

**ADDENDUM TO OFFICERS REPORT**

**Item 7 pages 31-64**

Reference: 20/4194/FUL

698 Finchley Road, London, NW11 7NE

Pages 21-63

**Amendment**

The description of development is as follows:

“Demolition of the existing building and erection of a part single, part two and part five storey building comprising of Class E (commercial) space at ground floor level with 9no. self-contained flats (comprising of 7x 2 bed & 2 x 3 bed units) on the upper floors; and 11 car parking spaces at basement level accessed via Hoop Lane; associated amenity space, refuse storage and cycle parking”.

This is a stand-alone planning application and has been assessed on its own planning merits.

**Additional information**

The existing site contains 219 sqm of commercial floorspace. The proposal would make provision for 255sqm of commercial floorspace (Use Class E). As such, the proposal would result in an increase of 36sqm of employment generating floorspace at ground floor level, thereby improving opportunities for employment, whilst creating an active street frontage, in accordance with policy.

**LBB Conservation Team comments**

- When assessing any application for development which may affect the setting of a heritage asset, Local Planning Authorities may need to consider the implications of cumulative change.
- The proposed height of the proposed development would diminish views of this lantern tower, from the public realm looking north up Finchley Road and Hoop Lane, over and above the approved scheme (2011 development). Less than substantial harm is being caused to its setting.
- There is no additional public benefit provided over the approved scheme (2008 & 2011) and therefore there is nothing to outweigh the cumulative harm to the setting of the listed building.

Officer's comments: LBB Conservation Team note that the proposal would lead to “less than substantial harm” but that the proposal would not deliver satisfactory public benefits to outweigh the harm. The Local Planning Authority/Planning Officers disagree with their position and believe that the proposal would include several public benefits including, the delivery of Class E (commercial) use at ground floor, therefore creating employment opportunities for the local area; the provision of new housing; and in particular housing which is suitable for family occupation. It is considered that

these public benefits outweigh any harm caused to the setting of the listed building, and is therefore in accordance with paragraphs 202 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2021).

**Additional commentary and assessment on the proposed impacts on the setting of the subject Heritage Assets.**

Paragraphs 194-208 of the NPPF (2021) which relate to Heritage Assets have been fully considered during the assessment of the proposed development.

The adjacent Church of Edward the Confessor (to the north of the site) was designated as a Grade II statutory listed building in 2016. The listing entry makes it clear that the square lantern-tower dominates the building and can be considered an architectural element that is of high significance to the church.

The separation distances between the proposed scheme and the church ranges between 5.04m-15.8 metres away from the proposed development. The gap between the proposal and the church is considered sufficient to allow for the development to look in character with the area. The proposal is of high design quality, its massing, setbacks, bulk, height, appearance, appearance, variety of materials and detailing would respect the setting and significance of the Listed Church. The proposal would not have a detrimental impact on the nearby Hampstead Suburb Conservation Area.

Hoop Lane Jewish Cemetery lies behind the site, to the east of the site became a registered Park and Garden, containing two statutorily Grade II listed structures within its site. The entrance gateway and prayer hall building were both listed in December 2020. The distance between the proposal and the listed prayer hall building is 166.5m; and 159.7m from the entrance gate. As such, given the large distance between the proposal and these listed structures; Officers do not consider that the proposal would compromise the setting or significance of the heritage assets at the Jewish Cemetery on Hoop Lane.

**Item:9 pages 87-130**

**Reference:** 20/5845/FUL

**Address:** St Johns Church Hall

Friern Barnet Lane

London

N20 0LP

**Recommendation III on page 99**

- Date for submission of completed Section 106 agreement extended from 01 December 2021 to 01 March 2022.

**Pre-commencement Conditions**

- In the period from the preparation of the committee report and the assigned date of the meeting, the applicant has submitted additional information with the aim of removing the pre-commencement trigger on the following conditions;

1. Demolition Construction Management and Logistics Plan; no.5
2. Tree protection plan; no.7
3. Preliminary Risk Assessment; no.10

Condition 5 (Demolition Construction Management and Logistics Plan) –

The following information was received;

Demolition, Construction Management & Logistics Plan by Pendell Consultancy “St Johns Whetstone”

*Officer Comment* – The Highways Officer has confirmed the submitted report is acceptable for its purpose and the pre-commencement trigger can be removed and replaced with a requirement that the development proceeds in accordance with the submitted report. Condition 5 now reads;

4a) Any development or site works hereby approved shall only proceed in accordance with the submitted Demolition, Construction Management & Logistics Plan by Pendell Consultancy.

b) The development shall only be implemented in accordance with the measures detailed within the statement.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety, noise and good air quality in accordance with Policies DM04 and DM17 of the Development Management Policies DPD (adopted September 2012), the Sustainable Design and Construction SPD (adopted October 2016) and Policies SI 1, SI 7, D14 and T7 of the London Plan 2021.

