

Decisions of the Chipping Barnet Area Planning Committee

9 May 2017

Members Present:-

Councillor Wendy Prentice (Chairman)

Councillor Alison Cornelius
Councillor Tim Roberts

Councillor Reema Patel
Councillor Kathy Levine

REVISED ORDER OF BUSINESS

The Chairman revised the running order, as reflected in these minutes.

1. MINUTES OF LAST MEETING

REVISED ORDER OF BUSINESS

The Chairman revised the running order, as reflected in these minutes.

It was **RESOLVED** that the minutes of the meeting held on 9th March 2017 were agreed as a correct record.

2. ABSENCE OF MEMBERS (IF ANY)

Apologies were received from Councillor Sowerby and Councillor Williams.

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

Councillor	Item	Interest
Wendy Prentice	Wessex Court, 51 West End Lane, Barnet	Non-pecuniary Interest declared as she knows Mr Bishop, the applicant, but will still vote
Reema Patel	49 Firs Close, London N11	Non-pecuniary Interest declared as she lives close to the application site, but will still vote.

4. REPORT OF THE MONITORING OFFICER (IF ANY)

None.

5. ADDENDUM (IF APPLICABLE)

An Addendum to the main report was published and circulated to Members and made available to the public at the meeting.

6. LAND ADJACENT TO 23 HAMPDEN ROAD LONDON N10 (COPPETS WARD)

Officers presented the report.

Oral representations objecting to the application were received from Andy Waiter and Paul Scott. Johnathan Kent, the applicant's agent, also spoke.

Following discussion, Members carried a motion to vote against the officer recommendation for approval. Cllr Roberts moved the motion, seconded by Cllr Levine.

Reasons for the overturn were given follows:-

1. The proposed development by reason of its size, siting and design would be a cramped form of development, out of character and out of keeping with the pattern of development in the surrounding locality contrary to policies DM01 of the Adopted Barnet Development Management Policies DPD (2012), CS NPPF and CS1 of the Adopted Barnet Core Strategy DPD (2012) and Residential Design Guidance SPD (2016).
2. The proposed development by reason of its size, siting and design would have an overbearing appearance and result in overshadowing of neighbouring gardens, to the detriment of the residential amenities of the occupiers of the adjoining properties, contrary to policies DM01 of the Adopted Barnet Development Management Policies DPD (2012), CS NPPF and CS1 of the Adopted Barnet Core Strategy DPD (2012) and Residential Design Guidance SPD (2016).
3. Add Informative 1: The plans accompanying the application are: 372.(1).0.101 Rev B (Existing Plan and Demolitions), 372.(1).0.102 Rev A (Existing Front Elevation and Section AA), 372.(1).0.103 Rev A (OS Map), 372.(1).1.101 Rev C (Proposed Ground Floor Plan), 372.(1).1.102 Rev D (Proposed Roof Plan), 372.(1).1.103 Rev B (Existing and Proposed Roof Plan Superimposed), 372.(1).2.101 Rev K (Proposed Elevations, Front and Rear), 372.(1).3.101 Rev G (Proposed Sections. Section AA and BB), 372.(1).2.102 Rev I (Proposed Side Elevations. Elevations BB and CC), 372.(1).2.103 Rev D (Proposed Elevations. Front Elevation), 372.(1).3.101 (Proposed Sections), 372-HAM-018-Design and Access_Rev B (Design and Access Statement prepared by Lipton Plan Architects. January 2017), Sustainability Statement prepared by Lipton Plan Architects. February 2017.

Add informative 2: CIL - Refusal

A vote was then taken to refuse the application.

It was **RESOLVED** that the application was refused. Votes were as follows:

Refused (An overturn of the officer recommendation)	5
Approval	0
Abstained	0

7. 49 FIRS AVENUE LONDON N11 3NF (COPPETTS WARD)

Officers presented the report.

Oral representations objecting to the application, were heard from Natalie Hugin, who spoke on behalf of Ms Mousiou and Sally Abraham. Mr N Ravi, the applicant's agent, also spoke.

It was **RESOLVED** that the application was approved in accordance with the officer report

Votes were as follows:

For (approval)	3
Against (approval)	1
Abstained	1

8. 100/102 & 104 LANCASTER ROAD BARNET EN4 (EAST BARNET WARD)

The committee received the officer presentation and addendum with amended conditions 1 and 6.

It was **RESOLVED** that the application was approved in accordance with the officer report and addendum.

The votes were unanimously in favour of approval.

