

**LOCATION:** IBSA House and Former Printworks, The Ridgeway, London, NW7 1RN

**REFERENCE:** 19/6551/FUL                      **Received:** 06 December 2019  
**Accepted:** 17 December 2019

**WARD:** Mill Hill                                **Expiry:** 17 March 2020

**CASE OFFICER:** Hardeep Ryatt

**APPLICANT:** Ziser London

**PROPOSAL:** Demolition of existing printworks/factory buildings and redevelopment of the site (to provide a total of 197 residential units) including conversion of the existing IBSA House office building into 61 flats with associated external alterations. Erection of 5 no. new blocks ranging from 3 to 6 storeys in height to provide 136 flats. Provision of private amenity space, communal rooftop terraces, refuse storage, 344 cycle parking spaces and basement and surface level parking for 197 cars. Single storey extension to the existing gate house to provide management/security office. Associated alterations to landscaping and ancillary works.

#### **RECOMMENDATION 1:**

The application being of strategic importance to London, it must be referred to the Mayor of London. As such, 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 Service Director of Planning and Building Control or Head of Development Management:

1. Legal Professional Costs Recovery  
Paying the council's legal and professional costs of preparing the Agreement and any other enabling agreements;
2. Enforceability  
All obligations listed below to become enforceable in accordance with a timetable to be agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority;
3. Indexation  
All financial contributions listed to be subject to indexation.
4. Affordable Housing  
Provision of 42no units and 20% by habitable room (Intermediate) – with both early and late stage review mechanism.

5. Employment and Enterprise  
The applicant would be required to enter into a Local Employment Agreement with the Council in order to provide an appropriate number of employment outcomes for local residents. Alternatively, the applicant may wish to make a financial contribution in lieu of the employment outcomes outlined above. Such a contribution would be commensurate with the number of outcomes secured and in line with the Barnet Delivering Skills, Employment, Enterprise and Training SPD guidance.
6. Carbon Offset Contribution  
Payment of £481,109 index-linked as a contribution to ensure that the development achieves net zero carbon dioxide emissions, in accordance with the London Plan 2021.
7. Highways Improvement Works  
The applicant shall provide a contribution of £24,000 (exc. VAT) in order for the highway authority to implement the following highway improvement works and any subsequent design/construction overruns:
  - A new dropped kerb tactile crossing as the site vehicular access;
  - A new dropped kerb tactile crossing across The Ridgway south of the site; and
  - Remove vegetation to establish full footway width on the eastern and western footways of Bittacy Hill, allowing for some resurfacing.
8. Section 278 Highway Works  
All necessary works to the public highway under section 278 of the Highways Act to facilitate the implementation of the development in agreement with the Local Highways Authority.
9. Residential Travel Plan Monitoring  
Payment of a monitoring contribution of £10,000.
10. Residential Travel Plan Incentives Fund  
£300 per unit Residential Travel Plan Incentive Fund to be used by 1st occupiers to get 2 of the 3 TP incentives of the following:
  - Oyster card with £150 credit
  - Cycle shop voucher to the value of £150
  - Car club credit/membership to the value of £150
11. Control Parking Zone (CPZ)  
Financial contribution towards Local CPZ monitoring, consultation and implementation, final sum to be agreed.
12. Traffic Management Order  
Financial contribution (per phase if applicable) towards the amendment of Traffic Management Order (TMO) to ensure that the new occupants are prevented from purchasing parking permits in local CPZs.
13. Monitoring Fee  
A contribution of £5,000 towards the monitoring of the S106 agreement.

### **RECOMMENDATION 3:**

That subject to Recommendation 1 and upon completion of the agreement specified in Recommendation 2, the Service Director of Planning and Building Control or Head of Development Management to approve the planning application reference 19/6551/FUL under delegated powers, subject to the conditions as set out within this report.

That the Committee also grants delegated authority to the Service Director of Planning and Building Control or the Head of Development Management to make any minor alterations, additions or deletions to the recommended conditions/obligations or reasons for refusal as set out in this report and addendum provided this authority shall be exercised after consultation with the Chairman (or in their absence the Vice-Chairman) of the Committee (who may request that such alterations, additions or deletions be first approved by the Committee).

### **CONDITION(S)**

Conditions and Informatives will be reported in full in the Addendum.

## **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 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.

Barnet's Local Plan is made up of a suite of documents, including the Core Strategy and Development Management Policies. The Core Strategy and Development Management Policies documents were both adopted by the Council in September 2012.

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. In this instance, the Mill Hill East Area Action Plan (adopted January 2009).

More detail on the policy framework relevant to the determination of this development and an appraisal of the proposal against the development plan policies of most relevance to the application, is set out in subsequent sections of this report dealing with specific policy and topic areas.

The development proposals have been carefully considered against the relevant policy criteria and, for the reasons set out in this report, it is concluded that the development would fulfil them to a satisfactory level, subject to the conditions and planning obligations recommended. The proposed development is therefore considered to comply with the requirements of the development plan.

## National Planning Policy Framework (February 2019)

The 2019 NPPF was adopted in February 2019 replacing the 2012 NPPF and includes minor clarifications to the revised version published in July 2018. The NPPF sets out the Government's planning policies for England and how these should be applied<sup>1</sup>. It provides a framework within which locally-prepared plans for housing and other development can be produced.

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 also states that the purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development. In addition the NPPF retains a 'presumption in favour of sustainable development', unless any adverse impacts of a development would "significantly and demonstrably" outweigh the benefits.

## The London Plan 2021

The new London Plan which sets out the Mayor's overarching strategic planning framework for the next 20 to 25 years was adopted on the 2nd March 2021 and now supersedes the previous Plan (2016).

The new London Plan policies (arranged by chapter) most relevant to the determination of this application are:

### Chapter 1

- GG1 Building strong and inclusive communities
- GG2 Making the best use of land
- GG3 Creating a healthy city
- GG4 Delivering the homes Londoners need
- GG5 Growing a good economy
- GG6 Increasing efficiency and resilience

### Chapter 2

- Policy SD1 Opportunity Areas
- Policy SD3 Growth locations in the Wider South East and beyond
- Policy SD10 Strategic and local regeneration

### Chapter 3

- Policy D1 London's form, character and capacity for growth
- Policy D2 Infrastructure requirements for sustainable densities
- Policy D3 Optimising site capacity through the design-led approach
- Policy D4 Delivering good design
- Policy D5 Inclusive design
- Policy D6 Housing quality and standards
- Policy D7 Accessible housing
- Policy D8 Public realm
- Policy D11 Safety, Security and resilience to emergency
- Policy D12 Fire safety
- Policy D14 Noise

## Chapter 4

Policy H1 Increasing housing supply

Policy H2 Small sites

Policy H3 Meanwhile use as housing

Policy H4 Delivering affordable housing

Policy H5 Threshold approach to applications

Policy H6 Affordable housing tenure

Policy H7 Monitoring of affordable housing

Policy H8 Loss of existing housing and estate redevelopment

Policy H10 Housing size mix

Policy H11 Build to Rent

## Chapter 5

Policy S4 Play and informal recreation

## Chapter 6

Policy E11 Skills and opportunities for all

## Chapter 7

Policy HC3 Strategic and Local Views

Policy HC4 London View Management Framework

## Chapter 8

Policy G1 Green infrastructure

Policy G2 London's Green Belt

Policy G4 Open space

Policy G5 Urban greening

Policy G6 Biodiversity and access to nature

Policy G7 Trees and woodlands

## Chapter 9

Policy SI 1 Improving air quality

Policy SI 2 Minimising greenhouse gas emissions

Policy SI 3 Energy infrastructure

Policy SI 4 Managing heat risk

Policy SI 5 Water infrastructure

Policy SI 6 Digital connectivity infrastructure

Policy SI 7 Reducing waste and supporting the circular economy

Policy SI 8 Waste capacity and net waste self-sufficiency

Policy SI 12 Flood risk management

Policy SI 13 Sustainable drainage

Policy SI 17 Protecting and enhancing London's waterways

## Chapter 10

Policy T1 Strategic approach to transport

Policy T2 Healthy Streets

Policy T3 Transport capacity, connectivity and safeguarding

Policy T4 Assessing and mitigating transport impacts

Policy T5 Cycling

Policy T6 Car parking

Policy T6.1 Residential parking

Policy T9 Funding transport infrastructure through planning

## Chapter 11

### Policy DF1 Delivery of the Plan and Planning Obligations

#### Barnet Local Plan

The development plan documents in the Barnet Local Plan constitute the development plan in terms of local planning policy for the purposes of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act (2004). The relevant documents comprise the Core Strategy and Development Management Policies documents, which were both adopted in September 2012. The Development Management Policies document provides the borough wide planning policies that implement the Core Strategy. These policies will be used for day-to-day decision making.

The Local Plan development plan policies of most relevance to the determination of this application are:

#### Core Strategy (Adopted 2012):

CS NPPF (National Planning Policy Framework - Presumption in favour of sustainable development)

CS1 (Barnet's Place Shaping Strategy - Protection, enhancement and consolidated growth - The three strands approach)

CS4 (Providing quality homes and housing choice in Barnet)

CS5 (Protecting and enhancing Barnet's character to create high quality places)

CS7 (Enhancing and protecting Barnet's open spaces)

CS8 (Promoting a strong and prosperous Barnet)

CS9 (Providing safe, effective and efficient travel)

CS11 (Improving health and well-being in Barnet)

CS12 (Making Barnet a safer place)

CS14 (Dealing with our waste)

CS15 (Delivering the Core Strategy)

#### Development Management Policies (Adopted 2012):

DM01 (Protecting Barnet's character and amenity)

DM02 (Development standards)

DM03 (Accessibility and inclusive design)

DM04 (Environmental considerations for development)

DM06 (Barnet's heritage and conservation)

DM08 (Ensuring a variety of sizes of new homes to meet housing need)

DM10 (Affordable housing contributions)

DM14 (New and existing employment space)

DM15 (Green belt and open spaces)

DM16 (Biodiversity)

DM17 (Travel impact and parking standards)

#### Mill Hill East Area Action Plan (AAP) 2009:

The Mill Hill East Area Action Plan (AAP) was adopted by the Council in 2009 and forms part of Barnet's Local Plan containing policies relevant to the determination of planning applications in the area. The AAP forms a material consideration in the

determination of Planning Applications in this area. The relevant policies for the consideration of this application are:

MHE2 (Housing)  
MHE3 (Employment)  
MHE12 (Sustainable Transport)  
MHE13 (Parking)  
MHE14 (Creating a Sustainable Development)  
MHE15 (Design)  
MHE16 (Delivering Design Quality)  
MHE17 (Conserving Built Heritage)  
MHE18 (Delivering the AAP)  
MHE19 (Planning Obligations)

A number of local and strategic supplementary planning guidance (SPG) and documents (SPD) are material to the determination of the application.

Local Supplementary Planning Documents:

Planning Obligations (April 2013)  
Residential Design Guidance (April 2013)  
Sustainable Design and Construction (April 2013)  
Delivery Skills, Employment, Enterprise and Training from Development through S106 (October 2014)

Mayoral Supplementary Planning Documents and Guidance:

Barnet Housing Strategy 2015-2025  
Accessible London: Achieving an Inclusive Environment (April 2004)  
Sustainable Design and Construction (May 2006)  
Wheelchair Accessible Housing (September 2007)  
Planning for Equality and Diversity in London (October 2007)  
Shaping Neighbourhoods: Play and Informal Recreation (September 2012)  
All London Green Grid (March 2012)  
Housing (March 2016)  
Affordable Housing and Viability (August 2017)  
The Control of Dust and Emissions during Construction and Demolition (July 2014)  
Mayor's Transport Strategy (2018)

### Barnet's Local Plan (Reg 18) 2020

Barnet's Local Plan Reg 18 Preferred Approach document sets out the Council's preferred policy approach together with draft development proposals for 67 sites. It is Barnet's Emerging Local Plan. Whilst this will increase in weight as it progresses through the consultation and examination stages, it is now a material planning consideration and therefore any future planning decision requires some awareness of the emerging policies contained within the draft Local Plan. Of particular relevance to the proposed development is:

Policy GSS07 Mill Hill East

*Millbrook Park is making progress as an example of good suburban growth. The implementation of the 2011 planning consent following the adoption of the Mill Hill*

*Area Action Plan in 2009 has already delivered 600 new homes, with the expectation of a further 1,645 units to be completed.*

*Within the wider area around Mill Hill East there is capacity to deliver 1,400 additional new homes.*

*The Council will positively consider proposals on suitable sites to deliver further good suburban growth, including at Mill Hill East Station, Watchtower House and IBSA House, which together could deliver around 745 new homes.*

*Any development proposal must consider the Mill Hill Conservation Area and Green Belt designations.*

The application site is within the Mill Hill East Growth Area and the Proposed Site Allocation List (no.46) as identified in the Proposed Barnet Local Plan. This document states at para 4.18.3:

*A planning framework for Mill Hill East has been established with the Area Action Plan adopted in 2009. With development also underway at the former National Institute of Medical Research other development opportunities have emerged around the Mill Hill East AAP area including Watchtower House, IBSA House and Mill Hill East station. Careful consideration of development within the Mill Hill Conservation Area and Green Belt will be required. These three sites are identified in the Schedule of Proposals at Annex 1.*

The Local Plan 2012 remains the statutory development plan for Barnet until such stage as the replacement plan is adopted and as such applications should continue to be determined in accordance with the 2012 Local Plan, while noting that account needs to be taken of emerging policies and draft site proposals.

### The Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010

Planning obligations need to meet the requirements of the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010 (as amended) to be lawful. Were permission to be granted, obligations would be attached to mitigate the impact of development.

## **2. PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS**

### **2.1 Site Description**

The land to which this proposal relates lies entirely within the London Borough of Barnet. The application site extends to an area of approximately 2 hectares and can be broadly split into two parts; the west side (front part of the site containing a part five, part-six storey building) and the east side (rear part of the site containing a printery). Vehicle access is taken from The Ridgeway to the west.

