

## Appendix 1 – Consultation Responses

No.	Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
	<b>INTERNAL</b>		
1	LBH Conservation	<p><b>Background:</b> The site falls within the Fortis Green Conservation Area. The proposal is for the conversion of the existing building to family sized units, construction of 6 maisonettes within the adjacent land and a separate dwelling to the rear.</p> <p>In my role as Conservation Officer I will concentrate on whether the proposal would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of Fortis Green Conservation Area. I refer to Haringey’s Strategic Policy SP12, which seeks to preserve and enhance the character and appearance of conservation areas, and which reflects the statutory duty of section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act of 1990.</p> <p><b>Significance of the asset:</b> The overall character of this part of the conservation area is represented by a mix of Victorian, Edwardian and later development set behind low brick walls, timber fences and hedges along a narrow street with considerable tree cover. The building at No. 35 Eastern Road is a three storey yellow stock brick Victorian former villa set behind a timber fence in a large garden with substantial tree cover and vegetation. The building retains a prominent ground floor brick porch, a slate roof and large gauged arch windows, although the original sash windows have been inappropriately replaced in UPVC. There is also a rather ‘generic’ looking fire escape to the front that again detracts from the architectural significance of the property.</p>	Noted, conditions recommended.

No.	Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
		<p>The applicant's heritage statement gives a detailed description on the history and development of the site as well as the wider conservation area. It aptly establishes the significance of the site and the positive contribution that the existing building, along with the grounds makes to the conservation area. It also gives details of the various alterations to the building, many of which detract from the building's significance in terms of its architectural quality. As such, the significance of the site is established in accordance with the NPPF and Historic England's good practice guidance.</p> <p><b>Impact of proposed development:</b>  The scheme proposes to convert the existing building to family sized flats. This would ensure that the building's new use is closest to the original use of the building. The change of use is also compatible with the established suburban residential character of the conservation area. As such, from a conservation point of view, the proposal would reinstate and preserve the original use of the site and would be acceptable.</p> <p>As part of the conversion, the scheme proposes to remove the inappropriate and poor quality alterations that detract from the architecture of the building. This includes removal of the fire escape and the inappropriate UPVC windows. In addition, whilst not under the Council's control in terms of planning legislation, a number of key internal spaces and finishes/materials such as the entrance hall would be retained and enhanced as part of the proposals.</p>	

No.	Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
		<p>In addition, the scheme also proposes additional floor space at the roof level. This is proposed to be set back from the front elevation of the building and would be in a buff coloured brick. This would complement the existing building whilst remaining sub-ordinate to it. The scheme also adds an additional floor to the rear with a gable end. This would also complement the existing architectural language of the building whilst continuing to be sub-ordinate to it. Overall, the proposal is considered to preserve and enhance the significance of the building as well as the conservation area and as such would satisfy Council's statutory duty as part of Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act, 1990 (as amended).</p> <p>To the south of the main building, the scheme proposes to erect a terrace of six maisonettes. These would be three storeys in height and would be in line with the existing building. This would have an impact on the setting of the building as well as the conservation area in that it would reduce the extensive open grounds in the vicinity of the site. This would cause some harm to the significance of the heritage assets and their setting. However, this harm would be less than substantial as the street frontage at present is dominated by hard surfacing. A substantial part of the open area would be retained as communal amenity space for the proposed units, without any impact on the topography or natural setting of the site.</p> <p>It is also considered that the gap in the street frontage detracts from tightly knit urban grain elsewhere in the conservation area. As such, the proposed terrace would be considered to 'repair' the street frontage resulting in heritage</p>	

No.	Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
		<p>benefits that would outweigh the less than substantial harm to the heritage assets.</p> <p>The design of the proposed terrace relates appropriately to the established layout and scale of existing buildings within the area. The proposed architectural language and materials are such that they interpret the 'terrace housing' in a contemporary way without appearing dominant or intrusive on the street scene. Whilst the car parking to the front would be retained for the purposes of the new units, appropriate landscaping is proposed to be incorporated in order to reduce the visual intrusiveness of the paving. Overall, it is considered that the proposed terrace would complement the existing street scene as well as the original building, enhancing their significance. The less than substantial harm caused due to the impact of the development on the setting of the heritage assets, would be outweighed by the heritage benefit of a 'repaired frontage' and the architectural merits of the scheme. As such it is acceptable from a conservation point of view.</p> <p>To the rear, the scheme proposes to demolish a modest single storey garage that does not contribute to the conservation area. This is proposed to be replaced with a high quality 'modernist' style detached house, two storeys in height (above ground level). The scale and layout of the building is such that it appears to be an ancillary 'garden pavilion' style building that relates to the established nature of the site. In terms of the architectural language, it positively enhances the setting of the existing building and conservation area. As such the proposal would be considered acceptable.</p> <p>Overall, the proposed scheme would be considered</p>	