Replacing from the committee report (Page 90);

4a) No development or site works shall take place on site until a 'Demolition and Construction Management and Logistics Plan' has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The Demolition and Construction Management and Logistics Plan submitted shall include, but not be limited to, the following:

- i. details of the routing of construction vehicles to the site, hours of access, access and egress arrangements within the site and security procedures;
- ii. site preparation and construction stages of the development;
- iii. details of provisions for recycling of materials, the provision on site of a storage/delivery area for all plant, site huts, site facilities and materials;
- iv. details showing how all vehicles associated with the construction works are properly washed and cleaned to prevent the passage to mud and dirt onto the adjoining highway;
- v. the methods to be used and the measures to be undertaken to control the emission of dust, noise and vibration arising from construction works;

- vi. a suitable and efficient means of suppressing dust, including the adequate containment of stored or accumulated material so as to prevent it becoming airborne at any time and giving rise to nuisance;
- vii. noise mitigation measures for all plant and processors;
- viii. details of contractors compound and car parking arrangements;
- ix. details of interim car parking management arrangements for the duration of construction;
- x. details of a community liaison contact for the duration of all works associated with the development.

For major sites, the Statement shall be informed by the findings of the assessment of the air quality impacts of construction and demolition phases of the development.

b) The development shall thereafter be implemented in accordance with the measures detailed within the statement.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety, noise and good air quality in accordance with Policies DM04 and DM17 of the Development Management Policies DPD (adopted September 2012), the Sustainable Design and Construction SPD (adopted October 2016) and Policies SI 1, SI 7, D14 and T7 of the London Plan 2021.

#### Condition 7 (Tree protection plan) –

The following information was received;

Arboricultural Method Statement – Prepared by Arbtech, 15 October 2021

Tree Protection Plan - 3322-PD601-Rev F

Arboricultural Impact Assessment - 3322-PD601-Rev F

*Officer Comment* – The Trees Officer has confirmed the submitted report and plans are acceptable for their purpose and the pre-commencement trigger can be removed and replaced with a requirement that the development proceeds in accordance with the submitted report/plan. Condition 7 now reads;

7 No site works (including any temporary enabling works, site clearance and demolition) or development shall take place until the temporary tree protection shown on the approved tree protection plan approved under this condition, Tree Protection Plan - 3322-PD601-Rev F, has been erected around existing trees as shown on the submitted plan. This protection shall remain in position until after the development works are completed and no material or soil shall be stored within these fenced areas at any time. The development shall be implemented in accordance with the protection plan and method statement, Arboricultural Method Statement – Prepared by Arbtech, 15 October 2021, as approved under this condition.

Reason: To safeguard the health of existing trees which represent an important amenity feature in accordance with Policy DM01 of the Development Management Policies DPD (adopted September 2012), Policies CS5 and CS7 of the Local Plan Core Strategy DPD (adopted September 2012) and Policy G.7 of the London Plan

Replacing from the committee report (Page 91);

7a) No site works or development (including any temporary enabling works, site clearance and demolition) shall take place until a dimensioned tree protection plan in accordance with Section 5.5 and a method statement detailing precautions to minimise damage to trees in accordance with Section 6.1 of British Standard BS5837: 2012 (Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction - Recommendations) have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

b) No site works (including any temporary enabling works, site clearance and demolition) or development shall take place until the temporary tree protection shown on the tree protection plan approved under this condition has been erected around existing trees on site. This protection shall remain in position until after the development works are completed and no material or soil shall be stored within these fenced areas at any time. The development shall be implemented in accordance with the protection plan and method statement as approved under this condition.