The western half of the site comprises a part five, part six-storey (plus basement) IBSA House and associated surface parking. Internally, IBSA House contained a mix of different administrative functions associated with the former owners, the Servants of Jehovah's Witnesses religious institution. The existing building has rhythmic windows and an L-shaped form that leads to a tower forming a focal point to the south-west part of the building. The main body of the building is faced in multi red brickwork which is in very good condition and is adorned by dark red painted render architrave that wraps around the building above the ground floor. The tower has a

vertical element on each elevation and forms a small gable at roof level which is surrounded with painted render which matches the architrave, lintels, and cills to the fenestration. The roof shape is that of a traditional mansard roof and falls away to a crown roof. The total gross internal area is approximately 11,500sqm. Surface parking lies adjacent to the building.

The eastern half of the site encompasses the former Printworks and factory buildings which were formally associated with the production and distribution of IBSA's "Watchtower Magazine" and also includes an area of hardstanding (primarily used for HGV parking). The existing buildings in this portion of the site comprise of two large interconnecting industrial sheds with a total gross internal floor area of approximately 7,700sqm split between the basement, ground and mezzanine levels. Prior to the winding down of operations in these buildings in early 2018, maintenance and support functions were located within the basement. The building is of a functional design and industrial appearance and is not considered to contribute positively to the appearance of the site or the wider area.

The Gatehouse building is a small single storey building located at the main entrance to the site and functions as a security/monitoring presence for both vehicles and pedestrians entering the site. This has a total gross internal area of approximately 29sqm.

The use of the site is linked with Watch Tower House located around 100 metres further north along the Ridgeway. These sites are in the process of becoming surplus to requirements due to the construction of a new UK headquarters at the former Temple Farm site near Chelmsford in Essex.

An area of woodland area lies to the north of the existing buildings and is located within the application site. This comprises an area of TPO trees (Tree Preservation Order).

The application site is bounded to the south and east by the recent Millbrook Park residential development. Two-storey residential dwellings along the Ridgeway are located to the west of the application site.

To the north (and northern side of Partingdale Lane) is the Metropolitan Green Belt and an area designated as a Site of Metropolitan Importance for Nature Conservation which is known as the Mill Hill Substation Pastures. Burtonhole Brook (a tributary of Folly Brook) and the Grade II Site of Borough Importance for Nature Conservation known as Burtonhole Lane and Pasture are located nearby. The Grade I Site of Borough Importance for Nature Conservation known as Folly Brook and Darlands Lake Nature Reserve is situated c950m from the application site.

Mill Hill East, including the Northern Line London Underground Station, are located around 0.5 miles to the south. Mill Hill Broadway shops and railway station are accessible by bus to the west of the application site. The site has a public transport accessibility level (PTAL) rating of 1B, bordering 2 and is served by three bus routes including the 221, 240 and 382.

The site is not within a conservation area, although the Mill Hill Conservation area is located c150m to the west of the site. There are no listed buildings on site, however, there are three listed designations in the vicinity:

- Grade II Listed Partingdale Manor (50m from site but screened by heavy planting);
  - Grade II Listed War Room Bunker (330m from site but screened by heavy planting);
- and
- Grade II Listed Milestone outside number 8 The Ridgeway.

The application site is located within Flood Zone 1 (less than 1 in 1,000 annual probability of river or sea flooding).

## **2.2 Proposed Development**

This application seeks planning permission for the demolition of the existing printworks/factory buildings and redevelopment of the site to provide a total of 197 residential units. This would involve:

- conversion of the existing IBSA House building into 61 flats with associated external alterations plus extension and adaption of the existing lower ground-basement floor and adapting it for car park use;
- erection of 5 new blocks ranging from 3 to 6 storeys in height to provide 136 flats, plus extension and adaption of the existing lower ground-basement floor and adapting it for car park use;
- provision of private amenity space, communal rooftop terraces, refuse storage, 344 cycle parking spaces and basement and surface level parking for 197 cars.
- single storey extension to the existing 'gatehouse' at the front of the site, to provide management/security office.
- associated alterations to landscaping and ancillary works.

Modest external alterations are proposed for IBSA House in order to adapt the building to residential use such as new fenestration and private balconies for all units. Maintaining the original height and utilising the existing building whilst enhancing the appearance sympathetically would ensure the established appearance of the site from The Ridgeway is largely retained. The existing gatehouse at the front of the site adjacent to the Ridgeway would also be retained and marginally extended at ground floor only.

The planning statement prepared by Firstplan states the redevelopment of the rear half of the site would deliver five distinctive residential blocks (Blocks A – E), which range in height from three to six storeys, including basement car and cycle parking. Block A is situated along the northern boundary and is part 6 storey with the eastern end dropping to 4 storeys towards the eastern perimeter. Block B is 6 storeys and sits in the centre of the site, separated from IBSA House by a landscaped area that leads to a woodland viewing deck and access to the established woodland to the northern section of the site.

The two smaller four storey Blocks C and E sit on the eastern edge of the site, and the smallest 3 storey Block D is on the southern edge facing Albuhera Mews. The arrangement of the blocks results in the taller elements are located in close proximity to IBSA House, which is an established building of 5/6 storeys. Proposed Blocks A and B would respect the existing five storey element of IBSA House, by lowering the levels of the rear site, which in turn reduces the overall visibility of the new development blocks.

The overall site layout has been designed to optimise the use of land whilst providing new landscaping and public realm for future residents. The current site is virtually entirely covered by the footprint of the existing buildings. The proposal seeks to significantly reduce the built footprint creating a permeable layout and a connected pattern of development.

### Revisions and additional information

In the course of the assessment, additional details and clarification were provided in respect of various detailed aspects of the scheme e.g. boundary treatments, drainage, energy, landscaping, ecology, access, parking layout/pathways and additional tree planting along the southern and eastern boundary. These have involved various minor amendments to the scheme. However, most importantly following lengthy negotiations the affordable housing provision has been independently viability tested by the council and separately by the GLA; and increased from 5% to 20%.

## **2.3 Relevant Planning History**

Planning applications relating to the application site are:

Reference: 19/4347/ESR

Address: IBSA House, The Ridgeway, London, NW7 1RN

Decision: Environmental Statement not Required

Decision Date: 6 September 2019

Description: Environmental impact assessment screening opinion

Reference: 19/0329/PNO

Address: IBSA House, The Ridgeway, London, NW7 1RN

Decision: Prior Approval Required and Refused

Decision Date: 13 May 2019

Description: Change of use from Offices (Class B1(a)) to 127 Residential dwellings (Class C3)

Reference: 18/5801/PNO

Address: IBSA House, The Ridgeway, London, NW7 1RN

Decision: Prior Approval Required and Refused

Decision Date: 22 November 2018

Description: Change of use from B1 (Office) to C3 (Residential)

Reference: 18/1998/PNO

Address: IBSA House, The Ridgeway, London, NW7 1RN

Decision: Prior Approval Required and Refused

Decision Date: 22 May 2018

Description: Change of use from Use Class B1 (office) to Use Class C3 (residential) to provide (221 Units)

Reference: H/00807/14

Address: IBSA House, The Ridgeway, London, NW7 1RN

Decision: Approved following legal agreement

Decision Date: 22 May 2014

Description: Extension of IBSA House comprising three-storey extension to the north-west wing at first, second and roof level, and three-storey extension to the south wing at second, third and roof level, to create 3,233sqm of additional office floorspace

Reference: H/05138/13

Address: IBSA House, The Ridgeway, London, NW7 1RN

Decision: Environmental Statement not Required

Decision Date: 26 November 2013

Description: Environmental impact assessment screening opinion and scoping opinion.

Reference: H/04237/12

Address: IBSA House, The Ridgeway, London, NW7 1RN

Decision: Approved subject to conditions

Decision Date: 20 December 2012

Description: Insertion of 6no. velux roof windows to west elevation in mansard roofslope and 2no. double glazed windows in the tower gable to replace existing louvres

Reference: H/02631/11

Address: IBSA House, The Ridgeway, London, NW7 1RN

Decision: Approved subject to conditions

Decision Date: 9 September 2011

Description: Installation of heat recovery unit cylinder between the two roofs of the building.

Reference: H/04511/08

Address: IBSA House, The Ridgeway, London, NW7 1RN

Decision: Approved subject to conditions

Decision Date: 27 January 2009

Description: Insertion of rooflights to north elevation.

Applications relating to TPO works at the application site are:

Reference: TPP/0154/19

Address: IBSA House, The Ridgeway, London, NW7 1RN

Decision: Trees: Refused

Decision Date: 13 May 2019

Description: 1 x Pine (applicant's ref. T1) - Reduce 30% (3m crown reduction all over), Remove any decayed or split branches. Standing in area A1 of Tree Preservation Order

Reference: TPP/0614/18

Address: IBSA House, The Ridgeway, London, NW7 1RN

Decision: Trees: Approved subject to Conditions

Decision Date: 11 January 2019

Description: 1 x Sycamore (Applicant's ref. T1 / 13.4) - Reduce by 1 third. Standing in area A1 of Tree Preservation Order

Reference: TPM/0707/16

Address: IBSA House, The Ridgeway, London, NW7 1RN

Decision: Trees: Approved subject to Conditions

Decision Date: 23 December 2016

Description: 1 x Ash (applicant's ref. 106 / 108) - Remove one branch overhanging neighbour's garage. Standing in area A1 of Tree Preservation Order, 1 x Hornbeam (applicant's ref. area A134) - Remove. Standing in area A1 of Tree Preservation Order, 1 x Lime (applicant's ref. area A134) - Remove. Standing in area A1 of Tree Preservation Order

Reference: TPP/0709/16

Address: IBSA House, The Ridgeway, London, NW7 1RN

Decision: Trees: Refused

Decision Date: 23 December 2016

Description: 1 x Cedar (applicant's ref. C4) - Remove limb as specified. Standing in area A1 of Tree Preservation Order

Reference: TPF/0700/16

Address: IBSA House, The Ridgeway, London, NW7 1RN

Decision: Trees: Split Decision

Decision Date: 16 December 2016

Description: 1 x Conifer (applicant's ref. 481) - Remove. Standing in area A1 of Tree Preservation Order, 1 x Lime (applicant's ref. 471) - Remove. Standing in area A1 of Tree Preservation Order

Reference: TPF/00170/15

Address: IBSA House, The Ridgeway, London, NW7 1RN

Decision: Trees: Approved subject to Conditions

Decision Date: 12 May 2015

Description: 1 x Horse Chestnut (applicant's ref. T200) - Fell. Standing in area A1 of Tree Preservation Order

## **2.4 Pre-application Consultation by the Applicant**

A Statement of Community Involvement has been submitted with the Planning Application, prepared by Kanda, which outlines the consultations which the applicant carried out prior to the submission of the application.

This document states that the applicant has undertaken consultations with key stakeholders, representatives and local residents. A targeted flyer served to facilitate public consultation and gather responses and opinions. In addition, an exhibition of the proposals was held on Tuesday 15th October 2019.

## **2.5 Public Consultations**

As part of the consultation exercise, 298 letters were sent to neighbouring properties and residents. In addition the application was advertised in the local press and site notice(s) was posted. A total of 98 responses were received, comprising 97 letters of objection and 1 letter of representation (neither support nor object).

### Representation:

The letter of representation received is set out below:

- Provision of pedestrian access from the rear (Eastern area) of the site through to Tommy Flowers Mews should be considered in order to connect the new residential community with the Millbrook Park community as a whole.

### Public Objections:

The letters of objection received are summarised as follows:

- Infrastructure and utilities in Mill Hill area already overstretched due to the recent new developments.
- The tube, bus and local facilities - schools and GP surgeries are already overcrowded.
- Overshadow the recent new housing in Millbrook Park and will make an irregular roof line.
- Much of this area of Mill Hill has had a huge amount of redevelopment over the past few years, without adequate provision for car parking.
- Increase congestion along Ridgeway/Bittacy Hill.
- Air pollution will also increase.
- Proposal is too high and too dense - inappropriate over-development of the site.
- New buildings would have a negative impact to the neighbours (Albuhera Mews & Tommy Flowers Mews), the facing balconies and communal roof garden result in loss of privacy and overlooking.
- More frequent tube journeys and direct services required, TFL should open up the derelict line to help ease pressure
- Local transport provision is inadequate.
- Insufficient car parking spaces.
- Inappropriate development for this area. Incongruous tower blocks not in keeping with the Mill Hill village.
- The area is already over-developed.
- Danger to cyclists because of parked cars and not appropriate due to steep hill.
- Cycle spaces are also unrealistic and impractical in a development that sits on the top of a very steep hill.
- The public transport locally is inadequate. Mill Hill East station is a single track station which is regularly full before it leaves the station.
- Barnet Council has refused this site for residential development three times previously and it should be refused again to developers who wish to cash in on sites that are currently and should remain as office space by building residential accommodation.
- The area backs onto green belt, should not turn the area into a concrete jungle
- For the local residents backing onto this proposed 4-6 storey development it would block out natural light and be an eye-sore.
- The site should be converted to retail/services space.
- Demolition process will be awful with dust, fumes and possibly asbestos.
- A whole community is being destroyed. The green suburb is being turned into an urban mass resembling Manhattan.
- Existing developments in the area already causing significant disruption and congestion. Additional new large developments not needed in the area.

- Visible across the green belt land, would also be out of character and scale with the surrounding two story houses on the Ridgeway and the three story houses at the top of the adjoining Inglis barracks development.
- Over-development, height of the new buildings and the altered top story of the existing building would create a skyline inappropriate to the site
- The site never generated much vehicular traffic because the workers commute on foot from Watch Tower house.
- Block A should be omitted and Blocks B,C,D and E reduced to maximum 3 storey.
- Result in an incongruous development on a sensitive site adjacent to the Green Belt, and will result in a loss of trees that will exacerbate the impact of views into the site and lead to a loss of residential amenity.
- Application contravenes the underlying design principles for the development at Millbrook Park in that there should be only low rise buildings adjacent to Partingdale Lane and the Green Belt.
- The Millbrook Park development was specifically designed so that houses at the top of the hill were limited to three stories, to limit the damage to the skyline and views from Partingdale Lane and the surrounding Green Belt and Conservation Area.
- Partingdale Lane is a road that requires greater protection one side is green belt and structure comprising Partingdale Manor and Manor End, Grade II listed, with TPOs protecting the trees and gardens.
- The area requires employment and this site should remain in order to provide employment
- The transport plan for the application is flawed in many parts. The plan also assumes residents will cycle to Mill Hill Broadway, which is 3.2 km from the site. While some (more likely very few) may do so, Mill Hill East is within walking distance and West Finchley and Finchley Central are much nearer.
- Does not provide adequate footway or cycle path development, despite providing cycle parking spaces. As part of the developer's section 106 commitments the provision of good quality cycle lanes in the area must be funded.
- The developer's own assumptions in the travel plan show the majority of residents will enter and leave the development by car during peak times. This will saturate an already congested area for traffic.
- De-value existing properties making them difficult to sell.
- Three previous applications have been refused and the same arguments/reasons for refusal apply to this application.

