

Location **Stowe House, Carpenter House, Abington House, Beaufort House, Kingsley House And Cosway House Emmott Close London NW11**

Reference: **21/4794/FUL** Received: 2nd September 2021
Accepted: 6th September 2021

Ward: Garden Suburb Expiry 1st November 2021

Case Officer: **John Sperling**

Applicant: Ian Cade

Proposal: Alterations to hard and soft landscaping including: Installation of areas of hardstanding to facilitate the storage of refuse: Repairs to existing paths and reinstatement of missing areas of existing hedging (AMENDED DESCRIPTION AND DRAWINGS).

OFFICER'S RECOMMENDATION

Approve subject to conditions

AND the Committee grants delegated authority to the Service Director – Planning and Building Control to make any minor alterations, additions or deletions to the recommended conditions/obligations or reasons for refusal as set out in this report and addendum provided this authority shall be exercised after consultation with the Chairman (or in their absence the Vice- Chairman) of the Committee (who may request that such alterations, additions or deletions be first approved by the Committee)

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

B9547-PR-AH-XX-DR-B-PL001 P2 - Existing Location and Block Plans
B9547-PR-AH-XX-DR-B-PL101 P6 - Existing Site Plan. Abington House
B9547-PR-AH-XX-DR-B-PL102 P6 - Proposed Site Plan, Abington House
B9547-PR-AH-XX-DR-B-PL201 P4 - Existing Elevations, Abington House
B9547-PR-AH-XX-DR-B-PL202 P6 - Proposed Elevations, Abington House
B9547-PR-BH-XX-DR-B-PL101 P3 - Existing Site Plan, Beaufort House
B9547-PR-BH-XX-DR-B-PL102 P4 - Proposed Site Plan, Beaufort House
B9547-PR-BH-XX-DR-B-PL201 P2 - Existing Elevations, Beaufort House

B9547-PR-BH-XX-DR-B-PL202 P4 - Proposed Elevations, Beaufort House
B9547-PR-CH-XX-DR-B-PL101 P5 - Existing and Proposed Site Plan, Carpenter House
B9547-PR-CH-XX-DR-B-PL201 P5 - Existing and Proposed Elevations, Carpenter House
B9547-PR-AH-XX-DR-B-PL101 P1 - Existing Site Plan, Cosway House
B9547-PR-CH-XX-DR-B-PL102 P5 - Proposed Site Plan, Cosway House
B9547-PR-CH-XX-DR-B-PL201 P5 - Existing and Proposed Elevations, Cosway House
B9547-PR-AH-XX-DR-B-PL101 P4 - Existing Site Plan, Kingsley House
B9547-PR-KH-XX-DR-B-PL102 P4 - Proposed Site Plan, Kingsley House
B9547-PR-KH-XX-DR-B-PL201 P5 - Existing and Proposed Elevations, Kingsley House
B9547-PR-SH-XX-DR-B-PL101 P5 - Existing and Proposed Floor Plan, Stowe House
B9547-PR-SH-XX-DR-B-PL201 P5 - Existing and Proposed Elevations, Stowe House

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).

- 2 This development must be begun within three years from the date of this permission.

Reason: To comply with Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

- 3 The materials and hedging to be used for the works of the development hereby approved shall be in accordance with the details submitted within the approved plans.

Reason: To safeguard the visual amenities of the building and surrounding area in accordance with Policy DM01 of the Development Management Policies DPD (adopted September 2012) and Policies CS NPPF and CS1 of the Local Plan Core Strategy (adopted September 2012).

- 4 a) The submitted scheme of replacement privet hedging shall be carried out before the end of the first planting and seeding season following commencement of the works hereby approved.
- b) Any existing tree shown to be retained or trees or shrubs to be planted as part of the approved landscaping scheme which are removed, die, become severely damaged or diseased within five years of the completion of development shall be replaced with trees or shrubs of appropriate size and species in the next planting season.

Reason: To ensure a satisfactory appearance to the development in accordance

with Policies CS5 and CS7 of the Local Plan Core Strategy DPD (adopted September 2012), Policy DM01 of the Development Management Policies DPD (adopted September 2012), the Sustainable Design and Construction SPD (adopted October 2016) and G5 and G7 of the London Plan 2021.