Reason: To safeguard the health of existing trees which represent an important amenity feature in accordance with Policy DM01 of the Development Management Policies DPD (adopted September 2012), Policies CS5 and CS7 of the Local Plan Core Strategy DPD (adopted September 2012) and Policy G.7 of the London Plan

Condition 10 (Preliminary Risk Assessment) –

The following information was received;

FORMER CHURCH HALL, FRIERN BARNET LANE, WHETSTONE, N20 0LP,  
REMEDICATION METHOD STATEMENT, MKM DEVELOPMENTS LIMITED dated 22ND JANUARY 2021  
LS5497 version 1.0” and “FORMER CHURCH HALL, FRIERN BARNET LANE, WHETSTONE, N20 0LP,  
PHASE I AND PHASE II GEOTECHNICAL AND GEO-ENVIREONMENTAL INVESTIGATION, MKM  
DEVELOPMENTS LIMITED dated 22ND JANUARY 2021 LS5381 version 1.0.” by Land Science Ltd.

*Officer Comment* – The Environmental Health Officer comments;

“These reports are good, however the applicant acknowledges that there are issues so the Contaminated Land condition is still required for the second part: the verification report is necessary. Also, the council need to ensure that they carry out the remediation and verification work in line with the Remediation Method Statement Report because it is good. So in terms of the condition, the applicant has fulfilled Part 1a,b and c. But they still need to comply with the Remediation Report and they need to provide a Verification Report at the end of the works.

Condition 10 therefore now reads;

10 The remediation of contamination on the site shall be carried out in accordance with the submitted method statement - FORMER CHURCH HALL, FRIERN BARNET LANE, WHETSTONE, N20 0LP, REMEDIATION METHOD STATEMENT, MKM DEVELOPMENTS LIMITED dated 22nd JANUARY 2021 LS5497 version 1.0” and a report that provides verification that the required works have been carried out, shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority before the development is occupied.

Reason: To ensure the development can be implemented and occupied with adequate regard for environmental and public safety in accordance with Policy CS NPPF of the Local Plan Core Strategy DPD (adopted September 2012), DM04 of the Development Management Policies DPD (adopted September 2012), the Sustainable Design and Construction SPD (adopted October 2016).

Replacing from the committee report (Pages 92 and 93);

10 Part 1

Before development commences other than for investigative work:

a) A desktop study (Preliminary Risk Assessment) shall be carried out which shall include the identification of previous uses, potential contaminants that might be expected, given those uses, and other relevant information. Using this information, a diagrammatical representation (Conceptual Model) for the site of all potential contaminant sources, pathways and receptors shall be produced. The desktop study (Preliminary Risk Assessment) and Conceptual Model shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority. If the desktop study and Conceptual Model indicate no risk of harm, development shall not commence until approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

b) If the desktop study and Conceptual Model indicate any risk of harm, a site investigation shall be designed for the site using information obtained from the desktop study and Conceptual Model. This shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority prior to that investigation being carried out on site. The investigation must be comprehensive enough to enable:

- a risk assessment to be undertaken,
- refinement of the Conceptual Model, and
- the development of a Method Statement detailing the remediation requirements.

The risk assessment and refined Conceptual Model shall be submitted, along with the site investigation report, to the Local Planning Authority.

c) If the risk assessment and refined Conceptual Model indicate any risk of harm, a Method Statement detailing the remediation requirements, using the information obtained from the site investigation, and also detailing any post remedial monitoring shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority prior to that remediation being carried out on site.

## Part 2

d) Where remediation of contamination on the site is required completion of the remediation detailed in the method statement shall be carried out and a report that provides verification that the required works have been carried out, shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority before the development is occupied.

Reason: To ensure the development can be implemented and occupied with adequate regard for environmental and public safety in accordance with Policy CS NPPF of the Local Plan Core Strategy DPD (adopted September 2012), DM04 of the Development Management Policies DPD (adopted September 2012), the Sustainable Design and Construction SPD (adopted October 2016).

