

Decisions of the Finchley and Golders Green Area Planning Committee

7 September 2017

Members Present:-

Councillor Eva Greenspan (Chairman)

Councillor Arjun Mittra
Councillor Alan Schneiderman
Councillor Melvin Cohen

Councillor Shimon Ryde
Councillor Jim Tierney
Councillor Gabriel Rozenberg (In place of
Councillor John Marshall)

1. MINUTES OF LAST MEETING

Following an amendment to section 3 of the minutes which corrected:

- Councillors Melvin Cohen's declaration in respect to 1069 Finchley Road
- The spelling of Councillor Ryde's name

The Committee **RESOLVED** that the minutes of the meeting held on 18 July 2017 be agreed as a correct record.

2. ABSENCE OF MEMBERS (IF ANY)

An apology of absence was received from Councillor John Marshal, therefore Councillor Gabriel Rozenberg attended as a substitute Member.

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

A non-Pecuniary Interest was declared from Councillor Gabriel Rozenberg. He stated that the supporting speaker Mr Brian Plen who made a verbal representation in relation to The Lodge was he was a friend of his. Councillor Rozenberg took part in the consideration of the item and took part in the voting process.

4. REPORT OF THE MONITORING OFFICER (IF ANY)

None.

5. ADDENDUM (IF APPLICABLE)

The addendum to the Officers reports was published on the Council's website in advance of the meeting and circulated to Members of the Committee. The content of the document was considered at the relevant individual agenda items.

6. THE LODGE, LONG LANE, LONDON N3 2PY - 17/4102/FUL

The report and the addendum to the report was presented by the Planning Manager.

A verbal representation was heard from Councillor Ross Huston, Ward Councillor for West Finchley, Mr Roger Chapman who spoke in objection, Mr Brian Plen who spoke in support and the applicant's agent.

Following the consideration of the report the Chairman requested that the item be moved to the vote.

The vote in favour of the Officer's recommendation was 0.

The Chairman moved an alternative outcome and moved to refuse the application which was seconded by Councillor Ryde. The Committee considered the reasons for refusal which were supplied by Members.

The Planning Officer confirmed the reasons which were provided by the Committee and unanimously resolved to overturn the officer's recommendation and therefore the application was refused for the following reasons:

- 1) The proposed development by virtue of its bulk, size, scale and massing including the extent of the footprint and proximity to the boundaries would give rise to a cramped and overbearing form of development that would be visually dominant, incongruous and significantly out of keeping with the character and appearance of the area and the streetscene and would negatively affect the setting of Victoria Park. As such, the proposed development would fail to accord with policy DM01 of the Local Plan Development Management Policies DPD, Policies CS1, CS5 and CS NPPF of the Local Plan Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the Mayor's London Plan
- 2) The appearance of the proposed elevations would fail to achieve a high quality of design, would not respond to the context and character of the surrounding area and would therefore appear unjustifiably incongruous and alien within the streetscene. As such, the proposed development would fail to accord with policy DM01 of the Local Plan Development Management Policies DPD, Policies CS1, CS5 and CS NPPF of the Local Plan Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).
3. The proposed development by virtue of the close proximity of the footprint of the development to the boundaries, presence of boundaries the height of the boundary and associated planting would give rise to a poor quality of residential amenity for future occupiers which would result in poor outlook, sense of enclosure. As such, the proposed development would fail to accord with policy DM01 of the Local Plan Development Management Policies DPD, Policies CS1 and CS NPPF of the Local Plan Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).
- 4) In the absence of a legal agreement to provide replacement and additional tree planting to Victoria Park, the proposals would provide inadequate soft landscaping and fail to mitigate the visual impact of the development when viewed from the surrounding area and park. The proposals would be contrary to Policy DM01 of the Adopted Barnet Development Management Policies 2012, CS15 of the Local Plan Core Strategy (adopted September 2012), and the Planning Obligations SPD (adopted April 2013).
- 5) In the absence of a legal agreement to amend the necessary traffic order to create the proposed access, the proposals would have a harmful impact on highway and pedestrian

safety, contrary to policy DM17 of the adopted Barnet Development Management Policies 2012, CS9 and CS15 of the Local Plan Core Strategy (adopted September 2012), and the Planning Obligations SPD (adopted April 2013).

6) The site is considered ancillary to the park and the proposals would compromise the open space being contrary to policy DM15 of the Adopted Barnet Development Management Policies and policy 7.18 of the London Plan.

7. GROUND FLOOR FLAT, 15 REDBOURNE AVENUE, LONDON, N3 2BP - 17/4160/FUL

The report was presented by the Planning Manager.

A verbal representation was heard from Dr David Jones and Mr Wilson who spoke in objection to the application and a response from the applicant's agent.

Having considered the report the committee **RESOLVED** to approve the application in line with the Officer's report and addendum subject to an amendment to condition 4:

With replacement condition 4:

The use of the outbuilding hereby permitted shall at all times be incidental to and occupied in conjunction with the main building and shall not at any time be occupied as a separate unit or dwelling.

Reason: To ensure that the development does not prejudice the character of the locality and the amenities of occupiers of adjoining residential properties in accordance with Policy DM01 of the Development Management Policies DPD (adopted September 2012).

The vote recorded was:

For – 4

Against – 3

8. 124 FRIERN PARK, LONDON, N12 9LN - 17/3192/S73

The report and the addendum to the report was presented by the Planning Manager.

A verbal representation was heard from Ms Gill Brailey who spoke in objection and a response from the applicant's agent.

Having considered the report and the addendum to the report the Committee **RESOLVED** to approve the application in line with the Officer's report and addendum.

