

with the number of outcomes secured and in line with the Barnet Delivering Skills, Employment, Enterprise and Training SPD guidance.

6. Community Access Agreement
7. Student Management Plan
8. Supported (C2 Use) Accommodation Management Plan
9. Carbon Offset Contribution
Payment of £101,175 index-linked as a contribution to ensure that the development achieves net zero carbon dioxide emissions, in accordance with the London Plan 2021 and based on £95 per Tonne per annum over 30 years.
10. Highways Improvement / Works Contributions
 - i) All measures identified within the Active Travel Zone (ATZ) assessment, including accident mitigation.
 - ii) Local Cycle Lanes identified by LBB Highways.
 - iii) Improvements to pedestrian pinch-points along the Burroughs.
11. 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.
12. Residential Travel Plan Monitoring
Financial contribution towards a travel plan monitoring, final sum to be agreed.
13. Residential Travel Plan Incentives Fund
 - i) Travel Plan with robust targets demonstrating commitment to London plan mode share targets.
14. Control Parking Zone (CPZ)
Financial contribution towards Local CPZ monitoring, consultation and implementation, final sum to be agreed.
15. CPZ Restriction and Traffic Management Order
 - i) Financial contribution (per phase if applicable) towards the amendment of Traffic Management Order (TMO) to ensure that all new occupants, both student and residential occupants, are prevented from purchasing parking permits in local CPZs.
 - ii) Middlesex University Student Accommodation contracts shall prevent students parking within the University campus.
16. Greenspaces
 - i) CAVAT payment contribution required to compensate the loss of trees located within the application site, final sum to be agreed.
17. Student Accommodation – Nomination Agreement
Student accommodation should be operated directly by Middlesex University and if not then a Nomination Agreement will need to be secured for the majority of the bedrooms in perpetuity in line with policy LPP H15.
18. Public Realm Improvements

Mitigation measures to secure streetscape improvements within the conservation area as a whole, including inappropriate boundary treatments, street furniture and hardstanding/paving.

19. Monitoring Fee

A contribution of £5,000 towards the monitoring of the S106 agreement.

RECOMMENDATION 2:

That subject to Recommendation 1 and upon completion of the agreement specified, the Service Director of Planning and Building Control or Head of Development Management to approve the planning application reference 21/4722/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) and INFORMATIVES

Please refer to Appendix HR1 at the end of this report for the full list of proposed Conditions and Informatives.

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.

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 (2021)

This document replaces the previous version of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) published in February 2019. The NPPF sets out the Government's planning policies for England and how these should be applied. It provides a framework within which locally-prepared plans for housing and other development can be produced.

The NPPF states at Para 126, "The creation of high quality, beautiful and sustainable buildings and places is fundamental to what the planning and development process should achieve. Good design is a key aspect of sustainable development, creates better places in which to live and work and helps make development acceptable to communities."

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 though not exclusive 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 SD6 Town centres and high streets

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 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 H15 Purpose-built student accommodation

Chapter 5

Policy S1 Developing London's social infrastructure
Policy S2 Health and social care facilities
Policy S4 Play and informal recreation

Chapter 6

Policy E2 Providing suitable business space
Policy E11 Skills and opportunities for all

Chapter 7

Policy HC1 Heritage conservation and growth

Chapter 8

Policy G1 Green infrastructure
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 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

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 T6.2 Office Parking
Policy T6.5 Non-residential disabled persons 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.

Although other policies are of relevance, 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)
CS10 (Enabling inclusive and integrated community facilities and uses)
CS11 (Improving health and well-being in Barnet)
CS12 (Making Barnet a safer place)
CS13 (Ensuring efficient use of natural resources)
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)
DM07 (Protecting housing in Barnet)
DM08 (Ensuring a variety of sizes of new homes to meet housing need)
DM09 (Specialist housing – including student accommodation)
DM10 (Affordable housing contributions)
DM13 (Community and education uses)
DM14 (New and existing employment space)

DM16 (Biodiversity)
DM17 (Travel impact and parking standards)

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)

The Burroughs and Middlesex University Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) has not yet been formally adopted. The Council has been advised by leading and junior counsel that although not adopted, the draft SPD nonetheless may be regarded as a material consideration. The Council has also been advised that the weight to be given to any material consideration is a matter of planning judgement. The draft SPD is yet to be formally adopted. The Chief Executive has also been delegated 'to make any necessary minor changes to the SPD in consultation with the Chairman of the Committee before its final publication'. That process has yet to be undertaken. The draft SPD is also supplementary to proposed policies in the emerging plan (Barnet's Draft Local Plan) some of which are subject to objection and all of which have yet to be subject to independent examination by an inspector at an examination in public. In addition, the draft SPD is currently subject to an application for judicial review. The Council is robustly defending its position and hopes to be successful in those proceedings. However, if the judicial review application were to be successful and if the Council had relied on the draft SPD in the determination in favour of the grant of this application there would be a possible risk that it might be regarded as having contaminated the lawfulness of its decision to grant planning permission. That risk however small can be avoided if the draft SPD is not given any weight. Accordingly, having regard to all of these factors, officers have exercised their planning judgement and have not given the draft SPD any weight in the determination of this application.

As explained above, the SPD has been given no weight in the consideration of this application. As such, the outcome of those judicial review proceedings will not affect any of the conclusions set out in this report.

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 22) 2021

Barnet's Draft Local Plan on 26th November 2021 was submitted to the Planning Inspectorate for independent examination which will be carried out on behalf of the Secretary of State for the Department of Levelling Up, Housing and Communities. This is in accordance with Regulation 22 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2021 (as amended).

The Regulation 22 Local Plan sets out the Council's draft planning policy framework together with draft development proposals for 65 sites. 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 has been taken of the policies and site proposals in the draft Local Plan limited weight has been given to the draft Local Plan in the determination of this application (see further below).

The sites identified in the draft Local Plan Schedule of Proposals and which remain relevant to the Hendon Hub regeneration project and the current set of planning applications are tabled below. This application site is no.40:

Site No.	Site Address	Indicative Units
35	Egerton Gardens Car Park, The Burroughs	23 (69 student)
36	Fenella, The Burroughs	60 (180 student)
38	Ravensfield House, The Burroughs	84 (252 student)
40	Meritage Centre, Hendon	36 (108 student)
41	PDSA and Fuller St Car Park, Hendon	12 (36 student)

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.

Environmental Impact Assessment Regulations (2017)

The Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) (England and Wales) Regulations 2017 (hereafter referred to as 'the EIA Regulations') requires that for certain planning applications, an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) must be undertaken.

The term EIA is used to describe the procedure that must be followed for certain projects before they can be granted planning consent. The procedure is designed to draw together an assessment of the likely environmental effects (alongside economic and social factors) resulting from a proposed development. These are reported in a document called an Environmental Statement (ES).

The process ensures that the importance of the predicted effects, and the scope for reducing them, are properly understood by the public and the local planning authority before it makes its decision. This allows environmental factors to be given due weight when assessing and determining planning applications.

The Regulations apply to two separate lists of development project. Schedule 1 development for which the carrying out of an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) is mandatory and Schedule 2 development which require the carrying out of an EIA if the particular project is considered likely to give rise to significant effects on the environment. The proposed development does not fall within Schedule 1 of the regulations.

The development which is the subject of the application comprises development within column 1 of Schedule 2 of the Regulations. The development is deemed to fall within the description of Infrastructure projects and more specifically urban development projects (paragraph 10(b)).

As a development falling within the description of an urban development project, the relevant threshold and criteria in column 2 of Schedule 2 of the Regulations is that the area of development exceeds 5 hectares or 150 residential units.

Given the nature and scale of the development, it was common ground with the applicant that the application would need to be accompanied by an ES in line with the Regulations.

An EIA Scoping Report was submitted to the London Borough of Barnet (LBB) as the relevant local planning authority (LPA) by GL Hearn on behalf of the London Borough of Barnet (LBB) as the "Applicant". The Report requested an EIA Scoping Opinion (under Section 13 of the Regulations) in respect of information required to be submitted in support of planning application(s) for the redevelopment of a number of sites within the Hendon area.

These would come forward as separate planning applications, however given the proximity and interconnection of these sites, for the purposes of EIA Regulations, they collectively are considered to constitute a single development known as the 'Hendon Hub'. The Local Planning Authority subsequently issued a Scoping Opinion in May 2021 confirming that the proposed scope of the ES was acceptable.

The current application is thus accompanied by an ES, the scope of which has been agreed by the LPA, fully in accordance with the Regulations. It is a comprehensive Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA). Volumes I, II and III of the Environmental Statement (ES) detail the existing baseline environmental effects from the proposed development, during its demolition, construction and operation. The ES concludes that in relation to each environmental topic scoped in, there are no anticipated residual significant adverse effects, following adoption of the mitigation measures outlined in the ES.

2. PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

2.1 Background & Site Context

The Hendon Hub Project consists of 7 separate sites which will see proposals for development, refurbishment and landscaping focused primarily in and around The Burroughs area in Hendon. The sites are principally focused around the civic centre of Hendon, running along the west and east sides of The Burroughs from Watford Way in the south to Church Road in the north.

The Burroughs (A504) is a major road that connects the A41 (Watford Way) through to Finchley in the north east. At the southern end of The Burroughs is the Burroughs Conservation Area. This broadly extends from Watford Way in the south to St Josephs Grove in the north in linear form.

To the north of St Josephs Grove is the civic core to Hendon, characterised by larger civic buildings which include Hendon Town Hall, Hendon Library on the western side of The Burroughs and Middlesex University Buildings to the east. There are also several listed buildings in this area, the Town Hall, Public Library, and Fire Station.

To the north of The Burroughs is Church Road. This area is the southern extent of the Hendon Church End Conservation Area. Hendon Church End is a linear development, with St Mary's Parish Church at its heart, and links Church Road to the south with Watford Way to the west.

The Hendon Hub Project led by Barnet Council as applicant, is a significant Regeneration Project that would integrate new academic, community, retail and civic spaces along The Burroughs and other nearby sites to enhance and lift this important area of Hendon.

The 7 planning applications which have been submitted and form the Hendon Hub project are:

21/4709/FUL – Ravensfield & Fenella

Three new buildings providing a mix of student accommodation, affordable housing, new teaching and student facilities, with community and retail uses at street level. There will also be two important new civic buildings; the relocated Hendon Library and the new Arts and Creative Industries (ACI) facility.

21/4722/FUL – Meritage Centre *(this application report)*

Redevelopment which will deliver new student accommodation, a healthcare-based community use and new shared accommodation for young adults.

21/4723/FUL & [21/4724/LBC] – Building 9/Hendon Library

New grade A teaching Facility for Middlesex University.

21/4612/FUL – Fuller Street

New building to house the re-located PDSA (Pet Hospital).

21/4613/FUL – Former Quinta Club

Change of use and refurbishment of the existing building for the relocation of Schools Libraries Resource Service (SLRS)

*21/5054/FUL – Linear Woodland**

Landscaping proposals including the installation of wayfinding signage, new lighting, improvements to the existing public footpath and creation of a new public footpath.

* - This application has been formally withdrawn as requested by the applicant.

21/5061/FUL – Land @ Prince of Wales Estate

Provision of car parking spaces as well as the creation of informal play areas and landscaping works within the estate.

Hendon Hub Masterplan:



2.2 Site Description

The land to which this proposal relates lies entirely within the London Borough of Barnet. This site comprises Meritage Centre, nos. 32-46 Church End, nos. 28-30 Church End, nos. 2-6 Church Terrace, nos. 13 – 21 Prince of Wales Close (also known as 13-21 Church End). The site is approximately 0.75ha in size.

The Meritage Centre sits in the north west part of the site and comprises a part single/part two storey block to the east connected to a two-storey block to the west with a single storey connecting corridor structure. It provides a number of community uses and had retail use at ground floor. The eastern two storey block has further community uses and residential units on the upper floors. Nos.28-30 Church End is a two storey block accommodating community groups including Mencap which also provides residential facilities for patients.

This part of the site is located within the Church End Conservation Area on the eastern edge. There are no Statutorily Listed Buildings within the site; however, there are surrounding the site. These include the Parish Church of St Mary (Grade II*) adjacent to the Meritage Centre and associated Tombs (Grade II); Church Farmhouse Museum (Grade II*) to the north east; and the Daniel Almshouses (Grade II) to the south of the site. The Chequers Pub, The Greyhound Pub and Church House are all Locally Listed.

Nos.2-4 Church Terrace is single storey and houses the PDSA which is a veterinary centre which adjoins No.6 which is a vacant single storey building previously used as a joinery. This block sits to the east just outside the conservation area. Adjacent is a public footpath that links Church Terrace with Sunningfields Road and separates the building with the neighbouring school building. 6 Church Terrace backs on to a set of garages whilst the neighbouring PDSA building benefits from its own rear car park.

To the south of this site is Nos. 13-21 Prince of Wales Close which is a three storey residential block at the corner of Church End/Church Road.

Sunny Hill Park is to the north and within walking distance of the site (c140m) as is Middlesex University campus and Brent Street town centre. In terms of open space, there is an area of open grassland to the south west of the site on the opposite side of Church End which is used by Middlesex University. The site is located within 0.1 miles from the Secondary Retail Frontage on Church Road (within the boundary of the Brent Street District Shopping Centre) and 0.4 miles from the Primary Retail Frontage on Brent Street.

The site is located within Flood Zone 1 and has a PTAL rating of 2 (poor) to the northern part and 3 (moderate) to the southern part of the site. The site is also within an Area of Special Archaeological Significance. The north boundary of the site adjoins a 'Site of Local Importance for Nature Conservation'.

The Meritage Centre (including nos 32 to 46 Church End):

Provides space to Citizens Advice Bureau (CAB) and the Chinese Mental Health Association (now called 'Meridian') as well as a vacant retail unit previously occupied by a newsagents (no.46 Church End). The western two storey block has the CAB on the ground floor and residential units (nos. 32 to 38 Church End) are located on the upper floors which the Council currently lease (private/open market tenure).

28 – 30 Church End:

Occupied by Mencap (Sherrick House - care home) and the African Cultural Association. No. 28 Church End is the end of a former terrace of three houses, dating from about the 1850s. The northernmost two of the terrace were demolished and replaced with No 30, built in the 1930s.

PDSA (Nos. 2-4 Church Terrace) and No.6 Church Terrace:

The People's Dispensary for Sick Animals (PDSA) unit is located at no.2-4 Church Terrace. The unit operates as a veterinary centre. The PDSA is a single story building and abuts no. 6 church terrace which is a former joinery workshop.

13 – 21 Prince of Wales Close:

No. 13 – 21 Prince of Wales Close (also known as 13-21 Church End) is a three storey residential block of flats consisting of 9 residential units. Two of the nine dwellings are leased on private/open market tenancies. The remaining seven dwellings are let on social rented tenancies from Barnet Homes.

2.3 Proposed Development

This application seeks planning permission for the demolition of:

- Meritage Centre
- nos.32-46 Church End
- nos.28-30 Church End
- nos.2-6 Church Terrace
- nos.13-21 Prince of Wales Close (also known as 13- 21 Church End)

And the erection of 4 blocks ranging from two, three and four storeys comprising:

- 181 x purpose built student accommodation units
- 33 x purpose-built shared living accommodation units
- Care Unit (125 sqm – Use Class C2)
- Health and Wellbeing Centre (470 sqm - Use Class E)
- 6 x car parking spaces and 7 x blue badge parking spaces plus landscaping.

Buildings 1 and 2 are located to the north closest to the Church of St Mary and within the Church End Conservation Area. These two buildings are modest in scale and height, set at 2 storeys to Church End and 3 storey to Church Terrace. The roof line has been articulated with pitched roofs. Building 1 would comprise of 37 student units and Building 2, 42 units.