No.	Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
		<p>acceptable. In coming to this conclusion I have given great regard to the desirability of the preservation or enhancement of the heritage assets, as per the Council's statutory duty. The proposed alterations to the main building as well as the pavilion building to the rear would preserve and enhance the appearance of the original building. The terraced development to the south would cause some harm to the current open and green setting of the existing building and the conservation area. This harm is considered to be less than substantial as the open space creates gap in the street frontage which detracts from the conservation area. The terraced development would complete the street frontage, enhancing the appearance of the area. The layout, scale, massing and the architectural language would complement and positively enhance the significance of the conservation area and would outweigh the less than substantial harm caused due to the development. In addition, the scheme would retain the landscaped area as communal space, similar to the site's current use. As such the scheme would preserve and enhance the significance of the heritage assets and would be acceptable.</p> <p><b>Conclusion:</b> Acceptable.</p> <p><b>Conditions:</b> All materials to be conditioned. Landscape layout and management should also be conditioned.</p>	
2	LBH Transportation	The application site falls within an area that has a medium Public Transport Accessibility Level (PTAL) of 3 and is served by the 102, 234 and 263 bus routes which operate with a combined two-way frequency of 38 buses an hour. The site is also within reasonable walking distance of East Finchley	Noted, conditions recommended.

No.	Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
		<p>underground station. It is considered that prospective residents of the development would use sustainable modes of transport for some journeys to and from the site. However, the large family sized units are likely to have a need for the use of a private vehicle.</p> <p>The Fortis Green controlled parking zone (CPZ), which operates Monday to Friday 11:00am-1:00pm and has the primary function of preventing commuter parking. However, there are indications that the area suffers from a level of on-street parking stress outside the CPZ operational times.</p> <p>The application will involve the creation on 10 residential units consisting of 4 x4 bed units, 3 x 3 bed units and 3 x 2 bed units. The 10 units will be served by 10 on-site parking spaces. Given that the size of the units and the fact that the surrounding area is known to suffer from on-street parking stress, it is considered that the relatively high parking ratio is justified in this case. Notwithstanding this, the level of parking provision falls in line with both the Councils parking standards set out within the appendix of the Unitary Development Plan as well as standards set out within the London Plan. The proposal includes covered and secure cycle storage to London Plan standards as demonstrated in the proposed ground floor plan drawing no. A-GA-0220.</p> <p>The application is supported by a Transport Statement, which has been produced by TTP Consulting. The report uses comparable sites from the TRICS trip rate prediction database to establish that the development is likely to generate 16 combined in and out vehicle movements during the day. This is similar to the level of traffic generation</p>	

No.	Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
		<p>expected in connection with the sites existing C2 use class. It is therefore considered that the proposal is unlikely to result in any significant increase in traffic generation.</p> <p>The site currently has a main point of access onto Eastern Road, but also has a minor secondary access from Western Road via the garages to the rear of Beechwood Close. It has been noted that the proposal will involve the creation of a second crossover onto Eastern Road, which will facilitate an "In &amp; out" access arrangement. Although the application will involve the retention of the secondary access to the rear of the site, it is intended that servicing and deliveries will take place from Eastern Road. The Transport Statement confirms that "refuse and recycling will be collected on-street with a refuse store located within the southern section of the site, near to the proposed new access point". The Council's Neighbourhood Action Team has made separate recommendations regarding the refuse collection requirements.</p> <p>The proposal is unlikely to result in any significant negative impact to the highway network or parking demand within the vicinity of the site. Therefore the highway and transportation authority does not wish to raise any objections to the above application subject to the imposition of the following conditions:</p> <p>1. The applicant/ developer is required to submit a Construction Management Plan (CMP) and Construction Logistics Plan (CLP) for the local authority's approval prior to construction work commencing on site. The plans should provide details on how construction work (including</p>	