Informative(s):

- 1 In accordance with paragraphs 38-57 of the NPPF, the Local Planning Authority (LPA) takes a positive and proactive approach to development proposals, focused on solutions. The LPA has produced planning policies and written guidance to assist applicants when submitting applications. These are all available on the Council's website. The LPA has negotiated with the applicant/agent where necessary during the application process to ensure that the proposed development is in accordance with the Development Plan.

OFFICER'S ASSESSMENT

1. Site Description

The application site comprises a development off Kingsley Way, in the Hampstead Garden Suburb.

The collection of buildings in Emmott Close including Stowe House, Carpenter House, Abington House, Beaufort House, Kingsley House And Cosway House are included as part of the current application.

They are locally listed buildings and sit in Area 4 of the Hampstead Garden Suburb Conservation Area.

The Hampstead Garden Suburb Character Appraisal states:

"Emmett Close was originally built as flatlets for working women with shared bathrooms on each landing. These have been merged into full-size flats with modern amenities without any change to the external appearance. The refurbishment has widened the driveway without materially reducing the size of the green. The 1928 design is in simple brick, in

keeping with the almshouse appearance and the use of two-storey gabled protrusions sets the domestic scale. The terraces are linked by the small dormers in the roofs. Prominent chimneys reinforce the Norfolk-style appearance, clever windows being set in to the lower floors in some cases."

2. Site History

The relevant site history for all the relevant houses is as follows:

Stowe House:

Reference: 15/06735/FUL

Address: Stowe House, Emmott Close, London, NW11 6QA

Decision: Approved subject to conditions

Decision Date: 2 February 2016

Description: Replacement of existing windows with new timber double glazed windows

Carpenter House:

Reference: 21/3079/FUL

Address: Carpenter House, Emmott Close, London, NW11 6PX

Decision: Refused

Decision Date: 30 July 2021

Description: Repair to existing concrete path. New bin stores

Reference: 16/3819/FUL

Address: Carpenter House, Emmott Close, London, NW11 6PX

Decision: Approved subject to conditions

Decision Date: 30 August 2016

Description: Replacement of existing front and rear windows. Replacement of existing roof tiles to match existing

Abington House:

Reference: 16/6421/FUL

Address: Abington House, Emmott Close, London, NW11 6QB

Decision: Approved subject to conditions

Decision Date: 21 December 2016

Description: Replacement of all existing windows with new double glazed metal crittal style set within timber sub frames, replacement of roof tiles and lead around the roofing and dormers. [AMENDED DESCRIPTION]

Beaufort House:

Reference: 16/6423/FUL

Address: Beaufort House, Emmott Close, London, NW11 6PU

Decision: Approved subject to conditions

Decision Date: 27 October 2016

Description: Replacement of all existing windows with new double glazed metal crittal style set within timber sub frames, replacement of roof tiles and lead around the roofing and dormers. [AMENDED DESCRIPTION]

Kingsley House:

Reference: 17/0500/FUL

Address: Kingsley House, Emmott Close, London, NW11 6PY

Decision: Approved subject to conditions

Decision Date: 1 February 2017

Description: Proposed access ramp with handrails at rear of property

Reference: 16/6417/FUL

Address: Kingsley House, Emmott Close, London, NW11 6PY

Decision: Approved subject to conditions

Decision Date: 26 October 2016

Description: Replacement of all existing windows with new double glazed metal crittal style set within timber sub frames, replacement of roof tiles and lead around the roofing and dormers. [AMENDED DESCRIPTION]

Reference: 16/3694/FUL

Address: Flat 3, Kingsley House, Emmott Close, London, NW11 6PY

Decision: Approved subject to conditions

Decision Date: 12 August 2016

Description: Proposed access ramp with handrails at rear of property

Cosway House:

Reference: 16/6431/FUL

Address: Cosway House, Kingsley House, Emmott Close, London, NW11 6PY

Decision: Approved subject to conditions

Decision Date: 26 October 2016

Description: Replacement of all existing windows with new double glazed metal crittal style set within timber sub frames, replacement of roof tiles and lead around the roofing and dormers. [AMENDED DESCRIPTION]

3. Proposal

Planning permission is sought for 'Alterations to hard and soft landscaping including: Installation of areas of hardstanding to facilitate the storage of refuse: Repairs to existing paths and reinstatement of missing areas of existing hedging (AMENDED DESCRIPTION AND DRAWINGS).'