#### Elected Representatives:

A letter of objection was received from Andrew Dismore AM (London Assembly Member for Barnet and Camden) objecting to the proposed development. The letter received can be summarised as follows:

- In the new Millbrook Park development all the buildings alongside Partingdale Lane were required to be a maximum of 2 storeys to respect the lane and the adjacent Green Belt.
- However the proposed buildings along the lane will be 6 storeys high and on elevated ground. The tree screen between the buildings and the lane is deciduous

and can be seen through during winter. The blocks will be visible from and impact on the Green Belt.

- Result in overlooking and enclosure - particularly to Partingdale Lodge, Turpins and the Cottages 1 - 6.
- Overdevelopment of the site, with the additional impact of extra traffic and a burden on already stretched facilities, such as school places and doctors' surgeries.

#### Officer Comment

A number of the buildings at the top of Millbrook Park are 3 storeys and include 4 storey blocks. Block A is part 6 reducing to 4 storey and screened by the extensive and thick green woodland, within and to the north of the site. Furthermore the ground level would be dropped so Block A (and Block B) would sit in line with five-storey height of IBSA House. The planning submission is supported with both photographic and measured surveys (prepared by BB Partnership Ltd) undertaken at a number of viewing points from both: the surrounding public realm and urban areas on the east, south and west side; and the Green Belt to the north side. These are examined in section 3.3 of this report. In summary it is considered the development would not have a detrimental impact on the openness of the Green Belt.

#### Neighbouring/Residents Associations & Local Amenity Groups:

##### **Mill Hill Residents Association:**

The Mill Hill Residents' Association would like to submit a number of objections to the above planning application. Here is a collation of the main points that have been voiced and that we feel need to be considered as part of this consultation.

##### *Previous Planning Applications*

Firstly, we there have been apparently three refusals already by LBB for this development and now our residents are being asked to respond once again to this proposed development.

Many of our members are asking what the difference is between the past proposals and this one as this has not been clearly communicated as part of the latest consultation.

Also, a number of our members are assuming that their previous objections would still be considered as part of this fourth attempt to get permission for this development and that they do not need to resubmit their objections for this round 4. If they do, then we ask that those members of the public that have already submitted their objections for the previous applications be notified so that they be made aware that they need to to post their objections once again.

##### *Green Belt Issues*

This development is yet another erosion of our green belt.

The character and attraction of what used to be a Green Belt village location has been and continues to be rapidly eroded with each new estate development over the past years. The rate and scale of each large new development that has been permitted to proceed is out of place and is having an environmental impact on the surrounding green belt.

##### *Out of Character*

There is a lot of strong feeling that the looming residential blocks are out of character with the current low rise, 1930's suburban housing stock and listed buildings in the area.

### *Overdevelopment of the area*

In addition to being out of character there is also a lot of concern that the area as a whole is being massively overdeveloped. Within just a short distance of this proposed development are already new dwellings in Millbrook Park and additional new dwellings on the NIMR site. With just these two projects alone we are talking of a good few thousand new dwellings and the feeling is that this is already more than enough for such a small area of Mill Hill.

### *Lack of sufficient Public Transport*

There are serious concerns that the already very overstretched public transport infrastructure in the area will simply not be able to cope at all with the additional massive increase in demand.

While we have been told that there are discussions about providing additional buses and bus routes along the ridgeway to accommodate the additional new residents that will be moving into the thousands of new dwellings that are currently being developed, there is still no sign that this will happen in the near future, if at all!

Further, we are concerned that Mill Hill East tube station will not be able to cope with the huge additional demand that will be caused by so many new residents in the area. The Mill Hill East tube is already standing only space during rush hour.

For this reason approving yet another set of residential units in the area, without first resolving the current lack of adequate public transport, is very worrying.

### *Lack of Sufficient School & Medical Facilities*

Similar to the problem with lack of public transport infrastructure, many local residents are already complaining that there are not enough school places in the area for local children.

When it comes to medical facilities, many residents are telling us of excessive waiting periods of many weeks to get a simple doctor's appointment.

As it is, the existing schools and medical clinics (and hospitals) are already seriously struggling to cope with the existing demand and many residents are frightened that if new schools and medical facilities are not provided in advance of any new developments, the current infrastructure will not be able to cope at all.

### *Loss of Employment*

A number of members have expressed concern that the change of designation from office use to residential use will further reduce the very limited employment opportunities for locals in the area. We have already seen a huge erosion of employment capabilities with the residential development at NIMR and now we are seeing a further erosion of employment opportunities for locals by converting this site into residential use too. The concern is that there seems to be no plans in place to create new job opportunities in the area to replace, and indeed expand on, the loss of jobs that these developments are causing.

For the above reasons, we believe that further building developments in and around that area should be rejected.

### Officer Comment

All of the above representations have been taken into account and are considered within the relevant sections of this report and which form part of the assessment set out below. For clarity it should be noted that previous refusals referred to prior approval applications which were refused due to the site being identified as a single planning unit in sui generis use, rather than planning considerations.

The planning submission is supported with both photographic and measured surveys (prepared by BB Partnership Ltd) undertaken at a number of viewing points from both: the surrounding public realm and urban areas on the east, south and west side; and the Green Belt to the north side. These are examined in section 3.3 of this report. In summary it is considered the development would not have a detrimental impact on the openness of the Green Belt.

The previous developments recently granted in the vicinity have all been taken into consideration and referenced within the relevant reports. The site is an allocated site marked for redevelopment within the draft local plan. Modest external alterations are proposed for IBSA House. Maintaining the original height and utilising the existing building would ensure the established appearance of the site from The Ridgeway is largely retained. The proposed new buildings to the rear of the site derive from this design concept and therefore relate to the existing building and the site enveloped with a comprehensive landscaping scheme. Therefore the proposed development is considered in keeping with the character of the site.

Monetary contributions would be secured through a formal legal agreement as part of the highway improvement works and measures identified as part of the Active Travel Zone Assessment. Various additional contributions would be secured through the formal s106 agreement and listed under Recommendation 2 at the start of this report, such as the Residential Travel Plan and incentive funds.

In relation to the loss of the employment on the site, this change has been fully supported by the Council's Economic Development Team who have agreed an appropriate financial payment to better support employment opportunities elsewhere in the Borough and in more sustainable town centre sites.

#### **Mill Hill Neighbourhood Forum:**

Concerned that the infrastructure to support this and other recently approved developments is not in place or planned. A secondary School (all faiths) that students from NIMR, Millbrook Park, IBSA House and other nearby roads not in the Mill Hill County catchment area could walk to, is much needed and further provision of a GP surgery for the area is required, together with more frequent trains in and out of Mill Hill East tube line with many being through trains throughout the day not just at peak times. CIL & Section 106 monies should be dedicated specifically to resolving these very real issues facing the local community.

We acknowledge that the front part of the scheme is stepped-down on the north elevation, but are concerned that the rear buildings (notably F) are above guidelines set out in the MHEAAP for buildings facing Partingdale Lane and the Green Belt beyond. Recognising that the top of the Millbrook Park site is topographically higher at ground level than the IBSA House site, we suggest that the height of Building F be reduced by two floors to mitigate this issue. This would also serve to provide residents on the upper floors of Building A more light and extensive views into the Green Belt land to the north. It would further reduce the overlooking of houses in Partingdale Lane.

#### **Mill Hill Preservation Society:**

##### *Background*

The development team presented the proposal to our Committee at The Studio, and subsequently held a public exhibition at Old Camdenians.

Previous applications have also been commented on, we refer to our letter 22nd August 2019 on application 19/4347/ESR in which we raised issues related to PTAL,

Employment loss, Location, Characteristics of the Development, the Potential Impact and concluded the application was ill-considered that would have an adverse impact on the local environment. The comments we made in that letter are still relevant to this application and we wish them to be taken into account against 19/6551/FUL. For ease of reference the letter referred to is attached.

### *Assessment*

The site is an existing employment site and as such Policy DM14 of the Development Management Policies applies. It is noted that the Applicant has sought to argue that this policy isn't relevant due to Millbrook Park being approved and that employment land lost. They have not sought to provide any analysis or assessment as to the acceptability of the loss of this employment site. Whilst the background to the Mill Hill East Area Action Plan (2009) may be of some merit, it does not simply mean that the designation within that adopted document, as a 'retained employment' area can be simply ignored.

The Applicant's approach to the loss of employment land is at best dismissive and lacks any robust evidence to demonstrate that the loss of this mixed use site is acceptable and is not required for any alternative employment use. It is assumed that the site has not been marketed for any alternative use, or continued mixed use, therefore the Applicant has no evidence to show it is not required for its continued use or an alternative employment use.

Whilst the findings associated with Millbrook Park may be similar for this site, they did submit a robust Employment Study and therefore addressed Policy DM14. The Applicant should be made to adhere to planning policy and similarly demonstrate that this site is not required.

Whilst the site is not located within the Green Belt, it is adjacent to it, accordingly, the site is sensitive and as such any proposed development needs to be reflective of this edge of settlement, more rural location. We would therefore expect a development to be lesser density, and of the highest design standards appropriate to the sensitive location and in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework. We find this is not the case.

We would like to refer to the design principles for the Millbrook Park development that is adjacent to the site. The heights of the various phases were managed carefully, with 2 and 3 storey houses near the Green Belt edge, increasing in size across, and down, the site towards the underground station where 6 and 7 storey blocks are located. This philosophy has been adhered to and respects the nature of both the Green Belt and Partingdale Lane.

Appreciating that this site does not need to comply with the design principles established as part of an adjacent development, the Applicant cannot seek to rely on the employment land argument applied to the Millbrook Park development and then ignore other parameters.

The proposal fundamentally undermines the established design approach to the area. The retention of IBSA House will automatically lead to residential properties at a higher level than the surrounding development, but this does not set a precedent for an additional 5 blocks of development between 3-6 storey's, complete with upper floor terraces. The retention and conversion of IBSA House provides a 'nod' to the historic use of the site.

The surrounding residential development is comprised of 2-3 storey dwellings, with some flat blocks, but not exceeding 3 storeys. Most surrounding development is also at a lower level than the IBSA site - when reviewing the site sections submitted with the application this is not proposed to be altered. This is particularly significant when reviewing sections D-D and 4-4.

Consequently, any ground floor of the proposed site will automatically be at a higher level than the adjacent residential units.

To the north, the development will tower above the established tree belt dominating the rural edge, undermining the openness of the Green Belt, while development to the south, adjacent to Albuhera Mews, will be significantly closer to the boundary and almost 2 storey's higher (when including the roof plant) than the existing eaves of the factory building.

Accordingly, the physical scale of this development will be overbearing on adjacent properties, and unduly dominate from numerous vantage points, most significantly the wider Green Belt. The appearance of such large dominant blocks will result in an alien feature within the landscape undermining the concept which underlies the whole development of the adjacent Barracks site, with which the proposal will be read.

We are especially concerned about Block A: this is the one parallel to Partingdale Lane being of six storeys plus roof constructions and is immediately adjacent the main Front Site building where it steps down in height to one or two storeys as the land drops away. Block A is totally disproportionate to the adjacent blocks on the frontage and to the immediate surroundings.

The height of the blocks is a significant issue. They will be an unwelcome intrusion into an otherwise rural scene and will be visible over a wide area from almost all directions. Users of the Green Belt and its footpaths need to be considered. As such the proposals will run against current thinking that such rural views are beneficial to health and therefore to be safeguarded; of added importance in this location is that 'the valley' is illustrated in several of the wider London Plans as an area to be included in 'Living Landscape' and 'Green Grid' proposals, the object of which is to keep such areas for people to walk in and mentally escape the 'built environment'. The proposal would be contrary to the Health and Wellbeing agenda set out in the National Planning Policy Framework.

The design of the blocks are also considered to be somewhat random, providing a vague nod to the host building, their boxy form bears no relationship to the red brick 'L' shaped host building, or the adjacent new development which successfully combines a dominance of more traditional built form, with hints of contemporary design, again with a focus on red brick and render.

The height and massing of the buildings, as highlighted above will dominate the public vantage points of the site and rural area beyond, but this will only be further exacerbated by the alien form of design proposed that will create a significant discord between what is appearing to be a successful adjacent development and a visual eyesore.

Concerns regarding the visual impact of the development are further exacerbated when regard is given to the impact on adjacent trees. Whilst the Arboricultural Report alludes to no impact on trees, it does raise some concerns.

The report fails to consider the increase in below ground excavation towards the northern boundary, with the introduction of a ramp and additional parking adjacent to this boundary.

These works will require significant retaining walls and detailing, such that regard needs to be given to the impact on the root structures of adjacent trees. The loss of any trees adjacent to this boundary will further open up the views of the site from the wider Green Belt.

To the south the Arboricultural Report highlights an area of land whereby hard-surfacing needs to be removed by hand to allow for level changes and tree roots, however, this position is then undermined when development is required to occur within the tree protection zone. Appreciating that the Applicant has indicated a piling method for foundations, there is no indication as to how an invasive machinery-hungry method required for blocks of this size can be reconciled against the need to hand remove hard surfacing to protect the trees?

Lastly, there has been no regard given to the future impact on trees. The CGI's submitted with the application show clearly that the separation distances between trees and blocks are limited, such that the pressure to remove trees in the future due to the impact on sunlight and daylight, along with nuisance leaf fall will be high. We also object to the description by the Applicant of the tree strip alongside Partingdale Lane as 'woodland' as it is no more than deciduous scrub in a lot of places that does not screen the existing low rise buildings effectively, and which will certainly not screen such a large development. Being deciduous it has no screening impact in winter.

