

# FINCHLEY & GOLDERS GREEN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE

10th March 2016

## ADDENDUM TO SERVICE DIRECTOR OF DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT AND BUILDING CONTROL'S REPORT

---

**Pages:**

**Reference: 15/05969/FUL**

**Church Walk House**

**Paragraph 5.3.2**

The officer's report refers to the development providing a contribution of 1.5% provision. This is not strictly correct, given that this does not allow for the subsidy of affordable housing units and profit for the developer, so the percentage is likely to be greater.

**Paragraph 5.3.5**

The communal area for the apartments is confirmed as being 645sq m in area.

**Paragraph 5.3.6**

The applicant has provided an addendum to the Transport Statement which clarifies that the previous use had 57 care home units rather than 42.

**Paragraph 5.3.9**

To clarify, the development would achieve 35% target emissions rate improvement, which is compliant with the Mayor's London Plan.

**Add Paragraph 5.3.13**

**Impact on Trees of Special Amenity Value**

The applicant has provided tree survey and arboricultural method statement with the planning application.

The proposals involve the removal of two trees to the rear of the site and a small tree to the rear boundary with Lyndale Avenue.

The main trees to be removed are:

T17 Cherry – This tree is of average quality and sits within the middle of the site. It is considered necessary to fell facilitate to the development.

T24 Box Elder - This tree is of average quality and sits within the middle of the site. It is considered necessary to fell facilitate to the development.

The construction of steps within the RPA of Lime tree T23 would need to be done with care to ensure no harm to this tree. This is a good quality tree under Tree Preservation Order.

The belt of TPO trees to the rear of the site is of great importance. This would be retained and there is considerable distance between the rear extent of the building and basement to these trees. It is therefore considered that these trees should remain, and a condition is suggested that additional planting is provided.

Mitigation is proposed including hand digging, no dig surfaces, and low invasive foundations for the new front wall. Conditions are suggested in order to ensure that this is adhered to.

### **Consultation**

An additional letter of objection was received on 8<sup>th</sup> March 2016.

The objections can be summarised as follows;

- Limited access down narrow road
- Insufficient parking provided
- Overdevelopment of site

These points are addressed in the main committee report.

A further consultation response was received on 10<sup>th</sup> March raising concern that their initial response was not fully detailed in the committee report.

The response stated that their planning objection regarding height was not adequately represented in the committee report and they raise concern that the Councillors will not have the full detail of their objection to make an objective planning decision.

The neighbours initial objections raised can be summarised below;

“Although there is a 4m level change across the Church Walk House plot (source: Design & Access Statement, section 3.2), the proposed development is designed as a level building.

The result is that while the proposed development is the same height as the homes at the upper end of Lyndale Avenue (as can be seen in cross section BB in the existing and proposed plans), THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT WILL BE TWO STOREYS HIGHER THAN OUR HOME at the lower end. These two additional storeys with windows, balcony and terraces will overlook our home with consequent loss of privacy, and noise and light disturbance. Viewed from our home, the proposed development is effectively a five storey building and not three storey as described in the planning application! This can be seen by examining cross section FF in the existing and proposed plans. With the existing building, we are overlooked only by the roof of Church Walk House whereas in the proposed development we will be overlooked by two additional storeys. This includes the second floor balcony of apartment 2-9, the second floor terrace of apartment 2-8 and the third floor side terrace of apartment 2-8. These are all at a height above our roof level!

We are disappointed that the proposed development has not taken account of the level change across the plot, and would argue that the height of the development should be graduated to avoid towering over our home. “

In response to the above concerns the addendum to the report includes further information in relation to the height of the proposed building and any impact this will have on the surrounding neighbouring properties. 2<sup>nd</sup> Paragraph of the agenda report on page 58 should follow on to read as follows:

The proposed building has staggered building heights measuring approximately 9.5m high to top of 2<sup>nd</sup> floor level and 12m at its highest point to top of 3<sup>rd</sup> floor level (measured from the ground level of the site). The land naturally slopes downwards from Church Walk towards Lyndale Avenue to the rear. Given the significant drop in land levels it is recognised that the proposed development will inevitably be at a higher level when viewed from the rear of Lyndale Avenue properties.

However, taking into consideration the site specific circumstances, the natural sloping of the land, the distances maintained between the facing buildings, in excess of the 21m minimum distances as stated in the councils guidance, and the adequately tree lined rear boundary it is not considered that the proposed building would have a detrimental impact on residential amenities of the occupiers of the Lyndale Avenue properties to an unacceptable degree to warrant refusal of the application. Furthermore, the applicants have agreed to plant number of additional mature trees along this rear boundary which will further mitigate concerns with regards to overlooking and loss of privacy and this will be secured by way of a condition to ensure that appropriate planting is undertaken along this boundary.

**Pages:**

**Reference: 15/06414/FUL**

**706 High Road**

Amend Recommendation I to include additional Heads of Terms and the Monitoring Costs as follows;

To address the amenity space shortfall an Open Space contribution of £21,000 is required to invest in Play equipment in Percy Park.

The monitoring costs are £1050.

**Pages:**

**Reference: 16/0469/FUL**

**1 Cumbrian Gardens**

Two additional objections were received during the consultation period, raising the following concerns;

- Impact on character
- Overdevelopment
- Impact on neighboring amenity
- Unacceptable design
- Impact on highway safety
- Building control issues
- Issues relating to scaffolding
- Party wall issues
- Impact on trees

All material planning considerations were addressed in the report.