

# Decisions of the Finchley and Golders Green Area Planning Committee

9 March 2017

Members Present:-

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

Councillor Arjun Mittra  
Councillor Alan Schneiderman  
Councillor Melvin Cohen

Councillor Shimon Ryde  
Councillor Jim Tierney

## 1. MINUTES OF LAST MEETING

**RESOLVED-** That the minutes of the meeting held on 9<sup>th</sup> February 2017 be agreed as a correct record.

## 2. ABSENCE OF MEMBERS (IF ANY)

Apologies for lateness from Councillor Schneiderman.

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

Councillor	Item(s)	Nature of Interest	Detail
Shimon Ryde	11	Non-pecuniary	That the Councillor knew the applicant
Melvin Cohen	11	Non-pecuniary	That the Councillor's offices are located directly opposite to the site of the planning application.

## 4. REPORT OF THE MONITORING OFFICER (IF ANY)

None.

## 5. ADDENDUM

The Committee noted the Addendum.

## 6. 114-120 WEST HEATH ROAD - 16/5993/FUL (AGENDA ITEM 7)

The Planning Officer introduced the application, which related to 114-120 West Heath Road. The Planning Officer noted an error in the report and asked that the section 106 deadline be amended to 09/04/2017.

An oral representation in objection to the application was heard from Mr Bob Warnock.

An oral representation in objection to the application was heard from Ms Tatiana Bogomolova.

An oral representation was heard from a representative of the applicant, Mr Gavin Steinmain.

Following discussion of the item, the Chairman moved to the recommendation in the cover report, which was to approve the application subject to conditions set out in the report and the addendum. Votes were recorded as follows:

\*Councillor Schneiderman did not vote on this application as he entered the room late.

For	2
Against	2
Abstain	2

The Chairman used her casting vote in favour of the application.

**The Committee therefore RESOLVED to APPROVE the application, subject to conditions as per the officer's report.**

**7. 1069 FINCHLEY ROAD, NW11 OPU - 16/7565/FUL (AGENDA ITEM 11)**

Councillor Shimon Ryde and Councillor Melvin Cohen both left the room, as they had declared a non-pecuniary interest in relation to this item, and thus did not vote on the item.

The Planning Officer introduced the application, which related to 1069 Finchley Road.

An oral representation in objection to the application was heard from Ms Christine Clyne.

An oral representation in objection to the application was heard from Mr Ronjon Banerjee.

An oral representation was made by a representative of the applicant, Ms Caroline Abcar.

Following discussion of the item the Committee requested that if approved the Construction Management Plan be referred to the Committee for approval.

The Chairman moved to the recommendation in the cover report and addendum, which was to approve the application subject to recommendations outlined in the report. Votes were recorded as follows:

For	1
Against	1
Abstain	3

The Chairman used her casting vote in favour of the application.

**The Committee therefore RESOLVED to APPROVE the application, subject to recommendations as per the officer's report.**

**8. NORTH WESTERN REFORM SYNAGOGUE - 17/0369/FUL (AGENDA ITEM 15)**

The Planning Officer introduced the application, which related to North Western Reform Synagogue.

An oral representation in objection to the application was heard from Mr Russell Braum.

An oral representation was made by a representative of the applicant, Ms Mary Fortune.

Following discussion of the item, the Chairman moved to the recommendation in the cover report and addendum, which was to approve the application following legal agreement. Votes were recorded as follows:

For	7
Against	0
Abstain	0

**The Committee therefore RESOLVED to APPROVE the application, subject to conditions as per the officer's report.**

**9. 39 WOODSTOCK ROAD - 16/6250/FUL (AGENDA ITEM 9)**

The Planning Officer introduced the application, which related to 39 Woodstock Road.

Following discussion of the item, the Chairman moved to the recommendation in the cover report, which was to approve the application subject to conditions. Votes were recorded as follows:

For	3
Against	3
Abstain	1

The Chairman used her casting vote in favour of the application.

**The Committee therefore RESOLVED to APPROVE the application, subject to conditions as per the officer's report.**

**10. 8B ACCOMMODATION ROAD LONDON - 16/5860/FUL (AGENDA ITEM 10)**

The Planning Officer introduced the application, which related to 8B Accommodation Road.

An oral representation in objection to the application was heard from Ms Julia Brown.

An oral representation in objection was heard from Dr Bernadette Loughman.

An oral representation was made by a representative of the applicant.

Following discussion of the item the Chairman moved a motion to add the following recommendations to condition 4:

- i) within two months of the date of this decision the rear rooflight windows facing Woodstock Road shall be obscure glazed and fixed shut.
- ii) if an appeal is made in pursuance of (i) above, that appeal shall have been finally determined and the submitted scheme shall have been approved by the Secretary of State.

The motion was seconded by Councillor Marshall.

Votes on this motion were recorded as follows:

For	6
Against	0
Abstain	1

**The Committee therefore RESOLVED to APPROVE the application, with agreed amendment to condition 4 and subject to the conditions as per the officer's report.**

**11. WHITE LODGE, THE VALE - 16/8017/FUL (AGENDA ITEM 8)**

The Planning Officer introduced the application, which related to White Lodge.

An oral representation in objection to the application was heard from Mr Wolchover.

An oral representation was made by a representative of the applicant, Mr Andrew Neil.

Following discussion of the item, the Chairman moved to the recommendation in the cover report and addendum, which was to approve the application subject to conditions. Votes were recorded as follows:

For	3
Against	3
Abstain	1

The Chairman used her casting vote in favour of the application.

**The Committee therefore RESOLVED to APPROVE the application, subject to conditions as per the officer's report.**

**12. 15 NORTH SQUARE - 17/0348/LBC (AGENDA ITEM 13)**

The Planning Officer introduced the application, which related to 15 North Square (17/0348/LBC) and 15 North Square (16/6950/HSE).