We turn to neighbour amenity, large tower blocks looming over existing residential properties, complete with balconies large enough to sit out and enjoy, will result in direct overlooking into habitable room windows around the site. The worst relationship will be along the southern boundary and the relationship with properties on Albuhera Mews. The plans show a separation distance of circa 23.5m, this may be a suitable relationship for a back to back dwelling situation, where there is no terracing at first floor or above, in this instance there are three storey balconies. Even if it could be argued that there is no direct loss of amenity as a result of this relationship, there is a perceived loss of amenity and privacy, as the central balconies on Block D particularly have direct views into bedroom windows.

### *Conclusion*

It is our opinion that this application is unacceptable on a number of grounds, but most critically, the Applicant has failed to address the matter of the principle of a change of use of the site in the first instance by failing completely to address Policy DM14. It is not acceptable for a developer to 'cherry pick' policies considered to apply to them to best suit their case.

Further to this we are of the opinion that the proposal will result in an incongruous development on a sensitive site adjacent to the Green Belt, and will result in a loss of trees that will exacerbate the impact of views into the site and lead to a loss of residential amenity.

It is not considered that there are amendments to this application that can be made to make it acceptable. The application should be refused or withdrawn and the Applicant required to address the matter of Employment Land before any alternative scheme is progressed.

#### Officer Comment

These representations have been taken into account and are considered within the relevant sections of this report and which form part of the assessment set out below. In addition please see officer comments above. In terms of the trees, The Landscape Statement confirms the existing boundary planting will be retained wherever possible and would be enhanced and strengthened by introducing new tree planting along the length of the eastern and southern boundary. The proposed trees would complement the retained trees as part of a long-term succession strategy and help to provide replacement screening and soften views of the development.

The landscape buffer around the site and the removal and planting of trees is a key element of the proposal and has been carefully considered. Additional information has also been sought from officers and detailed in section 3.6 of this report. The existing mature trees along the southern and eastern boundary provide screening for properties on Albuhera Mews and Tommy Flowers Mews, the scheme proposes to keep as many of these existing trees as possible. Where trees have to be removed and in existing gaps new trees will be planted. These will be selected with consideration of canopy height and width in relation to proximity to the new buildings and density of canopy to ensure they do not cause overdue shading to new apartments.

An Arboricultural Impact Assessment in support of the development proposals. However clarity was sought on the number of trees to be removed. The applicant has confirmed 55 existing trees are shown to be removed and 73 new trees are proposed to be planted. However exact numbers will not be known until construction begins as factors such as the ground conditions and methods of construction will affect how many trees can be retained. Therefore the numbers of trees shown to be removed is a worst-case scenario, with all trees likely to be affected shown to be removed, at this stage. These details have been reviewed by the councils Arboriculturalist who has confirmed the principle as set out is acceptable. It has been agreed that the details should be secured through conditions including for example a comprehensive landscape, ecological and woodland management plan.

#### 2.4.6 Responses from External Consultees

##### **Greater London Authority (GLA)**

##### Strategic Issues Summary

*Principle of development:* The proposed residential redevelopment of the site within an Area of Intensification is strongly supported in principle subject to providing the maximum viable level of affordable housing (paragraphs 18-25).

*Affordable housing:* The quantum (5%) and mono-tenure nature of the proposed affordable housing is wholly unacceptable. GLA officers seek significant improvement to the quantum and tenure diversity of the affordable housing offer and will robustly interrogate the financial viability assessment to ensure that the maximum amount of affordable housing, with an appropriate affordable tenure mix is secured (paragraphs 26-34).

*Urban and inclusive design:* Whilst the scale, massing and layout of the scheme is acceptable, there are concerns that the proposal is designed as a gated development. The applicant should revise the internal layout of the IBSA House building and provide clarification on the purpose of the management office. The access gates to the front of the site should be removed to ensure open access to the development (paragraphs 35-56).

*Transport:* Car parking should be reduced in line with the Mayor's Intend to Publish London Plan. Improvements are required to the site layout to improve walking and cycling and the applicant must increase the electric vehicle charging provision. Conditions and obligations are required (paragraphs 57-69).

*Sustainable Development:* The applicant should provide further information regarding energy and urban greening (paragraphs 70-93).

The GLAs Stage 1 response included the following recommendation:  
That Barnet Council be advised that the proposed level of affordable housing is wholly unacceptable and the application does not comply with the London Plan and the Mayor's Intend to Publish London Plan for the reasons set out in paragraph 97 of this report. The resolution of these issues could lead to the application becoming compliant with the London Plan and the Mayor's Intend to Publish London Plan.

#### Officer Comment

The affordable housing provision has been independently viability tested by the council and increased from 5% to 20%. The proposals have been reviewed by the councils highway officers and the parking provision of a ratio of 1:1 is what the team have requested and which the council consider is appropriate in this instance.

#### **Thames Water**

##### Waste Comments

Thames Water would advise that with regard to WASTE WATER NETWORK and SEWAGE TREATMENT WORKS infrastructure capacity, we would not have any objection to the above planning application, based on the information provided.

With regard to SURFACE WATER drainage, Thames Water would advise that if the developer follows the sequential approach to the disposal of surface water we would have no objection. Where the developer proposes to discharge to a public sewer, prior approval from Thames Water Developer Services will be required. Should you require further information please refer to our website.

<https://developers.thameswater.co.uk/Developing-a-large-site/Apply-and-pay-for-services/Wastewaterservices>

Thames Water would recommend that petrol / oil interceptors be fitted in all car parking/washing/repair facilities. Failure to enforce the effective use of petrol / oil interceptors could result in oil-polluted discharges entering local watercourses.

##### Water Comments

With regard to water supply, this comes within the area covered by the Affinity Water Company. For your information the address to write to is - Affinity Water Company The Hub, Tamblin Way, Hatfield, Herts, AL10 9EZ - Tel - 0845 782 3333.

## **MET Police – Secured by Design**

I do not have any major concerns regarding this proposal, but would like to comment upon the following:

One of the biggest factors for the development and one of the most beneficial is the plan to retain the secure gates at the initial entry point into the development from The Ridgeway, in essence creating a cul-de-sac. This area will also include a management/security office at the 'gate-house'. With a secure gate and secure 1.8m+ boundary around the site, it is a very positive aspect and will allow the control of those wishing to enter the development and restrict access to those whom do not reside or have a legitimate reason to enter the site. This will create a semi-private area and should help to increase the confidence of residents to challenge any persons within the estate with no valid reason.

The architects have already included areas of defensible space for residents within the site, such as defensive planting and maximum 1.5m boundary treatment or demarcation for ground floor terraces and so on.

Although it is very positive to control the estate via the primary gates into the development, there is a high degree of permeability within the site around the various blocks, especially evident behind the blocks between the building line and the site boundary. Burglary more often than not occurs at the sides and rear of properties and as such, these areas of the estate are considered to be more vulnerable. To help to reduce the opportunity for this sort of crime to occur in these areas, a secure boundary line of at least 1.8m should be introduced at the edge of each building, thereby restricting the ability for anybody without a legitimate purpose to enter these areas 'behind' the buildings. This can help to prevent perpetrators disappearing out of sight from natural surveillance, that could lead to an opportunity to attack ground floor doors and windows and force entry.

To enhance the above, all doors and windows considered 'easily accessible' must be certificated to security rating PAS24:2016. It is recommended that a low level of defensive planting is also installed beneath these windows to help to deter a person from approaching the window with any ease.

Due to levels of vehicle crime within the ward and proposed number of units/residents within the site, it is also important to secure the underground parking areas with security rated gates or roller-shutters for residents use only. This measure, along with protecting the 'undercroft' areas that the agent/architect has already advised will be secure, will help to protect vehicles, cycles and residents from unlawful intrusion and the potential for crime and disorder to occur.

I have discussed security measures for the development with the agent in order to help provide the best levels of crime prevention for its future residents. I have also offered to assist the agent throughout the duration of this project.

I do not object to this proposal, but due to crime rates within the ward, especially vehicle crime levels and the overall burglary rate within the LB of Barnet, I would respectfully request that a planning condition is attached to any approval, whereby the development must achieve Secured By Design accreditation, prior to occupation.

## **OFFICER COMMENT**

These comments are duly noted and generally agreed. However in terms of the front entrance gate, this would be removed and replaced with bollards or similar, in line

with comments received from the GLA. This matter can be secured through condition along with the requested secured by design condition.

### **Environment Agency**

We have no comment to make in relation to this application as it does not trigger our current risk bar. However please be aware that the proposed development site appears to have been the subject of past industrial activity which poses a medium risk of pollution to controlled waters. We are however unable to provide detailed site-specific advice relating to land contamination issues at this site and recommend that you consult with your Environmental Health / Environmental Protection Department for further advice.

Where necessary we would advise that you seek appropriate planning conditions to manage both the risks to human health and controlled waters from contamination at the site. This approach is supported by Paragraph 170 of the NPPF.

### **The London Fire Brigade**

Unable to determine access and facilities for the fire service to provide access for a pumping appliance to within 45 metres of all points inside each flat of a block, measured along the route of the hose.

Other comments: As per Approved Document B B5 for access and facilities for the fire service.

The Commissioner strongly recommends that sprinklers are considered for new developments and major alterations to existing premises, particularly where the proposals relate to schools and care homes. Sprinkler systems installed in buildings can significantly reduce the damage caused by fire and the consequential cost to businesses and housing providers, and can reduce the risk to life. The Commissioner's opinion is that there are opportunities for developers and building owners to install sprinkler systems in order to save money, save property and protect the lives of occupier. Please note that it is our policy to regularly advise our elected Members about how many cases there have been where we have recommended sprinklers and what the outcomes of those recommendations were. These quarterly reports to our Members are public documents which are available on our website.

### Officer Comments

The fire safety regulations of the proposal are also covered by the GLAs requirements and are therefore covered during the Stage 1 response. The applicant has submitted a Fire Strategy prepared by British Fire Advisory Service Ltd to the GLA in order to fully address all issues. The GLA have raised no objections.

### **Transport for London (TFL)**

#### *Access*

#### **Pedestrian Realm and Access**

Pedestrian access from the public highway is via the footway on only one side of the access road: this is not ideal. The applicant shall review the design ensuring continuous footway would be provided on both sides of the vehicular route. It is also felt that current public realm adjacent to the access road would be dominated by continuous areas of perpendicular car parking, and it is considered that parallel parking layout that is better integrated with landscaping with segregated pedestrian

and cycle access should be set out in line with Intend to Publish London plan policies D7 and T2.

#### *Vehicular*

Vehicle access to the development will continue to be via the priority junction with The Ridgeway. TfL requests that the current gated access should be removed to ensure that the development is integrated with the wider network of streets in the area. It is also requested that the internal vehicle circulation route be designed to calm traffic speed with priority given to pedestrians over vehicles. Stage 1 Road Safety Audit should be undertaken to confirm all design would be principally acceptable in highway safety terms.

#### *Trip rate & mode share assessment*

In line with London Plan, and Policy T4 Assessing and Mitigating Transport impacts of the London Plan, a trip generation assessment has been submitted for the proposal. Across all trips, 45% (43 two-way AM trips) are expected to be by car which is inconsistent with delivering the Mayor's strategic target of 80% sustainable travel. This reinforces the need to reduce car parking as set out above

#### *Healthy Street and Vision Zero*

In line with the Mayor's Healthy Street approach, an Active Travel Zone (ATZ) has been undertaken, which identified a number of walking and cycling improvement opportunities, including crossing point improvements and to remove vegetation to widen existing footway, this is welcomed. The Council is strongly encouraged to secure necessary improvements by legal agreement.

The applicant should consider highway schemes associated with the proposal taking into account of the Mayor's Vision Zero agenda ensuring it would be designed to prevent accidents and ensure safety of all road users.

#### *Cycle Parking*

The proposal includes 234 residents' cycle parking spaces at basement level below the rear blocks, 105 residents' cycle parking spaces and five visitors' spaces on the ground floor of the front building. This parking area will be adjacent to a management office which will be manned 24/7 to facilitate use of the cycle parking store by visitors. This level of provision meets the minimum Draft London Plan cycle parking standards and is therefore supported. The applicant shall also ensure all cycle facilities would be designed fully in line with the London Cycle Design standards (LCDS) including the provision of larger spaces to at least 5% of the spaces.

#### *Public Transport*

TfL requests that the applicant to provide a directional split on bus service demand to determine the proposal's impact to local bus services. Depending on the outcome, TfL may request mitigation for any impact on the bus network.

#### *Car Parking*

The proposal includes 197 car parking spaces, which equates to a 1:1 ratio. As the site achieves a PTAL of 2 to the south and is within reasonable walking distance of Mill Hill East station, the applicant should consider reducing the site wide ratio to less than 1 space per dwelling. This could be achieved by reconfiguring surface parking as advised above and by limiting the extension of basement area. Of all of the spaces, 10% will be for disabled use and 1 car club space is also to be provided. However, the applicant is required to provide passive electric vehicle

charging provision (ECVP) for 80% of the car parking spaces as well as 20% active EVCP facilities; rather than 20% active and 20% passive as per currently committed, this is in line with the Draft London Plan car parking standards and Draft London Plan policy T6 'Car Parking'.

A permit system to allocate car parking is outlined in the Draft Residential Travel Plan, which is based on the current proposed parking provision, this should be revised to reflect comments on parking reduction. The finalised policy should form part of the Car Parking Management Plan to be secured by condition, in line with Draft London Plan policy T6 Car Parking. Legal restriction shall also be imposed to exempt future residents for local parking permits.

### *Servicing*

In line with the Draft London Plan policy T2 Healthy Streets and T7F, a Draft Delivery & Servicing Plan (DSP) has been submitted and the proposed servicing strategy is principally supported which regulate servicing activities on site. It is expected that the final Delivery & Servicing Plan (DSP) the proposed development would be submitted and be secured by condition.

### *Construction*

TfL also expects the development will be supported by a Construction Logistics Plan (CLP). This plan should be secured by condition and/or through the s106 agreement as appropriate and should accord with TfL guidance. The Plan should identify efficient, safe and sustainable arrangements to be employed at each stage of implementation of the development to reduce and mitigate impacts of freight vehicle movements arising from the scheme, including impacts on the expeditious movement of traffic, amenity and highway safety. Details should, where relevant, include Freight Operator Recognition Scheme (FORS) or similar accreditation, site access, loading/unloading and parking arrangements, booking systems and timing of arrivals at and departures from the site, vehicular routes, scope for load consolidation and use of alternative modes and measures to reduce risks and impact of collisions with vulnerable road users. This is in line with Policy T7 Deliveries, Servicing and Construction.

