

PLANNING & ENVIRONMENT COMMITTEE MEETING

19th September 2012

ADDENDUM TO REPORT OF THE ACTING ASSISTANT DIRECTOR OF PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT

Pages: 17-42

Reference: B/01347/12

**Address: Barnet General Hospital, Wellhouse Lane, Barnet, Herts EN5
3DJ**

Amend recommendation to read as:

APPROVE SUBJECT TO CONDITIONS FOLLOWING NO OBJECTIONS RAISED BY THE MAYOR OF LONDON

Add the following condition:

Before works relating to the car park hereby approved commence, details of the existing and proposed levels of the car park, road(s) and footpath(s) in relation to adjoining land and highway(s) and any other changes proposed in the levels of this part of the site shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be implemented in accordance with such details as approved.

Reason:

To ensure that the work is carried out at suitable levels in relation to the highway and adjoining land having regard to drainage, gradient of access and the amenities of adjoining occupiers and the health of any trees on the site.

Add the following condition:

Before works relating to the car park hereby approved commence, details of the materials to be used for the hard surface of the car park shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be implemented in accordance with such details as approved.

Reason:

To safeguard the visual amenities of the locality.

Amend 'Greater London Authority' section within Internal/other Consultations to include:

The Mayor reviewed the application on 11th September 2012. His comments can be summarised as follows:

Whilst the application is broadly acceptable in strategic planning terms, on balance, the application does not comply with the London Plan. The following

changes might, however, remedy the deficiencies and could possibly lead to the application being compliant with the London Plan:

Inclusive Access: Barnet Council should secure by condition step free access to all external entrances of the new extensions. The network of accessible pathways to ensure pedestrian safety should also be extended as part of the new/reconfigured car park through and secured by condition

Sustainability: Barnet Council should however secure by condition the provision of sustainable urban drainage for the additional 208 car parking spaces

Transport: The following issues should be addressed before the application is referred back to the Mayor:

- Justification for the proposed provision of additional parking spaces on site to demonstrate it is acceptable;
- Securing of construction logistics plan, delivery servicing plan and travel plan via appropriate conditions;
- Confirmation of disabled parking provision and electric vehicle charging points for the site.

The Mayor's recommendation is therefore:

That Barnet Council be advised that the application does not comply with the London Plan, for the reasons set out in paragraph 36 of this report; but that the possible remedies set out in paragraph 38 of this report could address these deficiencies. The application does not need to be referred back to the Mayor if the Council resolves to refuse permission, but it must be referred back if the Council resolves to grant permission.

Following the receipt of the Stage I response, the committee report was sent to the Mayor for consideration. The Council has been advised in an email received by the GLA that the issues have been resolved at stage I and we do not require any stage II documentation however formal confirmation of this will only be provided following the Regular Planning meeting which is on Thursday 20th September 2012.

Amend Informative 3 to read as follows:

The applicant is advised that Wood Street is a Traffic Sensitive Road; deliveries during the construction period should not take place between 8.00 am-9.30 am and 4.30 pm-6.30 pm Monday to Saturday. Careful consideration must also be given to the optimum route(s) for construction traffic and the Environment and Operations Team should be consulted in this respect.

An additional letter with comments was received from an existing objector. These comments can be summarised as follows;

- The objection summary in the officers report appears dysfunctional as it fails to properly reflect objections and comments “made by neighbours”
- The consideration of the application should be deferred from consideration until the Council has identified why neighbour comments during the consultation process are not reported
- Approval of the proposal is considered premature before the publication of the BCF Estates Strategy for public consideration
- The impact of this development is obviously “regional” in nature on the road network within Greater London so that having an address outside of the London Borough of Barnet should not result in comments and consideration of impacts on non residents being excluded
- The Transport Statement dated 29 March 2012 failed to take account of bus service 614 or of the alterations to the bus stopping arrangements for Bus Route 307
- The Transport Statement has not been amended following concerns raised about the analysis of parking demand and following the inclusion of additional parking spaces
- Report under-estimates the likely increase in both staff and patients to the Barnet General Hospital site.
- Amelioration proposals were suggested (not reported) that included improvements to the Lavender Hill/Hunters Way junction in Enfield and the Ridgeway/main entrance junction at Chase Farm and the improvements to the bus stopping facilities on the Chase Farm Hospital site. Such amelioration should be developed and carried out and put in place before the proposed development at Barnet General Hospital is brought into use.
- The Mayor was due to review the present proposal on 11th September. Any outcome was not reported in public to the members of the BCF Hospitals NHS Trust Board on 14th September

Comments on the additional grounds of objection which relate to the planning merits of the proposal and any other relevant points are considered to have been dealt with in the officer’s report. The officer’s report is considered to fairly summarise the representations received.