No speakers made representations in regard to 15 North Square 17/0348/LBC.

Following discussion of the item, the Chairman moved to the recommendation in the cover report and addendum, which was to approve the application subject to conditions. Votes were recorded as follows:

For	7
Against	0
Abstain	0

**The Committee therefore RESOLVED to APPROVE the application, subject to conditions as per the officer's report.**

**13. 15 NORTH SQUARE - 16/6950/HSE (AGENDA ITEM 14)**

An oral representation in objection to the application was heard from Mr Michael Einhorn.

An oral representation in objection to the application was heard from Ms Kim Einhorn.

An oral representation was made by a representative of the applicant, Ms Mary Clare.

Following discussion of the item, the Chairman moved to the recommendation in the cover report and addendum, which was to approve the application subject to conditions. Votes were recorded as follows:

For	7
Against	0
Abstain	0

**The Committee therefore RESOLVED to APPROVE the application, subject to conditions as per the officer's report.**

**14. 85-87 THE RIDGEWAY - 16/7996/FUL (AGENDA ITEM 6)**

The Planning Officer introduced the application, which related to 85-87 The Ridgeway.

An oral representation in objection to the application was heard from Mr Arjun Jaganathan.

An oral representation in objection to the application was heard from Ms Judy Stapleton on behalf of Mr Ravi Patel.

An oral representation was made by a representative of the applicant, Ms Hannah Spence.

Following discussion of the item the Committee agreed to add the following additional conditions to the application:

- i) A detailed scheme for the protection of the retained trees (the tree protection plan) and the appropriate working methods (the arboricultural method statement) in accordance with paragraphs 5.5 and 6.1 of British Standard BS 5837: Trees in

relation to design, demolition and construction - Recommendations (or in an equivalent British Standard if replaced) shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority. No proposed dwelling shall be occupied until the scheme for the protection of the retained trees has been carried out as approved. In this condition “retained tree” means an existing tree which is to be retained in accordance with the approved plans and particulars.

- ii) The details submitted in accordance with Condition above shall include:
  - i) a plan showing the position of every tree on the site and on land adjacent to the site (including street trees) that could influence or be affected by the development, indicating which trees are to be removed;
  - ii) a schedule in relation to every tree identified listing: - information as specified in paragraph 4.4.2.5 of British Standard BS 5837: Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction - Recommendations) (or in an equivalent British Standard if replaced); and, - any proposed pruning, felling or other work;
  - iii) in relation to every existing tree identified to be retained on the plan referred to in i) above, details of: - any proposed alterations to existing ground levels, and of the position of any proposed excavation, that might affect the root protection area; and, - all appropriate tree protection measures required before and during the course of development (in accordance with paragraph 5.5 of British Standard BS 5837) (or in an equivalent British Standard if replaced);
  - iv) areas of existing landscaping to be protected from construction operations and the method of protection.
- iii) Details of the standards to which the highway works relating to the crossovers of the public footpath serving the development are to be constructed shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority. No proposed dwelling shall be occupied until the crossovers have been constructed in accordance with the approved details.

The Chairman then moved to vote on the recommendations in the cover report, which was to approve the application, with the above additional conditions included. Votes were recorded as follows:

For	3
Against	2
Abstain	2

**The Committee therefore RESOLVED to APPROVE the application, subject to conditions as per the officer’s report and outlined above.**

**15. 48 RAVENSCROFT AVENUE - 16/8101/FUL (AGENDA ITEM 12)**

The Planning Officer introduced the application, which related to 48 Ravenscroft Avenue.

Following discussion of the item, the Chairman moved to the recommendation in the cover report, which was to approve the application subject to s106. The votes were recorded as follows:

For	0
Against	7
Abstain	0

The motion to approve the application was lost.

Councillor Melvin Cohen moved a motion to refuse the application for the following reasons:

- i) The proposals by reason of the size of extensions and amount of development, be an overdevelopment of the site that would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the streetscene and general locality and to the visual amenities of neighbouring occupiers. The proposals would be contrary to policy DM01 of the Adopted Barnet Development Management Policies, CS5 of the Barnet Core Strategy and Supplementary Planning Document: Residential Design Guidance.
- ii) The proposals would be an over-intensive use of the property that would be detrimental to the character of the area and neighbouring residential amenity. The proposals would be contrary to policy DM01 of the Adopted Barnet Development Management Policies, CS5 of the Barnet Core Strategy and Supplementary Planning Document: Residential Design Guidance.
- iii) The development does not include a formal undertaking to ensure that the future occupiers of the development are prevented from being able to obtain parking permits for the Controlled Parking Zone and in the absence of sufficient on-site parking to serve the residential units. The proposal would result in an increased demand for on street parking which would lead to increased kerbside parking, resulting in a detrimental impact on highway and pedestrian safety contrary to policy DM17 of the Adopted Barnet Development Management Policies DPD 2012.

The motion was seconded by Councillor Arjun Mittra.

The Chairman moved to vote on the motion to refuse, votes were recorded as follows:

For	7
Against	0
Abstain	0

**The Committee therefore RESOLVED to REFUSE the application.**

**16. 108-112 REGEANTS PARK ROAD - 16/6950/S73 (AGENDA ITEM 16)**

The Planning Officer introduced the application, which related to 108-112 Regents Park.

Following discussion of the item, the Chairman moved to the recommendations in the cover report, which was to approve the application subject to conditions. Votes were recorded as follows:

For	4
-----	---

Against	1
Abstain	2

The Committee therefore **RESOLVED** to **APPROVE** the application, subject to conditions as per the officer's report.

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

The meeting finished at 8.45pm.