

ADDENDUM

PLANNING COMMITTEE A

5th June 2023

Agenda Item 1

Reference: 21/0673/ADV

Site Address: A1000 High Road, Junction With Bedford Road To The North And Brompton Grove To The South,

Pages: 11-22

Further to publication of the committee report, an additional site plan showing the proposed locations of the PVC advertisement lamppost banners was submitted. No changes to the locations of the PVC advertisement lamppost were made. As such, an amendment to wording of condition 1 (Approved Plans) has been made:

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

Drawing with Banner Dimensions: Banner size W:785mm, H: 2200mm, D: 785mm, LBM: 2800mm
Banner Visuals: Locations: Barnet 2016, Camden, Hammersmith & Fulham Method Statement, Method Statement for Lamppost Mounted Banner Installations, version 3.8, dated January 2014, produced by Bay Media

Site Maps, A1000 High Road [1 of 3], Site Information x, X14 Sites, produced by Bay Media

Site Maps, A1000 High Road [2 of 3], Site Information x, X14 Sites, produced by Bay Media

Site Maps, A1000 High Road [3 of 3], Site Information x, X14 Sites, produced by Bay Media

Site Location Plan, Version 1.0, produced by Stanfords For Business on 11 January 2021, received 25 May 2023

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).

In addition, following the amended scheme with 14no. PVC advertisement lamppost banners being proposed, an additional public objection was received from one of the initial objectors to the scheme. Therefore chapter 4: 'Consultation' of the Committee Report reads as follows (in italics and indented):

Public consultation is not mandated for advertisement consent applications.

However, two objections from the public were received prior to the first Planning Committee meeting date 08.02.2023 where the proposal was presented to Members. They can be summarised below:

- *Insufficient information to say what the banners are going to be used for*
- *The longevity of the banners being in place is unacceptable*
- *Creation and proliferation of additional clutter along East Finchley High Road*
- *Causes distractions to users of the road and pavement*

- *Misleading number of banners*
- *Location of banners next to several listed buildings including Phoenix Cinema*
- *Location of banners next to Amazing Grates and Bald Faced Stag*
- *Impact on Edwardian terraces of good quality*

One further objection was received by one of the initial complainants following the first Planning Committee date 08.02.2023 where the proposal was presented to Members. The main points can be summarised below:

- *Causes proliferation and clutter of signs, thus negatively impacting the streetscene and visual amenity of the local area*
- *The Council should be looking to reduce the visual clutter not add to it*
- *Causes a distraction to users of the road and pavement by their very existence*
- *No indication that the adverts will be for public gain, therefore it must be commercial gain*
- *Impacts on listed buildings including the Phoenix Cinema, Amazing Grates and the Bald Faced Stag thus impacting their historic visual presence*
- *Impact on the High Street which has good quality Edwardian Terraces, which the banners will detract from their visual amenity*

The application was initially called in to committee by Councillor Farrier and Councillor Mittra. This was on the grounds of the impact the banners would have on the character of East Finchley High Road.

Following the Planning Committee dated 08.02.2023 and revisions being made, Councillor Farrier and Councillor Mittra were reconsulted on the scheme. Any additional comments will be reported in the Addendum.

The Highways department were consulted initially prior to the application going to the committee dated 08.02.2023 and raised no objection to the scheme.

Moreover, the additional text is to be added at end of chapter 6: Response to public comments within the Committee Report (see below in italics and indented):

Public comments after the Committee dated 08.02.2023:

- *Causes proliferation and clutter of signs, thus negatively impacting the streetscene and visual amenity of the local area*

Response: This has been covered in the point above under the heading "Creation and proliferation of additional clutter along East Finchley High Road". Following revisions to a reduction in the advertisements to 14no., there would be an even less of a sense of clutter along the High Street.

- *The Council should be looking to reduce the visual clutter not add to it*

Response: the right advertisement in the right place can be beneficial. For example, for the survival of small businesses in a local high street.

- *Causes a distraction to users of the road and pavement by their very existence*

Response: this is covered in the point above under the heading "Causes distractions to users of the road and pavement"

- *No indication that the adverts will be for public gain, therefore it must be commercial gain*

Response: The lamp posts are in the LBB's ownership and will be generating for the LBB. However, this is not considered to be a planning consideration.

- *Impacts on listed buildings including the Phoenix Cinema, Amazing Grates and the Bald Faced Stag thus impacting their historic visual presence*

Response: this is covered in the point above under the heading "Location of banners next to several listed buildings including Phoenix Cinema". It should be noted that there are not any advertisements outside the any statutorily listed buildings.