### *Travel Plan*

A Framework Travel Plan has been submitted, it is however felt targets set for mode shift to sustainable travel modes, namely walking and cycling shall be more ambitious in order to help to achieve the Mayor's Strategic Target of 80% trips to be made by sustainable transport modes. Additional measures should also be provided to encourage the up-take of walking and cycling by residents, such as but not limited to local walking tours and cycle training. The final Travel Plan shall be secured by s106 agreement.

### *Community Infrastructure Levy*

The MCIL2 rate for London Borough of Barnet is £80 per square metre.

### *Summary*

The following matters should be resolved before the application can be considered in line with the transport policies of the Intend to Publish London Plan:

1. Revise site access including the gated entrance and internal layout including footways on both sides and reduce perpendicular car parking.
2. Secure improvements identified in the ATZ assessment by s106 agreement;
3. Secure the provision of cycle parking and approval of details by condition;

4. Secure the provision of electric vehicle charging points meeting the Draft London Plan car parking standards;
5. Secure legal restrictions to exempt future residents eligibility for local parking permits;
6. Secure a 'Car Parking management plan' to regulate the use of car parking spaces;
7. Secure the DSP and CLP by conditions;
8. Improve the travel plans with enhanced targets and measures to encourage sustainable travel behaviour in light of comments and secure them by s106 agreement; and
9. Secure appropriate Mayor CIL payment from the proposal toward Crossrail.

#### Officer Comment

The proposals have been reviewed by the councils highway officers and the parking provision of a ratio of 1:1 is what the team have requested and which the council consider is appropriate in this instance. Various contributions would be secured through the formal s106 agreement, such as the Residential Travel Plan and incentive funds for example.

#### 2.4.7 Responses from Internal Consultees

##### **Ecology**

No objections, the proposed development has been reviewed and is considered acceptable subject to a number of standard conditions and informatives, which will be included.

##### **Environmental Health**

No objections, the proposed development has been reviewed and is considered acceptable subject to a number of standard conditions and informatives, which will be included.

##### **Arboriculturalist**

There are no arboricultural reasons to object to this application, recommend a number of conditions relating to:

- Levels
- Hard & Soft landscaping
- Pre-demolition tree protection and method statement
- Pre-construction tree protection and method statement
- Green roof
- Landscape management

##### **Green Spaces**

No objections, development meets the required amount of play space provision. However siting of some of the equipment could be improved, creating a more formal play area which would allow children of different ages and from different families to play together. There is ample room in the larger play space shown in the centre of the site to allow for this and offering a place for families and the community to come together.

These details can be secured via condition as part of the overall landscaping strategy.

##### **Policy**

No objection:

## Employment

*IBSA House is recognised in the Mill Hill East Action Plan as an employment site. Policy 2.13 of the current London Plan (consolidated version March 2016) remains relevant for this application as the new London Plan is yet to be adopted by the Mayor. This policy identifies Mill Hill East as an intensification area (area 43) and supports redevelopment opportunities and the Area Action Plan.*

*Draft London Plan 2017 Policy E2 supports Boroughs in the protection of a range of employment uses*

*As such Policy DM14 New and Existing Employment Space needs to be taken into consideration; which states that loss of existing employment space that reduces the levels of employment use will be resisted and a contribution towards loss of employment space is expected.*

*While the applicant has now submitted amended plans to include flexible workspace and meetings rooms for future occupiers, which is welcomed, this does not constitute replacement workspace.*

*The applicant has also submitted marketing evidence however, this appears to be over a relatively short timeframe. The policy states that a suitable period of effective marketing needs to have occurred. It is stated in paragraph 15.2.4 of the DMLP that this is 12 months.*

*Emerging Policy EY01 (reg 18 Draft Barnet Local Plan) also seeks to protect and retain employment space and uses, with financial contributions being sought for the loss of employment floorspace.*

Policy Observation: Barnet Local Plan and London Plan Policies support the retention of employment uses and sites. Should it be found on balance that the redevelopment of this site is appropriate for residential development a financial contribution towards the loss of employment should be sought (calculated in accordance with the SEET SPD). This contribution should be used towards creating employment opportunities in appropriate employment generating uses located within a reasonable distance from the site to be agreed with Town Centres Team at the time of drafting the s106 agreement.

## Carbon/ Energy

As part of the application an Energy and Sustainability Strategy was submitted this appears to be in accordance with London Plan Policy.

It is noted that a Carbon Offset payment of £303,858 is identified in the report this should be secured through the s106 agreement.

There is also a comment that 'the proposed development will provide facilities for any future connections, of the site, to a district heating energy centre' this has been noted and a requirement to supply this connection should be secured as part of the permission in order to ensure that should an opportunity arise in the future to connect to district heating that this can occur. This would also assist the development in decarbonising in the future and reduce the reliance on gas boilers.

## Officer Comment

The carbon offset payment has increased to £481,109 in line with the new London Plan 2021.

### **Travel Plan Coordinator**

No objections. There will be a requirement to submit an annual Travel Plan Incentive Fund Monitoring Report. This will include an update on the uptake of the Residential Travel Plan Incentives and the drawdown on the associated Fund.

The applicant will also be required to provide a Travel Plan Monitoring contribution of £10,000 which would need to be secured under a s106 agreement.

### **Transport and Regeneration**

There are no objections to the proposal, it is considered the amendments and revisions address the points which were initially raised.

The parking provision of a ratio of 1:1 is what the team requested and which the council believe is appropriate. The design issues have also been addressed.

Therefore, in terms of the monetary contributions which highways would be looking to secure through a formal legal agreement are the measures identified as part of the Active Travel Zone Assessment (Section 3.12 & drawings included in Appendix Q of the TA) and funded by the Developer:

- A new dropped kerb tactile crossing as the site vehicular access
- A new dropped kerb tactile crossing across The Ridgway south of the site
- Remove vegetation to establish full footway width on the eastern and western footways of Bittacy Hill, allowing for some resurfacing

Overall requirement to be £24,000 excluding VAT and any subsequent design/construction overruns to be funded by the developer.

There will be a requirement to submit an annual Travel Plan Incentive Fund Monitoring Report. This will include an update on the uptake of the Residential Travel Plan Incentives and the drawdown on the associated Fund.

The applicant will also be required to provide a Travel Plan Monitoring contribution of £10,000.

The developer should also fund one years' free membership of the car-club space for all residents.

### **Drainage/SuDs**

No objections to the scheme following submission of additional information and subject to conditions.

### **Waste/Refuse**

No objections – the suggested levels of capacity for waste and recycling in this planned development appear correct based on our developer's guidance document.

The concept of a central collection point as detailed in the plans can work however there are a number of points that should be highlighted to the developer:

1. Our staff are not permitted to drag bins more than 10 metres to be emptied;
2. If our staff have to move bins up and down from any raised footways there must be dropped kerbs in place;
3. All bins must be available at the central collection point for emptying from 06:30am on the allocated collection day;

4. Recycling and Waste bins may both be emptied on the same day so there must be enough space there for all bins to be presented together.

The site should be visited and assessed by one of our officers once construction is underway so that further advice can be given and an order placed for the required recycling and waste bins.

### **Urban Design**

No objections.

#### **Context:**

The proposal is informed by the local context which is suburban low-rise with most of the area being residential in character. The design blends in a positive manner with the existing trees and aims to enhance the natural environment through a legible easy to manage landscape strategy. The proposal is invisible form key Green Belt views.

#### **Building footprints:**

The building footprints have been rationalised and re-presented in the second iteration of the design. The breaks in buildings are welcome as we get more light penetration in the site and views out.

#### **Height:**

There are no tall elements which would affect Green Belt views to the site in a negative way. The variation of height on site is subtle and allows for elements to frame the courtyard without compromising sky exposure.

#### **Massing:**

There are sufficient breaks in the massing to allow for light permeability and better views out from the heart of the site.

#### **Views:**

Views to the site were examined. Due to the lush nature surrounding the site there is no view that is presenting a detrimental impact of the development.

#### **Topography:**

The presented levels and manipulation with regards to movement is continuous and smooth with attention paid to accessibility so that everyone can enjoy the natural elements of the masterplan located at the heart of the site.

#### **Landscape:**

There is more green on the arrival square which is welcome. The essential emergency corridors are hardscaped which is unavoidable as vehicles need access on emergencies. The development of more useable lawn areas is welcome as these can accommodate for many uses and be enjoyed by all ages.

#### **Architecture/Materials:**

There is enough façade variation to avoid severe repetition through the new development. This variation is subtle, understated but still works very well in differentiating buildings. Materials are complementing across plots and provide enough variation on site to relate to the architecture of buildings and landscape. The proposed mixed brick is welcome this is an overarching principle to be kept into the next stages of development. Shading screens are now designed with a pattern that fits the structures reminiscent of a pinecone structure which translates the lush green

character of the area. The curvature of the structure around balconies and windows works well with the materials proposed.

### Employment and Skills

No objections.

#### Part 1 - Non-Financial Contributions

<b>Part 1a - Non-financial obligations</b>	<b>Outputs</b>
a) Progression into Employment (unemployed under 6 mths)	8
b) Progression into Employment (unemployed over 6 mths)	5
c) Apprenticeships (min NQV Level 2)	14
d) Work Experience (min 10 days)	18
e) School/College/ University Site Visits	106
f) School/College Workshops	88
g) Local Labour	30%
h) Local supplier requirements	2

Number of Affordable Residential Units (as per Planning Application)	10
<b>Part 1b - Construction Training Initiative</b>	Applicable

*NOTE: Refer to Affordable Housing SPD (Feb 2017), page 23 and Appendix 6*

Number of End use jobs (as per Planning Application)	0
<b>Part 1c -Local Employment Agreement (LEA)</b>	Not applicable

*NOTE: Refer to SPD-SEET (Oct 2014), LEAs, page 10*

## Part 2 - Financial Contributions

Part 2a -Loss of Floorspace (non-residential) Financial Contribution	Area (m <sup>2</sup> )	Use Class Types - Notes
Existing Floorspace	11,555.00	Office (B1a) and Warehouse & Distribution (B8)
Replacement Floorspace	10,907.00	[Enter comments]
<b>Floorspace compensation</b>	<b>£ 288,360.00</b>	
<b>Comments</b>		
Loss of employment floorspace B1(a) office - 648 sqm Loss of employment floorspace - B8 Storage and distribution - 8,803.5 sqm Re-location of IBSA to purpose-built facility at Galleywood, close to Chelmsford in Essex <b>Please provide additional clarification on the re-provision use classes and definition(s).</b>		

Part 2b - Commuted sums in lieu of Local Employment Agreements		
Apprenticeship Contribution	£ 540,960.00	Subject to Indexation
Employment Contribution	£ 72,218.16	Subject to Indexation
<b>Total LEA payment in Lieu</b>	<b>£ 613,178.16</b>	Subject to Indexation
<b>Comments</b>		
[Enter comments]		

The application site is included within the Mill Hill East Area Action Plan and the draft Local Plan Schedule of Proposals. Both documents allocate the site for employment use. Consequently, any redevelopment of the application site would need to adequately re-provide employment uses onsite, or mitigate its loss through a financial contribution. Planning application states a financial contribution towards employment and skills within the Borough as the preferred option, given the application site is located outside of a town centre and the surrounding area is predominantly residential in character.

Post relocation of IBSA, retaining the site for a new intensive employment use would not be appropriate for the area as the residential context of the wider area is now very much established and the residential development of Millbrook Park, which is promoted through the AAP, reinforces this.

Following our review of the Financial Viability Assessment for this Site, and including the justification offered within the AAP and Planning Statement; Paragraphs 5.5- 5.7, we accept that the requested Financial Contribution, will not be required/requested towards this Loss of Employment Floorspace.

Based on the Affordable Housing SPD; 2007; Chapter 10, Paragraph 10.1, we accept your proposal and at your discretion, not to provide the Construction Training Initiative, within this Site.

Finally, I would like to offer, those options available to this Planning Application, when considering the discharge of The Council's SPD-SEET Requirements.

### **Option 1.**

Table Part 2b provides a Financial Calculation and equivalent of LEA Payment in Lieu of £613, 178.16, towards Employment and Skills. By paying this financial

contribution, it means, the Site/ Application will not be required to enter into any agreement to provide any Employment and Skills obligations, during the development phases. This also includes Local Labour requirements. The Financial Contribution will be used for the purposes of supporting Local Residents of Barnet, towards Employment, Skills and support additional economic and social interventions, aligned to the terms of this Financial Contribution, within Barnet SPD; 2014.

### **Option 2.**

The Applicant can opt to discharge the Employment and Skills Obligations defined within Table Part1a. This will include Local Labour requirements. Stephanie and I agree to reduce the Local Labour to 15%. By so doing, the Applicant will not be required to provide any financial contributions towards these Obligations. The Applicant may be required to pay a financial contribution of a) £25,000 per apprenticeship and b) 5,340 per other employment outcomes; if some or all of the Obligations within Table Part1a, are not discharged/ delivered as per the Planning agreement and/ or during the Development phases of this Site.

### **Option 3.**

In exceptional circumstances and in this case, based on the Financial Viability Assessment, the Council can Commute the Employment and Skills obligations in Table Part1a, into a Financial Contribution, in order to generate alternative employment alternatives (SPD-2014; Para 2.8-2.10). The Council calculates this amount to be £515,540. This calculation is broken down as follows.

Progressions into Employment (-6mths & +6mths)	13	5,340.00	69,420.00
Apprenticeships	14	25,000.00	350,000.00
Work Experience	18	5,340.00	96,120.00
Local Labour		0.00	0.00
Site Visits and Site Workshops		0.00	0.00
<b>Commutated Sum in lieu</b>			<b>515,540.00</b>

Please note, the site will require to offer Employment and Skills based on the SPD;2014 eligibility criteria, mitigating the impact to the community and ensuring their comments/ feedback from the community are equally addressed.