No.	Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
		<p>demolition) would be undertaken in a manner that disruption to traffic and pedestrians on Eastern Road, Beechwood Close and the surrounding residential roads is minimised. It is also requested that construction vehicle movements should be carefully planned and co-ordinated to avoid the AM and PM peak periods.</p> <p>Reason: To reduce congestion and mitigate any obstruction to the flow of traffic on the transportation network.</p> <p>2. The new crossover shall be restricted to a maximum width of 3metres. Works to construct the crossover will be carried out by the Council at the applicant's expense once all the necessary internal site works have been completed. The applicant should telephone 020-8489 1316 to obtain a cost estimate and to arrange for the works to be carried out.</p> <p>Reason: To ensure satisfactory construction of the crossover and in the interests of highway safety.</p> <p>Informative: The new development will require numbering. The applicant should contact the Local Land Charges at least six weeks before the development is occupied to arrange for the allocation of a suitable address.</p>	
3	LBH Environmental Health	<p>With reference to this planning application, I recommend the following conditions:</p> <p><b>Contaminated land (CON1 &amp; CON2):</b></p> <p>1. Before development commences other than for</p>	Noted, conditions recommended.



No.	Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
		<p>investigative work:</p> <p>(a) A desktop study 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 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.</p> <p>(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:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ a risk assessment to be undertaken,</li> <li>▪ refinement of the Conceptual Model, and</li> <li>▪ the development of a Method Statement detailing the remediation requirements.</li> </ul> <p>The risk assessment and refined Conceptual Model shall be submitted, along with the site investigation report, to the Local Planning Authority.</p> <p>(c) If the risk assessment and refined Conceptual Model</p>	

No.	Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
		<p>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.</p> <p>2. 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.</p> <p>Reason: To ensure the development can be implemented and occupied with adequate regard for environmental and public safety.</p> <p><b>Control of Construction Dust:</b></p> <p>No works shall be carried out on the site until a detailed report, including Risk Assessment, detailing management of demolition and construction dust has been submitted and approved by the LPA with reference to the GLA's SPG Control of Dust and Emissions during Construction and Demolition. The site or Contractor Company should also be registered with the Considerate Constructors Scheme. Proof of registration must be sent to the LPA prior to any works being carried out on the site.</p> <p><b>Combustion and Energy Plant:</b></p>	

No.	Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
		<p>Prior to installation details of the gas boilers to be provided for space heating and domestic hot water should be forwarded to the Local Planning Authority. The boilers to be provided for space heating and domestic hot water shall have dry NOx emissions not exceeding 40 mg/kWh (0%).</p> <p><b>Informative:</b></p> <p>Prior to demolition of existing buildings, an asbestos survey should be carried out to identify the location and type of asbestos containing materials. Any asbestos containing materials must be removed and disposed of in accordance with the correct procedure prior to any demolition or construction works carried out.</p>	
4	LBH Waste Management	<p>The drawings indicate that there are 3 bin storage areas but it is not clear what they are serving and the location of the proposed waste storage areas is insufficient for access.</p> <p>This proposed development of 3 x 4 bedroom basement houses, 3x 3 bed maisonettes, 3x 2 bedroom maisonettes and 1x 4 bedroom basement houses requires a communal waste storage area of sufficient size to store 3x 1100 refuse bins, 2x 1100 recycling bins and 2x 140 litre food waste bins. Each household will require a food waste kitchen caddy.</p> <p>Bulk waste containers must be located no further than 10 metres from the point of collection and the route from waste storage points to collection point must be as straight as possible with no kerbs or steps. Gradients should be no greater than 1:20 and surfaces should be smooth and sound,</p>	Noted, conditions recommended.

No.	Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
		<p>concrete rather than flexible. Dropped kerbs should be installed as necessary.</p> <p>The site will require the managing agents to have a cleansing schedule to remove litter from the external areas of the site and cleansing of the waste storage areas. A clear instruction from the managing agents to residents of how and where to dispose of waste responsibly is recommended.</p>	
	<b>EXTERNAL</b>		
5	London Fire Brigade	<p>The Brigade is satisfied with the proposal for fire fighting access.</p> <p>This Authority strongly recommends that sprinklers are considered for new developments and major alterations to existing premises, particularly where the proposals relate to schools and care homes. Sprinkler systems installed in buildings can significantly reduce the damage caused by fire and the consequential cost to businesses and housing providers, and can reduce the risk to life. The Brigade opinion is that there are opportunities for developers and building owners to install sprinkler systems in order to save money, save property and protect the lives of occupier. Please note that it is our policy to regularly advise our elected Members about how many cases there have been where we have recommended sprinklers and what the outcomes of those recommendations were.</p>	Noted.
6	Thames Water	<p>Waste Comments: Thames Water requests that the Applicant should incorporate within their proposal, protection to the property by installing for example, a non-return valve or other suitable device to</p>	Noted. Informatives attached.

