

Decisions of the Finchley and Golders Green Area Planning Committee

4 February 2016

Members Present:-

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

Councillor Jack Cohen
Councillor Arjun Mitra
Councillor Alan Schneiderman

Councillor Melvin Cohen
Councillor Jim Tierney

1. MINUTES OF LAST MEETING

The minutes of the meeting held on 21 January 2016 were agreed and signed as a correct record.

2. ABSENCE OF MEMBERS

None.

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

Councillor Melvin Cohen declared a non-pecuniary interest in item 8, 124 Friern Park London N12 9LN – 15/06884/FUL, as he knew the applicant as a passing acquaintance. He remained in the room during the consideration of this item and participated in the decision.

Councillor John Marshall declared a non-pecuniary interest in item 16, 8 Alberon Gardens London NW11 0AG – 15/06652/HSE, as he knew one of the people speaking against the application very well. He did not remain in the room during the consideration of this item or participate in the decision.

4. REPORT OF THE MONITORING OFFICER (IF ANY)

None.

5. PUBLIC COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS (IF ANY)

None.

6. MEMBERS' ITEMS (IF ANY)

None.

7. ADDENDUM (IF ANY)

The Committee's attention was drawn to the addendum to the report.

8. 11 MIDDLETON ROAD LONDON NW11 7NR - 15/06090/HSE

The Planning Officer presented the application.

Having considered the application and heard oral representations from Dr Laura Cullen and Mr Adam Quint, and having heard from Mr Derek Owusu-Afriyie on behalf of the applicant, the Committee:

RESOLVED to approve the application as set out in the Officer's report.

Having been put to the vote, the following was recorded:

For – 2

Against – 0

Abstain – 5

9. 75 TORRINGTON PARK, LONDON, N12 9PN - 15/06707/FUL

The Planning Officer presented the report.

It was proposed that the application be deferred to allow the applicant to submit a daylight and sunlight report to address the potential impact on the front garden of the adjoining property.

For: 3

Against: 3

Abstain - 1

The Chairman used her casting vote to vote against the proposal.

The motion was lost.

Having considered the application and heard oral representations from Ms Monica Shama, and from Mr John Chart on behalf of the applicant, the Committee:

RESOLVED to approve the application as per the officer's report and variations to the conditions as set out in the addendum plus the following additional condition:

"The development shall not be occupied until after the landscaping scheme has been implemented, as approved, in its entirety."

Reason: To ensure a satisfactory appearance to the development in accordance with policies DM01 of the Adopted Barnet Development Management Policies DPD (2012) and 7.21 of the London Plan 2011 and CS5 and CS7 of the Adopted Barnet Core Strategy DPD (2012).

Having been put to the vote, the following was recorded:

For – 4

Against – 3

Abstain – 0

10. 124 FRIERN PARK LONDON, N12 9LN - 15/06884/FUL

The Officer presented the report.

Having considered the application and heard oral representations from G Bailey, Dylan Davis and from Martin Saluzzo on behalf of the applicant, the Committee

RESOLVED to REFUSE the application, which was a reversal of the officer recommendation.

Reasons:

“1. The proposed development, by reason of its size, siting, scale, bulk and design and the introduction of car parking within the rear garden, would constitute overdevelopment of the site, would fail to respect, and would detract from, the established character and appearance of the site property and the wider area contrary to policies CS1 and CS5 of Barnet's Adopted Core Strategy (2012), policy DM01 of the Adopted Development Management Policies DPD (2012) and the Adopted Residential Design Guidance SPD (2013).”

“2.The proposed development, by reason of the location of the proposed car parking area and access thereto, would result in the introduction of car movements and associated noise and disturbance into the rear garden area, which would be detrimental to the residential amenity of neighbouring occupiers contrary to Policy CS5 of Barnet's Adopted Core Strategy (2012), Policy DM01 of the Adopted Development Management Policies DPD (2012), the Adopted Residential Design Guidance SPD (2013) and Adopted Sustainable Design and Construction SPD (2013).”