## **3. PLANNING ASSESSMENT**

### **3.1 Principle of development**

#### Housing Delivery

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 new London Plan 2021 recognises the pressing need for more homes in London and seeks to increase housing supply to in order to promote opportunity and provide real choice for all Londoners in ways that meet their needs at a price they can afford.

The previous London Plan (2016) had set an annual monitoring target of 2,349 homes for Barnet between 2015-2025, with a minimum provision of 23,489 over the same 10 year period. In the new London Plan 2021, the 10 year target for 2019/20 – 2028/29 is 23,640 for Barnet.

Barnet Local Plan documents also recognise the need to increase housing supply. Policies CS1 and CS3 of the Barnet Core Strategy expect developments proposing new housing to protect and enhance the character and quality of the area and to optimise housing density to reflect local context, public transport accessibility and the provision of social infrastructure.

The development would seek to make the most efficient and effective use of brownfield site, providing 197 new residential units for the area which would assist Barnet in meeting this target.

### Land Use/Employment

The site is within the Mill Hill East Growth Area and the Proposed Site Allocation List (no.46) as identified in the Proposed Barnet Local Plan – Reg 18 2020 document. Policy GSS07 Mill Hill East, states:

*The Council will positively consider proposals on suitable sites to deliver further good suburban growth, including at Mill Hill East Station, Watchtower House and IBSA House, which together could deliver around 745 new homes.*

Employment has historically formed part of the established use on site. This is reflected in the sites planning history and allocation within local planning documents. The site is included within the Mill Hill East Area Action Plan and the draft Local Plan Schedule of Proposals for employment use. However the employment allocation was applied in the AAP to specifically safeguard the operations of IBSA. The allocation was not applied to safeguard general employment land within the borough or because the site was considered to be of importance to the council's employment land supply.

Furthermore the site is not within the council's designated Locally Significant Industrial Sites. In addition given the planning history and the refusal of Prior Approval applications for the conversion from office to residential, it has been established that the lawful use of the site is sui generis. The GLA have also confirmed Policy E7 of London Plan 2021, which protects Industrial sites including non-designated sites with a prevailing industrial use, does not apply, given the established sui generis use.

In regards to Policy DM14 New and Existing Employment Space. The proposed scheme includes flexible workspace and meetings rooms for future occupiers, although this does not constitute replacement workspace. The applicant has also submitted marketing evidence, although it is noted this does not cover the full 12-month period. However as the applicant's planning statement highlights, the proposal has been through significant pre-application discussions with both the Council (and GLA).

Given the allocation it has been agreed that any redevelopment of the application site would need to adequately re-provide employment uses onsite or mitigate its loss through a financial contribution. In accordance with Policy DM14 the applicant has agreed to provide a financial contribution towards employment and skills within the Borough and loss of employment floorspace.

The proposal has been reviewed by both policy officers and the skills and employment team. Taking all matters into consideration, it has been concluded that following the relocation of IBSA, retaining the site for a new intensive employment use would not be appropriate for the area as the residential context of the wider area is now established and the residential development of Millbrook Park, which is promoted through the AAP, reinforces this.

Policy DM14 advises that the loss of office space will only be permitted in town or edge of town centre locations where it has been demonstrated that the site is no longer suitable and viable and a suitable period of active marketing has been undertaken. DM14 is silent in relation to the loss of offices outside such locations and given this, the evidence of the previous marketing, the supporting information which has been submitted by the applicant and the support (with financial payment) of the Head of Economic Development it is considered that the loss of the employment floorspace provision in this location accords with Policy so far as an appropriate payment is made to provide employment elsewhere.

Therefore given the site is located outside of a town centre and the surrounding area is predominantly residential in character, officers consider that a residential scheme can be supported, subject to adequate affordable housing provision and a financial contribution towards employment and skills within the Borough and loss of employment floorspace.

### Affordable Housing

The Barnet Core Strategy (Policy CS4) seeks a borough wide target of 40% affordable homes on sites capable of accommodating ten or more dwellings. Council policies seek a tenure split of 60% social rented and 40% intermediate housing.

Policy H4 of London Plan 2021 and the Mayor's Affordable Housing and Viability SPG set a strategic target of 50% affordable housing. Policy H5 'Threshold approach to applications', effectively accepts schemes under a 'fast track' process which propose a minimum level of 35% onsite affordable housing by habitable room without the need to submit a viability assessment. Schemes which provide less than this level need to be accompanied by a viability assessment. In those circumstances where the outcome of a viability review indicate that a scheme cannot viably provide more affordable housing, then a scheme can be approved with a lower level of affordable housing subject to the attachment of early and late stage viability reviews.

The submitted scheme proposed 5% affordable housing by habitable room, all at London Living Rent. As such a viability assessment produced by Doug Birt Consulting, was provided. The Council instructed BNP Paribas to carry out an independent review of this document.

The viability assessment has been the subject of lengthy and detailed discussions between both parties and the GLA. Various issues have been examined, for example the construction costs, benchmark land value and values of the proposed units. In the revised assessment prepared by Doug Birt Consulting dated 14<sup>th</sup> October 2020, 18% affordable housing (16 LLR units and 20 DMR units) was proposed although it stated this would generate a £5.742m deficit. It advised that the applicant is willing to continue offering 18% affordable housing, even though the scheme does not generate the required threshold profit levels.

BNP Paribas have concluded this scheme with 18% affordable housing (16 LLR units and 20 DMR units) does generate a deficit, albeit a lesser figure of £2,861,623.

Following further discussions with the GLA and the council, the applicant proposed a revised offer of 20% affordable housing by habitable room with both LLR and DMR units. Following discussions with the GLA the proposed affordable units would now all be LLR and comprise, 15x 1B; 14x 2B; 7x 3B; and 6x 4B (total of 42 AH units).

This offer has been reviewed by BNP Paribas who have advised the council that this is acceptable. It should be noted that whilst the Council normally seeks a tenure split of 60% Social Rented and 40% intermediate as outlined in Policy DM10, the highlighted policy does allow for these proportions to be determined on a case by case basis. Given this has been independently viability tested, the proposed development is deemed compliant with Policy DM10.

The onsite affordable housing contribution will be secured via a s106 agreement with both an early and late stage review mechanism.

### Residential density

Chapter 11 of the National Planning Framework (Revised 2019) (NPPF) states that:

*Planning policies and decisions should promote an effective use of land in meeting the need for homes and other uses, while safeguarding and improving the environment and ensuring safe and healthy living conditions. Strategic policies should set out a clear strategy for accommodating objectively assessed needs, in a way that makes as much use as possible of previously-developed or 'brownfield' land.*

This strategic objective to optimise redevelopment opportunities within sustainable locations is reinforced within the London Plan 2021.

The previous London Plan (2016) set out a density matrix which served as guidance for appropriate densities in different locations and with varying levels of accessibility. However, the new London Plan 2021 takes a less prescriptive approach stating inter alia, that the density of a development should result from a design-led approach to determine the capacity of the site. This should consider site context, its connectivity and accessibility by walking and cycling, existing and planned public transport (including PTAL) and the capacity of surrounding infrastructure. Policy D3 goes on to state that proposed residential development that does not demonstrably optimise the housing density of the site in accordance with this policy could be refused.

The density of the proposed development would equate to 98.5 units per hectare or 324 hr/ha, which is significantly less than the figure of 350 units per hectare, requiring additional design scrutiny under Policy D4 of The London Plan 2021. However the numerical application of the density matrix needs to be balanced against design and the quality of residential environment created. The application site has been subject to a design-led approach to optimise the potential of the site. In this instance it is not considered to result in any overdevelopment symptoms. Officers consider that the density of the scheme is suitably expressed and respects the verdant character of the site. The wider details of the proposal are reviewed in the following sections of the report to assess the overall impact of the development.

### 3.2 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 the new London Plan 2021. 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 2021 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 proposed development proposes the following unit mix across the application site:

<b>Tenure</b>	<b>1B 2P</b>	<b>2B 3P</b>	<b>2B 4P</b>	<b>3B</b>	<b>4B</b>	<b>Total Units</b>
London Living Rent (LLR)	15	14	0	7	6	40
Private	40	34	12	45	24	157
<b>Total</b>	<b>55</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>52</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>197</b>

In terms of dwellings types which constitute family accommodation provision, the London Housing Design Guide classifies family housing as all units upwards of 2 bedroom 3 person units. Based on this definition the proposal would provide a total of 142 family units equating to 72.09% of the total number of units on site. Notably there are also a total of 52 x3b and 30 x4b units, with 12 (7 x3b & 6 x4b) of these provided as affordable housing units.

Overall it is considered that the proposed scheme comprises a good mix of housing types and sizes to address the housing preference and need. Officers therefore consider the proposed dwelling mix to be acceptable and in accordance with Policy DM08 of the Local Plan.

#### Residential Internal Space Standards

The London Plan and Barnet's Sustainable Design and Construction SPD outlines the minimum gross internal floor area required for different dwelling sizes. Following some minor revisions to the internal layout to IBSA House – all units in the detailed element of the proposal now meet the minimum standards in relation to the unit sizes and also meet the minimum areas for bedrooms, bathrooms w/c's and storage and utility rooms. For clarity this will be also be secured through a planning condition.

## Wheelchair Accessible Housing

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 have 10% wheelchair home compliance, as per London Plan Policy D7 Accessible housing.

The planning submission sets out that 10% of the residential units would be provided as wheelchair adaptable in line with aforementioned policy context and in accordance with Part M4(3) of the Building Regulations. This is considered to be acceptable and a condition would be attached which would secure these as wheelchair adaptable units.

## Amenity space

Barnet's Sustainable Design and Construction SPD Table 2.3 outlines the minimum external amenity space standards required for new residential developments. For flats, the SPD requires 5sqm of space per habitable room for all minor, major and large-scale developments. 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 compliance. The minimum requirements are set out in the table below:

<b>Outdoor Amenity Space Requirements</b>	<b>Development Scale</b>
For Flats: 5m <sup>2</sup> of space per habitable room	Minor, major and large scale
For Houses: 40m <sup>2</sup> of space for up to four habitable rooms 55m <sup>2</sup> of space for up to five habitable rooms 70m <sup>2</sup> of space for up to six habitable rooms 85m <sup>2</sup> 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 Mayor's housing SPG sets out a requirement of 5 sqm of private amenity space for 1 and 2 person dwellings with a further 1 sqm per additional person.

The proposed amenity provision has been developed to ensure that each dwelling is provided with private outdoor amenity space. All the proposed flats except the single studio flat in Block A, would be provided with private terraces/balconies. The proposed scheme has 647 habitable rooms requiring 3235m<sup>2</sup> of outdoor amenity space. 2170m<sup>2</sup> of the amenity space would be provided through private amenity space; balconies and terraces, with the remainder provided across the communal courtyards and rooftop gardens.

In addition the scheme would also provide 1470m<sup>2</sup> of separate playspace, see below. Overall, it is considered that acceptable levels and quality of outdoor amenity space are afforded all future residents.

## Children's Play Space

London Plan 2021 Policy S4 Play and Informal Recreation, requires housing development to make provisions for play and informal recreation. Barnet Core Strategy Policy CS7 requires improved access the children's play space from all developments that increase demand, and Policy DM02 requires development to demonstrate compliance with the London Plan.

The proposed scheme has a requirement to provide 10m<sup>2</sup> of playspace for each child, based on the accommodation schedule of 197 units this equates to 147 children, thus a requirement of 1470m<sup>2</sup> playspace. This playspace requirement would be met with a combination of more 'formal' equipped play areas and multi-functional 'playable' landscapes across the site offering a range of objects and habitats for children of all ages and provide opportunities for creative play. The courtyard spaces would also be 'playable' offering leisure areas for residents of all ages and an attractive outlook from the buildings. The council's green spaces team also advised that a more formal play area should be created which would allow children of different ages and from different families to play together within the larger play space shown in the centre of the site. Therefore the overall level of play space provision is considered acceptable and the details would be secured via condition.

### Secured by Design

Policy DM01 requires that the principles set out in the national Police initiative, 'Secured by Design' should be considered in development proposals. The proposed development was subject to consultation with the Met Police who have raised no objections subject to the standard condition. Therefore a condition would be attached to any permission requiring the proposed development and design to achieve Secured by Design accreditation.

## **3.3 Design**

The National Planning Policy Framework (revised 2019) makes it clear that good design is indivisible from good planning and a key element in achieving sustainable development. This document states that permission should be refused for development which is of poor design that fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area and the way it functions. It identifies that good design involves integrating development into the natural, built and historic environment and also points out that although visual appearance and the architecture of buildings are important factors; securing high quality design goes beyond aesthetic considerations.

The London Plan 2021 also contains a number of policies promoting a design led approach having regard to various matters such as character, layout, scale, sustainability, public realm and landscaping for example. The London Plan 2021 emphasises the need for a good quality environment, with the design of new buildings supporting character and legibility of a neighbourhood. The London Plan 2021 states that buildings, streets and open spaces should provide a high quality design response that has regard to the pattern and grain of the existing spaces and streets in orientation, scale, proportion and mass; contributes to a positive relationship between the urban structure and natural landscape features, including the underlying landform and topography of an area; is human in scale, ensuring buildings create a positive relationship with street level activity and people feel comfortable with their surroundings; allows existing buildings and structures that make a positive

contribution to the character of a place to influence the future character of the area; and is informed by the surrounding historic environment.

Policy CS5 of Barnet Council's policy framework seeks to ensure that all development in Barnet respects local context and distinctive local character, creating places and buildings of high quality design. In this regard Policy CS5 is clear in mandating that new development should improve the quality of buildings, landscaping and the street environment and in turn enhance the experience of Barnet for residents, workers and visitors alike. Policy DM01 also requires that all developments should seek to ensure a high standard of urban and architectural design for all new development and high quality design, demonstrating high levels of environmental awareness of their location by way of character, scale, mass, height and pattern of surrounding buildings, spaces and streets. Proposals should preserve or enhance local character and respect the appearance. Policy DM03 seeks to create a positive and inclusive environment that also encourages high quality distinctive developments. The above policies form the basis for the assessment on design.

### Character, Layout, Scale, Height

The Barnet Characterisation Study 2010 identifies Mill Hill East as a distinct character area, having a mainly suburban character with some interspersed rural, retail and campus typologies. The submitted Landscape Design Statement provides a summary of the land use and surrounding character of the site. This highlights, the recently completed phases of the Millbrook Park residential developments immediately adjacent to the site, which adds more residential character and includes 3 & 4-storey apartment blocks. The Millbrook Park development, when completed, will also include commercial and retail development near Mill Hill East Station.

