

PLANNING COMMITTEE

2 November 2020

ADDENDUM TO SERVICE DIRECTOR OF DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT AND BUILDING CONTROL'S REPORT

Item No. 7

19/6610/FUL

Land at Basing Way, Moat Crescent and Amberden Avenue, London, N3

Since the publication of the committee report, the Design & Access Statement and Landscape Strategy and Open Space Audit have been updated to account for amenity space at the front of the maisonettes on Basing Way being private garden space instead of communal amenity space. This change makes no change to the amount of communal amenity space lost or re-provided as a result of the proposed development.

The following amendments are made to the committee report:

On page 38 of the report under residential car parking:

Applying a sliding scale of provision based on PTAL scale of 1-6, for a PTAL of 1b, the Council's Highways Officer considers that a maximum of 50 spaces is allowable.

On page 38 of the report under internal layout:

Highways would raise no objection to the proposed layout within Zone B provided the carriageway is widened to 5.5 metres. The widening of the road was investigated by the applicant; however, it was found to be unachievable given the site constraints, with the requested widening rendering the proposed Block B unbuildable. It is considered there are alternative solutions which could be explored and these could take place within the review of the S278 works.

Highways would therefore recommend that partial footway parking is introduced along this stretch and that the works are undertaken under a s278 agreement with the Council. The applicant considers that double yellow lines at the top of Basing Way is the most suitable solution, rather than footway parking. However, further review and consideration of the most suitable solution can be undertaken and decided within the s278 agreement.

Item No.8

20/0276/FUL

Beaufort Park, Aerodrome Road, London, NW9 5JH

Representation

The following representation from Cllr Weeden-Sanz should have been reported within the officer report:

I am writing to object to the above planning application in Beaufort Park on Aerodrome Road.

It is a madness that St George are continuing to pursue this application during the current global pandemic. They appear to have learnt nothing from our predicament which proves that tower blocks like the one proposed are not remotely suitable places for people to be living in in the 21st century and an age of lockdowns and self-isolation. We are still yet to see the full repercussions of Covid-19 play out. They are doubtless going to have to result in a rethink of how society operates and will have tremendous implications on planning policies which are now based on out of date assumptions. We need to pause and wake up to the new reality.

There reasons why this application should not be appropriate are numerous. Primarily the 21-storey tower block is totally out of keeping with the rest of Beaufort Park. It will change the nature, appearance and mid-rise character of the estate by creating a 1960s prison in the sky.

It won't just be Beaufort Park which will be affected by this application, the whole of Aerodrome Road will have its character changed by having such a tall tower on it and the view of Beaufort Park from Aerodrome Road and also from Lismore Gardens will be negatively impacted. It will overshadow and block natural light from the surrounding properties as well as loom over the community park on Beaufort Square making it a much less appealing place for the residents to enjoy.

The whole application goes against the original Master Plan which was created for Beaufort Park and what was originally agreed. The huge increase in height of the development along with the density of this proposal would cause a huge overdevelopment of both Aerodrome Road but also the wider neighbourhood where the local infrastructure is already struggling to cope in terms of schools, GPs, roads and hospitals. Particularly given the increase of development and homes in the rest of Colindale and particularly in the regeneration area. It is especially worrying when considered alongside the application for an additional 26 storey tower and 1,200 units in Colindale Gardens. The area simply cannot cope.

The original plan did not include high rise living or units being so densely packed and this would unacceptably increase the number of units with the development.

This proposal would also go against the guidelines for parking provision, with parking already being strictly limited and a widespread issue across Colindale. If approved the parking space ratio would be reduced to lower than the suggested level and there is no additional parking for visitors, care givers or family.

Daylight/Sunlight

Members should note the following discourse from the applicant in relation to daylight/sunlight matters:

The Committee Report refers to daylight provision within two amenity spaces; Beaufort Square and the internal courtyard within Building D.

It should be noted that Beaufort Square, which lies to the north of Building D and is accessible to all residents of Beaufort Park including the Building D residents, benefits from good sunlight availability; 77.90% of the Square would receive at least 2 hours of direct sunlight on 21st March. This is in excess of the BRE recommendation of 50% and the same level as provided by the Extant Permission for Building D.