The following amendments were made to the informatives:

Add new informative:

The plans accompanying the application are: Site Location Plan; 124FP-PP1-01 Rev B Existing Section and Site Plan & Proposed Site Plan; 124FP-PP1-02 Rev D; Proposed Floor Plans; 124FP-PP1-03 Rev C Proposed Floor Plans; 124FP-PP1-04 Rev A Proposed Elevations; 124FP-PP1-05 Rev D; Proposed Sections; Design and Access Statement

Amend informative 1 to refusal

Amend informative 3 to refusal (CIL)

Delete informatives 2 and 4.

Having been put to the vote, the following was recorded:

For – 4

Against – 1

Abstain – 2

11. CHANDOS LAWN TENNIS CLUB WELLGARTH ROAD, LONDON, NW11 7HP - 15/06847/S73

The Planning Officer presented the application.

Having considered the application and heard oral representations from Jonathan Schwarz, and having heard from Mr Gerry Cassidy on behalf of the applicant, the Committee:

RESOLVED to approve the application as per the officer's report and variations to the conditions as set out in the addendum plus the following additional condition:

"All new trees and landscaping along the boundary of the site with properties on the southern boundary with Chandos Way, as well as the boundaries with Reynolds Close and Waterloo Court shall be planted at least 3 months before first occupation of any of the flats.

Reason:

To ensure a satisfactory appearance to the development in accordance with policies DM01 of the Adopted Barnet Development Management Policies DPD (2012) and 7.21 of the London Plan 2011 and CS5 and CS7 of the Adopted Barnet Core Strategy DPD (2012)."

Having been put to the vote, the following was recorded:

For – 4

Against – 0

Abstain – 3

12. 49 HODFORD ROAD, LONDON, NW11 8NL - 15/07402/HSE

The Committee considered the application simultaneously with items 13 (49 Hodford Road, London, NW11 8NL - 15/07399/HSE) and 14 (49 Hodford Road, London, NW11 8NL - 15/07472/HSE).

The Officer presented the reports for all three applications.

The Committee considered oral representations from Kate Fawkes and Salma Karmi-Ayyoub, and from Max Wolman on behalf of the applicant.

In relation to the first floor side extension, the Committee was concerned that the extension would reduce the gap between properties and would itself, and also taken together with other extensions to the roof of the property, adversely affect the appearance of the property and the streetscene. This street is not characterised by such first floor side extensions and the Committee considered that the introduction of such an extension would reduce the evident gap between properties that is not characteristic in this particular location and would erode the spacious feel of this part of the street, detrimental to its character and appearance.

In relation to the two applications for rear extensions, taken cumulatively together with the existing extensions to the property and those under construction, the Committee considered the individual proposals would result in overdevelopment of the property. The resulting building would be considerably larger than others in the vicinity and the totality

of extensions would fail to respect the size of the original house, representing disproportionate additions.

Additionally, the extensions individually and when considered cumulatively together with existing extensions to the property, by reason of their size and siting would have an overbearing appearance when seen from the neighbouring properties. The Committee considered this would have a detrimental impact on the amenities of the occupiers of those properties.

Having considered the application and heard oral representations from Ms Fawkes, Ms Karmi-Ayyoub and Mr Wolman, the Committee

RESOLVED to REFUSE the application, which was a reversal of the officer recommendation.

Reason:

The proposals, by reason of the size, siting and design of the extension, would result in the reduction of spacing between properties resulting in a terracing effect that would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the property, the streetscene and general locality, contrary to policy DM01 of the Barnet Adopted Development Management Policies DPD (2012) and the Adopted SPD 'Residential Design Guidance' (2013).'

The following amendments were made to the informatives

Amend informative 1 to refusal

Add new informative: The plans accompanying the application are: Site location plan: 380 EX00

- Existing plans: 380 EX01, 380 EX02, 380 EX04, 380/S.06, 380 EX07, 380 EX08 and 380 EX09.

