

LOCATION: Former Peel Centre, Peel Drive, Colindale, London, NW9 5JE
REFERENCE: H/04753/14 **Received:** 29 Aug 2014
Accepted: 29 Aug 2014
WARD: Colindale **Expiry:** 19 Dec 2014

APPLICANT: Redrow Homes Limited

PROPOSAL: Hybrid planning application for the phased comprehensive redevelopment of part of the existing Peel Centre site including the demolition of all existing buildings and the provision of a residential-led mixed use development comprising up to 2,900 new residential units (Use Class C3), with 888 units in full detail and up to 2,012 units in outline in buildings ranging from 2-21 storeys; up to 10,000 square metres of non-residential floorspace (Use Classes A1-A4, D1, D2); the provision of a 3 form entry primary school (including nursery provision) and a minimum of 4 hectares of public open space. Associated site preparation/enabling works, transport infrastructure namely a new pedestrian connection to Colindeep Lane and junction works, landscaping and car parking. The application is accompanied by an Environmental Statement.

APPLICATION SUMMARY

The report relates to the hybrid planning application for the phased comprehensive redevelopment of part of the existing Peel Centre site in Colindale to provide a residential-led mixed use development comprising up to 2,900 new residential units, a new neighbourhood centre including up to 10,000 square metres of floorspace for a range of town centre uses (Class A1-A4, D1 and D2), a 3 form entry primary school (including nursery provision) and a minimum of 4 hectares of public open space comprising a new neighbourhood park, garden squares and plazas.

Environmental Impact Assessment

The application is accompanied by an Environmental Statement (ES) addressing the EIA Regulations 2011 as well as other relevant legislation and guidance. The ES considered a full range of topics using an acceptable methodology, having identified a comprehensive set of sensitive receptors and assessed impacts including interactions, cumulative and residual effects. The ES was scrutinized by an independent environmental consultant on behalf of the council and found to be acceptable for the purposes of assessing the impacts of the scheme. Various negligible to moderate adverse effects were identified during the demolition and construction phase which can be mitigated through controlling the activities of this

phase for example, through a construction management plan. The completed and operation development involved a range of negligible, minor and non-significant impacts. Of those impacts that were moderate, the nature of their effect was beneficial to the following: Housing provision, playspace provisions, Colindale Avenue Travel by foot, journeys through the site and via the Peel Link on foot. There were no moderate or major adverse impacts identified. Mitigation measures were identified throughout the ES for various topics and which have been consolidated into a mitigation register which would form a condition of approval if the council was minded to approve the application.

Principle of Development

The Peel Centre site is within the Colindale and Burnt Oak Opportunity Area of the London Plan and is one of the identified development sites in the Colindale Area Action Plan (CAAP). These designations promote the residential-led redevelopment of the site along with the creation of a new neighbourhood centre and provision of associated infrastructure.

The loss of existing buildings on the site is considered acceptable. There are no listed buildings or underlying archaeology affected; The MPS buildings are surplus to requirements and are outmoded and not conducive to modern accommodation standards; the current layout is not conducive the redevelopment and creation of a new neighbourhood focus for Colindale; the residential accommodation will be reprovided to current day standards; and the redevelopment is a more optimal and sustainable development of the site.

The proposed residential-led, mixed use redevelopment of brownfield land also accords with the NPPF as well as London Plan and Barnet policies.

Density

The scheme equates to a site wide density of 220 dwellings per hectare, although the density varies across different parts of the site. Densities are lower in areas where houses are proposed and is higher particularly at the western end of the development reflecting the proximity to Colindale Tube and the new neighbourhood centre. In accordance with the London Plan, the intent is to optimize housing rather than applying density mechanistically and therefore the numerical density figure for the development has been considered against the design quality of the scheme, improved connectivity to the area, space standards and livability, amenity space provision and quality, access to new open spaces, access to services, management and contribution to place-shaping. On this basis, the proposed development and density has been considered to be acceptable given the quality of environment and place that the scheme will deliver.

Loss of existing sports facilities

The proposal results in the loss of existing playing fields and running track from the site which were for the exclusive use of the MPS officers. The loss of these facilities is acceptable on balance because there are improvements underway to improve the quality and access to existing facilities elsewhere in the Colindale Area, including Montrose Playing Fields, in addition to improvements recently completed to sports pitches at Copthall. The facilities of the former Peel Centre were never open to the public at large and are no longer needed as part of the training of MPS officers on

account of structural changes. There are alternative provisions for MPS officers in London such that the Peel Centre facilities are surplus to requirements. The scheme makes provision for the future users of the site within a new neighbourhood park in addition to facilities such as a MUGA that will be provided as part of the new school. The parks and spaces within the new development will be publicly accessible compared to when the site was inaccessible as a secure MPS facility and therefore the new provision can be considered a net gain in public facilities. The loss of the existing playing fields and sports facilities was considered and justified as part of the Examination in Public into the Colindale AAP by the Planning Inspector on the grounds that if more of the open space was retained on site, that this would be at the expense of the strategic priority of housing delivery.

Employment floorspace

The existing floorspace is surplus to requirements and is not protected with the CAAP which identifies the site as a redevelopment opportunity. In respect of employment generation, it is noted that the retained MPS facility would maintain the 1,200 jobs as part of the consolidated operations on site as well as create 75 construction jobs. The subject application is predicted to generate a further 551 full time jobs.

Retail and town centre floorspace

The scheme proposes 10,000sqm of town centre uses comprising 7000sqm of Class A1-A4 including a 3,000sqm foodstore, with the balance being for Class D1 and D2 community uses. London Borough of Brent objected the scheme in regards to overprovision of town centre floorspace. However, a Retail Impact Assessment including a sequential test and impact assessment has been submitted in support of the proposal. In summary the additional floorspace over and above previous targets reflects the increase in housing in Colindale over previous projections. The assessment found that there would not be a significant impact on the network of town centres with the proposal addressing the needs of the local area. Any potential impact would be mitigated through projected growth in population and expenditure.

Healthcare provision

The scheme would generate the need for 3 GPs. The scheme includes the setting aside of floorspace in Block B for the purposes of a healthcare facility which will be secured as part of the s106 planning agreement.

Education provision

The proposal safeguards land for the delivery of a 3FE primary school. The proposal generates a demand for a 2FE and as such the 3FE provisions represents a significant scheme benefit in regards to fulfilling the strategic imperative of the CAAP to safeguard land for educational use to meet the increasing demand of the wider Colindale area on account of birth rates, migration trends and urban regeneration.

Affordable Housing

The development will provide 20% affordable housing by unit number with the split of 50:50 between affordable rent and shared ownership tenures.

The application is supported by a viability appraisal which has been independently assessed by viability consultants Deloitte, to confirm that the maximum level of affordable housing and other contributions is being secured, in addition to Mayoral and Barnet CIL.

A review mechanism will be included in the section 106 agreement which will require updated viability appraisals to be submitted at later stages of the development. Should the updated appraisals demonstrate an uplift such that it can support additional affordable housing on site this will be delivered in future phases.

Housing Quality

A suitable range of unit types and sizes catering for housing need are providing, ranging from studios through to 4 bedroom 8 person dwelling houses. The scheme includes a significant proportion of duplex units which provide accommodation that is suitable for families.

All flats in Development Stage 1 meet the minimum London Plan and Barnet space standards and it will be necessary for future blocks in Development Stage 2 and 3 to address them at the time of reserved matters applications.

The units in Development Stage 1 address Lifetime Homes criteria and 13 units (13%) affordable units are designed to wheelchair housing standards. The reserved matters applications in Development Stage 2 and 3 will be required to demonstrate LTHS and 10% wheelchair housing provision.

Amenity Space and Play Provision

On a block-by-block basis amenity space is provided via a combination of private balconies and terraces as well as communal amenity space. The proposed provision exceeds the minimum amenity space requirements of the GLA and Barnet for Development Stage 1. It will be a requirement for blocks in Development Stages 2 and 3 to demonstrate the minimum standards are met at reserved matters applications.

Based on the Mayors SPG, a total of 8495.8sqm of playspace is required within the development. The scheme demonstrates a provision of 10,586sqm with components spread across the site and located at ground level and in podium amenity space of blocks H, J, K, M, P, Q and U.

The development also includes the ability for a variety of sports pitch configurations to be accommodated within Peel Park totaling 10,100sqm and a further informal ball games court space of 395sqm. The MUGA of the primary school which is estimated at between 820-1,610sqm will have access outside of school hours secured through the planning agreement, and the site layout accommodates a 1.5km running circuit around Peel Park and other streets.

Public Open Space

The scheme includes the provision of 5.4039Ha of public open space across Development Stages 1, 2 and 3 in a combination of different spaces including Peel Park, Garden Square East, Garden Square Central, Garden Square West, Peel Square, Station Plaza, Community Gardens and Rowan Gardens.

Design

The proposed detailed design for Development Stage 1 and the illustrative masterplan for the remainder of the site as controlled through the primary control documents for Development Stages 2 and 3 s considered to represent a high quality scheme. In terms of height, bulk, scale and massing, the built form which is a series of perimeter blocks and development zones, is varied across the site. The extent of buildings is considered acceptable including its relationship to neighbours, the surrounding context as well as maintaining an acceptable level of amenity.

Based on the parameters sought, the scheme includes a 21 storey at the western end of the site and an 18 storey tower at the eastern end of the site. Two 14 storey towers are located along Aerodrome Road and five 10 storey towers throughout the development. The proposed tall buildings (those over 30m) have been assessed against the criteria contained in the London Plan, Barnet Core Strategy and English Heritage / CABE Guidance on Tall Buildings Assessment and found to meet the required criteria. In respect of visual impact and views, a total of 26 viewpoints and visually verified views have been supplied to consider the appearance and impact of the scheme upon the surrounding area. Although there will be temporary impacts in the development and construction phase, once completed and occupied, the development will have negligible or beneficial impacts to townscape and visual amenity.

The character and appearance of the detailed component of the scheme represents contemporary architecture with a limited pallet of high quality materials. The buildings follow a traditional architectural composition or base, middle and top, with façade detailing such as deep recesses. A consistent approach to the urban grain of buildings across the site including active ground floor frontages framing a hierarchy of streets and interconnected open spaces which create distinct character areas.

The scheme provides appropriate relationships with neighboring developments including its treatment adjacent to Colindale Avenue, the retained MPS facility on Aerodrome Road, the Aerodrome Road and M1 frontage, the southern edge to London Underground track as well as the remaining land left to be disposed of in the south east corner;

The proposed layout provides improved connectivity and permeability of the site and reconnects it with the surrounding neighbourhoods providing access to proposed new facilities (neighbourhood centre uses and public open spaces) as well as improved access to adjacent public transport and wider networks such as cycling routes.

In respect of safety, security and crime mitigation, the routes through the site and network of spaces are legible and safe. There is a clear design distinction between private, semi-private and public spaces. Active ground floor frontages promote passive surveillance and a sense of ownership is considered to be achieved through laying out the communal spaces. Security measures will be incorporated into the scheme noting that the applicant has made a commitment to achieved Secured by Design Level 2 accreditation.

Amenities of Neighbouring and Future Occupiers

In regards to privacy, overlooking and outlook, separation distances to neighbours are in excess of the minimum 21m guidance. Within the site, the various separation distances across different streets between fronts of buildings varies. Where distances are less than the guidance they have been carefully considered and found to be acceptable with regard to the policy approach which reflect higher densities in the Colindale Opportunity Area.

The effects in terms sunlight and overshadowing upon neighbouring properties has been assessed and shown to be negligible. There is a minor impact in terms of the daylight received for some properties, although in all the cases of the affected properties the results show that the majority of their windows do comply with the VSC and DD test criteria, therefore the impact is not considered sufficient on balance to warrant amendment or refusal of the scheme. In respect of the future occupiers of the scheme overall, the level of daylight, sunlight and overshadowing is considered acceptable, in balancing the BRE guide expectations in a conventional suburban context with the expectations for a more intensive development according with the London Plan Opportunity Area designation and CAAP objectives.

No significant new or cumulative operational noise impacts are identified for neighbours as a consequence of the proposed development. Whilst there is an increase in the intensity of the site, the use is consistent with the residential character of the wider area. Nevertheless, in considering the potential impact to neighbours and also particularly in relation to future occupiers of the site who will be closer to any potential sources of noise from the proposed non-residential uses and any mechanical plant and equipment, the council's environmental health team have recommended appropriately worded conditions to control the levels of noise within acceptable limits.

In respect of air pollution, no significant impacts are identified by the council's Environmental Health Team. In respect of the design, the scheme contributes towards overall reductions in CO2 production, having regard to energy and sustainability policies.

In respect of microclimate (wind), overall, the microclimate of the site is largely suited to the intended use with only a few exceptions which will require further testing and mitigation. This is identified as a requirement in the ES mitigation register for future phases and compliance with this document forms a condition of approval. In respect of the Stage 1 detailed component the ES identifies requirements for mitigation for test points 43 and 110 which will be secured through an appropriately worded condition.

As part of the EIA procedure, the ES has considered the demolition and construction phase of the development in the assessment of potential impacts. Potential impacts including traffic and parking, noise and general, disturbance, air quality, water quality and contamination will be mitigated through the construction management plan required by condition if the council is minded to approve the application.

Highways, Traffic and Parking

The comprehensive redevelopment of the former Peel Centre site integrates the development with the surrounding residential streets and facilitates improved pedestrian and cycle connections throughout the local area. The proposed new access arrangements and highways impact have been subject to review and assessment by officers and TfL. The resultant vehicle trips will be satisfactorily accommodated within the existing transport network providing the proposed package of transport works is implemented. A total of 2,053 car parking spaces (0.7 spaces per unit) will be provided for the development in accordance with the CAAP parking standards. These will largely be accommodated 'on plot' within undercroft or basement car parks, with some on street. Total numbers of cycle and disabled parking will be provided in accordance with the London Plan standards. The Transport Assessment (TA) demonstrates that careful and extensive work has been undertaken to examine the existing situation and to use suitable data to build acceptable models of the area. All assessment work is in accordance with national guidance and best practice on schemes of this nature and size, taking into account the development committed in the CAAP.

In respect of waste and recycling, arrangements are made of the segregating, storage and collection of waste from the various uses of the site. Vehicle tracking diagrams around the site demonstrate the feasibility of access, subject to the detailed design of Stages 2 and 3 being verified at reserved matters stage. The Council's waste team is satisfied with the proposal and recommends an appropriately worded condition to secure the waste management plan.

Energy and Sustainability

A combination of energy efficient and sustainable measures which address the Mayors Energy Hierarchy will result in a 41% reduction in CO2 emissions.

An on-site energy centre will be located in block H to provide for the needs of the scheme and will have capability for future connection to area wide networks in Colindale.

Code for Sustainable Homes accreditation no longer applies following a recent government review of housing standards. It is anticipated that a new version of the Building Regulations later in the year will contain key elements from Code for Sustainable Homes. The non-residential components of the development are targeting BREEAM 'Excellent' and an appropriately worded condition is recommended for assessment at the time of detailed assessment to reconfirm the target will be achieved.

Landscaping and biodiversity

The landscape concept breaks the site down into landscape character areas including civic squares, community parks and gardens, urban streets and green streets. There are no trees that are currently the subject of a Tree Preservation Order (TPO) whilst 4 Category A trees were identified. Existing trees which are to be retained are concentrated along the southern site boundary as small groups of varying species and age along with a group of mature London Plane trees close to the junction of Aerodrome Road and Colindale Avenue and several individual specimens at the eastern end of the site at the boundary near Aerodrome Road. In general, trees are retained in the areas of proposed hard and soft landscaping.

There are no statutory designated sites for nature conservation, either within the site or directly adjacent. Potential bat roosts were identified in one building on site and in Rowan Drive. The Silk Stream to the south which is defined as a Habitat of Principal Importance in addition to the woodland being a London BAP Priority Habitat and forming part of a corridor between Colindale and Hendon. The scheme considers these aspects and proposes improvements and mitigations to maintain biodiversity of the site and adjacent areas.

Flood risk, Water Resources, Drainage and SUDs

The site is within Flood Zone 1 which is classified as being of low risk of flooding. The design of the proposed sustainable urban drainage system (SUDS) including attenuation, swales, green roofs and pollution controls will address any potential downstream impact on the site itself. In regards to the proposals potential impact upon utilities, the supply of electricity, gas, water, telecommunications and sewerage and surface water drainage have been considered in consultation with providers and conditions of approval recommended.

Other Considerations

In respect of electronic interference, the ES has considered the effects TV reception, mobile telephones, wireless networks and emergency services. Very few neighbouring properties are affected with the overall, permanent effect of the proposal on reception is assessed as negligible.

In respect of ground conditions and contamination, whilst the likelihood of any contamination being present is low, with the council's Environmental Health Team recommending appropriate conditions if the council is minded to approve the application.

Community Infrastructure Levy and Section 106 Contributions

The proposed development would attract an estimated Barnet CIL payment of £28.5million towards necessary infrastructure to support development in Colindale and the Borough. A Mayoral CIL payment of £9.45million would also be generated.

In addition the application includes section 106 contributions totalling £14.8million including £11.25million towards Colindale tube station and £2,269,016 towards public realm and pedestrian / cycle link improvements.

RECOMMENDATION

Recommendation 1

The application being one of strategic importance to London it must be referred to the Mayor of London. Any resolution by the committee will be subject to no direction to call in or refuse the application being received from the Mayor of London.

Recommendation 2

Subject to Recommendation 1 above, the applicant and any other person having a requisite interest be invited to enter by way of an agreement into a planning obligation under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and any other legislation which is considered necessary for the purposes of seeking to secure the following, subject to any changes as considered necessary by the Assistant Director for Development Management and Building Control:

- (a) Legal Professional Costs Recovery
Paying the Council's legal and professional costs of preparing the Agreement and any other enabling arrangements.
- (b) Enforceability
All obligations listed below to become enforceable in accordance with a timetable to be agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority.
- (c) Affordable housing
20% affordable housing by units across the whole development (580 units in total) on the basis of 50:50 split between affordable rent and shared ownership with the affordable rent units being up to 65% of open market rent. Affordable housing to be provided per phase including minimum 10% wheelchair accessible provision in each tenure.

For Development Stage 1 a minimum of 126 affordable units shall be provided in accordance with the following detailed mix:

Affordable Rent (59 Units)

2 x 1 bed 1 person
19 x 1 bed 1 person
18 x 2 bed 3 person
8 x 2 bed 4 person
12 x 3 bed 5 person

Shared Ownership (67 Units)

24 x 1 bed 2 person
20 x 2 bed 3 person
17 x 2 bed 4 person
6 x 3 bed 5 person

For Development Stage 2 & 3 a minimum of 454 affordable housing units shall be provided in accordance with the following indicative mix and potential blocks shall be identified in the agreement:

Rented (227 Units)

47 x 1 bed 2 person
35 x 2 bed 3 person
75 x 2 bed 4 person
70 x 3 bed 5 person

Shared Ownership (227 Units)

15 x 1 bed 1 person
48 x 1 bed 2 person
35 x 2 bed 3 person
129 x 2 bed 4 person

- (d) Affordable Housing – Review Mechanism
A positive review mechanism with the trigger to be agreed with the council for provision of affordable housing additionality on the former Peel Centre site in later stages to be agreed, limited to a maximum of the equivalent value of 20% of the total units proposed.
- (e) School plot land transfer to the Council at nil cost
- (f) Health care centre:
A minimum of 510sqm provided to shell and core reserved in the neighbourhood centre for a time limited period (such period to be agreed with LBB during drafting of the s106 agreement) for occupation by the NHS or nominated APMS (Alternative Provider of Medical Service) GP practice in accordance with NHS requirements and charged at market rent for a health use to be agreed by independent valuation. The agreement shall include the option for NHS or other nominated provider to take up a further 590sqm of floorspace for health (up to the combined maximum provision of 1,100sqm) subject to additional funding
- (g) £11.25m contribution towards Colindale tube station improvements
- (h) £250,000 contribution towards improvements in local bus services
- (i) £680,524 contribution towards Peel Link
- (j) £1,588,492 contribution towards Colindale Avenue public realm improvements
- (k) Section 38 Land Transfer
Transfer of the strip of land along Colindale Avenue to the Council via a Section 38 Highways agreement to enable the necessary widening and improvement works to Colindale and for this to form part of the adopted highway.
- (l) Local Employment Agreement
Shall include Forecasting of job opportunities; Notification of job vacancies; Local labour target; Jobs brokerage and skills training;

Apprenticeships and work experience; Use of local suppliers; Delivery of specific LEA targets including the following:

Output summary	Min no.	Max no.
<i>Jobs</i>		
1. Progression into employment [<6mths]	53	86
2. Progression into employment [>6mths]	35	56
<i>Apprenticeships/Work experience</i>		
3. Apprenticeships	90	146
4. Work exp (+16yrs)	117	189
5. School/college/uni site visits	1064	1717
6. School/college workshops	585	945

- (m) £138,348 Controlled Parking Zone contribution
- (n) £895,000 Travel Plan measures and monitoring:
Comprising £870k travel plan incentive fund plus £25k monitoring fee
- (o) Section 278 Works
Necessary works to the public highway under section 278 of the Highways Act to facilitate the implementation of the development
- (p) Nursery floorspace
A minimum of 400sqm provided to shell and core standard reserved in the neighbourhood centre for a time limited period (such period to be agreed with LBB during drafting of the s106 agreement) for occupation by a nursery (use class D1) and charged at market rent
- (q) Public Open Space
Provision of a minimum of 4ha of Public Open Space which shall remain open and accessible to the general public. Within the main park the playing fields are required to be made available for use by the primary school.
- (r) £50,000 Section 106 Monitoring contribution
- (s) All financial contributions listed above to be subject to indexation.

Recommendation 3

That subject to Recommendation 1 and upon completion of the agreement specified in Recommendation 2, the Assistant Director for Development Management and Building Control approve the planning application reference H/04753/14 under delegated powers subject to the appropriately worded conditions in **Appendix 3** and any changes to their wording and or deleting and or adding conditions and their attached reasons why they are being imposed as considered necessary by the Assistant Director for Development Management and Building Control.

PROCEDURE FOR DETERMINING THE PLANNING APPLICATION

The planning application for the redevelopment of the Peel Centre was submitted 29 August 2014 and underwent an initial consultation for 4 weeks in September and October 2014 and reconsultation for 4 weeks in May 2015. Approximately 6702 properties were notified of the application on both occasions.

Referral to the Mayor a major development: Mayor of London Order 2008

The application is one of strategic importance (as the scheme includes more than 150 residential units) and is therefore referable to the Mayor of London. The Mayor of London formally considered the application in October 2014 and issued a 'Stage 1' report. The contents of this report have been considered by both the Council and the applicant and their comments and concerns are addressed within this report.

Should Members resolve to grant planning permission for this application, it will be referred back to the Mayor of London as a 'strategic development' prior to the issue of any decision. The Mayor has a period of 14 days from the date of the referral to consider the Council's resolution before issuing his decision. The Mayor will direct that either the Council can determine the application at the local level; direct that the application should be refused or choose to take the application over and determine the application directly.

SoS referral as a departure: Town and Country Planning (Consultation) (England) Direction 2009

The Council is required to consult with the Secretary of State before granting permission for certain types of development pursuant to the Town and Country Planning (Consultation)(England) Direction 2009.

The Direction applies to any application for permission which -

- (a) is for Green Belt development, development outside town centres, World Heritage Site development, playing field development or flood risk area development; and
- (b) is received by a planning authority on or after 20 April 2009.

Paragraph 5 of the Order states that for the purposes of the Direction, "development outside town centres" means development which consists of or includes retail, leisure or office use, and which –

- (a) is to be carried out on land which is edge-of-centre, out-of-centre or out-of-town; and
- (b) is not in accordance with one or more provisions of the development plan in force in relation to the area in which the development is to be carried out; and
- (c) consists of or includes the provision of a building or buildings where the floor space to be created by the development is:
 - (i) 5,000 square metres or more; or

- (ii) extensions or new development of 2,500 square metres or more which, when aggregated with existing floor space, would exceed 5,000 square metres.

Paragraph 7 of the Order states that for the purposes of this Direction, “playing field development” means development of a description where –

- (a) the land (or any part of the land) which is the subject of the application –
 - (i) is land of a local authority; or
 - (ii) is currently used by an educational institution as a playing field; or
 - (iii) has at any time in the five years before the application is received been used by an educational institution as a playing field; and
- (b) the English Sports Council (“Sport England”) has been consulted pursuant to article 10(1) of the Order, and has made representations objecting to the whole or part of the development on one or more of the following grounds –
 - (i) that there is a deficiency in the provision of playing fields in the area of the local authority concerned;
 - (ii) that the proposed development would result in such a deficiency; or
 - (iii) Where there is an alternative or replacement playing field proposed that it does not match that which would be lost whether in quantity, quality or accessibility

The SoS has a 21 day period to consider the proposal and notify the authority if it intends to issue a direction pursuant to section 77 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, or if not, the authority may proceed to determine the application.

The application was advertised as a departure to the development plan on a precautionary basis on the grounds that it proposes over 5,000sqm of town centre uses and includes the loss of existing playing fields from the site.

It should be noted that the application site does not fall under Paragraph 7(a) of the Order.

Therefore there is no requirement to refer the application to the SoS. However, given that Sport England has objected to the application on the grounds of the loss of playing fields, the council will notify the SoS informally having regard to the procedure set out above to seek confirmation whether the SoS wishes to call the application in.

Notification to DCLG of EIA Development: The Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2011

Pursuant to Regulation 16 of the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) Regulations (1999 and 2011) the council must notify the Department of Communities and Local Government of the application and send it a copy of the

application and the Environmental Statement (ES). The DCLG has 14 days in which consider the application and the borough must not make a decision in that time. The borough must notify the DCLG of any decision made in relation to EIA development.

BACKGROUND TO THE APPLICATION

The site lies within the Colindale and Burnt Oak Opportunity Area, as set out in policy 2.13 of the London Plan. This policy requires development proposals to support strategic policy directions for these areas, optimise residential output, provide necessary infrastructure, promote sustainable transport and support the regeneration of the wider area. The Opportunity Area designation covers 262Ha and includes a range of sites with capacity for residential-led, mixed-use redevelopment. This includes parts of RAF East Camp adjacent to the M1, Hendon College site, the Grahame Park Estate, Colindale tube, hospital and library sites in Barnet as well as sites nearby in Brent. The area is identified in the London Plan and contributing 12,500 homes and 2,000 jobs in the period until year 2031. London Plan Policy 2.13 promotes the development of Opportunity Areas, utilising their public transport accessibility and potential to contribute residential, employment and other uses through more intensive mixed use development of increased densities. (check 2015 London Plan)

The Barnet Core Strategy was adopted in September 2012 and policy CS3 includes Colindale as one of the main areas for strategic housing growth in the borough.

Barnet's Colindale Area Action Plan (CAAP) was adopted in March 2010. It was prepared in Partnership with the GLA, TfL as well as local strategic partners and key land owners in the Colindale area to guide development and change over the next 10-15 years. The CAAP seeks to demonstrate how the planned growth identified in this area together with the necessary supporting infrastructure will be delivered. The CAAP is a statutory planning document which forms part of the Barnet Local Development Framework (LDF). Along with other LDF documents, the CAAP provides policies and guidance which are material considerations in the determination of applications in this area.

The CAAP identifies eastern part of the site as Peel Centre East within the Aerodrome Road 'Corridor of Change'. The Aerodrome Road Corridor of Change is identified as bringing forward "...the single largest and most significant phase of growth in the Colindale and will transform the suburb".

The CAAP also identifies the western part of the site as Peel Centre West within the Colindale Avenue 'Corridor of Change'. Colindale Avenue vision is to "...be the vibrant heart and gateway to the area and become a sustainable, mixed-use neighbourhood, anchored by a new high quality public transport interchange with pedestrian piazzas on both side of the street. A high quality, urban environment will serve a higher density population..."

The wider Peel Centre site in Colindale is approximately 27.5ha (69 acres). Until recently, the whole site was owned by the Mayor's Office for Policing and Crime (MOPAC) and occupied by the Metropolitan Police Service (MPS) and the Home

Office. It was been used principally as a Metropolitan Police training centre since the 1930s. Since then, the requirements for users have changed due to a greater use of technology, e-learning as well as structural changes in the way that the MPS trains its officers. The facilities on site are outdated, in need of repair or upgrade and no longer provide the desired quality of accommodation, including the buildings constructed in 1960s and 1970s. Consequently, the building stock on site is underutilised and inefficient and in excess of future MPS operational requirements.

In October 2012, MOPAC entered into a pre-application discussions with the GLA to explore the comprehensive redevelopment of the site to provide replacement facilities for the MPS as well as residential development, student accommodation, commercial uses, a primary school and public open space. However, MOPAC resolved not to pursue the comprehensive redevelopment and instead, to separate the consolidated MPS facility and residential-led element into two separate proposals. Planning permission was granted in September 2013 for a new MPS training and operational facility on part of the retained land at Peel Centre along Aerodrome Road (Barnet planning Ref: H/01571/13). Construction work on this building is now advanced. The remaining land at Peel Centre which was surplus to MPS operation requirements (approx 22Ha) was to be disposed of and the receipt from the sale would fund the new MPS accommodation.

In support of the land disposal for the residential-led element of the site, a planning parameters document was produced in May 2013 by GVA on behalf of MOPAC (landowner); Transport for London (landowner); the London Borough of Barnet (Local Planning Authority); and the Greater London Authority (Strategic Planning Authority). It set out the Planning Authorities' informal advice on the form of development that would be considered acceptable at the Peel Centre Disposal Site in planning terms having regard to the existing planning policy framework provided by the London Plan, Barnet Local Plan and Colindale Area Action Plan.

In 2013 Redrow Homes Ltd (Applicant) purchased the Peel Centre disposal land from (MOPAC) following a competitive bid process through the GLA's London Development Panel.

Prior to submitting the subject application in late August 2014, the Applicant undertook pre-application discussions with the GLA and TfL from November 2013 up to formal submission. The applicant also undertook a consultation exercise with stakeholders and the local community with exhibitions, briefings and meetings. The consultation was executed in two stages. The first in February 2014 to seek early input into the proposal and a second event in July 2014 to provide feedback on the consultation as well as present the updated design, with a further opportunity to comment on the proposal.

1. MATERIAL CONSIDERATIONS

1.1 Key Relevant Planning Policy

Introduction

Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act (2004) requires that development proposals shall be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. In this case the development plan is The London Plan and the development plan documents in the Barnet Local Plan. These statutory development plans are the main policy basis for the consideration of this planning application.

A number of other planning documents, including national planning guidance and supplementary planning guidance and documents are also material to the determination of this application.

National Planning Policy Framework

The 'National Planning Policy Framework' (NPPF) was published on 27 March 2012. 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.

In March 2014 the National Planning Practice Guidance was published (online) as a web based resource. This resource provides an additional level of detail and guidance to support the policies set out in the NPPF.

London Plan 2015

The London Plan is the development plan in terms of strategic planning policy for the purposes of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act (2004). On the 10th March 2015, the Mayor published (i.e. adopted) the Further Alterations to the London Plan (FALP). From this date, the FALP are operative as formal alterations to the London Plan (the Mayor's spatial development strategy) and form part of the development plan for Greater London. The London Plan has been updated to incorporate the Further Alterations. It also incorporates the Revised Early Minor Alterations to the London Plan (REMA), which were published in October 2013.

The London Plan policies (arranged by chapter) most relevant to the determination of this application are listed in Appendix 6.

It is further noted that the Mayor's Housing Supplementary Planning Guidance (November 2012) provides guidance on how to implement the housing policies in the London Plan.

Relevant Local Plan (2012) Policies

Barnet's Local Plan is made up of a suite of documents including the Core Strategy and Development Management Policies Development Plan Documents (DPD). Both DPDs were adopted on 11 September 2012. The policies relevant to the determination of this application are listed in Appendix 6.

Supplementary Planning Documents and Guidance

The Council has a number of adopted Supplementary Planning Documents (SPDs) which provide detailed guidance that supplements policies in the adopted Local Plan, and sets out how sustainable development will be delivered in Barnet including generic environmental requirements to ensure that new development within Barnet meets sufficiently high environmental and design standards. They are material considerations for the determination of planning applications:

Local Supplementary Planning Documents and Guidance:

Sustainable Design and Construction SPD (April 2013)

Affordable Housing SPD (2007)

The Residential Design Guidance SPD (April 2013)

Planning Obligations SPD (April 2013)

Delivering Skills, Employment, Enterprise and Training from Development through S106 (Oct 2014)

In addition, the following guidance is produced by the DCLG and GLA which is relevant:

DCLG

Written Statement to Parliament: Planning Update March 2015

GLA

Strategic Supplementary Planning Documents and Guidance:

SPG on Accessible London (October 2014)

Sustainable Design and Construction SPG (April 2014)

Colindale Area Action Plan (CAAP)

The Colindale Area Action Plan (CAAP) was adopted in March 2010. This provides a planning policy and design framework to guide and inform the development and regeneration of Colindale up to 2021 in response to the London Plan's designation as an Opportunity Area.

The CAAP contains guidance on sustainable development and identifies a number of key infrastructure improvements needed to support the delivery of growth in Colindale. It identifies four character areas, the 'Corridors of Change', which identify specific development sites and set specific policy objectives to be achieved from redevelopment. The former Peel Centre application site falls within the Aerodrome Road Corridor of Change and the Colindale Avenue Corridor of Change. It also sets out general policies and standards for new developments in the area. The policies relevant to the determination of this application are listed in Appendix 6.

1.2 Key Relevant Planning History

With the exception of the applications identified below, the site planning application history relates to the MPS occupation of the site which is not directly relevance to the current application.

Application Ref.	Description of Development	Decision and Date
H/01571/13	Demolition of existing buildings (except Building 36) and the provision of new training and operational facilities comprising of: The erection of a new 4 storey building (Building A) The erection of a new part 2, part 3 storey building (Building B) adjoining Building 36 Provision of 71 car parking spaces Replacement parade ground Landscaping including provision of new memorial garden Relocation of Grade II Listed Sir Robert Peel Statue and Police Call Box Structures	Approved 23.09.2013
H/01526/14	Environmental Impact Assessment Scoping Opinion request	Scoping Opinion 16.06.2014 (Scheme is EIA development & ES required)

1.3 Pre-application Consultation by the Applicant

A statement of community involvement, entitled 'Statement of Community Involvement' August 2013' (Document Ref: PC32) accompanies the application, prepared by the London Communications Agency, summarising the public consultation activity of the applicant prior to submitting their application formally.

The stated objectives of the consultation were to engage and generate interest in the development, to communicate compelling reasons for residents, politicians and stakeholders to support the proposal and demonstrate how the applicant responded and sought to incorporate feedback into evolving plans where possible.

The approach adopted for the consultation was focussed around two public exhibitions as part of the pre-application process. The first presented the scheme and feedback from this was to be reflected in the subsequent exhibition. The public exhibitions ran for a total of five days, the first being for two days in February 2014 and the second for 3 days in July 2014. The exhibitions were promoted in local newspapers, letters to stakeholders, residents groups and local politicians as well as a flyer that was distributed to 15,000 households and businesses. A dedicated website with information was established. In the course of this there were a series of meetings, briefings and previews for stakeholders including elected MPs, London Assembly Member, local councillors, MPS/MOPAC, and Brent Executive Cabinet.

207 people attended the exhibitions in addition to online visits to the website and separate meetings with the local stakeholders. Options for providing feedback included comments cards completed at the event or returned via Freepost, online comments via the website or via email info@redrowcolindale.com and by the Freephone consultation line 0808 146 736.

The consultation responses were reproduced in section 6 and 7 of the 'Statement of Community Involvement' with the following main responses summarised below.

1st consultation responses

- Positive: Plans for shops, supermarket and active high street, pedestrian links, green space, investment in local bus services
- Negative: Concern about local traffic impact and need for primary and secondary school

In addition, comment cards at the exhibition invited comment in response to the following 5 questions:

- What do you think makes a good neighbourhood?
- What do you think the new neighbourhood should be called?
- What type of housing would you like to see as part of the proposals?
- What sort of public spaces would you like to see in your new neighbourhood?
- What amenities and services would you like to see as part of this new neighbourhood and for the benefit of the wider area?

Redrow's response to the 1st consultation feedback is provided in section 9 of the 'Outline Estate Management Strategy' and in summary the following key aspects were features were incorporated into the proposal in response:

- A variety of housing tenures i.e. market and affordable housing variants
- Different types of public open space
- Inclusion of community benefits e.g. supermarket, community floorspace including health centre, as well as restaurants, shops and cafes

2nd consultation responses

- Positive: Plans for green spaces, school, supermarket, shops, potential improvements to Colindale tube station; comment that Redrow had taken notice of comments from the 1st consultation
- Negative: Impact on traffic and parking; height of the tall elements; need for a primary and secondary school and level of development in Colindale
- Comments: Query as to the timing of delivery of the health centre, shops, restaurants and road improvements; query about the level of affordable housing being achieved

A feedback form invited open comments, the main issues being summarised as follows:

- Positive: Provision of community facilities, green spaces, cycling routes, primary school; thought given to public transport links; provision of houses; provision of a retail/entertainment district; improving Colindale tube station; range of housing

- Comments: The need for transport improvements and traffic management with the all the developments in the area and the congestion it will bring; the widening of roads especially Colindale Avenue and Edgware Road was regarded as a priority; a slip road to the M1 was suggested; requested more housing for older people; querying the jobs and business offer
- Negative: Height of the towers; lack of parking on site and loss of parking spaces on currently quiet roads and the suggestion that permits be introduced to protect parking spaces; development density; loss of the Metropolitan Police Running track

1.4 Public Consultations by the Council and Views Expressed

Public Consultation

6702 local residents were consulted on the planning application by letter on 19.09.2014. The application was advertised in the local press on 25 Sep 2014 and site notices were put up on site on 25 Sep 2014. The consultation process carried out for this application is considered to be appropriate for a development of this nature. The extent of consultation exceeded the requirements of national planning legislation and the Council's own adopted policy.