The adjacent Partingdale Lane has a semi-rural character on the north side however this is counterbalanced by the recent two and three-storey residential developments to its immediate south as part of the Millbrook Park redevelopment.

As the submitted Design and Access Statement (DAS) states the scheme has been subject to a number of iterations in response to consultations with both the Council and the GLA. The site is distinctly different to the surrounding context and uniquely separated from the suburban surroundings that it sits within. This provides the opportunity to create a development which would have its own identity by allowing it to relate and respond to IBSA House and the woodland area.

The new built form to the rear half of the site would be split into five blocks. The mass and height of the proposed new development blocks seek to complement IBSA House and have been carefully configured and take reference of its scale and massing, whilst also being of a scale which can sit comfortably with the surrounding residential development. Block A situated along the northern boundary and Block B at the centre of the site are the tallest elements at six storeys, as they sit closest to IBSA House. Most importantly proposal involves an alteration to the ground levels at the rear part of the site to enable the main bulk and roof levels of Blocks A and B to sit in line with the five-storey height of IBSA House.

The eastern end of Block A drops in scale and height down to four storeys as the building reaches the east boundary of the application site, towards Tommy Flower Mews. Blocks C and E also on the east boundary are likewise set at four storeys in

height. Finally Block D located on the southern boundary, closest to Albuhera Mews steps down further to three storeys.

The separation of the new built form into five blocks of varying size and scale along with their siting, helps to break up the overall mass and also increase permeability in and around the site which provides areas for shared amenity. A thorough and detailed landscaping scheme has also been designed to enhance the sites verdant character and green setting by connecting through to the existing woodland.

In respect of design, both the DAS and planning statement explain a comprehensive site wide approach has been taken in order to link the converted IBSA House with the new residential blocks at the rear of the site. This has primarily been achieved through the materials selected and the external alterations proposed to IBSA House which provide a visual link to the new contemporary blocks to the rear.

The redevelopment of IBSA House is a key element of the proposal. The subdivision of the deep internal space creates spacious units with the majority dual aspect to maximise on outlook, daylight, and ventilation. There are no north facing single aspect units. New fenestration would be added to provide better outlook and balconies added for private amenity. The existing vertical element will be converted into a rendered structure to support the new balconies and will match the existing architecture of the building. Rendered horizontal bands would also be added to break up the elevations and relate to the new blocks to the rear.

A contemporary architectural design approach has been taken to the rear blocks with the intention to deliver buildings which would have a visual lightness and horizontal emphasis. Furthermore the simple pallet of materials helps to produce architectural clarity and provide balance with the retained IBSA House. The balconies would have laser cut metal screens, (some fixed and some on sliders) that would enable the occupants to control privacy and solar shading. This element would also add visual interest and enrich the elevations.

### Views

The visibility of the scheme has also been considered from the surrounding areas throughout the design process to ensure there would be no detrimental visual impact. The planning submission is supported with both photographic and measured surveys (prepared by BB Partnership Ltd) undertaken at a number of viewing points from both: the surrounding public realm and urban areas on the east, south and west side; and the Green Belt to the north side.

### Surrounding Residential Areas

Referring to 'Proposed Views from Neighbouring Areas' (prepared by BB Partnership Ltd) the new buildings would be screened from the Ridgeway from the west by the existing buildings. There would be locations where the new building blocks and the existing IBSA House would be seen from the south and east through gaps between the existing buildings in Millbrook Park. However these views show that the new structures at the rear of the development site would not visually dominate or overwhelm the housing development.

### Green Belt

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) states the fundamental aim of Green Belt Policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open; the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and permanence. The Green Belt serves five purposes:

- i. to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas.
- ii. to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another.
- iii. to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment.
- iv. to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns.
- v. to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land.

As with previous Green Belt policy, inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances. When considering any planning application, LPA's should ensure that substantial weight is given to any harm to the Green Belt. 'Very special circumstances' will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt, by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations. The NPPF indicates that the construction of new buildings should be regarded as inappropriate in the Green Belt unless they fall within certain specified exceptions.

The London Plan 2021 also strongly supports the protection, promotion and enhancement of London's open spaces and natural environments. Policy G2 London's Green Belt under part A confirms Green Belt should be protected from inappropriate development and proposals that would harm the Green Belt should be refused except where very special circumstances exist.

In terms of local policy, Policy DM15 reflects both National and Regional policy. It confirms that, "Except in very special circumstances, the council will refuse any development in the Green Belt or MOL which is not compatible with their purposes and objectives and does not maintain their openness."

The woodland within the application site to the north of the existing buildings is designated as Green Belt, along with the open space to the north, which is outside the application boundary. However, no built development will encroach into the Green Belt as a result of the proposed development. The woodland within the application site, is currently overgrown and not accessible. As the supporting Landscape Statement and Arboricultural Impact Assessment outline, the woodland area would remain largely unchanged. The proposals would only involve the removal of the existing fence and storage units along the southern edge of the woodland. This would only help to create a softer and more permeable edge with greater connection to the woodland.

A key consideration beyond the application site, is the impact of the development on the Green Belt. In this regard Block A located at the northern boundary faces north towards the Green Belt. However by lowering the ground level at the rear, former Printery site creates a common roof line with the existing IBSA House. Importantly this also reduces the visibility of the new buildings from the Green Belt (and also the new residential development in Millbrook Park).

It is also pertinent to highlight the site is heavily screened by the extensive and thick green woodland, within and to the north of the site. This band of trees and planting provides a meaningful and prominent green buffer to the proposed development and

significantly limits any views into the site.

The proposal also benefits from a comprehensive analysis of the Green Belt, prepared by BB Partnership Ltd which tested the views from the Green Belt based on an accurate survey of 21 vantage points. These are detailed in the supporting document titled 'Proposed Views from Green Belt'. The views were taken from Partingdale Lane northwards up to Burtonhole Lane and towards the north-east. This review demonstrates that the new building would not be visible during the summer with the exception of 1 view. During the winter months there would be limited views of part of the building from 3 points.

It is noted that these are limited views more through the existing tree canopy cover rather than above overall canopy height. In addition the highest element of the development is at the same height as the existing IBSA House building and the development sits below the general tree line. Therefore it is considered the development would not have a detrimental impact on the openness of the Green Belt.

### Heritage Assets

The Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 sets out the statutory duties for dealing with heritage assets in planning decisions. In relation to listed buildings, all planning decisions should "have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses".

There are no designated heritage assets on the application site, however it is recognised that the Grade II Listed Partingdale Manor and Grade II Listed War Room Bunker are approximately 50m and 330m respectively to the north east of the site. However, given the distance from the application site coupled with the heavy green planted buffer/screening between the application site and these assets, the proposed development is not considered to cause any harm to the heritage assets of their setting.

## **3.4 Amenity Impact on Neighbouring Properties**

### 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.

The distances between the proposed development and adjoining properties in Tommy Flower Mews and Albuhera Mews all exceed 21m. In addition Block D on southern boundary closest to Albuhera Mews is set at 3 storeys; and Blocks C and E along the eastern boundaries are 4 storeys along with Block A dropping down to 4 storeys. Therefore given the separation distances and the reduced scale of the proposed buildings towards the perimeter edges of the site, it is considered there are no residential properties within the vicinity which would be adversely affected by the proposal.

### Daylight/Sunlight & Overshadowing

The application confirms that the proposed scheme has been guided by daylight/sunlight studies undertaken from the outset and through the design process to inform the potential building form and height. The applicant has undertaken a Daylight, Sunlight and Overshadowing assessment for the proposed development and neighbouring residential properties based on the approach set out in the Building Research Establishment's (BRE) 'Site Layout Planning for Daylight and Sunlight: A Good Practice Guide'.

Daylight has been assessed in terms of Vertical Sky Component (VSC), NO Sky Line (NSL) and Average Daylight Factor (ADF) and sunlight has been assessed in terms of Annual Probable Sunlight Hours (APSH) and has been assessed against the above BRE guidelines. The BRE Guidelines stipulate that there should be no real noticeable loss of daylight provided that either:

- The Vertical Sky Component (VSC) as measured at the centre point of a window is greater than 27%; or the VSC is not reduced by greater than 20% of its original value. (Skylight); or
- The daylight distribution, as measured by the No Sky Line (NSL) test where the percentage of floor area receiving light is measured, is not reduced by greater than 20% of its original value; or
- The daylight distribution, as assessed by the Average Daylight Factor (ADF) calculation which assesses the actual level of light received by a room rather than potential light. The ADF requires the achievement of values of 1% in bedrooms, 1.5% in living rooms and 2% in kitchens.

The BRE guidelines explain that the guidelines are not mandatory and that the guide should not be seen as an instrument of planning policy; its aim to help rather than constrain the designer. Although it gives numerical guidelines, these should be interpreted flexibly since natural lighting is only one of many factors in site layout design. In special circumstance the developer or planning authority may wish to use different target values.

The assessment prepared by Brooke Vincent Partners states the neighbouring residential buildings have been analysed and all the VSC results have confirmed that good daylight has been retained. Daylight distribution has also been tested and confirms that in all but 3 locations the results would be fully satisfied, and no adverse effect would occur. The analysis also confirms that in all locations the sunlight availability to the neighbouring buildings would be retained in accordance with the BRE recommendations. In terms of overshadowing, all neighbouring amenity areas included in the analysis would not be impacted by the overshadowing of the proposed development and the BRE guidance has been fully satisfied.

Therefore it is considered that the proposal would have no detrimental impact on the daylight/sunlight levels enjoyed by surrounding properties in the new residential developments to the east (Tommy Flower Mews), south (Albuhera Mews) and the existing houses to the west (Ridgeway).

### Noise

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 proposal has been reviewed by the Council's Environmental Health team and conditions are recommended ensuring that any plant or machinery associated with the development, extract and ventilation equipment, achieves required noise levels for residential environment.

However as a major development, the construction phase would involve large-scale operations. As there is the potential for significant adverse environmental effects during this phase, a Construction Logistics Plan and an Environmental Management Plan would be therefore be secured via condition. Subject to the above Officers do not consider that the development would have any significant impact on the existing residential amenity in the immediate or surrounding area. It should be noted the council's highway officers have confirmed that Bittacy Hill and its connections to the A1 should be the principal construction traffic access route. The proposed construction route initially submitted has therefore been amended to the south towards Bittacy Hill Circus.

### Air Quality

The development proposal and details were reviewed by the Council's Environmental Health team who have advised that the proposed development is acceptable. The proposal does not, in air quality terms, conflict with national or local policies, or with measures set out in the London Borough of Barnet's Air Quality Action Plan. There are no constraints to the development in the context of air quality.

Suitable conditions are attached regarding ventilation and the submission of details of proposed plant and equipment. In respect of traffic and parking impacts on air quality, the levels of parking are controlled and the travel plan statement encourages sustainable travel modes to and from the site. In respect of the design, the scheme contributed towards overall reductions in CO2 production, having regard to energy and sustainability policies.

## **3.5 Transport / Highways**

Policy CS9 of the Barnet Core Strategy (Providing safe, effective and efficient travel) identifies that the Council will seek to ensure more efficient use of the local road network and more environmentally friendly transport networks, require that development is matched to capacity and promote the delivery of appropriate transport infrastructure. Policy DM17 (Travel impact and parking standards) of the Barnet Development Management Plan document sets out the parking standards that the Council will apply when assessing new developments. Other sections of Policies DM17 and CS9 seek that proposals ensure the safety of all road users and make travel safer, reduce congestion, minimise increases in road traffic, provide suitable and safe access for all users of developments, ensure roads within the borough are used appropriately, require acceptable facilities for pedestrians and cyclists and reduce the need to travel.

### Residential Car Parking

The London Plan 2021 sets out maximum parking standards which are outlined in Table 10.3 The supporting text provided in the parking addendum sets out that all

developments in areas of good public transport accessibility should aim for significantly less than 1 space per unit.

Car parking standards for residential development are also set out in the Barnet Local Plan and recommend a range of parking provision for new dwellings based on the on a sites Public Transport Accessibility Level (PTAL) and the type of unit proposed. Policy DM17 of the Local Plan sets out the parking requirements for different types of units with the range of provision is as follows:

- four or more bedroom units - 2.0 to 1.5 parking spaces per unit
- two and three-bedroom units - 1.5 to 1.0 parking spaces per unit
- one-bedroom units - 1.0 to less than 1.0 parking space per unit

The Transport Assessment (TA) prepared by EAS and supporting planning documents confirm a total of 197 car parking spaces are provided on site, 53 of which are surface parking spaces, with the remainder provided at basement level. These are inclusive of 1 car club bay, 10% disabled bays, 20% electric parking provision and 80% electric parking passive provision.

The total of 197 parking spaces has been determined as follows:

- 0.73 spaces per 1 bed/studio apartments - which falls within the maximum parking levels for all the relevant parking standards and reflects the likely low car ownership for the studio and one bed units, likely to be made up of mostly renters and first time buyers.
- One space per two and three bedroom apartments - this provision matches the average car ownership levels based on the Census data for flatted development only and is within all of the maximum parking levels for all the relevant standards.
- 1.5 spaces per four bedroom apartments – this provision meets the minimum requirement of 1.5 spaces per 4 bed unit as required by the Barnet parking standards.

The applicant has noted the GLAs comments to reduce the number of car parking spaces on site. However the parking provision has been discussed extensively and agreed with council's highways officers, which delivers a policy compliant scheme. The strategy is based on balancing the London Plan requirements with Barnet Council's parking policy; alongside evidence from the Census car ownership data and consideration of the sustainability of the location of the site.

### Trip Generation

The TA states that the method for estimating trip generation is based upon that used in the Transport Assessment for the recently approved redevelopment of the National Institute for Medical Research (NIMR), which was agreed with highway officers. The TRICS 7.6.1 database was interrogated for private apartments in suburban sites. Due to the site's location on the edge of London, with a lower transport provision than more central sites, sites throughout southern and central England were considered; and two sites in inner London were excluded.