Abington House:

The proposal involves repositioning the bins from the rear of the site to the front, behind the proposed reintroduced front boundary hedging placed either side of the central concrete pathway. The 2no concrete areas would both measure a depth of 1.2 metres and the left space would measure a width of 1.5 metres and 2 metres to the right space. The concrete areas would be distanced 3.8 metres from the front elevation of Abington House. The space would accommodate 4no refuse 1150 litre bins and 3no recycling 1150 litre bins measuring 1 metre in height.

Also to Abington House is a replacement concrete pathway to the immediate rear of the application site and expand the full width of the site. To the left-hand side of Abington House, a concrete pathway would project 2 metres from the side, extend 2.3 metres deep,

then reduce to 1.3 metres and then expand across the full width of the site. The same material would be used as existing.

Beaufort House:

Beaufort House is situated opposite Abington House in the furthest portion of the Emmott Close estate.

The proposal involves repositioning the bins from the rear of the site to the front, behind the proposed reintroduced front boundary hedging. The proposed bin areas would be placed either side of a central concrete pathway. The 2no concrete areas would measure a depth of 1.2 metres and width of 1 metre on the left side and 2 metres on the right side. The concrete areas would be distanced 3.8 metres from the front elevation of Abington House. The space would accommodate up to 6no 1150 litre bins, 4no refuse on the right side and 2no recycling bins to the left, and measure 1 metre in height.

The existing side gap on the hedging frontage would be retained as existing. No further element proposed to Beaufort House.

Carpenter House:

The proposal involves repositioning the bins from the rear of the site to the front, behind the proposed reintroduced front boundary hedging. The proposed bin areas would be placed either side of the three concrete pathways leading to/from the premises. Each concrete area would measure a depth of 1.2 metres and width of 1 metre and accommodate for 2no bins in each space. A total of 8no 1150 litre refuse and 4no 1150 litre recycling bins are proposed. The concrete areas would be distanced 3.5 metres from the front elevation of Carpenter House.

The existing route to the rear, located to the right-hand portion of the property, would be retained as existing.

Cosway House:

The proposal involves repositioning the bins from the rear of the site to the front, behind the proposed reintroduced front boundary hedging. The proposed bin areas would be placed either side of the central and north-eastern (right-hand) concrete pathway. For the central pathways 2no concrete areas measuring a depth of would be placed behind the hedging and measure a depth of 1.2 metres and width of 2 metres (left space) accommodating for 4no refuse 1150 litre bins. The right space would measure 1 metre in width and accommodate for 2no recycling 1150 litre bins. The north-eastern pathway would also have 2no concrete areas and measure a depth of 1.2 metres and vary in width according to the angle of the pathway, a maximum of 3.25 metres. The central concrete areas would be distanced 3.2 metres from the closest point of principal elevation of Cosway House.

Kingsley House:

Kingsley House, is located adjacent to Cosway House, forming part of the initial properties when viewed from Kingsley Way. The proposal involves repositioning the bins from the rear of the site to the front and side elevations, behind the proposed reintroduced front boundary hedging placed either side of the central concrete pathway. For the central pathway 2no concrete areas would be implemented and measure a depth of 1.2 metres

and width of 2 metres on the left side and 1 metre on the right side. The left side would hold 4no 1150 litre refuse bins and the right side 2no 1150 litre recycling bins and would be distanced 3.2 metres from the front elevation of Kingsley House. To the northern-western portion of the site a larger concrete area measuring 3 metres wide, and 1.2 metres deep would be installed to accommodate 6 1150 litre bins (4no refuse and 2no recycling).

