

<p style="text-align: center;"><b><u>MEETING</u></b></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>PLANNING COMMITTEE B</b></p>
<p style="text-align: center;"><b><u>DATE AND TIME</u></b></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>TUESDAY 15TH FEBRUARY, 2022</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>AT 6.30 PM</b></p>
<p style="text-align: center;"><b><u>VENUE</u></b></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>HENDON TOWN HALL, THE BURROUGHS, LONDON NW4 4BQ</b></p>

Dear Councillors,

Please find enclosed additional papers relating to the following items for the above mentioned meeting which were not available at the time of collation of the agenda.


Item No	Title of Report	Pages
5	ADDENDUM	2 - 6

[planning.committees@barnet.gov.uk](mailto:planning.committees@barnet.gov.uk)

**43 Wentworth Park Finchley N3 1YH**

**21/4025/FUL**

**Evidence to support that the submitted plans misrepresent the existing front elevation which is obscured by overgrown foliage**



# **Addendum**

## **Planning Committee B**

### **15 February 2022**

## **AGENDA ITEM 5**

Reference: 21/1377/FUL

Address: 124 Bulwer Road, Barnet, EN5 5EX

Pages: 45-64

Further to the published committee report, an objecting comment has been submitted in lieu of a registered speaker unable to attend the committee hearing. The comments received have been interleaved with officer responses as follows:

- there are sufficient 2 and 3 bed flats being provisioned in more suitable locations, such as Station Road EN5, Mill Hill and Whetstone, and in purpose built units.

Officer response: The application has been assessed on its own individual merits in the context of a borough wide shortage of housing stock which is supported by policy.

- there is a chronic shortage of 4 bed family homes. If the developer was meeting the development needs of Barnet then the loft conversion should go ahead. Instead, we are receiving smaller, poor standard housing.

Officer response: The existing dwelling relates to a three bedroom house acknowledged within policy as being a medium priority, there is nothing before officers compelling the applicant to upscale to a four bedroom dwelling. Given the proposal re-provides a three bedroom unit, there is no residual loss in medium priority housing and added benefit of a two bedroom unit recognised in the emerging local plan as a medium priority. Furthermore, both units would comply with the adopted minimum space standards.

- although this is a larger plot than most, the resulting works will have three of the smallest gardens and smallest properties in the area.

Officer response: As acknowledged within the comments, the subject site relates to an unusually larger than average plot size allowing adequately for further densification of the site without resulting in any discernible harm to the local character. Both units would benefit from ample outdoor amenity space in compliance with the requirements and meet the respective internal space standards.

- the parking survey is currently under investigation with the ICO for data privacy concerns. It is unlawful processing of data and should be removed.

Officer response: This is not a material planning consideration and needs to be sought through civil means. The comments therefore have no bearing on the assessment of this application.

- as per recent UK gov guidance, any new properties should provision electric car charging points with sufficient off-street parking for both properties.

Officer response: Parking provision and its acceptability have been addressed within the committee report. To further add, in accordance with Policy T6.1 of The London Plan (2021) which sets the maximum provision of parking spaces, the proposal would attract a maximum of 1.75 spaces (rounded to 2 spaces), leaving a maximum shortfall of 1 space which it is considered could be adequately accommodated on street.

- several complaints and enforcement actions have taken place against the developer and owner, they have not followed their own method statement, causing excessive disruption and pollution compared to other works in the area. Any approval should ensure they follow good responsible building codes and include guidance on enforcement to ensure they comply throughout all the build.

Officer response: These matters appear to relate to the previously approved appeal scheme and not the subject application and therefore not applicable. In any event, mitigation measures for the subject proposal have been secured through a pre-commencement condition (Condition 4) for a Demolition and Construction Management and Logistics Plan to be submitted.

Reference: TPF/1068/20

Address: Lee Close (near 13-24), EN5 5HP

Pages: 11-20

Further to the published committee report, the following statement has been submitted in lieu of the Applicant/Agent being able to attend the committee hearing. The statement is as follows:

*Dear Sirs,*

*We refer to the late invitation to speak at the forthcoming Committee Meeting on 15 February 2022 regarding the application TPF/1068/20.*

*Whilst we do not propose to attend the meeting in person, we would be grateful if the following could be provided/read to the Committee in lieu of our attendance:*

- This is an application for consent to remove an Oak tree, which is causing subsidence damage to Ms Boodhun's property. Your own engineer's report confirms that the tree is indeed causing damage;*
- As the tree is subject to a TPO, consent is required before it can be removed. An application was made in late 2019, but was not validated until 8 June 2021. A decision was due within 8 weeks, but some six months later (and over a year since the application was first made) a decision is still awaited. Ms Boodhun has unfairly already waited an unduly long time;*
- This was previously listed to be heard at a Planning Committee meeting on 17 January 2022. With no prior notice to us, the item was omitted from the committee's discussions on the day. The failure to determine the application to date is considered to be a deemed refusal of consent;*
- We note that in the event that consent is ultimately granted, there is a condition that a replanting scheme is agreed. We would be happy to discuss the requirements for such a replanting scheme with the Council officers in due course;*

- *There is not widespread community opposition to removal of the tree, with only 2 objections received from 68 neighbours consulted (3% of the consultees). It is anticipated that the replanting condition may appease those objectors in any event;*
- *If the Committee's decision is to refuse consent, then the tree will remain in place and an intrusive engineered scheme of works to the foundations will be required to stabilise the property. As previously notified, these works are expected to cost in the region of **£300,000**, but are avoidable if consent to remove the tree is ultimately granted. In the event of refusal, the costs will have to be incurred and a statutory compensation claim will be brought against the Council. Notice of such a claim has already been provided. Given the Council's acceptance that the tree is causing the damage, we expect such a claim to succeed. There is therefore a clear benefit to both Ms Boodhun and the Council if consent is granted.*

*We thank you for finally considering our application and we await the decision.*

Reference: 21/4025/FUL

Address: 43 Wentworth Park, N3 1YH

Pages: 65-82

The attached page has been submitted pursuant to representations to be made by one of the speaking objectors and relates to a discrepancy in the drawing of the front elevation. Whilst it is not clear whether the overhang is buttressed at any point in the manner depicted, it remains the case that the building envelope is not proposed to change at ground floor level along this flank – save for to the rear where the new extension will be introduced. As such, it is not considered that any such discrepancy in the drawing as may exist would have any material bearing on the recommendation.

This page is intentionally left blank