9. WESSEX COURT 51 WEST END LANE BARNET EN5 (UNDERHILL WARD)

Committee received the officer report and addendum which updated the position regarding public consultations.

An oral representation in objection was provided by Lydia Bower. The agent Alex Cox also spoke.

It was **RESOLVED** that the application was refused in accordance with the officer report.

Votes were as follows:

For refusal (as recommended)	3
Against	1
Abstained	1

10. HADLEY GREEN GARAGE/GRANGE JAGUAR, VICTORS WAY BARNET (HIGH BARNET WARD)

Officers presented the report and addendum which included an amendment to condition 1 as a result of the submission by the applicant of a revised external lighting scheme.

It was **RESOLVED** that the application was approved in accordance with the officer report and addendum.

Members voted unanimously in favour of approval (Councillor Patel was not in the room during part of the presentation of this item and did not vote).

11. HOLLY LODGE 189 BARNET ROAD BARNET EN5 (HIGH BARNET WARD)

Officers presented the report.

An oral representation was heard from the applicant's Agent, Carl Copestake.

It was **RESOLVED** that Committee approved this application in accordance with the officer report.

Members voted unanimously in favour of approval.

12. 236 EAST BARNET ROAD BARNET EN4 (EAST BARNET WARD)

Committee received the officer's report.

It was **RESOLVED** that Members approved the planning application in accordance with the officer report.

Members voted unanimously in favour of approval.

13. LAND ADJACENT TO 1 KENDAL CLOSE LONDON N20 (OAKLEIGH WARD)

Officers presented the report.

It was **RESOLVED** that the application was approved in accordance with the officer report.

The vote was unanimously in favour of approval.

14. FAIRLIGHT COTTAGE 7 HORSESHOE LANE LONDON N20 (TOTTERIDGE WARD)

Committee received the officer report and addendum for Application number 16/8068/CON for Canterbury Combi-style fencing.

An oral representation was heard from the applicant, Lorraine Robinson.

Following debate, Members made a motion to refuse the application, proposed by Councillor Alison Cornelius and seconded by Councillor Roberts. Reasons for the motion for refusal are outlined below:

The proposed fence, by reason of its design and appearance, would be out of keeping with the rural character of this part of the road and would not preserve or enhance this part of the Totteridge Conservation Area. The proposal would be contrary to Policies CS NPPF, CS1 and CS5 of the Local Plan Core Strategy (adopted September 2012),

Policies DM01 and DM06 of the Development Management Policies DPD (adopted September 2012) and the Totteridge Conservation Area Character Appraisal.

Add informative 1: The plans accompanying this application are: Drawing No. 2102 (received 4 April 2017).

It was **RESOLVED** that the application was refused for the above reasons.

Votes were as follows:-

For Approval (as in officer recommendation)	0
Refusal (against officer recommendation)	4
Abstained	1

15. FAIRLIGHT COTTAGE 7 HORSESHOE LANE LONDON N20 (TOTTERIDGE WARD)

Committee received the officer report and addendum for application number 17/1307/CON for vertical boarding with a trellis.

An oral representation was heard from the applicant, Lorraine Robinson.

Following debate, Members favoured this option.

It was **RESOLVED** that Members approved the application in accordance with the officer report and addendum.

Members voted unanimously in favour of approval.

16. FAIRLIGHT COTTAGE 7 HORSESHOE LANE LONDON N20 (TOTTERIDGE WARD)

Committee received the officer report and addendum for Application number 17/1312/CON for Larch lap fencing panel and trellis on top.

An oral representation was heard from the applicant, Lorraine Robinson.

Following debate, Members made a motion to refuse the application, proposed by Councillor Alison Cornelius and seconded by Councillor Roberts. Reasons for the motion for refusal are outlined below:

The proposed fence, by reason of its design and appearance, would be out of keeping with the rural character of this part of the road and would not preserve or enhance this part of the Totteridge Conservation Area. The proposal would be contrary to Policies CS NPPF, CS1 and CS5 of the Local Plan Core Strategy (adopted September 2012), Policies DM01 and DM06 of the Development Management Policies DPD (adopted September 2012) and the Totteridge Conservation Area Character Appraisal.

Add informative 1: The plans accompanying this application are: Drawing 2104 (received 4 April 2017).

It was **RESOLVED** that the application was refused for reasons outlined above.

Votes were as follows:-

For Approval (as in officer recommendation)	1
Refusal (against officer recommendation)	4
Abstained	0

17. PLANNING ENFORCEMENT QUARTERLY UPDATE JANUARY 2017 TO MARCH 2017

Members noted the report.

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

None.

The meeting finished at 9.48 pm