Stowe House:

The proposal involves repositioning the bins from the rear of the site to the front, behind the proposed reintroduced front boundary hedging. The repositioned bins would be placed either side of the three concrete pathways leading to/from the premises. Each concrete area would measure a depth of 1.2 metres and width of 1 metres and accommodate for 2no 1150 litre bins in each space. A total of 12 are proposed, 8no being refuse 4no being recycling. The concrete areas would be distanced 3.5 metres from the front elevation of Carpenter House.

The replaced hedging areas will exactly match the existing species, as per agent's email dated 07/10/2021. Also, it is noted that the concrete slabs placed underneath the relocated bins would be level with the existing ground level.

4. Public Consultation

Consultation letters were sent to 111 neighbouring properties.

27no. objections were received during the original consultation.

Amendments were sought in the lifetime of the application and a reconsultation undertaken on 4th April 2022. 15no. objections were subsequently received.

The comments may be summarised as follows:

- No residents consultation was done prior to the applications submission.
- No problem with existing bin location.
- Does not suit the estates interest.
- Close bin store proximity to habitable windows.
- Noise and nuisance more problematic than existing due to location.
- Impact on mental health and quality of living for residents.
- Loss of privacy as people pass to place their rubbish and the noise of comings and goings will be intolerable and will significantly disrupt our quality of life. For some, the noise from the intercom attached to the front door/heavily weighted fire door is enough already.
- Poor smell and associated vermin and foxes will harmfully impact our quality of life.
- Likely to see an increase of fly tipping. Unwanted furniture is frequently dumped by the bins. This will incur a cost to the residents of the Emmott (which is most visible) close to get it removed.
- Existing garden space is limited, the proposed bins stores would reduce this further and detract from beautified space the residents have created. Outdoor space has been vital throughout the pandemic and will continue to be so.
- Harmful impact on the character and appearance of the houses and wider area, conflicting with DM01 and DM06 of Barnet's Development Management Policies.
- Money better spent on maintaining the buildings, such as the paths to the rear

which are hazardous and in desperate need of maintenance.

- If satellite dishes are not allowed due to the fact that they are unsightly, then having bins in the front does not make any sense.
- Over-provision of bins for residents' needs. Bins for every pathway and door is not necessary. There are 10 tenants in total in Cosway House so 12 bins is excessive and again, a complete waste of money.
- The proposal would create a positive appearance of the properties but be harmful to the outlook of the existing residents.
- In winter, residents would be obliged to step on muddy grass to put their rubbish in the bins, which is slippery, hazardous and impractical. Many disabled, infirm and elderly residents live here.
- Previous permission for cycle parking and new bins was refused by the LPA and Trust some 18 years ago, the same decision should be made in this instance.
- There is a large manhole cover to the front of one of the buildings (Beaufort House).
- As long as I've lived here, no-one has complained of where the current bins are located, including the maintenance workers.
- Residents are aware that a minority of new maintenance personnel do not like removing bins from the rear of all blocks and I'm convinced is the only reason this application has been made.
- I am delighted that the hedges are being attended to finally and think this should be done for purely aesthetic reasons and not just to hide multitudes of smelly bins.

4.1 Internal Consultation

The Hampstead Garden Suburb Trust have no objection to the proposed development.

The LPA's highways department have no objection to the proposed development.

The LPA's tree officers raises no objection to the proposed development, subject to conditions.

The LPA's heritage officer raises no objection to the proposed development.

5. Planning Considerations

5.1 Policy Context

National Planning Policy Framework and National Planning Practice Guidance

The determination of planning applications is made mindful of Central Government advice and the Local Plan for the area. It is recognised that Local Planning Authorities must determine applications in accordance with the statutory Development Plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise, and that the planning system does not exist to protect the private interests of one person against another.

The Revised National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) was published on 20 July 2021. This is a key part of the Governments reforms to make the planning system less complex and more accessible, and to promote sustainable growth.

The NPPF states that 'good design is a key aspect of sustainable development, is indivisible from good planning, and should contribute positively to making places better for

people'. The NPPF retains a presumption in favour of sustainable development. This applies unless any adverse impacts of a development would 'significantly and demonstrably' outweigh the benefits.

Existing policies in Barnet's Local Plan (2012) should not be considered out-of-date simply because they were adopted prior to the publication of the revised NPPF. Due weight should be given to them, according to their degree of consistency with the revised NPPF.