Condition 1 (Approved Plans) now reads;

The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans and documentation:

PD601 Rev F (Location Plan and Floor Plans),

PD 602 Rev C (Elevations),

PD 603 Rev C (Ground floor block plan) ,

PD604 (First floor block plan),

S01A - (Existing Plans),

Arboricultural Method Statement – Prepared by Arbtech, 15 October 2021

Tree Protection Plan - 3322-PD601-Rev F

Arboricultural Impact Assessment - 3322-PD601-Rev F

Demolition, Construction Management & Logistics Plan by Pendell Consultancy “St Johns Whetstone”

FORMER CHURCH HALL, FRIERN BARNET LANE, WHETSTONE, N20 0LP, REMEDIATION METHOD STATEMENT, MKM DEVELOPMENTS LIMITED dated 22ND JANUARY 2021 LS5497 version 1.0” and FORMER CHURCH HALL, FRIERN BARNET LANE, WHETSTONE, N20 0LP, PHASE I AND PHASE II GEOTECHNICAL AND GEO-ENVIRONMENTAL INVESTIGATION, MKM DEVELOPMENTS LIMITED dated 22ND JANUARY 2021 LS5381 version 1.0.” by Land Science Ltd.

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning and so as to ensure that the development is carried out fully in accordance with the plans as assessed in accordance with Policies CS NPPF and CS1 of the Local Plan Core Strategy DPD (adopted September 2012) and Policy DM01 of the Local Plan Development Management Policies DPD (adopted September 2012).

Replacing from the committee report (Pages 88 and 89);

The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:

PD601 Rev F (Location Plan and Floor Plans),

PD 602 Rev C (Elevations),

PD 603 Rev C (Ground floor block plan) ,

PD604 (First floor block plan),

S01A - (Existing Plans),

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning and so as to ensure that the development is carried out fully in accordance with the plans as assessed in accordance with Policies CS NPPF and CS1 of the Local Plan Core Strategy DPD (adopted September 2012) and Policy DM01 of the Local Plan Development Management Policies DPD (adopted September 2012).



**Item: 12** (page 165 – 194)

**Reference:** 21/2602/FUL

**Address:** Land Rear Of The Bobath Centre 250 East End Road London N2 8AU

Correction to wording of condition 12 to read as follows:

“Prior to occupation, a full Parking Management Plan (PMP) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development thereafter shall only be operated in accordance with the approved Parking Management Plan.

Reason: In the interest of highway safety in accordance with London Borough of Barnet's Local Plan Policy CS9 of Core Strategy (Adopted) September 2012 and Policy DM17 of Development Management Policies (Adopted) September 2012.”

**Item:13 pages 195-200**

**Reference:** 21/4636/FUL

**Address:** 189 Regents Park Road, London, N3 3PB

Rewording of condition 2 and 4 to read as follows:

Condition 2

The use hereby permitted shall be for a limited period only, expiring in two years from the date the decision is issued when the use shall be discontinued.

Reason: To enable the Local Planning Authority to monitor the impact of the use in order to protect the amenities of the area.

Condition 4

The number of children looked after shall not exceed 9.

Reason: To safeguard the amenities of occupiers of adjoining residential properties in accordance with Policy DM01 and DM04 of the Development Management Policies DPD (adopted September 2012) and the Residential Design Guidance SPD (adopted October 2016).

**Items: 15 and 16 pages 209-224**

**Reference:** 21/4178/FUL and 21/4191/ADV

**Address:** O/s 836 High Road, N12 9RE

One objection received from the Finchley Society.

Officers consider that the distance of 30m from the BT Street Hub to the listed milestone will not adversely affect its setting.

Members should be aware that this was the only Street Hub in which the Police and Highways did not raise an objection.

The letter from the Finchley Society is replicated below.

Note for members of Planning Committee C

Mr Michael Levitsky objected to 21/4178/FUL as a member of the Planning Committee of the Finchley Society. Unfortunately neither he nor any other member is available to speak to it, owing to a meeting of the society. I am therefore submitting this note elaborating the reasons why we ask the Committee

to refuse this application (with the related 21/4191/ADV). We do not believe that the council officers' reports on these applications take full and proper account of the circumstances. The question of BT Street Hubs is of concern to the Finchley Society not only because of this application but because of BT's intent to place these in as many locations around Barnet as possible. We consider these structures to be fundamentally unsuited to our suburban context, or indeed to almost any context in London with traditional architecture.

The officers' reports recommend accepting BT's proposal, whereas the report for a recent very similar proposal recommended refusal (21/1140/ADV). We do not understand the change in the attitude of officers (not only the planning officers but also the highways department) in such a short time. The latest reports appear inconsistent with this previous one. They are also less comprehensive and thorough.