First consultation

44 responses were received objecting to the scheme, including a total of 4 requests to speak at committee from including a request from Andrew Dismore (London Assembly Member), Cllr Nagas Narenthira (Colindale Ward) as well as 2 members of the public.

The comments received from members of the public have been summarised under relevant headings below:

Consultation and procedural aspects

- Only aware of the application through being on the mailing list of Andrew Dismore, London Assembly Member [*Officer response: See consultation details above*]
- Querying extent of the consultation [*Officer response: See consultation details above*]
- There needs to be a public inquiry into this application [*Officer comment: There is no procedural basis or planning justification necessitating a public inquiry at this stage*]

EIA

- Insufficient capacity of schools (including primary and secondary), healthcare, public parks [*Officer comment: As discussed in section 3.1 of this report, the ES which accompanies the application has considered capacity and the scheme proposes a 3FE primary school. The council's Education team raises no objection to the scheme in respect of secondary school impact, it being noted that the scheme will contribute an estimated Barnet*

CIL contribution of £28.5m which could be used towards education. The land for the new school will be secured through the section 106 agreement and transferred to the Council. The scheme is proposing as healthcare facility and public open spaces provision to address the future needs of the development]

Principle

- Cumulative, overdevelopment in the area: mentioned British Library site [*Officer comment: The scheme including the ES and TA consider the cumulative effect along with other committed development including the British Library Newspaper site and based on implementing the scheme including the mitigations measures, conditions and s106 obligations as noted throughout this report, there are not impacts to warrant refusal]*
- Scheme is over-dense [*Officer comment: Although the scheme exceeds the numerical density calculations, the London Plan states that this is not a reason alone to refuse the scheme given the NPPF emphasis is on sustainable development and high density is justified in a London Plan Opportunity Area. The numerical density figure for the development has been considered against the design quality of the scheme, improved connectivity to the area, space standards and livability, amenity space provision and quality, access to new open spaces, access to services, management and contribution to place-shaping. This is discussed in section 3.2 of this report]*
- Object to more multi-storey development in the area [*Officer comment: The scheme accords with the adopted CAAP and London Plan aspiration for reusing a brownfield site as discussed in section 3.2. There are three existing towers on the site which establishes the principle of multi storey buildings. The proposed tall buildings have been assess against relevant London Plan, LBB and EH/CABE guidance]*
- Excessive scale and number of flats [*Officer comment: As above, the scheme accords with adopted policy and in terms of scale, the scheme further addresses policy for large scale residential development and tall buildings as discussed in section 3.2]*
- Insufficient affordable housing [*Officer comment: The council's independent financial consultant confirms that the maximum affordable housing level has been achieved along with factoring in the costs of the other necessary s106 mitigation measures as well as Mayoral and Barnet CIL. See section 3.11 of this report]*
- Loss of the existing athletics track [*Officer comment: The loss of the athletics track is necessary for the optimal use of the site for housing and does not impact on the retained MPS activity or on the future residents and wider area for which there is provision of open space, including a running circuit. See sections 3.2 and 3.3 regarding the acceptability of the loss of existing facilities and the proposed facilities of the redevelopment respectively]*
- Query in respect of what local job creation is proposed [*Officer comment: The neighbourhood centre as well as the school will provide employment opportunities. In addition as s106 planning obligation will secure a Local*

Employment Agreement for job and work experience opportunities for local residents]

- Concern that Barnet's planning provisions are being ignored [*Officer comment: The scheme accords with the redevelopment intent for the Peel site as identified in the CAAP as discussed in section 3.2, not to mention national (NPPF) and regional (London Plan) policy and guidance as discussed throughout this report]*
- Query in respect of the basis for considering the scheme as a departure to the development plan [*Officer comment: The proposal is notified as a departure on the basis that there is a loss of existing sports pitches for which there is an objection raised by Sport England. See previous section 'Procedure for Determining the Planning Application']*
- Net loss of employment [*Officer comment: The MPS-related employment levels as well as the additional jobs created by the proposed neighbourhood centre and school result in an increase in employment as discussed in section 3.2]*
- Question the benefit (and possible negative impact to other shopping parades) of a supermarket use [*Officer comment: See section 3.2 of discussion that the provision of a new neighbourhood centre is specific to the needs of the future residents of this site, reflects the housing targets of the area and will not impact on other town centres, especially when considering future growth in population and expenditure]*
- Querying the necessity of the proposed housing and if it will address actual needs [*Officer comment: Housing is a regional and local priority as stated in policy. The scheme provides a range of dwelling sizes and tenures including affordable housing as well as different formats including actual dwelling houses as well as wheelchair accommodation to address different housing needs]*
- Note the need for a supermarket in the area [*Officer comment: Noted and in accordance with the CAAP range of uses identified for the Peel Centre redevelopment]*
- Concerned about a shortfall in open space in the area [*Officer comment: As noted in section 3.2, Colindale is not in an area of deficiency in terms of amount but in terms of quality and accessibility, which the council's Green Spaces team is in the process of addressing in response to the study of facilities in the area in 2013]*
- Impact on healthcare provision and existing long waiting times for doctors appointments [*Officer comment: The planning obligations include provision of floorspace for a healthcare facility to accommodate the demand for 3 additional GPs created by the proposal as well as additional floorspace to accommodate provision for the wider Colindale Area as a permanent facility location]*
- Concern that primary education provision is not sufficient in the area and query as to where secondary pupils will be accommodated [*Officer comment: The CAAP identifies the provision of a 3FE primary school on site which will address the 2FE demand of the proposal as well as wider development in the*

area. In respect of secondary provision, there is no such requirement specified in the CAAP. Furthermore, the Council's Education Team confirm that there is not a shortfall in the area, it being noted that any funding to mitigate the impact of the scheme on secondary places could be addressed through the use of use of the Barnet CIL for which this scheme will contribute]

Housing Quality

- *Provision of family sized homes to fulfil need rather than flats [Officer comment: Family sized accommodation including dwelling houses are proposed as discussed in section 3.3]*
- *Concern that some amenity space is unusable, amounting to merely building curtilage [Officer comment: Sections 3.3 and 3.4 of the report detail the amount and variety of amenity spaces around the site to address the needs of future residents, the final details and quality of which will be controlled by conditions of approval]*
- *Concern that there is a disproportionate amount of flats as compared to houses [Officer comment: There is no policy preference stipulating that more dwelling houses are required, it being noted that there is a need for a range of housing sizes, not just houses]*
- *Concerned about the variety and choice of residential properties to accommodate changing and or future needs [Officer comment: As noted in section 3.3, although the requirement of Lifetime Homes Standards has been redirected to the building regulations stage, these standards as well as 10% wheelchair housing are achieved, thereby future proofing the development for occupiers]*

Design

- *Impact to significance of relocated Sir Robert Peel Statue and Call Box [Officer Comment: These features were relocated as part of the retained MPS facility planning permission and are not affected by the proposal]*
- *Visual impact of tall buildings [Officer comment: The scheme is considered to address tall buildings policies and no impacts identified to warrant refusal as discussed in section 3.4 of this report, it being noted that the principle of tall buildings has already been established on the site]*
- *Concern about maintenance specifically mentioned the unsightly nature of the tall building components if they were to fall into disrepair [Officer comment: Although future maintenance and state of repair is not a planning consideration and reasons to refuse tall buildings, it should be noted that material quality is controlled by condition and construction quality is controlled by the Building Regulations]*
- *Querying the difference between the height of existing towers on site and the proposed tall buildings [Officer comment:*
- *Concern with presentation of static CGIs especially for tall buildings [Officer comment: CGIs and verified views are considered to assess the scheme in relation to it surroundings]*

Amenity

- Noise and general disturbance impact *[Officer comment: Appropriately worded conditions are imposed to limit the noise generation of different uses and plant on site. Furthermore, any noise is consistent with the principle residential and neighbourhood centre function, notwithstanding that any excessive and unreasonable noise is covered by the Environmental Protection Act 1990.]*
- Noise impact from cars *[Officer comment: Noise from cars is consistent with the with the principle residential and neighbourhood centre function of the site]*
- Impacts during construction: noise and vibration *[Officer comment: Impacts are mitigated through the requirement for a construction management plan as well as a condition limiting the hours of construction.]*
- Loss of light
- Overlooking and loss of privacy *[Officer comment: No significant privacy impacts for neighbours are identified, it being noted that building separation distances are in excess of 21m to all neighbours and furthermore, are across public streets to the primary frontage]*
- Existing social problems of graffiti and anti-social behaviour, littering, fly-tipping, and derelict empty houses need to be addressed *[Officer comment: The redevelopment involves the demolition of existing properties and replacement with high quality buildings and open spaces, benefitting from active ground floor frontages and passive surveillance. Such arrangements as well as a management company responsible for management and maintenance will mitigate against problems such as graffiti, antisocial behaviour, littering and fly-tipping, notwithstanding that these are criminal matters]*
- Increasing sense of enclosure from tall buildings *[Officer comment: The tall buildings are set within the scheme away from neighbours and will not result in increasing enclosure]*
- Microclimate (wind) impact *[Officer comment: With a very few exception in respect of the future site development where localised mitigation is required for future users, the scheme will not impact on the wind conditions of neighbours]*
- Concern about construction impacts including implementation in an environmentally and considerate manner *[Officer comment: The ES considers impacts in the course of the construction phase and mitigation measures are included which will be conditioned. In addition, an appropriately worded condition requiring a construction management plan is recommended and the developer is encouraged to sign up the Considerate Contractors national accreditation initiative]*

Transport

- Insufficient and unmanaged car parking and increased pressure from illegal parking and overspill including Cheery Close, Colindeep Lane, Court Way, manor Way, Colin Park Road *[Officer Response: The proposed parking*

provision is in accordance with the CAAP. Based on existing provision of controlled parking zones in the area and the proposed Peel Link, it is envisaged that any additional parking demand not catered for within the development is likely to be displaced to the south of the site. To ensure there is suitable protection for local residents in this area, the proposed streets for Controlled Parking Zones implementation are shown in Section 3.6 and include sections on Colindeep Lane, Court Way and Manor Way. Colin Park Road been reviewed and is calculated to be 700 metres from the edge of the development. This is envisaged to be too far from the development to be affected. Cherry Close is located approximately 250metres to the north of the site, with minimal uncontrolled parking provision and existing parking demand.]

- *Traffic impact including impact on Colindale Avenue, Aerodrome Road, A5 Edgware Rd, Greyhound Hill, Hendale Ave, Watford Way, Hendon Way, A41, Sunny Hill, Church Road, Brent Street, A406, A1 [Officer comment: The impact of the development on Transport and Movement is fully addressed at Section 3.6 of this report, which considers that the impacts resulting from the development can be satisfactorily accommodated within the capacity of the existing highway network.]*
- *Cumulative effect with other developments including sites in LB Brent [Officer comment: The cumulative impact of multiple developments within the area has been taken into account within the strategic modelling undertaken to provide the future flow figures on which the TA for the development has been based. Specific Committed Development Schemes (as listed in Section 8 of the TA) include but are not restricted to, Grahame Park Estate, Beaufort Park, Brent Works, Station House, Former Colindale Hospital, British Library Newspaper site, Colindale Business Centre, Greenpoint and the National Blood Service expansion. Further details are contained in Section 3.6 of this report.]*
- *Junction impacts including the following: Colindale Avenue and Edgware Road; Colindeep Lane and Edgware Road; Montrose Avenue and Edgware Road; Hay Lane and Edgware Road; Kingsburt Road and Edgware Road; Kingsbury Road and Edgware Road; Sheaveshill Avenue and Wakeman's Hill and Edgware Road; Rushgrove Avenue and Edgware Road; mini roundabout of Rushgrove, Colindeep Lane, Aerodrome Road and Watford Way, A41 and Aerodrome Road [Officer Response: The impact of the development on Transport and Movement is fully addressed at Section 3.6 of this report, which considers that the impacts resulting from the development can be satisfactorily accommodated within the capacity of the existing highway network.]*
- *Traffic safety impacts including Cheery Close [Officer Response: Traffic flow increases due to the development on Cherry Close and Colindeep Lane are not considered to be significant and therefore the impact on road safety will be minimal. A Road Safety Audit has been undertaken (see Section 3) on the sections of highway where changes are proposed and the design is shown to be satisfactory.]*
- *Query about the traffic levels included the completed development [Officer Response: The impact of the development on Transport and Movement is*

fully addressed at Section 3.6 of this report which considers that the impacts resulting from the development can be satisfactorily accommodated within the capacity of the existing highway network.]

- Insufficient capacity of and impact to Colindale Tube station and northern line [*Officer Response: The existing and future capacity of Colindale Tube station, including gate and stair capacity has been assessed as well as capacity on the Northern Line, as per Section 3.6 of this report with an associated s106 planning contribution proposed*]
- Querying if improvements will be made to the tube station and if this will include car, motorcycle and bicycle parking for tube commuters to relieve pressure on surrounding streets [*Officer Response: A significant contribution to improvements to the Colindale Underground Station will be secured through the s106 agreement if planning permission be granted. Cycle parking provision at the underground station will be progressed through the improvements to the station as being designed by Transport for London (TfL). Although there is not expected to be any increase in car parking provision, there will be on street parking controls introduced in the local area to combat commuter parking.*]
- Capacity of the road infrastructure and the cumulative impact with other developments and full effect of the completed development [*Officer Response: The impact of the development on transport and movement is fully addressed at Section 3.6 of this report, which considers that the impacts resulting from the development can be satisfactorily accommodated within the capacity of the existing highway network. The cumulative impact of multiple developments within the area has been taken into account within the traffic modelling undertaken to provide the future flow figures on which the TA for the development has been based.*]
- Insufficient bus stops [*Officer Response: New bus stops have recently been installed on Aerodrome Road. Further bus stop locations will be progressed at the detail design stage in conjunction with TfL, to tie in with those stops recently sited. The proposed development is required to meet the criteria set out within section 3.5.16 of the CAAP, 'throughout the Colindale area, the proposed bus network needs to provide at least one bus stop within 400 metres of each residential unit, in line with TfL guidance'.]*
- Impact of bus capacity including Nos. 113 and 186 to Brent Cross and effect to bus movement on Edgware Road [*Officer comment: Existing spare capacity on bus services have been assessed and the maximum predicted additional passengers per any single bus movement peaks at 11 per bus (Service 204 southbound AM Peak Outbound). With regards to Services 113 and 186, in year 2026, with the full CAAP proposals including the Peel Development there will be a minimum 8% spare capacity on Service no. 118 (Southbound AM Peak Outbound) and 17% on Service no. 186 (Eastbound AM Peak Outbound).*]
- Comment that the Peel Link will need improved illumination and surfacing and regular maintenance to serve a benefit of the future residents and the public at large [*Officer Response: The Peel Link proposals, providing a pedestrian and cycling link to and from the development will meet the*

required lighting and surfacing standards as part of the detailed design process]

- *Querying what cycle friendly measures are proposed [Officer Response: The Peel Link will provide a vehicular free connection from Colindeep Lane to the development, creating a significant improvement to sustainable linkage within the area. New streets within the development are designed to encourage low vehicle speeds to provide a safer environment for pedestrians and cyclists. The developer is providing half metre margins on Primary Routes within the development, where the lane width is greater than 3m, are proposed, which could increase safety for cyclists. There is improved cycle provision on the south side of Colindale Avenue and improved crossing facilities on this road for cyclists. Cyclists will benefit from new routes through the scheme, presenting an alternative route to Aerodrome Road. Given the nature of proposed street design which promotes pedestrian and cycle movement, it is not considered that there is any need for segregated cycle ways.]*
- *Impact of the 3FE school [Officer Response: With regards to the proposed 3 form entry primary school for 669 school pupils (including nursery places) and 50 members of staff, 70 parking spaces will be provided specifically for the pickup and drop off of school children, together with 13 spaces for staff. It is estimated that 179 school children will live within the proposed development and therefore not generate any additional trips on the local transport network. With regards to trips on the external transport network, in the AM peak it is calculated that there will 68 car arrivals/ 29 car departures, increasing to 68 car arrivals /80 car departures in the PM peak.]*
- *Traffic safety and risk of accidents because of traffic volume [Officer Response: A review of recorded personal injury accidents in the Colindale area for a three year period has been undertaken. In total 149 accidents were recorded of which 29 involved pedestrians. A more detailed review is included in Section 3.6 but in summary there is no underlying issues with highway safety at the site access points and it is not considered that the proposed development will adversely contribute to accidents in the area. In addition, a Road Safety Audit and Design Engineer's Response to the proposed highway changes has been received, reviewed and accepted by officers.]*

Energy, Sustainability & Resources

- *Air pollution from additional vehicles [Officer comment: In recognising the outer London location, car parking is provided although, number are limited to reflect requirements whilst successive parking is mitigated through removing the option of future residents to apply for parking permits, thus limiting the air pollution attributable from cars. Furthermore, the requirement for a green travel plan will promote alternatives and incentives for more sustainable methods of travel than by car]*
- *Querying what energy solutions including renewable options are proposed in the development [Officer comment: A combined heat and power plant is proposed and in the case that connection is not feasible for the dwelling houses, photo voltaics are proposed]*

Landscape and Biodiversity

- Tree loss [*Officer comment: Although trees are removed as part of the proposal, there will be replacement planting in streets and open spaces as part of the proposal. In addition, trees to be retained on an around the site will be protected during construction by appropriately worded conditions*]
- Querying tree protection measures [*Officer comment: Tree protection measures including fencing/hoarding as well as no-dig practices where possible for construction of roads*]

Other relevant material planning considerations

- Reference to not recreating 1960s models of housing development and ensuring social cohesion [*Officer comment: The scheme therefore reflects the sustainable development imperative of the NPPF which specifically seeks to address problems of 20th century schemes. Specifically, the proposed involves a mixed-tenure, mixed-use redevelopment with supporting facilities and infrastructure on a site where the coherent layout with active ground floor frontages and passive surveillance improves the connectivity to public transport, whilst the high quality architecture, landscaping and open space treatments will improve the sense of place, amenity and safety and security.*]
- Errors in documents [unspecified]
- Query if the existing two storey properties within the red line and along Colindale Avenue are to be demolished as part of the proposal and why they are not being reused [*Officer comment: Yes, the dwellings will be demolished to make way for a greater number of replacement units in this location which represents a more optimal use of the site and in fulfilment of addressing housing needs and the borough's delivery targets in accordance with the London Plan*]
- Impact to utilities including electricity, Water and telephone and sewerage system [*Officer comment: Impact to utilities has been considered in the development of the proposal in consultation with providers as noted in section 3.10 of this report*]

Matters which are not relevant planning considerations for this application

- Infrastructure suggestions which are not directly related to the proposed scheme including building a station on Aerodrome Rd on the Thames Link Line, building a station between Colindale and Hendon on the northern line, reinstating the mill hill loop to Colindale on the northern line and adding a new station, creating an overground rail link and increasing bus routes available
- Loss of views from tall buildings
- Devaluing property values in the area
- Prefer to see the land retained for police training
- Reference to other development in the area including their style, lack of decoration and lack of gardens and landscaping including trees
- The area will be destroyed even more [unspecified]

- Reference to the school at the top of greyhound Hill causing bedlam with drop-offs and local highway impacts
- Tall buildings are a fire and health risk if the lifts break down
- The dwellings will be bought by investors and are not local people
- Reference made to other development in the Colindale area and opinion that these have not brought any shops and restaurants or investment in infrastructure and are just residential dormitories
- Opinion that planning decision making is made behind closed doors
- Opinion that people have not been kept informed of developments in the Colindale area and a lack of involvement by the local MP [unspecified]
- Historic references to tall buildings leading to crime and antisocial behaviour as well as being eyesores and poorly maintained
- Reference to the reduction of services at Barnet Hospital
- Concern for due planning process including consideration of the development plan and resident consultation in the situations where council departs from the development plan and supports a scheme
- Extent of application documentation for such a large scheme and the need for several summarising documents which are more manageable
- Concern about vehicular safety of Peel Link connection with Colindeep Lane [Officer comment: this is not a vehicular or servicing link, it is solely a pedestrian and cycle link]
- Query about the specifics of who actually benefits from the affordable housing and whether or not they 'deserve it' [Officer comment: Eligibility criteria for prospective affordable housing tenants or prospective shared owner buyers is according to separate criteria which is not relevant to the planning application process under the Town and Country Planning Act which is merely seeking to secure the provision of affordable housing in the first instance]
- Concern that occupiers will be transient with no real attachment to the area
- Concern about future proposals to further increase the height of tall buildings contained in the proposal
- Concern for property sales values and whether or not the scheme will go to deserving local people [Officer comment: *Whilst sales values in the context of assessing the financial viability are considered by an independently financial viability consult appointed by the council, property sales including the final purchasers and the final values and terms agreed with purchasers is not a relevant to the assessment of the application*]
- Confirmation sought that there are no more large proposals to come forward in the area [Officer comment: *There is nothing to prevent sites coming forward for consideration for development and these would need to be considered on their individual merits having regard to planning policy and guidance as well as the consideration of impacts including cumulative impacts under the EIA regulations as may be relevant*]

- Reference to loss of the A&E dept at Edgware Hospital and that local residents now need to travel to Royal Free or Barnet General in an emergency [*Officer comment: A&E dept provision is subject to national administration by the Department of Health and is not a material consideration to the determination of planning applications for residential development under the Town and Country Planning Act*]
- Suggestion the Peel site should instead be allocated for use as open play area, public park or playing fields [*Officer comment: Notwithstanding that the scheme includes a public open space running several hectares and which includes playspace, the scheme is identified in the Colindale AAP for housing redevelopment to recognise a regional and locally identified need of the GLA and Barnet respectively as well as representing an optimal use of the site in accordance with the London Plan*]
- Suggestion of renewal of the junction at Greyhound Hill and Watford Way
- Suggestion that there should be investment in road infrastructure above and beyond the Colindale AAP include road widening, pedestrian pavement and pathway improvements and additional bus routes
- Traffic safety on Greyhound Hill during snow conditions
- Danger to Life [unspecified]
- Reference to the this being no longer a quiet residential area
- Mention of the impact to and displacement of flora and fauna on other sites including hedgehogs and butterflies and starlings
- Indiscriminate littering from pedestrians and car users

2 responses were received supporting the scheme on the following grounds:

- Improvement to the site landscape
- Provides much needed housing, supported by educational facility and commercial space
- Need to consider affordable housing provision including shared ownership
- More jobs
- More diversity [unspecified] to the area

Ward Councillor Comments

In addition to the comments from neighbours, an objection was received from Cllr Nagus Narenthira, Colindale Ward Councillor, raising the following concerns:

- Visual impact of tall buildings which are out of character with the area and are contrary to the London Plan and Colindale AAP [*Officer comment: The scheme addresses the criteria of tall buildings policy as discussed in section 3.2*]
- Overdevelopment [*Officer comment: The proposal accords with the*

redevelopment intent as an Identified London Plan Opportunity Area and as a site in the CAAP. Although the scheme exceeds the numerical density calculations, the London Plan states that this is not a reason alone to refuse the scheme given the NPPF emphasis is on sustainable development and high density is justified in a London Plan Opportunity Area, especially when balanced with the scheme benefits and level of amenity nonetheless achieved, as discussed in section 3.2 of this report]

- Insufficient affordable housing at the expense of local community need and concern about viability impacting on its provision [*Officer comment: The council's independent financial consultant confirms that the maximum affordable housing level has been achieved along with factoring in the costs of the other necessary s106 mitigation measures as well as Mayoral and Barnet CIL. See section 3.11 of this report.*]
- Impact on existing poor transport facilities [unspecified] and opinion that need would not be fully met even in the case of new bus route and Colindale tube station upgrade
- Increase propensity to car use and resulting transport congestion [*Officer comment: In recognising the outer London location, car parking is provided although, numbers are limited to reflect requirements whilst excessive parking is mitigated through removing the option of future residents to apply for parking permits. Furthermore, the requirement for a green travel plan will promote alternatives and incentives for more sustainable methods of travel than by car and mitigating against congestion being added to the network*]
- Insufficient car parking provision [*Officer comment: As noted in the transport section 3.6, adequate provision has been made for the residential properties, the school and the neighbourhood centre uses including servicing*]
- Opinion that 3 form of entry primary school is absolutely essential [*Officer comment: The scheme makes provision for a 3FE school*]
- Sports facilities needed for youth to combat crime and antisocial behaviour [*Officer comment: In addition to the sports facilities in the proposed school which use by the community after hours will be secured through the s106 planning agreement, sports and play provision is made through the array of open space provision on site as variously identified in sections 3.3, 3.4 and 3.9 of this report*]

GLA Assembly Member Comments

An objection was received from London Assembly Member Andrew Dismore raising the following concerns:

- Overdevelopment in the Colindale area which is also in addition to development nearby in LB Brent [*Officer comment: The proposal accords with the redevelopment intent as an Identified London Plan Opportunity Area and as a site in the CAAP. The cumulative effect of the development including schemes in LB Brent has been considered as part of the application including the ES as discussed in section 3.1 and in terms of economic impact in section 3.2 and in terms of transport in section 3.6. Although the scheme*

exceeds the numerical density calculations, the London Plan states that this is not a reason alone to refuse the scheme given the NPPF emphasis is on sustainable development and high density is justified in a London Plan Opportunity Area, especially when balanced with the scheme benefits and level of amenity nonetheless achieved, as discussed in section 3.2 of this report]

- 21 storey buildings not in keeping with the area especially properties to the south in Colindeep Lane [*Officer comment: The scheme is considered to address tall buildings policies and no impacts identified to warrant refusal as discussed in section 3.4 of this report, it being noted that the principle of tall buildings on the site is established by the three existing towers]*
- Population growth in Colindale in last 9 years [*Officer comment: The proposal accords with the London Plan Opportunity Area and Barnet CAAP site specific policies which identify growth in the Colindale Area, including this site. The scheme responds with a range of uses, supporting facilities as well as s106 and CIL contributions such that the scheme is considered to be sustainable and will mitigate impacts upon the surrounding area]*
- Impacts to roads [*Officer comment: The cumulative impact of multiple developments within the area has been taken into account within the strategic modelling undertaken to provide the future flow figures on which the TA for the development has been based. Specific Committed Development Schemes (as listed in Section 8 of the TA) include but are not restricted to, Grahame Park Estate, Beaufort Park, Brent Works, Station House, Former Colindale Hospital, British Library Newspaper site, Colindale Business Centre, Greenpoint and the National Blood Service expansion. Further details are contained in Section 3.6 of this report.]*
- Impact to NHS [*Officer comment: The planning obligations include provision of floorspace for a healthcare facility to accommodate the demand for 3 additional GPs created by the proposal as well as additional floorspace to accommodate provision for the wider Colindale Area as a permanent facility location]*
- Impact to tube (northern line) concern that there had been plans to build a new [Colindale tube] station however these appear to have been shelved [*Officer comment: The s106 planning agreement includes a contribution towards the upgrade of the Colindale Tube station as identified in section 3.11 of this report. It is noted that TfL and Council are in the process of considering the feasibility of different options for station improvements such as access for people with a disability in support of the increased population growth in Colindale, as identified in the CAAP]*
- Impact to utilities: electricity, water, gas, drains and sewers [*Officer comment: Impact to utilities has been considered in the development of the proposal in consultation with providers as noted in section 3.10 of this report]*
- Exacerbating localised surface water flooding on Aerodrome Rd [*Officer comment: The proposal is not located in an area of flood risk and the proposed surface water drainage proposal, including the use of a Sustainable Urban Drainage System (SUDS) will not result in any impact downstream, including upon Thames Water infrastructure, the Silk Stream*

and neighbours. Storm events up to and including 1 in 100 year are mitigated by the proposal.]

- Concern that the viability document has not been published [*Officer comment: [The viability appraisal submitted by the applicant has been independently reviewed and assessed by Deloitte. They have advised that the resulting level of affordable housing is the maximum reasonable taking into consideration the CIL and S106 contributions. The viability appraisal includes commercially sensitive information and is not made public as part of the application and is therefore not published on the council's statutory register]*]
- Inability to comment on affordable housing offer although concerned about the level achieved for the nearby Beaufort Park scheme and suggestion that 40% affordable should be achieved in line with the Mayor of London Policy [*Officer comment: The final level of affordable housing achieved as identified in section 3.3 is confirmed by the Council's independent viability consultant as the maximum affordable housing level achievable along with factoring in the costs of the other necessary s106 mitigation measures as well as Mayoral and Barnet CIL. See section 3.11 of this report.]*]
- Inadequate parking (at a ratio of 0.7 spaces per dwelling) with reference to the 'Pulse' development and impact to nearby residential streets [*Officer comment: As noted in the transport section 3.6, adequate provision has been made for the residential properties in accordance with the CAAP parking ratios. Provision is also made for the school and the neighbourhood centre uses including servicing. As such the scheme is considered to have adequately addressed the requirements for provision on site. Nevertheless, future residents will be exempted from being able to apply for parking permits and the planning agreement includes a contribution to establish a Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) in the area. Both measures will mitigate the impact on parking for residents in their local streets.]*]
- Cumulative traffic impacts [*Officer comment: The cumulative impact of multiple developments within the area has been taken into account within the strategic modelling undertaken to provide the future flow figures on which the TA for the development has been based. Specific Committed Development Schemes (as listed in Section 8 of the TA) include but are not restricted to, Grahame Park Estate, Beaufort Park, Brent Works, Station House, Former Colindale Hospital, British Library Newspaper site, Colindale Business Centre, Greenpoint and the National Blood Service expansion. Further details are contained in Section 3.6 of this report.]*]
- Suggestion of a condition capping the cost of parking spaces to not more than an LB Barnet resident parking permit to mitigate the on street parking pressure [*Officer comment: the development will be subject to car parking management plan to be submitted to and agreed with the Council via condition. This will include allocation of spaces, permit controls, charges, management and enforcement]*]
- Impact on GPs and the scheme should make provision for additional services [*Officer comment: The planning obligations include provision of floorspace for a healthcare facility to accommodate the demand for 3 additional GPs*]

created by the proposal as well as additional floorspace to accommodate provision for the wider Colindale Area as a permanent facility location]

- No consideration of the impact on secondary health care (hospitals) *[Officer comment: Funding for hospital provision is through central government nevertheless, were provision identified at local level, this would represent an infrastructure improvement that could be eligible for CIL for which the scheme will make a contribution to as identified in section 3.11]*
- No consideration for secondary school provision *[Officer comment: The CAAP identifies the provision of a 3FE primary school on site which will address the 2FE demand of the proposal as well as wider development in the area. In respect of secondary provision, there is no such requirement specified in the CAAP. Furthermore, the Council's Education Team confirm that there is not a shortfall in the area, it being noted that any funding to mitigate the impact of the scheme on secondary places could be addressed through the use of use of the Barnet CIL for which this scheme will contribute]*
- The scheme should be providing jobs in light industrial and high tech sectors in light of the closure of nearby developments, rather than homes and no supporting infrastructure *[Officer comment: The London Plan and Barnet CAAP do not identify the location as suitable for industrial or high tech development. Nevertheless, in terms of employment The MPS-related employment levels are maintained as well as the additional jobs created by the proposed neighbourhood centre and school results in an increase in employment as discussed in section 3.2]*

Reconsultation – May 2015

A re-consultation exercise was undertaken in the form of neighbour letters on 15.05.15 and re-advertisement in the local press on 19.05.15 and further site notices on 21.05.15. The extent of re-consultation was the same as the original.

A further **2** requests to speak at committee were made by members of the public

A further **7** responses were received objecting to the scheme raising the following new additional issues to those of the previous consultation:

- The application would destroy completely all social and environmental standards [Unspecified] *[Officer comment: Report sections 3.1 to 3.10 identify how the scheme responds to standards within planning policy and guidance]*
- Querying if feasibility studies have considered the impacts on roads, transport and the environment *[Officer report: Section 3.6 identifies how the scheme has considered the potential transport impacts of the proposal. Section 3.1 identifies how the scheme has considered a comprehensive range of environmental impacts]*
- Querying provision of dentists *[Officer comment: The planning obligation includes the provision of a healthcare facility that has the potential to*

accommodate a dentist. Notwithstanding that further floorspace proposed in the neighbourhood centre could accommodate a dentist use]

- Querying provision of jobs for the new residents [*Officer comment: In addition to jobs in the new neighbourhood centre when the scheme is completed and occupied, the s106 planning agreement includes a local employment agreement to secure jobs and work experience for local residents]*
- Increased noise and air pollution from additional trains and traffic [*Officer Comment: The ES submitted did not identify significant new or cumulative operational noise impacts for neighbours as a consequence of the proposed development. Whilst there is an increase in the intensity of the site, the use is consistent with the residential character of the wider area. Nevertheless, in considering the potential impact to neighbours and also particularly in relation to future occupiers of the site who will be closer to any potential sources of noise from the proposed non-residential uses and any mechanical plant and equipment, the council's environmental health team have recommended appropriately worded conditions to control the levels of noise from the development within acceptable limits.]*
- Query why there is not an air quality monitoring station near the development to monitor air quality [*Officer comment: In respect of air pollution, no significant impacts are identified by the council's Environmental Health Team. In respect of the design, the scheme contributes towards overall reductions in CO2 production, having regard to energy and sustainability policies.]*
- Impact to views and setting from St Mary's Crescent, Church Farm House Museum, old dairy buildings opposite the museum, Greyhound PH and St Mary's Church [*Officer comment: The scheme is sufficiently distant from the St Mary's Crescent, Church Farm House Museum, old dairy buildings opposite the museum, Greyhound PH and St Mary's Church such that there is no impact on their setting. There are protected views from these locations]*
- Light impact from tall buildings, noting impact already from the university [*Officer comment: Notwithstanding that the proposed lighting of the scheme is controlled by an appropriately worded condition, it being noted that lighting will need to be kept to a minimum for the additional reasons of mitigating the impact to ecology i.e. to the south and east of the site]*
- Concern about exacerbating existing traffic problems at Church End and Church Road junction [*Officer comment: The impact of the development on Transport and Movement is fully addressed at Section 3.6 of this report, which considers that the impacts resulting from the development can be satisfactorily accommodated within the capacity of the existing highway network.]*
- Opinion that Colindale is a suburban location, not a city centre and therefore there should be height limit of 25m [*The scheme is located in an opportunity area in the London Plan and as part of a new neighbourhood centre and contributing to transformational change in the Colindale area according to the CAAP. There is no objection in principle to tall buildings and the proposal addresses the criteria of tall buildings policy as discussed in section 3.4]*

- Suggestion that a review of traffic lights at the Hendon War Memorial is needed [*Officer Response: The impact of the development on Transport and Movement is fully addressed at Section 3.6 of this report, which considers that the impacts resulting from the development can be satisfactorily accommodated within the capacity of the existing highway network.*]

No further letters in support were submitted as a result of the reconsultation and 1 further comment was provided although it did not raise new additional matters to those of the previous consultation.

Consultation Responses from Statutory Consultees and Other Bodies

Department for Communities and Local Government (DCLG)

DCLG confirmed receipt of the notification and advised that they had no comments to make on the application.

Greater London Authority (GLA)

The Stage 1 report summarises the main findings of the assessment, in particular the areas of non compliance with London Plan Policy and possible remedies, as follows:

- Principle of development: Given the site's location in an Opportunity Area and identification in the London Plan and the council's CAAP as an area for high density, residential led, mixed use redevelopment, the proposed mix of uses is supported. However, further discussion regarding provision and delivery of the primary school, community and health facilities, and retail floorspace to ensure the proposal fully accords with London Plan Policies 3.16, 3.18 and 4.7
- Housing: With a lack of agreed viability, it is not possible to determine if the proposal provides the maximum reasonable amount of affordable housing in accordance with London Plan Policy 3.12, nor if family size affordable housing provision in particular is a priority in accordance with Policy 3.11. Further discussion is needed regarding the details of the offer including how the outline component is secured and the affordable housing review mechanism. Further discussion is needed regarding any private rented sector units and engagement with a registered social housing provider is required as a priority
- Children's play space: further discussion required regarding how quality play provision will be secured, including more comprehensive design principles as part of the outline element
- Transport: A financial contribution towards Colindale station is sought which is a priority and this should be reflected in a more clear and realistic revised TA forecasts for passenger numbers Mode split and trip generation analysis needs revising and the technical analysis and choice of data sources needs revisiting. Provision for cycling and the Peel Link need to be fully addressed. Bus contribution being sought
- Urban design and housing quality: The design is strongly supported. However, more discussion regarding the design principles document is needed to ensure it is robust. Matters regarding the underpass link and layout of block M need to be addressed

- Climate change adaption: The overall package is broadly supported. A commitment to delivery of the measures is necessary, with further discussion needed to ensure the finally agreed measures are reflected in the design code document and are secured
- Climate change mitigation: The applicant is expected to fully commit to the delivery of the Colindale-wide district heating network and delivery and connection should be prioritised and evidence of realising this system is required. Connection to the system will need to be secured by condition, linking all users with an exemption test required for any users not to be connected. Further discussion is necessary regarding how the final strategy is secured. Also, the supporting the energy efficiency DER, TER and BRUKL output test sheets for the residential dwellings to verify energy efficiency savings proposed in this scheme

[Officer comment: The Council and the applicant have been working with the GLA to resolve the abovementioned outstanding issues ahead of the Stage II Mayoral referral, through a combination of further information as well as further negotiations as part of agreeing the s106 heads of terms, the planning agreement drafting as well as the imposition of appropriately worded conditions]

Transport for London (TfL)

Dialogue with TfL has been ongoing throughout the planning application process. TfL initially objected to the planning application due to the content in the TA dated August 2014. Following further discussion and technical notes, resulting in submission of the Transport Statement Addendum dated May 2015, TfL has now confirmed that overall, subject to a reasonable package of mitigation being secured by suitable conditions and obligations, TfL supports the scale of the proposed development.