The Mayor's London Plan 2021

The London Development Plan is the overall strategic plan for London, and it sets out a fully integrated economic, environmental, transport and social framework for the development of the capital to 2041. It forms part of the development plan for Greater London and is recognised in the NPPF as part of the development plan.

The London Plan provides a unified framework for strategies that are designed to ensure that all Londoners benefit from sustainable improvements to their quality of life.

Barnet's Local Plan (2012)

Barnet's Local Plan is made up of a suite of documents including the Core Strategy and Development Management Policies Development Plan Documents. Both were adopted in September 2012.

- Relevant Core Strategy Policies: CS NPPF, CS1, CS5.
- Relevant Development Management Policies: DM01, DM02 and DM06.

The Council's approach to extensions as set out in Policy DM01 is to minimise their impact on the local environment and to ensure that occupiers of new developments as well as neighbouring occupiers enjoy a high standard of amenity. Policy DM01 states that all development should represent high quality design and should be designed to allow for adequate daylight, sunlight, privacy and outlook for adjoining occupiers.

Policy DM02 states that where appropriate, development will be expected to demonstrate compliance to minimum amenity standards and make a positive contribution to the Borough. The development standards set out in Policy DM02 are regarded as key for Barnet to deliver the highest standards of urban design.

Barnet's Local Plan (2012)

Barnet's Draft Local Plan on 26th November 2021 was submitted to the Planning Inspectorate for independent examination which will be carried out on behalf of the Secretary of State for the Department of Levelling Up, Housing and Communities. This is in accordance with Regulation 22 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2021 (as amended).

The Regulation 22 Local Plan sets out the Council's draft planning policy framework together with draft development proposals for 65 sites. The Local Plan 2012 remains the statutory development plan for Barnet until such stage as the replacement plan is adopted and as such applications should continue to be determined in accordance with the 2012 Local Plan, while noting that account needs to be taken of the policies and site proposals in the draft Local Plan and the stage that it has reached.

Supplementary Planning Documents

Residential Design Guidance SPD (2016)

- Sets out information for applicants to help them design developments which would receive favourable consideration by the Local Planning Authority. The SPD states that large areas of Barnet are characterised by relatively low-density suburban housing with an attractive mixture of terrace, semi-detached and detached houses. The Council is committed to protecting, and where possible enhancing the character of the borough's residential areas and retaining an attractive street scene.
- States developments should normally be consistent in regard to the form, scale and architectural style of the original building which can be achieved through respecting the proportions of the existing house and using an appropriate roof form.
- In respect of amenity it states that developments should not be overbearing or unduly obtrusive and care should be taken to ensure that they do not result in harmful loss of outlook, appear overbearing, or cause an increased sense of enclosure to adjoining properties. They should not reduce light to neighbouring windows to habitable rooms or cause significant overshadowing, and should not look out of place, overbearing or intrusive when viewed from surrounding areas.

Supplementary Planning Documents

Sustainable Design and Construction SPD (adopted 2016)

- Provides detailed guidance that supplements policies in the adopted Local Plan, and sets out how sustainable development will be delivered in Barnet.

Hampstead Garden Suburb Conservation Area Character Appraisal.

5.2 Main issues for consideration

Officers consider that the main planning considerations are as follows:

- Whether the alterations would detract from the character and appearance of the street scene and this part of the Hampstead Garden Suburb Conservation Area.
- Whether harm would be caused to the living conditions of neighbouring residents.

5.3 Assessment of proposals

- Whether the alterations would detract from the character and appearance of the street scene and this part of the Hampstead Garden Suburb Conservation Area

Any scheme for the site will need to respect the character and appearance of the local area, relate appropriately to the site's context and comply with development plan policies in these respects. This will include suitably addressing the requirements of development plan policies such as DM01 and DM06 which states that all proposals should preserve and enhance the local character of the area, as well as policies CS05 (both of the Barnet Local Plan), D1, D3 and D6 (of the London Plan).