A key omission from the reports is the presence of the Grade II listed milestone outside Nos. 842 and 844 High Road (Historic England No. 1064902), located only 30 metres from the proposed Street Hub. The report states there are no such listed buildings (or other assets) in the vicinity, which is incorrect. The milestone, about 200 hundred years' old, is an important part of Barnet's heritage and of the local scene. The Street Hub would obscure views of the milestone, and its large black metallic rectangular presence would clash with the small white traditional milestone. Proposals for structures located so close to nationally listed monuments should receive much closer scrutiny than is contained in these reports.

A further problem with the officers' reports is the failure to apply Council Policy DM18 on Telecommunications (which the report for 21/1140/ADV did apply). Failure to apply this policy is a fundamental shortcoming because BT's application is clearly for telecommunications infrastructure. DM18 provides essential guidelines for considering the application and solid grounds for refusing it. The BT Street Hub would violate a number of the policy's provisions: (i) the appearance of the building against which it stands (Sainsbury's supermarket) will be compromised, (ii) it will adversely affect a Grade II heritage asset, (iii and iv) this is not the most efficient and least obtrusive way to provide the telecommunications infrastructure, (v) The Street Hub is not appropriately designed, coloured and landscaped for the setting, and (vi) there is substantial negative effect on the visual amenities of local residents.

A second omission from the officers' reports is the London Plan, which is mentioned as relevant but not applied as it was in the report for 21/1140/ADV. Two policies stand out as relevant. Policy D4 on "Delivering Good Design" calls for refusing this application. The large black metallic structure, with entirely linear features, is wholly inappropriate for the traditional suburban context. Policy D8 on "The Public Realm" also argues for refusal, because of its adverse effect on the street scene, its contribution to street clutter (despite removal of the disused phone box), and the likelihood that the structure like the phone box it replaces is unnecessary.

The officers have also not taken note of Barnet's Draft Local Plan Reg 19 of 2021. While the 2012 Local Plan still has statutory force, the new plan must also be taken into account, as pointed out in the officers' report for 21/1140/ADV. The new Local Plan has a policy on Advertising (CDH09) which is far clearer and more stringent than previous council policy. It articulates high standards of design, compliance with context, avoidance of street clutter, and contribution to the public realm. We strongly support this new policy. The BT Street Hub falls short of its requirements.

The officers have applied the council's guidance on advertising, which is contained in a remarkably ancient Design Note from 1994 (DGN 1). This calls for structures to be "well related to their surrounding in terms of size, scale siting" and "be located to avoid visual clutter". In our view these guidelines have not been rigorously applied by the officers, nor has the expansion of these requirements in the new CDH09.

The BT street Hub is 3 metres tall. This the same height as a single-story house extension, a single-story flat-roofed retail structure or an entire shopfront. Its profile is the same as the display window of a regular shop. Its design and setting needs to be considered in architectural terms beyond those applied to mere street furniture, and it should fail examination in this respect. This is an ultra-modern black metallic structure of entirely linear design. It may fit into an ultra-modern setting, but it is completely out of context within the architecture of Finchley. Although the Sainsbury's supermarket is a modern building, it has been constructed of traditional bricks and is sympathetic to local context in terms of structure. The rest of the immediate area is characterised by 1 to 3 storey traditional shop terraces from the early-20th Century, which are in places not without appeal. Within this low-rise and small-scale context, the Hub is clearly over-sized. There are very few black-coloured elements in the built landscape and none that relate to the BT Street Hub's design. The Street Hub spoils the careful brickwork symmetry of the supermarket by bisecting a line of light bricks that marks the point where the arches at the entrance meet the vertical elements.

In their reports the officers describe the BT Hub as "less bulky" than the existing phone box with an impact that would be "marginal". This seems to us incorrect. Due to its greater height and width, the Street Hub will obscure 65 percent more area than the phone box. The large profile it presents to pedestrians and motorists makes it appear more, not less, bulky. The difference between the profile of the phone box and the Street Hub is equivalent to that between a 5 storey and 8 storey building, which is hardly "marginal".

The immediate vicinity of the proposed Street Hub is already cluttered with street furniture and utility elements. In addition to the phone box (which would be replaced), these are: poles for CCTV, streetlights, and a bus stop, a small stone model of North Finchley Library, three wooden benches, a BT utility cabinet (unrelated to the proposed Hub), a Council refuse bin, a large bus shelter and five bicycle parking railings. This is an area that requires less clutter, not a new large structure. Advertising is already heavily present in the form of a double-sided display on the bus shelter and on a 5-metre-high monopole nearby.