Building 1 has been set back from considerably from Church End and from the boundary edge to the Church and its grounds. To the front (west) of the building would be a new landscaped public courtyard with important existing trees maintained. Within this new courtyard would be a single storey projection which would accommodate the Health and Well-being Centre across the ground floor.

Buildings 3 and 4 are located outside of the conservation area. Building 3 would be 4 storeys in height which is in line with the extant planning permission (at no. 6 Church Terrace). The building footprint would be set around a courtyard entrance with new enclosed parking spaces to the rear and would have a mansard roof. This building would have a total of 102 student units.

Building 4 would also be at 4 storeys high and comprise of 33 independent young adult accommodation units. The building would have a mansard roof at the upper level. The building remains perpendicular to Church Road with the additional footprint and mass added to the north as the new building extends slightly along Prince of

Wales Close. The verdant character and landscaping to the south of the site fronting Church Road is retained and enhanced further around the site.

The proposal would also involve additional improvements to the public realm providing enhanced links to Sunny Hill Park along with better natural surveillance.

Land Use

The detailed planning submission and documents (e.g. planning statement, floorspace schedule, appendix 2) confirm all existing residential and community uses within the existing Meritage Centre site, will be re-provided within the redevelopment of Ravensfield & Fenella site (21/4709/FUL) together with this application. Under the former application it is confirmed that there would be an overall net increase of community use floorspace and affordable housing provided by the Hendon Hub Regeneration project.

The current floorspaces and uses at this application site are set out in the table below:

MC Existing Uses: Address	Use	Tenure	Size of C3 Unit	Sqm (GIA)	MC Headline Land Use Totals				
					Class C3 (SQM GIA) (Private)	Class C3 (SQM GIA) (Social Rented)	Class C2 (SQM GIA)	Class E (SQM GIA)	Class F.2 (SQM GIA)
38 Church End (flat above Citizens Advice)	C3	Private	One bedroom	49.26	49.26	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
36 Church End (flat above Citizens Advice)	C3	Private	One bedroom	49.26	49.26	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
34 Church End (flat above Citizens Advice)	C3	Private	One bedroom	49.26	49.26	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
32 Church End (flat above Citizens Advice)	C3	Private	One bedroom	49.26	49.26	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
46 Church End (Newsagent)	E	N/A	N/A	52.25	N/A	N/A	N/A	52.25	N/A
40-44 Church End (Citizens Advice)	E	N/A	N/A	434.53	N/A	N/A	N/A	434.53	N/A
Meridian	F.2	N/A	N/A	548.2	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	548.2
30 Church End - MENCAP Care Home	C2	N/A	N/A	187.08	N/A	N/A	187.08	N/A	N/A
28 Church End (African Cultural Association)	E	N/A	N/A	81.21	N/A	N/A	N/A	81.21	N/A
PDSA, 2-4 Church Terrace	E	N/A	N/A	226.98	N/A	N/A	N/A	226.98	N/A
6 Church Terrace (Former Walker Boon)	E	N/A	N/A	150.16	N/A	N/A	N/A	150.16	N/A
13 - 21 Church End (also known as nos. 13 - 21 Prince of Wales Close) Flat 13	C3	Social Rent	One bedroom	49.28	N/A	49.28	N/A	N/A	N/A
13 - 21 Church End (also known as nos. 13 - 21 Prince of Wales Close) Flat 14	C3	Private	One bedroom	49.28	49.28	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
13 - 21 Church End (also known as nos. 13 - 21 Prince of Wales Close) Flat 15	C3	Social Rent	One bedroom	49.28	N/A	49.28	N/A	N/A	N/A
13 - 21 Church End (also known as nos. 13 - 21 Prince of Wales Close) Flat 16	C3	Social Rent	One bedroom	49.28	N/A	49.28	N/A	N/A	N/A
13 - 21 Church End (also known as nos. 13 - 21 Prince of Wales Close) Flat 17	C3	Social Rent	One bedroom	49.28	N/A	49.28	N/A	N/A	N/A
13 - 21 Church End (also known as nos. 13 - 21 Prince of Wales Close) Flat 18	C3	Social Rent	One bedroom	49.28	N/A	49.28	N/A	N/A	N/A
13 - 21 Church End (also known as nos. 13 - 21 Prince of Wales Close) Flat 19	C3	Social Rent	One bedroom	49.28	N/A	49.28	N/A	N/A	N/A
13 - 21 Church End (also known as nos. 13 - 21 Prince of Wales Close) Flat 20	C3	Social Rent	One bedroom	49.28	N/A	49.28	N/A	N/A	N/A
13 - 21 Church End (also known as nos. 13 - 21 Prince of Wales Close) Flat 21	C3	Private	One bedroom	49.28	49.28	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
					295.6	344.96	187.08	945.13	548.2

A summary table of the combined new floorspace and uses at the Ravensfield & Fenella site has been provided below:

Table 3(a): Proposed [and MC re-located] Floorspace and Uses on RFC Site			
Description	SQM GIA	Use Class	Student Bedrooms
Citizens Advice Bureau	340	E	
Hendon Library Facility	675	F.1	
Additional Community Use (linked to Library)	155	F.2	
Arts and Cultural Industries / ACI (Middlesex University)	4450	F.1	
Purpose Built Student Accommodation	8547	Sui generis	384
Retail Space	415	E	
MSU Suite	100	F.1	
Community Hall Space	150	F.2	
Safer Neighbourhood Team	70	F.2	
Meridian	250	F.2	
African Cultural Association (ACA)	65	E	
Unallocated Basement Space	70	F.2	
Dwellingflats	2329	C3	

Citizens Advice Bureau currently has GIA of 273.55 sqm, this would increase to 340 sqm, a gain of 66.45 sqm within a new modern facility. The Meridian (Chinese Mental Health) currently has GIA of 548.2 sqm. They would be provided with 250 sqm, plus the use of the community hall and space within the new library, which gives a total of 552 sqm, a marginal gain within but still within new modern facilities. The African Cultural Association currently has GIA of 81 sqm and would be provided with 65 sqm of space however they would also have the ability to use the adjoining community hall (150 sqm).

The Care Home (Use Class C2) located at Sherrick House, no. 30 Church End will be re-provided on this application site within the new Building 4 at ground floor and with a net gain in the internal floorspace (195 sqm GIA).

The existing People's Dispensary for Sick Animals (PDSA) has a GIA of 227 sqm and would be re-provided on the Fuller Street Car Park site (80m to the east) in a new purpose built facility which will provide 520 sqm of internal floorspace. This is being considered under application 21/4612/FUL.

The applicant has confirmed that Mencap have already been relocated to 154 Station Road, Hendon, alongside Age UK Barnet.

2.4 **Relevant Planning History**

There is no strategic planning history relevant to the application site other than the formal scoping opinion:

Reference: 21/2885/ESC

Address: Hendon Hub In And Around The Burroughs, Church Road And Church End Hendon London NW4

Decision: Statement Scope Acceptable

Decision Date: 16 July 2021

Description: Environmental impact assessment scoping opinion

There are other minor planning applications relating to the various buildings contained within the red line boundary however these are generally not considered to be directly relevant to this application. However notwithstanding, it is relevant to note the extant planning permissions granted at 6 Church Terrace for new student accommodation. These are listed below:

Reference: 20/2105/FUL

Address: 6 Church Terrace London NW4 4JU

Decision: Approved following legal agreement

Decision Date: 09 September 2020

Description: Demolition of existing building and erection of a four-storey building including semi-basement level and a roof to provide student accommodation (19 student rooms with shared facilities), office space at semi-basement level. Provisions of cycle, refuse and recycle storage

Reference: 19/5483/FUL

Address: 6 Church Terrace London NW4 4JU

Decision: Approved following legal agreement

Decision Date: 03 February 2020

Description: Demolition of existing building and erection of a three-storey building including semi-basement level and a roof to provide student accommodation (17 student rooms with shared facilities), office space at semi-basement level. Provisions of cycle, refuse and recycle storage

Reference: 17/2645/FUL

Address: 6 Church Terrace London NW4 4JU

Decision: Approved following legal agreement

Decision Date: 20 November 2017

Description: Demolition of existing building and erection of a three-storey building including semi-basement level and a roof garden to provide student accommodation (12 student rooms with shared facilities), office space and Caretaker's flat at semi-basement level. Provisions of cycle, refuse and recycle storage

There has also been a planning application submitted by the St Mary's 8th Hendon Scout Troop for new facilities providing 324sqm at the rear of Church House:

Reference: 20/4902/FUL

Address: Church House, 49 Church End, NW4 4JT

Decision: Pending

Decision Date: 14 December 2021

Description: Demolition, refurbishment and improvement works to the existing Scout Hut building; demolition of the existing single storey outhouse buildings and erection of a new building to provide new facilities including a community hall, canteen, kitchen, pantry, garage storage, changing facilities, new entrance points, and improved hard and soft landscaping

2.5 Pre-application Consultation by the Applicant

A Public Consultation Report has been submitted with the planning application, prepared by GL Hearn, which outlines the public consultations which the applicant's agent has carried out prior to the submission of the application.

The report details for example:

- 14-week non-statutory public consultation period ran from 27 February 2021 to 7 June 2021, with the aim to obtain feedback from local residents and stakeholders.
- A project website was set-up (www.hendonhub.co.uk) to allow people to find out more about the consultation and feedback via the online survey.
- A total of eight online presentations were held via Zoom and an additional four in-person events were held at the Scholars Courtyard at Middlesex University during the week commencing 17 May 2021.
- Leaflets were delivered to over 13,000 addresses (including residential and business addresses) in the Hendon and West Hendon wards.
- At the same time the leaflets were distributed, press releases were issued to local news media.
- The applicant (LBB) promoted the project and consultation events through its own social media channels, including its corporate Facebook and Twitter accounts.
- The University has also been undertaking its own local engagement in parallel to the work being carried out by the applicant's project team.
- The Barnet Libraries team also undertook its own consultation exercise in parallel to the main consultation.

2.6 Public Consultations

As part of the consultation exercise, 916 letters were sent to neighbouring properties and residents. In addition the application was advertised in the local press and site notices were posted. At the time of preparing this report a total of 193 letters of objection were received.

In addition three letters in support have been received from Middlesex University.

The African Cultural Association have also written to confirm they are in support of the redevelopment and move.

2.6.1 Public Objections:

The letters of objection received are summarised as follows:

- Considerable opposition to these developments by residents, so should be refused.
- Sites are not brownfield or unused sites.
- Hendon Masterplan with its 8 applications is a development proposal that is not supported by a formally adopted SPD nor the new Local Plan (currently at Reg 19 Stage).
- Application must be judged against the adopted 2012 Local Plan and existing policies.
- The area is being overtaken by the University, overcrowding and overdevelopment.

- Insufficient demand for this student accommodation.
- The proposed development contrasts with London Plan Policy H15 regarding purpose-built student accommodation.
- By virtue of size and mass, is inappropriate for Church End, an important conservation area with much archaeological interest.
- Proposed heights of buildings are not supported by Historic England.
- Opportunity to decarbonise construction by repurposing Nos 28 & 30, rather than demolishing and rebuilding, which increases environmental costs contrary to CDH02 and ECC01.
- True benefit for the community would be a dedicated community hub at the Meritage site.
- 28 Church Road has historical significance and its demolition will cause significant harm.
- This will result in overcrowding, increased noise, littering, antisocial behaviour, crowded pavements, more traffic and congestion.
- There would be severe detrimental effects on the residents with a very obvious change of character and outlook in the area.
- No alternative provision has been made for the Scouts. All the existing community groups are being displaced.
- Meritage Centre and related properties do need redevelopment however proposed buildings are not appropriate, should just be community centre.

2.6.2 Neighbouring/Residents Associations & Local Amenity Groups:

The Burroughs Residents Association:

The Burroughs and Middlesex University Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) which sets out the development principles that guide and shape the Hendon Hub regeneration has not yet been formally adopted. Therefore, no weight should be placed on the SPD.

Building Communities

GG1A of the London Plan was not properly considered or complied with when creating the Hendon Hub scheme. It took at least 2-3 years for the community to be meaningfully engaged in the plans and at that stage the process moved very quickly and was not sufficiently meaningful. Just 36 hours after The Burroughs and Middlesex University SPD Consultation ended, Hendon residents received paperwork for the Hendon Hub Consultation. Therefore, no SPD feedback from the public was considered when Barnet Council created the draft Hendon Hub scheme. Additionally, the Leader of the Council made it clear in correspondence to residents from January 2021 that he was already fully behind the proposals.

Despite 88% of residents who responded to the Hendon Hub consultation opposing it (Barnet Council's figures) the plans were still approved.

Building new student accommodation blocks in established conservation/residential areas between two primary schools, displacing long-standing residents, community groups and organisations, reconstructing the civic town centre of Hendon into a university campus (two current residential/conservation sites are even described as the two new "gateways to student campus" in Planning Application Supplementary Documents) when instead Middlesex University could have built the accommodation on its own footprint where there is room for it contradicts Policies GG1C, GG1E, GG1F and GG1G of the London Plan.

Large New Accommodation blocks will have catastrophic impact on residential area, conservation area, community and heritage

- The Meritage Centre is a community centre situated in the heart of a residential area and one of only two conservation areas in Hendon. Why are buildings which house residents, organisations, community groups and charities being demolished and the occupants torn out of there and moved into a student campus?
- The plans for big blocks of accommodation do not do justice to the conservation area nor to the listed buildings in the surrounds. The proximity of the proposed new buildings to listed buildings and 'buildings of interest' must be a material consideration in its design, scope and space. It isn't in this current plan. It actively detracts from it.
- Proposed heights of buildings are not supported by Historic England.
- By demolishing No.28 Church Road, there will be no example of this local architecture left in the area.
- The Church End conservation area also abuts areas of archaeological interest & should remain part of the exciting history of Hendon & not be land grabbed to become part of MDX campus.
- Development should focus on and enhance the overall character of this historic area. These large, ugly buildings do not enhance the character and will dominate the locale.
- Multilevel accommodation blocks will overlook SMSJ Middle School.
- Demolishing residential properties Nos. 13 - 21 on corner of Church Road and Church End Road and replacing them with a 3-storey housing block (Block 4) means the new building will be taller than existing properties and will tower over the Claddagh Ring Pub. 9/12
- This area is in need of renovation. Development should focus on the existing community and be modelled on the character of the historic area which is suburban residential.
- The 12th/13th century St Mary's Parish Church is on the Historic England at-risk register with its condition described as poor and issues with drainage at and below ground level. There are risks to the church if extensive development of huge and tall blocks is undertaken at the Meritage site. Documents have acknowledged that the Urban Greening Factor for the site can only be rated as good if green walls and roofs are installed. There are already existing kerbs and hard standing that cannot be removed or replaced and this will increase costs for sustainable drainage systems, require longer construction times as well as increase the risks to nearby Grade 2 listed buildings.
- Block 2 student accommodation on 2, 4 and 6 Church Terrace has 102 student units and 11 garages. The proposal requires the PDSA to move yards to Fuller Street car park. There is a development approved in September 2020 at 6 Church Terrace for a 4 storey, 19 unit student block. This was the third approval to progressively increase the number of units from 12 to 19 units. H/4690/08 in 2009

refused 4 flats on a 3-storey building on that site because ‘the size, height, bulk and design would be unduly obtrusive and detrimental to the character and appearance of the street scene and general locality’. It is disingenuous to now ignore such reasoning when the area has not changed much in the last 11 years. The approval by Barnet Planning for 6 Church Terrace seems an orchestrated move between Barnet Council and the developer to set a precedent for the 4-storey 102 unit student block. This would suggest a pre-decision to approve the application and is unfair to the community who have no real input in the matter. There should only be a small block of 19 units placed on this site, albeit it was one that slipped in under the cover of the pandemic.