The Hampstead Garden Suburb Character Appraisal Statement notes that, with respect to the character and appearance of the buildings, the choice of individual design elements

was carefully made reflecting the architectural period of the particular building. Each property was designed as a complete composition and design elements, such as windows, were selected appropriate to the property. The Hampstead Garden Suburb, throughout, has continuity in design of doors and windows with strong linking features, giving the development an architectural form and harmony. It is considered that any disruption of this harmony would be clearly detrimental to the special character and appearance of the Conservation Area. The front of the properties being considered of equal importance as the rear elevation, by the original architects, forms an integral part of the whole concept.

Policy DM06 of Barnet's Local Plan (DPD 2012) seeks to ensure all heritage assets will be protected in line with their significance and have regard to the local historic context.

In terms of the impact of the proposed development on the locally listed heritage asset and Hampstead Garden Suburb Conservation Area Policy DM06 states that there is a presumption in favour of retaining all listed buildings.

According to the Barnet's Local Heritage List, January 2020, the properties along Emmott Close are characterised as 'large Arts and Crafts, two storey blocks of flats set around a central green, by Hendry & Schooling, 1928. Red brick with tiled hipped roofs, dropped eaves with dormer windows. Steel casement windows.'

The proposed concrete surfaces to place the bins to the front of the properties, by reason of being the same level as the existing ground level, the relatively small footprint of the concrete surfaces and their positioning behind the replacement front boundary hedging, are not considered to harmfully disrupt the architectural uniformity and tasteful appearance of the properties to the degree where a materially harmful impact would take place to the character and appearance of the individual properties and the grouping as a whole.

Further to this, despite the bins being moved from the rear of the properties the proposed alterations involved in the repositioning of the bins would not be visible from the streetscene by virtue of the replacement hedging blocking views of the bins. As such, no materially harmful impact to the character of the streetscene is considered to take place. A condition will be included within the decision notice to ensure the hedges are well maintained. Therefore, the impact to the character and appearance of the properties is considered to comply with the policies and expectations outlined in Policy DM01 and DM06.

With regards to the proposed hedging, it is noted that the case officer conducted a site visit on the 20th October 2021 and noted that the existing hedging along the boundary is in poor condition. The proposed replacement hedging is considered to be an improvement to the character and appearance to all the buildings situated along Emmott Close and resemble a more fitting appearance within the Conservation Area as a whole. The impact of the proposed bin store location would be minimised by the front hedging. It is noted that the Trust have confirmed no objections with the proposed development. This aspect of the development is noted to comply with Policy DM01 and DM06.

With regards to the minimal increase to proposed rear paving to Abington House, this is considered relatively minimal and would be constructed with similar materials and at the same level as existing. Therefore, the impact is not considered materially harmful and would comply with Policies DM01 and DM06.

As such, the proposed development is considered acceptable on character and appearance grounds.

Potential impacts upon the amenities of neighbouring residents

It is important that any scheme addresses the relevant development plan policies (for example policy DM01 of the Barnet Local Plan policy D6 of the London Plan) in respect of the protection of the amenities of neighbouring occupiers. This will include taking a full account of all neighbouring sites.

The LPA acknowledges that the current application is extremely contentious amongst the existing residents and highlights that the material considerations assessed in this report do not include some of the types of objections raised, such as muddy ground conditions and smell emitted from the bins. As such, the assessment of the material planning considerations is as follows:

The LPA notes that the existing arrangement of the bins being placed at the rear of the properties makes the process of transporting the household waste less conspicuous within the suburban context than the proposed arrangement. This forms a key element of the residents' concern with the development in question, who are content with the arrangement. The proposal would involve increased activity, including the associated noise and disturbance from opening and closing the bins, taking place to the front of the properties and in the public realm. The existing residents view that this would create a reduced sense of enjoyment of the outdoor amenity space and the outlook thereof.

On review of the proposed development, it is considered that the nature of the proposal, comprising of concrete slabs and the resultant repositioning of the bins to the front of the properties is not considered to result in a deleterious loss of residential amenity. This is because the height of the bins (being one metre) is considered reasonable and not likely to result in a harmful sense of enclosure or loss of outlook. The bins would also be distanced at its closest point 3.2 metres from Cosway House and Kingsley House, 3.5 metres from Carpenter House and Stowe House and 3.8 metres from Abington House and Beaufort House) which is considered acceptable to offset any harmful impact. Therefore, with the height of the bins and distance from the closest point of the respective properties it is not considered to result in a deleteriously harmful loss of outlook, enclosure or loss of visual amenity.