The votes were recorded as follows:

For – 4

Against – 3

9. 15 WYCOMBE GARDENS, LONDON, NW11 8AN - 17/4182/FUL

The report and the addendum to the report was presented by the Planning Manager.

A verbal representation was heard from Mr R Hawthorn who spoke in objection and a response from the applicant.

Following the consideration of the report the Chairman requested that the item be moved to the vote. The votes in favour of the Officer's recommendation were recorded as follows:

For approval – 3

Against approval – 4

The Governance Officer in attendance requested from Members of the Committee who voted against the application for planning reasons for refusal to be provided.

Having considered the reasons for refusal which the Planning Manager confirmed the Committee resolved to overturn the officer's recommendation and therefore refused the application for the following reasons:

The proposed development by reason of its size, design, massing, plot coverage, front forecourt arrangement; would be an overdevelopment of the site 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 Barnet Core Strategy and policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the Mayor's London Plan.

The vote was recorded as follows:

For refusal – 4

Against refusal – 3

10. 29 RAVENSCROFT AVENUE LONDON NW11 8BH - 17/3818/FUL

The report and the addendum to the report was presented by the Planning Manager.

Having considered the report and the addendum to the report the committee **RESOLVED** that that the application be approved in line with the Officer's report

The vote recorded was:

For - 4

Again - 3

11. BRONDESBURY CRICKET TENNIS AND SQUASH CLUB, 5A HARMAN DRIVE, LONDON, NW2 2EB - 17/0239/FUL

The report and the addendum to the report was presented by the Planning Manager.

A verbal representation was heard from Mr Dan Coppel and Ms Anne Linton who spoke in objection to the application. The applicant spoke in response.

Following the consideration of the report the Chairman requested that the item be moved to the vote. The votes in favour of the Officer's recommendation were recorded as follows:

For – 3

Against – 4

The Governance Officer in attendance requested from Members of the Committee who voted against the application were required to provide planning reasons for refusal.

Having considered the reasons for refusal which the Planning Manager confirmed the Committee resolved to overturn the Officer's recommendation and therefore refused the application for the following reasons:

The proposed tennis court, by reason of its siting would by reason of its associated noise, disturbance and general activity, be harmful to the residential amenities of neighbouring occupiers. This would be contrary to policy DM01 of the Adopted Barnet Development Management Policies 2012.

The vote was recorded as follows:

For refusal – 4

Against refusal – 3

12. BERKELEY COURT, 39 RAVENSCROFT AVENUE, LONDON NW11 8BG - TPF/0077/17

The report and the addendum to the report was presented by the Principal Planner for Trees and Environment.

Having considered the report and the addendum to the report the committee **RESOLVED:**

That consent be unanimously REFUSED for the following reason:

The loss of the tree of special amenity value is not justified as a remedy for the alleged subsidence damage on the basis of the information provided.

Add informative 'The applicant is advised that an application to reduce the tree as opposed to fell may be more favourably received.

13. 69 CUMBRIAN GARDENS, LONDON, NW2 1ED - 17/3513/FUL

The report was presented by the Planning Manager.

A verbal representation was heard from Mr Milan Korenko, Mr Roberto Revillia who spoke in objection and a response from the applicant.

Having considered the report and the addendum to the report the committee **RESOLVED that that the application be approved**

Votes were as follows:

For - 4

Again - 2

Abstain - 1

14. 87 BRIDGE LANE, LONDON, NW11 0EE - 17/3752/FUL

The report was presented by the Planning Manager.

A verbal representation was heard from Natalie Ginsbury who spoke in objection and a response from the applicant's agent.

Having considered the report the committee **RESOLVED** to approve the application.

The vote was recorded as follows:

For – 4

Against – 3

15. LAND R/O 138 CLITTERHOUSE ROAD, LONDON, NW2 1DN - 17/1872/FUL

The report and the addendum to the report was presented by the Planning Manager.

A verbal representation was heard from Mr Lambert who spoke in objection and a response from the applicant's agent.

Following the consideration of the item the Chairman requested that the item be moved to the vote. The votes in favour of the officer's recommendation were recorded as follows:

For – 2

Against – 3

Abstain -2

The Governance Officer in attendance requested from the Members that voted against the item to provide planning reasons for refusal.

Having considered the reasons for refusal the Committee resolved to overturn the Officer's recommendation and therefore the item was refused for the following reasons:

The proposed development by reason of its siting, form, design, and amount of hardstanding would be an obtrusive form of development out of character with the general pattern of development in the area. This would be contrary to policy DM01 of the Adopted Barnet Development Management Policies 2012 and policy CS5 of the Adopted Barnet Core Strategy.

The vote recorded was

For refusal – 2

Against refusal – 3

Abstain – 2

16. VICEROY COURT CAR PARK, EAST END ROAD, LONDON, N2 8AU - 17/3301/FUL

The report was presented by the Planning Manager.

A verbal representation was heard from Mr Travers who spoke in objection and a response from the applicant's agent.

Having considered the report committee **RESOLVED** that that the application be approved subject to the officer's report.

Votes were as follows:

For - 4

Against - 3

17. 11 PRIMROSE CLOSE, LONDON, N3 2RU - 17/0694/HSE

The report presented by the Planning Manager.

A verbal representation was heard from Ms Maria Close who spoke in objection and a response from the applicant's agent.

Having considered the report and the addendum to the report the Committee unanimously **RESOLVED** that the item be deferred in order for Officers to seek further information relating to bin storage and collection arrangements at the location.

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

There were no urgent items.

The meeting finished at 10:10pm