Campus creep will change residential nature of area

- From the London Plan (March 2016) .2.6: in reference to Outer London Vision and Strategy, one of the key opportunities for outer London is maintaining and enhancing the quality of life that is already there. Delivery of “lifetime neighbourhoods” is an important part of preserving this quality of life. These plans seek to actively diminish and dismantle a “lifetime neighbourhood”.
- The student campus, which has been creeping increasingly closer to residential streets, should not be expanding into the Meritage Centre suburban area. Building three accommodation blocks for 181 students and one block for 33 independent youths who have left the care system between two primary schools and by two nurseries, quiet residential streets and a community church is inappropriate when these blocks could be built within the university’s own campus footprint a couple of minutes walk away. The density of the student accommodation will encroach on this part of Hendon.
- This large, invasive spread into a residential area of Hendon sees the university treating Hendon not as a community of which the university is part of but as if it was an asset the university is entitled to and a resource to be colonised to the university’s financial advantage.
- Residents will not feel free to enjoy their public spaces if it appears to be mostly adult students spending leisure time in big groups gathering around the public realm areas/high street centres, especially where drinking & noisy activities take place or they keep unsocial hours.

Senior citizens community space to be removed

- What alternative provision has been made for the Scouts, Age Concern, social groups for senior citizens and other groups who use the Meritage Centre space? The Meritage area is a much-loved and needed hub for senior citizens.

Traffic and parking issues

- There is no guarantee that GPs will be found to occupy the ground floor of one of the student blocks. If that’s the case, what will happen to this space? Student residential units are still evident in the floorplans.
- Increased traffic congestion on Sunningfields Road during school drop off / pick up. This is a very narrow street with cars parked on both sides and only one car can pass at a time. Parents currently use Fuller Street car park. I cannot see them going to POW Close.
- Student/university staff parking is already an issue for residents who live on the streets including and around Greyhound Hill, Sunningfields Road, Sunny Gardens Road, Parson Street, up to the A41/A1. Barnet Council and Middlesex University’s claim that students will be car-free is unrealistic. Bringing in over 200 new residents to this small area and their visitors will exacerbate this issue.

With all the above in mind, I urge Barnet Council to reconsider their current Hendon Hub proposals and instead create a plan that is equally beneficial to both Hendon residents and Middlesex University.

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.

Vivian Avenue Residents Group:

As a group of residents living in Vivian Avenue & surrounding roads, we are aghast that Hendon Hub plans were not notified to our households. Many of us use the civic centre, Library, churches & Church End area as well as Brent St.

The consultation area is very limited for such huge proposals that will change the way Hendon will look, feel & function for the future.

We strongly object to the proposals for Blk 1 & 2 student units, too close to notable listed church & its grounds. This is not an appropriate use of the site which should remain a community base for various groups. Rehousing these groups at the RFC site is not the solution as the setting will be very different & unsettling for these vulnerable groups.

The buildings proposed for all 4 blocks are still too tall & have too many units of accommodation in an area of low 2 storey homes, schools, nurseries & local amenities. Blk 3 is excessive & dominates its surrounds.

This insidious campus expansion cannot work because it will generate parking pressures, noise/litter/pollution complaints, increased costs/time in following up issues, disruption to the community THAT NO LANDSCAPING OR BEAUTIFUCATION of small surrounding patches of tufts will solve.

The Health Centre on the ground floor of Blk 1: is that for student population or for the community? There is no guarantee that a GP can be found to take up the premises. MDX can always apply to change it to student accommodation in the future & Barnet Council will approve it. Same applies to Block 4.

The plans also show that there is excessive hardstanding on Blk 1 & 2 sites, original & proposed, & that green walls & roofs must be installed to attain a good Urban Greening Factor. Surely that signifies the proposal is overdevelopment/overuse of site? The documents also show that windows facing Church End cannot be opened because of proximity to roads, resulting in poor indoor air quality. Moderate builds must be contemplated using less plant machinery.

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.

The Barnet Society:

The Barnet Society objects to this application. It submitted comments on the proposed redevelopment of the Meritage Centre site as part of the consultation, but none of the points we raised have been addressed.

The four blocks of student accommodation which are proposed to replace the Meritage Centre are wholly inappropriate to this historically significant and sensitive setting, given their scale and bulk. Building three- and four-storey buildings in this location would have a detrimental effect on the conservation area and cluster of listed buildings. Moreover, they are totally out of keeping with the village character of the conservation area and the adjacent listed buildings, most notably St Mary's Church, Church Farmhouse and the Model Farm.

Decanting of the existing tenants to make room for student accommodation means that the Meritage Centre site will become part of the university campus and therefore a private, not public, space. This site should continue to be used for public housing and amenities, including a properly resourced health centre and community facilities. 181 student accommodation units represent a gross over-development of the site and should be accommodated on the university campus.

There are scarcely any public benefits to this scheme and the scope and therefore the harm to the conservation area outweighs the value of the one benefit which has been proposed, namely the health and wellbeing centre.

Officer Comment

Vivian Avenue is located some distance away from the application site beyond the consultation radius of the planning application. Nevertheless 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.

2.6.3 In Support

Middlesex University

Chief Executive:

I write in my capacity as the Chief Executive Officer of Middlesex University Students' Union, Middlesex University to state that the Students Union is certainly in favour of the new academic buildings and student accommodation proposed in the above planning applications. As They will enable our students to be taught in modern facilities with much improved teaching spaces and more flexibility while they study at Middlesex.

I'm conscious of the importance of adequate teaching spaces and the impact it has on our students' experience. We see this reflected in our annual surveys and want to do all we can to improve student experience at Middlesex. Some of the buildings in these planning applications will soon become unfit for teaching purposes (such as the old single storey clinic behind the Hendon Library building and the Ravensfield building), and these plans would give us the opportunity to house teaching and learning in purpose built, improved facilities.

Consolidating more of our student accommodation in Hendon would be very welcomed by our student population. Currently, many of our students travel across London from Wembley or elsewhere and this adds financial burden, and can be

challenging especially for those with part time jobs or caring responsibilities. I think it would be hugely beneficial for more of our accommodation to be within walking distance of the campus.

I have seen some local residents' concerns about student behaviour and the Students' Union, in collaboration with the University is committed to ensuring that students' impact on the local area is as positive as possible.

Vice Chancellor:

As Vice-Chancellor of Middlesex University, I support the Hendon Hub proposals contained within the planning applications above. They will enable the University to improve the facilities for students and staff, in line with our commitment to infrastructure that enables flexibility, which is a key part of the University's 2031 Strategy.

Middlesex University is passionate about high-quality education for all of our students. Our teaching changes lives locally, nationally and globally, enabling our students to shape their own lives and the world around them. Our practice-centred approach means that our students can flourish in society and the world of work because they have developed the skills and mind-set of entrepreneurialism, social justice and sustainable change. Teaching our students in some of our current spaces will become more difficult as some of these older buildings become no longer fit for purpose. The proposals in the planning applications will enable the replacement of four old educational premises with two modern buildings. These proposals are aimed at providing improvements in the quality of our facilities and improving our students' experience.

The proposals will also allow us to consolidate more of our student accommodation into Hendon, rather than being housed in Wembley or elsewhere in London. We believe this will improve students' experience. We have noted residents' concerns about student behaviour and we are committed to ensuring that students' impact on the local area is as positive as possible. The University is working in partnership with the local police and with Barnet Council to mitigate anti-social behaviour, recognising that this is caused by only minority of our students and also by people who are not students. Overall, we are very proud of our students, who contribute a great deal to their local community through work placements in local businesses, hospitals and care settings and volunteering in the local area. Equally, we are aware of the very considerable economic and social contributions that students make to the Barnet area.

Director of Estates:

I am writing in support of this planning application in my role as the Director of Estates for Middlesex University. I think there are benefits for Middlesex University and to the local community.

This scheme would see one hundred and eighty one bed spaces for students within three blocks and I believe any detrimental effect on the local neighbourhood will be minimal. The scheme would also see thirty three shared units also for other uses which are sorely needed. In addition a Health and Wellbeing Centre would be a great addition to the services for local people.

The area of and around the Meritage Centre is a very poor fragmented urban space with some very poor buildings but the proposals for residential accommodation will see a huge improvement which will take into account the delicate balance between new low rise residential accommodation with the nearby listed St Mary's Church. I believe the proposals will be sympathetic and complementary to surrounding buildings but in a modern setting.

Students living close to the campus would mean less pressure on buses and trains as there would no longer be a need for those students to travel to the campus from their accommodation much further away at Wembley and Cricklewood and elsewhere. An added benefit of course is that those students will end up spending their money in local shops.

The proposals for the Meritage area will without doubt enhance this part of Hendon. The buildings have been carefully designed to avoid any loss of privacy for nearby neighbours and there will also be improvements to paving and roadways as a result. This is all to be welcomed and I hope that this application will be passed without reservation.

African Cultural Association – Chairperson & Coordinator

African Cultural Association is positive about plans in Hendon:

The African Cultural Association, founded in 1995, was formed as a result of a group discussion with people from African, Caribbean and other ethnicities, who had been experiencing issues in their communities around race, social economic issues, education, finance and other important everyday concerns.

The Association is now recognised as a charity and members include qualified professionals from various disciplines such as lawyers and teachers and have over 200 local people, with the majority being residents or having local links to Barnet.

Local people are able to learn important skills and access training, creative classes and support with improving English and Maths and all at no cost. The association are currently based at Church End, in Hendon. Hendon Hub development proposals will see them move from an old building, no longer fit for purpose, to a new home for their members, should plans be approved.

The Co-ordinator as well as the Chairperson – and majority of some of our members at the African Cultural Association, who commented on the move and plans for Hendon Hub said:

“We like the idea of the community and Middlesex University moving forward together. Our members are excited about the development and the benefits it will bring local communities like us, who work in the area. The benefits of students having their accommodation close to the University should help future generations. We are looking forward to working from a cleaner and safer work environment where we can help young people and the wider community.”

2.7 Responses from External Consultees

Historic England – Heritage Assets

Summary position – “significant degree of less than substantial harm”.

Historic England was consulted on these proposals at pre-app stage by the professional team involved. As the scheme remains essentially the same, our advice remains the same, and I attach our advice letter accordingly.

[The following is taken from the pre-application advice letter which was sent as part of this consultation although dated 19 July 2021]:

Historic England has been asked for pre-application advice on two sites that form part of the broader Hendon Hub masterplan area.

As the two sites are separate and present different issues, they have been treated separately within this letter.

Meritage Centre site

Summary

The Meritage Centre site is a significant part of the Church End conservation area, which consists of the surviving elements of a small hamlet clustered around a Grade II*-listed church. The demolition of the Meritage Centre is uncontroversial, but a historic building that is a positive contributor to the conservation area would also be demolished, and the proposed replacement student accommodation buildings would be excessively sized and relatively coarse in terms of their urban grain, causing harm. The significant harm resulting to the conservation area should be given great weight in the balancing of harm against public benefit in appraising the scheme. While it will be for the decision-maker to undertake this balancing exercise, it is disappointing that in this scheme, the potential of the only significant development site within the conservation area to enhance the character and appearance of the conservation area has not been fully realised.

Advice

Significance

The Meritage Centre site lies at the heart of the Church End conservation area, which covers the historic hamlet of Church End centred around the Hendon parish church of St Mary. Despite the ancient presence of the parish church, centre of a large parish, this was only ever a hamlet, with the church, an inn, two farms and a few houses clustered around it, and various roads and paths centred on this intersection stretching out into the surrounding fields. Much of the historic hamlet survives in some form, but this only consists of 10-12 historic buildings, depending on the definition used, and the conservation area is largely surrounded by suburban development of the last 150 years.

The various historic buildings of the conservation area, including the parish church (Grade II*), Church Farm House (Grade II*), the model farm milking parlour (Grade II), and the Daniel almshouses (Grade II), also derive part of their significance from their setting, including the inter-relationship between each other and their positions as part of the historic hamlet, which is still discernible despite harmful mid-late twentieth century development.

The historic pattern of roads and paths in the conservation area is largely intact, and a number of historic footpaths have been preserved in the wider landscape, despite the areas they run through having long been built-up. This is important to the significance of the conservation area in terms of retaining a sense in which it is the heart of the area, which routes radiate towards. Church Terrace is a particularly good

example of this, as it runs north from the conservation area through open land (Sunny Hill Park) as far as the A1. Of the views of the church and the conservation area, that looking north up Church End towards the church is perhaps the most relevant in the context of this proposal. However, the mapping evidence demonstrates that while the Daniel almshouses were designed to have a formal axial presence at the southern end of Church End, the view north round the curve of the street to the church was an informal, unplanned one, with the church historically being glimpsed over lower buildings that shepherd one round the curve, and then the body of the church emerging as a surprise in a gap between smaller domestic buildings.

The post-war development around the conservation area detracts from its significance to some degree, by eroding the effect of a rural hamlet while introducing nothing of particular interest. Particularly harmful are the relatively recent buildings of Middlesex University immediately to the south-west of the conservation area; their alien scale, planning, coarse grain, height and cladding materials mean that they cause a significant degree of harm to the conservation area by damaging its setting.

The existing Meritage Centre buildings are of no interest in themselves, and do not make any contribution to the significance of the conservation area. They are not insensitive, by the standards of the time at which they were built; their height is appropriate. This is why Historic England has previously advised that new development on this site should be of similar height. The use of brick is also contextual, and the massing of the building fronting Church End has clearly been contrived with the setting of the church in mind. However, the buildings have a poor relationship with the streets of Church End and Church Terrace, instead feeling as if they are objects dropped into landscaping in a typically modernist way.

28 Church End, dating perhaps from the 1850s, is the survivor of what was a small terrace of three houses (the northernmost two were demolished to build the current 30 Church End). It is the last survivor of the initial 19th century expansion of Hendon village, and is therefore a significant part of the history of the settlement, holding evidential value. Despite its somewhat rundown condition, it also holds aesthetic value as a classic small terraced London house of the period, with its stock brick, sash windows, moulded window frames and traditional proportions. It is noted on the conservation area appraisal as a "Positive Building" within the conservation area, and this is an assessment that we endorse.

30 Church End is a semi-detached house that was built between 1936-56 based on mapping evidence, and probably in the late 1930s on stylistic evidence. It relates successfully to the conservation area in that it is of a suitable scale and relatively fine grain, it relates well to the street, and its muted materials, colours and textures are appropriate for the conservation area. It reads as part of the cluster of small houses around the church which positively contribute to its domestic scale setting.

Impact

The proposals involve the complete demolition of the Meritage Centre and adjoining contemporary buildings, the demolition of 28 and 30 Church End, and complete redevelopment of the site (which includes two areas just outside the conservation area, one of which is separate and slightly to the south of the principal site). Demolition of the Meritage Centre would not have an adverse impact on the conservation area or the setting of the nearby listed buildings.

Demolition of 28 Church End, a positive contributor to the conservation area, would cause harm to the conservation area. It would remove the last evidence of the nineteenth century expansion of the settlement, and would remove one of only 10-12 historic buildings within the conservation area. This would result in a significant level of harm, exacerbated by the demolition of 30 Church End, which also makes a positive contribution, albeit a lesser one, to the conservation area. The small size and fragility of this conservation area means that the loss of these buildings has a considerably greater relative impact on the conservation area than it would in many other conservation areas.