Further to the above, the repositioning of the bins to the front elevation, by reason of the footprint of the concrete areas, is not considered to result in a materially harmful reduction in the available outdoor amenity space. The case officer notes that the properties benefit from relatively spacious front, side and rear space to enjoy and this would not be unacceptable compromised by the position of the proposed bins spaces. Also, the number of bins and footprint of the concrete surfaces have been reduced on request to the minimum necessary to meet requirements.

Lastly, it is noted that the concrete slabs placed underneath the relocated bins would be identical to existing levels and so not contribute to the height of the bin which may lead to unnecessary amenity harm to the existing ground floor streetscene-facing residents.

No materially harmful impact to the existing residents is considered to take place as a result of the reintroduced boundary hedging.

Therefore, due to the nature of the proposed development and the impact on the existing residents not being unacceptable, officers consider the application to be acceptable.

5.4 Response to Public Consultation

- No residents consultation was done prior to the applications submission.
- No problem with existing bin location.
- Does not suit the estates interest.
- Close bin store proximity to habitable windows.
- Noise and nuisance more problematic than existing due to location.
- Impact on mental health and quality of living for residents.
- Loss of privacy as people pass to place their rubbish and the noise of comings and goings will be intolerable and will significantly disrupt our quality of life. For some, the noise from the intercom attached to the front door/heavily weighted fire door is enough already.
- Poor smell and associated vermin and foxes will harmfully impact our quality of life.
- Likely to see an increase of fly tipping. Unwanted furniture is frequently dumped by the bins. This will incur a cost to the residents of the Emmott (which is most visible) Close to get it removed.
- Existing garden space is limited, the proposed bins stores would reduce this further and detract from beautified space the residents have created. Outdoor space has been vital throughout the pandemic and will continue to be so.
- Harmful impact on the character and appearance of the houses and wider area, conflicting with DM01 and DM06 of Barnet's Development Management Policies.
- Money better spent on maintaining the buildings, such as the paths to the rear which are hazardous and in desperate need of maintenance.
- If satellite dishes are not allowed due to the fact that they are unsightly, then having bins in the front does not make any sense.
- Over-provision of bins for residents' needs. Bins for every pathway and door is not necessary. There are 10 tenants in total in Cosway House so 12 bins is excessive and again, a complete waste of money.
- The proposal would create a positive appearance of the properties but be harmful to the outlook of the existing residents.
- In winter, residents would be obliged to step on muddy grass to put their rubbish in the bins, which is slippery, hazardous and impractical. Many disabled, infirm and elderly residents live here.
- Previous permission for cycle parking and new bins was refused by the LPA and Trust some 18 years ago, the same decision should be made in this instance.
- There is a large manhole cover to the front of one of the buildings (Beaufort House).
- As long as I've lived here, no-one has complained of where the current bins are located, including the maintenance workers.
- Residents are aware that a minority of new maintenance personnel do not like removing bins from the rear of all blocks and I'm convinced is the only reason this application has been made.
- I am delighted that the hedges are being attended to finally and think this should be done for purely aesthetic reasons and not just to hide multitudes of smelly bins.

The material considerations noted in the objections received in the lifetime of the application have been addressed in the officer's report in full. The case officer notes that the number of bins have been reduced to the existing arrangement and the concrete space decreased accordingly.

6. Equality and Diversity Issues

The proposal does not conflict with either Barnet Council's Equalities Policy or the commitments set in the Equality Scheme and supports the Council in meeting its statutory equality responsibilities.

7. Conclusion

Having taken all material considerations into account, it is considered that subject to compliance with the attached conditions, the proposed development would have an acceptable impact on the character and appearance of the application site, the street scene, the wider area and Hampstead Garden Suburb Conservation Area. The development is not considered to have an adverse impact on the amenities of neighbouring occupiers. This application is therefore recommended for approval, subject to conditions.