- *Impact on the High Street which has good quality Edwardian Terraces, which the banners will detract from their visual amenity*

Response: this is covered in the point above under the heading "Impact on Edwardian terraces of good quality".

Agenda Item: 3

Reference: 22/4592/FUL

Site Address: Rear Of 5 Lambert Road, London, N12 9ER

Pages: 31-56

Further to publication of the committee report, it has been acknowledged that an amendment to condition 1 (approved plans) is needed. The plan number has been edited for the 'Proposed First Floor' plan as it was entered incorrectly, and a duplicate plan number has been removed. The term 'Proposed' has been removed from the site location plan drawing. As such, an amendment to wording of condition 1 (Approved Plans) has been made:

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

Existing Front Elevation 0012 03

Existing Ground Floor 0012 02

Existing Section 0012 04

Existing Site Plan 0012 01 Rev A

Proposed First Floor 0012 12 Rev A

Proposed Front Elevation 0012 14

Proposed Ground Floor 0012 11 Rev A
Proposed Rear Elevation 0012 15 Rev A
Proposed Roof Plan 0012 13 Rev A
Proposed Section 1 0012 16 Rev A
Proposed Section 2 0012 17 Rev A
Proposed Site Plan 0012 10 Rev A
Proposed Street Views 0012 19 Rev A
Proposed Section 3 & 4 0012 18 Rev A
Site Location Plan 0012 00

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).

Agenda Item: 4

Reference: 22/4593/FUL

Site Address: Rear Of 7 Lambert Road, London, N12 9ER

Pages: 57-80

The following condition must be added:

18. Roof not to be used as balcony

The flat roof of the building hereby permitted shall only be used in connection with the repair and maintenance of the building and shall at no time be converted to or used as a balcony, roof garden or similar amenity or sitting out area.

Reason: To ensure that the amenities of the occupiers of adjoining properties are not prejudiced by overlooking in accordance with policy DM01 of the Development Management Policies DPD (adopted September 2012).

Further to publication of the committee report, it has been acknowledged that an amendment to condition 1 (approved plans) is needed. The term 'Proposed' shall be removed from the plan 'Proposed Site Location Plan 0013 00' as this was entered in error. As such, an amendment to wording of condition 1 (Approved Plans) has been made:

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

Existing Front Elevation 0013 03
Existing Ground Floor 0013 02 Rev A
Existing Section 0013 04 Rev A
Existing Site Plan 0013 01 Rev B
Proposed First Floor 0013 12 Rev A
Proposed Front Elevation 0013 14

Proposed Ground Floor 0013 11 Rev A
Proposed Rear Elevation 0013 15 Rev A
Proposed Roof Plan 0013 13 Rev A
Proposed Section 1 0013 16 Rev A
Proposed Section 2 0013 17 Rev A
Proposed Section 3 & 4 0013 18 Rev A
Proposed Street Views 0013 19 Rev A
Site Location Plan 0013 00
Proposed Site Plan 0013 10 Rev A

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).

Additionally, the wording of condition no. 6 is to be amended as follows:

Prior to the first occupation of development, cycle storage shall be provided in full accordance with approved plan nos. 0013 14 and 0013 11 and be permanently retained as such thereafter.

Reason: To ensure that cycle parking facilities are provided in accordance with the minimum standards, in the interests of promoting cycling as a mode of transport and to safeguard the visual amenities of the building and surrounding area, in accordance with Policy T5 and Table 10.2 of The London Plan (2021), Barnet's Local Plan Policies CS NPPF, CS1 and CS9 of Core Strategy (Adopted) September 2012, and Policies DM01 and DM17 of Development Management Policies (Adopted) September 2012.

Agenda Item: 11

Reference: 23/0931/FUL

Site Address: Land Adjacent to 235 Nether Street, N3 1NT

Pages: 95-116

Further to the publication of the committee report, a revised plan showing the proposed elevations in relation to the wider streetscene was submitted. No changes to the elevations were made. Additionally, an existing streetscene drawing was submitted. As such, amendment to wording of Condition 1 (Approved Plans):

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

Archaeological Desk based assessment by Thames Valley Archaeological Services TQ 25492 91584 dated August 2021

5228_Ex_01

5228_PL_01

5228_PL_02a

5228_PL_03

5228_PL_04

5228_PL_05c
5228_PL_06d
5228_PL_07c

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)."