The proposed redevelopment of the site would be for two blocks of student accommodation of 2-3 storeys within the conservation area, and a further two blocks just outside it. Both of the blocks within the conservation area have their primary fronts (the long fronts with greatest height, and continuous gables) facing Church Terrace. The elevations facing Church End feel in massing terms like the backs, set back from the street, despite the presence of a space designated for a doctor's surgery. This does not fit well with the character of the conservation area, in which the top of Church End is the primary street and focus of the village and Church Terrace has historically been little more than a footpath. The height reduction shown in the amended plans, from 3-4 storeys down to 2-3 storeys, reduces the level of harm. Having carefully considered the impacts and our previous advice, Historic England considers that this is a broadly appropriate height, given that the two storey sections are towards Church End, on the more sensitive western side of the site.

However, the area of each of the two proposed blocks in the conservation area is comparable to that of the church. This is considered an excessive size and coarseness of grain in a conservation area the character of which is fundamentally defined by being a historic hamlet that consists of small domestic buildings that are subservient to the church in terms of their size. While the grain of the Meritage Centre is too coarse, the proposed development would make this worse.

The proposed layout does preserve a pedestrian connection west from the junction of Church Walk and Church Terrace to connect with Church End. This is not a very obvious or prominent connection, and more could be done in landscaping terms to signpost the presence and significance of these routes.

Policy

The 1990 Listed Buildings Act, the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), the London Plan and local plan and other local and national policy and guidance provide the framework for decision-taking on heritage applications.

At paragraph 192, the NPPF emphasises "the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets and putting them to viable uses consistent with their conservation".

The NPPF continues at para 193: "When considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation (and the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be). This is irrespective of whether any potential harm amounts to substantial harm, total loss or less than substantial harm to its significance."

The adopted SPD Design Brief for the Meritage Centre site emphasises that development should not be 'overbearing or imposing on' St Mary's church, and states

that 'a terraced form of development could fit the site, provide small individual footprints and therefore enforce pleasant continuity'.

Position

These impacts would result in a significant degree of less than substantial harm to the conservation area and to the setting of the church, because of the demolition of two of the few historic buildings within the conservation area, one of which is formally acknowledged as a positive contributor, and because of the coarsening of the urban grain that the erection of two blocks of this size represents. It will be for the decisionmaker to balance this harm against the public benefits of the scheme.

Mitigation for the harm that the scheme would cause could include streetscape improvements to the conservation area as a whole, which has a variety of ill thought out and inappropriate boundary treatments, street furniture and paving which harms the conservation area. There is considerable potential for the atmosphere of the conservation area to be improved with a well-thought out scheme for improving these in the whole of this small conservation area.

Bearing in mind that the Church End conservation area is very small, and fragile, and that this is probably the only potential development site on any scale that will ever come forward in it, it is disappointing that the potential that the Meritage Centre site has for improving the significance of the conservation area has not been realised by this scheme. A finer-grained residential scheme would be more likely to achieve the statutory objectives of preserving and enhancing the character and appearance of the conservation area.

Officer Comment:

It should be noted that the design briefs/guide for the SPD were part of the SPD itself and therefore are not formally adopted and no weight is being given to the draft SPD. HE's position of "less than substantial harm" is duly noted and officers agree with its overall assessment of harm. It is weighed in the assessment set out below against the public benefits along with the suggested improvements to the streetscape which could also assist in mitigation and it is also assessed against the statutory presumptions (see further below) .

Historic England – GLAAS

No objection – recommended Archaeological Condition:

No demolition or development shall take place until a stage 1 written scheme of investigation (WSI) has been submitted to and approved by the local planning authority in writing. For land that is included within the WSI, no demolition or development shall take place other than in accordance with the agreed WSI, and the programme and methodology of site evaluation and the nomination of a competent person(s) or organisation to undertake the agreed works.

If heritage assets of archaeological interest are identified by stage 1 then for those parts of the site which have archaeological interest a stage 2 WSI shall be submitted to and approved by the local planning authority in writing. For land that is included within the stage 2 WSI, no demolition/development shall take place other than in accordance with the agreed stage 2 WSI which shall include:

- A. The statement of significance and research objectives, the programme and methodology of site investigation and recording and the nomination of a competent person(s) or organisation to undertake the agreed works
- B. Where appropriate, details of a programme for delivering related positive public benefits.
- C. The programme for post-investigation assessment and subsequent analysis, publication & dissemination and deposition of resulting material. This part of the condition shall not be discharged until these elements have been fulfilled in accordance with the programme set out in the stage 2 WSI.

Reason:

This pre-commencement condition is necessary to safeguard the archaeological interest on this site. Approval of the WSI before works begin on site provides clarity on what investigations are required, and their timing in relation to the development programme.

Informative:

Written schemes of investigation will need to be prepared and implemented by a suitably qualified professionally accredited archaeological practice in accordance with Historic England's Guidelines for Archaeological Projects in Greater London. This condition is exempt from deemed discharge under schedule 6 of The Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015.

I envisage that the archaeological fieldwork would comprise the following:

Evaluation

An archaeological field evaluation involves exploratory fieldwork to determine if significant remains are present on a site and if so to define their character, extent, quality and preservation. Field evaluation may involve one or more techniques depending on the nature of the site and its archaeological potential. It will normally include excavation of trial trenches. A field evaluation report will usually be used to inform a planning decision (pre-determination evaluation) but can also be required by condition to refine a mitigation strategy after permission has been granted.

Evaluation trenches should be focussed on open areas between existing buildings, and in gardens of the terraced housing that previously existed on the site.

Officer Comment

These comments are duly noted and the requested condition and informatives shall be added.

Thames Water

No objections.

Waste Comments

Thames Water would advise that with regard to FOUL WATER sewerage network infrastructure capacity, we would not have any objection to the above planning application, based on the information provided.

Thames Water would advise that with regard to SURFACE WATER network infrastructure capacity, we would not have any objection to the above planning application, based on the information provided.

There are public sewers crossing or close to your development. If you're planning significant work near our sewers, it's important that you minimize the risk of damage. We'll need to check that your development doesn't limit repair or maintenance activities or inhibit the services we provide in any other way. The applicant is advised to read our guide working near or diverting our pipes.

<https://developers.thameswater.co.uk/Developing-a-large-site/Planning-your-Development/Working-nearor-diverting-our-pipes>.

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

Following initial investigations, Thames Water has identified an inability of the existing water network infrastructure to accommodate the needs of this development proposal. Thames Water have contacted the developer in an attempt to agree a position on water networks but have been unable to do so in the time available and as such Thames Water request that the following condition be added to any planning permission.

No development shall be occupied until confirmation has been provided that either:- all water network upgrades required to accommodate the additional flows to serve the development have been completed; or - a development and infrastructure phasing plan has been agreed with Thames Water to allow development to be occupied. Where a development and infrastructure phasing plan is agreed no occupation shall take place other than in accordance with the agreed development and infrastructure phasing plan.

Reason: The development may lead to no / low water pressure and network reinforcement works are anticipated to be necessary to ensure that sufficient capacity is made available to accommodate additional demand anticipated from the new development.

The developer can request information to support the discharge of this condition by visiting the Thames Water website at [thameswater.co.uk/preplanning](https://www.thameswater.co.uk/preplanning). Should the Local Planning Authority consider the above recommendation inappropriate or are unable to include it in the decision notice, it is important that the Local Planning Authority liaises with Thames Water Development Planning Department (telephone 0203 577 9998) prior to the planning application approval.

There are water mains crossing or close to your development. Thames Water do NOT permit the building over or construction within 3m of water mains. If you're planning significant works near our mains (within 3m) we'll need to check that your development doesn't reduce capacity, limit repair or maintenance activities during and after construction, or inhibit the services we provide in any other way. The applicant is advised to read our guide working near or diverting our pipes.

<https://developers.thameswater.co.uk/Developing-a-large-site/Planning-your-development/Working-nearor-diverting-our-pipes>

Cadent Gas Ltd

No objection, informative note required.

To prevent damage to our assets or interference with our rights, please add the following Informative Note into the Decision Notice:

Cadent Gas Ltd own and operate the gas infrastructure within the area of your development. There may be a legal interest (easements and other rights) in the land that restrict activity in proximity to Cadent assets in private land. The applicant must ensure that the proposed works do not infringe on legal rights of access and or restrictive covenants that exist.

If buildings or structures are proposed directly above the apparatus the development may only take place following diversion of the apparatus. The applicant should apply online to have apparatus diverted in advance of any works, by visiting cadentgas.com/diversions.

Prior to carrying out works, including the construction of access points, please register on www.linerearchbeforeudig.co.uk to submit details of the planned works for review, ensuring requirements are adhered to.

MET Police – Secured by Design

No objections subject to standard conditions.

This proposal involves the construction of new student accommodation, community based facilities and new accommodation for independent young adults. This will comprise of several different buildings and improvements to the public realm. It is positive to note the draft management strategy of the shared living scheme proposed and the need for a resident to sign and enter into an 'accommodation agreement'. Clear rule-setting is important and a resident must be under no illusion that issues of ASB, crime and disorder will not be tolerated and this could lead to enforcement and possible eviction. This would also be applicable to a party entering into any tenancy agreement with the managing agent/landlord etc.

It is commendable that the applicant has included a section within the DAS regarding crime prevention and 'design out crime'. With residential accommodation it will be possible to provide ongoing guidance and assistance for Secured by Design (SBD) purposes in respect of these buildings (current SBD guide – Homes 2019). With crime statistics and levels of burglary within the borough, achieving SBD for these buildings should greatly assist in being able to deter and reduce crime and disorder in this area. As alluded to within the DAS, specific guidance relating to security rated products can be provided in due course and it does appear possible for these buildings to achieve SBD accreditation. I would respectfully request that this is considered as a formal planning condition upon any approval of this proposal.

With regards to the soft landscaping for the scheme, it is important to consider incorporating 'defensible space' between more private areas and the public realm where possible. This can help to provide a buffer zone between the more vulnerable private area and the public realm, such as directly outside and under ground floor unit windows, to not only deter loitering directly outside (to the annoyance of its resident), but to also help protect ground floor windows from potential attack (burglary).

Seating appears to be central to the proposal and well overlooked by the surrounding units. With lighting and CCTV also proposed here, this will help to deter potential perpetrators from misusing this space.

It is very positive that the applicant amended some of their plans such as under-croft parking and so on due to concerns that these would attract issues of ASB, crime and disorder to the site.

Officer Comment

These comments are duly noted and this matter can be secured by condition.

Highways England

National Highways raises no objection.

2.8 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. The detailed comments are set out in the relevant section of this report.

Environmental Health

No objections. The proposed development has been reviewed in regards to noise, air quality, overheating, contaminated land and is considered acceptable subject to a number of conditions and informatives, which will be included.

Arboriculturalist

No objections. The proposal requires the removal of established trees. Compensation for this loss in accordance with the Council's adopted tree policy must be made. The Capital Asset Value for Amenity Trees (CAVAT) value of the tree will be required to mitigate the loss, and the money received used to support the planting targets.

Recommend a number of conditions relating to:

- Levels
- Hard & Soft landscaping
- Excavation for services
- Pre-commencement, Tree protection and method statement
- Landscape management

Policy

No objections.

Planning Documents considered in assessing the applications

- NPPF
- The London Plan 2021
- The Barnet Core Strategy
- The Barnet Development Management Policies

See comments on the SPD at 1.1 above.

Loss of Community Uses at the Meritage Centre

The current Local Plan Policies CS10 and DM13 as well as draft Local Plan Policy state that the loss of community uses is only acceptable in exceptional circumstances and should be resisted unless they are re-provided to an equivalent or improved quality.

The Hendon Hub applications need to be understood and assessed with regards to the re-provision of the community uses Citizens Advice Bureau, African Cultural Association, Meridian and a Community Hall are to be provided space in the development of the Ravensfield site. If application 21/4709/FUL (Ravensfield/Fenella etc site) is approved then the community uses can be assessed as being re-provided to an improved quantum (548.2sqm lost from the Meritage Centre site will be re-provided in the new buildings described in application 21/4709/FUL with 695sqm). If this application is approved the policy requirement set out in the Local Plan can be met.

Application 21/4612/FUL proposes the re-provision of the Peoples Dispensary for Sick Animals (PDSA) to the proposed development at Fuller St Car Park. The PDSA is a veterinary clinic run by a charity providing free and low-cost treatment to pets in need, is considered to be a community use. If this application is approved then this use will be considered to be re-provided. The existing PDSA building has a Gross Internal Area of 226.98sqm the proposed new building would increase this to 510sqm and be designed to meet the needs of a modern veterinary practice.

Character, Heritage and Design

The proposed development set out in the Hendon Hub applications has an impact on the Hendon – Church End Conservation Area. There is also development proposed immediately adjacent to the Grade II* Statutory Listed St Mary's Church. In order to comply with the NPPF, London Plan Policy HC1 and Local Plan Policies CS5 and DM01 and DM06 and draft Local Plan Policy CDH08, development in this area needs to be very sympathetic to its overall setting of the Conservation Area and not visually detract from the Church or its immediate setting.

Design and materials should therefore be approved by the Council's Heritage and Conservation Officers as well as the Design Officers and in consultation with Heritage England as required.

Loss of Housing / Housing Mix

Policy DM07, DM08, CS4

As a result of the proposed development there will be a loss of 13 1xbed homes (C3 use class) Application 21/4709/FUL which focusses on the redevelopment of the Ravensfield / Fenella site will deliver 28 new homes comprising a mixture of 1 and 2 bedroom homes. The proposals will deliver an uplift in homes and provide an improved housing mix therefore reflecting DM07, DM08 and CS4.

Student Housing (London Plan Policy H15, Local Plan Policy DM09 and draft Policy HOU04)

London Plan Policy H15 has established a London wide need of 3,500 student units per annum. The Hendon Hub applications in total propose an additional 565 student units at Hendon (181 student units on the Meritage site and 384 on the Ravensfield site) would go towards meeting this need. Policy DM09 expects proposals for student accommodation to demonstrate that they support educational establishments within Barnet and meet an identified local need. Although Middlesex University, rather than

a third party is expected to manage the site, this should be clearly demonstrated to reflect policy DM09.

London Plan Policy H15 also requires that a mixed and balanced community is created. The area surrounding the Meritage Centre site is predominately residential and contains many family homes. Student Housing therefore needs to respect the wider site. The Student Management Plan highlights the importance of the University and students working with the community emphasising that students and staff will be encouraged to be 'good neighbours' with local residents and for them to work with local community groups. It is strongly encouraged that this initiative is taken forward. Fifty percent of the student units are to be offered at discount market rent which is in accordance with London Plan Policy on affordable student accommodation.

Care Housing

30 Church End is a Victorian semi-detached dwelling that is currently used as a residential care facility, the intention as part of the redevelopment of the site is to re-provide with a purpose built facility in Block 4 of the proposed development. This will better serve the needs of the residents with more space. This would then satisfy Policies CS10 and DM07 and DM13 regarding the re-provision of housing / community facility, as well as CS4, CS11, DM09 and draft Policy HOU04 and H12 of the London Plan regarding specialist housing. Adult social services should be consulted to ensure that this is going to continue to meet the needs of Barnet residents.

Shared Living

It is proposed that Block 4 on the corner of Church End and Church Road will also contain 33 shared living units for young adults. Policy H16 of the London Plan and draft Policy HOU04 requires this type of accommodation to meet several requirements in terms of design and management. A draft management plan has been submitted with the application. It is recommended that this is formalised before occupation. The draft Management Plan indicates that it will comply with the London Plan requirement that it will integrate into the wider community to ensure it is part of a mixed and inclusive neighbourhood. Design Officers should be satisfied it meets the policy design requirements.