In relation to the internal courtyard to Building D which is accessible to residents within Building D only, this would receive 0% in part and 88% in part on 21st March and 98.77% in part and 57.30% in part on 21st June. These results are in excess of the BRE Guidelines with the exception of the southern portion of the courtyard which receives 0% in March. Residents would have access to both portions of the amenity space and, therefore, would have access to an amenity space with sunlight availability year round. In addition, residents would also have access to Beaufort Square which, as summarised above, has access to good sunlight availability as well as private amenity spaces.

In terms of daylight/sunlight to surrounding properties, the Committee Report refers to the Vertical Sky Component (VSC) levels which have significantly improved following the amendments to the scheme. Alongside VSC, Daylight Distribution (DD) is the other primary tool for the assessment of daylight as set out in the BRE Guidelines. For DD, a room is recommended to retain greater than 0,8 times its former value. The comparative DD results between the scheme as submitted and the scheme as revised with reduced massing are set out in the table below:

Property	Daylight DD - Submission	Daylight DD - Revised
Colindale Gardens	40/40 rooms in compliance (100%)	40/40 rooms in compliance (100%)
Building E1, E7 and E8	62/154 rooms in compliance (40%)	110/154 rooms in compliance (71%)

Building F9	128/146 rooms in compliance (88%)	138/146 rooms in compliance (95%)
Building D1 and D2	48/96 rooms in compliance (50%)	66/98 rooms in compliance (67%)
Building C8 and C8A	97/165 rooms in compliance (59%)	97/165 rooms in compliance (59%)
TOTAL	375/601 rooms in compliance (62%)	451/603 rooms in compliance (75%)

As can be seen above, the submission scheme would have resulted in 40% of the rooms within Building E1, E7 and E8 of Beaufort Park achieving the recommended DD levels. The revised scheme, and particularly the reduction in height of the development from 21 to 16 storeys has resulted in an additional 13% compliance as a whole and an additional 31% of the rooms within Building E1, E7 and E8 achieving the guideline DD levels, a significant increase in adherence over and above the submission scheme.

Heads of Terms

The report incorrectly refers to 2 car club spaces being secured by the S106 Agreement; as per the submitted plans and as agreed with officers one space will be provided.

Item No.9

19/2657/FUL

Colesworth House, Crokesley House, Curtlington House, Clare House And Kedyngton House, Burnt Oak Broadway, Edgware, HA8

Wording of Conditions 20, 21 and 22

Since the publication of the report, there has been minor amendments to the wording of Condition 20, 21 and 22 which should now read as follows;

20) Prior to the first occupation of the development hereby approved, a scheme of suitable arrangement for the provision of funding for highway improvements for the existing junction at Montrose Avenue and Burnt Oak Broadway must be submitted in writing and approved by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure the development does not prejudice highways safety and the free flow of traffic in accordance with Policy DM17 of the Development Management Policies DPD.

21) Prior to the first occupation of the development hereby approved, a scheme of suitable arrangements for provision of carbon offset funding must be submitted in writing and approved by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure the development is in accordance with the London Plan (2016) Policies 5.2 and 5.3, and the GLA's Energy Assessment Guidance (2018)

22) a) Prior to the first occupation of the development hereby approved, a report by a competent acoustic consultant that assesses the likely noise impacts from the development of the plant, and establishes any mitigation measures for the development to reduce these noise impacts to acceptable levels (as may be required) must be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

The report shall include all calculations and baseline data, and be set out so that the Local Planning Authority can fully audit the report and critically analyse the content and recommendations.

b) The measures approved under this condition shall be implemented in their entirety prior to the first occupation of the development and retained as such thereafter.

Reason: To ensure that the proposed development does not prejudice the amenities of occupiers of neighbouring properties in accordance with Policy DM04 of the Development Management Policies DPD (adopted September 2012), the Sustainable Design and Construction SPD (adopted April 2013) and Policy 7.15 of the London Plan 2015.