

**PLANNING COMMITTEE A – 7<sup>th</sup> July 2022**

**ADDENDUM TO OFFICERS REPORT**

**Item N0: 6**

**Reference:** 20/4355/FUL

**Address:** Dawlish Court and 63 Daws Lane, London, NW7 4SG

Since the publication of the officer's report, Recommendation III point 2 should read as follows (amended parts in bold):

'That if the above agreement has not been completed or a unilateral undertaking has not been submitted by **7<sup>th</sup> October 2022**, unless otherwise agreed in writing, the Service Director for Planning and Building Control REFUSE the application under delegated powers for the following reason(s):

The proposed development does not provide a legal agreement to mitigate **the visual impact of the development and the loss of on-site soft landscaping, it is therefore considered that proposal would have an adverse impact on the character and appearance of the locality, visual amenity and biodiversity net gains, contrary to policies G6 and G7 of the London Plan (2021) and policies DM01 and DM16 of the Development Management Plan (2016)**'

**Item N0: 8**

**Reference:** 20/3715/S73

**Address:** 356 Cricklewood Lane, NW2 2QH

The wording of condition 3 shall read as follows:

The building shall not be occupied before 11:30am or after 10:45pm from Monday to Sunday, except for a maximum of 1 hour and 30 minutes outside of these hours to accommodate Fajr (morning prayers) only. Opening shall be no earlier than 10 minutes before the time of Fajr as set out in the Revised Planning Statement and Design and Access Statement dated 11<sup>th</sup> October 2021."

**Item N0: 09165 Granville Road**

**Reference:** 22/0189/FUL

**Address:** Unit 4, Hawthorn Business Park, 165 Granville Road, NW2 2AZ

Changes to be made to delegated report, under section 'Impact on the amenities of neighbours'

*'These would ensure that the use is carried on as a religious meeting room only and not a use such as a ~~place of worship or function space~~'*

Changes to be made to delegated report, under section 'Impact on the amenities of neighbours'

*'As above, the relatively modest intensity of use and conditions restricting the use of the site for events such as wedding receptions or parties, in addition to restricting the number of users at any one time to 30 persons, are considered to mitigate potential impacts to neighbouring amenity'.*

Should read as;

As above, the relatively modest intensity of use and conditions restricting the use of the site for events such as wedding receptions or parties, in addition to restricting the number of users at any one time to 35 persons, are considered to mitigate potential impacts to neighbouring amenity.

Changes to Condition 5:

The premises shall not be used for the purposes of banqueting, wedding receptions or parties.

Reason: To safeguard highway safety and the residential amenities of neighbouring occupiers in accordance with Policies DM01 and DM17 of Barnet's Development Management Policies DPD 2012.

As amended:

The premises shall not be used for the purposes of banqueting, wedding receptions or parties, ***and there shall be no amplification of voices or music***

Reason: To safeguard highway safety and the residential amenities of neighbouring occupiers in accordance with Policies DM01, ***DM04*** and DM17 of Barnet's Development Management Policies DPD 2012.

In addition to the published Report, the Agent has provided further clarification as to the proposed use and situation as relating to parking provision:

- *The original application made reference when lodged to mixed office and place of worship, as this was considered acceptable terminology to describe the activities of a religious group. However, when the case officer amended the description of development, we have collectively agreed to accept what was proposed, as it was considered to accurately reflect the operations of the church. The confusion emanates from the planning statement not having been updated since the point of submission in January, reflecting the original description of development.*
- *As we have explained, the Church's activities do not generally tie in with the typical functions of a place of worship, notably big church services, the hosting of religious ceremonies such as weddings/funerals, wedding receptions and religious celebrations. This is a nonconformist church, formed out of a bible study and prayer group led by one pastor and this informal arrangement has established the basis of the religious meetings which take place, as well as the main service which takes place on Sunday. This is an unusual type of community use, atypical to traditional religious worship, which is why the Applicant is comfortable with the description.*

- *Notwithstanding, even if members are concerned that the space would be used as a place of worship (with the associated add on activities such as large events and activities), they can be rest-assured that there are a range of conditions that would preclude this from happening. These include:*
  - *Condition 5 – precluding the use for banqueting, wedding receptions and parties*
  - *Condition 6 – limiting the use of the site to 35 persons*
- *Again, these conditions have been agreed by the Applicant as being appropriate and they would be able to operate freely from the site as they wish.*

*We trust that this clarifies the position for the benefit of you and your colleagues on the land use matter.*

*Onne other minor discrepancy we have noted in the report, whilst undertaking final checks, relates to parking provision – whereas officer approval has been given to provision of two off-street parking bays in this scheme, there are in fact 4 available, with two at lower ground level as per the lease plans which are not included within the approved plans, but are included within other documents such as the Transport Assessment and Travel Plan.*

*As this provides a significant betterment of what is recommended for approval, the suitability of the scheme is not affected*

**Item NO:** 13

**Reference:** 22/0804/FUL

**Address:** Sisters Of The Sacred Heart, 6 Oakleigh Park South, N20 9JU

Since the publication of the officer's report, amended plans were received to correct an inaccuracy in the siting of the new building and provide further clarification. Condition 1 (approved plans) should therefore read as follows:

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

SK-31, SK-32, PL-33, PL-34, PL-35B, PL-36A, PL-37A, PL-38, PL-39, PL-40, PL-42,  
Bat Scoping Survey (7 March 2022), Planning Statement, Arboricultural Survey Report, Hybrid Parking Survey/Transport Statement, Sustainability and Accessibility Statement.

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).'

Furthermore, changes are made to the delegated report correcting the dimensions stated under: first Paragraph on page 155 and should read as follows:

The proposed detached building would be sited approx. 13 m from the front boundary line. The front building line would be set back 0.825m from the front building line of neighbouring property no.4b. In terms of footprint and scale, the dwelling would measure a maximum depth of 17.5m at ground level and 15.7m at first floor level, a width of 10.7m, an eaves height of 6m and maximum height of 9.3m similar to the previous approved scheme under 21/3594/FUL. It would feature a crown roof. The rear elevation would feature 2 dormers. It would be sited 1m from both side boundaries.

And paragraph 8 on page 158 should be amended to read as:

In terms of footprint, it is noted that the rearwards projection would extend beyond the adjacent rear building line of the neighbouring property no.4b by 2m at two storey level. However, a relevant material consideration is the substantial drop in land levels between the application site and the no.4b. The submitted drawings demonstrates that the ridge of detached property would be situated approximately 1.9m lower than no.4b and two storey eaves would be 2m lower than eaves of no.4b . As such the two storey rearward projection of the development would appear at a height of 4 m to its eaves when viewed from the neighbouring garden. This aspect would adequately reduce any adverse impact to the residential amenities of no.4b in terms of overbearing impact, overshadowing or loss of daylight. Furthermore the proposed building would be sited to north east in relation to no.4b and because of orientation together with siting at lower level it is not considered to have overshadowing or loss of light of no.4b.