Health Centre

Concerns have been raised during the Hendon Hub consultation on the continued access to health services for the community, the provision of the Health and Wellbeing Centre is being delivered after consultation with the NHS and local GPs. London Plan Policy S2 and Local Plan Policy CS11 and DM13 support the provision of this facility.

SuDs

Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) are encouraged across the site to lower the amount of runoff entering the stormwater infrastructure. All SuDS designs, drainage plans and paving materials should be agreed with the Drainage and Highways Team at the Council.

Energy

According to the Energy Statement the remaining reduction of CO2 emissions shall be off-set by a cash in-lieu payment to the London Borough of Barnet, based on £95 per Tonne per annum over 30 years, this is calculated by the statement to be £1065.00. This should be confirmed and secured through a S106 obligation or similar.

Urban Greening Factor / Biodiversity

London Plan Policy G5 requires that predominately residential development (should achieve an Urban Greening Factor of 0.4 this site is currently projected to achieve 0.360521). Although Policy G5 does not allow for the shortfall to be offset elsewhere in the Borough, as this is part of a wider Masterplan and there are areas both within the Masterplan area and on its boundary that would benefit from additional greening, these should be explored, along with incorporation of planting in SuDS projects.

Biodiversity, there are significant trees in the area and the neighbouring church yard and Sunny Hill offer the opportunity of enhancing this site to strengthen the ecological links across the area the Ecological Assessment estimates that the proposed planting will increase the biodiversity a gain of 53.45% . Section 5.5 of the Ecology Report lists ideas for biodiversity enhancements that can be incorporated in landscaping plans and planting regimes.

Parking

London Plan Policies T6.1 should be followed for the residential elements of the proposal, including the provision of charging points for ultra-low emission vehicles.

Traffic/Transport – Please refer to Transport Planner comments.

Heritage

No objections – summary position is “less than substantial harm”.

This application site lies both within the Hendon, Church End Conservation Area and partially within its setting. Adjoining the site lies the Parish Church of St Mary, a Grade II* listed building dating from the mid-13th century.

Four new blocks are proposed, of two to four storeys in height, providing student accommodation and a health and wellbeing centre. The proposed blocks 1 and 2 lie within the CA and blocks 3 and 4 lie just outside the CA boundary.

The buildings proposed for demolition include the Meritage Centre and Nos 28 and 30 Church Terrace. All lie within the CA. The Meritage Centre dates from the 1970/80's. No. 28 is the remaining house of a terrace dating from the mid-19th century. No.30 dates from the 1950's. Whilst the Meritage Centre is not considered to be of any architectural or townscape merit, No.28 is indicated in the Hendon, Church End Area Character Appraisal as making a positive contribution to its character and appearance. No.30 is not referred to in the appraisal. The proposed demolition of No.28 will have an adverse impact given its contribution to the CA. Its retention was not considered feasible in view of the proposed layout of buildings on the site. The loss should be considered against other improvements to the conservation area as part of this proposal and any other benefits that result.

The opportunity to introduce new, more appropriate buildings, spaces and landscaping presents itself as a result of the proposed demolition of the Meritage Centre, being the dominant structure and the element closest to St. Mary's Church and churchyard, but detracting from the area's character and appearance. The character appraisal comments that the buildings which form the Meritage Centre 'do not sit comfortably with the local vernacular of the majority of the buildings within the Conservation Area and detract from the established character.'

The proposed contemporary design, whilst incorporating traditional facing materials, is considered to be a contextually appropriate response to the CA. At its closest point to St Mary's Church, the front building line of block 1 has been intentionally set back to open up views towards the church in Church End and within Church Terrace, views towards the church and the mature trees within the churchyard have been maintained. It is recognized that elements of blocks 1 and 2 have been reduced in height from 3 and 4 storeys to 2 and 3 storeys. Blocks 1 and 2 are lower in height fronting Church End, where there is greater sensitivity and to reduce their visual impact in the streetscene. This is welcomed and reduces their visual prominence and impact within the CA and on setting of the listed church.

Greater articulation, such as additional fenestration could, however, improve a number of the key elevations, such on the 3 storey element (north and south elevations) of blocks 1 and 2, and the 2 storey element of blocks 1 and 2, facing Church End. The palette of traditional facing materials of red brick, natural slate, clay tiles, dark-stained timber weatherboarding and vertical tile hanging is an appropriate response to their context.

Blocks 3 and 4 lie outside of the CA but close to the boundary. They will replace buildings of limited architectural merit. Their scale is slightly larger at 4 storeys, but with the upper storey's set into the roofspace and featuring dormer windows. Their contemporary design is considered to be appropriate and an enhancement within the streetscene relative to the existing buildings on the two sites.

Although some minor harm will result from the loss of no.28 Church End as a positive contributor to the conservation area's character, this will be less than substantial and should therefore be weighed against any benefits that might outweigh that harm. The scale and design of the 4 blocks is considered to be acceptable, but some elevational modifications would be beneficial and could result in improvements to their visual appearance. Their contribution to the conservation area's character and appearance will also be dependent on the landscaping of the public route between Church End and Church Terrace, and on the architectural detailing and the use of good quality traditional materials, to echo those which are featured locally.

Officer Comment:

The harm to heritage assets, public benefits along with the suggested improvements to the streetscape which would also assist in mitigation are reviewed later in this report in the planning balance and assessed against the statutory presumptions of preservation,. Details of fenestration and indeed landscaping and improvements to the public realm would be secured through conditions.

Urban Design

No objections.

General:

The building form, mass and footprint is in keeping with the area's overall height.

Height:

The introduction of new preserves the character of the area and. The low buildings are proposed to blend in at 3-4 storeys. Due to the proximity of St Mary's Church the heights should not be overbearing or imposing on this Grade II* building.

Massing:

Due to the curve of the road and the importance of the view along Church End heading away from The Burroughs the setback on Church End accommodates sightlines Northwest to the church and pub the proposal does not dominate its setting. The mass is not intrusive although the majority of the ground floors are only activated by residential windows and defensible space, this makes the ground plane be perceived heavier. The proposed entrance to the Wellbeing Centre and surrounding ground floors are performing better in terms of activation and lightening up the perception of mass.

Building footprints:

Building footprints allow for landscaping and setbacks that preserve existing views. Having said that the need for more meaningful activation is key to how the buildings sit on site.

Architecture:

The forms proposed are very simple, incorporating pitched roofs as an attempt to provide a more familiar form for the area. The use of this architecture is more successful around the Wellbeing Centre where larger openings manifest and the forms can be visually penetrated more. The pitching of the roofs is an acceptable feature to the buildings as it is carrying forward the overarching roof typology of the area.

Material and façade variation:

Materials are varied across the site, the general layout of materials is centred around pronouncing bases, middles and tops of buildings. The traditional red brick shown could be revised as it shows a lot of saturation in the colour. Perhaps a mixed red with more tactility could work better. Using wood within this proposal is very welcome as it is a natural material that will age gracefully if applied correctly.

Views:

Views into the site from the residential quarters are tested thoroughly. Overall views are not seen as detrimental. The existing green environment is considered so is the local topographic changes. The development also acts successfully as a small network of suburban streets with clear views into the site from the pedestrian perspective.

Wayfinding:

We have clear views and a robust wayfinding strategy which efficiently leads people to open spaces, green spaces and front doors.

Local integration:

Activation should be done through entrances and defensible space with pleasant landscaping. The quiet character of Church Terrace should be maintained. There is a lot of opportunity to activate the ground floors on the residential parts of this proposal

Transport and Regeneration

Summary - No objections. The development is acceptable on transport grounds subject to a legal agreement and planning conditions. The detailed comments provided by transport officers has been incorporated in the highways section of this report.

Drainage/SuDs

No objections, however further details and information are required therefore have requested this is controlled by condition.

Waste/Refuse

No objections – however further details and information are required therefore have requested this is controlled by condition.

Employment and Skills

No objections subject to appropriate term in s106 legal agreement.

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

Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, and the National Planning Policy Framework 2021 (NPPF), require 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 Policy H15 identifies a strategic requirement for 3,500 purpose-built student bedspaces over the plan period. The London Plan also 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.

The London Plan states that non-self-contained accommodation for students should count towards meeting housing targets on a 2.5:1 ratio. Therefore the proposed 181 student units would give a figure of 72.4 conventional housing units; which would assist Barnet in meeting 10 year housing target. Taking the Hendon Hub project overall, including the redevelopment of RFC site (21/4709/FUL) the total figure would be 254 units. This would be an important contribution to Barnet's 5 Year Housing Land Supply.

The student accommodation should be operated directly by Middlesex University and if not then a Nomination Agreement would need to be secured for the majority of the

bedrooms in perpetuity in line with London Plan Policy H15 and Local Plan DM09. This would be secured through the formal legal agreement.

In accordance with London Plan Policy H8 and Local Plan Policy DM07 all thirteen of the existing residential units which would be lost on site (together with the seven lost at the RFC site) would be re-provided under the redevelopment at RFC, application 21/4709/FUL. Overall therefore the Hendon Hub Regeneration project delivers 28 new affordable homes (an uplift of 8 new units) with an improved housing mix of 1 and 2 bedroom units, reflecting DM07, DM08 and CS04.

Affordable Housing

London Plan Policy H15 and Local Plan Policy DM07, DM08, and Draft Policy HOU4 all require the provision of Affordable Housing on the site for both student and residential units. 50% of the student accommodation would also be affordable in full accordance with London Plan Policy H15.

As stated in the penultimate paragraph all the residential (C3) units which would be lost from this site would be re-provided within the RFC site. All the new residential units would be affordable with 36% 'Social Rented' and 64% 'London Living Rented' tenure. The scheme would provide an overall net gain of 538.9 sqm of C3 residential floorspace.

Community/Education Uses & Social Infrastructure

This is one of seven applications which together form the Hendon Hub Regeneration project. All the existing community uses from this Meritage Centre site, involving Citizens Advice Bureau, Meridian (Chinese Mental Health), African Cultural Association and Community Hall would be relocated within the redevelopment at RFC under application 21/4709/FUL. The re-provision of these community uses is strongly supported in line with Local Plan Policies CS10 and DM13.

In addition, application 21/4612/FUL proposes the re-provision of the Peoples Dispensary for Sick Animals (PDSA) to the proposed development at Fuller Street Car Park. The PDSA is a veterinary clinic run by a charity providing free and low-cost treatment to pets in need and is considered to be a community use. The existing PDSA building has a Gross Internal Area of 226.98sqm the proposed new building would increase this to 510sqm and be designed to meet the needs of a modern veterinary practice.

Care Housing

As the council policy team highlight, 30 Church End is a Victorian semi-detached dwelling that is currently used as a residential care facility, the intention as part of the redevelopment of this site is to re-provide with a purpose built facility in Block 4 of the proposed development. Officers consider that this would better serve the needs of the community and residents with more space. This would meet Policies CS10 and DM07 and DM13 regarding the re-provision of housing / community facility, as well as CS4, CS11, DM09 and draft Policy HOU04 and H12 of the London Plan regarding specialist housing.

Shared Living

The new proposed Block 4 on the corner of Church End and Church Road would also contain 33 shared living units for young adults. Policy H16 of the London Plan and draft Policy HOU04 sets the requirements for this type of accommodation. A draft management plan has been submitted which officers consider note should be formalised through a legal agreement before occupation. Officers have also sought to clarify and confirmed by the applicant that, all proposed living accommodation units within shall not be self-contained or capable of being used as self-contained homes

Health Centre

The proposed Health and Well-being Centre would be located within an 'Edge of Centre' location, i.e. within 300 metres of the Brent Street District Centre boundary [190 metres to boundary] and will be accessible via buses from along Brent Street and walking and cycling from surrounding areas. The applicant has confirmed that the provision of the Health Centre is being proposed following consultation with the NHS and local GPs. This is therefore strongly supported and in accordance with London Plan Policy S2 and Local Plan Policy CS11 and DM13.

Retail Use

The proposals would result in the loss of the vacant newsagent, no.46 Church End (52.25 sqm GIA). In accordance with Part (iv) of Policy DM12 the applicant marketed the vacant unit beginning in December 2019 and the property was also advertised on the Council's property website. Officers are content that this meets Policy requirements of DM12 and that the loss of this use is acceptable.

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.

Provision of accommodation for future occupiers

There are no defined space standards for student accommodation specifically set out in the London Plan. However Policy H15 does state that student accommodation should provide adequate functional living space and layout for the occupants. The proposed development would provide student accommodation with adequately sized rooms and good-sized communal areas. The applicant has confirmed that typical student residential units would have an internal GIA of minimum of 11.5sqm and a typical disabled room minimum of 18.5msq. In addition, on each floor there would be separate large communal areas serving each core.

The proposed care rooms are provided as studios with an ensuite bathroom. The provision and layout of each of these rooms is considered to be acceptable. There is a large communal area on the ground floor and other smaller communal areas located on each floor around the building which facilitate a number of uses and

provide different activity opportunities for future occupiers. Overall, the proposed accommodation is found to be acceptable for future occupiers.

Outdoor amenity spaces are also provided within a secluded area to the north of Building 1. The proposal includes landscaping improvements across the site and is located within 100m to Sunny Hill Park directly to the north.

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. However this is not directly applicable to purpose built student accommodation.

Nonetheless the planning submission sets out that 5% of the total number of student rooms would be provided as wheelchair adaptable, which is supported.

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.

Daylight/Sunlight – Future Occupants

A Daylight/Sunlight Report was prepared by GL Hearn. This assessment has considered the levels of daylight and sunlight within the proposed development. All of the rooms that require assessment have been assessed. It is noted that part of the development is for student accommodation. The BRE does not specify a targeted level, accordingly these have been assessed applying target for a residential room of that type.

The report confirms that the daylighting has been assessed to 291 rooms using the Average Daylight Factor. 280 rooms meet the levels recommended in the BRE. This equates to 96% compliance rate. For Block 1, 52 Rooms were assessed and 50 passed equating to a 97% pass rate. The two rooms that fall below serve the communal areas for the student accommodation. All 52 rooms in Block 2 passed.

In Block 3, 115 rooms were assessed and 108 meet the BRE guidance equating to a 94% pass rate. However all of these rooms except one serve the communal areas, the report states , the high level of daylight received to the majority of the student bedrooms should mitigate the deviations to the communal areas. The one student bedroom with reduced daylight should be treated with leniency.

Block 4, 72 rooms were assessed and 71 meet the BRE guidance equating to a 99% pass rate. The room that is subject to deviation is a Living/Kitchen Diner. It achieves a ADF of 1.37 marginally falling below the recommended 1.50 ADF target. However, the accommodation as a whole will receive good daylight levels.

The specialist report concludes that overall the high level of compliance demonstrates well designed accommodation for future occupiers to enjoy. Accordingly officers consider the standard of accommodation overall would be more than acceptable.

3.3 Design

The NPPF 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, such as Policy D3, 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.

The submitted Planning Statement along with the Design and Access Statement (DAS), outlines the evolution of the masterplan. The proposed design emerged from an understanding of the site and context, heritage setting and a consideration of both the constraints and opportunities of the site. The development has followed a design and heritage-led approach which seeks to optimise the use of public land. Appropriate consideration has been given in terms of height, massing, materials and layout to the character and buildings on Church End, Church Terrace, Prince of Wales Close and Church Road.

Section 5 of the DAS illustrates the evolution of the masterplan following the extensive pre-application discussions with officers over the period of 16 months, plus public and stakeholder engagement. The application is also accompanied by an ES and Heritage and Visual Impact Assessment (HTVIA). The HTVIA provides an assessment of the impact of the proposed development on heritage, townscape and visual receptors.