Comments from TfL include:

London Underground

- The main outstanding issues have been trip generation figures and methodology, and disagreement about how the re-provision of the police training facility affects baseline trip numbers and distribution. TfL remains unconvinced that the applicant has taken full account of the demand arising from its development on Colindale Station.
- CAAP (CAAP) 2009 which sets out clearly that improvement to the existing station needs to take place in response to the planned intensification of development in the area. This was picked up in the Mayor's stage 1 report: "this development will be required to make a significant and substantial contribution towards the delivery of additional station capacity". We are aware of, and strongly support, the joint GLA/Barnet request for £14m towards Colindale Station improvements.

[Officer comment: Officers have been fully involved in discussions regarding the trip generation figures and methodology, and debate about how the re-provision of the police training facility affects baseline trip numbers and distribution. Agreement has been reached with all parties regarding the £14m contribution towards public transport including improvements to Colindale

Station, which will alleviate the impact of the proposal on the underground and bus network.]

Cycle Parking

- The new proposals to lower the overall previously “generous” amounts of retail cycle parking need more justification/ explanation. The Transport Statement Addendum (TSA) states:

“9.5.3 There is potential for the various non-residential uses to be consolidated to provide a lower overall number of cycle parking for visitors to account for cross-visitation between retail/commercial uses”.

It is better for security to provide separate parking storage spaces for different land-use or commercial entities. In any case, the applicant should be required to adhere to London Plan standards and guidance.

[Officer comment: A total of 88 visitor cycle parking spaces for A3 retail use (3,500sqm) have been proposed. The London Plan standards state long stay at 1 space per 175sqm and short stay at 1 space per 40sqm, resulting in 108 spaces. Although the provision is 20 spaces below the standards, the 1,568 residential cycle spaces for Phase 1 are 42 spaces above the required relevant standard. Therefore, overall there is sufficient parking.]

Aerodrome Road zebra crossing

- The improvements to the Aerodrome Road/eastern site access will include a new crossing island which may be used by cyclists to connect between the Peel Centre and Beaufort Park. This is disappointing as TfL has requested the provision of a zebra crossing since the earliest pre-application discussions. This crossing should fit in with desire lines to and from bus-stops and help ‘calm’ the relatively fast traffic speeds on Aerodrome Road.

[Officer comment: The provision of a zebra crossing on Aerodrome Road, adjacent to the western entrance of Heritage Avenue, as part of the Beaufort Park development, is considered sufficient.]

- TfL welcomes the attempts to progress the masterplan, however the plans are not quite clear enough in respect of understanding the width of road from back of pavement to back of pavement which is being provided. It is necessary to have this before TfL can support the proposals particularly in respect of Colindale Avenue to understand the relative space that can be given for pedestrians, cyclists, buses/HGVs and cars. The previous masterplan illustrated a separate cycle path on the south side footway but this appears no longer to be there, whilst there is a wide central reservation with an ‘over-runnable surface with off-street access’ and new trees with an unusually high (4.75m) canopy.

[Officer comment: The proposed ‘over-runnable surface with off-street access’ central reservation of Colindale Avenue will be 3.50m wide with trees located centrally (1.75m from kerb) with a 4.5m clearance to underside of canopy in accordance with the Design Principles Document.

At the western end of the site the square adjacent to Colindale Station will have a shared pedestrian / cycle route to enable cyclists to reach cycle parking at the station.

A connecting route will also be provided along Colindale Avenue to link cyclists to the designated lightly trafficked route of Booth Road. Cyclists travelling west would travel through Colindale Square northwards along Colindale Avenue eastern shared cycle/pedestrian route then cross the central refuge to enter Booth Road.

To access Grahame Park Way and the on street cycles lanes north of Lanacre Avenue from the site, cyclists can route through between Blocks A and C and then either circulate the Colindale Avenue / Aerodrome Road Roundabout or make use of the widened refuge islands.

A 3.0m wide footpath will be provided on the southern side, regardless of whether the northern footway width is extended to 3.0m. Should the northern footway width increase, then the public realm strip between the carriageway and the footpath on the south side will reduce accordingly. The plans will be progressed further at the detail design stage.]

- The applicant has supplied a Designer's response to the Stage 1 Road Safety Audit, dated May 2015. Oddly, there is no mention at all of buses in the analysis. As with the audit's recommendation on page 9, TfL supports the removal of the trees on the central reservation to ensure inter-visibility between bus and vulnerable road users. It would like to see more information to justify why the central reservation needs to be so wide on a relatively narrow, busy road.

[Officer comment: The carriageway width of Colindale Avenue is proposed to be 3.0m in each direction with a 3.5m central reservation. The central reservation enables vehicles to overtake bus halted at the bus stop, provides a facility for right turning vehicles to wait and also is a safe central area for pedestrians to cross the road in stages.

Provision of 3.0m carriageway lanes results in drivers not attempting to overtake cyclists and is in accordance with TfL's London Cycling Design Standards 2015 which states:

"3.4.4 Avoiding pinch-points and lane widths in the range 3.2 to 4.0 metres is essential"

Furthermore , Manual for Streets 2 (2010) states that narrower lanes are easier for pedestrians to cross and can encourage lower traffic speeds without causing a significant loss of traffic capacity (p53, paragraph 8.6.2).

The Road Safety Audit was undertaken by an independent company and did not highlight any significant issues relating to bus movements. Provision of a wide central reservation and trees is linked to the provision of an improved urban environment as set out in the CAAP:

“3.4.2. Colindale Avenue is the key east/west link that crosses the Underground line, serves Colindale Underground station and links Colindale to the A5/Edgware Road. Although it is a key ‘gateway’ to the study area, its current scale and character do not reflect its importance, and this should be improved in the future. It is currently a major bus link and an important route for pedestrians and cyclists. Colindale Avenue is frequently congested on the approach to the A5.”]

- In summary, the comments TfL previously made on the inconsistencies in the diagrams and supporting information on cycle routes have not been responded to ‘outside the development’. The Peel Centre Bike Network in the TA is recommended to be revised before TfL can support the applicant’s plans for improving the attractiveness of cycling.

[Officer comment: At the western end of the site the square adjacent to Colindale Station will have a shared pedestrian / cycle route to enable cyclists to reach cycle parking at the station.

Linkage is also provided to the designated lightly trafficked route of Booth Road via a connecting route.

To the south the Peel Link will provide pedestrian and cycle access to Colindeep Lane]

- TfL previously raised a concern about the width of the Primary Routes where the lane width was to be between 3.1m and 3.5m: this design encourages unsafe driver behaviour in relation to overtaking cyclists. The applicant has attempted to respond and is “prepared to introduce [a] half metre margin [or margins – this is not clear?] on the Primary Routes where the lane width is more than 3m”. The applicant is requested to supplement and clarify this revision with a plan showing a measured cross section of a representative internal primary road (indicating typical position of a bus, vehicle, cyclist and pedestrian). The confirmation that only Primary routes are intended to take bus traffic (if introduced in the future) is welcome.

[Officer comment: The plans will be progressed further at the detail design stage. Provision of the half metre margins on the Primary Routes, where the lane width is more than 3m, will assist cyclists. As per the London Cycling Design Standards, for roads with less width, drivers are less likely to overtake cyclists.]

- Peel Link (pedestrian and cycle) it is important that inconsistencies between parameter plans identified at this stage are not perpetuated in future stages/reserved matters. Should Barnet Council intend to fix the road width measurements etc as part of approving parameter plans then naturally it is important to reach agreement at this stage.

[Officer comment: The plans have been reviewed and are acceptable. As the scheme progresses, the layout will be developed via the detail design stage.]

- TfL last wrote to the applicant's transport consultant, WSP, on 29th April 2015 on modelling. We re-stated the necessity to have a select link analysis for Booth Road and an analysis of where re-distributed vehicular trips would go. No further information has been received and the TSA does not refer to these concerns.

[Officer comment: The lack of a response regarding Booth Road has been noted. However, select link analysis has been provided for Colindale Avenue and area wide network plots indicate only small changes in flow across a wider area.]

- The most serious omission is trip distribution. TfL is concerned that it is still uncertain where traffic will be re-distributed to on the road network. The applicant's work to date simply suggests to TfL the Peel Centre development generates a sufficient amount of traffic to displace through-trips; in other words; some drivers who currently use Aerodrome Road to pass from "A to B" will choose alternative routes.

[Officer comment: The modelling of trips routing and rerouting across the wider network has been undertaken based on the traffic model produced as part of the CAAP and updated by the London Borough of Barnet. This 'CAAP Refresh' Model has been approved by TfL. Analysis indicates only small changes in flow across the wider area:

Two way net changes in flow – 2026 Full Area Action Plan development, with and without proposed development]

	AM Peak		PM Peak	
	Net change	% change	Net change	% change
A41 Watford Way	-106	-3%	63	2%
A5 (North of Colindale Avenue)	11	1%	-61	-3%
A5 (South of Colindale Avenue)	40	2%	22	1%

- Regarding MPS mode share, we explained in our 2nd March letter that the applicant did not make the requested and promised adjustment to the split of the non-car modes; in our 29th April letter we pointed out that instead the cycle mode share had been increased by 720% against an LU mode share increase of only 37%. This is clearly unrealistic and is inconsistent with the explanation of the methodology in the original TA.
- Much has been discussed about the trip generation and mode split in relation to impact of the development on Colindale Station's capacity. The TSA appears not to alter or add to this. Accordingly, and in the knowledge that s106 discussions are currently progressing, TfL does not wish to add to its previous comments, except to point out that the modal share anomaly in the previous section is further indication that the applicant is not taking full account of the amount of extra of tube traffic the development will generate

for Colindale Station.

[Officer comment: There are significant differences in the modal split figures estimated by the developer and TfL regarding sustainable travel modes. However, the matter has been settled through agreement being reached with all parties regarding the contribution to the underground and bus network to accommodate the increase in passenger numbers.]

Buses

- The applicant has reviewed as requested bus stop locations and how they might tie in better with passenger demand from this major scheme. TfL has recently placed a new stop on the Peel Centre side of Aerodrome Road which is not shown in the original un-updated TA plan (Fig 4.4, Public Transport facilities, TA) and the new plans appear not to show what is there now. It would appear that instead of the two new bus stops proposed to replace those currently near the roundabout end of Aerodrome Road (presumably because the latter are too close to the new/enlarged accesses to the Peel Centre), only one is needed. The re-located bus stop on the Peel Centre side of Colindale Avenue does not seem to be in a different place than the stop that is already there, and it is not well (or demonstrably better) located in relation to the station or safe crossing points for pedestrians.
- Therefore, whilst TfL welcomes that the applicant has after a hiatus taken up the issue of how to capitalise on new connections for new and current residents to an increased number of bus stops, we cannot approve the re-location(s) at this stage. The TSA states the final location of the stops can be determined further to consultation “as part of the final design process”, which is taken to refer to s278 works.
- It is advised that to increase understanding of this important aspect of improving the attractiveness and capacity of bus infrastructure the applicant should revisit the site (preferably on an accompanied trip with TfL and Barnet Council officers) to re-survey the bus facility locations. The objective would be to provide a single plan that shows current bus stop locations with the new locations indicated, though realistically this is unlikely to be achieved, prior to determination.

[Officer comment: The bus stop locations will be progressed further at the detail design stage in conjunction with TfL.]

- Aside from the proposed illustrative plans for improving the public realm on the highways, no specific funding mitigation for impacts on the bus, TLRN or underground is suggested in the TA, although there is limited bus infrastructure improvement in the form of bus-stops on Aerodrome Road.

[Officer comment: The applicant has agreed to contribute financially to mitigating the impacts TfL has identified through a s106 agreement as set out in Section 13.1.]

- The TSA concludes that the assessments and changes to proposed

transport infrastructure identified in the Addendum TA document will not significantly change the overall findings of the submitted TA. TfL is broadly in agreement however in terms of some modelling we are still at variance and awaiting further information. That said, we await the outcome of broader section 106 negotiations with the applicant.

[Officer comment: Agreement has been reached with all parties regarding the contributions to be made towards the necessary mitigation measures for the underground and bus network to accommodate the increase in passenger numbers due to the development.]

Natural England

June 2015 comments:

- Brent reservoir Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI): Satisfied that the proposal will not damage or destroy the interest and features of this site
- Green Infrastructure: the integrated approach across the site including SUDs will help adapt to climate change and benefit wildlife; welcome community growing in landscaped areas; roof gardens and living walls would enhance SUDs, sustainability and provide more greenery
- Local wildlife sites: The site is adjacent the Silk Street and Burnt Oak SINC. Barnet should satisfy itself that there is sufficient information to fully understand the impact of the proposals. Recommendations are:
 - Preserving a dark corridor along waterways for foraging and commuting by local bats
 - Reinforcing the woodland edge on the Peel Centre side of the railway using native species
 - Welcome site management to mitigate against increased recreational pressure as a result of increased access
 - Discharge to the stream should be monitored
- Biodiversity enhancements:
 - To compensate for the loss of habitat for bats, birds and other wildlife on site, the scheme should incorporate roosting opportunities for bat (boxes or bricks), nesting site for birds and planting for pollinators
 - Ecological management plan to be produced to cover the construction and operation phases
- Lighting: The lighting strategy should demonstrate the use of very low lighting along stream borders
- Protected Species: Standing advice applies to the scheme

Sport England

October 2015 comments:

In summary, SE objects on grounds of the significant loss of a playing field, contrary to Barnet CS policy, para 74 of the NPPF and SE Policy. Also, the application is referable to the Mayor pursuant to the Mayor of London Order 2008 as it constitutes an application of 'potential strategic importance' because it is considered to prejudice a playing field of more than 2Ha

[Officer comment: Without prejudice to the referral to the Mayor and Secretary of State, the loss of the playing field is considered justified as discussed in detail in section 3.2 and furthermore in light of the advice in this section from Green Spaces

about improvements being made in the Colindale Area, as well as the new provision being made on site to address the needs of future users as discussed in section 3.3.]

Environment Agency (EA)

May 2015 comments:

No objection to the proposed amendments and updated information

October 2014 comments:

- Statutory nature conservation sites (i.e. In close proximity to the Brent Reservoir of Special Scientific Interest) – no objection
- Protected species – refer to standing advice
- Local sites (i.e. Adjacent to the Silk Street and Burnt Oak SINC) – If adjacent to a locally significant site, Barnet should ensure there is sufficient information to understand the potential impact
- Biodiversity enhancements – incorporate features such as bat roosts and bird boxes and secure these as part of any planning permission
- Landscape enhancements – opportunity to enhance character and local distinctiveness, use natural resources more sustainability and bring benefits to the local community such as green space provision as well as access to and contact with nature

Highways Agency

No objection

Network Rail (NR)

February 2015 comments:

No objection to the scheme following further discussions. NR would like to be kept informed of the final geological assessment and detailed design proposals.

October 2014 comments:

- As the site is located adjacent NR land and operational infrastructure, it is recommended that the developer contact the Asset Protection LNE team prior to works commencing.
- Concern about the loss of roadway at the top of the cutting and proximity of new buildings which are likely to require significant foundation works
- Developer to ensure that the construction and operation development does not variously impact on NR land and operational infrastructure
- Conditions and informatives recommended in respect of the following: Construction; scaffolding, piling, earthworks, demolition, drainage, noise and vibration, lighting, roads and parking, landscaping including species permitted and not permitted

[Officer comment; Conditions and informatives are recommended to address the above comments if the council is minded to approve the application.]

Historic England (Formerly known as English Heritage) Listed Buildings

The application should be determined on the basis of Barnet advice and it is not necessary to consult Historic England

Historic England (formerly known as English Heritage) Greater London Archaeology Advisory Service (GLAAS)

The application is not in an Archaeological Priority Area and is unlikely to have a significant effect on assets of archaeological interest

Thames Water (TW)

June 2015 comments specifically regarding the Peel Link:

TW have assets in this location and although there are no formal applications or requirements, they will need to be involved and review the detailed design and construction proposal in relation to how it may affect their assets

October 2014 general comments:

- Waste comments – There is insufficient capacity in the existing infrastructure to accommodate the proposal. Therefore, a grampion condition requiring a drainage strategy to be agreed in consultation with TW
- Surface water drainage:
 - It is the developers responsibility to make adequate provision for drainage
 - Regarding surface water, storm water flows should be attenuated
 - Prior approval form TW is needed for discharge to public sewer and connections are not permitted for removal of groundwater
 - Piling – method statement to be agreed on consultation with TW
 - Public sewer access – prior approval form TW should be sought if any building or underpinning within 3metres of a public sewer, noting that this applications would normally not be agreed
- Water comments – this area is covered by Affinity Water

[Officer comment; Conditions and informatives are recommended to address the above comments if the council is minded to approve the application.]

Affinity Water

September 2014 comments:

The site is close to or within the Environment Agency defined groundwater Source protection Zone for the Heathbourne Rd Pumping Station which is a public water supply operated by Affinity Water. The construction and operation of the development should be in accordance with British Standards and Best Management Practice [Unspecified] to thereby reduce the risk of groundwater pollution. If pollution is found then monitoring and remediation will need to be undertaken.

Metropolitan Police Crime Prevention Design Advisor

October 2014 and June 2015 advice:

Remain concerned with the excessive permeability in the layout of this estate.

[Officer comment: The Metropolitan Police Crime Prevention Design advisor was first consulted on a pre-application basis, not to mention their involvement and support for the Colindale CAAP. It should be noted included references to the Peel centre and indicative masterplan layout not dissimilar to the subject application. The applicant has committed to achieving Secure by Design Level 2 Accreditation in the course of negotiations with Metropolitan Police.

The applicant responded in detail to the objection on grounds of excessive permeability with the following justification:

- There are several key factors when considering the movement framework that underpins the masterplan:
 - This is a very large site, extending approx. 20 hectares and a distance of approx. 1km from end to end (eastwest). At this scale it is vital that a number of good quality and appropriately located access points are provided for entry to the site via a range of modes (vehicles, pedestrians and cyclists). It is also vital that these routes provide direct connections to and through the large site area so that both future and existing residents can access the various services and amenities surrounding the site, as well as those created by the development (local parks, shops, the neighbourhood centre, the new park and the school).
 - It is important to recognise that this is not a single isolated 'estate' type development. The development has been designed to create a new piece of Colindale that is integrated with the existing surrounding communities, rather than creating a gated community. In order to achieve this, new public connections must be created to locations beyond the site boundary.
 - This site is currently surrounded by a secure fence and forms a significant barrier to movement between the communities to the north and south. A key objective for the masterplan layout has therefore been to increase accessibility and connect the surrounding neighbourhoods in a positive manner. The development must achieve this objective to accord with planning policies (against which it will be assessed during determination), to ensure good urban design practice, and to meet what is a core strategic objective for Barnet and the GLA.
- Creating places that are accessible, where people can move through easily, and that include all people, are key planning policy requirements that the development must meet and against which the proposals will be assessed by the planning authorities i.e. The NPPF, Barnet Core Strategy Policy CS5, Development Management Policy DM03 and CAAP Policy 3.1
- In addition, the scheme is underpinned by well-established principles of good quality urban design including 'By Design', produced by the national body CABI (the Commission for Architecture and the Built Environment) as referred to in the Barnet Core Strategy. By Design identifies that:
 - Successful development depends on good access and connections.
 - A coherent urban structure should achieve connection and overlap with the surrounding areas.
 - Successful movement frameworks (that plug into wider movement networks) should provide the maximum choice for how people will make their journeys and the maximum number of direct connections to main streets carrying through traffic.
 - Direct, attractive connections between key facilities, avoiding dead ends, help to create more convenient and comfortable places.

- *Notwithstanding, that that applicant has borne in mind Secure by Design principles in developing the masterplan since the pre-application stage*
- *In respect of the masterplan principles, and the issue of minimising the number of access points, it is considered that that the layout has achieved this by limiting access points to where they are necessary to enable vehicles and people to move into and through the site to complete their desired journeys in a safe and enjoyable manner. As required by policy and good practice, the layout provides essential access points that connect the site with the existing surrounding neighbourhoods; however the number of points (six main points to locations beyond the site) is very much proportionate to the scale of this site. In this way, the number of ofescape routes for criminals has been limited*
- *It could be argued that the site should be more permeable; however the substantial retained Police land fronting Aerodrome Road presents an impermeable barrier to movement onto Aerodrome Road, preventing further access points and limiting the number of opportunities for linkage with Beaufort Park to the north.*
- *It is important also to note that, as a large site/development the proposed masterplan creates a series of new neighbourhoods served by new public roads and streets. The proposed development should not therefore be viewed as a single isolated private 'estate' as suggested.*
- *Promoting access through the site for pedestrians and cyclists provides a much improved environment for accessing these local facilities and the station. It is a much better environment than Aerodrome Road, which accommodates substantially more vehicle movements than would be present within the site. The connections through the site will therefore encourage greater use of non-car modes of travel which is fully in accordance with the national, regional and local policy objectives.*
- *A further with restricting access by the wider community is the impact that this would have on the quality and security of streets and spaces throughout the development. Restricting access would reduce the amount of pedestrian activity within the streets and spaces, reducing 'eyes on the street' and the natural surveillance required to create safe places. Creating walkable and connected neighbourhoods helps to link people directly to their destinations, encouraging people to walk and cycle, and creating activity on the streets so that they are safe, secure and welcoming. Conversely, creating impermeable environments that people are unable to move through results in dead spaces without natural surveillance (or 'eyes on the street') and creating opportunities for crime. The masterplan layout has been designed with this in mind – to maximise accessibility, encourage pedestrian movement, avoid dead ends and integrate with the surrounding neighbourhoods, and we strongly believe that it is a high quality design proposal.*
- *Moving away from the external access points, to concerns with the number of access routes around the individual blocks. Looking more closely at the individual neighbourhoods created by the masterplan, we would emphasise*

that the number of access routes to each block or area is limited. The blocks are relatively large and form traditional streets, with front doors onto those streets and a single access point to each communal block. There are no gaps in the block frontages, which are complete at ground floor level providing a good degree of enclosure to the streets and spaces. In addition there is a consistent approach to clearly defined defensible space along residential blocks, regulating pedestrian movement away from the building facades into well overlooked routes.

- *The layout provides a clear hierarchy of routes, where people moving through the site to the school, neighbourhood and station will use the main spine road or the alternative direct route to the south via the new park. The smaller streets that come off the main spine road will be used predominantly by people access their streets or blocks. Restricting access through these secondary streets would prevent effective vehicle circulation and access to the blocks, creating dead ends and limiting the amount of activity. This would be of particular concern to us in areas such as the southern boundary route where maximising public activity is central to the success of the Peel Link underpass connection and the community gardens concept, with the proposed design being the conclusion of detailed discussions with Barnet Council and the GLA. Restricting access through the streets goes against planning policy and good practice requiring the layout to maximise accessibility and create safe and secure environments through activity.*
- *In seeking to provide further comfort that the design has had regard to Secured by Design principles, the following are examples of the principles adopted:*
 - *Vehicle and pedestrian routes have been designed to ensure they are visually open, direct and well used.*
 - *A high level of street activity has been encouraged across the site.*
 - *All street lighting for highways and footpaths, private estate roads and car parks will comply with BS 5489-1:2003.*
 - *Where isolated footpaths have been provide they will meet the minimum 3m width specified by SBD New Homes (2014).*
 - *Where necessary ground cover planting will be clipped to a maximum height of 1m, while all tree canopy's (new and existing) will be kept to 2m+ to maximise natural surveillance.*
 - *Privacy strip planting provides clear demarcation between property and communal boundaries.*
 - *A primary feature of the design intent is to maintain access to communal areas at all times in order to reduce feeling of exclusivity and segregation and as a result encourage strong social cohesion.*

In addition, the masterplan approach as well as the detailed design, which reflects CAAP principles is not dissimilar to other schemes in Colindale including the Beaufort Park site to the north. The site is currently operating in a manner similar to what is envisaged on Peel, with a management company overseeing the operation of a site with a network of publicly accessible streets and spaces designed to be permeable and reconnect the site with its surroundings, with active ground floor uses as well as residential frontages defined and protected by defensible space for example.

In conversations with Metropolitan Police regarding their more recent of objection to excessive permeability, the officer has advised that the objection is not based on an awareness of other sites in Colindale such as Beaufort Park nor any reported or anecdotal incidence of crime and how this as well as policing of crime is affected by what they consider to be excessive permeability. Instead, the Metropolitan Police objection is based on generalised, historical references to 1960s estates rather than to the current schemes which, amongst other things, are fundamentally different in terms of their landuse and design approach including layout, connectivity and ground floor treatment as well as the founding masterplan principles underpinning the design.]

September 2014 advice:

Notes that there was no intention to apply for Safer by Design accreditation for the scheme. In addition the following specific design comments were provided:

- Notes in discussions with the agent that there will be a management structure for this estate with concierges employed.
- CCTV will be registered and comply with the information commissioners guidelines although the numbers of staff, cameras, or operators at this time are not known.
- Notes that There will be a 3m high brick wall perimeter to the Met Police Buildings. There will also be 10m garden separation leading to the perimeter wall.
- Any recess will be to a maximum of 600mm from the building line.
- Play parks should have substantial railings to around 1.8m high which can be controlled and opened at dawn and locked closed at dusk.
- Lighting will be to British Standard 5489, work with the CCTV system and with the landscape design. This will provide facial images of people in this estate.
- All communal and all residential doors will be to BS PAS 24-2012, or other acceptable enhanced security standard. For over 10 units secondary access control communal doors are required to compartmentalise residential entrances. Doors from the garages will also be to an enhanced standard. If there is a fire exit from the garage then the stair will need to lead directly to outside the building and not allow entry to the rest of the building.
- All opening and accessible windows will be to BS PAS 24-2-12 with p1a rated laminated glass.
- Residential access control will be audio and video. Over 10 units must be able to capture images of people in camera and record. Control can be gained with cctv and fire doors per BS PAS 24-2012 on the stairway.
- Stud partition walls will be enhanced with 9mm plywood or metal mesh. This will be from common parts into the residence. Particular attention is required around entrance doors.
- For Bins and bike stores, if they allow access further into the building, an enhanced door (BS PAS 24-2012 or LPS 1175 sr 2 or other acceptable standard) will be required to be fitted to prevent unauthorised access into the building. If no access can be gained then a suitable fit for purpose self-closing and locking door will be fitted. Suggestion that the number of bike stores should be reduced in number to around 10. This can be achieved by

- splitting rooms, caging, or mesh screen.
- Postal delivery should be either through the wall to secured individual letter box, or internal foyer post boxes with ground floor controlled by fob access. Movement around the building should be controlled with BS PAS 24-2012 doors.
 - Landscaping - ground foliage should be beneath 1m high and tree canopies above 2m high.
 - Car parking access to be controlled by roller shutter (or other full height and width feature) to LPS 1175 sr1.
 - Utility meters to be located in a central location or outside of the building.
 - Any security gates to be 2.4m high, self-closing and self-locking and should be designed so it is not easy to climb, with an anti-climb topping.

[Officer comment: Comments noted for the applicant for addressing relevant British Standards as well as seeking separate Secured by Design accreditation for the scheme. The applicant has agreed with Metropolitan Police to commit to achieving Secure by Design Level 2 Accreditation]

Metropolitan Police (MOPAC)

June 2015 comments:

MOPAC confirm that the sports fields on the Peel Centre were used by police officers and personal and only otherwise used occasionally as part of a police sponsored or organised event such as children's five-a-side football tournaments. The land was never open to the public at large and the above mentioned activities ceased several years ago on security grounds. It was further noted that the land disposal to Redrow and the redevelopment of the retained MPS site means the fields are no longer available for use by MPS.

In respect of re-provision, reflecting structural changes in the police service, sports facility provision for the Met has been re-provided London-wide. It is important to appreciate that at one time new recruits spent 18 - 20 weeks at the Peel centre for their initial training and the land was made available for them to use recreationally. Training now differs and recruits are allocated to their posts sooner with more on the job training locally.

The Met has four sports club facilities at Imber Court, Thames Ditton, Chigwell, Hayes Warren in Bromley and at Bushey, Herts offering a range of facilities for playing sport. The four sports clubs are strategically located and provide access for recreational use for all Police Officers and staff who choose to use them. The Met do not consider there is any shortage of facilities for their needs.

In addition in terms of facilities still in the Colindale area, MPS note that Copthall sports facility is only 1 mile away.

London Fire Brigade (LFB)

October 2015 comments:

Stage 1 [detailed component submitted for full planning permission] appears satisfactory for fire brigade access [for planning purposes], it being noted that consideration of fire hydrant details in particular would be picked up separately at Building Regulations approval stage.

LB Brent

June 2015 comments: The council objects to the proposal for the following reasons:

- Impact of the proposed neighbourhood centre on Colindale and Burnt Oak District Centres:
 - A condition is needed to ensure no more than 5k sqm is in A1 use *[Officer comment: This is limited through the Development Schedule primary control document and therefore, further control through condition is not necessary]*
 - A 3k sqm is non consistent with the CAAP which refers to a foodstore being 2.5k sqm, noting their previous objections to this as part of the original consultation *[Officer comment: The floor area is justified on the basis of the increased dwellings proposed as well as the predicted population and expenditure increases, see detailed discussion in section 3.2 of this report]*
 - Retail impacts assessment fails to recognise the positions and roles of the Burnt Oak and Colindale in the town centre hierarchy and fails to take into account the state of the centre including vacancy levels and health of the centres with the opinion that even very modest trade diversion having a significant adverse impact.
- Infrastructure: Previous objections apply, the scheme must meet its full open space requirements in Policy 5.5 of the CAAP
- Traffic Impact an Brent highway network:
 - Residential car parking has been reduced and remains within Brent's maximum parking allowances *[Officer comment: Noted]*
 - Retail parking has increased to 150 spaces and 70 spaces for the school and there is no concern raised in this regard *[Officer comment: Noted]*
 - Flexible management of parking as supplemented by a travel plan and car club will minimise the risk of overspill parking and given the distance away, there is no concern regarding overspill onto roads within Brent *[Officer comment: Noted]*
 - Residential bicycle parking provision in detailed and outline phases is sufficient *[Officer comment: Noted]*
 - Previous concerns about trip generation calculations for the retained Met Police Training Centre have been addressed in further sensitivity testing and assurances about the parking regime. There are no significant traffic impacts to roads within Brent *[Officer comment: Noted]*
 - Nonetheless, a significant contribution should be made to transport infrastructure, particularly towards public transport where significant increased in movements are predicted. Contributions towards Colindale tube station will need to be agreed with TfL and secured though either s106 or CIL, with a sum of £3.5m considered appropriate. Subject to a significant financial contribution being secured there would be no objection on transport grounds *[Officer comment: Highway and public realm improvements are proposed to Colindale Avenue and the creation of the Peel Link will provide improved connection across the area for pedestrians and cyclists.*

Significant financial contributions are also being secured for public transport improvements to the area.]

- Framework travel plan targets have been updated and are acceptable
[Officer comment: Noted]

October 2014 comments: Brent council objects to the proposal for the following reasons:

- Impact of the proposed neighbourhood centre on Colindale and Burnt Oak District Centres: Sequential test and impact assessment are necessary; the 3k foodstore is excessive for meeting the local population's everyday needs
- The development needs to meet its own social infrastructure needs
- The scheme falls below the CAAP requirement of providing a 5Ha park and noting level of open space deficiency in the area

- Transport impacts:-

- A significant level of trip generation from the new development has been offset by a predicted reduction in future trips to the Metropolitan Police Service Training Facility due to a reduction in staff parking and an associated modal shift from car use to public transport use. Even with extended Controlled Parking Zone controls and a travel plan, this reduction should be treated with extreme caution *[Officer comment: The reduction in parking provision at the Metropolitan Police Service Training Facility, associated with a Travel Plan and extension to the existing Controlled Parking Zone will restrict car journeys.*

The modal split assumptions within the TA have been reviewed by the London Borough of Barnet / TfL and further work provided from the developer's transport planning consultant to ensure the figures provided are robust.

The reduction in parking at the Metropolitan Police Service Training Facility and associated modal split is part of previously approved planning permission for this site.

Confirmation from the Metropolitan Police has been received regarding occupancy at the time of the surveys. Controlled Parking Zones in the Colindale area have been reviewed and Redrow have agreed that they will fund the cost of the implementation of Controlled Parking Zones in the Peel Centre area.

The agreed Travel Plan has three types of measures:

- 'Hard' engineering measures incorporated into the design of the development e.g. cycle parking, shared parking etc;
- 'Key services and facilities' secured through the Section 106 agreement; and
- 'Soft' marketing and management measures which will be implemented as part of the development proposals to ensure that sustainable travel behaviour is maximised.

The targets and associated monitoring having been set.]

- No junction analysis on the A5 corridor has been undertaken as the strategic modelling undertaken indicates a reduction in trips on the A5 Edgware Road Corridor with the development compared to full occupancy of the Metropolitan Police Service Training Facility due to

the modal shift *[Officer comment: With the restriction to parking at the Metropolitan Police Service Training Facility as part of their existing planning permission for the site, the resulting net change in traffic movements plus the expected modal shift does cause a reduction in trips on the A5 compared to the proposed development. Following submission of the TA, further traffic modelling work has been provided indicating that changes in flow across the wider network, due to existing movements being displaced by the proposed development, is minimal.]*

- Due to concerns regarding the modal shift, significant financial contributions should be made to transport infrastructure, particularly widening the Colindale Avenue / Edgware Road junction *[Officer comment: The request for financial contributions is noted. However, based on the TA and subsequent requested analysis, the impact on the Colindale Avenue / Edgware Road junction is minimal. This junction is already planned to be improved with contributions secured from other developments.]*
- The significant increase in public transport demand should result in associated financial contributions to improve services and station capacity, to be secured through a S106 Agreement or CIL funding. A minimum £3.5m contribution is required for highway and public transport improvements *[Officer comment: Highway and public realm improvements are proposed to Colindale Avenue and the creation of the Peel Link will provide improved connection across the area for pedestrians and cyclists. Significant financial contributions are also being secured for public transport improvements to the area.]*

In addition, the following consultees were notified of the application but did not respond: RAF Museum, Barnet and Southgate College, Colindale Primary School, St James Catholic High School, Blessed Dominic RC Primary School, The Orion Primary School, Middlesex University, Colindale School, Barnet Wildlife Trust, Access in Barnet, National Health Service (NHS) London, Primary Care Commissioning NCEL, Barnet Clinical Commissioning Group, NHS Blood and Transplant Centre, Metropolitan Police Estates Group, EDF, UK Power Networks, London Underground, National Grid (NG), Transco, London Wildlife Trust, Royal Society for the Protection of Birds(RSPB) London Office, Department of Communities and Local Government

Internal Consultation responses

Transport and Regeneration

The comprehensive redevelopment of the former Peel Centre site integrates the development with the surrounding residential streets and facilitates improved pedestrian and cycle connections throughout the local area.

The proposed new access arrangements and highways impact have been subject to review and assessment by officers who raise no objections to the development. The resultant vehicle trips will be satisfactorily accommodated within the existing

transport network providing the proposed package of transport works is implemented. 2,053 car parking spaces (0.7 spaces per unit) will be provided for the development in accordance with the Colindale Area Action Plan (CAAP)'s parking standards. These will largely be accommodated 'on plot' within undercroft or basement car park, with some on-street. Total numbers of cycle and disabled parking will be provided in accordance with the London Plan standards.

The Transport Assessment (TA) demonstrates that careful and extensive work has been undertaken to examine the existing situation and to use suitable data to build acceptable models of the area. All assessment work is in accordance with national guidance and best practice on schemes of this nature and size, taking into account the CAAP that was formally adopted by the London Borough of Barnet Council on 2nd March 2010.

The detailed assessment of a full range of impacts is covered in section 3.6.

It is clear that the development will result in some impacts on the surrounding highway and public transport networks if the proposed highway measures and other elements of the proposed transport package are not implemented, but that if the package is delivered the development will be fully mitigated against.

The TA demonstrates that careful and extensive work has been undertaken to examine the existing situation and to use suitable data to build acceptable traffic models of the area. Although there has been disagreement regarding the methodology of the modal split calculations for London underground, bus and walk, the necessary contributions to London underground and bus has been accepted by all parties.

Officers consider that the impacts of the development on the transport network have been robustly assessed, and that all appropriate mitigation measures and control mechanisms are provided for, should permission be granted. The planning conditions and obligations recommended in this report are considered to provide an effective framework of control and officers therefore recommend the scheme for approval on matters relating to highways and transport.

Environmental Health

Recommending appropriately worded conditions of approval for air quality, contaminated land remediation, construction method statement, noise report and impact mitigation, extraction and ventilation equipment, plant noise restriction, gym noise mitigation, acoustic fencing, school noise mitigation as well as informatives regarding flues and acoustic consultant

Refuse and Recycling

Recommend a waste management plan condition to ensure an acceptable detailed design from an operations perspective including bin store design, their size and access details, dropped curbs as well as details of how the bulking station would work for example.

Green Spaces

Advice is offered further in relation the Sport England objection. Also, noting the comments in the planning inspectors report leading to the adoption of the CAAP as well as further Playing Pitch Assessment in 2009 and Colindale Open Space Assessment in 2013, advice about ongoing improvements to facilities in area which seek to address needs and off-set the perceived impact of the loss the Peel Centre sports pitches.