We are surprised by the cursory attention given in the officers' reports to the issue of traffic safety. The report on 21/4191/ADV uses language from a DOE circular from 1992 which has been withdrawn (4.3, first paragraph, last sentence). This language should be excised from all such reports on advertising, where it regularly appears. The effect of this language is to reduce the attention paid to the distraction and obstructions caused by advertisements. The government's new guidance places far greater emphasis on this. The proposed BT Street Hub sits only 10 metres from a very busy and complex intersection marked by a large four-way box-junction and adjacent to a large bus stop. The High Road is one of the busiest roads in Barnet. That section of Ravensdale Avenue has heavy traffic from the Sainsbury's car park. Motorists, pedestrians, and cyclists need unobstructed views and as little distraction as possible to navigate the difficult junction. The BT Hub will obscure views and present changing bright advertisements to distract pedestrians and motorists. Similar consideration led to refusal of the Hubs in applications 21/1140/ADV and 19/4852/FUL (in which the Hub would have been located very near the current proposal).

We believe that because of the hybrid nature of the structure proposed by BT, it must be acceptable both under the Council's Telecommunications Policies and under its policies for advertising and for the preservation of the public realm. The BT Street Hub is clearly not an acceptable form of telecommunications infrastructure, since it packages a tiny amount of hardware within a massive advertising hoarding. As an advertisement, it fails all tests of acceptability in its proposed location.

A key question is whether the telecommunications facilities proposed by BT (public phone, wifi, Mobile 4G) are needed. BT has not addressed this issue. In practice, it is clear that the facilities are unnecessary. The phone box has probably not been properly used in years and there is fully adequate mobile and internet connectivity in that location. Since the telecommunications features of the BT Street Hub are unneeded, this element should be ignored. The question for the council is whether it will condone replacement of the derelict phone box by a very large street hoarding. We trust it would not.

BT has retained its unused, derelict and vandalized phone boxes in Barnet and other urban areas for many years. It has been deaf to polite requests to remove them. There is clearly a link between its "squatting" on council-owned land with such phone boxes and its intention to persuade councils to allow installation of Street Hubs concurrent with their removal. The company has raised questions over its trustworthiness and care for the community that should weigh in the balance for councillors.

#### Officer response to the letter

- The application at Ballards Lane REF 21/1140/ADV is a different context and whilst the design is similar each site is considered on its own merit
- The listed milestone is 30m away from the location of the Hub. There is street furniture far closer than this including the bus stop. The Hub would not materially obscure views of the

milestone since it is set close to the flank wall of the supermarket. The Hub is not considered to materially affect the setting of the milestone.

- The Street Hub is higher and wider than the phone box but is slimmer and has a cleaner finish. It is modern, but the immediate environment with the large flank wall of Sainsbury to the rear is not traditional. The commercial centre of North Finchley has a variety of architectural styles as well as variety in scale and form of design.
- The Highway Officer raised no specific matters of traffic safety in regard to this particular proposal
- Policy matters:
- The North Finchley Town Centre has a range of architectural styles, and the form and scale of building varies, and although three storeys is the average, there are a number of taller buildings. Moreover, this is a broad thoroughfare with wide pavements in part, including outside Sainsbury. It is also primarily commercial in character with retail, hospitality and office use predominating at street level. Within this specific context, the hub is not considered to be contrary to policy.
- The report did not specifically refer to Policy D4 (Delivering good design) but the general provisions were taken into consideration in determining the proposal. Consideration was taken of the site and the context in which the structure would sit, and mindful of an already existing structure there. The proposal is more contemporary but that is not inappropriate in a commercial street of the 21<sup>st</sup> Century.
- Turning to Policy D8 (Public Realm), Provision K states 'ensure that street clutter, including street furniture that is poorly located, unsightly, in poor condition or without a clear function is removed, to ensure that pedestrian amenity is improved. Consideration should be given to the use, design, and location of street furniture so that it complements the use and function of the space. Applications which seek to introduce unnecessary street furniture should be refused.' It is not considered that this specific hub is poorly located nor its design inappropriate in this commercial street. Pedestrian amenity is not materially harmed by it and Highways raised no objection in this regard.