Conservation Area & Heritage Assets

Barnet Policy DM06 indicates that all heritage assets will be protected in line with their significance and development proposals must preserve or enhance the character and appearance of Barnet's conservation areas.

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”.

Section 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (PLBCAA 1990), imposes a statutory duty on Local Planning Authorities and states that “In considering whether to grant planning permission for development which affects a listed building or its setting, the local planning authority or, as the case may be, the Secretary of State shall 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”. Under Section 72(1) there is also an equivalent duty in regard to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the conservation area.

The NPPF (Paragraph 199) states that when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation irrespective of whether any potential harm amounts to substantial harm, total loss or less than substantial harm to its significance.

At Paragraph 202 the NPPF confirms where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use. In addition the effect of an application on the significance of a non-designated heritage asset should be taken into account in determining the application (Paragraph 203).

Part of the site, Blocks 1 and 2 are located within the Church End Conservation Area to the eastern edge. There are no Statutorily Listed Buildings within the site; however, there are surrounding the site. These include the Parish Church of St Mary (Grade II*) which would be closest to Building 1, and associated Tombs (Grade II); Church Farmhouse Museum (Grade II*) to the north east. The Daniel Almshouses (Grade II) is to the south of the site.

20 Church End (formerly The Chequers Pub), Rose Cottage, The Greyhound Pub and Church House are all Locally Listed.

Figure 5: Statutory and Locally Listed and other non-designated heritage assets



The statutory and locally listed buildings are shown below:

- Model Farm and Milking Parlour, Greyhound Hill (Grade II) 
- Church Farm House (Grade II*) 
- Parish Church of St Mary (Grade II*) 
- Various Structures within Church Grounds [nearest to site boundary (Grade II) 
 - Headstone of Thomas Thatcher in S Marys Church Yard
 - Unidentified chest tomb 15 metres south of east of Church in church yard.
 - Tomb of John Haley in Church Yead
- Rose Cottage, Church End, NW4 4JT (Locally Listed) 
- The Chequers PH, No. 20 Church End, NW4 (Locally Listed) 
- The Greyhound PH, No.50 Church End, NW4 (Locally Listed) 
- Church House, No. 49 Church End, NW4 (Locally Listed) 
- 28 Church End (Page 46 of the Church Hendon Church End Conservation Area Character Appraisal and Management Proposals Document (November 2012) considers 28 Church End to make a positive contribution to the Church End Conservation Area) 

The main considerations in the assessment of the proposal in regard to heritage are:

- Demolition of the existing buildings Meritage Centre, 28 and 30 Church End within the Church End, Hendon Conservation Area;
- Impact of the new development on the settings of the Conservation Area, Listed Buildings and any non-designated heritage assets.

However these matters are to be considered together as part of the overall judgement of the proposal.

Demolition of existing buildings within Hendon Church End Conservation Area

Hendon Church End Conservation Area was first designated in 1983 and subject of an Appraisal and Management Proposals document adopted in 2012. It has a linear form essentially on a north-south axis with St Mary's Parish Church at the centre. The Conservation Area primarily runs along Church End, with just a single rear access road, Church Terrace, which runs to the rear of 20 Church End (formerly The Chequers Public House) and St Mary's churchyard, ending at Sunny Hill Park.

The Character Appraisal identifies the key views with one of those looking northwards along Church End featuring key buildings. It confirms that St Mary's at Hendon Parish Church and Churchyard is the principal building within the Conservation Area, pg35.

In regard to the Meritage Centre building which dates from the 1970/80's, it states at pg34,

“The Meritage Club and modern shops, offices and flats complex sit right in the heart of the Conservation Area... As a recent development, they do not sit comfortably with the local vernacular of the majority of the buildings within the Conservation Area and detract from the established character.”

The Conservation Appraisal identifies 28 Church End as a building that contributes positively to the character and appearance of the conservation area, by reference on a map on pg52. Although it acknowledges within the main text of the appraisal that it is 'overpowered' by 30 Church End on pg34.

The Council's Heritage Officer has reviewed the scheme and associated heritage reports and documents. The officer comments that,

The buildings proposed for demolition include the Meritage Centre and Nos 28 and 30 Church Terrace. All lie within the CA. The Meritage Centre dates from the 1970/80's. No. 28 is the remaining house of a terrace dating from the mid-19th century. No.30 dates from the 1950's. Whilst the Meritage Centre is not considered to be of any architectural or townscape merit, No.28 is indicated in the Hendon, Church End Area Character Appraisal as making a positive contribution to its character and appearance. No.30 is not referred to in the appraisal. The proposed demolition of No.28 will have an adverse impact given its contribution to the CA. Its retention was not considered feasible in view of the proposed layout of buildings on the site. The loss should be considered against other improvements to the conservation area as part of this proposal and any other benefits that result.

The opportunity to introduce new, more appropriate buildings, spaces and landscaping presents itself as a result of the proposed demolition of the Meritage Centre, being the dominant structure and the element closest to St. Mary's Church and churchyard, but detracting from the area's character and appearance. The character appraisal comments that the buildings which form the Meritage Centre 'do not sit comfortably with the local vernacular of the majority of the buildings within the Conservation Area and detract from the established character.'

Historic England's comments have also been noted. On balance, officers consider that the loss of the existing Meritage Centre and 30 Church End would not result in any harm to the Conservation Area. 28 Church End is not statutorily or locally listed however is identified as making a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the conservation area. This contribution though is considered to be limited. Any low-level harm that may arise from its loss is to be weighed against the enhancements to the conservation area through the removal of buildings which detract from the conservation area; and the improvements the new development would bring overall. This low level of harm is considered to be less than substantial harm.

Listed Buildings

The listed buildings in vicinity to the application site and within the conservation area have been detailed within the applicant's heritage report and have been duly considered. It has been accepted by all parties, including Historic England that the

key listed building to consider is Parish Church of St Mary. The details are set out below:

Parish Church of St Mary – Grade II* Listed Building.

Entry Number: 1359029

Listed: 3rd February 1950

Details: *Mid C13. Rendered. Slate roof. Nave, chancel and north aisle with early C16 north chapel. Later nave and south aisle by Temple Moore 1914-15 to replace original south aisle. Small C15 ragstone west tower. East window early C15. Flat pitched, 4 bay timber roof to nave and north aisle C15. Font, fine C12 square with 8 inter-secting enriched arcades to each face. Window to north chapel - Kempe and altar screen - Bodley. High altar hangings and posts by Comper. Monuments include deeply incised black marble slab to Sir Jeremy Whichcot d.1677, William Rawlinson d.1703, Sir Charles Colmore 1806 by Flaxman, Giles Earle 1811 by Charles Harriott Smith. Sir Stamford Raffles d.1826. Founder of Singapore.*

The proposed development would not affect the principal elements of significance of the Church nor one's ability to appreciate the historic interest of the church. The key assessment is to the setting of the heritage asset.

In assessing its significance, the submitted Heritage Report (HTVIA) identifies that the building has high architectural and historic significance. The applicant's heritage report confirms the principal setting is that of its churchyard with its intact historic boundaries. The principal contribution made to the significance of the church is contained within its immediate setting to the church yard, close views to the church from the east and west approaches and approach from Greyhound Hill.

Views of the church from the south along Church End and Church Terrace are the most important and are part obscured by the unattractive Meritage Centre. Similar to the positive effects on the conservation area, the removal of these blocks would have a positive effect on the approach/views to the Church from the south. Furthermore the setback of blocks 1 and 2 fronting Church End along with the improved landscaping would open and enhance views towards the Church travelling north. In addition the built form and footprint of the building 1 has been moved further away from the boundary to the Church to increase the spatial distance between the two. In addition the layout and built form to the rear has also been carefully considered so that important views to the cedar tree and open space within the churchyard are also respected.

The Council's heritage officer has also acknowledged the enhanced views north to the Church stating:

At its closest point to St Mary's Church, the front building line of block 1 has been intentionally set back to open up views towards the church in Church End and within Church Terrace, views towards the church and the mature trees within the churchyard have been maintained. It is recognized that elements of blocks 1 and 2 have been reduced in height from 3 and 4 storeys to 2 and 3 storeys. Blocks 1 and 2 are lower in height fronting Church End, where there is greater sensitivity and to reduce their visual impact in the streetscene. This is welcomed and reduces their visual prominence and impact within the CA and on setting of the listed church.

It is noted that a number of memorials within the churchyard are listed, however by their nature and location within the church grounds, there would be no harm to the ability to appreciate these memorials. The proposed development would therefore cause no adverse impact to the settings of these listed structures.

Block 4 is located to the south of the application site at the corner of Church End and Prince of Wales Close. It is set around 30m to the north of Daniel Almshouses (Grade II) and separated by the busy main road and has existing mature trees along the boundary fronting Church Road. The new building would be a storey higher however the building remains perpendicular to the road with the additional mass added to the north along Prince of Wales Close. Therefore it is considered that there would be no adverse impact to the setting of this listed building.

Non-designated heritage assets

20 Church End (formerly The Chequers) has been repeatedly modified over recent decades and now features multiple extensions which result in the substantial redevelopment and alteration of the building including its roof form. Other locally listed buildings are positioned and orientated so that they would not be affected. Therefore the proposed development would have no adverse impact on any non-designated heritage assets.

Setting on Hendon Church End Conservation Area

The applicant's detailed submission confirms the massing has been carefully considered across the Site to provide coherent architectural forms that relate to each other and that respond to the character of the conservation area. The scale and mass of the proposals has also been refined throughout the design process and in consultation with officers and Historic England.

As noted above, blocks 1 and 2 are lower in height fronting Church End, where there is greater sensitivity and to reduce their visual impact in the streetscene with the modest increase in height set to the east along Church Terrace. However these blocks are set further back from the edge and are now activated at street level with additional improvements to the public realm. The proposal also seeks to uplift the neglected spaces to the rear (east) of the Conservation Area along Church Terrace.

The submission documents highlight that, height has been carefully considered and, alongside massing and scale, have been tested at length through the pre-application process via modelling and key view evaluation with a resultant reduction in both the initial proposed height of the scheme and the footprints.

Historic England have also noted the reduction in height and confirmed that the 2 storey height fronting Church End is 'broadly appropriate'. They also confirm that the proposed layout does preserve a pedestrian connection west from the junction of Church Walk and Church Terrace to connect with Church End.

The development of Blocks 3 and 4 outside the conservation area enhance the setting of the conservation area by removing existing unattractive buildings and replacing them with buildings of an appropriate scale and design. As the council's heritage officer notes, their scale is slightly larger at 4 storeys, but with the upper storey's set into the roofspace and featuring dormer windows. Their contemporary

design is considered to be appropriate and an enhancement within the streetscene relative to the existing buildings on the two sites.

The proposed landscaping is a fundamental element of the overall proposal which would provide numerous enhancements to the currently poor public realm of this area of the Conservation Area and the immediate context. To the front (west) of the site a new landscaped public courtyard would be introduced with important existing trees maintained. The public realm to the rear (east) along Church Terrace are also improved with new building lines set back from pavement edge. Views are also maintained towards the churchyard and important trees within the church grounds.

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 vista3d) undertaken at a number of viewing points from the surrounding area and key vantage points, which had been agreed with heritage and design officers during the pre-application discussions.

Whilst it is accepted that the assessment of any proposal is best understood as part of a kinetic moving experience around the site and vicinity, the viewpoints do help to provide a snapshot to demonstrate that there are no adverse impacts to the either the heritage assets, residential properties or the character and appearance of the area.

The development would be visible in a number of views within the conservation area as identified in the conservation area appraisal. However the redevelopment of the site would not affect the majority of the views identified in the appraisal. The principal positive impact would be on views north along Church End towards the church, which would be opened. Viewpoints 15, 18 and 19 help illustrate this to some extent. Views of the site when approaching from the west would also be enhanced, travelling up from Greyhound Hill. This is illustrated with Viewpoint 17.

Materiality

The application submission confirms the materiality of the new buildings has been carefully considered to respond to the surrounding context, drawing from elements such as the traditional brickwork, and the arrangement of fenestration. The variety in materiality and form of the buildings breaks down the mass of the buildings and reflects the grain of the surroundings.

Building 1 would be largely red traditional brickwork reflecting the conservation buildings such as the Farm House Museum and Vicarage, 48 Church End. This also connects with St Mary's School at Church Terrace, creating a continuity along this new street frontage. Black stained timber reflecting the traditional weatherboarding of the area (48 Church End) is proposed at upper levels to define form and break the overall mass. The brick palette is further defined by texture in the form of corbelled brick and deep reveal windows to give added relief to the elevations. The roof line has been deliberately articulated with pitched roofs reflecting a more traditional plot width and thereby breaking the overall mass of the building. Natural slate tiles are proposed for the roof again in keeping with the surrounding skyline.

These principles continue for building 2 also within the conservation area. For this building a palette of more buff traditional brickwork reflecting the brick flanks of Church House or the lower floor of the Model Farm House are proposed.

Buildings 3 and 4 provide the opportunity for more contemporary materials (outside of CA) that would provide a modern interpretation of the materials found in the conservation area. For building 3, again a clean visual palette of largely traditional brickwork is proposed, now in a buff colour. Tying in with the brickwork to the extension opposite at 20 Church End. A dark grey ribbed brick base contrasts with the lighter buff brick providing visual interest and gives the building a strong base. A mansard roof with dark metal dormers using ceramic roof tiles, would give a contemporary whilst providing visual interest and a varied form to the skyline and upper level.

Building 4 would have a darker red reflecting the nearby Alms Houses creating some visual synergy with its context. This palette is further defined at ground level by a textured corbelled brick adding visual interest at ground level. A mansard roof solution at the upper level with dark metal dormers gives a contemporary feel whilst reducing mass. The upper level would be finished in red ceramic roof tiles.

The council's heritage officer has worked closely with the applicant's design team and reviewed the submission, commenting that the palette of traditional facing materials of red brick, natural slate, clay tiles, dark-stained timber weatherboarding and vertical tile hanging is an appropriate response to their context.

Officers consider that the selection of appropriate materials for each of the buildings will be very important, as will the attention to detail of individual features and the use of high quality hard and soft landscaping. Accordingly notwithstanding the detailed submission, these matters will be controlled by way of conditions.

Summary

Taking all matters into consideration, officers views are that the new buildings would at the least preserve the character and appearance of this part of the Conservation Area. The Council's heritage officer concludes that although some minor harm would result from the loss of no.28 Church End as a positive contributor to the conservation area's character, this will be less than substantial and should therefore be weighed against any benefits that might outweigh that harm.

The proposed development and new built form is of an appropriate scale and design and are considered acceptable. The proposed development also results in certain improvements to views within the conservation, particularly with respect to the church. As the Council's heritage officer confirmed Blocks 1 and 2 are lower in height fronting Church End, where there is greater sensitivity and to reduce their visual impact within the CA and on setting of the listed church. Historic England also accept that the proposed heights of Blocks 1 and 2 are acceptable. Therefore on balance officers consider that any harm through the 'coarseness of grain' as identified by HE is clearly less than substantial harm and should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal. This means the setting of nearby listed buildings and St Mary's Church in particular, would at the minimum be preserved.

Therefore taking account of the condition of the site as a whole and the effects of the proposed development as a whole, it is considered that the beneficial aspects of the

development are capable of outweighing any low level harm that arises from the demolition of No. 28 and the setting of the Church. Furthermore the Council's heritage officer has also highlighted that through subtle modifications to certain elevations (to blocks 1 and 2) could result in further improvements to their visual appearance. The buildings contribution to the conservation area's character and appearance will also be dependent on the landscaping of the public route between Church End and Church Terrace, and on the architectural detailing and the use of good quality traditional materials.