Key improvements to sport and recreation facilities to be aware of in the area are:

- Montrose PF: Although proposals for are still in the development stage, the aim to maintain the current level of football whilst investing in the drainage of the pitches to raise their standard
- Copthall PF: based on the finding of the borough Playing Pitch Assessment 2003. The borough has just completed £500k investment. The borough has followed the FA Football Development Programme Football Development Toolkit as part of the proposals. The improvements see an increase in the number of pitches from 15 to 25 and within that, providing a greater variety of pitches sizes to address grass roots football need. Improved drainage also means that pitches can be used 2-3 times per week compared to once a week prior to the improvements for example
- Other facilities:
 - Power League Facility (Adjacent Copthall PF) – multiple 3G pitches and floodlighting
 - Chase Farm (Adjacent Copthall PF) – multiple grass pitches of varying sizes
 - Compton Academy – recently upgraded to 3G pitch and with the ability to subdivide the space into varying formats for multiple play

Housing Strategy

- Request the mix be altered, omitting entirely any affordable studio units and for all 3 beds to be affordable rent tenure, not s/o
- Seeking further details regarding details of service charging, estate management and concierge facilities and how these relate to the affordable units
- Concerned that there have been no discussions with RPs and that their requirements have not been factored into the design which may lead to problems down the track
- Concerned about assumptions within the applicant's viability appraisal and if they are reasonable, the level of uplift to contribute towards additional affordable housing, it being noted that housing on site is being sought rather than a payment in lieu for off-site affordable housing provision
- Affordable wheelchair housing provision needs to be made
- Concerned about floorplan layouts i.e. open plan kitchens in affordable rent units

[Officer comment: In response to these comments, the applicant has indicated that:

Unit mix

- *There is no objection in principle to the 3 beds within the affordable blocks all being affordable rent*
- *London Plan policy requires development to create mixed and*

balanced communities with a broad range of housing types, sizes and tenures which the applicant believes is achieved by the housing mix proposed. The smaller studio, one and two bed units play an important role in meeting local housing need across the income brackets. In this context, the mix of units in Block H provides a good balance in accordance with planning policy, noting that there are only 2 studios in this block (2.5% of total units). The applicant does not agree an amendment to the mix in this block.

- *However, there is no objection in principle to excluding studios from affordable blocks within the outline stages, provided they are replaced with 1-beds.*

Charging details

- *The affordable housing blocks will be managed by the relevant RP's. There will be some estate management charge apportioned to the affordable blocks, however this is yet to be determined. A planning condition is suggested, requiring the submission and approval of an Estate Management Plan which will deal with estate management matters (including estate management charges). Service charges and service provision to the affordable units will be set at an appropriate rate, which will be subject to future discussion with the selected RP.*

RP discussions and their requirements

- *The applicant suggests that the proposed layouts have been designed to reflect the requirements of the RP market. They are confident that the proposals for Block H (which are in full detail) meet the requirements of RPs. The future design of blocks within the outline stages will be designed in consultation with the selected RP, to be chosen in consultation with LBB.*

Viability assumptions and affordable housing provision

- *The applicant notes that viability has been independently scrutinised by the council's viability consultant and notes that any additional affordable housing provision is subject to viability negotiations*

Affordable wheelchair unit provision

- *The affordable wheelchair provision is detailed for Block H (which is submitted for approval in full detail). There are 17 wheelchair accessible units within Block H (13% of the total units in the block). An access consultant confirm that they are policy compliant as they meet the requirements of the relevant policy guidance in the London Plan Housing SPG (refer to the Access Statement, DAS Volume II)*

Floorplan layouts

- *All of our units have been designed to accord with the London Plan Housing SPG which is the relevant policy guidance to determine the acceptability of internal layouts. It is on this basis that the proposed configuration of all units is acceptable in policy terms.]*

Education and Children's Services

Seeking contributions towards delivery of the primary school and nursery on site.

Skills and Enterprise

Seeking a s106 planning contribution in accordance with the Council's SPD

- An Employment and Training Strategy and Action Plan

- Quantitative targets for specific initiatives as follows:

Output summary	Min no.	Max no.
<i>Jobs</i>		
1. Progression into employment [<6mths]	53	86
2. Progression into employment [>6mths]	35	56
<i>Apprenticeships/Work experience</i>		
3. Apprenticeships	90	146
4. Work exp (+16yrs)	117	189
5. School/college/uni site visits	1064	1717
6. School/college workshops	585	945

- A financial contribution towards the Council's Skills and Employment Support Programme which provides support projects that align with the developers own activities to ensure that local residents and businesses can access the opportunities, thereby ensuring the E&T outcomes in the s106 are met – contribution of £300k for programme support to assist local residents accessing the initiatives of the LEA is requested
- Monitoring fee (5% of E&T cost) as well as option for the council to prepare the E&T Plan

[Officer comment: A local employment agreement is being secured as part of the s106 planning obligations.]

In addition, the following consultees were notified of the application but did not respond: Trees and Landscaping, Planning Policy.

2. DESCRIPTION OF THE SITE, SURROUNDINGS AND PROPOSAL

2.1 Site Description and Surroundings

The application site is 20.35ha and is relatively flat with extensive areas levelled for various site activities. It is bound by Midland Mainline track and the M1 motorway to the east, Colindale Avenue to the west, Aerodrome Road and retained MPS facility to the north and London Underground Northern Line track to the south. The majority of the site is occupied by Metropolitan Police Service (MPS) which falls under the responsibility of the Mayor's Office for Policing and Crime (MOPAC). According to the planning statement the lawful use is Class C2A 'Secure Residential Institution'.

The MPS facility opened in 1934 although most of the current building stock is from the 1970s. Buildings comprise of office accommodation, dwellings, driver training areas, sport and athletic facilities including running track and grass playing fields, as well as car parking and landscaping. Building heights range from 1 to 22 storeys (including plant) with the tallest elements being located at the south-eastern end of the site. It is a secure site not accessible to the general public with its main site access onto along Aerodrome Road.

In addition, the application site includes 12 no. 2-storey houses on Colindale

Avenue, vacant land between the Northern Line and Colindeep Lane and adjacent highway land.

It is noted that two areas of the Peel site are not included within the application site red-line boundary, and these are the retained MPS facility fronting Aerodrome Road as well as former section houses on Rowan Drive which adjoin the site to the east between the site and the Midland Mainline railway tracks.

The surrounding development is largely residential interspersed with other uses. The building stock is of various ages, from low scale 1930s housing stock through to modern high density flat developments. The Colindale area is undergoing significant change as guided by the London Plan and Local Development Framework and there are a number of developments completed, occupied, in the process of construction or approved. To the north of the site is the Beaufort Park development by St George which is a modern flatted development of over 3,000 homes in buildings up to 18 storeys. Middlesex University Student accommodation at Platt Halls is also located to the north of the site at its western end. Beyond these are the RAF Museum and the Grahame Park Estate which is currently undergoing redevelopment in the area north of Grahame Park Way. To the south, beyond the Northern Line are Colindale Park, Silk Stream, Rushgrove Park, and low scale 1930s suburban residential streets. To the east between the Midland Mainline Tracks and the M1 motorway are light industrial units. To the east of the M1 are more 1930s suburban residential streets and the A41. To the west on the opposite side of Colindale Avenue are two storey houses, is Colindale Tube Station and an area of further redevelopment comprising the Fairview homes residential redevelopment of the former Colindale Hospital Site (buildings between 3 and 10 storeys) which is nearing completion, the aparthotel and student accommodation development (between 7 and 18 storeys) and the recently approved redevelopment of the former British Newspaper Library site (buildings between 4 and 11 storeys). Montrose Playing Fields are located beyond to the north-west.

2.2 Approved retained MPS Peel Centre operations

The MPS has been through a process of rationalising its estate requirements and consolidating its activities into new accommodation, allowing the surplus land to be released for redevelopment which is the subject of this application. As noted by MOPAC, structural changes in the force means that the facilities in Colindale are no longer used in the way they were originally intended and the buildings themselves are now outmoded and inefficient for current requirements.

As part of the consolidated estate at Peel Centre, the MPS are retaining a number of existing buildings along the Aerodrome Road as well as constructing a new facility on part of the retained land. The retained MPS facility covers an area of 2.28Ha and the recent approval (ref: H/01571/13) for the new facility comprised the following development:

- Demolition of existing buildings (Except Building 36) and the provision of new training and operational facilities (Use Class Sui Generis) comprising of:
- The erection of a new 4 storey building (Building A)
- The erection of a new part 2 and 3 storey building (Building B)

- Provision of 71 car parking spaces
- Replacement parade ground
- Landscaping including a new memorial garden
- Relocation of the Grade II Listed Sir Robert Peel Statue and Police Call Box Structures but still within the site (Related Listed Building consent app ref: H/01613/13)

Construction has commenced on site and is well advanced.

2.3 Description of the Proposed Development

Overview

The application by Bilfinger GVA ('Agent') on behalf of Redrow Homes Limited ('Applicant') is submitted in hybrid form for demolition of existing buildings and redevelopment in phases for residential-led, mixed-use redevelopment comprising the following:

- 2,900 residential units (Class C3) of which 888 comprise the full component and up to 2,012 units in outline, in buildings between 2 to 21 storeys
- 10,000sqm of non-residential floorspace (Class A1, A2, A3, A4, D1 and D2)
- 3-form entry primary school and nursery
- Minimum 4Ha public open space
- Associated preparation and enabling works
- Transport infrastructure including a new pedestrian connection to Colindeep Lane and junction works and car parking
- Landscaping

Key aspects of the proposal are discussed in more detail below.

Hybrid: Full (detailed) component

The full component of the proposal is for development stage 1 which comprises blocks H, J, K, L, M, N, P, Q, R, S T and U. Stage 1 has a total of 888 dwellings and 179sqm of non-residential floorspaces (Class A1, A2, A3, A4 and D2). Also included in stage 1 is the provision of a 2.3Ha neighbourhood park as well as the site preparation/enabling works, landscaping, car parking and infrastructure works including the site access points onto Aerodrome Road. Full plans, elevations, sections and supporting details are provided for these blocks and related curtilage areas including amenity space.

Hybrid: outline component

The outline component seeks approval for 'access' whilst 'appearance', 'landscaping', 'layout' and 'scale' are reserved for approval at a later stage under Reserved Matters applications.

The Outline component comprises the following stages:

- The remainder of Stage 1: School block – 3 form entry primary school and nursery

- Indicative Stage 2: Blocks A, B, C, D, E, F and G comprising up to 1,160 dwellings and up to 10,000sqm on non-residential floorspace (Class A1, A2, A3, A4, D1 and D2) including a food store of up to 3,000sqm GIA
- Indicative Stage 3: Blocks V, W, X, Y and Z comprising up to 852 dwellings
- Associated demolition and site preparation/enabling works and provision of landscaping, car parking an infrastructure

In addition to full details being supplied for 'access', illustrative information is provided for the reserved matters components.

Key documents submitted with the application are discussed in more detail below.

Supporting documentation

The various application supporting documentation (See Appendix 4) either relate to the development or are specific to the full and outline components mentioned above.

The primary control documents are as follows:

- Entire application:
 - Site plan outlined in red
- Detailed component:
 - Plans, section, elevations as well as hard and soft landscaping
 - Detailed component of the Revised Development Schedule (Doc PC5)
- Outline component:
 - Parameter plans (Doc PC6) defining:
 - Development zones (where future blocks will be located),
 - Access and circulation (where the routes through the site),
 - Landscaping treatment (specifying areas of public spaces including hard landscaped squares as well as public parks and gardens),
 - Frontages (specifying the principle landuse characteristic for any given block at its ground floor, the predominant being residential dwelling frontages as well as town centre uses (Mostly Class A uses) or a mixture
 - Development zone horizontal limits of deviation (specifying the extent to which the building edge can project inwards or outwards in the defined development zone to facilitate building design variation for any individual block)
 - Proposed site levels and vertical limits of deviation (specifying variance of site levels around the site as well as references to heights beyond the red line boundary to contextualise this)
 - Development Zone and Maximum Heights (specifying a building envelop for each block in each development zone. It should be noted that the height control is specified in metres which is based on assumptions about illustrative floor to ceiling heights. A storey heights plan has been prepared for illustrative purposes. This and the floor to ceiling height assumption is included in appendix 5 of this report for information purposes

- for interpreting the maximum heights parameter plan)
 - Basement levels and limits of deviation (Specifying the location of basement car parking as well as extent to which the basement edge will extend outwards or inwards to facilitate building design variation)
 - Outline component of the Revised Development Schedule (Doc PC5)
 - The Design Principles Document (Doc PC7) which provides a set of design principles for the detailed design development for blocks being submitted for reserved matter approval in the future. There are mandatory and non-mandatory principles to follow as well as general informative text. The document is set out as follows:
 - Section 1 introduction explains how to use the document should be used in conjunction with other documents submitted as well as a step-by-step worked example of applying them to the preparation of a detailed design for a future block
 - Section 2 describes the masterplanning principles guiding the development intent across the entire site including areas of public realm, distribution of land uses, street hierarchy, density and character areas
 - The remaining sections 3 to 6 detail the principles for streets and routes, the design of public spaces, general design principles (e.g. form and massing breakup, composition of ground floor frontages, amenity protection and quality, architectural details and materials selection, parking and sustainability) as well as detailed design guidance for individual buildings including tall building elements (Blocks B and V)

In addition to the above, there are a range of other supporting documents (referred to in the application as secondary control documents) reflecting the supporting information requirements for a planning application of this size and complexity according to the national and local requirements. Key documents to note in particular are as follows:

- Revised Illustrative Mattersplan (Doc PC11): Provides an indicative of what the site *could* look like when it is constructed, based on the application of the abovementioned control documents
- Planning Statement and separate Statement of Conformity (Doc PC12): Describes the proposed development and how key planning policy themes are addressed by the proposal
- Design and Access Statement Vols I, II, III and Addendum (Doc PC13): Explains the design development of the proposal, describes the key scheme characteristics and issues addressed in the design. Additional detail is provided in relation to blocks submitted as part of the full component. Volume II detailed drawings and Volume III a BRE daylight, sunlight and overshadowing assessment for the future occupiers (NB: the BRE assessment of the impact to neighbours is separately addressed in a chapter of the ES)
- Environmental Statement comprising Non-technical summary, Vols I, II and

III, separate Wind and Microclimate appendix to Chapter 15 and separate Statement of Conformity (Doc PC14 & 15): Prepared in accordance with EIA legislation reflecting the Scoping Opinion issued by Barnet having regard to the significance of a full range of environmental effects, including cumulative effect having regard to the baseline including other existing and committed development in the area. Mitigation measures are recommended, which are summarised in a separate mitigation document

Although it does not form part of this hybrid application, a key document to be produced in support of future Reserved Matters applications is an Equalisation Statement. The Equalisation Statement is to confirm that, for any given reserved matters application for any given phase, that the remaining balance of floorspace for different uses for which outline planning permission has been granted, is capable of being delivered in a way that that satisfies the development parameters as well as any relevant planning conditions and obligations.

Phasing and construction

The Construction Management Plan and Delivery Strategy (Doc PC32) sets out how Redrow intend to deliver the development if the Council is minded to approve the application. It is proposed by the Redrow that the final detailed Phasing and Delivery Strategy and separate Construction Management Plan would be subject to planning conditions. As such, the following details of phasing are for illustrative purposes and are subject to change.

In summary, the construction is phased over approximately 11 years in which there are 3 main development stages which are further broken down into development phases as follows:

- Stage 1:
 - Phase 1A (Spring 2015 - Summer 2017): Enabling demolitions and enabling infrastructure, construction of blocks H, L, N, U and T
 - Phase 1B (September 2015 – September 2018): Enabling demolitions, enabling infrastructure, construction of blocks R, S, P, Q, M and school
 - Phase 1C (September 2017 – April 2019): Construction of blocks J and K
- Stage 2:
 - Phase 2A (Early 2017 – late 2020): Enabling demolitions, construction of blocks A, B and G
 - Phase 2B (Spring 2019 – Spring 2021): Construction of blocks D and F
 - Phase 2C (Late 2019 – Early 2023): Construction of Blocks C and E
- Stage 3:
 - Phase 3A (Spring 2021 – Autumn 2023): Construction of blocks W and X
 - Phase 3B (Spring 2022 – Early 2025): Construction of blocks V, Y and Z

See appendix 6 for diagrams identifying the illustrative construction sequence across the site as well as the timetable.

Scheme amendments in the course of the application

Following the initial consultation and assessment of the application, there have been amendments to the scheme. The changes were consolidated into an updated set of revised and additional supplementary documents. The application was re-notified in May 2015 for information of consultees, neighbours and general public.

A summary of the changes are as follows:

- Existing site: CIL form floor area correction: Slight reduction from 78,438sqm GIA to 77,639sqm GIA and associated update to the number of existing houses on Colindale Avenue from 20 to 12 and on Rowan Drive, from 8 to 5 houses
- Surrounding area: Reference to a further approval at Beaufort Park for an additional 237 units and non-residential floorspace (ref: 14/07064/FUL)
- Amount of development: increase in residential floorspace by 209sqm as a result of design changes to the Stage 1 detailed design, bringing total residential floorspace to 276,813sqm (excludes car parking)
- Changes to car parking: A site wide reduction in residential parking from 2,118 spaces (ratio 0.73) to 2,053 spaces (ratio 0.71); includes reduction in the detailed Stage 1 from 672 to 642 spaces
- Site wide dwelling Mix: Additional controls namely a minimum of 2% 4-bed units and 18% 3-bed units, minimum of 99 dwelling houses and 50% of the 2-bed units to be 4-person (rather than 3-person) but no change to the overall total
- Detailed component dwelling mix: very minor adjustment to the number studios (reduction) and 2-beds (increase) but no change to the overall unit total
- Access: Changes to the Aerodrome Rd site access junction where local widening has been introduced to increase the width of the turning lane
- Scale: Minor amendments relating to adjustments to the internal arrangements for blocks in the detailed component (Full schedule of drawing-by-drawing changes supplied in Doc PC8)
- Layout: Minor changes to parking layout, podium landscaping layout, internal floorplan changes to rooms to achieve London Plan SPG minimums, Lifetime Homes Standards layout added, privacy screening added to amenity spaces, corrections to layout to reflect elevations (Full schedule of drawing-by-drawing changes supplied in Doc PC8)
- Landscaping: Revised podium layouts, amendments to the area between blocks T and S, 'green street' design proposed, 'Peel Park' layout further developed, children's play strategy further developed, additional public space adjacent to development zone Z (Full schedule of drawing-by-drawing changes supplied in Doc PC9)
- Appearance: Updates to the elevations of various Stage 1 (detailed) blocks including the following: revised brick/materials strategy; revised entrances; revised window position and sizes; Amendments to the fenestration of blocks H, T and U; revisions to the H-block chimney design; amendments the feature wooden frame of Blocks L and N (Full schedule of drawing-by-drawing changes supplied in Doc PC8 and also as referred to in DAS Vol I

(PC13))

- Parameter Plans: Changes to parameter plans as described in detail in Planning Application Specification Addendum (Doc PC2) with the sum total effect of reducing the extent of the proposed future buildings with no new or additional impacts arising
- Development phasing: Start dates for each phase are pushed back by 2 calendar quarters to account for the extended application assessment period as referred to in the Planning Application Specification Addendum (Doc PC2)
- ES Mitigation Schedule: A convenient summary of the mitigation measures proposed throughout the ES documents

Subsequently, further minor updates were made in June 2015 as follows:

- Design Principles Document (Doc PC7): Includes clarification regarding the extent of projecting balconies
- Development Zones and Maximum Heights parameter plan (Ref 0108): Further reducing the height in blocks G and V
- Planning Application Specification Addendum (Doc PC2): Updated references to the requirement for an Equalisation Statement requirement in the In addition to detailing land use information, the following additional information (secured by conditions) will also be supplied for approval:
 - Phasing reconciliation statement to demonstrate how development in the phase is in accordance with the ES, Phasing and Delivery Strategy and how it relates to the future development phases
 - A reconciliation plan showing how the proposed detailed layout of roads, pedestrian and cycle routes and detailed layouts of open spaces and public realm is consistent with the primary control documents
 - A written statement explaining how the details respond and conform to the primary control documents in terms of scale, layout, access and open space
 - Car parking reconciliation providing evidence that the number of vehicular parking spaces proposed for each development zone is proportionate having regard to the site wide parking strategy and targets
- Parameter Plan (Ref: 0106): Reduced horizontal deviation for blocks D and Y
- Illustrative Masterplan: Labelling of block references on the drawing
- Updated CIL and application forms reflecting the abovementioned changes to floor areas and numbers

However, these changes were considered very minor, would not give rise to any new or additional impact and therefore, renotification was considered unnecessary.

In addition, in the course of viability and s106 discussions it is noted that following dwelling mix and tenure changes were offered in principle by the applicant and agent:

- All 3-bed units being affordable rent and not shared ownership;
- Omitting any studio accommodation from affordable housing in the outline component and replacing them with 1-beds in future reserved matters applications

3. PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

3.1 Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA)

The EIA procedure in the UK is directed by the Town & Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2011 (the 'Regulations'), EU Directive 85/337/EEC (as amended), Circular 02/99 as well as the National Planning Practice Guidance (2014).

Screening and Scoping for EIA development

In respect of EIA screening, the proposed development does not fall within 'Schedule 1' development. However, the development is considered to constitute the 'Schedule 2' development namely, an 'urban development project' in accordance with Section 10(b) of Schedule 2 of the Regulations. The threshold identified for such projects is an area exceeding 0.5ha. Although, it is noted that the site is not located in a sensitive area as defined in the regulations.

Prior to the subject application, an EIA Scoping Opinion was sought by the environmental consultant URS acting for the applicant in March 2014 pursuant to section 13 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990. Following consultation and assessment, the council provided its opinion on 16 June 2014 (Ref: H/01526/14). The Council's opinion advised that the following impacts were considered likely to be significant, namely:

- Traffic and transportation
- Increase in density and changes to the socio-economic profile of the area and impact local services
- Landscape and visual impact

The opinion also provided general comments regarding information requirements; detailed advice about the content necessary for specific environmental topics; and confirmed the status of other developments in the area with which to consider effect interactions and cumulative impacts.

Environmental Statement (ES)

URS have prepared the ES (Doc PC14) and ES Non-Technical Summary (Doc PC15) in support of the application. The scope of the ES included consideration of the abovementioned topics identified at pre-application stage in the Council's Scoping Opinion.

The ES is made up of a non-technical summary, Vol I – Main Assessment, Vol II – Town Scape and Visual Assessment, Vol III – Technical Appendices as well as separate bound document for Wind Microclimate (Chapter 15).

In addition:

- A Statement of Conformity to the ES and Non-technical Summary was

provided in support of the abovementioned amendments to the application to confirm the ES remains valid and that further assessment is not necessary

- A Mitigation Register consolidating all the various mitigation measures identified throughout the ES into a convenient summary

Environmental topics considered include the following:

- Alternatives analysis and design evolution
- Demolition and construction
- Waste management
- Socio-economics
- Traffic and transportation
- Noise and vibration
- Air quality
- Ground conditions
- Water resources and flood risk
- Cultural heritage
- Ecology and nature conservation
- Wind microclimate
- Daylight, sunlight and overshadowing
- Electronic interference
- Townscape, visual and heritage impacts
- Effect interactions and cumulative effects assessment
- Residual effects

As part of the assessment of the planning application, independent consultants and specialists were appointed to review the relevant sections of the ES. Through the review process and dialogue with URS, various aspects of the ES were clarified. The review considered that overall that the ES provided sufficient information for the London Borough of Barnet Council to determine the Planning Application subject to imposing conditions to ensure that what is proposed will deliver a scheme which is consistent with what has been assessment.

Methodology

In summary the submitted ES has considered the likely significant effects of the proposed development on its neighbours, local environment, local and regional economy and the wider area. According to the ES Vol I, through the design development process, the environmental specialists have been involved to seek to reduce or eliminate adverse effects or incorporate mitigation measures (paras 2.9-10). The preparation of the ES has taken into account a full range of criteria including the following:

- Consultation which statutory and non-statutory consultees
- EIA Scoping exercise
- Relevant policy and guidance in planning and EIA process
- Establishing a baseline assessment
- Consideration of technical standards for the development of a significance criteria for the considerations of impacts in the environmental criteria being assessed

- Identification of sensitive receptors
- Review of the design and assessment of alternatives
- Review of available secondary information e.g. previous studies
- Desk-top studies as well as physical surveys and monitoring
- Making reference to best practice for sustainable development

It should be noted that for the parts of the development submitted in outline form where the detailed aspects of the design are reserved, the ES has tested the maximum extent of the future proposal i.e. the worst case scenarios.

Sensitive receptor identification

The ES has identified and considered the potential impacts to sensitive receptors during the demolition/construction phase as well as once the development is completed and in operation. The sensitive receptors considered are:

- Neighbouring residential and commercial properties
- Demolition and construction workers
- Future site users
- Social infrastructure and community facilities
- Air quality
- Water resources and utilities
- Townscape and views
- Built heritage
- Local road and transport networks and users
- Local ecology and habitats

Consideration of alternatives

Chapter 3 of the ES reviews the design alternatives considered including the 'do nothing'/'No development' alternative, alternative sites and alternative designs.

The 'No development' scenario was ruled out as undesirable, being a lost opportunity to deliver the following:

- Housing in support of Mayoral and Borough housing targets and the proposed open spaces,
- improved accessibility and links;
- A more optimal use of the site and thereby redress the underutilisation of the site.

There were no alternative sites identified, with the current site considered the most appropriate to optimise housing delivery, provide opportunities for residents to live and work, and deliver high quality design and open space as has been identified in Barnet planning policy.

In respect of design alternatives, this was considered in the course of pre-application discussion with the council. Alternatives were considered in the course of developing the zones and blocks as well as the open spaces and connections between. The evolution of the scheme is in particular response to such factors as follows: urban and architectural quality, microclimate, townscape and visual impact,

biodiversity, amenity space provision, sustainability, and accessibility to open space.

Interactions, cumulative and residual effects

In respect of interactions effects, this has been considered in the demolition/construction phase as well as the completed/operational development.

In the development and construction phase, the combined effects such as noise, vibration, and dust would be negative (albeit with varying magnitude and significance). However, they would be temporary and appropriate mitigation is identified in the ES.

In the completed/operational phase, combined beneficial effects were identified, for example, for neighbouring commercial and residential properties in terms of additional housing, additional spending and employment generation, provision of open space and play space, and improvements to pedestrian travel.

In respect of cumulative effects, the ES considered the effect development in relation to other developments, also in terms of the demolition/construction phase and completed/operation development. Effects were classified either 'adverse', 'negligible' or 'beneficial' and on a scale of magnitude of either 'minor', 'moderate' and 'major'. Whilst there were minor to major beneficial effects identified, it is noted that only the following adverse effects and scale of magnitude were identified:

- Negligible adverse – Cumulative construction noise and air quality
- Minor adverse – Cumulative construction road traffic noise
- Minor adverse – Cumulative increase in vehicle numbers and their noise with the completed development
- Minor adverse (to beneficial in some instances) – Cumulative wind effects

These potential impacts are addressed later in this report under the relevant headings

Residual impacts and mitigation measures

Chapter 19 of the ES summarises the residual effects anticipated as a result of the demolition and construction phase and once the development is completed and occupied.

In the case of residual effects identified in the demolition and construction phase, the vast majority were all 'negligible' or 'minor'. The exception demolition and construction noise which was 'negligible to moderate' in effect. Nevertheless, the nature of the effect was temporary. There were no 'major' impacts identified.

In the case of completed and operational development, the vast majority were either 'negligible', 'minor' or 'non-significant'. Of those where a 'moderate' impact was recorded, the nature of the effect was 'beneficial', as follows:

- Housing provision
- Playspace provision
- Colindale Avenue travel on foot

- Journeys through the site on foot
- Journeys via the Peel Link on foot

There were no moderate adverse effects recorded and no major impacts for the completed and occupied development

Throughout the ES chapters there are proposed mitigation measures proposed to address instances where adverse impacts are identified. For the avoidance of doubt, the various measures are consolidated into a mitigation register. The requirement to undertake the mitigation measures identified would form a condition of approval if the council was minded to approve the application.

EIA procedure and screening future applications including RMAs

Notwithstanding the provision of an Equalisation Statement in support of any proposed reserved matters applications (to demonstrate how development in the phase is in accordance with the ES, Phasing and Delivery Strategy and how it relates to the future development phases), there is nonetheless the requirement for the council to consider whether or not the environmental information already before them (i.e. the ES submitted with the 2005 outline application) is adequate to assess the environmental effects of the development pursuant to the regulation 8 of the 2011 Regulations and other relevant EU legislation as may be updated in the future. An informative identifying the requirement to consider the requirements for EIA as part of reserved matters approval for future phases is recommended if the council was minded to approve the application.

In summary, the submitted ES is considered to have appropriately addressed the provisions of the 2011 Regulations and other related legislation in the identification, considering and mitigation of the potential environmental impacts of the proposal, thereby making the development acceptable.

3.2 Principle of Development

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) states that planning law requires applications for planning permission to be determined in accordance with the development plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise. Development that that accords with an up-to-date Local Plan should be approved.

The site lies within the Colindale and Burnt Oak Opportunity Area, as set out in policy 2.13 of the London Plan. This policy requires development proposals to support strategic policy directions for these areas, optimise residential output, provide necessary infrastructure, promote sustainable transport and support the regeneration of the wider area. The Opportunity Area designation covers 262Ha and includes a range of sites with capacity for residential-led, mixed-use redevelopment. This includes parts of RAF East Camp adjacent to the M1, Hendon College site, the Grahame Park Estate, Colindale tube, hospital and library sites in Barnet as well as sites nearby in Brent. The area is identified in the London Plan and contributing 12,500 homes and 2,000 jobs in the period until year 2031. London Plan Policy 2.13 promotes the development of Opportunity Areas, utilising their

public transport accessibility and potential to contribute residential, employment and other uses through more intensive mixed use development of increased densities.

The Barnet Core Strategy was adopted in September 2012 and policy CS3 includes Colindale as one of the main areas for strategic housing growth in the borough.

Barnet's Colindale Area Action Plan (CAAP) was adopted in March 2010. It was prepared in Partnership with the GLA, TfL as well as local strategic partners and key land owners in the Colindale area to guide development and change over the next 10-15 years. The CAAP seeks to demonstrate how the planned growth identified in this area together with the necessary supporting infrastructure will be delivered. The CAAP is a statutory planning document which forms part of the Barnet Local Development Framework (LDF). Along with other LDF documents, the CAAP provides policies and guidance which are material considerations in the determination of applications in this area.

The CAAP identifies eastern part of the site as Peel Centre East within the Aerodrome Road 'Corridor of Change'. The Aerodrome Road Corridor of Change is identified as bringing forward *"...the single largest and most significant phase of growth in the Colindale and will transform the suburb"*.

The CAAP also identifies the western part of the site as Peel Centre West within the Colindale Avenue 'Corridor of Change'. Colindale Avenue vision is to *"...be the vibrant heart and gateway to the area and become a sustainable, mixed-use neighbourhood, anchored by a new high quality public transport interchange with pedestrian piazzas on both side of the street. A high quality, urban environment will serve a higher density population..."*

The redevelopment accords with the abovementioned policies for an intensive, mixed-use proposal which is intended to positively transform the site and the area with its uses including residential, commercial, school and open space provision, as well as its design and the associated improved relationships to and connectivity with the surrounding area.

Specific aspects of the development principles of this proposal are discussed in more detail below.

Density

London Plan policy 3.4 seeks to optimise the housing potential of sites. This provides a guide to appropriate density ranges for particular locations, depending on accessibility and setting.

The Transport Assessment (Doc PC16) indicates a varying PTAL across the existing site of between level 1b (Very poor) in the south-eastern corner up to level 4 (Good) in the south-western corner, which is nearest to the tube. The recalculation of PTAL for the completed development shows an improvement in accessibility, owing to improved site connectivity and permeability. The PTAL in the south eastern corner rises to level 2 (Poor) whilst the western half of the site is between Levels 3 (Moderate) to 4 (Good).

The density matrix of the London Plan 2015 nominates a density range of 150-250 hab. rooms per Ha for a Suburban PTAL 2-3 and 200-700 hab. rooms per Ha for an Urban PTAL 4-6.

Setting	Public Transport Accessibility Level (PTAL)		
	0 to 1	2 to 3	4 to 6
Suburban	150–200 hr/ha	150–250 hr/ha	200–350 hr/ha
3.8–4.6 hr/unit	35–55 u/ha	35–65 u/ha	45–90 u/ha
3.1–3.7 hr/unit	40–65 u/ha	40–80 u/ha	55–115 u/ha
2.7–3.0 hr/unit	50–75 u/ha	50–95 u/ha	70–130 u/ha
Urban	150–250 hr/ha	200–450 hr/ha	200–700 hr/ha
3.8–4.6 hr/unit	35–65 u/ha	45–120 u/ha	45–185 u/ha
3.1–3.7 hr/unit	40–80 u/ha	55–145 u/ha	55–225 u/ha
2.7–3.0 hr/unit	50–95 u/ha	70–170 u/ha	70–260 u/ha
Central	150–300 hr/ha	300–650 hr/ha	650–1100 hr/ha
3.8–4.6 hr/unit	35–80 u/ha	65–170 u/ha	140–290 u/ha
3.1–3.7 hr/unit	40–100 u/ha	80–210 u/ha	175–355 u/ha
2.7–3.0 hr/unit	50–110 u/hr	100–240 u/ha	215–405 u/ha

Density matrix (London Plan 2015 table 3.2, page 12)

The CAAP refers to the following densities:

- Colindale Avenue Corridor of Change: Policy 4.1(e) refers to this area providing a new focus for sustainable higher density living with a typical residential density of approximately 150 dwellings per Ha
- Aerodrome Road Corridor of Change: Policy 4.2(b) refers to a density range of between 120-150 dwellings per hectare (dph) depending on accessibility and proximity to the improved public transport interchange (Colindale Underground Station).

The table below from the Planning Statement (Doc Ref. PC12) sets out the densities across the site in terms of dwellings per hectare (dph) and habitable rooms per hectare (hrph). The table shows that the densities across site are at the higher end or exceed to the nominated density ranges. Whilst the site wide density calculation falls within to top end density range of the London Plan, it should be noted that this corresponds with an Urban PTAL of 4-6 and the highest recorded PTAL is 4 for the Peel site. The site wide density exceeds the AAP targeted density range.

	Target Density (AAP)	Acceptable Range (London Plan Density Matrix)	Planning Application
Western Area – Development Zones A, B, C and D	150 dph	45-260 dph 200-700 hrha	332 dph 809 hrha
Western Area – Development Zones E, F and G	150 dph	45-170 dph 200-450 hrha	201 dph 568 hrha
Central Area – Blocks H, J, K, L and M	120 - 150 dph	45-170 dph 200-450 hrha	143 dph 434 hrha
Central Area – Blocks N, P, Q, R, S and T	120 - 150 dph	45-170 dph 200-450 hrha	201 dph 558 hrha
Eastern Area – Block U and Development Zones V, Y and Z	120 - 150 dph	45-170 dph 200-450 hrha	211 dph 610 hrha
Eastern Area – Development Zones W and X	120 - 150 dph	45-170 dph 200-450 hrha	223 dph 621 hrha
Site wide average density (net)	120 – 150 dph	45-260 dph 200-700 hrha	220 dph 608 hrha

Peel site residential densities (Planning Statement PC12, page 28)

Although the scheme is over the nominated range, the numerical application of the London Plan density matrix needs to be balanced against design quality and the quality of residential environment created. Account also needs to be taken of the improved connectivity through the site and to the surrounding area including its public transport as well as the provision of social infrastructure on site. This reflects the approach of “*optimising*” housing according to London Plan Policy 3.4, it being noted that the density matrix is not intended to be applied mechanistically (London Plan para 3.28).

In addition the Mayors housing SPG sets out the exceptional circumstances where densities above the relevant density range may be justified (London Plan para 3.28A). Exceptional circumstances include the following and which are considered relevant in the case of this application:

- “Liveability” as described in section 2.2 – 2.4 of the SPG (E.g. Neighbourhood scale and provision of outdoor spaces, playspace, designing out crime, social infrastructure, dwelling standards and facilities, and sustainability)
- Exemplary design and quality
- Access to services
- Management of communal areas
- Contribution to ‘place shaping’

These comments are reflected in the GLA Stage 1 comment which does not raise any strategic concerns and instead, considers that the densities across the site are appropriate given the sites location within an Opportunity Area, is nearby to Colindale Tube and concentrates higher densities in the most accessible part of the site as well as high quality design being evident.

Demolition of existing buildings

The proposal involves the demolition of 12 dwellings along Colindale Avenue, 7 flats on Colindale Avenue and 5 dwellings on Rowan Drive (equivalent to 2001sqm) as well as demolition of 75,638sqm of non residential floorspace being the existing MPS buildings. The total existing floorspace to be demolished is 77,639sqm.

The loss of the existing building stock is considered acceptable on the basis of the following:

- There are no listed buildings or underlying archaeology affected
- The MPS buildings are surplus to their requirements and are no longer required on account of structural changes with the MPS
- The design and construction of the MPS buildings are outdated and outmoded, and are not conducive to modern accommodation standards including information technology provision
- The built form and arrangement on is not conducive to the site reconfiguration which seeks to reconnect the former Peel Centre with its surrounding and provide a high quality and sustainable public realm and neighbourhood centre which is to be the “vibrant heart” of Colindale
- Residential accommodation including 64 dwelling houses (Blocks G, M, P & Q) are nonetheless reprovided to current day standards, meaning that there is a significant net gain in accommodation to meet the critical local and strategic landuse priority for more housing in London, it being noted that there is a commitment to providing 99 houses in the Revised Development Schedule May 2015 (Doc PC5)
- The residential and other non-residential uses provided as part of a mix use redevelopment is a more optimal use of the site and a design which is sustainable and reflective of the capacity and character of an Opportunity Area as identified in the London Plan and a neighbourhood centre as identified in the CAAP.