Pages: 1-16

Reference: H/00146/12

Address: Blocks C5 to C12, Beaufort Park (Land at Former RAF East Camp Site), Aerodrome Road/ Grahame Park Way, Hendon, London, NW9

1. Amend recommendation to read ‘**Approve Subject to S106**

Subject to a Section 106 Agreement

RECOMMENDATION I:

1. That the applicant and any other person having a requisite interest be invited to enter by way of an agreement into a planning obligation under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning

Act 1990 and any other legislation which is considered necessary for the purposes seeking to secure the following:

- 1 Paying the council's legal and professional costs of preparing the Agreement and any other enabling agreements;
- 2 All obligations listed below to become enforceable in accordance with a timetable to be agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority;
- 3 **Special Site-Specific Obligation**
Agreement to ensure that no more than 2,800 residential units (Excluding the 190 residential units approved under application W00198BT/07) are built in accordance with the original outline permission reference number W00198AA/04.

Recommendation I in the report will become recommendation II to read *'That upon completion of the agreement the Acting Assistant Director of Planning and Development Management approve the planning application reference H/00146/12 under delegated powers subject to the conditions set out in the report.'*

2. The sole applicant is St George Central London Limited.

3. For the purposes of clarity, the scheme is for 560 dwellings and not 566, it has been amended.

4. The final paragraph on page 1 should state that The Core Strategy was adopted by the Council on September 11 2012. It is now subject to a 6 week period of legal challenge which ends on October 30 2012. Therefore very significant weight should be given to the 16 policies in the CS. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (para 216) sets out the weight that can be given to emerging policies as a material consideration in the determination of planning applications.

Development Management Policies was adopted by the Council on September 11 2012. It is now subject to a 6 week period of legal challenge which ends on October 30 2012. Therefore very significant weight should be given to the 18 policies in the DMP. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (para 216) sets out the weight that can be given to emerging policies as a material consideration in the determination of planning applications.

5. The first word of the 4th sentence on the 5th line is "We" whereas this should refer to "The applicants", reading *'the applicants have found that the oversized 3 beds are not being sought by purchasers and have therefore reduced these in size and utilised the space to incorporate additional 2 bed homes. Again, all homes being proposed exceed the minimum sizes outlined in the London Plan (2011).'*

6. In the section entitled "Design Heights and Massing on page 8 the last line should refer to a reduction in the height of "Blocks **C9 and C11**".

7. A number of residents have raised the issue that reserved matters approvals exist for a greater number of dwellings than approved under the outline planning permission. Legal advice has been sought and it is noted that a condition attached to the outline grant of planning permission W00198AA/04 restricts the development to 2800 units (An additional full permission exists for 190 dwellings, giving a total of 2990). The grant of this planning permission will be subject to a legal undertaking to ensure that no more than 2,800 residential units (excluding the 190 residential units approved under application W00198BT/07) are built in accordance with the original outline permission reference number W00198AA/04.

8. To clarify the final paragraph on page 11. There are a total of 421 car parking spaces as stated in the third paragraph of this page

9. The committee report incorrectly states that highways comments were not received at the time of writing the report. They are contained within the body of the report and additional comments are provided below.

10. The third paragraph from the bottom of page 11 should read as follows: "The applicant has conducted a survey of the existing parking. This has found that currently there is a maximum parking occupancy of 66.4%. Over the various times during the day when the car parking was counted (7am, 11am, 1pm, 5pm and 11pm) the maximum usage was recorded for each block. At its maximum the Block B car park is almost at full capacity at 93.3% however there are more than enough free spaces available in block A and C and E."

11. It should be emphasised that the report on the results of the parking monitoring surveys undertaken in July is draft, and officers have yet to discuss and agree the findings with the Applicant. However, additional Highways comments summarising the key findings follow.

Currently 1,153 units have been built with approximately 1,000 occupied. The survey response rate is over 50% which is considered to be a representative sample. The survey data shows the vehicle ownership of the sample is 74% and found that 14 % of the residents intend to buy another vehicle. The surveyed level of the actual car park occupancy is at an average of up to 61% and an average maximum of 66.4%, (although this varies from 18% in block C to 93% in block B). The differences between the resident survey results and those of the car park surveys reflects the fact that not all vehicles will be parked on site at any one time and that the residents survey is a sample.

It should be noted that on the residents' survey questionnaire question "Have you EVER experienced the car park to be full", 17 % responded "yes"; and when asked about the frequency of the event, 9% responded that they experienced this up to twice a month; 3%, 3 to 4 times and 5% more than 5 times. These results conflict with the findings of the car park occupancy surveys. However, it is possible that some residents may not be aware of all the locations that they are permitted to park in, and reflects the high occupancy of certain blocks.

Parking on street, is chosen by 2.8% of the residents who responded to the survey and for those experiencing problems parking on site, 8% chose to park on the nearby streets. Out of the 14% residents surveyed that are intending to purchase another vehicle, 2% are planning to park on street. Over 26% of the visitors are also choosing to park on the nearby streets.

LBB Highways is monitoring the parking situation on streets surrounding this development. The developer has paid contributions in relation to the planned CPZ and will continue to monitor the parking as further phases are constructed and can vary the parking provision according to the demand, as previously agreed under the terms of the S106.