No.	Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
		<p>avoid the risk of backflow at a later date, on the assumption that the sewerage network may surcharge to ground level during storm conditions.</p> <p>Surface Water Drainage:  With regard to surface water drainage it is the responsibility of a developer to make proper provision for drainage to ground, water courses or a suitable sewer. In respect of surface water it is recommended that the applicant should ensure that storm flows are attenuated or regulated into the receiving public network through on or off site storage. When it is proposed to connect to a combined public sewer, the site drainage should be separate and combined at the final manhole nearest the boundary. Connections are not permitted for the removal of groundwater. Where the developer proposes to discharge to a public sewer, prior approval from Thames Water Developer Services will be required to ensure that the surface water discharge from the site shall not be detrimental to the existing sewerage system.</p> <p>Legal changes under The Water Industry (Scheme for the Adoption of private sewers) Regulations 2011 mean that the sections of pipes you share with your neighbours, or are situated outside of your property boundary which connect to a public sewer are likely to have transferred to Thames Water's ownership. Should your proposed building work fall within 3 metres of these pipes we recommend you contact Thames Water to discuss their status in more detail and to determine if a building over / near to agreement is required.</p> <p>We would expect the developer to demonstrate what measures he will undertake to minimise groundwater</p>	

No.	Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
		<p>discharges into the public sewer. Groundwater discharges typically result from construction site dewatering, deep excavations, basement infiltration, borehole installation, testing and site remediation. Any discharge made without a permit is deemed illegal and may result in prosecution under the provisions of the Water Industry Act 1991. Should the Local Planning Authority be minded to approve the planning application, Thames Water would like the following informative attached to the planning permission:</p> <p>“A Groundwater Risk Management Permit from Thames Water will be required for discharging groundwater into a public sewer. Any discharge made without a permit is deemed illegal and may result in prosecution under the provisions of the Water Industry Act 1991. We would expect the developer to demonstrate what measures he will undertake to minimise groundwater discharges into the public sewer. Permit enquiries should be directed to Thames Water's Risk Management Team”.</p> <p>Thames Water would advise that with regard to sewerage infrastructure capacity, we would not have any objection to the above planning application.</p> <p>Water Comments: Thames Water recommend the following informative be attached to this planning permission. Thames Water will aim to provide customers with a minimum pressure of 10m head (approx 1 bar) and a flow rate of 9 litres/minute at the point where it leaves Thames Waters pipes. The developer should take account of this minimum pressure in the design of the proposed development.</p>	

No.	Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
		<p>On the basis of information provided, Thames Water would advise that with regard to water infrastructure capacity, we would not have any objection to the above planning application.</p>	
7	Muswell Hill and Fortis Green Association	<p>This comment is submitted by the Muswell Hill and Fortis Green Association which has over 700 hundred members and this includes many living in the immediate vicinity of the application site.</p> <p>This is clearly an ambitious redevelopment scheme in an established residential setting and there is understandable concern about how it might affect local residents.</p> <p>Accordingly, if the Authority is minded to grant permission we look to the Council to ensure that the development is built as proposed with regard to the open space provision, protection of trees and on site car parking provision. Also, during the construction period there should be minimum disruption to local residents.</p>	Noted. Construction nuisance would be controlled via other appropriate legislation.
8	Beechwood Close Residents Association	<p>The directors of Beechwood Close Residents Association Limited wish to raise the following comments:</p> <p>1. We note that the Gatekeeper's Lodge will be demolished and in its vicinity a detached pavilion unit will be erected. We consider that the proposed design of the detached unit (2-storey plus basement) with a flat roof is not in keeping with the conservation area. The proposed pavilion will protrude above the height of the existing wall and face directly the ground and first floor flats of the northern end of Beechwood Close. No consideration seems to have been given to the</p>	<p>1. The pavilion unit has been designed to be a lightweight, small and discrete structure within the setting of the extensive gardens on the site, and the contemporary approach to the design of the pavilion dwelling is considered to enhance the conservation area. The pavilion dwelling is located approximately 25 metres from Beechwood Close which is considered</p>