Loss of existing sports facilities

The existing site has 5.9Ha of land that meets the statutory definition of playing fields, which is in addition to indoor sports facilities.

In respect of planning policy, NPPF para 70 seeks to guard against the unnecessary loss of valued facilities particularly when it would reduce the communities ability to meet its day-to-day needs, it being further noted in para 73 that access to spaces and opportunities makes an important contribution to health and well-being of communities.

NPPF Para 74 states they [sports facilities] should not be built on unless:

- There has been an assessment which has clearly shown they are surplus to requirements
- The loss would be replaced by an equivalent or better provision in terms of quality and quantity
- The development is for alternative sport and recreation provision, the needs for which clearly outweigh the loss

The NPPF also notes its definition of ‘open space’ that this provides important opportunities for sport and recreation, amongst other things (Page 54).

London Plan Policy 3.16 Protection and Enhancement of Social Infrastructure (and similarly Policy 3.19 Sports Facilities) supports development providing high quality infrastructure responding to local and strategic needs assessment whilst proposals involving a loss without realistic proposals for re-provision will be resisted. It also states that facilities should be accessible and multiple use should be encouraged.

Although the loss of sports facilities is resisted, London Plan para 3.87A states that the loss of social infrastructure in areas of defined need may be acceptable if it can be demonstrated that the disposal of assets is part of an agreed programme of social infrastructure re-provision.

Barnet Core Strategy para 12.2.3 refers to the principle factors of quantity, quality and accessibility of the open space network including sports facility provision. It also refers to the NPPF para 73 requirement for planning policy to be based on an assessment of need, further noting that the Council's Core Strategy evidence base includes the Barnet Open Space, Sports and Recreation Facilities Needs Assessment'. It provides information about the existing network as a basis for improvement to meet increasing future demand and changing needs (para 12.2.2).

Para 12.5.1 states that Barnet is well provided for in terms of the geographical distribution of its 277 pitches in the borough, although, there is additional demand because of issues of quality (poor drainage) and the lack of accessibility. In relation to open space provision in general it is noted in Policy CS7 Map 10 that the site is not in an area of open space deficiency. Although, it should be noted that the Colindale Open Space Strategy by Burns and Nice for Barnet (study reported 2013) identified a deficiency of sports pitches and other sports facilities across the Opportunity Area.

Policy CS7 seeks to secure improvements and access to open space including sports facilities to address the demand arising from development.

The scheme involves a loss of existing playing fields from the site. Even with the provision of playing pitches in the proposed new Neighbourhood park and the provision of a Multi Use Games Area (MUGA) as part of the school, there is a net loss of sports pitches across the site. Sport England has objected to the loss of playing fields.

However having regard to the criteria of NPPF para 74, and London Plan para 3.87A, the loss of existing facilities is considered acceptable on balance for the following reasons:

- The wider Colindale Area: The CAAP sets out a strategy in relation to new open space based on the provision of new parks and open spaces to serve existing and future residents; improvements to existing parks and playing fields to make them more attractive and usable; and the creation of new and improved green links connecting the spaces and making them more accessible. Following the CAAP the Council commissioned Colindale Open Spaces Strategy in 2013 (thereby updating the 2009 evidence base to the CS). This identified that while the area is served by some large and established areas of local open space, there is a deficiency in the area at a

local park level, particularly to the area to the north of Aerodrome Road, and that the quality of existing open spaces is varied and in some cases poor. In accordance with the CAAP strategy and the recommendations of the 2013 Open Spaces Strategy, the Council is in the process of investing in existing parks and open spaces in Colindale to make improvements to the quality of space, park facilities, sports facilities and activities. Proposals have been drawn up and consulted on for Montrose Playing Fields, Silk Stream Park, Colindale Park and Rushgrove Park. These proposals include improvements to the drainage, layout and quality of the sports pitches in Montrose Playing Fields and the associated changing pavilion. This investment will allow these facilities to be more intensively used by the wider area. A new pedestrian and cycle access into Montrose Playing fields is also being provided through the Pulse development on the former Colindale Hospital site which will open up this significant open space and sports pitches to other residents in Colindale.

- Previous users of the facilities at Peel Centre: The sports facilities at the Peel Centre site were never open to the public at large. It was an MPS facility for use by officers who trained there intensively on site for up to 28 weeks. However, structural change in the service means recruits are no longer trained here. The MPS has reprovided recreational facilities across London as follows:
 - Imber Court in Thames Ditton
 - Chigwell
 - Hayes Warren in Bromley
 - Bushey, Herts

The MPS has confirmed that for their operations, there is no deficiency of provision in meeting the needs of their recruits. Therefore the facilities could be viewed as surplus

- Future users of the redeveloped site: The scheme makes provision for open space, playspace and sport and recreational space to meet the needs of the future residents as demonstrated in the Open Space, Sports and Recreation Strategy and Addendum (Doc PC21). These new spaces are designed to be publicly accessible and therefore the new sports pitch within the new Neighbourhood Park represents a net increase in public sports provision in the Colindale area when compared to the existing site which was not available to members of the public as a secure MPS facility.

The loss of the playing fields and running track from the Peel Centre site to allow for the comprehensive redevelopment of the site was considered and accepted in the preparation of the CAAP. It was addressed specifically at the Examination in Public in Matter 6 'Have the impacts on green infrastructure been adequately assessed and addressed?'. The Planning Inspector's report into the EIP considered that the proposals were justified in the circumstances. The Inspector concluded:

"In reaching the conclusion that the AAP is sound on this aspect [i.e. The provision of recreation open space and the real opportunity to significantly improve the quality and accessibility of existing and proposed open spaces in the opinion of the Inspector in para 3.18], I have borne in mind the extent of the loss of the existing open space at the Metropolitan Police College. However, if more of that open space

were to be retained, the strategic housing target for Colindale would not be achieved with the serious consequence that much needed housing in this part of London would have to be accommodated elsewhere”

Residential-led, mixed-use redevelopment of brownfield land

In addition to the site and area specific designations of the London Plan and CAAP, a residential-led, mixed-use development approach is an NPPF core principle (para 17) and an expectation for large-scale development according to London Plan Policy 3.7

Making more effective use of brownfield land through redevelopment is a core principle encourage by the NPPF (para 17); is implicit in the identification of the site as within the Colindale Opportunity Area of the London Plan (para 2.58); and is regarded as an appropriate way to make more efficient use of land as well as an appropriate means to effectively manage growth according to the Barnet Core Strategy para 8.2.1.

Loss of employment floorspace

The existing lawful use of the site is Class C2A. It is noted that the existing floorspace, is outmoded and surplus to MPS requirements, the principle of the redevelopment for other uses was accepted with the adoption of the CAAP. As such there is no site specific policy protection for the Class C2A use, which is consistent with NPPF para 22 which states that policies should avoid the long term protection of sites allocated for employment use where there is no reasonable prospect of a site being used for that purpose.

Instead, CAAP policies 4.1 and 4.2 specifically identify the preferred range uses to come forward including housing, commercial, education, health and community uses.

In respect of employment generation and London Plan Policy 4.12 and Barnet Core Strategy CS8 and CAAP 7.5, 551 full-time jobs will be created by the proposal. This is additional to the jobs associated with the separate, retained MPS training facility. It should be noted that at the time of the MPS application there were 1,200 jobs on the site and the proposal to consolidate its operations proposed to maintain those 1,200. There were also 75 full time construction jobs. Therefore, there is a net gain in employment across the site.

Retail and town centre floorspace

In respect of policy, NPPF Chapter 2 seeks positive planning policies to promote competitive town centres and manage their growth, recognising that town centres are the heart of their communities (Para 23). Where main town centre uses are proposed that are not in an existing centre, a sequential test should be applied (para 24).

London Plan Policy 4.7 seeks to ensure that the scale of the retail and other town centre uses is commensurate with the size, role and function of the town centre and

its catchment

Barnet Core Strategy policy CS6 seeks to promote successful and vibrant centres throughout the borough to serve the needs of residents, workers and visitors, which is appropriate in scale and character to the centre in which it is located. Also, by taking a planned approach the borough will promote development opportunities in smaller centres including Colindale.

In respect of site specific policy, the CAAP policy 4.1 seeks a neighbourhood centre with a nominated range of uses. Policy 7.4 states that the neighbourhood will incorporate 5,000sqm gross retail space. This includes 2,400 net convenience goods floorspace. Justification for this provision is based solely on meeting the needs of the housing growth planned and that the needs of the existing community are already met [and not affected].

In accordance with the CAAP, the application proposes a neighbourhood centre in the ground floor of blocks A, B, C and D.

However, the amount of town centre floorspace exceeds the CAAP policy 4.1 provision, as follows:

- Total town centre use floorspace = 10,000sqm, comprising the following:
 - 3,000sqm (net sales area) foodstore (Class A1)
 - Up to a maximum of 7,000sqm Class A1-A4
 - The remaining balance for Class D1 and D2 uses

LB Brent has objected to the proposal on the basis of overprovision of town centre floorspace which will impact on other centres and that adequate justification has not been supplied (See section 1.4 of this report).

A Retail Impact Assessment (Ref. PC19) including a sequential test and impact assessment has been submitted in support of the proposal in accordance with the NPPF.

In summary, the CAAP floorspace figures were based on a planned target of 10,000 homes in the Colindale Opportunity Area. However, this has been revised to 12,500 in the London Plan. The additional housing would generate an additional 2,600sqm floorspace, bringing the total floorspace requirement for Class A1 to 7,600sqm.

In regards to the requirement for a sequential test in the NPPF, the proposal is within a new neighbourhood centre identified in the CAAP, and thereby accords with the up-to-date local plan. As such, a sequential test is not required. Nevertheless, it is noted that the proposed neighbourhood centre is specific to the Peel Centre and no other centres or sites are identified.

Further to convenience goods impact assessment, the assessment by Bilfinger GVA in the Supplementary Retail Report (Doc PC19) outlines the aspects of the assessment undertaken, namely:

- Three catchment areas tested: 1) Proposed site; 2) CAAP area; 3) Wider catchment area which equates to Zone 9 of the Barnet Retail Impact Study which extends into LB Brent;

- In summary, the assessment apportions market shares to each identified retail destination in the Zone 9 catchment area and draws on the 2009 and 2008 Barnet and Brent Retail Studies. It estimates the turnover required to support the uplift in the convenience goods floorspace proposed and then models the effect of the implementation of the foodstore with the projected growth in population
- The model considers the turnover of Colindale and Burnt Oak, as well as the three nearby main foodstores: Sainsbury's at Hyde; Asda at Capital Industrial Park and Morrisons at Honey Pot Lane. In addition, the assessment factors in the Morrisons at Oriental City (LB Brent)
- Modelling assumptions include that the proposal will obtain 95% of turnover from within the Zone 9 catchment and 5% from further afield on account of its location on the road network i.e. A5 Edgware Road.
- The modelling predicts that the largest potential impact will be experienced by the Morrison's at Honey Pot Lane and the Asda at Capital Industrial Estate. However, balancing the implementation of the foodstore against population growth, any small potential impact on neighbourhood centres in Colindale and Burnt Oak will be substantially outweighed by population and expenditure growth
- The proposed foodstore at the former Peel Centre will perform a main and top-up shopping role and is considered unlikely to compete with the type of convenience shop mix present in the two district centres of Colindale and Burnt Oak, or others like it in the Zone 9 catchment
- Report conclusion: The proposed foodstore will support a sustainable neighbourhood (in accordance with the NPPF principle) and will not have a detrimental impact on the network of town centres, it being noted that any potential impact would be minor and otherwise mitigated by the projected growth in population and expenditure.

Healthcare provision

CAAP policy 4.1 identifies that the new neighbourhood centre will comprise healthcare facilities as part of its community use floorspace. Healthcare impact and provision has been evaluated as part of the socio-economics chapter of the Environmental Statement (attached) at paragraphs 7.88-7.91 and 7.189-7.197.

In addition to the CAAP, the intent to provide a facility on the Peel site reflects the strategic approach to addressing short term, temporary and permanent healthcare arrangements in the wider Colindale area, as contained in to the emerging options appraisal prepared for LB Barnet and NHS England. The options appraisal considers the available options for new and expanded healthcare facilities within the Colindale and West Hendon Regeneration Area. This is in response to the Project Initiation Document (PID) approved by NHSE England in November 2014.

Based on a maximum population for the site is forecast at 5886 resident, the applicant has stated that the new population would generate a need for 3 GP's based on the standard of 1GP per 1,800 patients.

Block B is intended to provide the healthcare facility. An Illustrative health centre study (January 2015) shows how a facility could be accommodated in practice. A minimum of 510sqm for a health facility will be reserved in the neighbourhood centre through the section 106 agreement. This will allow for a further 590sqm to be provided should the NHS decide to take it up, providing a total of 1,100sqm. The facility is proposed to be secured as part of the planning agreement and the floorspace arrangement would form part of the detailed design submitted at reserved matters stage for Block B.

Education provision

London Plan policy 3.18 states that schemes which enhance education provision, particularly those addressing current and projected shortages in primary and secondary spaces, will be particularly encouraged. Barnet Policy DM13 considers the siting of education uses and ensuring that the transport and amenity impacts on their surroundings are addressed. The CAAP policy 4.2 specifically seeks a safeguarded opportunity for a new primary school in this area of Colindale, with the former Peel Centre identified as the most appropriate location.

The application proposes to safeguard land for a 3FE primary school and 39 place nursery, on a plot adjacent to the proposed new Neighbourhood Park ('Peel Park'). The DAS section 6.15 (Doc PC13) provides two illustrative layout options for the school to demonstrate that it can be successfully accommodated on site, subject to the detailed design coming forward at reserved matters stage. Owing to the nature of the school, it is a phase of its own, with Development Stage 1, with timing subject to the requirements of the education provider. The planning section 106 agreement will secure the transfer of the school land to the Council. The development will attract a Barnet CIL payment of £28.5m. The Council will use CIL fund to deliver the school on the allocated school plot. As a result the school will need to be added to the Council's Regulation 123 List as local infrastructure.

In terms of the impact generated by the proposal, the requirement for education provision to mitigate the scheme is addressed in the socio-economic chapter 7 of the ES (Doc PC15). Whilst the predicted child yield calculations of the ES suggest that the development would only generate a requirement for an additional 1 form of entry, the council's Education Team differ in their child yield calculations and show that 2 forms of entry would be required to mitigate the primary school demand for the development. Nevertheless, having regard to the strategic imperative of the CAAP to safeguard land for educational use to meet the increasing demand of the wider Colindale area on account of birth rates, migration trends and urban regeneration, for a plot for a 3FE school is accommodated in the masterplan for the Peel Centre site. The school plot would have an area of 0.7ha in size and would require the school to use sports pitches in the proposed new Neighbourhood Park. Securing the site for the school is considered a significant scheme benefit for the Colindale area and meets the policy objectives of the CAAP. This provision, along with the provision of nursery school places is supported by the council's Education team.

Other community floorspace provision

In addition to the abovementioned primary school and nursery provision on the plot adjacent to Peel Park, a further nursery provision is intended in the floorspace of the new neighbourhood centre in Development Stage 2. This along with the healthcare facility would utilise some of the 3,000sqm metres available for community uses pursuant to the Development Schedule (Doc PC5). The provision is supported and the setting aside of this floorspace for an agreed period of time will be secured as part of the planning section 106 agreement.

3.3 Housing Quality

A high quality built environment, including high quality housing in support of the needs of occupiers and the community is part of the ‘sustainable development’ imperative of the NPPF. It is also implicit in London Plan Ch1 ‘Context and Strategy’, Ch2 ‘London’s Places’, Ch 3 ‘London’s People’, and Ch 7 ‘London’s Living Places and Spaces’, and is explicit in policies 2.6, 3.5, 7.1, and 7.2. It is also a relevant consideration in Barnet Core Strategy Policies CSNPPF, CS1, CS4, and CS5 Development Management DPD policies DM01, DM02 and DM03 as well as the Barnet Sustainable Design and Construction SPD, Residential Design Guidance SPD and CAAP policy 5.2.

Unit mix

Development plan policies require proposals to provide an appropriate range of dwelling sizes and types, taking account of the housing requirements of different groups to address housing need (London Plan Policy 3.8, and Barnet Development Management Policies DPD policy DM08). The council’s Local Plan documents (Core Strategy and Development Management Policies DPD) identify 3 and 4 bedroom units as the highest priority types of market housing for the borough. Although, this should not be interpreted as implying that there is not a need for a full range of unit sizes.

The following table shows the site-wide unit mix from the Revised Development Schedule, May 2015 (Doc. ref. PC5):

Site-Wide Unit Mix						
Size	Studio	1 Bed	2 Bed	3 Bed	4 bed	Tot
Mix %	10%	25%	45%	18%	2%	100%
Target Unit Nos.	290	725	1305	522	58	2900

The mix of unit sizes for the detailed component of Development Stage 1 is shown in the table below.

Detailed Mix																
Block	Tot	Flats						Duplex					Houses			
		1B1P	1B2P	2B3P	2B4P	3B5P	3B6P	2B4P	3B5P	3B6P	4B6P	4B7P	3B5P	3B6P	4B7P	4B8P
H	126	2	43	42	13	15		9		2						
J	66	6	12	10	14	8			6					10		
K	64	4	12	10	14	8			6					10		
L	22	1	4	6	6	1			4							
M	62		7	1	13	8		1		4				18	10	
N	22	1	4	6	6	1			4							
P	96	3	22	8	22	11	6	4	2	4	2	4	3		5	
Q	96	3	22	8	22	11	6	4	2	4	2	4	3		5	
R	63	6	15	15	15	3		5	4							
S	62	12	12	12	12	6		4	4							
T	72		27	18	14	6		3	2	2						
U	137		54		52	15	5	8	3							
Tot	888	38	234	136	203	93	17	38	37	16	4	8	6	38	10	

In terms of dwellings types which constitute family accommodation provision, there are duplexes ranging in size from 2-bed 4-person through to 4-bed 7-Person and terraced houses ranging in size from 3-bed 5-person to 4-bed 8-person. The scheme contains 20% 3 bed or larger units. However it also includes 38 number of 2 bed duplex units. These units, split over two floors, are suitable for smaller families. The scheme design has sought to maximise the provision of duplex units on the ground floor of the buildings to ensure activity is provided at street level. Therefore when these units are taken into account the scheme can be considered to provide 21.3% family accommodation.

The application is considered to provide a suitable range of dwelling sizes and types to address housing preference and need in accordance with the abovementioned policy.

Affordable Housing

London Plan 2015 policy 3.12 seeks the maximum reasonable amount of affordable housing to be negotiated. The Colindale AAP policy 7.2 states that the maximum amount of affordable housing will be sought in developments having regard to the boroughwide target and to a viability assessment. The CAAP sets a 50% target reflective of the now superseded 2008 London Plan. The Barnet Core Strategy (Policy CS4) seeks a boroughwide target of 40% affordable homes on sites capable of accommodating ten or more dwellings. All of the above policies seek a tenure split of 60% social rented and 40% intermediate housing.

The development comprises a total minimum affordable housing provision of 580 units which is equivalent to 20% by unit numbers. The affordable housing is proposed to be split 50:50 between affordable rent and shared ownership tenures. The rent levels for the affordable rent units will be capped at up to 65% of Open Market Rents (as opposed to the maximum 80% which could be charged) to ensure that they are affordable to Barnet residents.

For Development Stage 1 a minimum of 126 affordable units will be provided within Block H. This equates to 15% by unit. The mix is as follows:

Affordable Rent (59 Units)

2 x 1 bed 1 person

19 x 1 bed 1 person
 18 x 2 bed 3 person
 8 x 2 bed 4 person
 12 x 3 bed 5 person

Shared Ownership (67 Units)

24 x 1 bed 2 person
 20 x 2 bed 3 person
 17 x 2 bed 4 person
 6 x 3 bed 5 person

The balance of the affordable housing to achieve the site wide minimum of 20% will be made up in the outline component of the application (Development Stages 2 and 3). This will include a minimum of 454 affordable housing units. The applicant has provided the following indicative mix and identified blocks D, W, Y and Z to accommodate the units:

Rented (227 Units)

47 x 1 bed 2 person
 35 x 2 bed 3 person
 75 x 2 bed 4 person
 70 x 3 bed 5 person

Shared Ownership (227 Units)

15 x 1 bed 1 person
 48 x 1 bed 2 person
 35 x 2 bed 3 person
 129 x 2 bed 4 person

Outline Mix (Illustrative)						
Block	Tot	Studio	1 Bed	2 Bed	3 Bed	4 Bed
<i>Development Stage 2</i>						
A	180	40	60	60	20	
b	190	35	65	65	25	
c	300	25	150	95	30	
d	145	5	65	60	15	
e	90	5	30	45	5	5
f	195	20	65	65	45	
g	60	5	5	20	20	10
Tot	1160	135	440	410	160	15
<i>Development Stage 3</i>						
v	170	30	20	90	30	
w	172	30	12	100	30	
x	197	30	10	125	32	
y	150		5	120	25	
z	163	10	25	90	38	
Tot	852	100	72	525	155	0
Grand Tot	2012	235	512	935	315	15

The application has been subject to an independent assessment of viability carried out by Deloitte. This review has confirmed that this is the maximum level of affordable housing that the development can support having regard to the existing value of the site, the significant Barnet CIL and Mayoral CIL contributions totalling over £37.9m, and the section 106 contributions of £14.5m.

The London Plan identifies housing and public transport as priorities for delivery. Colindale AAP policies 3.4 and 4.1 require development to deliver a dynamic new public transport interchange around Colindale Underground Station, improving the interchange between different modes of transport and providing a new gateway in to Colindale. Policy 3.4 specifically identifies requirements for step free access and an improved ticket hall with increased passenger capacity and facilities. Reflecting the growth in Colindale and detailed discussions with TfL, the application proposes a contribution of £11.25m towards Colindale station to help deliver these improvements. In this instance having regard to the identified priorities set out in the CAAP and London Plan, and taking into account the provision of 20% affordable housing, this financial contribution is accepted in place of further affordable housing.

Therefore, in accordance with the abovementioned policy justification, the level of affordable housing secured is considered acceptable on balance.

The following additional matters are noted in relation to the future reserved matters applications:

- The final dwelling mix and tenure split for the outline component (all blocks in Stages 2 and 3) will be specified as part of the reserved matters applications. There will be a requirement to reconcile the levels for individual blocks within the site wide unit mix and demonstrate this in the equalisation statement which will be required as part of any application for reserved matters for future phases.
- The applicant has agreed to omit affordable housing studios in Development Stages 2 and 3. The studios will be substituted with 1 bedroom flats. As such the percentage of other units sizes as well as the total number of units will be unchanged.

Floorspace standards

Table 3.3 in the London Plan provides a minimum gross internal floor area for different types of dwelling, as set out in the below table, which shows the areas relevant to the unit types in this proposal.

Table 3.3 Minimum Space standards for new dwellings (adapted from London Plan)

	Dwelling Type (bedroom/persons- bed spaces)	Gross Internal Area Standard (m ²)
Flats	1 bedroom 1 person	37
	1 bedroom 2 person	50
	2 bedroom 3 person	61
	2 bedroom 4 person	70
	3 bedroom 5 person	86
	3 bedroom 6 person	95
	4 bedroom 5 person	90
	4 bedroom 6 person	99
2 storey house	2 bedroom 4 person	83
	3 bedroom 4 person	87
	3 bedroom 5 person	96
	4 bedroom 5 person	100

	4 bedroom 6 person	107
3 storey house	3 bedroom 5 person	102
	4 bedroom 5 person	106
	4 bedroom 6 person	113

All the dwellings in the Stage 1 detailed design (Blocks H, J, K, L, M, N, P, Q, R, S, T and U) meet the minimum standards as demonstrated in the area schedules contained with the Design and Access Statement Vol II and Addendum (Doc ref. PC13).

It will be necessary for the future blocks in Stages 2 and 3 to address these minimum floorspace requirements or any update to the standards at the time of later reserved matters applications.

Lifetime Homes and wheelchair housing standards

Barnet Local Plan policy DM03 requires development proposals to meet the highest standards of accessible and inclusive design, whilst policy DM02 sets out further specific considerations. All units should comply with Lifetime Homes Standards (LTHS) with 10% wheelchair home compliance, as per London Plan policy 3.8.

In respect of LTHS, compliance is demonstrated with the criteria in Development Stage 1 and an appropriately word condition would require compliance for Development Stages 2 and 3.

In respects of wheelchair housing for the Stage 1 detailed design, the area schedules contained with the Design and Access Statement Vol II (Doc ref. PC13) detail the specific units which are designed as accessible/adaptable. The amount is summarised below.

Wheelchair units (Stage 1 - Detailed)														
Block	Tot flats	Tot Wheelchair	% Wheelchair	Flats						Duplex				
				1B1P	1B2P	2B3P	2B4P	3B5P	3B6P	2B4P	3B5P	3B6P	4B6P	4B7P
H	126	17	13.5%		8		6	3						
J	66	7	10.6%		1	3	3							
K	64	7	10.9%		1	3	3							
L	22	0	0.0%											
M	62	1	1.6%		1									
N	22	0	0.0%											
P	96	13	13.5%			4	7		2					
Q	96	0	0.0%											
R	63	63	100.0%	6	15	18	12	3		5	4			
S	62	0	0.0%											
T	72	4	5.6%		2	2								
U	137	10	7.3%				5	5						
Tot	888	122	13.7%	6	28	30	36	11	2	5	4	0	0	0

Over 13% percent are designed to wheelchair standards across varying unit sizes. This includes a total of 13 units in H Block which is proposed as affordable housing.

In respect of the outline component (All blocks in Stages 2 and 3), wheelchair accessible provision will be specified as part of the reserved matters applications. The applicant has confirmed that the minimum 10% is proposed to be achieved. There will be a requirement to reconcile the levels for individual blocks within the site wide unit mix and demonstrate this in the equalisation statement which will be required as part of any application for reserved matters for future phases

Amenity space

Barnet's Sustainable Design and Construction SPD Table 2.3 sets the minimum standards for outdoor amenity space provision in new residential developments. For both houses and flats, kitchens over 13sqm are counted as a habitable room and habitable rooms over 20sqm are counted as two habitable rooms for the purposes of calculating amenity space requirements.

Table 2.3: Outdoor Amenity Space Requirements	Development Scale
For Flats: • 5 m ² of space per habitable room.	Minor, Major and Large scale
For Houses: • 40 m ² of space for up to four habitable rooms • 55 m ² of space for up to five habitable rooms • 70 m ² of space for up to six habitable rooms • 85 m ² of space for up to seven or more habitable rooms	Minor, Major and Large scale
Development proposals will not normally be permitted if it compromises the minimum outdoor amenity space standards.	Householder

The table below summarises the amenity space provision for the blocks in the detailed component compared with the overall requirement of the Barnet Residential Design Guide of 5sqm per habitable room and the GLA standard of 5sqm of balcony space for every 1-2 person dwelling with an extra 1sqm for each additional occupant. All of the flats proposed have private balconies or terraces, all of which would meet the SPD minimum width requirement of 1.5 metres, therefore comprising usable amenity space. The blocks also have podium gardens providing a mix of communal and private amenity space.

Amenity Space (Stage 1 - Detailed Component) (Sq.M)					
Block	Private	Communal	Total	LBB req't	GLA req't
H	1016	1088	2104	1740	640
J	1141	495	1636	1460	450
K	1112	495	1607	1330	440
L	516	214	730	325	143
M	2365	253	2618	2225	511
N	607	214	821	325	143
P	1759	752	2511	1780	681
Q	1760	752	2512	1780	681
R	1098	339	1437	845	391
S	930	339	1269	800	384
T	560	655	1215	995	444
U	1065	859	1924	1900	879
Total	13929	6455	20384	15505	5787

In respect of the illustrative unit mix provided in Stages 2 and 3, the following table indicates the minimum required amenity space requirements based on current standards. It should be noted that compliance will be required with any updates to these standards at the time of reserved matters applications.

Amenity Space (Stages 2 & 3 - Illustrative) (Sq.M)		
Block	LBB min*	GLA min*
<i>Stage 2</i>		
A	2100	1020
B	2300	1090
C	3650	1685
D	1875	830
E	1225	535
F	2625	1175
G	1025	430
Tot	14800	6765
<i>Stage 3</i>		
V	2300	1030
W	2470	1050
X	2765	1206
Y	2350	945
Z	2410	1019
Tot	12295	5250
Grand Total	27095	12015
<small>* Based on living space = 1 hab room; Based on flats; Detailed design may require more space based on hab rooms and number of people</small>		

Playspace and sport/recreation provision

London Plan Policy 3.6 of the London Plan requires housing development to make provisions for play and informal recreation based on child yield, referring to the Mayor's SPG Shaping Neighbourhoods: Play and Informal Recreation 2012. Barnet Core Strategy Policy requires improvement to open space including provision for children's play and sports facilities for all development that creates additional demand. Barnet DM Policy 02 requires London plan standards for provision to be made.

In respect of the current context, as noted previously in this report the site does not fall within an area of open space deficiency. However, there is a deficiency in terms of the quality and therefore usability of sports pitch provision in the wider area. It is noted that the Council is in the process of a program of improvements.

In respect of the proposed application, based on the Mayor's SPG benchmark of providing 10sqm per child and a scheme with a child yield of 849 using their Mayor's calculator and based on the target site wide mix, a total provision of 8495.8sqm is required (May 2015 Open Space, Sports and Recreation Strategy, Doc PC21).

The Open Space, Sports and Recreation Strategy as well as DAS section 7.5 identify the provision of a total of 10,586sqm of play provision across the site. The

provision is spread across the site such that there is provision in all stages of the development. Components are located at ground level within the public open spaces as well as playspaces within the podium amenity spaces of blocks H, J, K, M, P, Q and U. A variety of different provision is made in these spaces to cater for the varying needs and preferences of users.

In addition to the abovementioned provisions:

- A variety of sports pitch configurations are capable of being accommodated within the new Neighbourhood Park ('Peel Park') totalling 10,100sqm;
- A further informal ball games court space of 395sqm is accommodated in Peel Park;
- A Multi Use Games Area (MUGA) between 820sqm-1,610sqm will be provided in the primary school and will be accessible outside of school hours and secured through the planning agreement;
- The site layout accommodates a 1.5km running circuit around Peel Park and other streets.

Therefore the varying provisions made across the site are acceptable and are considered to address the demand of the development in accordance with the abovementioned policies and guidance.

3.4 Design

High quality design underpins the sustainable development imperative of the NPPF 2012, as well as London Plan (2011) chapter 7 'London's Living Places and Spaces', in particular policies 7.6 'Architecture' and 7.7 'Location and Design of Tall and Large Buildings'. In addition, Barnet Core Strategy DPD (2012) policies CS NPPF, CS1 and CS5 as well as Development Management Policies DPD (2012) DM01, DM02, DM03, DM05 as well as CAAP policies 4.2, 5.1, and 5.3.

Masterplan Concept

The proposed illustrative masterplan is based on a hierarchy of streets and interconnected open spaces framed by buildings of varying scale. The streets form a series of perimeter blocks with active ground floor frontages which provide clear and legible routes through the site. The masterplan responds to the retained MPS estate on the northern side of the site along Aerodrome Road as well as the boundary conditions of the Northern Line tube lines to the south and Midland Mainline to the east.

The masterplan works off a central avenue running east to west through the site which forms the main spine for the development. A series of public open spaces of varying size and character are located along this central spine with other side streets and routes leading off it. Vehicular access into the site is only possible from two main junctions on Aerodrome Road. This road then forms a vehicular loop through the site serving the development blocks.

At the western end of the site the scheme provides a large urban square, 'Station Plaza' adjacent to Colindale Avenue and close to Colindale Tube Station. This responds to the CAAP Policy 4.1 objective of providing pedestrian piazzas on Peel

Centre West site. The space will form the main neighbourhood centre for the area with the supermarket, retail, café, health and gym uses activating the edges. Buildings range from 2 storeys to 10 storeys around the space with a 21 storey tower located at the south eastern corner acting as a visual marker for the neighbourhood centre. This space provides views into the development and along the central avenue providing visual linkage and legibility for pedestrians as well as a clear, safe and direct route to the tube station.

Moving east, the masterplan leads into a second smaller formal square with the central avenue running along the southern edge. This square contains formal gardens, play space and open space enclosed by railings, much like a London Square. Two 10 storey blocks mark key views across the space with residential entrances and activity overlooking the space.

A series of smaller streets are located on the south side of the central avenue. These 'green streets' are designed as homezones with limited vehicular traffic and slow vehicle speeds. They are planted with trees and landscaping and contain the bulk of the residential terraced housing. They link into the smaller green spaces along the southern boundary which include community growing gardens.

Moving east along the central avenue a smaller linear park is provided on the north side framed by residential buildings with front doors leading off the space.

The avenue then leads to and runs along the northern edge of a new neighbourhood park ('Peel Park') which is located towards the eastern end of the site. This 2ha open space includes play space for a range of age groups, space for sports as well as more formal open space for people to relax in. The proposed new primary school is located on the south side of the park adjacent to a new pedestrian/cycle path link under the tube lines. This new pedestrian/cycle route provides access to/from Colindale Avenue to the south. Peel Park is framed by 7 and 8 storey mansion blocks with an 18 storey tower in the north east corner.

The avenue turns north after the park and leads to Aerodrome Road passing through another large public plaza adjacent to the new MPS building. This space is framed by a 10 storey block on the south side and a 14 storey block on the north east corner.

A further garden square is located to the east of the park. The perimeter block and street network provide connections to the future development plot in the south east corner of the Peel Centre site (outside the red line of this application).

Height, bulk, scale and massing

Reflecting the hybrid nature of the application, the details of the height, bulk, scale and massing for Development Stage 1 (detailed component) are secured on the application drawings whereas, the details for Stages 2 and 3 (outline component) are secured in the parameter plans and Design Principles Document

The proposed built form of the site comprises a series of perimeter blocks and development zones organised around a network of streets and public spaces. The

bulk, scale and massing of individual blocks varies to account for the proposed uses and the scale of the spaces that they frame or relate to. This provides variation in character, visual interest, identity, place and way-finding across the masterplan.

Heights vary across the site between single-storey podium amenity space elements (3.3m) up to 21-storeys (61.225m). Across the site, heights are lower through the central area with taller elements located at the western end of the site in the area of the proposed neighbourhood centre, and the eastern end of the site around the new public park and public plaza as well as at key gateway locations.. In particular the scheme includes a 21 storey tower at the western end of the site set back from Colindale Avenue facing onto the main public plaza with the railway lines to the rear. A second tall tower (18 storeys) is located at the eastern end of the site on the north east corner of the new Neighbourhood Park. Two 14 storey blocks are proposed along Aerodrome Road marking the two main gateway junctions into the site. Blocks up to 10 storeys are proposed at key locations throughout the masterplan to mark or enclose public spaces and terminate key views. The majority of the buildings are between 6 and 8 storeys dropping down to 3 storey terraced town houses along some of the streets.