Agenda Item: 12

Reference: 23/1231/HSE

Site Address: 14 Woodberry Gardens, N12 0HD

Pages: 117-124

For clarification, further to the publication of the committee report, the host site is neither statutory nor locally listed and therefore does not constitute a 'heritage asset' as defined within the meaning of NPPF nor the Development Plan. Notwithstanding the above, the impact on character and appearance has not been considered to be unduly detrimental to the host site nor the surrounding wider area as noted within the officer's report.

Agenda Item: 7

Reference: 23/1290/HSE

Site Address: 6 Church Way, London, N20 0LA

Pages: 23-30

As set out in the Committee Report, further to the receipt of amended plans, a re-consultation exercise was undertaken. As part of this, two further representations were received, which are reported as Appendices to this Addendum. These are from the residents of No 4 and No 8.

With regard to the representations from No 4:

Rear View: The extension incorporates an upstand (or small parapet) to the outside edge to prevent rainwater discharge over the common boundary. This is 10cm in height above the level of the roof as annotated.

First Floor: The 1m off-set from the boundary is to the flank wall of the extension at first floor level (as per the expectations set out in Para 14.17 of the Residential Design Guidance SPD. The roof overhang projects another 0.35m and the guttering 0.15m into the gap

Block Plan: The LPA have no reason to suspect there is a material discrepancy in the plans. Nevertheless, if the neighbouring outbuilding has been surveyed slightly out of position, the depth of the extension where it is proximate to the boundary with No 4 is just 3.5m – which again is consistent with the expectations of Para 14.21 of the Residential Design Guidance SPD. On that basis, the LPA do not consider that it would result in an unacceptable impact on the residential amenities of

neighbouring occupiers. In any event, as pointed out to Members on site, the rear building line of No 4 is also set further back – further reducing the relative depth.

There is no moratorium against ground floor extensions being built up to the boundary. This is a common form of development evident throughout the Borough, including elsewhere in Church Way. As revised, at first floor level the flank wall is situated 1m from the common boundary (consistent with Para 14.17) and does not project to the rear of the existing building line where it is beyond the side of the original dwellinghouse – or beyond the rear of No 4.

Consequently, as amended it is also not considered to create a terracing effect, or that there would be any undue loss of outlook or overshadowing, as set out in the Report.

The ridge line of the two storey extension is set down from the main ridge and the front at first floor level is set back by 1m

Officers have sought compromise from the Applicant during the course of the application, resulting in the amended plans which render the development more commensurate with the expectations of the SPD and the context provided by other pertinent extensions – such as those to Nos 20 and 24. It is a requirement of the NPPF that the LPA work proactively with applicants (Para 38) and does not imply a prejudicial approach. In any event, in this instance the decision on the recommendation rests with the Committee.

With regard to further representations from No 4 dated 3rd June, the examples discussed in the Report are relevant in terms of illustrating the form and character of extensions in the surrounding area – and that the proposal is not correspondingly incongruous. The impact on neighbouring amenity is undertaken on a case-by-case basis and is set out in the Report and above.

As above, working with an Applicant to try and achieve a scheme which the LPA can recommend for approval is common practice. Subsequent to receipt of amendments (where they are additional, material, or attempting to address grounds of objection), the LPA typically engage in re-consultation. The recommendation would then be confirmed based on the outcome of that re-consultation. As such, no impropriety can be attested to this case. For the avoidance of doubt, public consultation is designed to raise issues that would otherwise not be apparent. The weight of objection is not material to the decision.

With regard to the representations from No 8:

23/0124/PNH was an application for Prior Approval relating to a permitted development under the provisions afforded to householders by the Government directly through the General Permitted Development Order. The objections were taken into account in determining that application however, the considerable off-set from the boundary on either side was considered to appropriately mitigate any amenity impact – as set out in the corresponding report. That consent remains extant and is a significant material consideration therefore in determining this application.

23/1290/HSE Whilst the LPA would dispute the illustration of the effect in Images 2, 4 and 6 and would point out that Image 9 relates to the un-amended plans for the extensions at first floor level, it is nonetheless acknowledged that the extension will be visible from the rear roof terrace at No 8 and at an oblique angle from the corresponding rear window. However, whilst there will be an impact in

absolute terms, the modest depth and distance from the common boundary is not considered to render an unacceptable impact on the amenity of neighbouring occupiers.

As is evident from the daylight/sunlight diagrams provided by the objectors, the proposed extension would have limited direct impact and the terrace would still receive direct light for the considerable majority of any day and retain a commanding perspective over the surrounding gardens throughout most of its aspect.