- Approved scheme under construction: 380 3PL01, 380 3PL02, 380 3PL03, 380 3PL05, 380/3PL.06 REV A, 380 3PL07 and 380/3PL.09.

- Proposed plans: 380 5PL02, 380 5PL03, 380 5PL05, 380 5PL06, 380 5PL07, and 380 5PL08.

Having been put to the vote, the following was recorded:

For – 0

Against – 4

Abstain – 3

13. 49 HODFORD ROAD, LONDON, NW11 8NL - 15/07399/HSE

The Committee considered the application simultaneously with items 12 (49 Hodford Road, London, NW11 8NL - 15/07402/HSE) and 14 (49 Hodford Road, London, NW11 8NL - 15/07472/HSE).

The Officer presented the reports for all three applications.

The Committee considered oral representations from Kate Fawkes and Salma Karmi-Ayyoub, and from Max Wolman on behalf of the applicant.

In relation to the first floor side extension, the Committee was concerned that the extension would reduce the gap between properties and would itself, and also taken

together with other extensions to the roof of the property, adversely affect the appearance of the property and the streetscene. This street is not characterised by such first floor side extensions and the Committee considered that the introduction of such an extension would reduce the evident gap between properties that is not characteristic in this particular location and would erode the spacious feel of this part of the street, detrimental to its character and appearance.

In relation to the two applications for rear extensions, taken cumulatively together with the existing extensions to the property and those under construction, the Committee considered the individual proposals would result in overdevelopment of the property. The resulting building would be considerably larger than others in the vicinity and the totality of extensions would fail to respect the size of the original house, representing disproportionate additions.

Additionally, the extensions individually and when considered cumulatively together with existing extensions to the property, by reason of their size and siting would have an overbearing appearance when seen from the neighbouring properties. The Committee considered this would have a detrimental impact on the amenities of the occupiers of those properties.

Having considered the application and heard oral representations from Ms Fawkes, Ms Karmi-Ayyoub and Mr Wolman, the Committee

RESOLVED to REFUSE the application, which was a reversal of the officer recommendation.

Reason:

The proposals, by reason of the size, siting, scale and design of the extensions, would represent an overdevelopment of the site, which would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the property, the streetscene and general locality and would be detrimental to the residential amenities of the occupiers of neighbouring properties by reason of overbearing appearance, contrary to policy DM01 of the Barnet Adopted Development Management Policies DPD (2012) and the Adopted SPD 'Residential Design Guidance' (2013).

The following amendments were made to the informatives

Amend informative 1 to refusal

Add new informative: The plans accompanying the application are: Site location plan: 380 EX00

- Existing plans: 380 EX01, 380 EX02, 380 EX04, 380/S.06, 380 EX07, 380 EX08 and 380 EX09.

- Approved scheme under construction: 380 3PL01, 380 3PL02, 380 3PL03, 380 3PL05, 380/3PL.06 REV A, 380 3PL07 and 380/3PL.09.

- Proposed plans: 380 5PL02, 380 5PL03, 380 5PL05, 380 5PL06, 380 5PL07, and 380 5PL08.

Having been put to the vote, the following was recorded:

For – 0

Against – 6

Abstain – 1

14. 49 HODFORD ROAD, LONDON, NW11 8NL - 15/07472/HSE

The Committee considered the application simultaneously with items 12 (49 Hodford Road, London, NW11 8NL - 15/07402/HSE) and 13 (49 Hodford Road, London, NW11 8NL - 15/07399/HSE).

The Officer presented the reports for all three applications.

The Committee considered oral representations from Kate Fawkes and Salma Karmi-Ayyoub, and from Max Wolman on behalf of the applicant.