In respect of the Stage 1 detailed component, the proposed buildings as shown on the supporting plans and elevations (Docs PC8 & 9) are as follows:

- **Block H:** U-shaped perimeter block with ground floor and first floor parking and servicing area behind access points and duplex dwellings with a podium (2nd) floor shared amenity space with flats above. Varying heights around the block are podium level (7.7m), 5-storeys (17.2m), 7-storeys (23.9m) and 10-storeys (33.7m). A further 3.6m high energy centre flue will project above the tallest element
- **Block J:** Perimeter block with ground floor parking and servicing behind a frontage of duplexes and flats with podium (1st) floor shared amenity space with flats above. Varying heights around the block are podium level (3.52m), 3-storeys (10.8m) and 6-storeys (20.9m)
- **Block K:** Perimeter block with ground floor parking and servicing behind a frontage of duplexes and flats with podium (1st) floor shared amenity space with flats above. Varying heights around the block are podium level (3.3m), 3-storeys (10.5m), and 6-storeys (21m)
- **Block L:** Linea block with ground floor access and servicing serving, private amenity gardens in the rear behind a frontage of duplexes and flats. Upper floors comprising of flats in a 5-storey (17.7m) building.
- **Block M:** Perimeter development composed of duplex/flat block with podium shared amenity space at its northern edge as well as terraces at the south, east and west edges with rear gardens and some garages. Varying heights across the plot are 2/3-storeys (6.5m/10.9m), and 6-storeys (19.7m)
- **Block N:** Linea block with ground floor access and servicing serving, private amenity gardens in the rear behind a frontage of duplexes and flats. Upper floors comprising of flats in a 5-storey (17.7m) building.
- **Block P:** Perimeter block with ground floor parking and servicing behind a frontage terraced dwellings and duplexes with podium (1st) floor shared amenity space with flats above. Varying heights around the block are podium level (3.3m), 3-storeys (10.6m), 5-storeys (16.2m), 6-storeys (21.9m) and 8-

storeys (27.1m)

- **Block Q:** Perimeter block with ground floor parking and servicing behind a frontage of terraced dwellings and duplexes with podium (1st) floor shared amenity space with flats above. Varying heights around the block are podium level (3.3m), 3-storeys (9.6m), 6-storeys (10.7m), and 8-storeys (27.3m)
- **Block R:** Linea block with ground floor access and servicing serving behind a frontage of duplexes. Upper floors comprising of flats in a 5/7-storey (16.3/23.1m) building.
- **Block S:** Linea block with ground floor access and servicing serving behind a frontage of duplexes. Upper floors comprising of flats in a 5/7-storey (16.2/24m) building.
- **Block T:** Wedge block with ground floor access and servicing serving behind a frontage of duplexes. Upper floors comprising of flats in two no. massed elements of 7-storeys (24.5m) and 10-storeys (33.5m) respectively with a single-storey (3.3m) central podium .
- **Block U:** Wedge perimeter block with ground floor access and servicing serving behind a frontage of duplexes, flats, and commercial floorspace. Upper floors comprising of flats in two no. massed elements of 7-storeys (24.1m) and 14-storeys (46.6m) respectively

In respect of Development Stage 2 and 3 outline component, the following development zones and their building envelopes are described in the parameter plans and design principles document. The corresponding indicative storey heights (for illustrative purposes) are provided at appendix 5 of this report:

- Stage 2 – Western end of the site
 - **Zone A:** Perimeter block with varying heights of 19.3m, 22.525m, 28.975m and 35.425m with a shared podium amenity space (6.525m) above an active ground floor frontage of town centre uses and residential properties. The corresponding indicative storeys heights for the block are 2/5/6/8/10 storeys
 - **Zone B:** Linear block with varying heights of 22.525m and 75.75m with an active ground floor frontage of town centre uses and residential properties. The corresponding indicative storeys heights for the block are 2/3/6/21 storeys
 - **Zone C:** Perimeter block of varying heights of 28.975m and 48.325m with a shared podium amenity space (6.525) with an active ground floor frontage of town centre uses and residential properties. The corresponding indicative storeys heights for the block are 2/4/8/14 storeys
 - **Zone D:** Perimeter block of varying heights of 22.525m and 28.975m with a shared podium amenity space (3.3m) with an active ground floor frontage of town centre uses and residential properties. The corresponding indicative storey heights for the block are 2/4/6/8 storeys
 - **Zone E:** L-shaped block of varying heights 22.525m and 28.975m with a podium amenity space (3.3m) to the rear with an active ground floor frontage of residential properties. The corresponding indicative storey heights for the block are 6/8 storeys
 - **Zone F:** Perimeter block of varying heights of 22.525m and 35.425m

with a shared podium amenity space (3.3m) with an active ground floor frontage of residential properties. The corresponding indicative storey heights for the block are 4/6/10 storeys

- Zone G: Perimeter development composed of duplex/flat blocks with podium shared amenity space at its northern and southern edges as well as terraced houses at the east and west edges with rear gardens. Varying heights across the plot of 12.85m, 16.075m and 22.525m. The corresponding indicative storey heights for the block are 3/4/6 storeys
- Stage 3 – Eastern end of the site
 - Zone V: Perimeter block of varying heights of 16.075m, 25.750 and 61.225m with a shared podium amenity space (3.3m) with an active ground floor frontage of residential properties. The corresponding indicative storey heights for the block are 2/4/7/18 storeys
 - Zone W: Perimeter block of varying heights of 22.525m and 28.975m with a shared podium amenity space (3.3m) with an active ground floor frontage of residential properties. The corresponding indicative storey heights for the block are 1/2/4/6/8 storeys
 - Zone X: Perimeter block of varying heights 22.525m and 28.975m with a shared podium amenity space (3.3m) with an active ground floor frontage of residential properties. The corresponding indicative storey heights for the block are 2/3/4/6/8 storeys
 - Zone Y: Perimeter block of varying heights 22.525m, 28.975m and 35.425m with a shared podium amenity space (3.3m) with an active ground floor frontage of residential properties. The corresponding indicative storey heights for the block are 2/6/8/10 storeys
 - Zone Z: Perimeter block of height 22.525m, with a shared podium amenity space (3.3m) with an active ground floor frontage of residential properties. The corresponding indicative storey height variation for the block are 2/4/6 storeys

As well as the maximum heights as controlled by parameter plan 0108 the extent to which the building line can vary (thereby providing an element of flexibility in the detailed design and reserved matters stage) is limited by parameter plan 0106. Within the Design Principles Document, there are further design principles to break down the scale, bulk and massing on a zone by zone basis, this ensuring that blocks will not be built out to the maximum height parameter. The Design principles document provides a step-by-step instruction for applying the controls contained in the parameter plans, Development Schedule and Design Principles Document.

There have been extensive design negotiations at pre-application stage and in the course of the assessment to consider the height, bulk, scale and massing across the site and it is considered that a suitable proposal has been achieved in terms of on the site itself, its relationship to neighbours and surrounding context as well as maintaining an acceptable level of amenity. Such matters are considered in more detail in various sections of the report below.

Tall buildings assessment

Barnet Core Strategy defines tall buildings as buildings of 8 storeys or 26m and states that they may be appropriate in strategic locations. It specifically identifies the Colindale Avenue Corridor of Change within the Colindale AAP area as one such location.

The majority of the blocks within the proposed illustrative masterplan including the detailed component and outline component are between 6 and 8 storeys. This provides a datum height across the site from which buildings drop lower or rise taller. Whilst considered tall buildings by the definition of the Core Strategy, the proposed 8 storey blocks are considered appropriate on the basis that they are contained within the site and relate appropriately to the scale of new open spaces being created.

Taller elements of 10 storeys (x4), 14 storeys (x2) 18 storeys (x1) and 21 storeys (x1) are then proposed above the datum height in key locations.

Blocks H, T and U within the detailed component of the application and Zones A, B, C, F, V, and Y within the parameter plans proposed include buildings exceeding 30m in height. These have been assessed against London Plan Policy 7.7, Barnet Development Management Policy DM05 and other guidance regarding tall buildings and are considered to address the relevant criteria and are acceptable on site for the following reasons:

London Plan Policy considerations:-

- Will not adversely affect their surroundings in terms of microclimate, wind, overshadowing, noise and reflected glare
- No impact is identified in terms of aviation, navigation and telecommunications interference
- The site and its surroundings including listed buildings/structures and conservation areas are not considered to be sensitive or adversely affected by the proposal
- Both the elevations of the detailed component as well as the primary controls for the outline component and supporting details illustrate the scheme is of the highest architectural quality. The tall elements of the scheme serve as markers to the development including its public spaces, new neighbourhood centre as well as the nearby public transport interchange on Colindale Avenue

Barnet Development Management Policy considerations:-

- Active ground floor frontages are provided to Colindale Avenue, Aerodrome Road as well as the proposed internal streets
- The proposed design integrates into the existing urban fabric noting that this is evolving in line with the CAAP and Opportunity Area designation
- There are no adverse impacts identified to views and the skyline
- There is no harm to heritage assets and their setting, including conservation areas
- The microclimate effects on adjacent the site within the proposed spaces on site are not significant nor compromise their intended use and function

English Heritage/CABE Guidance on Tall Buildings considerations:-

- *Context:* Reflects the CAAP Policy 5.3 criteria
- *Historic assets impact:* There is no adverse impact to listed buildings, conservation areas or their setting
- *Relationship to transport:* There is availability of public transport and planning contributions are to be secured to further enhance public transport capacity
- *Architectural quality:* The detailed design of Stage 1 as well as controls on stage 2 and 3 indicate buildings of the highest quality, including tall buildings will be proposed
- *Sustainability:* The proposals minimise energy use and maximise the CO2 reductions
- *Design Credibility:* The scheme is being developed by an established house-builder and architectural team
- *Contribution to spaces and facilities:* The development contributes ground floor active frontages, a range of uses including town centre uses as well as public amenity space in line with the CAAP aspiration for the site
- *Environmental effect:* No significant adverse impacts are identified including microclimate, overshadowing, night-time appearance, vehicle movement or to neighbour's amenity
- *Contribution to permeability:* The proposal opens up the site to public access with streets and connections to the surrounding area
- *Well-designed environment:* In summary, high quality public and semi-private communal spaces and connections to well-designed buildings which address the needs of future users and provide a high level of amenity are demonstrated in the proposal

Character and appearance

Both the Stage 1 detailed design component and the primary controls and illustrative information for outline Development Stages 2 and 3 indicate a high quality design which will improve and enhance the site and the wider CAAP area. The following key attributes are noted in particular:

- A traditional architectural composition of a defined base, middle and top. The ground floor of the blocks is carefully designed to ensure that they provide active frontage and natural surveillance of the street. A defensible zone or landscape buffer is provided for residential dwellings which have a front door and habitable rooms and private amenity space fronting the street. In the case of the latter, dwellings with a ground floor presence are by and large either duplexes or terraced houses. As such, they have an upper floor and an alternative aspect and amenity space provision offering relief from the street.
- A traditional organisation to dwelling design, employing mansion block and terrace house formats as well as perimeter flat blocks and tall building elements.
- Contemporary architectural design employing a limited palette of high quality materials, including a prevalence of face brick as the primary material as well as other secondary materials to provide a degree of variation across the site as well as articulation of individual buildings.
- Façade detailing including the attention paid to the pattern of fenestration,

deep recesses and design and organisation of private balconies and other features, further reinforce a sense high quality appearance and enduring architectural character.

Built form relationships to surrounding sites and boundary edges

The proposal is considered to appropriately address site relationships and neighbouring development in terms of design. The following key aspects are noted below.

Colindale Avenue edge

CAAP policy 4.1 seeks to transform Colindale Avenue into a high quality, tree-lined street or 'boulevard' which caters for both vehicular traffic movement and pedestrians and cyclists and is well overlooked and enclosed by new and existing buildings. The supporting text explains that the street should be widened to provide wider pavements, improved bus stopping facilities and improved vehicular carriageways and integrated cycle facilities. It goes on to explain that all development sites on the south side of Colindale Avenue will be required to safeguard land on their frontages to achieve this.

Within the proposed masterplan Blocks A and B as well as the civic square provide an edge to Colindale Avenue. Both blocks are set back by XXm from the current back edge of pavement on Colindale Avenue in order to provide space for a new widened pedestrian footpath on the south side planted with new trees, the introduction of a central island reservation down Colindale Avenue landscaped with mature tree planting, and new bus stop facilities. The proposals are designed to allow for generous pedestrian thoroughfare on the south side of the street. The building line also allows for the potential future widening of the bridge over the Northern Line tracks to provide improved pedestrian movement.

The primary control documents namely the parameter plans and Design Principles Document specifically control the bulk, massing, scale and height of blocks A and B including controls requiring building breaks given the low scale residential properties opposite. This is balanced with the focus of this part of the site as the new neighbourhood centre and a public transport interchange for the area. As such, tall elements acting as markers are positioned further into the site so as to not over-dominate residential neighbours or the appearance and views along Colindale Avenue.

Retained MPS facility, Aerodrome Road

Stage 1 Blocks H, L, N, R, S, T and U as well as Stage 2 Zones C and E frame the retained MPS facility. Intervening between the future buildings and the security perimeter are hard and soft landscaping edges including the two vehicular access points into the site from Aerodrome Road as well as soft amenity landscaping and future Peel Square public open space. As part of the site disposal MOPAC specified a 10m separation distances to be maintained between any proposed building and their security perimeter and this has been addressed as part of this application. No other issues are identified in this relationship in the course of the assessment.

Aerodrome Road & M1 Edge

Stage 1 Block U and Stage 3 Zones Y and Z are set back from Aerodrome Road thereby providing improved pedestrian thoroughfare as well as the opportunity to introduce components of public amenity space, including Rowan Gardens. The contemporary design and tall elements contributes to the evolving character of Aerodrome Road as a significant area of growth and change in the CAAP. Their staggered frontage reflects the varied setbacks in the buildings across the road in the Beaufort Park development. The scale of buildings along this part of the site also reflects the scale of buildings constructed or approved opposite. Tall elements contribute to sense of identity and point of access and way-finding on this street frontage. The building line set backs and steps in combination with the controls in the parameter plans and Design Principles Document to break down the facades and the provision of a significant public open space adjacent to the new MPS building and generous public realm, is considered to mitigate against any possible 'canyonisation' and over-dominance along Aerodrome Road.

Along the M1 edge the development maintains a building frontage with points of access, landscaping treatment and public open space provision. Additionally, the Design Principles Document includes controls on the appearance and breakdown of the massing of zones Y and Z which face the M1. As such, the scheme will present a high quality, interesting and visually appealing frontage to the M1.

Edge to London Underground and the nature area

With the exception of Zone B in the new neighbourhood centre, the edge to the southern boundary is characterised by a soft landscaped character including community gardens along the boundary and adjacent to Blocks D, F, G, K, M and Q. The new Neighbourhood Park ('Peel Park') and the 3FE school plot adjoin the southern edge. The proposed Peel Link is located along this edge and will link into Peel Park adjacent to the school. The link will be a pedestrian and cycle link under the tube line to link with Colindeep Lane to the south.

A series of small landscaped amenity spaces and community growing gardens are located along the southern edge adjacent to the tube lines. The proposed buildings face onto these spaces and present a high quality, interesting and visually appealing frontage when viewed from the tube, Peel Link and from the south in general.

Future redevelopment opportunity – student accommodation in south eastern corner

Although not included in the current application, the proposed masterplan has been designed to account for the potential redevelopment of the remaining section of the Peel Centre site, Rowan Drive, in the south eastern corner adjacent the M1 and London Underground lines. This part of the site is identified in the CAAP as a suitable site for new student accommodation that could serve Middlesex University.

The proposed masterplan includes a new street at this point separating Zones W

and X from the adjacent land with the proposed blocks fronting onto this street. This layout allows for future perimeter blocks to be configured on the Rowan Drive land to complete a street layout with buildings facing onto it. The proposals therefore do not prejudice the ability for comprehensive development to take place.

Visual impact and views

The following supporting information is provided in consideration of the scheme's visual impact and impact upon views within the site itself and from the surrounding area:

- Townscape and Visual Impact Assessment in the ES Vol II (Doc PC14)
- CGIs in the Design and Access Statement Addendum Vol I (Doc PC13)
- Various CGIs, CAD drawings and massing studies in the Design Principles Document (Doc PC7)

In respect of EIA and the impact on views from the surrounding area, a total of 26 viewpoints and visually verified views (VVMs) have been supplied to consider the appearance and impact of the scheme upon the surrounding area. As well as the existing and proposed views, 'cumulative' views which take into account the committed schemes in the area are provided. The views tested are within a 2km radius and are based on geographical studies to test theoretically where the development would be visible from. In practice the locations coincide with vantage points along public roads and open spaces. Some views also coincide with the edges of the conservation areas mentioned previously in this report and which fall within a 2km radius of the site.

The ES identifies that there would be adverse effects upon townscapes and visual amenity on account of the demolition construction activities. Their magnitude and significance varies, although it should be noted that these impacts are temporary. In respect of the completed development, negligible or beneficial impacts to townscape and visual amenity have been identified, with varying magnitude and significance. In respect of cumulative impact assessment and residual impact, negligible and beneficial impacts are identified no adverse effects identified. In practice, this means that the building is visually apparent in the tested views however, when compared to the existing views and the cumulative effect of the other developments, the only negative impact is considered to be during the demolition and construction phase. The completed development will either have negligible effect or positively contribute with its high quality building facades and varied heights and massing. There is no harm identified to warrant further amendment or refusal of the application on grounds of impact to visual amenity or views in the surrounding area.

In respect of visual amenity and views within the site, the CGIs, CAD drawings and massing studies in the DAS and Design Principles Document demonstrate the varying built form, streets and open spaces across the site, contributing the different character areas in both the detailed (Stage 1) and outline (Stage 2 and 3) components of the application. Both the detailed design and primary control documents in relation to the outline components will result in a scheme that provides an appropriate balance between consistency and variation in the treatment of buildings, such that there are no adverse impacts to visual amenity and views in

an around the site.

Layout and connectivity

The site layout comprises a network of streets providing access and connectivity in and around the site and defining the perimeter block arrangement of buildings and the public open spaces across the site.

Vehicular access into the site is via two points on Aerodrome Road. These provide the primary route through the site. More minor roads provide servicing to the school and neighbourhood centre uses as well as to the residential blocks. Key pedestrian and bicycle only links include Station Plaza onto Colindale Avenue and tube station, as well as the Peel Link connecting the site to Colindeep Lane to the south.

The improved connectivity and permeability of the site, which accords with the intent of London Plan and Barnet Core Strategy reconnects the site with its surrounding neighbourhoods providing access to its proposed facilities (neighbourhood centre uses and public open spaces) as well as improved access to adjacent public transport and wider networks such as cycling routes.

Ground floor treatment

The scheme seeks to ensure that the ground floor of the buildings relate to the streets and public spaces by having active neighbourhood centre uses and residential entrances and habitable room windows facing the street. This minimises dead frontage.

Whilst the future neighbourhood centre in Stage 2 seeks to maximise the direct relationships to the proposed station plaza there is a trade-off for residential properties at ground floor to ensure that future occupiers still have a sense of privacy and defensible space maintained.

Along with adding to a sense of vibrancy (through linking ground floor internal and external space), the approach to the ground floor uses and treatment is considered to improve the sense of neighbourhood identity (through openings and active uses at ground floor) as well as safety and security and mitigate against the incidence of crime (through improved surveillance and clear distinction and thresholds between public and private spaces) and neighbourhood identity (through a sense of address with individual points of entry and amenity and defensible provision at ground floor).

Amenity and open space

Public open space provision is described on Parameter Plan 0106 and in DAS sections 6.7, 6.9 and 7.5. A total provision of 5.4039Ha is currently demonstrated (DAS section 7.5), with a commitment secured in the Parameter Plans to a minimum of 4Ha across the site. The key design aspects to note are as follows:

Stage 1 (Detailed component)

- Peel Park: 2.19Ha; a new large neighbourhood park which is highly accessible to the future occupiers of the site as well as neighbourhoods to

the north and the south. The park will be a green space with sports pitches which will be shared by the school and community at different times, and with other informal areas for a variety of recreational uses.

- Garden Square Central: 0.125Ha; Similar design responses as Garden Square West.
- Peel Square: 0.5235Ha; a new civic style public space with formal landscaping to integrate the retained MPS site and the development creating a gateway entrance, framed by larger marker buildings.
- Shared Garden: 0.4347Ha Located adjacent to the southern boundary, these spaces include informal play areas, walking routes and opportunities for community allotments

Stage 2 (Outline component)

- Station Plaza: 0.3447Ha (Min. requirement 0.37Ha); a new neighbourhood centre is to be established as a focal point for the area which will contain a range of uses, connected to the Colindale Tube Station. At the centre of the neighbourhood centre is a public square with some soft landscaped areas
- Garden Square West: 0.4119Ha (Min. requirement 0.2Ha); seeking to reflect a London square concept, the soft landscaped square provides an informal outdoor and recreational space for the future residents including components of doorstep play for children
- Community Garden: 0.1683Ha (Min. requirement 0.07Ha) Located adjacent to the southern boundary, these spaces include informal play areas, walking routes and opportunities for community allotments. A Woodland Play area providing and equipped active play space is located at the western end

Stage 3 (Outline component)

- Garden Square East: 0.2878Ha (Min. requirement 0.23Ha); Similar design responses as Garden Square West
- Rowen Garden: 0.918Ha (Min. requirement 0.07Ha) has a similar response to the Community Gardens

Safety, security and crime mitigation

Pursuant to London Plan policy 7.3 and Barnet Core Strategy Policy CS12, the scheme is considered to enhance safety and security and mitigate the potential of crime because:

- Routes through the site and network of spaces are legible and will be well maintained noting that the scheme is supported by an estate management plan
- It is considered that the design details provide a clear indication of whether a space is private, semi-public or public, with natural surveillance of publicly accessible spaces from buildings at their lower floors achieved across the entire site
- The design including active ground floor frontages and surveillance and mix of uses encourages a level of human activity that is appropriate across the site, which will maximize activity throughout the day and night, thereby creating a reduced risk of crime and a sense of safety at all times
- Separate to Peel Park, Civic Square and Plaza which are more formally laid

out and designed as public focal points for Colindale, the network of communal spaces spaces are considered to be laid out and detailed in such a way to promote an appropriate sense of ownership

- Security measures will be integral to the design of buildings with details secured through appropriately worded conditions, it being noted that the MPS Designing Out Crime Officer has provided advice on achieving Secured by Design accreditation for the scheme
- The design of the scheme including perimeter development, defensible frontages and active ground floors across the site is considered to minimise the safety and security interventions needed and therefore the demands of ongoing management and maintenance costs

Conservation and Archaeology

The preservation and enhancement of heritage assets is one of the 12 core principles of the NPPF. It is a statutory obligation of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 to consider the special architectural and historical interest as well as the setting of listed buildings as well as the character and appearance of conservation areas. Saved PPS5 'Planning and the Historic Environment' provides guidance regarding consideration of designated and non-designated heritage assets. In addition, London Plan policy 7.8 and Barnet Core Strategy CS5 and DM06 variously require the consideration of the impact to heritage assets including listed buildings, conservation areas and archaeology. In this regard, the ES Chapter 13 has considered the assessment of the potential effects of the scheme.

In respect of archaeology, the site is not located in an area of interest and given the lack of archaeological potential in the area, this impact was scoped out of the EIA, as confirmed by Historic England through the EIA Scoping Opinion process and reconfirmed as part of the application consultation.

In respect of potential impact on Listed Buildings, Listed Building consent has already been granted for the relocation of the Grade II listed statue of Sir Robert Peel and the Police box in Cottenham Drive from the site and installation within the landscaped grounds of the new MPS training/operational facility on the retained land. Therefore these assets will not be affected by the proposal.

In respect of impact to conservation areas, the site is not within or nearby to any. The nearest conservation areas are Buck Lane CA (LB Brent) which is located approximately 1km south-west from the site and Hendon Church End CA located approximately 700m to the east of the site. Other consideration areas within a 2km radius of the application site area Hendon the Boroughs CA to the south-east, Roe Green CA (LB Brent) to the south-west and Watling Estate CA to the north-west. There are listed buildings within the CAs although the setting of these and the conservation area itself are not considered to be impact upon by the proposal having regard to the existing, proposed and cumulative views assessed in the ES Vol II, Townscape and Visual Assessment.

3.5 Amenities of Neighbouring and Future Residents

Part of the 'Sustainable development' imperative of the NPPF 2012 is pursuing improvements to amenity through the design of the built environment (para 9). Amenity is a consideration of London Plan 2011 policy 2.6 'Outer London: Vision and Strategy' and is implicit in Chapter 7 'London's Living Places and Spaces'. In addition Barnet Development Management Policies DPD (2012) DM01 as well as the Sustainable Design and Construction SPD provide further requirements and guidance.

Privacy, overlooking and outlook

The Barnet Residential Design Guidance SPD states there should be a minimum distance of about 21 metres between properties with facing windows to habitable rooms to avoid overlooking, and 10.5 metres to a neighbouring garden. Shorter distances may be acceptable between new build properties where there are material justifications.

Privacy and separation to surrounding sites

Not accounting for the horizontal deviation allowed for on Parameter Plan 0106, the proposal exceeds the minimum separation distances to the nearest neighbouring residential properties adjacent to the site in the following locations as follows:

- Colindale Avenue (West): 26m
- Sheaveshill Avenue (South-west): 45m
- Colindeep Lane (South): 25m
- Future development plot in south-east corner of MOPAC site: 22m
- Beaufort Park (North): 35m
- Middlesex University Platt Hall on north side of Aerodrome Road (west end): 34m

The application is found to be acceptable in this regard. It should be noted that through detailed design, the reserved matters applications for plots within the outline component will need to ensure that adequate privacy and separation is provided.

Privacy and separation within the site

The varying layout, scale of buildings and character areas across the site result in different separation distances. In general, blocks adjacent each other across the central avenue route and public amenity spaces exceed the minimum separation distances. Internal separation distances across the courtyard communal gardens within the perimeter blocks also generally meet or exceed the required separation distance. However, the following instances involve reduced separation distances:

Stage 1

- Block U internal courtyard east-west separation: 13-30m variable
- Block U tower and perimeter block separation: 7.5m
- Block T north and south block separation: 8m
- Across tertiary roads between blocks F, G, J, K, M, P and Q:

12m/12.5m/16m

- Between H and L: 7.5m
- East-west separation across the rear gardens of Block M terraces: 18m
- East-west separation across the rear gardens of Block M terraces: 18/24m stepped

Stage 2

- Across tertiary roads between blocks A and C and between D and D: 20m

Stage 3

- Across secondary roads between blocks U, V, W, X, Y and Z: 20m separation
- Across secondary roads between blocks D, F, G: 16m
- Block A internal courtyard east-west separation: 18-35m variable

It is further noted that in stages 2 and 3 submitted in outline, the separation distances may vary (Increase/decrease) at the time of future reserved matters applications on account of the flexibility provided in the variable building setback allowance of Parameter Plan 0106. The building relationships will need to be assessed at the reserved matters stage to ensure that satisfactory privacy conditions and environment is created.

The reduced separation distances are considered acceptable on balance for the following reasons:

- The CAAP and Opportunity Area designation thereby encourages a more dense development, the corollary of this being reduced building separation in the site layout and built form massing. Reduced front-of-house separation distances across public streets is not uncharacteristic of London. In acute places such as between H and L, building orientation means that it is a flank wall (with only a few windows) directly facing the other block rather than blocks facing head on. In addition, areas of closer proximity between buildings are off-set by the provision of more open, public spaces such that the sense of enclosure that may perpetuate the sense of overlooking and privacy impact in some streets is off-set by the openness elsewhere.
- Internal separation distances between terraces in Blocks M and G are close to the minimum and there are opportunities for this to be mitigated through landscaping, screening and off-set window locations
- The close distances between the built form elements of Block T and block U are mitigated by off-set windows and multiple-aspect rooms
- The internal separation distances across the courtyard of Block A are close to the minimum and could be further mitigated at reserved matters stage by off-set windows as well as screening for any balconies as identified in the Design Principles Document section 5.23 Amenity

Therefore, although there are instances where separation distances are less the minimum stated by the SPD, any privacy and overlooking impact experienced is considered to be off-set by the circumstances of the site and mitigation measures.

Noise and general disturbance

No significant new or cumulative operational noise impacts are identified for neighbours as a consequence of the proposed development. Whilst there is an increase in the intensity of use of the site, the use is consistent with the residential character of the wider area. The commercial and community uses including the school are appropriately located and accord with the redevelopment intent of the CAAP.

In considering the potential impact to neighbours, conditions are recommended to ensuring that any plant or machinery associated with the development achieves required noise levels for residential environment. The council's environmental health team have recommended appropriately worded conditions for noise reporting and impact mitigation, extract and ventilation equipment, plant noise, noise mitigation in the case of any gym use, acoustic fencing, school noise mitigation as well as informatives relating to extraction flues and acoustic consultants. It should be noted that any excessive or unreasonable noise is covered by the Environmental Protection Act 1990.

Air quality






In respect of air pollution, no significant impacts are identified by the council's environmental Health Team. A Ventilation and Extraction Principles report (Doc PC29) has been prepared to identify the general ventilation strategy through the development as well as specific considerations for the energy centre and extraction for non-residential uses such as Class A3 (restaurants).

Further in respect of any extraction that may be required for food premises (Class A3), although not proposed in the principles document, extraction ductwork will need to terminate above roof height via voids within the building rather than via external ducts to satisfy the council's environmental health team. The setting aside of voids for this purpose as part of the internal design and layout of blocks at reserved matters stage as well as supplying the detailed design of any future extract ducting will be subject to an appropriately worded condition.

In respect of traffic and parking impacts on air quality, the levels of parking are controlled and the green travel plan which will be secured as part of planning obligations will encourage transport by other modes. In respect of the design, the scheme contributed towards overall reductions in CO₂ production, having regard to energy and sustainability policies.

Microclimate (Wind)

The proposal involves tall buildings and Chapter 15 of the submitted ES (August 2014) considers effects of the proposed design both for the detailed stage 1 and maximum parameters of outline stage 2 and 3. The existing and proposed scenarios (both demolition/construction phase and completed development phase) as well as cumulative scenarios were tested. Wind tunnel testing of 207 points around the site was undertaken and the results of the scheme presented in terms of Lawson Comfort Criteria to establish if different areas around the site are fit for their intended purpose and function as detailed in table below.

Key	Comfort Category	Threshold	Description
	Sitting	1% > B3	Light breezes desired for outdoor restaurants and seating areas where one can read a paper or comfortably sit for long periods
	Standing/Entrance Use	6% > B3	Gentle breezes suitable for main building entrances, pick-up/drop-off points and bus stops
	Leisure Walking	4% > B4	Moderate breezes that would be appropriate for window shopping and strolling along a city/town centre street, plaza or park
	Business Walking	2% > B5	Relatively high speeds that can be tolerated if one's objective is to walk, run or cycle without lingering
	Roadway/Car-park	6% > B5	Winds of this magnitude are considered a nuisance for most activities, and wind mitigation is typically recommended

Lawson Comfort Criteria ES Vol III Appendix K

The testing considered summer as well as the windiest season which is typically winter. It is noted that the testing was undertaken with landscaping omitted therefore, the worst case scenario tested can be mitigated by landscaping in practice.

In terms of the results, strong winds were encountered in only three test points as follows:

Stage 1

- Test point 43: Ground floor north east corner of Block H
- Test point 110: Ground floor midway along the south elevation between Blocks R and S

Stage 2

- Test point 5: Ground level mid-way along the southern elevation of Block A

In each case the wind would not exceed category B6 'Strong Breeze' and this was experienced in each position for between 1.2 - 3.2 hours each year. This is not considered significant and can be mitigated by landscaping and screening.

In terms of other report finding and conclusions the following is noted:

- The windiest conditions on site are suitable for leisure walking. As such the routes through the site are suitable for their intended use;
- Entrances are suitable for their intended use with the exception of the abovementioned test point 110 between Blocks R and S which will require mitigation in the form of screening either side of the doorway;
- For outline Stages 2 and 3, although entrance details will be fixed at the reserved matters stage, many locations around the building perimeters are currently tested as suitable for standing/entrance or are even calmer. In any case, any requirement for mitigation would be confirmed through further wind tunnel testing of the detailed design at reserved matters stage;
- During summer months, the microclimate throughout the site is predominantly suitable for sitting. At ground level, there are some instances of standing and entrance use, which generally occur close to building corners or between buildings, which is considered acceptable given these areas are

primarily for thoroughfares and mitigation not required. However, the roof terrace of plot U (test location 194) will require mitigation in the form of landscaping, screening and or seating to provide a suitable amenity space;

- For the outline component (Stages 2 and 3), the amenity spaces are suitable for sitting with the exception of the following test points which will require mitigation and further testing of the detailed design at reserved matters stage:
 - Test point 4 – Station Plaza
 - Test point 141 – Garden Square East
 - Test point 35 – Block F podium communal amenity space
 - Test point 164 – Block Y podium communal amenity space

Overall, the microclimate of the site is largely suited to the intended use with the exceptions mentioned above which will require further testing and mitigation. This is identified as a requirement in the ES mitigation register for future phases and compliance with this document forms a condition of approval. In respect of Stage 1 detailed component and the requirements for mitigation for test points 43 and 110, an appropriately worded condition is recommended.

Daylight, sunlight and overshadowing

The application is supported by a BRE daylight, sunlight and overshadowing assessment of the impact to neighbours and on itself in ES Chapter 16 and DAS Vol III respectively.

The following tests were undertaken:

- Vertical Sky Component (VSC) – A measure of the amount of skylight available at the centre of a habitable room window and also, the amount of direct skylight received inside the corresponding habitable room. The BRE guide states that daylighting may be affected if the VSC calculation is less than 27% or less than 0.8 times its former value;
- Daylight Distribution (DD) – A measure that calculates the amount of area of a habitable rooms which receives direct skylight and how much does not. The BRE guide recommends that the minimum DD values should be achieved for bedrooms (1%), living rooms (1.5%) and kitchens (2%);
- Annual Probable Sunlight Hours (APSH) – Is a measure of the average number of hours per year in which direct sunlight is received by a window. The BRE guide states that rooms may be affected if they receive less than 25% APSH for the year and 5% APSH for the winter;
- Average Daylight Factor (ADF) – Is a measure of the daylight received inside a habitable room. The BRE guide recommends that the minimum ADF values should be achieved for bedrooms (1%), living rooms (1.5%) and kitchens (2%); and
- Shadowing: The BRE guide recommends that at least half the area of an amenity space should receive at least 2hrs of sunlight on the equinox (21 March).

Effects upon neighbours

The nearest surrounding residential properties were tested, namely:

- Properties assessed:
 - Colindale Avenue: 167, 169, 171, 173, Agar House, 1-7 Petri House, 177, 179, 181, 183, 185, 189
 - 2 & 4 Booth Road
 - 1-30 Goosander Court
 - Middlesex University Platts Hall Blocks A & B
 - Beaufort Park Blocks D & E, Aerodrome Road
 - Rowan Drive: 12-13, 14-15, 16-17, 18-19, 20-21, 22-23, 24-25, 26-27, 28-29
 - 150-152 Sheaveshill Avenue
- Private rear gardens assessed: Rowan Drive Nos. 12 – 27 (Consecutive numbers)

The results were as follows:

- VSC: Of the 760 windows tested, 563 (76%) satisfy the criteria and a further 160 (22%) are within 20% of the guidelines.
- DD: Of the 444 rooms tested, 400 (90%) will satisfy the criteria and a further 23 (5%) are within 20% of the guidelines.
- APSH: In respect of annual sunlight, of the 585 windows tested, 570 (97%) will satisfy the BRE criteria. For winter sunlight, 577 (99%) will satisfy the criteria
- Shadowing: The assessment shows that all the private gardens meet the BRE criteria

Overall the affect in terms sunlight and overshadowing is negligible and there is a minor impact in terms the daylight received for some properties. In all the cases of the affected properties, the results show that the majority of their windows do comply with the VSC and DD criteria, therefore the impact is not considered sufficient on balance to warrant amendment or refusal of the scheme.

It should also be noted that the Building Research Establishment (BRE) document is intended as a guide which is reflective of expectations for daylight, sunlight and overshadowing levels in a conventional suburban context. Therefore, it would be unreasonable to strictly apply the guidance in this case, given the site is within a London Plan Opportunity Area which is intended to undergo transformation to deliver a substantial proportion of the housing growth in the Colindale area in accordance with the CAAP.

Effect on future occupiers of the site

All blocks in the Stage 1 detailed component were tested as well as communal and public open spaces across the entire site. Reserved matters applications for blocks in Stages 2 and 3 will need to include a BRE daylight and sunlight assessment in support of the quality of the internal living environment.

The results for Stage 1 Blocks and the amenity space across the entire site were as follows:

- VSC: Of the 5078 windows tested, 2644 (52%) achieve the BRE criteria which is a good level of light in any context, it being noted the BRE Guide has criteria reflecting a suburban location. On the basis that the scheme is an Opportunity area and intended to comprise a new neighbourhood centre the corollary being higher densities reflecting an urban location, it is noted that a further 36.74% have a good level, between 15-27%.
- APSH: Of the 1634 windows tested, 962 (59%) achieve the annual guidelines and 1183 (72%) achieve the winter guideline. In the case of windows that do not achieve the BRE minimum criteria, the majority either relate to bedrooms (which the BRE states are less important than living rooms) or relate to rooms served by more than 1 window that meets the guidelines. In addition, the following is noted in practice when considering the practical significance of these results:
 - The inclusion of balconies adjoining living spaces with the subsequently recessed and or obstructed windows receive less light;
 - The sunlight reaching balconies will provide some value and a perception of light being available and therefore, this may lead to a degree of satisfaction for future occupiers;
 - The results for the detailed blocks are in part affected by the maximum parameters of the outline blocks in Stage 2 and 3. As the outline blocks represent maximum parameters and the worst case scenario, the final design of those blocks at the reserved matters stage will incorporate further articulation and break up of the massing which may result in some improvement for Stage 1 blocks in practice.
- ADF: Of the 1839 habitable rooms tested, 1735 (94%) achieve the BRE criteria. Of the rooms that did not satisfy the criteria, the shortfall from the recommended levels were minor in the majority of cases and are as a consequence of the following:
 - Deep living spaces, thereby reducing the amount of light up the back, although noting that these would be mostly occupied by the kitchen area where natural light would be supplemented;
 - The inclusion of balconies adjoining living spaces with the subsequently recessed and or obstructed windows receive less light
- Shadowing: The percentage of amenity space achieving the minimum 2hrs of sunlight recommended on 21st March is as follows:
 - Block A podium amenity courtyard: 31.56% (81.09% in summer)
 - Block C podium amenity courtyard: 40.83% (85.99% in summer)
 - Block D podium amenity courtyard: 0% (37.72% in summer)
 - Block F podium amenity courtyard: 11.57% (77.75% in summer)
 - Block G podium amenity courtyard: 59.56% (88.57% in summer)
 - Block H podium amenity courtyard: 50.72% (82.53% in summer)
 - Block J podium amenity courtyard: 93.89% (100% in summer)
 - Block K podium amenity courtyard: 36.71% (98.98% in summer)

- Block L rear garden: 45.67% (100% in summer)
- Block M rear gardens: 83.49% collectively (99.76% in summer)
- Block M podium amenity courtyard: 89.9% (92% in summer)
- Block N rear garden: 46.71% (100% in summer)
- Block P podium amenity courtyard: 78.07% (98.85% in summer)
- Block Q podium amenity courtyard: 3.42% (86.68% in summer)
- Block R podium amenity: 66.47%/13.68% (96.25%/83.69% in summer)
- Block S podium amenity courtyard: 0% (73.13% in summer)
- Block U podium amenity courtyard: 15.99% (64.61% in summer)
- Block V podium amenity courtyard: 0% (56.45% in summer)
- Block W podium amenity courtyard: 3.26% (73.76% in summer)
- Block X podium amenity courtyard: 4.63% (78.32% in summer)
- Block Y podium amenity courtyard: 0% (51.94% in summer)
- Block Z podium amenity courtyard: 49.87% (80.97% in summer)
- Station Plaza: 56.81% (99.52% in summer)
- Garden Square West: 100% (100% in summer)
- Community Gardens: 100% (100% in summer)
- Garden Square Central: 98.74% (100% in summer)
- Peel Park: 91.7% (99.24% in summer)
- Garden Square East: 91.46% (100% in summer)
- Peel Square: 99.8% (100% in summer)
- Rowan Gardens: 100% (100% in summer)

In winter months, all the public spaces exceed the minimum requirements. It is acknowledged that here are instances where the private communal amenity spaces within the podium courtyards do not meet the minimum requirement in the winter months. However, in these cases the level of compliance in the summer months is significantly better and these are the months when these amenity spaces are more likely to be used.

