable Design and Construction and London Plan policy 5.2.

Whether the proposals would harmfully increase local flood risk

Part of the rear of the site is located within Flood Zone 2. Environment Agency Guidelines advise that residential use is appropriate on such sites however a sequential test should be carried out. However, this has been discussed with the Environment Agency and given that no built development is taken place within zone 2 a sequential test is not required.

A flood risk assessment accompanies the proposals. The proposals make provision for flood attenuation and ensure that all of the building footprint is located outside the flood zone.
The applicant has provided a utilities statement which advises that:
• No additional gas services are required
• Air source heat pumps and photo-voltaic panels would provide electricity.
• Water supplies would be routed from Golders Green Road.
An application has been made to Thames Water who have been consulted on the proposals and have no raised objection.

<u>Whether there are any other material planning considerations that would outweigh the harm caused by the development</u>

The applicant has previously raised the issue of whether the fact that the development is not commercially viable is justification for the approval of the application despite the harm caused. They have advised that the previously refused scheme is not viable and that this has been confirmed by Deloitte in their reports.
Officers of the Local Planning Authority do not dispute that the current scheme may not be commercially viable. However, officers are confident that an alternative scheme could be proposed which provides affordable housing and is policy compliant in all other respects, whilst still being a viable scheme.

3. COMMENTS ON GROUNDS OF OBJECTIONS

Loss of light – *Addressed in main report*
Loss of privacy – *Addressed in main report*
Impact on Traffic/Parking – *Addressed in main report*
Flooding – neighbouring gardens will become flooded - *Addressed in main report. A drainage strategy would be secured by condition in the event of approval.*
No need for luxury development in the area – *Noted however it is not within the LPA's power to refuse due to the nature of the accommodation.*
Scale and appearance of development – *Addressed in main report*
Effect on nature conservation and loss of trees – *Noted. Policy DM16 requires ecological improvements with any planning application. The site is considered unlikely to provide a habitat for protected species under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981.*
Noise and disturbance resulting from the use – *Noted. Given the noise climate in the area it is considered that any impacts can be satisfactorily addressed through conditions.*
Impact on local security – *Appropriate boundary treatment could be provided through planning condition.*
Impact on stability of land and risk of subsidence - *The proposals would need to comply with the building regulations. The site is not understood to be in an area that suffers from hydrogeological issues and a soil survey accompanies the proposals.*
Land Covenants – This is not a material planning consideration.
Emissions of petrol and carbon monoxide – *A condition could be provided in the event of approval to ensure that contamination is identified and remediated.*
Access via ramp would have to be gate locked – *Noted and it is understood that this would be done.*
Security lights are needed to patios, pathways and staircases.- *External lighting would be controlled through a planning condition.*
Rodent infestation – This is principally an Environmental Health matter.

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

Whilst the proposals would have the benefit of providing additional family sized dwellings within the borough, the benefits of the scheme are considered to be outweighed by the harm the development would cause in terms of the impact on the appearance of the locality, impact on neighbouring amenity, and lack of provision for affordable housing.
Taking all relevant factors into consideration, the application is recommended for **REFUSAL.**

SITE LOCATION PLAN: 290-294, Golders Green Road, NW11 9PY
REFERENCE: F/05593/13