ADDENDUM

PLANNING COMMITTEE A 3rd May 2023

Agenda Item: 7

Reference: 22/2905/HSE

Site Address: 22 Rankin Close, London, NW9 6SR

Pages: 21-30

Further to the publication of the committee report, there is an inaccuracy in the site history. The record for previous application 17/4034/FUL is amended to say:

Reference: 17/4034/FUL

Address: 22 Rankin Close, London, NW9 6SR

Decision: Refused at Committee
Decision Date: 28 September 2017

Description: Erection of a two storey end of terrace dwelling. Associated parking, refuse and

recycling, cycle store

Reasons:

-The proposed dwelling by reason of its siting, size and bulk would result in a visually obtrusive form of development which would lead to an overdevelopment of the site and the residential cul-de-sac of which it forms a part and the introduction of a new gate into the park will lead to increased security risk contrary to policies CS1 and CS5 of Barnet's Adopted Core Strategy (2012), policies DM01 of the Adopted Development Management Policies DPD (2012) and the Adopted Residential Design Guidance SPD (2016).

-The proposal will lead to increased car parking pressure which would lead to increased kerbside parking to the detriment of free flow of traffic and highway and pedestrian safety, contrary to policies CS1 and CS9 of Barnet's Adopted Core Strategy (2012), policies DM17 of the Adopted Development Management Policies DPD (2012) and the Adopted Residential Design Guidance SPD (2016).

Agenda Item: 10

Reference: 22/4227/FUL

Site Address: Apex Court, Selvage Lane, London, NW7 3JU

Pages: 51-68

Further to the publication of the committee report, for the benefit of clarity the development description is modestly amended to more comprehensively reflect the proposed scheme (additional parts in bold):

Roof extension involving side and rear dormers and rooflights to front, side and rear elevations to form 2no. self-contained flats **along with internal layout alterations**. Associated refuse/recycling and cycle storage. Addition of 2no. off-street parking spaces

In respect of the internal layout alterations, this primarily relates to the minor internal layout alteration of the existing Flat 6 to facilitate the stairwell for the proposed new loft level flats. Flat 6 would remain a two-bedroom duplex unit (albeit for 3 persons rather than 4 persons) and would meet the required minimum space standards. Re-purposing of rooms within an existing dwelling house would not constitute development in and of itself. As such, it is not considered necessary to re-consult on the amendment to the development description

Clarification on Ownership matters:

In respect of deliverability of the proposed two parking spaces and any associated ownership/easement disputes, the agent has confirmed that his client (the applicant) acts on behalf of the sole freeholder of the red line site boundary. There are no other parties with an owner-interest and therefore the parking spaces are deliverable. The proposed parking spaces would not prevent site access as depicted in the submitted tracking plan (Drawing no. AC-127-A). Officers are satisfied with this response and that the parking spaces can be brought to fruition in the event of an approval.

Noise and Air Pollution:

The committee report refers to the need for windows of the proposed flats to remain permanently fixed shut which whilst this is probable outcome, it is clarified that such mitigation measures will be informed by noise and air pollution reports to be secured through pre-commencement Conditions 5 & 6 as detailed in the Officer recommendation. The mitigation measures outlined in the report will require approval from our Environmental Health Officers and would remain fully enforceable by virtue of the condition wording. As a failsafe, recommended Condition 18 ensures that upon completion the windows fitted meet the agreed specifications.

Agenda Item: 9

Reference: 23/0451/RCU

Site Address: 43 Fursby Avenue, London, N3 1PJ

Pages: 43-50

Further to the publication of the committee report, further representations have been received responding to the comments raised in the consultation:

The main objections appear to be to the loss of a front garden but nobody has mentioned that the majority of the front garden was paved with very little flower beds. All that has been done is to reduce the level to that of the neighbours and to make the front safer as when it rained the path became slippery and dangerous from both the rain and overflow from the raised parts of the garden on either side. Very little flower beds have been lost and there is drainage for the rain water which negates one of the other objections. From a health and safety perspective this is a far safer option.

One of the objections mentions a car port, however, there is no car port and there has never been a car port at the back. Additionally, the drive is a shared drive which means that the neighbours would have to keep moving cars to allow exit of the other's car should they both use it or they do not use the drive but do on street parking.

In general I believe that the off street parking is a better option as it means that the resident can park at their property as opposed to losing their space to commuters and is helpful for those with small children.

Also, a number of these people do not live near Fursby Avenue. Two of the objectors live outside the West Finchley area, these are o Mr Tim Stevenson of 63 Lodge Lane, N12 8JG o Mr Peter Pickering of 3 Westbury Road, N12 7NY

Two of the objectors appear to have car park ports. I do not understand why they are denying me the same courtesy. These are; o Salim Sabri of 24 Courthouse Gardens, N3 1PX o Marilyn Lee of 25 Courthouse Gardens, N3 1PU

There used to be no drainage on the property so that any rain water came off the path into the street but as there is now drainage. This counters the objection raised by 105 Brent Way