Overall, the level of daylight, sunlight and overshadowing is considered acceptable when balanced against the BRE guide expectations in a conventional suburban context with the expectations for a more intensive and larger scale of development according with the London Plan Opportunity Area designation as well as the expectation of transformative development providing a substantial proportion of the housing growth in the Colindale area in accordance with the CAAP.

Construction impacts

As part of the EIA procedure, the ES has considered the demolition and construction phase of the development in the assessment of potential impacts. Potential impacts including traffic and parking, noise and general disturbance, air quality, water quality and contamination will be mitigated through the construction management plan required by condition if the council is minded to approve the application

3.6 Transport, highways and parking

The NPPF 'sustainable development' imperative involves amongst other things, improvements to conditions for travel (para 9) as well as actively managing patterns of growth to make the fullest possible use of public transport, walking and cycling (para 19). Sustainable development is the focus of London Plan Chapter 4 'Promoting Sustainable Transport'. The importance of the transport and parking implications of development, particularly the appropriate approach for Outer London is addressed in London Plan 2011 policy 2.8 and generally in Chapter 6 'London's Transport' including policies 6.3, 6.9, 6.10 and 6.13. In addition, Barnet Core Strategy DPD 2012 Policy CS9, Development Management Policies DPD 2012 policy DM17 and CAAP policies 3.1, 3.2, 3.5 and 4.2.

In summary, the comprehensive redevelopment of the former Peel Centre site integrates the development with the surrounding residential streets and facilitates improved pedestrian and cycle connections throughout the local area.

The proposed new access arrangements and highways impact have been subject to review and assessment by officers who raise no objections to the development. The resultant vehicle trips will be satisfactorily accommodated within the existing transport network providing the proposed package of transport works is implemented. 2,053 car parking spaces (0.71 spaces per unit) will be provided for the development in accordance with the Colindale Area Action Plan (CAAP)'s parking standards. These will largely be accommodated 'on plot' within undercroft or basement car park, with some on-street. Total numbers of cycle and disabled parking will be provided in accordance with the London Plan standards.

The Transport Assessment (TA) demonstrates that careful and extensive work has been undertaken to examine the existing situation and to use suitable data to build acceptable models of the area. All assessment work is in accordance with national guidance and best practice on schemes of this nature and size, taking into account the CAAP that was formally adopted by the London Borough of Barnet Council on 2nd March 2010.

The detailed appraisal of the transport aspects is provided in the following section.

Introduction

This section of the report examines the transport issues related to the application. It summarises the information provided by the Applicant in the Transport Assessment (TA) dated August 2014 and Transport Statement Addendum (TSA) dated May 2015, in terms of the likely impacts on the transport system. A review of the mitigation measures and controls that are recommended as a means of ensuring that the proposed development can be safely accommodated on the transport system without unacceptable impacts, is also provided.

Transport Assessment

The TA has been taken through a pre-application process with the 'Peel Centre, Colindale Transport Assessment – Scoping Document' dated 18th February 2014 by

WSP issued for review. Comment by officers and TfL were provided and reviewed. However, it should be noted that on submission of the TA, the methodology used to calculate non car mode share had changed and has been subject to further discussion since the planning application was submitted.

The TA was included as part of the submission in August 2014 but had a number of areas where further clarity was required. Further information and associated meetings followed, culminating in a Transport Assessment Addendum submitted in May 2015. This identifies the scheme impacts and proposes appropriate measures to mitigate the impact of generated traffic onto the surrounding transport network.

In summary the development will provide an improved highway network through improvements to Colindale Avenue / Aerodrome Road and a contribution towards pedestrian / cycle link to Colindeep Lane. Increased movement generated by the development is expected to result in increased walk and cycle journeys, patronage for local rail, tube and buses, and traffic movements. This has been satisfactorily assessed and an appropriate package of mitigation measures proposed, particularly for London Underground.

Description of the existing site

The development proposals seek to redevelop part of the former Peel Centre site, which previously accommodated a Metropolitan Police Service training facility for staff training and operational functions, located to the south of Colindale Avenue and west of Aerodrome Road. Existing land uses include cadet and residential accommodation, classrooms, sport facilities, offices, catering facilities. In the south eastern part of the site, 42 residential houses are located outside the security fence. The total existing floorspace across the application site is 77,639 sqm.

In total 20.35 hectares of land is within the former Peel Centre site is proposed to be redeveloped within this planning application as separate planning permission was granted in August 2012 for a consolidated Metropolitan Police Service training facility on the site to be retained in situ on the land identified in Figure 1.

Existing Transport Conditions

The existing transport conditions are set out in detail in Chapter 5 of the TA. The site is relatively isolated from the area to the east and south being bordered by railway lines. To the north it borders Aerodrome Road and to the west is Colindale Avenue. Both roads are single lane two way carriageways which connect at the north east corner of the site, together with Eagle Drive and Grahame Park Way, in a Roundabout.

Colindale Avenue connects to the Edgware Road (A5), part of the Strategic Road Network (SRN). Aerodrome Road provides linkage to Watford Way (A41) which is part of the TfL Road Network (TLRN).

Colindale Underground Station is located on Colindale Avenue, between the roundabout and Edgware Road.

There are five entry/exit points for the Metropolitan Police Service training facility, one of which links to Colindale Avenue with the remainder onto Aerodrome Road. Rowan Drive provides access to/from the residential units onto Aerodrome Road.

The baseline travel characteristics of the Colindale area, in comparison to Barnet as a whole, based on census data method of travel to work, are:

Census Data Method Of Travel To Work (Those Travelling)

	Underground	Train	Bus/Coach	Taxi	Motorcycle	Driving	Passenger	Bicycle	On foot	Other
Colindale	29.3%	5.93%	16.9%	0.34%	1.15%	34.6%	2.57%	1.06%	7.36%	0.84%
Barnet	28.3%	6.37%	12.9%	0.47%	1.17%	39.4%	2.27%	1.56%	6.74%	0.85%

Colindale Underground Station can be reached from within a 10 minute walk across the site. Within a 20 minute cycle of the site, areas such as Finchley, Queensbury and Edgware can be reached.

Existing Parking

The Metropolitan Police Service training facility consists of 1,155 marked bays, of which 227 are designated for operational use (police cars), 911 for commuters, 17 for visitors, plus a further 300 overspill spaces.

There are 27 formal car parking spaces on Rowan Drive with an additional 45 informal spaces within the Rowan Drive loop.

Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) P, with parking restrictions in force between 1400-1500 hours Monday to Friday, extends across the adjacent streets of:

Controlled Parking Zone P

Ajax Avenue	Annesley Avenue	Booth Road
Cecil Road	Colindale Avenue	Eagle Drive
Falcon Way	Harrier Road	Pasteur Close
Rankin Close	Raven Close	Sheaveshill Avenue (north)

Aerodrome Road and Colindale Avenue have double yellow lines adjacent to the site.

Residential roads to the south of Colindeep Lane as well as Colindeep Lane itself, have unrestricted on-street parking.

Existing Pedestrian and Cyclist Facilities

Existing Pedestrian Links

There are good pedestrian connections into the site from surrounding streets from the north and west. Colindale Underground Station is in close proximity and is easily accessible from the site, although it has no means of step-free access at present.

There are poor connections to the east and south with access limited to a single overgrown footpath via a footbridge with poor visibility, providing connection across the railway lines.

Pedestrian Environment Review System (PERS) Audit

A (PERS) audit has been undertaken for this development and comprised walking routes to public transport and local facilities. The review assessed the local pedestrian environment as generally positive.

The PERS Audit has been used to help understand the potential movements across and around the site, barriers and required improvements to help design a scheme in which improvements for pedestrians are appropriately provided.

Existing Cycle Links

Provision for cyclists in Colindale is currently limited. There are no advance cycle stop lines at any of the signalised junctions within the study area and no dedicated cycle lanes.

However, both roads that bound the site are identified by TfL as quieter roads for use by cyclists. Aerodrome Road links to a subway (cyclists dismount) across Watford Way (A41) providing a connection to Greyhound Hill.

Road Safety

A review of recorded personal injury accidents in the surrounding area for the three year period ending October 2013 has been undertaken. In total 149 accidents were recorded of which 29 involved pedestrians.

At the Aerodrome Road / Colindale Avenue / Grahame Park Way / Eagle Drive Roundabout there were nine accidents, all of which were slight in severity. Over half the accidents related to a failure to look properly. In two thirds of the cases injuries occurred to occupants of motor vehicles, with a further two pedestrian casualties and one motorcyclist injury.

On Aerodrome Road, three motor vehicle and two pedestrian accidents were recorded, all of slight severity. The accidents were not concentrated in a specific location and the most common contributory factor was poor driver behaviour.

At Colindale Avenue, accidents were concentrated at the Booth Road junction and outside the tube station. In all there were nine slight accidents, split between 4 pedestrians and 5 motor vehicle occupants were noted, with carelessness and failure to look being the most common causes.

Colindeep Lane recorded eight accidents, of which one was fatal, two were serious and the remainder were slight. Injuries were all associated with motor vehicle occupants except in the case of a one slight injury to a pedestrian. The contributory factors associated with the fatality were *'Exceeding speed limit, Inexperienced or learner driver, Aggressive driving, Loss of control.'*

There are no underlying issues with highway safety at the site's access points and it is not considered that the proposed development will adversely contribute to accidents in the area. The highway proposals will include measures to reduce the accident risks as highlighted by providing clearly marked lanes for turning traffic, new and better pedestrian crossings, improved alignment and footway improvements.

All measures have been designed in accordance with latest accepted standards approved by officers. In addition, a Road Safety Audit and Design Engineer's Response to the proposed highway changes has been received, reviewed and accepted.

Public Transport

Existing Bus Routes

There are five main bus routes and one night bus that operate in close proximity to the site. Bus stops have recently been installed on Aerodrome Road and so there are a number of stops conveniently located on the north and western sides of the site.

Aerodrome Road is served by bus no. 186 and Colindale Avenue is served by bus no. 204 and 303. Colindeep Lane is served by bus no. 324. In total there are in the order of 24 buses an hour in each direction.

Bus Services – Frequency per Hour

Service No.	Route	Direction	Approx Frequency (per hr)	
			Am Peak	PM Peak
113	Edgware Station – Hendon Central – Finchley Rd – St John's Wood – Marble Arch	Northbound	6	6
		Southbound	6	6
186	Northwick Park Hospital – Edgware Station – Mill Hill Broadway – Colindale – Brent Cross	Eastbound	5	5
		Westbound	5	5
204	Sudbury town – Kingsbury – Colindale - Edgware	Northbound	6	6
		Southbound	6	6
303	Edgware – Mill Hill Broadway – Colindale Asda	Northbound	4	4
		Southbound	4	4
324	Stanmore – Kingsbury – Colindale – Hendon Central – Brent Cross	Eastbound	3	3
		Westbound	3	3
N5	Edgware – Colindale – Hendon Central – Finchley Road – Camden	Northbound	4	
		Southbound	4	

	- Whitehall		
--	-------------	--	--

These bus services provide a connection to a wide number of key areas of retail and employment as well as connecting to London Underground services.

Adjacent to the site, the southwest bound bus stop on Colindale Avenue has a shelter and bus routing information. On Aerodrome Road, only bus stop flags and bus stop routing maps are currently provided.

Existing bus loadings are summarised in the following table:

Bus Route / Direction		AM Peak (0700-1000)				PM Peak (1600-1900)			
		Board	Alight	Depart Load	Arrive Load	Board	Alight	Depart Load	Arrive Load
113	NB	2	2	36	36	1	8	44	52
	SB	7	2	47	42	5	1	32	29
186	E/B	4	1	32	29	3	3	22	22
	W/B	5	2	15	12	3	6	30	34
204	NB	4	2	23	22	2	5	19	22
	SB	2	0	23	20	1	2	18	19
303	NB	1	0	13	12	0	0	12	12
	SB	2	0	13	11	0	0	10	10
324	E/B	2	1	12	11	1	1	12	12
	W/B	5	0	24	19	0	2	23	25

Route Capacity and Contribution

The TSA included forecasts of passenger transport demand and a summary of additional passengers per bus is shown below:

Additional Passengers Per Bus

Service No.	Direction	Movement	AM Peak Hour Per Bus	PM Peak Hour Per Bus
113	North	In	4	1
		Out	5	1
	South	In	3	5
		Out	4	3
186	East	In	3	6
		Out	10	5
	West	In	6	5
		Out	4	4
204	North	In	5	6
		Out	4	4
	South	In	4	7
		Out	11	7
303	North	In	6	4

		Out	7	4
	South	In	1	3
		Out	1	1
324	East	In	5	2
		Out	6	1
	West	In	6	3
		Out	7	3

There are two services in the vicinity of the development, 113 and 324, where spare capacity in the forecast year of 2026 reaches 10% or less:

Predicted Spare Capacity on Services 113 and 324

Service No.	Direction	Movement	AM with committed Development	AM with committed and proposed development
113	South	Out	13%	8%
324	West	Out	24%	10%

A contribution of £250,000 has been agreed between all parties and is considered reasonable towards the provision of local bus service improvements.

Existing Tube / Rail

The nearest underground station is Colindale Station, which is on the Edgware branch of the Northern line. It is directly accessible via the 204 and 303 bus services. The line has an operational capacity of 18 trains per hour operating in both directions during peak periods.

The nearest mainline railway stations are Mill Hill Broadway and Hendon, both of which are 2km away. Mill Hill Broadway is accessible via bus service no. 186 and 303. Hendon is a short bus or a moderate walk from Hendon Central which is accessible via Service no. 113, 186 and 324. Travel time from Hendon to Central London is about 23 minutes with 4 trains per hour in the peak.

Tube / Rail Capacity

The Transport Assessment Addendum included forecasting of passenger transport demand and a summary of London underground trips is summarised in the following table:

Increase To Each Underground Train

2026		Entry (Outbound)		Exit (Inbound)	
		To North	To South	From North	From South
AM	Committed	1	29	8	3
	Plus Development	1	42	10	3
PM	Committed	1	13	20	1

	Plus Development	1	19	29	1
--	------------------	---	----	----	---

Analysis indicates there is sufficient spare loading on the Northern line to accommodate the increase.

Station gate line capacity analysis indicates that an additional gate is required in 2026 with the full CAAP and the proposed development.

Staircase capacity analysis has been undertaken and identifies that the stairways within the station would operate with an acceptable level of service.

TfL is currently developing proposals for improvements to the station, including the provision of step free access.

A financial contribution of £11.25m has been agreed with the developer to fund improvements to Colindale tube station and mitigate the impact of the proposed development.

Existing Public Transport Accessibility Levels (PTALs)

Public Transport Accessibility Levels (PTALs) is an accessibility index of rail, underground and bus services within given travel times from a particular location. PTAL scores range from 1 (poor) to 6 (excellent) and take into account walking distance, service reliability, number of services and average waiting time. The PTAL score of the proposed development site varies from 4 in the southwest corner to a PTAL of 1b in the southeast corner.

The increased permeability and connectivity across the site with the proposed development results in the PTAL of the southeast corner increasing from 1b to 2.

Development Proposals and Phasing – Transport Impacts

Phasing

The proposals for the redevelopment and regeneration of the application site, which are embodied in this hybrid application, are for a sequence of three stages of development with phases within each Development Stage. Of this Stage 1 (with the exception of the school which is submitted for approval in outline) is submitted for full planning permission. A total of 2,900 residential dwellings (2,801 flats and 99 houses), up to 10,000 sqm of town centre use (A1-A4 uses, including foodstore, and D1, D2), a three form entry primary school and nursery, public open space and new public realm to connect to the local infrastructure, are proposed.

A summary of the development sequence is shown below.

Stage 1:

- 888 new dwellings
- 179 sqm of A1-4/D2
- Associated site preparation / enabling works
- Landscaping works

- Transport infrastructure and car parking
- Primary school

Stage 2:

- 1,160 new dwellings
- Up to 9,821 sqm A1-4, D1 and D2 including a foodstore of up to 3,000 sqm net sales GIA

Stage 3:

- 852 new dwellings
- Associated site preparation / enabling works
- Landscaping works
- Transport infrastructure and car parking

The phasing will be confirmed pursuant to an appropriately worded planning condition, however the main works on the public highway are likely to be carried out in Stages 1 and 2 and they will be subject to a Section 278 Highways Agreement. A summary of the specific highway proposals is set out below:

- Two new access junctions are to be constructed at Aerodrome Road comprising priority junctions with ghost island right turn lanes
- A pedestrian crossing on Colindale Avenue adjacent to the Colindale Avenue / Aerodrome Road Roundabout
- An option to widen the northern footway on Colindale Avenue to 3m to accommodate further development within the Colindale area
- Improvements to the Colindale Avenue / Aerodrome Road Roundabout with widening of the approaches and increased flaring, resulting in greater capacity
- Public realm improvements on Colindale Avenue, with widened footways and additional uncontrolled opportunities for pedestrians and cyclists to cross the road
- Closure of existing main accesses to the Metropolitan Police Service training facility with a new access being provided within the development. Existing gates and crossovers onto Aerodrome Road are nevertheless retained for occasional/emergency use or where operational circumstances require, in accordance with existing arrangements.

The highways scheme layout plan has been subject to a number of detailed checks, in addition to which the applicant has submitted a Road Safety Audit (RSA), together with a Designer's Response to the safety issues raised. Officers have reviewed the documents and are satisfied that all matters raised should be capable of being addressed at the detailed design stage, as part of the Highway approvals, when more detailed RSAs will also be undertaken.

Delivery and Servicing

Refuse/recycling vehicles will require regular access upon occupation of the dwellings and for other users that currently occupy this site and are planned to in the future. The details of the proposed turning heads will need to be provided at various points, and this will be addressed as part of detailed design at the Reserved Matters stages.

Roads that are built to adoptable standards, whether adopted or not, need to be appropriate for servicing vehicle requirements. If service vehicles are required to enter private roads, the applicants will be required to sign an indemnity agreement.

A Servicing and Delivery Plan will be secured by condition, along with a Waste Management Plan in order to facilitate safe refuse/recycling collection for this development.

Trip Generation and Base Model Development

Base Year Flows

Traffic flows were surveyed in November 2011 and June/July 2012 to develop a base model in order to assess the development's impact. Further automatic traffic counts were undertaken in February / March 2014 to review changes in traffic flows over the intervening years.

Following the traffic surveys carried out on local roads, the peak hours agreed for assessment were AM Peak (0800-0900 hours) and PM Peak (1730-1830 hours) on a weekday. A summary of base traffic flows is shown below:

2012 Base Flows (Total Vehicles)

	AM Peak		PM Peak	
	Eastbound	Westbound	Eastbound	Westbound
Grahame Park Way	502	801	619	528
Aerodrome Road	517	535	439	640
Colindale Avenue (N)	466	732	559	627
Colindale Avenue (S)	416	424	390	348

Committed Development

The cumulative impact of multiple developments within the area has been taken into account within the strategic area wide modelling undertaken to provide the future flow figures on which the TA for the development has been based.

Committed Development Schemes

with associated planning applications in Colindale taken into account are:

- Grahame Park Estate
- Plot A8 (Grahame Park Estate)
- Beaufort Park
- Brent Works
- Station House
- Colindale Hospital
- Former College Plot within Colindale Hospital
- National Blood Service Expansion
- Zenith House
- Greenpoint
- Capitol Way
- Oriental City
- Barnet College
- British Library Newspaper site
- Colindale Business Centre
- Adastral South
- Runway Close
- Farrow House
- Land in between the railway lines
- National Grid / Kidstop

Other specific planned developments which currently have no planning application have also been included.

Metropolitan Police Service Training Facility

The Metropolitan Police Service training facility currently operates at 70-75% capacity. The TA has been based on a comparison of a possible 100% occupancy of the existing site (with the existing modal split) to the Peel Centre development with a Metropolitan Police Service training facility operating at current levels of occupancy but with a significantly altered modal split in the future situation, reflective of much lower car parking levels.

This results in a significant proportion of new trips being offset against a predicted reduction in future trips to the new Metropolitan Police Service Training Facility, due to the significant reduction in associated staff car parking and accompanying Travel Plan. These predicted reductions rely on a considerable reduction in single occupancy car use, as set out in the planning permission for the training facility.

Summary of change in Metropolitan Police Trips (Excluding Servicing Trips)

Mode of Travel	MPS Future Operations					
	AM Peak			PM Peak		
	In	Out	Two-way	In	Out	Two-way
Car Driver	-455	-57	-512	-35	-133	-168
Car Passenger	27	0	27	1	3	5
Motorcycle	69	0	68	5	14	20
Bicycle	69	5	74	5	12	17

LUL	1	6	7	-3	21	18
Bus	1	4	5	-2	14	12
Walk	0	2	3	-1	9	8
Total	-288	-40	-328	-29	-60	-89

Peel Centre Trip Generation

The development trip assessment was discussed in detail with officers and TfL at the pre-application stage and during submission.

Predicted trip rates per unit have been derived from selected developments across London with similar characteristics such as number of units, unit type, car parking ratio and public transport accessibility, as contained within the industry standard (TRICS/TRAVL) database.

The trip rates were applied to the number of units for residential use, floor areas for commercial use and number of staff and pupils for the school, to give the total vehicular trip generation for the development in each peak.

Peel Centre Modal Split

The TRICS/TRAVL database does not provide a breakdown of the walk/public transport split by mode for residential uses, so the developer's highway representative has derived this from the London Travel Demand Survey (LTDS) data for Barnet. The developers consultant has also referenced a range of other data sources and more recent all mode TRICS surveys to support this forecast. The resulting trip generation and modal split for the proposed development is:

Total Peel Centre Development Trips

Mode	AM Peak Hour			PM Peak Hour		
	IN	OUT	Total	IN	OUT	Total
Car Driver	235	514	749	486	273	759
Servicing trips	23	23	46	4	4	8
Car Passenger	83	99	183	181	75	256
Motorcycle	0	4	4	13	0	13
Bicycle	46	47	93	36	103	139
LUL	97	313	409	259	184	443
Bus	226	299	525	260	199	459
Walk	519	642	1,161	555	434	989
Total Person Trips	1,230	1,942	3,171	1,794	1,272	3,066

The removal of trips from the existing Metropolitan Police Service Training Facility which causes a significant reduction in car trips results in the following net change in predicted trip generation by mode:

Summary of Total Trips – Net Change Proposed Development Trips Less Metropolitan Police Trips

Mode	AM Peak Hour			PM Peak Hour		
	IN	OUT	Total	IN	OUT	Total
Car Driver	-220	457	237	451	140	591
Car Passenger	110	100	210	182	79	261
Motorcycle	69	3	72	19	14	33
Bicycle	115	52	167	42	114	156
LUL	98	319	416	256	205	461
Bus	227	303	529	258	213	471
Walk	520	645	1164	554	442	997
Total Person Trips	919	1879	2798	1762	1207	2969

Agreement has been reached between officers, the developer and TfL regarding the total number of trips estimated to be generated by the development (residential, commercial and primary school). The estimated weekday vehicular trip figures total 235 arrivals / 514 departures in the morning peak (0800-0900) and 486 arrivals / 273 departures in the evening peak (1730-1830).

However, agreement between the developer and TfL regarding the modal split of residents' trips between pedestrians, bus passengers and rail/underground users has not been reached.

Although, the modal split figures between London Underground, bus and walk are not agreed between all parties, the combined contribution to bus/London underground improvements is agreed at £11.5m.

Trip Distribution

The distribution of the residential and school related traffic has been carried out via the London Borough of Barnet's own traffic model for the Colindale area, also approved by TfL. The development traffic assigned via the model has been extracted and added to local observed traffic movements. This is accepted by both officers and TfL.

Retail trips have been distributed manually based on a retail report submitted as part of the application, which sets out current and projected shopping patterns within the catchment area for the site.

Scenarios, Sensitivity testing and Transport Impact

The Colindale traffic model has been utilised to assess the net change in traffic on the network between 2011 and 2026 both with and without the proposed development.

Capacity analysis was undertaken for 2026, based on committed development, with and without the proposed development.

Junction and Link Capacity

Junction Modelling

The transport impact was modelled using industry standard junction analysis software. The following junctions were assessed:

- Eastern Access / Aerodrome Road priority junction – major and tertiary accesses
- Western Access / Aerodrome Road priority junction – major and tertiary accesses
- Colindale Avenue / Booth Road
- Grahame Park Way / Aerodrome Road / Colindale Avenue / Eagle Drive Roundabout
- Aerodrome Road / Watford Way / Greyhound Hill signal junction

The results of the 2026 analysis indicate minimal queues at the priority junctions linking the site to Aerodrome Road with queues of less than 2 vehicles in both AM and PM peaks.

The Colindale Avenue / Booth Road junction with development causes predicted queues in the 2026 PM peak to increase from 2 to 4 vehicles. However, the junction remains within capacity and it is not therefore necessary to make any junction improvements.

Analysis of the Grahame Park Way / Aerodrome Road / Colindale Avenue / Eagle Drive Roundabout highlights overcapacity on the Colindale Avenue arm in 2026 with and without the proposed development. Subsequently, increased entry width and flaring on the approach to the roundabout on this arm have been designed providing an extra lane which results in the junction being within capacity in 2026.

Link Capacity

Link capacity in 2026 has been assessed via the Colindale traffic model analysis. The results include the impact of the development and the full Area Action Plan are summarised in the following table:

Link Flow And Percentage Change

	AM Peak		PM Peak	
	Vehicles	Percentage	Vehicles	Percentage
Edgware Road (N of Colindale Avenue)	12	1%	-16	-1%
Colindale Avenue (S)	-51	-4%	-8	-1%

Colindale Avenue (N)	-71	-4%	85	5%
Grahame Park Way	57	4%	6	0%
Aerodrome Road	16	1%	47	3%
Greyhound Hill	26	6%	6	1%
Watford Way	-75	-2%	19	1%
Edgware Road (S of Colindale Avenue)	52	2%	-10	0%
Colindeep Lane	-73	-5%	5	0%
Aerodrome Road (E)	-154	-10%	34	2%
Aerodrome Road (W)	76	5%	244	15%

The key increases in the AM peak are Greyhound Hill at 6% and Aerodrome Road (W) at 5%, but of the twelve links, five show a reduction in flow. In the PM peak the highest percentage increases are on Aerodrome Road (W) at 15% and Colindale Avenue (N) at 5%. The proposed changes at Grahame Park Way / Aerodrome Road / Colindale Avenue / Eagle Drive Roundabout have been undertaken to accommodate this increase in flow.

Officers and TfL asked the applicant to assess potential rerouting through the area. Colindale traffic model analysis has been undertaken and the results indicate no significant displacement on other roads within the wider area.

Parking Provision

Residential Car Parking

In total, for the 2900 dwellings, 2053 residential car parking spaces will be provided at a ratio of 0.71 spaces per unit, in a mixture of basement, undercroft, surface and on-street locations.

To provide confidence in the 0.71 ratio figure, estimates of parking demand have been undertaken using varying methods.

Analysis of parking demand in the TA has been based on a national research project undertaken by the Department for Communities and Local Development (DCLG), the results of which were published in 2007 and is accepted as a robust assessment procedure. The method draws on 2011 census data for Colindale Ward to obtain car ownership data by dwelling size, type and tenure and this has been used to provide and estimate the likely residential car parking demand. Depending on how tenure is classified, the results generate a ratio of between 0.65 (which underestimates demand) and 0.81 (which overestimates demand). The proposed figure of 0.71 is near the midpoint of these two estimates.

To ensure the analysis is robust, a further assessment has been carried out in the TA using census output area analysis, reviewing the number of cars per household according to whether houses or flats, and the percentage of affordable housing, which estimates a total parking demand of 2053spaces (0.71).

A temporary car parking facility will be provided to ensure that a 0.71 minimum level is maintained at all times as the development rolls out. The distribution of spaces across the development has been evened out across the site at officer's request.

The provision is in accordance with the applicable local parking policy in the CAAP:

'Policy 3.5 Parking: Residential parking requirements will vary across Colindale depending on the location of each development site. 1 space per unit will be taken as the maximum standard but a lower provision of 0.7 spaces per unit will be encouraged on sites within close proximity to the public transport interchange, neighbourhood centre and high frequency bus routes. Non residential parking will be provided at levels consistent with Annex 4 of the London Plan.'

For comparison purposes, applying Barnet's Local Plan standards, the maximum residential car parking requirements are as shown in the table below which sets out the development breakdown compared to the LBB Maximum Parking Standards with Lower (1905) and Upper (3864) parking levels. The development will provide 2,053 parking spaces and therefore is within the range of policy compliance.

Maximum Parking Standards

Number of Bedrooms	Number of Units	LBB Maximum Parking Standard	
		Lower	Upper
Studio / 1	1019	0	1019
2	1312	1312	1968
3	522	522	783
4	47	71	94
Total	2900	1905	3864

The council's assessment of the adjacent Beaufort Park site has also been reviewed by officers. The permitted development parking ratio at Beaufort Park was 0.9 spaces per unit, which equates to provision of 2,691 parking spaces for the 2,990 residential units. As part of the Section 106 agreement associated with the outline planning permission (ref: W00198AA/04 dated 8 April 2005), it was agreed that this ratio may be decreased to as low as 0.6 if a reduced parking requirement could be demonstrated following parking surveys.

Based on the car park occupancy surveys undertaken on site five times per day over a three week period, from 1st to 20th July 2012 with further set of surveys conducted between 25th September and 22nd October 2012, with nearly full occupancy, a maximum occupancy parking of 60% in July and 65.2% in October were recorded. An overall parking ratio of 0.7 per unit was then recommended and approved.

In conclusion, overall a ratio of 0.7 could be considered to be on the low side given the PTAL of the southern part of the site; however in practice there is a range of local bus services covering all points of the compass and the Colindale Underground Station is relatively close by and will be accessed via high quality and direct pedestrian and cycle routes through the development. The site will also create its own local facilities. The TA has used an approved methodology to derive the 0.7 ratio and this compares closely with the very similar adjacent Beaufort Park development. All this provides reassurance that overall, the proposed parking ratio of 0.7 can be considered appropriate.

Visitor Vehicular Spaces

There is no specific provision for visitor vehicular spaces as it has been assumed that those from the site visiting elsewhere will offset those arriving at the site. However, in any event, CPZs are proposed on adjacent streets to ensure neighbouring residents are not affected.

Accessible Spaces

A minimum of 290 (14%) accessible spaces will be provided for the residential development, in excess of the 10% figure set out in the London Plan. Accessible car parking spaces for the commercial development will be in accordance with the London Plan.

For the detailed application accessible parking bays will be allocated to wheelchair housing standard units at 1:1 provision.

Motorcycle Parking Spaces

Provision of 42 motorcycle parking spaces is proposed in Stage 1, followed by a further review to ensure sufficient provision.

Primary School

With regards to the proposed 3 form entry primary school, 70 parking spaces will be provided specifically for the pickup and drop off of school children, together with 13 spaces for staff.

There are no standards for school parking and so an assessment of the likely demand has been made from other schools in north London boroughs. The details of the school parking, drop off and coach pick up arrangements will be agreed under the Reserved Matters application for the school plot.

Car Club

A total of 8 car club spaces are proposed, to be located across the development, in accordance with CAAP Policy (3.6):

Food Retail Parking

Provision is proposed at 130 spaces in the basement, compared to London Plan standards of between 120-167 spaces. These spaces will be a limited to 'short stay' and available for visitors to the new high street within the development as a whole and not specifically associated with food store.

Non Food Retail Parking

Provision should number between 170-283 spaces to accord with the London Plan. As the non food elements are located close to Colindale Underground Station and therefore accessible by non car modes, plus the majority of use will be by the residents of the development, there are 18 on-street 'short stay' parking spaces designated for retail parking plus a share of the basement high street parking.

These proposals are considered to be acceptable given the food retail parking provision above.

Electric vehicle charging points

These are being provided in accordance with The London Plan, with 20% provision for all uses with potential for a further 20% when required for residential use and 10% for non- residential. This accords with CAAP Policy (3.6) and is considered acceptable.

Cycle Parking

Cycle Parking for Stages 2 and 3 will be provided in line with Code for Sustainable Homes, slightly in excess of the London Plan which states that for residents, one space for cycles should be provided for a studio and one bed unit. For those with two or more bedrooms, it is recommended that two spaces are provided. With regards to visitors, provision at 1 space per 40 units is stated.

For Stage 1, the London Plan standards equate to 1526 spaces, with 1568 spaces being proposed. For Stages 2 and 3 provision will be confirmed through Reserved Matters applications.

Cycle parking will be provided by a mix of secure underground and ground floor parking for residents and on street facilities for visitors and for commercial premises.

For A3 retail use (3,500sqm) a total of 88 visitor cycle parking spaces have been proposed. The London Plan standards state long stay at 1 space per 175sqm and short stay at 1 space per 40sqm, resulting in 108 spaces. Officers consider that this lower level of cycle parking will be sufficient.

Undercroft parking

Many of the undercroft car parks are limited in size, and the width of the entrance has been restricted to a single vehicle. This does mean that if a vehicle were emerging from the car park, any vehicle entering would need to give way to the vehicle exiting, slowing traffic within the development. Officers consider this will have a negligible impact.

Undercroft areas ceiling heights will be conditioned to meet the required standards including the recommended height of 2.6 metres above wheelchair accessible spaces and aisle widths in the car park.

Controlled Parking Zones

The CAAP states:

'3.5.26. The council will give further consideration to the adequacies of existing car parking controls in the surrounding area and explore options to expand CPZ controls if necessary. The Council will require contributions from developers to enable a review of CPZ controls, and where necessary expand them.'

The reduction in parking provision at the Metropolitan Police Service training facility has the potential to cause parking to be displaced across a wider area. There is also the potential risk of residential and visitor overspill parking from the proposed development. Based on existing provision of CPZs in the area and the proposed Peel Link (discussed in section 9 below), it is envisaged that any parking overspill is likely to be displaced to the south of the development.

In order to ensure the impact on the public highway in the vicinity of the site is minimised it is considered necessary to secure contributions towards implementing a CPZ to the south of the development. To ensure there is suitable protection for local residents, the proposed streets for CP Z implementation include:

Proposed Streets For Controlled Parking Zone Implementation

Beaulieu Close	Colindeep Lane (part)	Manor Way (part)	Rushgrove Avenue (part)
Chalfort Court	Court Way	Marlow Court	Scottwell Drive
Clovelly Avenue	Crossway	New Way Road	Sheaveshill Avenue (part)
Colin Crescent	Endersleigh Gardens	Poolsford Road	The Loning
Colin Drive	Grove Gardens	Rankin Close	Woodfield Avenue
Colin Gardens	Lynton Avenue	Hillfield Avenue (part)	

A condition is proposed that to control parking levels within the site residents will be excluded from purchasing a parking permit for any adjacent CPZ. A contribution of £138,348 has been agreed.

Car Parking Management Plan

An overall Car Parking Management Plan for the whole site will be conditioned to be submitted and approved pre commencement and this will set out how parking will be managed and the monitoring of future provision of additional accessible parking bays.

Phase Car Parking Strategy

In addition a Phase Car Parking Strategy will be required, so that the approach to on and off street parking can be kept under review as the development rolls out. Appropriate conditions are set out elsewhere in this report and it should be noted that at the reserved matters stage the number and location of parking spaces for subsequent phases will be required to be set out.

Pedestrians and Cyclists

The predicted number of pedestrians and cyclists generated by the proposed development are summarised in the following table:

Summary of Total Pedestrian and Cyclist Trips

	AM Peak Hour			PM Peak Hour		
	In	Out	Total	In	Out	Total
Pedestrians	520	645	1164	554	442	997
Cyclists	115	52	167	42	114	156

Improvements to the pedestrian / cycle network are required as although generally positive, the PERS assessment does indicate that changes are needed. The CAAP provides further clarification on the improvements required in the area including a Peel Access Link that was proposed to help reduce the severance across the Colindale Area created by the Northern Line and improve north-south pedestrian connectivity.

Analysis using the local traffic model indicates that vehicular provision through the Peel Link will not be of major benefit. However, as a pedestrian/cycle link there will be a significant improvement to the permeability of the wider Colindale area. Therefore, a pedestrian and cycle link using an existing railway bridge under the Northern Line is proposed, linking the development to Colindeep Lane.

The Peel Link will be built to the required standards, with the detail being provided at Reserved Matters stage.

Further provision for cyclists and pedestrians include:

- A right-hand turning lane for cyclists on Rushgrove Avenue onto Colindeep Lane (for onwards connection to the Peel Link)
- The development provides a new network of streets and pedestrian/cycle routes linking into the surrounding network.
- Public realm improvements are proposed on Colindale Avenue, with the potential for widened footways and additional opportunities (controlled and uncontrolled) for pedestrians and cyclists to cross the road.

Travel Planning

The Colindale Area Action Plan states:

‘Policy 3.6 Travel Plans and Sustainable Travel: Development proposals will require the submission of a travel plan and transport assessment and include appropriate measures to minimise impacts on the local highway network and promote the use of public transport, walking and cycling.’

A Draft Travel Plan Framework has been submitted as part of the TA (Appendix AA) which although provides valuable information is not considered acceptable therefore

will be required by obligation to be revised and resubmitted for approval prior to commencement. A Travel Plan is aimed at encouraging the use of non-car modes of travel. The site has multiple uses including residential, employment, community and educational. As each of these uses have differing requirements each will require a separate Travel Plan.

In order to ensure the objectives and targets of the individual Travel Plans are met a 'Monitoring Contribution' is required for the Council to undertake monitoring of the Travel Plans.