Historic England have also recommended measures to mitigate the harm (less than substantial), which include streetscape improvements, boundary treatments, street furniture and paving.

These beneficial aspects in terms of the impact on heritage assets are identified as:

- The removal of the existing Meritage Centre building itself.
- The removal of buildings outside the conservation area but that detract from its setting.
- Replacement buildings outside the conservation area that enhances the setting of CA.
- Enhancements to the permeability and landscaping of the site.
- Opening up views of Parish Church of St Mary (Grade II* Listed) from Church End (benefitting both the setting of the church and the conservation area directly)
- Public realm improvements

The applicant has also provided a list of the non-heritage public benefits which include:

- Optimising the reuse of previously developed land for housing and social infrastructure – as part of the wider regeneration project.
- Delivery of student accommodation for Middlesex University - 50% affordable student accommodation.
- As part of the wider of regeneration project, significantly enhanced teaching space and ancillary facilities. The University is one of Barnet's largest employers, employing c.1,500 local and London-based staff.
- Re-providing improved community space and allowing for the release of site for redevelopment.
- 100% 'affordable' purpose-built shared accommodation.
- Enhanced landscaping across the whole masterplan area.
- 53.45% on-site Net Gain in Biodiversity (National Government target 10%).
- Economic effects on local and regional economy during construction and operational use, e.g. job creation, wages as detailed within the ES.

As required by the NPPF, applications that directly or indirectly affect the significance of a designated heritage asset, the harm should be weighed against the public

benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use. Policy DM06 also requires a balancing of harm with identified benefits. Following the assessment undertaken and set out above, it is considered that the conservation area would at the least be preserved through careful consideration and implementation of the measures outlined, and that any low level harm is clearly outweighed by the heritage and non-heritage benefits identified above.

The cumulative impact of the applications has also been considered as part of the overall impact of heritage issues. The EIA confirms the effects relating to individual sites and Townscape, Heritage and Visual Impact aspects do not interact with each other. This is because there is no direct intervisibility between the Proposed Developments. Therefore it is considered that there would be no adverse cumulative impacts on the heritage assets even when the developments are considered overall.

For the reasons given in the report above, it is identified that there would be less than substantial harm to the significance of the designated heritage assets which although of a limited nature has nonetheless been given considerable weight by officers.

As stated above, in arriving at its planning judgement officers have had fully in mind the requirements of sections 66(1) and s.72(1) of the P(LBCA)A 1990, by which Parliament intended that the desirability of preserving the settings of listed buildings and conservation areas should not simply be given careful consideration but “considerable importance and weight” when carrying out the balancing exercise. This gives rise to a strong statutory presumption against granting planning permission for development which would cause (any) harm to the settings of listed buildings or the settings of conservation areas, even where the harm would be “less than substantial” the balancing exercise cannot ignore the overarching statutory duties imposed by sections 66(1) and s.72(1). In the present instance, officers have therefore attached considerable importance and weight to the section 66(1) and s.72(1) duties when carrying out this assessment and have found that having regard to the less than substantial harm caused (as identified above) to heritage assets any presumption against the grant of consent has been clearly displaced by the substantial public benefits arising from the proposal.

In this case there would be a package of benefits that would arise from the development which have been attributed substantial and moderate weight. With limited weight applied only to the financial benefits. In accordance with the NPPF it is considered that the overall package of these public benefits is of considerable and substantial importance which would clearly outweigh the harm to heritage assets notwithstanding the considerable weight given to the ‘less than substantial harm’ that would arise from the proposed development.

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.

There are no adjoining residential properties identified which would be adversely affected by the proposed development. Rose Cottage to the west is set significantly away, over 20m and faces north-south so that the side ends of the building face the main road, Church End. Building 1 would be set behind the line to the nearest property, 48 Church End and set considerably further into the centre of the application site to increase the separation distance. This together with the proposed enhanced landscaping to the front of the site would improve the outlook.

20 Church End is to the immediate south. Following the various permissions granted and the extensive redevelopment it is noted that the three closest habitable rooms facing the application site, are two bedrooms and one living room. However this first floor level is set approximately 17m away from the southern elevation of building 2. The third storey element of building 2 is set to the back and would not directly face this property. Therefore given the limited number of windows and the separation distance it is considered that the outlook and privacy from this property would not be so significant to merit grounds for objecting overall to the proposal.

The residential properties on the Prince of Wales Close to the south are off-set and do not directly overlook building 3 which is the nearest block. Building 4 is also over 21m away to the west of these properties and would be provided screening from the existing and proposed trees.

Properties on Fuller Street are to the north east of building 3 however these are over 21m away. Finally although clearly not a residential property, St Mary's School to the north east of building 1 is also over 20m away. Therefore it is considered there are no residential properties within the vicinity which would be adversely affected by the proposal.

Daylight/Sunlight

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' (2011).

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.

A Daylight/Sunlight Report has been prepared by GL Hearn in support of the proposed development. The daylight and sunlighting has been assessed to 15 of the neighbouring properties. This include the assessment of residential accommodation and buildings of special purpose, on Church Terrace, Fuller St, Prince of Wales Close, Church End and Church Road.

Daylighting has been assessed 271 windows using the Vertical Sky Component. 268 windows will achieve BRE compliance, which equates to a 99% pass rate. Sunlighting to the properties has been assessed using Annual Probable Sunlight Hours and 137 windows have been assessed. Annually 137 windows achieve the levels

recommended in the BRE. During winter months 137 windows achieve BRE compliance. This equates to a pass rate of 100% annually and 98% during winter.

The report concludes that the proposed development would not materially affect the adjoining properties' daylight and sunlight amenity. Based on the high level of compliance the proposed development is considered acceptable.

Noise

A Noise Impact Assessment was produced by GL Hearn (see report for full assessment and details of proposed mitigations). The site is considered suitable for the proposed development with respect to environmental noise levels provided that plant noise emissions are controlled.

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 existing area and residential character of the wider area. The accompanying 'Noise and Vibration' chapter within the Environmental Statement covers the effects of noise and vibration during both construction and operation of the proposals at the MC site. This identifies potential adverse impacts however through mitigation and the imposition of appropriate conditions this would be considered acceptable.

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.

In considering the potential impact to neighbours, conditions are recommended to ensuring that any plant or machinery associated with the development achieves required noise levels for residential environment. The council's environmental health team have also recommended appropriately worded conditions for noise reporting and impact mitigation, extract and ventilation equipment and plant noise. It should be noted that any excessive or unreasonable noise is covered by the Environmental Protection Act 1990.

Air Quality

An Air Quality Assessment was produced by GL Hearn and an air quality neutral assessment has been undertaken in line with GLA guidance. The assessment concluded that the Development is expected to be Air Quality Neutral in terms of both building and transport emissions.

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.

The councils environmental health team conclude the air quality report is acceptable, and it states that mitigation is required to control dust emissions, therefore the appropriate condition should be included. The report states that dust will be negligible, however due to surrounding premises which include vulnerable people,

(at Prince of Wales, St Mary's and St John's CE School and at Happy Journeys day nursery) dust monitoring should be carried out. Data should be readily available to view should any complaints arise. Therefore suitable conditions will be added.

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.

The application was accompanied with a Transport Assessment which has been reviewed by the council's transport highway officers who have provided detailed comments as set out below.

Existing Conditions

Based on TfL's WebCAT tool the site PTAL value varies between 1b and 3 which indicates poor to average levels of accessibility. Taking this into account, measures that seek to improve the public transport accessibility and active travel credentials of the site should be a priority in order to deliver a sustainable development in transport terms.

The TA suggests that the site's PTAL value is 4 and therefore the site has a good level of accessibility. The current Transport For London (TfL) PTAL calculation do not take into account all the buses in the area and the applicant has undertaken additional PTAL calculations (included within the appendices) accounting for all the bus routes and that Hendon Central is within a walkable distance. LBB officers agree that the WebCAT tool is potentially underestimating public transport convenience in this location given the very close proximity to the PTAL 4 boundaries.

The site is occupied by community and health land uses which are planned to be re-located to the Ravensfield and Fenella site and to be assessed / determined separately. For example, the PDSA is planned to move into the Fuller Street car park site which is subject to a separate application.

Baseline Transport Data

The nature of the development is to provide student accommodation near to the existing University campus. There will be no net increase in the total number of students at the University. As existing students travel to the University including from Wembley, where there is an existing halls of residence and will close, the development will reduce the number of students travelling and therefore reduce the use of tube, rail and bus. An analysis of TfL's bus usage data from the 2018 Bus Origin Destination Surveys (BODS) has confirmed that there is spare capacity along the selected bus routes including the 183, 240 and 326 through Hendon.

The Personal Injury Accident (PIA) review that has been provided is based on the 'Crashmap' database and therefore does not provide sufficient details as to the exact nature of the incidents and possibly does not contain the most current data. The TA concludes that 'the data does not suggest that there are any safety issues that need to be taken account of and resolved as part of the re-development proposed for the site.' LBB cannot verify this based on available data and have requested a more detailed PIA review. This is being undertaken and will be included with the results of the Active Travel Zone healthy streets assessment.

Proposed Development

The planning application seeks to provide the following:

- 181 student accommodation units;
- 33 shared living accommodation units;
- Community space (125 sqm); and
- Health and Wellbeing Centre (Class E, 470 sqm).

The applicant has confirmed that the student accommodation units are all single bedrooms. The shared living accommodation is for "assisted" living and they are not expected to generate parking demand.

Car Parking

It is proposed to provide 7 accessible (disabled) vehicle parking spaces plus 6 standard vehicle spaces with no restrictions. The accessible spaces are located three on the east side of Church Terrace in front of Building 3; there are three spaces perpendicular to Church Terrace to the east of Building 1; and one final space on the southern end of the row of seven parking spaces (the other six being standard) located on the northern edge close and north of Building 1.

The provision of disabled parking spaces (for all land uses) and electric vehicle charging points (20% active and remaining passive) in accordance with the London Plan should be conditioned.

The proposed low levels of parking would only be supported by the LB Barnet Transport Team subject to the following:

- Satisfactorily provision of sustainable transport and active travel measures / improvements;
- Implementation of a Travel Plan (to be conditioned);
- Protection of the local amenity from overspill parking via review / expansion of the Controlled Parking Scheme (CPZ);

- Residents of the development should be prevented from applying for on-street parking permits; and
- Implementation of a Parking Design and Management Plan (to be conditioned).

It is proposed for students to sign an agreement in their accommodation contracts preventing them from bringing cars into the University campus. Students would also not be able to apply for permits within the CPZ area. These measures would need to be appropriately secured.

The site is currently located within a CPZ (Monday-Friday 10am to 5pm and 11am to 3pm in other areas). However, the hours of control do not cover the general peak periods of residential parking demand. Therefore, there is concern that the proposed development with low on-site car parking provision would have potential for overspill parking onto the surrounding road network resulting a negative impact on the local amenity.

It is considered that the proposed development should help enable a review / expansion of the CPZ scheme in order to address the above concerns. LBB to request for a financial contribution towards a CPZ review / upgrade (secured via s106 agreement).

The development seeks to result in nil-detriment to parking availability within the local area (i.e. any lost parking spaces as a result of the development will be re-provided close by). The development shall result in 10 parking spaces being lost. It is proposed to provide 11 new parking spaces along the Prince of Wales Close. A fully dimensioned plan should be provided showing the existing parking spaces to be lost and the location of the proposed spaces.

A review of Traffic Orders in relation to on-street parking bays and prevention of on-street servicing / loading should also be undertaken and secured through the formal legal agreement.

Cycle Parking

The proposed levels of cycle parking proposed does not appear to comply with the minimum standards set out within the London Plan (e.g. student accommodation 0.75 long-stay spaces per bedroom plus 1 short-stay space per 40 bedrooms). Cycle provision should cover all land used proposed not just the proposed living accommodation.

Details of cycle parking provision / facilities should be in accordance with the London Plan and London Cycle Design Standards. There is capacity both within the site and within the wider university campus for cycle parking. Therefore this requirement can safely be controlled by way of a condition, which can be added.

General Layout

Whilst details of the proposed layout have been submitted further details are required. Thus, notwithstanding the details submitted, fully dimensioned layout plans, car parking layout plans, swept path analysis etc. shall be secured by condition for submission prior to construction.

The applicant has confirmed that no new sections are being given up to become adopted highway and there are no Stopping up applications, however there are some changes to access arrangements to some of the sites. For example, the small five-space car park adjacent to 13-21 Prince of Wales Close will be removed as part of the 10 parking spaces being lost and 11 new ones provided.

Healthy Streets Assessment/ATZ

A detailed Active Travel Zone assessment of the key walking and cycling corridors surrounding the Development is being undertaken by the applicants. Proposed improvements within reasonable distance from the site will be included within the s.106 agreement for funding contributions towards their implementation. This is in line with LBB and TfL sustainable travel policies and future mode share targets.

Trip Generation and Impact Assessment

The TA confirms the TRICS database has been used to undertake an assessment of the potential vehicle trip generation of both the existing and proposed developments, a full breakdown of the different land uses is also provided at Appendix E. Comparing Table 7.1 (existing) to Table 7.3 (proposed) the development would generate more person trips than the existing; 670 compared to 509 during the course of the day, which would be expected as the site currently has limited residential facilities. The TA states that the analysis undertaken using TRICS shows that there is expected to be a decrease in vehicle trips. In the AM it is predicted that there will be 9 less two-way vehicle trips and in the PM, there is likely to be 23 less two-way trips as shown in Table 7.2 and Table 7.4.

However the full TRICS output reports and the selection process / criteria used to identify comparable sites should be clearly set out for review purposes (this applies to both existing and proposed land uses). Therefore highway officers have requested further details in order to clarify this data.

Travel Plan

A Framework Travel Plan has been produced; Barnet transport Officers require that a more ambitious target for should be set to further encourage uptake of sustainable travel modes. The current plan targets of an increase of 5% in public transport use and 5% decrease in car use are insufficient, and is therefore recommended to review the targets, measures and action in the Travel Plan ensuring it would be aimed to achieve the Mayor's Strategic Target of 80% trips to be made by sustainable transport modes. Details to be included of exact measures and expected time scale to achieve the targets.

The applicant shall therefore secure the final Travel Plan by s106 agreement accordingly.

Car Parking Design and Management Plan

A Car Parking Design and Management Plan should be conditioned as part of the planning consent. This would detail how car parking will be designed and how they are to be controlled / managed. Details should also be included relating to the new blended working arrangements.

Delivery and Servicing Management Plan / Refuse Collection Strategy

Details of servicing, delivery and refuse arrangements for all land uses proposed is also required. This should be supported by swept path analysis with plans demonstrating trolleying distance compliance in relation to refuse collection. The swept path analysis should show vehicles being able to successfully pass standing refuse / delivery vehicles at locations that appear to be geometrically constrained. The swept paths of the large delivery vehicles entering / leaving each of the access points should be provided.

All servicing / delivery requirements should be accommodated within the confines of the site as opposed to relying on the public highway.

A Delivery and Servicing Management Plan should be conditioned as part of the planning consent. The maximum size of vehicles anticipated to use the site should be confirmed and controlled via a Delivery and Servicing Management Plan.

Construction

A Construction Logistics Plan (CLP) along with a Construction Worker Travel Plan (CWTP) should be conditioned as part of the planning consent. This should take into account the cumulative impacts of works in the surrounding area.