No.	Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
		<p>privacy aspect of either building.</p> <p>2. There is a private right of way which links the Gatekeeper's Lodge to Western Road. We object to the use of the right of way by any construction traffic (including skips, rubbish removal, deliveries, contractor's parking) on the following basis:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Such heavy traffic will cause substantial damage to the tarmac areas of Beechwood Close</li> <li>• Such heavy traffic will cause damage to the foundation and structure of the property, given the narrow access points and the close proximity to the property</li> <li>• Pedestrian access to Beechwood Close is via the tarmac areas around the back of the property. Accordingly the presence of construction traffic will provide a severe health and safety danger to the residents, in particular young children and the elderly</li> <li>• Such heavy traffic will interfere with the peaceful enjoyment of Beechwood Close by its residents</li> <li>• The proposed access in the rear wall to the existing right of way is depicted as a double gate. As well as the concerns about potential use during the construction phase, there are concerns about subsequent use for access. As the provision of parking spaces for the site is inadequate, despite Haringey's strictures, Western Road could be considered for use by the occupants of the pavilion, and possibly the 'No Parking' area outside Beechwood Close's garages</li> </ul> <p>We will look for the developers to provide an undertaking that the private right of way will not be used in any shape or form by construction traffic and that no contractor's vehicles will be</p>	<p>sufficient in terms of privacy.</p> <p>2. The access to the rear of the site will be for the single dwelling to the rear only, and secondary to the main access from Eastern Road. The access at the rear of the site will only be accessible from the private garden of the pavilion dwelling and therefore residents of other dwellings on the site will not be able to access Beechwood Close and Western Road through this point.</p> <p>A Construction Logistics Plan will be required via condition prior to the commencement of development on site which will provide details of the access to the site for construction traffic. It is likely that this rear access will not be used by construction traffic.</p>



No.	Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
		<p>left parked on the private property of Beechwood Close.</p> <p>3. The planning application fails to consider the impact of the development on local public services. In particular the directors are very concerned that the redevelopment of the site to provide 10 housing units will cause severe pressure on local school places and the position of Beacon Lodge puts Beechwood Close at a severe disadvantage. The application fails to provide an assessment of the impact on local school places.</p> <p>4. The redevelopment fails to provide for any visitor's car parking spaces, which will put additional strain on existing roadside parking.</p> <p>5. It is unclear whether the proposed open space for use of all residents will be freely accessible or not from Eastern Road. Intrusion by non-residents, an ongoing issue for Beechwood Close, could become a problem if the open space is not secure.</p>	<p>3. The contribution to the Council's Community Infrastructure Levy is designed to take into account the infrastructure requirements of the development, including education.</p> <p>4. The proposed car parking provision is in accordance with the Council's maximum standards.</p> <p>5. The open space at the south western part of the site is only for residents of the site. There will be a gate between the communal gardens and the parking area to provide separation from the parking area to the front of the site which could be accessible to the public.</p>
9	<b>Beacon Lodge Interest Group</b>	<p>We are broadly in favour of the proposals as set out in the planning application and attachments. We appreciate the efforts made by the developers to involve us from the start and to amend the scheme where we have made suggestions. We are pleased the original house will be kept and the great majority of trees and the green aspect of the site retained.</p> <p>We have 3 requests:</p> <p>1. We are very concerned about the construction phase - the</p>	

No.	Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
		<p>impact of the building works, including the access for heavy vehicles, turning areas, excavation of the basements, spoil disposal, routes for heavy vehicles, hours of work and the impact on resident's parking. We welcome the various safeguards referred to in the attachments to the planning application. The developers are aware of our concerns and tell us a Construction Management Plan will be agreed with the Council. We assume this will be a condition of planning approval. We suggest it includes a limit on the size of the vehicles, parking provision on site for all vehicles used on the site and those delivering to and taking from the site, on-site turning circle, on site storage, wheel cleaning and constant cleaning and maintenance of pavements and roadway. We ask that an informative be included requiring the developers to consult with local residents on a mutually acceptable plan.</p> <p>2. The increase in traffic. Eastern Road is narrow and there is already controlled parked. We note the comments made in the Transport statement but any increase in the number of cars will exacerbate the parking problems. The new residents will have a parking place on site so we ask that the existing resident's parking permit scheme is not extended to them. We ask the Council to review the parking situation after the scheme is complete, and the properties occupied, to see if the controlled parking hours need adjustment.</p> <p>3. The proposed safeguards to the existing trees set out in the Arboricultural Impact Assessment are very encouraging. But, because this is a conservation area, we ask please for the Council's Arboricultural Officer to monitor the implementation of the protection measures.</p>	<p>1. A Construction Logistics Plan will be required via condition prior to the commencement of development on site which will provide details of the access to the site for construction traffic. It is likely that this rear access will not be used by construction traffic.</p> <p>2. The proposed car parking provision is in accordance with the Council's maximum standards.</p> <p>3. Tree protection will be secured by way of a condition.</p>