The contribution will consist of:

£15,000 towards monitoring the objectives of the Residential Travel Plans

£5,000 towards monitoring the objectives of the School Travel Plans

£5,000 towards monitoring the objectives of the Retail / Commercial / Community Travel Plans

These contributions will be secured through the Section 106 Agreement, which will also include the requirement for a Travel Plan Champion for the whole site to be appointed who is suitably qualified and experienced and Travel Plan Champions for each individual TP.

To help deliver the targets of the Residential Travel Plan, the applicant has agreed to the provision of a Residential Travel Plan Incentives Fund to be secured via the Section 106 agreement. The fund will be aimed at incentivising the Residential Travel Plan by providing up to £300 per dwelling (£870,000 in total) for any two of the following: purchase of Oyster Cards, subsidised Car Club Membership or for Cycle Purchase vouchers.

As this development is to be constructed in phases over a number of years the initiatives set out in each of the Travel Plans should be updated and reviewed as per the Transport for London 'standardised approach to monitoring' as detailed below:

- Residential TP – In years 1,3,and 5 and then every other year until 5 years after first occupation of the final unit
- School Travel Plan – annually until the school is fully occupied
- Retail/commercial/community TPs – Years 1,3 and 5.

As part of the travel planning a Car Club is proposed to operate within the site, with a total of 8 spaces. This is a scheme that provides its members with quick and easy access to a car for short term hire. Members can make use of car club vehicles as and when they need them. This scheme is aimed at reducing the need for individuals to own a car. The exact location of car club parking spaces are identified on the parking allocation plan in the Transport Assessment Addendum. Through the Travel Plan monitoring, the possibility of increasing the number of car club spaces depending on the demand will be considered and can be incorporated at the Reserved Matters stage.

Section 106 Highways and Transport Contributions

To summarise from the above Highways and Transport section of this report the Section 106 Transport and Highways package that has been agreed is set out below:

TfL

- Local Bus Service Contribution £250,000 (exact timing of payments to be confirmed);
- A contribution of £11.25million is to be secured towards London underground improvements to Colindale tube station as requested by TfL.

CPZ

- Local Parking Measures Contribution for CPZ reviews with provision of £138,348 (based on an estimated split of £103,600 for signing / lining and £34,748 for consultation / officer time);
- Traffic Regulation Order amendments to exclude residents from CPZ permits £2,500 per phase/sub-phase.

Travel Plan

- Submission of a revised Framework Travel Plan prior to commencement of the development, including:
 - objectives and targets for the whole development
 - for each development use: commitment to develop and get approved appropriate Travel Plans, objectives and targets, key measures to be committed to for lifespan of individual Travel Plans, timescales and funding, life-span of the Travel Plan
 - site-wide measures
 - site-wide action plan
 - monitoring: Full Travel Plans are to be TRICS/SAM compliant. Travel Plan Statements to be iTRACE compliant
- Submission of a Residential TP prior to occupation of each phase of the development
- Submission of a School Travel Plan prior to occupation of the school, which meets the criteria in TfL guidance 'What a school travel plan should contain.'
- Submission of Retail/Commercial/Community Travel Plans within 6 months occupation of the use.
- Residential Travel Plan Incentives Fund comprising a Travel voucher/s per unit up to the value of (£300) to be spent on 2 of the following:
 - £150 Oyster card
 - Subsidised Car club membership to the value of £150 and/or towards car club hire
 - Bike voucher to the value of £150
- A Travel Plan Champion for the whole site is to be appointed
- Base line surveys within 6 months of first occupation or 25% of dwellings occupied, whichever is sooner
- The applicant needs to make a commitment towards the provision of car club parking spaces on site for the life of the development.

- Therefore a contribution of £870,000 towards the Residential Travel Plan Incentives based on 2,900 units would be required.
- A contribution of:
 - £15,000 towards monitoring the objectives of the Residential Travel Plans
 - £5,000 towards monitoring the objectives of the School Travel Plans
 - £5,000 towards monitoring the objectives of the Retail / Commercial / Community Travel Plans

Cycle/Pedestrian

Peel Link: Provision of a pedestrian / cycle connection through to Colindeep Lane, to the south of the site, to be secured via S106/S278. As certain items have yet to be considered in detail, monies within the Section 106 should be subject to the scheme to be agreed and costs independently verified by two quantity surveyors.

It should be noted that this does not include the costs of the major highway improvements, including Colindale Avenue, as these will be subject to approval under Section 278 of the Highways Act.

S278 Agreement

Any works proposed on public highway including any alterations to public highway will be concluded under Section 278 of the Highways Act 1980 and detailed design drawings of the proposals would need to be submitted to the local Highway Authority for approval prior to commencing any works on public highway.

Construction

Due to the size and location of the development, a Construction Management Plan (CMP) must be submitted to and approved by the local planning authority, prior to the commencement of any works within each phase of the development. The relevant condition is set out elsewhere in this report.

The CMP should also include limits on times of operation for the lorries and identify a designated safe route for lorries (via A41) to ensure minimal impact on the public highway and to demonstrate how the operation and construction can be done safely. These and other requirements are outlined in Chapter 20 of the TA and the PC32 Construction Management Plan and Delivery Strategy dated August 2014, which includes a number of outline management proposals that are considered acceptable at this stage, subject to submission of a full CMP as part of Reserved Matters.

The CMP should demonstrate that that pedestrian and cycle links through the site connecting to bus stops and the underground station, from any occupied residential blocks are provided throughout the construction period.

As part of the plan, the parking of construction workers will be subject to particular controls.

Transport Assessment of the Detailed Application

There is predicted to be a maximum potential net increase of 888 residential units and 179sqm of A1-4/D2 as part of the detailed element of the hybrid application. In accordance with the earlier discussion in this transport section of the report, it is anticipated that the major highway works will be implemented as part of Stages 1 and 2, and a temporary car park will be provided in Stage 1 to ensure residential car parking provision is at the required 0.71 ratio.

Colindale Avenue

At the request of the London Borough of Barnet, two options for the highway / public realm improvements for Colindale Avenue have been developed:

- A 2.35m minimum (1.80m minimum in the vicinity of the bollards east of Booth Road) wide footpath on the north western side of Colindale Avenue, between the tube line and Aerodrome Road Roundabout (Drawing 70001368-GA-04 Rev I)
- A 3m wide footpath on the north western side of Colindale Avenue, between the tube line and Aerodrome Road Roundabout (Drawing 70001368-GA-23 Rev A)

The option to provide a 3m wide footpath will ensure improved pedestrian links between the Colindale Underground Station and the area beyond the end of Colindale Avenue. This is officers preferred option, with funding for the additional widening to be secured from other developers in the area, as the pedestrian provision on the other (Peel Centre) side of Colindale Avenue are deemed sufficient within Drawing 70001368-GA-04 Rev I.

The proposed footway widening does result in a kink in the alignment of Colindale Avenue south west approach to the railway bridge adjacent to the underground station. Proposals to widen the bridge at this location are being developed, with a funding bid due to be submitted to TfL who are broadly supportive.

Internal Highway Layout

The internal road layout has been discussed earlier in this report and has been designed in recognition of the predicted volume of peak hour traffic flows and in accordance with generally acceptable Manual for Streets guidelines with greater emphasis placed on keeping vehicular speeds to 20mph or less without the need for reliance on vertical or horizontal traffic calming measures. Many of the junctions have been designed so that there are deliberately sharp corners. This encourages drivers to reduce speed and adopt a slower and more cautious approach. In many cases drivers will need to give way on parts of the streets where two-way movements are tight and therefore they would slow down.

At the eastern access (Rowan Drive position) the road will be raised to footway level and designed as a shared street.

The streets have been designed so that most of the junctions are raised tables which will assist in slowing vehicle speeds and improving road safety. The tables on

the main spine road route would be designed to be compatible with bus use should this be required in the future.

The internal road layout is not going to be adopted with access submitted for approval in detail – further details to be provided principally as part of landscape conditions and reserved matters applications.

Conclusion and recommendations for transport

It is clear that the development will result in some impacts on the surrounding highway and public transport networks if the proposed highway measures and other elements of the proposed transport package are not implemented, however with the proposed scheme design and package of improvements any impacts from the development will be fully mitigated.

The TA and Addendum demonstrates that careful and extensive work has been undertaken to examine the existing situation and to use suitable data to build acceptable traffic models of the area. Although there has been disagreement regarding the methodology of the modal split calculations for London underground / bus / walk, the necessary contributions to London underground and bus has been accepted by all parties.

Officers consider that the impacts of the development on the transport network have been robustly assessed, and that all appropriate mitigation measures and control mechanisms are provided for, should permission be granted. The planning conditions and obligations recommended in this report are considered to provide an effective framework of control and officers therefore recommend the scheme for approval on matters relating to highways and transport.

3.7 Waste and Recycling

Although the NPPF does not contain specific waste policies, it does state that part of the environmental dimension to 'sustainable development' is waste minimisation (para 7). As part of London Plan 2011 Chapter 5 'London's Response to Climate Change' policy 5.17 seeks suitable waste and recycling storage provision in new developments as does the Barnet Core Strategy DPD 2012 policy CS14 which also promotes waste prevention, reuse, recycling, composting and resource efficiency over landfill. This is reiterated by CAAP policy 6.6.

The Waste Management Plan (Doc PC22) considers the requirements for the residential occupiers as well as the other uses including the school. An outline waste storage and collection plan has been detailed for the entire site and it is envisaged that the detailed WMP for Stage 1 will be extended and replicated for outline stages 2 and 3 as they come forward, as follows:

- Residential: waste will be segregated, stored and collected in three main streams: organic, residual and mixed recycling. Dwelling houses will have individual bins whilst flats will have communal bin store facilities in the ground floor building footprint. Weekly collection is proposed. In dwelling

houses there will be a further stream, green waste, which will be collected fortnightly;

- Non-residential: waste will be managed using 1100L bins in dedicated bin storage rooms. At this stage the proposal assumes that compactors will not be used. Waste will be broken down into the same three streams and will be collected either by LBB or a private service.

Tracking diagrams around the site demonstrate the feasibility of access, subject to the detailed design of Stages 2 and 3 being verified at reserved matters stage.

The Council's waste team are satisfied with the proposal and recommend an appropriately worded condition to secure the waste management plan.

3.8 Energy, Sustainability, and Resources

London Plan Policy 5.2 requires development proposals to make the fullest contribution to minimising carbon dioxide emissions in accordance with the following energy hierarchy:

- Be lean: use less energy
- Be clean: supply energy efficiently
- Be green: use renewable energy

London Plan Policy 5.2 'Minimising Carbon Dioxide Emissions' requires all residential developments to achieve a 40% reduction in carbon dioxide emissions on 2010 Part L Building Regulations. The London Plan Sustainable Design and Construction SPG 2014 updated this target of 35% on 2013 Part L Building Regulations. Policy 5.3 of the London Plan goes on to set out the sustainable design and construction measures required in developments. Proposals should achieve the highest standards of sustainable design and construction and demonstrate that sustainable design standards are integral to the proposal, including its construction and operation. The Further London Plan Chapter 5 policies detail specific measures to be considered when designing schemes including decentralised energy generation (Policies 5.5 and 5.6), renewable energy (Policy 5.7), overheating and cooling (Policy 5.9), urban greening (Policy 5.10), flood risk management and sustainable drainage (Policies 5.13 and 5.15).

Local Plan policy DM01 states that all development should demonstrate high levels of environmental awareness and contribute to climate change mitigation and adaptation. Policy DM04 requires all major developments to provide a statement which demonstrate compliance with the Mayors targets for reductions in carbon dioxide emissions, within the framework of the Mayor's energy hierarchy. Proposals are also expected to comply with the guidance set out in the council's Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD) in respect of the requirements of the Code for Sustainable Homes.

The application is supported by the following:

- Sustainability Statement (Doc PC23): Considers amongst other matters the

following:

- Sustainable Action Plan (Including the Mayor's energy hierarchy, proposed site-wide heating network)
 - Code for Sustainable Homes (CFSH)
 - BREEAM (non-residential floorspace)
- Energy Statement (Doc PC24): Considers amongst other matters the proposed energy strategy, CO2 emissions and reductions and the proposed solutions to address the Mayor's Energy Hierarchy

In respect of the Mayor's energy hierarchy, the following measures are to be incorporated into the scheme:

Be lean:

- Passive design of blocks, block locations and orientation
- Thermal performance of the building envelope
- Glazing design optimisation balancing heat gains and losses and daylight benefits
- Air tight construction
- Efficient mechanical ventilation and heat recovery
- Variable speed fans and pumps
- Efficient lighting
- Increased occupier awareness through displays

Be clean:

- Connection to area-wide heat networks
- Development of a site wide heat network served by an energy centre
- Evaluate and commit to on-site CHP system

Be green:

- Consider available renewable technologies – Photovoltaic panels will be considered for Block M to meet the CO2 reduction target in the situation that it is not feasible to connect the houses to the on-site energy centre
- Consider the ability to integrate renewable technologies with the above measures

The total package of improvements results in a total site wide reduction of 41% in CO2 emissions which exceeds the London Plan policy 5.2 target.

On-site Energy Centre and heat networks in the Colindale Area

The application includes the provision of an on-site energy centre to serve the development. This will be designed to ensure connection of blocks as they come forward, rather than relying on retrofitting at a later date. The energy centre will be provided in Block H which is within the Stage 1 Detailed Component of the application. This is a central location within the site from which all phases can be served. The detailed design shows this facility accommodated in a double-height space at ground floor. The energy centre comprises CHP1 (650kWth), CHP2 (850kWth) as well as 5 no. gas boilers of 500/1000/2000 kW capacities (to provide resilience in supply and supplement the CHPs) and thermal storage (which reduces the potential size and number of CHPs required).

A heat network across the site will distribute heat to all of the blocks. The network also allows for potential connection to a future Colindale-wide energy network. The intention is for all apartments and non-residential buildings to be connected. At each stage the technical feasibility will be assessed and if found not to be feasible, such as in the case of the town houses in Block M, alternative green measures (such as PVs) will be proposed to achieve the required 40% CO2 reduction targets.

The energy statement includes the consideration of potential connection to existing and future energy networks. Although there are no current networks with capacity for the proposal to connect to, future connection potential will be secured in the design of the proposed energy centre, network layout and location of pipework to the edge of the site. The Council is in the process of considering a potential Colindale-wide system in accordance with CAAP Policy 6.2 which this site may connect to in the future. The potential for future connection to an area wide network to be assessed will be secured as part of the planning agreement.

Code for Sustainable Homes

The May 2015 addendum to the Sustainability Statement notes that following a recent review of housing standards the Government's new standards for homes was announced on 25th March 2015. This was introduced through the Housing Standards Review.

As a result of the review Local Planning Authorities are no longer able to mandate the Code for Sustainable Homes (CfSH) certification on new housing schemes. Any pre-existing CfSH project registrations will be upheld and still administered through the Building Research Establishment (BRE), and considered as legacy projects. However any new applications will only be accepted where there is a contractual requirement for CfSH (e.g. where funding has already been agreed).

In October 2015, a new revision to the Building Regulations is scheduled which is expected to contain new additional optional Building Regulations on water and access which will include key elements of the Code for Sustainable Homes. The Ministerial statement also states that where a local plan policy requires a CfSH commitment the minimum water and energy targets will be required.

“Where there is an existing plan policy which references the Code for Sustainable Homes, authorities may continue to apply a requirement for a water efficiency standard equivalent to the new national technical standard, or in the case of energy a standard consistent with the policy set out in the earlier paragraph in this statement, concerning energy performance.”

Therefore policies DM02 and CAAP policy 6.2 which require achievement of CfSH certification cannot be directly applied.

It is anticipated that 2015 updates to the Building Regulation will include many of the key areas as required by CfSH level 4 (level targeted in the originally submitted sustainability statement). Therefore, the addendum report states that no dwellings will be built to a lower quality or standard than CfSH level 4, for the minimum water

and energy requirements.

The addendum further confirms that the applicant will construct all new buildings to the standards of the approved building regulations at the time, and will achieve the minimum requirements for carbon dioxide emissions reductions in accordance with the London Plan Further Alterations 2015 (currently policy 5.2).

Accordingly, appropriately worded conditions regarding accessibility, water usage, and CO2 reduction measures are recommended if the council is minded to approve the application, to cover the remaining relevant matters.

BREEAM

The Sustainability Statement includes a BREEAM pre-assessment which demonstrates an 'Excellent' level can be achieved for the scheme. An appropriately worded condition is recommended for assessment at the time of detailed assessment to reconfirm the target will be achieved.

3.9 Landscaping and biodiversity

The 'sustainable development' imperative of NPPF 2012 includes enhancing the natural environment and improving biodiversity (para 7). London Plan 2011 policy 7.19 states that development proposals, where possible, should make a positive contribution to the protection, enhancement, creation and management of biodiversity. Barnet Local Plan policy DM16 states that when it is considering development proposals the council will seek the retention, enhancement or creation of biodiversity.

Landscape concept

Reflective of the approach to breaking down the site into character areas, the landscape concepts described in the DAS Vol I (Doc PC13) follows as similar approach. The site is broken down into landscape character areas as follows:

- Civic Squares: i.e. Station Plaza and Peel Square which are intended upon comprising high quality hard landscaping, with tree planting, raised planters, some limited elements of soft landscaping as well as street furniture
- Community Parks and Gardens: i.e. Peel Park, Garden Square East, Central and West as well as Rowan Gardens and the community gardens. The spaces will variously provide for local recreation, playable areas, open lawn, trees, flowering plants, grasses, ground cover and hedgerow planting. The community gardens along the southern boundary are also intended the opportunity for community allotments. Peel Park is the key space, comprising amenity and flower rich grassland areas for sports and recreation. Active edges of the park will include a trim trail, kick-about and outdoor gym
- Urban Streets: These are the primary and secondary routes for vehicular, pedestrian and cycling connectivity into and around the site. The space between buildings will be defined by the hard landscaping treatment as well

as street tree planting

- Green Streets: These are the more minor streets to access individual blocks and will be set out as a shared surface with street tree planting, seating and cycle parking. Planting privacy strips will define private and public space and individual and communal entrances may include doorstep seating.

Along with an overall Masterplan concept (Section 7.2), the DAS details how routes, playspace, sports and fitness including cycle routes, running circuit and trim trail and sports pitches are incorporated (Sections 7.3 to 7.6). Specific tree and amenity planting species are also identified in sections 7.8 to 7.9. In addition, the consideration of ecological values, levels and reuse of soil, SUDs and drainage, hard landscaping and furniture palette and lighting (Sections 7.10 to 7.15).

Particular aspects of the landscape masterplan are discussed under the various sub headings below.

Trees

In respect of existing tree DAS Vol I section 7.7 and the Tree Survey and Arboricultural Statement (Doc PC26) indicate that there are no trees that are currently the subject of a Tree Preservation Order (TPO). In respect of potential candidates, the majority of trees on site were identified as category B and C. Four Category A trees were identified namely, an Ash, Silver Birch and two no. Limes, all between 9 – 13m in heights and more than 40 years useful life left (Tree survey ID nos. 42, 107, 194 and 202). There are 29 Category U trees which have been assessed as unsuitable for retention and are identified for removal in a Tree Retention and Removal Plan.

Both category A and B trees warrant consideration for protection and retention. However, the redevelopment of the site to meet strategic landuse priorities for housing needs to be considered. In instances where trees cannot be retained on site due to the conflict with urban design and layout objectives, replacement planting will be required. This is the case for the abovementioned trees which conflict with buildings and access.

In respect of retention, the DAS indicates that the existing trees which are to be retained are concentrated along the southern site boundary as small groups of varying species and age. A group of mature London Plane trees close to the junction of Aerodrome Road and Colindale Avenue are proposed for retention as well as several individual specimens at the eastern end of the site at the boundary near Aerodrome Road. In general trees are retained in the areas of proposed hard and soft landscaping. The intention is to work around existing tree levels and root protection zones with no-dig paving construction and all works affecting trees under the advice of an approved arboriculturalist. These methods will be secured by an appropriately worded condition.

In respect of replacement planting, which forms part of the justification for the abovementioned loss of existing trees, DAS Vol I section 7.8 summarises the proposed tree planting as follows:

- Planting scheme with tree species to suit the scale, use and character of streets, gardens, squares, civic spaces or community gardens and boundary situations. Tree selection further on the basis of characteristics such as providing for shade, shelter, visual amenity, habitat potential and species biodiversity enhancement. Planting choices are also intended to provide year round interest in flowering and fruiting display as well as autumn leaf colour, branch form and bark colour
- Central spine road: Large street trees such as limes
- Secondary routes and urban streets: Robust medium scale street trees including Lime, Alder and Pear
- Green streets: Flowering and semi-ornamental species such as Birch, Field Maple and Ornamental Pear
- Aerodrome Road highways improvements: London Plan
- Hedgerow trees: Native species including the southern and eastern boundary including Field Maple, Hazel, Rowan and Hawthorn. These provide a varying canopy with feeding opportunities for insects and birds
- Urban Squares: Predominantly hard landscaped with tree planting for shade, shelter, visual amenity. Legacy trees providing long term canopy cover such as Cedar, Zelkovia and Liriodendron
- Peel Park, Garden Squares and Community Gardens: A mix of native and ornamental varieties including Birch, Oak and Pine. In particular, specimen Pine trees are proposed for Garden Square East as a visual orientation marker and termination of the central spine road
- Communal residents gardens: Smaller scale fruiting and flowering tree species such as Cherries, Pear, Apple, Witch Hazel and Amelanchier

Biodiversity

In regards to biodiversity and the existing and surrounding site conditions, the following key aspects are noted:

- There are no statutory designated sites for nature conservation, either within the site or directly adjacent.
- A phase 1 Habitat Survey in March 2014 identified the potential for bat roosting in a single building (No. 152 Colindale Avenue) however, emergence surveys concluded this was not a constraint on development as bats are not currently utilising the building. All other buildings either have low or negligible potential to support bat roosts.
- Surveys undertaken in 2012 identified a mature oak located within the site (within the area for Stage 3) and adjacent the boundary with 24 Rowan Drive as supporting a roost of common pipistrelle bats. In the 2014 survey of this tree, there were no features identified as suitable to support roosting bats. However as a precautionary approach, the tree is assumed to continue to represent a roost and is proposed to be retained.
- A corridor for wildlife movement is created by the deciduous woodland along

the northern bank of the Silk Stream as well as existing tree groups along the south eastern boundary of the site adjacent to the railway tracks.

- The Silk Stream to the south is defined as a Habitat of Principal Importance in addition to the woodland being a London BAP Priority Habitat and forming part of a corridor between Colindale and Hendon.

Consequently, the landscape masterplan proposes to strengthen the Silk Stream corridor and provide a new mosaic of habitats and opportunities for wildlife movement as follows:

- Native species hedgerow planting along the southern boundary;
- Flowering lawns in community gardens and park areas providing valuable habitat and increased floral diversity;
- Living ecological green and brown roofs to support invertebrates and birds;
- New tree planting to provide a net gain in canopy;
- Swales as part of the site wide drainage proposal which also provide a wet-dry habitat, connecting back to the Silk Stream;
- Species mix includes nectar rich flowering species as well as evergreen hedgerows, shrubs and ground cover providing year round habitat for invertebrates and food for insects and birds;
- Lighting design to respect habitat and wildlife corridors to the southern and eastern boundaries. Lighting is to be the minimum requirements, with minimal spread and directional with the use of shields and hoods where necessary and avoiding reflective surfaces. Also, avoiding blue and white wavelengths and only minimal ultra-violet light;
- In addition to counter the lighting impact, to use temporary closed board fencing until the vegetation matures. Nonetheless, establishing amenity planting as soon as possible within the construction programme; and
- Ongoing management and maintenance to encourage the development of biodiversity.

The ES chapter 14 considers ecology and nature conservation. In summary, the following impacts are identified:

Demolition and construction phase

- Permanent adverse effect to the Silk Stream and Burnt Oak SBI due to the loss of a component and woodland and scrub to allow the Peel Link. However, it represents 1% of the SBI area and provided best construction practice is observed, the SBI to function as a green corridor and not be compromised. As such the proposed development, both construction and operational phase is not considered to have a significant impact on the SBI.
- Loss of existing semi-natural habitat although this loss and the resulting effect is considered not significant.
- The creation of semi-natural habitat as part of the proposal including living roofs, grassland, hedgerows and swales as well as planting that will

strengthen the existing corridor of natural habitat to the south will provide a permanent beneficial effect.

- Trees and buildings which will be lost in Stage 1 have negligible bat roost potential. Trees and buildings lost in Stages 2 and 3 have low bat roosting potential with one building having moderate potential. The loss of a roost within the rear of 24 Rowan Drive is an adverse impact but not considered significant on the basis of the available roosting opportunities in the wider area.
- Works affecting bats and roosts will be undertaken under a natural England Licence and bat boxes will be installed. The overall effect to the bat population is reduced to a temporary adverse effect that is not considered significant.
- No impacts to reptiles are identified, it being noted that the loss of gardens at 6-10 Rowan Drive have limited potential to support them. Nonetheless, in order to avoid potential impact, vegetation clearance in the gardens will be undertaken according to a precautionary method.
- Although the scheme will result in the loss of existing semi natural habitats that benefit birds and invertebrates, there is an increase in the landscape diversity as part of the proposal that will have a beneficial effect, albeit non-significant.

Completed development

- Sensitive lighting design as previously outlined will mitigate the impact on retained bat roosts and potential bat movement corridors adjacent the site. Therefore, no adverse impacts are anticipated.
- There are no other adverse effects identified on protected and or notable species when the development is completed and occupied.
- There are no significant residual effects of the development.

As there are no significant and long term impacts identified and provided that the mitigation measures are followed, the scheme is considered to contribute to the protection and enhancement of biodiversity in accordance with the abovementioned policy.

Overall, having regard to the proposed approach to landscaping of the site, the proposed tree removal from the site is considered acceptable on the basis of the proposed replacement tree planting scheme and hard and soft landscaping proposals which have the potential to enhance biodiversity in accordance with the above-mentioned policy.

In addition to the abovementioned measures, bat and bird boxes will also be secured by condition in support of biodiversity enhancement.

Flood risk, Water Resources, Drainage and SUDs

In support these considerations are ES Chapter 12 (Doc PC15), Flood Risk Assessment (Doc PC25) and Fowl and Surface Water Drainage Assessment (Doc

PC27).

In respect of flood risk, the site is within Flood Zone 1 which is classified as being of low risk of flooding. The proposed development is acceptable in this zone and there is no requirement for exception and sequential testing of the acceptability of the scheme.

Nonetheless, in terms of the identification of potential flood risk, namely localised surface flooding, the greatest likelihood is as a consequence of the hard standing areas. A Surface Water Drainage Strategy has been prepared to handle water through attenuation measures proposed within the site boundary and will accommodate 1 in 100 year flood events. Discharge to the Silk Stream and Thames Water surface runoff sewers will therefore be limited.

It is noted that a flood risk assessment has also been undertaken for the Peel Link. Some flooding may be experienced in this area however, data provided by the EA in support of the assessment indicates that peak water levels for a 10/25/50/75 year event would not reach the level of the footpath. The flood risk is concluded as being low with low hazard (i.e. Low risk to life) and no mitigation is identified as being necessary.

In regards to water resources and the surface drainage on site, the ES confirms that mitigation measures during the site demolition and construction phase will protect the water environment such that there will be negligible effect on water quality and the environment downstream of the site.

In respects of the completed and occupied development, the proposed drainage strategy will mitigate any flood risk or impact to water quality downstream. The proposed strategy involves a sustainable urban drainage system (SUDS) with the following key features:

- Attenuation measures: Provided at podium level (beneath the landscaped communal amenity space) and also potentially in the basement of the blocks. Flows around the curtilage of buildings will be mitigated by permeable paving and soft landscaping as well as below ground attenuation;
- Swales: proposed in the soft landscaping strips adjacent to the blocks;
- Green Roofs: proposed as part of the development, both the communal podium and at roof level; and
- Pollution controls: petrol interceptors to capture pollutants from road runoff. Also, the consideration of siltation traps in the case that road gullies are not considered adequate at the detailed design stage to capture silt and debris.

The effect of the drainage strategy is predicted to reduce peak flows from the site by 90%, which is a significant improvement above the London Plan objective of reducing brownfield site flows by 50%.

3.10 Other matters

Utilities

In support of the application a Utilities Strategy (Doc PC28) has been prepared, considering the maximum estimated demand generated by the development as well as the impact upon the existing network and proposed connections to and distribution around the site.

The scheme may necessitate diversions and disconnection of utilities where their current location conflicts with the proposed development. This involves consultation and agreement with the necessary providers although, this is separate to the planning process.

Off-site upgrade of utilities to supply the demands of the development, the following key aspects are noted:

- Electricity: Providing capacity necessitates the extending of the Colindale grid substation as well as providing the connection to the site
- Gas: Sufficient low pressure and medium pressure gas capacity exists to serve the development
- Water: Capacity modelling is ongoing with the provider Affinity Water, although, no comments or objection have been raised by them in the meantime in response to the application consultation.
- Telecommunications: Further discussion and investigation with BT open reach will be needed to ascertain the capacity of the network as the scheme progresses.

With reference to the proposed Peel Link, LU/TfL, Affinity Water and Thames Water have been consulted to establish their requirements and potential impacts to their respective infrastructure when the link is delivered. At the detailed design stage, further site investigations and agreement regarding safeguarding and construction methods as well as the final design will be needed to secure the necessary consents to implement the works. These discussions and any agreements and approvals required are separate to the planning process.

In regards to sewer infrastructure, the separate Foul and Surface Water Drainage Assessment (Doc PC27) notes that modelling of the development is underway to consider its potential impact and any required mitigation. Thames Water have requested a grampian style condition is imposed requiring the drainage strategy to be agreed.

Electronic interference

ES Chapter 17 (Doc PC15) considers the potential effects on TV reception, mobile telephones, wireless networks and emergency services. The height and bulk of the proposal may potentially affect terrestrial and satellite TV however, the report states that Metropolitan Police have confirmed there would be no impact to their communications on their retained site.

In respect of the completed and occupied development, the potential impact to

terrestrial TV reception (reliant on the Crystal Palace Transmitter) and satellite TV reception (signal shadow extending 40m to the north west of the site) is resolved by upgrading terrestrial aerials to satellite (E.g. Freesat) and re-siting affected satellite dishes. It is noted in the ES that there are very few properties solely reliant on terrestrial-only reception i.e. 4 affected by Stage 1 and a further 12 affected by Stage 2 and 3. Also, only 6 dishes were identified within the digital reception shadow. Overall, the permanent effect of the proposal on reception has been assessed as negligible.

Ground conditions and Contamination

In regards to potential contamination, the ES (Doc PC15) Chapter 11 indicates that the likelihood of any contamination being present is low. Potential sources of contamination are limited to areas of made ground and point sources such as oil from boiler houses and fuel spills. It is noted that there may be asbestos materials in several buildings and possibly in demolition stockpiles. An Unexploded Ordinance Survey has been undertaken which confirms that there is a low risk within the site boundary as there was no significant bombing or other sources of unexploded ordinance. An area of medium risk was identified outside the application site boundary on account of WWII bombing in the area. In addition to the various mitigation measures of Chapter 11 which are consolidated in the Mitigation Register which will be conditioned, the council's Environmental Health Team have also recommended appropriate contamination remediation conditions if the council is minded to approve the application.

3.11 Viability, Planning Obligations & CIL

S106 obligations & viability

Policy CS15 of the Barnet Local Plan states that where appropriate the Council will use planning obligations to support the delivery of infrastructure, facilities and services to meet the needs generated by development and mitigate the impact of development.

The full list of planning obligations is set out in the heads of terms to this report.

In summary the scheme includes **20%** affordable housing by unit number with an affordable housing review mechanism and section 106 financial contributions totalling **£14,822,364**.

In respect of economic viability, the financial appraisal submitted in support of the proposal has been independently assessed by the Council's viability consultant. In summary, following extensive negotiations as part of the review, the council's consultant has agreed the appraisal inputs with the exceptions of the estimates of value, namely the Benchmark Land Value (BLV) and Residual Land Value (RLV). The applicant's viability appraisal demonstrates that the scheme, including the proposed level of affordable housing (20%), section 106 contributions and CIL payments, demonstrates a residual land value (RLV) which is lower than the benchmark land value (BLV). This indicates that there is a viability gap.

Notwithstanding this, officers negotiated an increase in affordable housing from 15% to 20% when compared to the original submission in addition to the section 106 package of financial contributions outlined in the heads of terms of this report.

The viability consultant confirms that this level of affordable housing as well as the amounts of the other financial contributions secured is considered to be the maximum contribution the scheme can make as well as factoring in the cost estimates of Mayoral and Barnet CIL. Notwithstanding this, a positive review mechanism has been agreed with the applicant to secure additional affordable housing on site in the scheme should circumstances improve in the future over the course of the construction of the development which is expected to be between 10 and 15 years.

In reaching this agreement, the Council has agreed to fund the construction of the 3FE primary school (a strategic landuse priority identified in the Barnet CAAP) through the Barnet CIL payment that the scheme will generate. At the appropriate stage the school will need to be added to the Council's Regulation 123 list of infrastructure.

LB Barnet CIL

As noted in SPD para 2.2.11, the purpose of Barnet's CIL is to secure capital funding to help address the gap in funding for local infrastructure. The money raised by Barnet's CIL will be used to pay for infrastructure required to mitigate the impact of development across the Borough.

Pursuant to the LB Barnet Planning Obligations SPD, the CIL charging rate is £135 per sqm. In the case of Barnet's CIL, ancillary car parking space is not chargeable (SPD Para 2.2.14). Allowing for indexation, the latest estimate of the CIL liability is **£28.5million** based on the floorspaces proposed as part of the application. It should be noted that this is an estimate only and CIL is calculated at the time it becomes chargeable, which is at commencement of development. This estimate excludes the calculation of any CIL relief which may be sought on affordable housing.

Mayoral CIL

Pursuant to the Table 3: Mayoral CIL Charging Rates of the Mayor's April 2013 SPG 'Use of planning obligations in the funding of Crossrail, and the Mayoral Community Infrastructure Levy', a flat rate charge of £35 applies to LB Barnet. Allowing for indexation, the latest estimate of the CIL liability is **£9.45million** based on the floorspaces proposed as part of the application. It should be noted that this is an estimate only and CIL is calculated at the time it becomes chargeable, which is at commencement of development. This estimate excludes the calculation of any CIL relief which may be sought on affordable housing.

4. EQUALITY AND DIVERSITY ISSUES

Section 149 of the Equality Act 2010, which came into force on 5th April 2011, imposes important duties on public authorities in the exercise of their functions,

including a duty to have regard to the need to:

- “(a) eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other conduct that is prohibited by or under this Act;*
- (b) advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it;*
- (c) foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it.”*

For the purposes of this obligation the term “protected characteristic” includes:

- age;
- disability;
- gender reassignment;
- pregnancy and maternity;
- race;
- religion or belief;
- sex; and
- sexual orientation.

Officers have in considering this application and preparing this report had regard to the requirements of this section and have concluded that a decision to grant planning permission for this proposed development will comply with the Council’s statutory duty under this important legislation.

The site is accessible by various modes of transport, including by foot, bicycle, public transport and private car, thus providing a range of transport choices for all users of the site.

A minimum of 10% of flats will be wheelchair adaptable.

The development includes level, step-free pedestrian approaches to the main entrances to the building to ensure that all occupiers and visitors of the development can move freely in and around the public and private communal spaces.

Dedicated parking spaces for people with a disability will be provided in locations convenient to the entrances to the parking area.

The proposals are considered to be in accordance with national, regional and local policy by establishing an inclusive design, providing an environment which is accessible to all.

7. CONCLUSION

In conclusion, the scheme is considered acceptable on balance having regard to relevant national, regional and local planning policies and guidance. The principle of the redevelopment of the site is considered acceptable and accords with the intent of the London Plan Opportunity Area designation as well as the specific landuse and other criteria of the Barnet CAAP. An ES has been submitted which robustly

assesses the proposed development against a full range of topics and identifies appropriate mitigation such that there are no significant adverse impacts posed by the scheme. The proposed detailed design for Stage 1 is considered to be high quality with appropriate levels of amenity space, public open space and residential standards achieved for future occupiers reflecting a development of this intensity and balanced with the need to optimize the use of the site. The amenities of neighbouring residential occupiers are not considered to be unduly impacted. The potential transport impacts of the scheme have been considered and appropriate mitigation proposed including limiting parking levels, provision of a green travel plan as well as contributions towards public transport improvements, and improvements to access and connectivity as part of the proposal. The scheme deals with its waste and recycling requirements and in terms of energy and sustainability, a range of measures are proposed achieving a 41% reduction in CO2 emissions. A suitable approach is taken to landscaping and biodiversity with retention of trees where possible as well as enhancement of the biodiversity values to the south and east of the site with appropriate treatments and species and mitigation. There is no flood risk to consider but nonetheless, the proposed SUDS addresses runoff on site and thereby mitigates any impact downstream. The scheme has also considered utilities provision, electronic reception and contamination and appropriately worded conditions are recommended. The scheme is considered to be appropriate and acceptable having regard to the full range of considerations in this report including the stated policies and guidance.

Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires the Council to determine any application in accordance with the statutory development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. All relevant policies contained within the development plan, as well as other relevant guidance and material considerations, have been carefully considered and taken into account by the Local Planning Authority. It is concluded that the proposed development generally and taken overall accords with the relevant development plan policies. It is therefore considered that there are material planning considerations which justify the grant of planning permission. Accordingly, subject to referral to the Mayor of London, a decision not to call in the application by the Secretary of State (in light of the objection by Sport England to the loss of sports pitches) and subject to the satisfactory completion of the Section 106 Agreement, **APPROVAL** is recommended subject to conditions as set out in appendix 3 of this report.