The tables presented in section 5 of the TA identifies that the proposed residential use is expected to generate a net increase in trip generation throughout the day but a net decrease during both the peak periods. This is particularly apparent in the PM peak when there is a drop in both directions, especially the outbound. In the AM peak there is a shift in the direction of the traffic, with a fall in inbound traffic almost balanced by a rise in outbound. OGV traffic falls throughout the day.

However, as shown in Table 5.1 of the TA, the traffic count data collected in 2018 amount to much less than the traffic recorded when IBSA House (and Watchtower House) were fully in use. Therefore when considering traffic generation it is important to recognise that when the traffic survey was undertaken, IBSA operations at the site were winding down, and it is very likely that when IBSA operations were at peak activity (prior to the printworks closing), the trips generated at the site would have been significantly higher than those forecast for the proposed development. This is based on surveys taken in 2012 when this site was fully operational.

### Cycle parking

A total of 392 cycle parking will be provided. 105 spaces for residents and 5 spaces for visitors will be provided on the ground floor of the front building, adjacent to the reception area which will be manned 24/7, facilitating use of cycle parking by visitors to the site. 282 spaces will be provided at the basement below the rear site, inclusive of the 18 spaces designed for larger or specialist cycles. Minor revisions have been made to the cycle stores and layouts across the site. Full details would be secured through appropriate conditions.

### Access/Highways Improvements

Following comments received by the GLA, the gates at the site entrance would be removed and replaced with bollards. The design/specification of the bollards is to be finalised and agreed via planning condition. This is a necessary security measure which would stop vehicles freely accessing the site, whilst still allowing full pedestrian access.

In order for the site to be pedestrian friendly and not dominated by cars vehicular movement will be restricted to the existing access road that runs from the site entrance on west and around the north of IBSA House. This will enable the whole of the large open space on the south side and around the new rear buildings to be pedestrianised and used safely as shared amenity and play areas. This would only be accessible to emergency vehicles.

Following discussions with officers, the measures identified as part of the Active Travel Zone Assessment and included within the TA are to be funded by the applicant and secured through the legal agreement. This will include:

- A new dropped kerb tactile crossing as the site vehicular access;
- A new dropped kerb tactile crossing across The Ridgway south of the site; and
- Remove vegetation to establish full footway width on the eastern and western footways of Bittacy Hill, allowing for some resurfacing.

These improvements will encourage pedestrians from the development and local community, to walk between the site and the facilities to the south of the site including, Mill Hill East underground station, the Waitrose Store. Due to a lack of cycle lanes and other infrastructure in the local area there is limited opportunity at a local area to provide improvements for cyclists, however as identified above cycle parking will be provided at a policy compliant level.

### Travel Plan

In addition to the above, a Travel Plan Statement has also been submitted which sets out a range of preliminary management strategies and measures to support and encourage sustainable travel. The overall aim/objective of the Travel Plan Statement is to minimise the impact of travel on the local and wider environment and to promote sustainable travel choices, such as walking, cycling and public transport.

The council's travel plan coordinator has confirmed there are no objections. There will be a requirement to submit an annual Travel Plan Incentive Fund Monitoring Report. This will include an update on the uptake of the Residential Travel Plan Incentives and the drawdown on the associated Fund.

The applicant will also be required to provide a Travel Plan Monitoring contribution of £10,000 which would be secured under a s106 agreement.

#### Construction Management/Logistics Plans

Details should include limits on times of operation for the lorries and identify a designated safe route for lorries to ensure minimal impact on the public highway and to demonstrate how the operation and construction can be done safely. Therefore notwithstanding the details submitted, final details will be confirmed with agreement with LBB and secured through appropriate conditions.

#### Delivery and Servicing

The submitted details have been reviewed by the council's waste team who have confirmed that there are no objections. However full details of the collection provision and collection point will be secured via condition.

### **3.6 Landscaping, Trees and biodiversity**

The 'sustainable development' imperative of NPPF includes enhancing the natural environment and improving biodiversity. London Plan 2021 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.

The area of woodland on the site's northern boundary, sloping down to Partingdale Lane provides a strong sense of enclosure. The Landscape Masterplan/Design Statement prepared by The Landscape Partnership sets out the design philosophy in regard to landscaping. This states the main design intent is to extend the quality and character of the northern wooded edge to within the site, with groups of trees to help balance the volume of the new buildings and to create a new woodland setting.

Extending this woodland character throughout the site aims to provide a cohesive landscape framework for both existing and new buildings which would help unify the site, whilst providing a visual link to the wider area. New arrival spaces would help connect the new residential development and create an entrance onto The Ridgeway.

The overall site layout has been designed to make the most efficient use of land whilst ensuring there is ample landscaping and public realm for future residents. The site is currently almost entirely covered by the footprint of the existing buildings. The

proposal seeks to significantly reduce the built footprint at ground level, providing the opportunity to create a permeable layout, introducing a variety of routes, greenery/soft landscaping and a connected pattern of development. Changes in materials would delineate the accessible parking and delivery drop-off areas from the main driveway and lead pedestrians and cyclists to building entrances and courtyards beyond. A series of large trees are proposed to link the pedestrian approach to the arrival space which in turn leads into the wooded residential courtyard spaces at the heart of the site.

The courtyard spaces are designed to create “woodland” groups of trees and shrubs at the heart of the scheme, for amenity and integrated play spaces. Organic, curved planting beds relate to the soft corners of the new buildings and define paths and spaces between buildings. A variety of play areas and ‘playable’ objects are integrated within the courtyard space, to allow all children and residents to explore and use the open spaces.

The Landscape Statement confirms the existing boundary planting will be retained wherever possible and would be enhanced and strengthened by introducing new tree planting along the length of the eastern and southern boundary. The proposed trees would complement the retained trees as part of a long-term succession strategy and help to provide replacement screening and soften views of the development.

The landscape buffer around the site and the removal and planting of trees is a key element of the proposal and has been carefully considered. Additional information has also been sought from officers. An additional daylight/sunlight assessment for Block D and E were undertaken to assess the impact that both the existing and proposed trees along the south boundary would have on their daylight and sunlight availability. The secondary report was prepared by Brooke Vincent Partners. This confirms that the proposed trees would have a minor effect on only two rooms in Block D, living/dining rooms at ground and first floor. All the 42 rooms tested within Block D would achieve ADF values in accordance with the BRE recommendation. There would be no tangible difference in Block E.

Officers also sought clarity on the relationship between properties on Tommy Flower Mews and Albuhera Mews and the tree planting/species proposed, in order to maintain screening without creating conflict with the buildings. Landscape Partnership have confirmed:

*The existing mature trees along the southern and eastern boundary provide screening for properties on Albuhera Mews and Tommy Flowers Mews, the scheme proposes to keep as many of these existing trees as possible. Where trees have to be removed and in existing gaps new trees will be planted. These will be selected with consideration of canopy height and width in relation to proximity to the new buildings and density of canopy to ensure they do not cause overdue shading to new apartments.*

*Existing trees beyond the IBSA site boundary within Tommy Flowers and Albuhera Mews will also continue to provide screening. A line of existing mature oak trees along the southern side of Albuhera Mews provides significant existing screening of views from these properties towards the new development. New trees have recently been planted to the north side of the Mews, these will also provide further screening as they mature. Beyond the eastern boundary there is existing shrub and tree planting along the edge of Tommy Flowers Mews, this would be unaffected by the proposals*

*and would continue to provide screening. New tree planting within the site along the eastern edge will provide further screening to replace any (mostly self-seeded and un-managed) existing trees that will need to be removed to enable the development.*

The Landscape Partnership also prepared an Arboricultural Impact Assessment in support of the development proposals. However clarity was sought on the number of trees to be removed. The applicant has confirmed 55 existing trees are shown to be removed and 73 new trees are proposed to be planted. However exact numbers will not be known until construction begins as factors such as the ground conditions and methods of construction will affect how many trees can be retained. Therefore the numbers of trees shown to be removed is a worst-case scenario, with all trees likely to be affected shown to be removed, at this stage.

These details have been reviewed by the councils Arboriculturalist who has confirmed the principle as set out is acceptable. It has been agreed that the details should be secured through conditions including for example a comprehensive landscape, ecological and woodland management plan.

### Ecology

The development proposal has been reviewed by the councils ecology team who have raised no objections to the proposal. It is accepted that the proposal would provide the opportunity to enhance the sites ecology and biodiversity. All the existing buildings to be demolished have been appropriately surveyed. The Preliminary Ecological Appraisal prepared by The Landscape Partnership confirms buildings were reviewed against BCT survey guidance and it is accepted that they are not suitable for bats.

The site is adjacent to Mill Hill Substation Pastures. This is an area of unimproved clay grassland and old hedgerow which would be difficult to recreate. It is a mosaic of horse-grazed pastures with evidence of unimproved clay grassland with mature hedgerows. Rare species supports locally uncommon plant species, such as sneezewort. There is also wet woodland located within the site boundary.

The Surface Water Drainage Strategy submitted as part of the planning application confirms the current surface water drainage is attenuated and released through a discharge pipe into the drainage ditch alongside Partingdale Lane. There is a water course directly opposite the discharge point on the north side of Partingdale Lane into the Mill Hill Substation Pastures. There will be a 20% reduced area of impermeable surface compared to the current situation, so there will be slightly more permeable surface for water to enter the ground which may contribute positively to maintaining damp conditions in the woodland and offset long-term climate change predictions of hotter drier summers.

In addition the proposed surface water attenuation using blue roofs, attenuation tanks and granular fill attenuation would also be discharged at the existing discharge point into the same ditch, thus maintaining water flow into Mill Hill Substation Pastures.

Accordingly it is considered that the proposal is acceptable in ecological terms and appropriate details can be secured via conditions, as part of a site wide Construction Ecological Management Plan (CEMP).

### **3.7 Energy/Sustainability**

London Plan 2021 Policy SI 2 requires development proposals to make the fullest contribution to minimising greenhouse gas emissions in operation and minimising both annual and peak energy demand, in accordance with the following energy hierarchy:

- Be lean: use less energy
- Be clean: supply energy efficiently
- Be green: use renewable energy
- Be seen: monitor, verify and report

Policy SI 2 5.2 'Minimising Greenhouse Gas Emissions' states major development proposals should include a detailed energy strategy to demonstrate how the zero-carbon target will be met within the framework of the energy hierarchy. A minimum on-site reduction of at least 35% beyond Building Regulations is required for major development. The London Plan 2021 sets out the sustainable design and construction measures required in new 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.

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 Mayor's 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 proposed development is accompanied by an Energy and Sustainability Strategy prepared by MWL (Mendick Waring Ltd). The proposed strategy follows a best practice approach, based on the Mayor of London's Energy Hierarchy. By incorporating a combination of all the feasible passive measures along with the use of Air Source Heat Pumps (with Boilers) and PV Panels, the CO<sub>2</sub> emissions of the newbuild residential blocks at the rear of the site have been reduced by 37.68%, which fulfil the planning requirements (of 35% CO<sub>2</sub> reduction). The residential units are subject to a Carbon Offset (Cash in Lieu) payment of £481,109 in order to comply with zero carbon policy. This is the higher figure based on the newly adopted London Plan 2021 which states that "a nationally recognised non-traded price of £95/tonne has been tested as part of the viability assessment for the London Plan which boroughs may use to collect offset payments".

In regard to the proposed conversion of IBSA House, the energy statement confirms by incorporating a combination of feasible passive measures along with the use of Air Source Heat Pumps (with Boilers), the CO<sub>2</sub> emissions of the converted IBSA House at the front of the site have been reduced by 15.14% and the development complies with all the requirements of Part L1B 2013 of Building Regulations.

The GLA have confirmed in their stage 1 response that the energy strategy is considered acceptable however further information was required in relation overheating, future-proofing for connection to district heating, PV and heat pumps.

The applicant has provided additional details and therefore these matters will be agreed in accordance with the GLA's requirements.

### **3.8 Flood Risk / SUDS**

Policy CS13 of the Barnet Core Strategy states that “we will make Barnet a water efficient borough and minimise the potential for fluvial and surface water flooding by ensuring development does no cause harm to the water environment, water quality and drainage systems. Development should utilise Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SUDS) in order to reduce surface water run-off and ensure such run-off is managed as close to its source as possible subject to local geology and groundwater levels”.

A flood risk assessment (FRA) has been prepared by Syntegra Consulting Ltd in support of the proposal. The site is located within Flood Zone 1 ‘Low Probability’ less than a 1 in 1000 (0.1%) Annual Probability of flooding from rivers. In accordance with the fundamental objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), the FRA demonstrates that: the development is safe through appropriate management of flood risk; does not increase flood risk; and does not detrimentally affect third parties. Furthermore the proposed development would see a reduction in the impermeable area and as a such a betterment reducing flood risk.

In addition a Surface and Foul Water Drainage Strategy prepared by Pitman Associates has also been provided. This confirms the surface water management strategy will adhere to the principles set out in DEFRA's Non-Statutory Technical Standards for Sustainable Drainage Systems. Current surface water drainage is attenuated and released through a discharge pipe into the drainage ditch alongside Partingdale Lane. Proposed surface water attenuation using blue roofs, attenuation tanks and granular fill attenuation would also be discharged at the existing discharge point into the same ditch at greenfield release rates thus maintaining water flow into Mill Hill Substation Pastures.

The Drainage Strategy and details have been reviewed by all parties concerned. The council's drainage team have confirmed that the proposed details are acceptable. Therefore these details would be secured via condition.

## **4 Planning Obligations & CIL**

### Planning Obligations

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.

In accordance with development plan policies the list of obligations as set out in the heads of terms at the beginning of this report; are required to be secured through a legal agreement with the developer.

### Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL)

The proposed development is liable for charge under the Barnet Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) at a rate of £135 per square metre. 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 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 the application

## **5 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;
- 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. The site will provide 10% wheelchair adaptable units.

The development includes level, step-free pedestrian approaches to buildings to ensure that all occupiers and visitors of the development can move freely in and around the public communal spaces. Lift is also provided to provide step-free access between the ground and the upper levels at Site 2. Dedicated parking spaces for people with a disability will be provided in convenient locations.

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.

## 6 Conclusion

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 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 the satisfactory completion of the Legal Agreement, **APPROVAL** is recommended subject to conditions as set out above.

**SITE LOCATION PLAN – Reference: 19/6551/FUL**