In relation to the first floor side extension, the Committee was concerned that the extension would reduce the gap between properties and would itself, and also taken together with other extensions to the roof of the property, adversely affect the appearance of the property and the streetscene. This street is not characterised by such first floor side extensions and the Committee considered that the introduction of such an extension would reduce the evident gap between properties that is not characteristic in this particular location and would erode the spacious feel of this part of the street, detrimental to its character and appearance.

In relation to the two applications for rear extensions, taken cumulatively together with the existing extensions to the property and those under construction, the Committee considered the individual proposals would result in overdevelopment of the property. The resulting building would be considerably larger than others in the vicinity and the totality of extensions would fail to respect the size of the original house, representing disproportionate additions.

Additionally, the extensions individually and when considered cumulatively together with existing extensions to the property, by reason of their size and siting would have an overbearing appearance when seen from the neighbouring properties. The Committee considered this would have a detrimental impact on the amenities of the occupiers of those properties.

Having considered the application and heard oral representations from Ms Fawkes, Ms Karmi-Ayyoub and Mr Wolman, the Committee

RESOLVED to REFUSE the application, which was a reversal of the officer recommendation.

Reason:

The proposals, by reason of the size, siting, scale and design of the extensions, would represent an overdevelopment of the site, which would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the property, the streetscene and general locality and would be detrimental to the residential amenities of the occupiers of neighbouring properties by reason of overbearing appearance, contrary to policy DM01 of the Barnet Adopted Development Management Policies DPD (2012) and the Adopted SPD 'Residential Design Guidance' (2013).

The following amendments were made to the informatives

Amend informative 1 to refusal

Add new informative: The plans accompanying the application are: Site location plan: 380 EX00
- Existing plans: 380 EX01, 380 EX02, 380 EX04, 380/S.06, 380 EX07, 380 EX08 and 380 EX09.
- Approved scheme under construction: 380 3PL01, 380 3PL02, 380 3PL03, 380 3PL05, 380/3PL.06 REV A, 380 3PL07 and 380/3PL.09.
- Proposed plans: 380 5PL02, 380 5PL03, 380 5PL05, 380 5PL06, 380 5PL07, and 380 5PL08.

Having been put to the vote, the following was recorded:

For – 0

Against – 6

Abstain – 1

15. 8 ALBERON GARDENS LONDON NW11 0AG - 15/06652/HSE

The Planning Officer presented the application.

The Committee heard oral representations from Howard Goldring and Hanna Isaacson.

The Committee was concerned about the cumulative impacts on the character and appearance of the property, streetscene and wider area of the extensions proposed when taken into account with other extensions to the property. The extensions would represent disproportionate additions to the original building resulting in a scale of development out of keeping with neighbouring properties. The Committee considered that the level of development overall would detract from the established character and appearance of the application site and the neighbouring area.

Having considered the report and heard oral representations from Mr Goldring and Mrs Isaacson, the Committee:

RESOLVED to REFUSE the application, which was a reversal of the officer recommendation.

Reasons:

“The proposed development, by reason of the cumulative impact of existing and proposed extensions to the property would represent an overdevelopment of the site that would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the property, the streetscene and general locality, contrary to policy CS5 of the Barnet Adopted Core Strategy (2012) and policy DM01 of the Barnet Adopted Development Management Policies DPD (2012) and the Adopted SPD 'Residential Design Guidance' (2013).”

The following amendments were made to the informatives:

Amend informative 1 to refusal

Add new informative: The plans accompanying this application are: 8/10A and 8/100C.

Having been put to the vote, the following was recorded:

For – 0

Against – 1

Abstain – 5

16. 57 ST GEORGES ROAD LONDON, NW11 0LU - 15/06513/FUL

The Planning Officer presented the application.

The Committee:

RESOLVED to approve the application as set out in the Officer's report and the variation to condition 5 as set out in the addendum.

Having been put to the vote, the following was recorded:

For – 6

Against – 0

Abstain – 1

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

None.

The meeting finished at 9.13 pm