No.	Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
	<b>RESIDENTS</b>		
	<b>3 responses received</b>	Height is unacceptable and will impact adversely on the light to the properties on the opposite side of Eastern Road with front gardens.	<p>Daylight and Sunlight Report states that the majority of windows will experience no material change to daylight and are fully compliant with BRE targets. A single ground floor room at 37 Eastern Road (to the north of the site) drops slightly beneath 0.8 times the forms daylight value, however this window serves a non habitable space and therefore this impact is considered negligible.</p> <p>In terms of sunlight, the report sets out that all rooms that have been assessed are in excess of the BRE criteria or are materially unchanged as a result of the proposal.</p>
		Front boundary to the site should be of similar height to the existing boundary fence which is 1.8m to maintain the existing status quo and shield cars parked within the development.	<p>Front boundary has been designed to be a low brick wall with retained planters, reflecting the local character and other street frontages along Eastern Road.</p> <p>Parking layout has been sensitively designed to ensure spaces are accessible and useable whilst not making the front of the site feel car dominated.</p>
		Minimal on site car parking provision. Development will add to the considerable parking pressure in the road.	The proposed car parking provision is in accordance with the Council's maximum standards.
		Proposals appear over intensive. Removal of rear dwelling and two storey development along Eastern Road would be	The proposed pavilion dwelling to the rear of the site has been designed to be of a similar

No.	Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
		more appropriate.	<p>footprint to the caretaker's dwelling that it replaces.</p> <p>The provision of a building in this location is in keeping with the character of the conservation area which comprises a number of ancillary dwellings at the rear of sites. Proposed pavilion dwelling has been designed to align with the ancillary building on the neighbouring site at 37 Eastern Road.</p> <p>The pavilion style is considered acceptable by the Conservation Officer.</p>
		Facing bricks for maisonettes should closely match or be compatible with existing buildings.	<p>The proposed maisonettes have been designed to rise to three storeys, providing a step up across the site between the neighbouring properties to the south of the site and the existing Beacon Lodge building.</p> <p>The proposed maisonettes are in keeping with the established building line.</p> <p>The facing brick for the maisonettes comprise yellow stock brick in order to be sympathetic to the original building.</p> <p>Proposals are considered acceptable by the Conservation Officer.</p>
		No trees should be felled in favour of new development.	The scheme has been designed to minimise the impact on trees as much as possible.

No.	Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
			<p>Some trees at the front of the site are proposed to be removed to enable adequate access to the properties. The trees proposed to be removed are not subject to TPOs and their loss will be mitigated with landscaping and replacement planting across the site.</p> <p>Replacement landscaping will be secured via condition.</p>
		<p>Agreement for the maintenance of open spaces / amenity area within the site should form part of the conditions of granting planning permission.</p>	<p>The large area of existing open space will be retained and enhanced with a comprehensive landscaping plan and will be accessible to all future residents. The landscaping and management of this would be secured via conditions.</p>
		<p>No vehicular or service access should be granted to the site from the garage court area of Beechwood Close at the rear of the site.</p>	<p>The landowners currently have a right of access to the rear of the site via Beechwood Close. It is proposed that this right of access be maintained for the use of the residents of the pavilion dwelling.</p> <p>Parking is provided only to the front of the site and there will be no vehicular access into the site via Beechwood Close.</p>
		<p>Everything should be done to protect trees. Will deep excavations affect their roots.</p>	<p>The layout of the scheme has been designed to avoid the root protection areas of trees as much as possible.</p>

No.	Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
			A Tree Protection Plan will be prepared prior to commencement of development on the site.
		Colour of the bricks does not blend - understand this has now been changed to blend in with Beacon Lodge.	<p>The bricks to be used in the construction of the maisonettes and the additions to the Beacon Lodge building will be yellow stock brick to be sympathetic to the materials which make up the existing Beacon Lodge building.</p> <p>The new constructions will be distinguishable by was of an alternative dog tooth brick coursing which will add interest to the facades and ensure that the modern additions to the site are of their time.</p>