The following Heads of Terms are therefore required:

- Contribution for measures identified in ATZ/PIA review
- Contribution for local Cycle lanes identified by LBB Highways
- Contribution to improve pedestrian pinch-points along the Burroughs
- Travel Plan with robust targets demonstrating commitment to London plan mode share targets
- Parking Permits Restrictions
- CPZ Monitoring
- Travel Plan Monitoring
- All Highway Works associated with the development to be provided via s.278 Agreement

The following conditions are also required:

- A Servicing and Delivery Plan
- A Construction Logistics Plan
- Car Park Management Plan
- Refuse & Recycling Strategy
- EVCP provision to London Plan Standards
- Cycle Parking to London Plan Standards for all uses
- Prior to commencement of the development dimensions of parking arrangements and swept path analysis to be submitted and agreed with the planning authority
- Prior to the commencement of the development, details of any highways to be stopped under Section 247 of the Town and Country Planning Act shall be submitted to and agreed with the Local Planning Authority.

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 key landscape design proposals for the Meritage and Church End site can be split into two categories, public access and semi private areas. The key focal point is a large, flexibly designed public square that sits at the heart of the former Meritage centre site. The square is designed to incorporate the existing mature trees at the western boundary of the site and also maintain and improve upon the existing pedestrian connection running east to west.

An Arboricultural Impact Assessment has been submitted with the planning application. This stipulates that the development results in the removal of 8 trees (3 moderate quality and 5 low quality under the BS), and the retention of the trees on the frontage of Church End and along the boundaries and open space near the site. One tree is recommended for removal due to its condition. There will be new planting along the new buildings and car parks to create softening and screening, canopy cover and ecosystem services. This results in a net gain of 42 trees.

These details have been reviewed by the councils Arboriculturalist who has confirmed the principle as set out is acceptable. However the value of the trees to be removed is required using the CAVAT value (appropriate valuation system) and set out how this has been accounted for through replacement tree planting.

Meritage Centre

This proposal retains the important birch trees at the front of the development on Church End/Grey Hound Hill. 6 trees will be removed to facilitate the proposal, 1 x cat B and x 5 cat C trees growing close to 28 & 30 Church End, due to their proximity to this building they are not suitable for special protection. Subject to compensation, the loss is considered acceptable.

Nos. 2-6 Church Terrace

Previously approved applications at the Nos. 2-6 Church Terrace ref 19/5483/FUL have a similar impact on the row of pine trees. Subject to an acceptable arboricultural method statement and tree protection plan this scheme is acceptable.

13 to 21 Prince of Wales Drive

The facilitate the development at 13 to 21 Prince of Wales Drive x 2 cat B trees field maple and a whitebeam (T59 & T60). These trees have considerable visual amenity as they are the first trees to be sighted on entering the estate. Compensation for the loss of these trees in the long term compensate for the reduction in amenity value.

The proposal also results in a 53.45% on-site Net Gain in Biodiversity.

There are no arboricultural reasons to object to this application, subject to the acceptable level of compensation in accordance with policies London Plan G7. The development is in accordance with planning policy DM01, DM16 and Policy G6 and G7 of the London Plan.

In addition officers also note that details and specifications are also important along the eastern perimeter edge which adjoins the existing residential area to the east. Therefore it agreed that the details should be secured through conditions including for example a comprehensive landscape and ecological management plan.

Ecology

The Council's Ecology Consultants have reviewed the submitted Environmental Statement and Preliminary Ecology Appraisal. Their comments are set out below.

There is 1 statutory site within 2km; Brent Reservoir Welsh Harp SSSI and LNR is 1.3km south west. We are satisfied that the site will not be affected by the proposal and that the evidence provided by the applicant is sufficient to address potential impacts and implications on biodiversity receptors. The site is within the IRZ of Brent Reservoir/ Welsh Harp but does not fall within the criteria of consultation with Natural England.

The scheme also falls near 14 local sites of nature conservation interest however, these are separated functionally by the urban environment; therefore, impacts are considered negligible. However, woodland is located to the north of the scheme and should be protected throughout the development in line with BS5837:2012 Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction.

Bats

The bat report states that "The Meritage Centre and Hendon PDSA Pet Hospital buildings have potential to support bat roosts. However, no bats emerged from the buildings during emergence surveys, therefore no further consideration into roosting bats is required".

If at any time following the start of demolition works, a bat roost or evidence of a bat roost is observed, all work would need to cease until a suitably licensed bat ecologist has been consulted and advice sought on how best to proceed under current laws and legislation. Where a bat roost is identified, destruction of the roost would usually need to be covered by a European Protected Species (EPS) Licence obtained from Natural England. The planning authority would need to have sight of any mitigation strategy developed for a licence application in order to address their obligations under The Habitats and Species Conservation Regulations 2018 (as amended).

If demolition is delayed for more than one-year after the date of the bat survey (July 2021), repeat bat surveys should be undertaken.

Nesting birds

Trees and scrub are likely to contain nesting birds between 1st March and 31st August inclusive. Trees and scrub are present on the application site and are to be assumed to contain nesting birds between the above dates, unless a recent survey has been undertaken by a competent ecologist to assess the nesting bird activity on site during this period and has shown it is absolutely certain that nesting birds are not present.

Hedgehogs and other mammals

Vegetation clearance should be undertaken in a sensitive manner to allow terrestrial mammals to disperse. Any excavations that need to be left overnight should be covered/fitted with mammal ramps to ensure that any animals that enter can safely

escape. Any open pipework with an outside diameter of greater than 120 mm must be covered at the end of each workday to prevent animals entering/becoming trapped or ensnared.

Proposed Planning Permission Conditions

Lighting

Please attach a condition on lighting strategy that it must be designed and used to minimise impacts on bats and their insect food. All exterior lighting should follow the guidance of the Bat Conservation Trust. Current (June 2014) advice is at <http://www.bats.org.uk/>. The lighting strategy should be submitted to the LPA for approval.

Biodiversity Enhancement Recommendations

In line with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF 2021) in aiming to achieve sustainable development and the obligations on public bodies to conserve and enhance biodiversity as required by the Natural Environment and Rural Communities (NERC) Act 2006 please ensure that the Biodiversity Enhancement Recommendations in Section 5.5.1 are adhered to and enforced through a suitably worded condition or conditions.

We note that the scheme has also entered into the BREEAM Scheme and as such the LEMP under LE05 should be sufficient to inform operations and management on the scheme for the next 5 years onwards.

Accordingly it is considered that the proposal is acceptable in ecological terms and appropriate details can be secured via conditions.

Archaeology

The development boundary falls within an identified 'Local Areas of Special Archaeological Significance'. A Desk-Based Archaeology Assessment was produced to identify the archaeological potential of deposits on the application site and consider the proposed scheme's likely impact on them.

Accordingly, The Greater London Archaeological Advisory Service (GLAAS) was consulted on this application and they have confirmed there are no objections and have requested a two-stage archaeological condition which could provide an acceptable safeguard. This will therefore be included.

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 Statement prepared by Capita. The proposed strategy follows a best practice approach, based on the Mayor of London's Energy Hierarchy. The supporting Energy Statement outlines the energy strategy which is predicted to achieve a 82% site-wide saving in CO2 emissions based on the modelling completed. The remaining 18% reduction of CO2 emissions shall be off-set by a cash in-lieu payment to the London Borough of Barnet, based on £95 per Tonne per annum over 30 years. This amounts to 1,065 Tonnes CO2, which shall therefore be off-set by a carbon off-set contribution of £101,175.

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 technical note has been prepared by Capita in support of the proposal. The report confirms the site is assessed to have very low risk of fluvial, surface water, ground water, and sewer flooding. As the site is located in Flood Zone 1, and is not identified as being at risk of flooding, the impact to the proposals and potential impact to third party receptors as a result of the proposed development is considered to be negligible.

In addition a Drainage Strategy prepared by Capita has also been provided. In accordance with the requirements of NPPF (National Planning Policy Framework), and accompanying Planning Practice Guidance, a review of the development site was undertaken for the use of suitable SuDS techniques. The sustainable drainage systems hierarchy identified and outlined in The London Plan (2021), Chapter 9, Policy SI 13, requires that an assessment for the drainage proposals has been conducted. In this instance, attenuating the rainwater for gradual release via the use

of below ground geo-cellular storage tanks is to be adopted for the development, with appropriate run-off rates. The proposed attenuation tanks are to be located beneath the soft landscape area for blocks 1-2 and beneath the hardstanding areas around block 3 and block 4.

The Drainage Strategy and details have been reviewed by all the council's drainage and flood consultants. The council's drainage team have confirmed that the proposed details are acceptable in principle and therefore the 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 all relevant chargeable developments.

5. Planning Benefits and Balance

As stated earlier, after an assessment of the proposed development, Officers find that less than substantial harm will be caused to the designated heritage assets. Taking all matters into consideration, officers views are that the new buildings would at the least preserve the character and appearance of this part of the Conservation Area. Although some minor harm would result from the loss of no.28 Church End as a positive contributor to the conservation area, this will clearly be less than substantial harm and should therefore be weighed against all the public benefits that outweigh that harm. In accordance with Barnet policy DM06 and paragraph 201 of the NPPF, the harm should be weighed against the public benefits.

The heritage benefits of the scheme which have been identified are:

- The removal of the existing Meritage Centre building itself.
- The removal of buildings outside the conservation area but that detract from its setting.
- Replacement buildings outside the conservation area that enhances the setting of CA.
- Enhancements to the permeability and landscaping of the site.
- Opening up views of Parish Church of St Mary (Grade II* Listed) from Church End (benefitting both the setting of the church and the conservation area directly)
- Public realm improvements

The Hendon Hub Project aims to bring a number of benefits, the proposed benefits of the scheme and the weight attributed to each is set out below:

- Optimisation of brownfield site delivering 181 student units with 50% affordable and 33 shared and supported units with 100% affordable (equal to 72.4 conventional housing units).
- Maximising the reuse of previously developed land for housing and social infrastructure – as part of the wider regeneration project.
- As part of the wider of regeneration project, significantly enhanced teaching space and ancillary facilities. The University is one of Barnet's largest employers, employing c.1,500 local and London-based staff.
- Re-providing improved community space and allowing for the release of site for redevelopment.
- 100% 'affordable' purpose-built supported accommodation.
- Enhanced landscaping across the whole masterplan area.
- 53.45% on-site Net Gain in Biodiversity (National Government target 10%).
- S106 contributions
- Economic effects on local and regional economy during construction and operational use, e.g. job creation, wages etc.
- Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) contributions to improve local infrastructure.

6. Conclusion of Planning Balance

For the reasons given in the assessment sections above, it is identified that there would be less than substantial harm to the significance of the designated heritage assets which although of a limited nature has nonetheless been given considerable weight by officers. Large levels of pre-application meetings and community consultation was undertaken prior to the submission of the application which heavily focused on heritage and design including the public realm and landscaping. A detailed submission has been provided in respect to these elements which seeks to appropriately integrate the proposed development within the specific site constraints,

existing character of the site and surrounding area including the context of the nearby conservation area.

In this case there would be a package of benefits that would arise from the development which have been attributed substantial and moderate weight. With limited weight applied only to the financial benefits. In accordance with the NPPF it is considered that the overall package of these public benefits is of considerable and substantial importance and that it would clearly outweigh the less than substantial harm that would arise through the proposed development.

As stated above, in arriving at this planning judgement officers have had fully in mind the requirements of sections 66(1) and s.72(1) of the P(LBCA)A 1990, by which Parliament intended that the desirability of preserving the settings of listed buildings and conservation areas should not simply be given careful consideration but "considerable importance and weight" when carrying out the balancing exercise. This gives rise to a strong statutory presumption against granting planning permission for development which would cause (any) harm to the settings of listed buildings or the settings of conservation areas, even where the harm would be "less than substantial" the balancing exercise cannot ignore the overarching statutory duties imposed by sections 66(1) and s.72(1).

In the present instance, officers have attached considerable importance and weight to the section 66(1) and s.72(1) duties when carrying out this assessment and have found that having regard to the less than substantial harm caused (as identified above) to heritage assets any presumption against the grant of consent has been clearly displaced by the substantial public benefits arising from the proposal.

Therefore, subject to mitigation, measures relating to design, character and appearance, landscaping, highways, noise, contamination, air quality, transport impacts and sustainability will be secured via S106 obligations and relevant conditions.

7. 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 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. 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. Officers conclude that the proposed development will overall contribute to the objective set out in section 149 and there is no adverse equality impact from this development.

Overall, it is not thought that any of the protected characteristics are majorly negatively affected. It is considered that the majority of vulnerable groups are impacted positively to some extent, including: disability, pregnancy/maternity, gender reassignment, and race/ethnicity. A significant number of mitigations and adjustments have been made to the scheme since then to accommodate for concerns regarding equalities and from consultation feedback. These include:

- Reduction in student accommodation unit numbers by 26%
- Introduction of additional placemaking improvements improving lighting and quality of space, and further service provisions, including a healthcare service and a potential Safer Neighbourhoods Team base
- CPZ and parking restrictions for new student population (introduced for non-disabled students only)
- DDA compliance of buildings, with 10% of accommodation provided being disability-friendly
- Removal of 2 car parks from the scheme with no overall net loss in parking
- Introduction of gender-neutral toilets in public space
- Relocation of community uses to a more prominent community hub on the RFC site

The African Cultural Association (ACA), Meridian and the community hall are proposed to be relocated to a community hub that is to be located approximately 0.3 miles away from their existing facilities, on the RFC site. The time to walk from the existing to the proposed facility is likely to be circa 6 minutes for a person without mobility issues. The new facilities will be located adjacent to the proposed library building and will occupy a prominent location on The Burroughs. The Citizens Advice Bureau (CAB) will also be located in the same 'community hub' on the RFC site.

The MENCAP unit is proposed to be relocated to 154 Station Road, Hendon, which is a council-owned building located approximately 0.6 miles away from their current facility on the Meritage Centre (a circa 14 minute walk for a person without mobility issues, or a 5 minute drive). MENCAP have a proposed change in service offer that this building will better facilitate. The applicant's team have been working with MENCAP on this relocation site.

The proposed library would move across the road on The Burroughs circa 110 yards away (a circa 2-minute walk away for a person without mobility issues). It would occupy the ground floor of the new building and would include an improved disabled access, better planned space to take into account equalities for all users with the addition of 100 sqm for the use of the community and local groups.

As a result, the cumulative impact of the scheme is thought to be slightly positive from an equalities perspective. In this regard account has been taken of the impact on older people (65+), disabled persons and other persons of restricted mobility and other protected characteristics. The impact on these groups is considered minimal, due to the close proximity of the proposed siting of the new facilities, including the library, to the existing facilities (i.e. across the road), the position of no net reduction in car spaces across the Hendon Hub Estate, the provision of disabled blue badge parking on site and the fact that the proposed replacement facilities including the proposed library will be provided in a modern fit for purpose building complying with modern standards including for disabled access.

Existing users of the Hendon Hub Estate facilities such as the Residents' forums, African Culture Association, Citizen's advice Bureau, and the Chinese Mental Health Association will continue to be open across the remainder of the development period and will be provided with equally commodious new replacement facilities of greater floorspace than their existing facilities as a result of the redevelopment.

Many of the community uses will as a result of the development gain larger premises as set out in paragraph 2.3 above.

It is also noted that the applicant has submitted an Equalities Impact Assessment (EQIA) in support of the application and advised that this document will be kept under constant review and updated throughout the lifecycle of the Hendon Hub development to manage Equalities considerations.

Officers conclude that there is no adverse equality impact from this application. 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. Officers conclude that the proposed development will overall contribute to the objective of the legislation

Officers conclude that there is no adverse equality impact from this application. 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. Officers conclude that the proposed development will overall contribute to the objective of the legislation

In addition, officers have also considered the proposal in terms of the HRA 1998 and in particular, articles 2 (right to education), 8 (respect for home and family life) and 14

(non discrimination) of the ECHR. Officers consider that granting planning for this development proposal would not breach of the HRA 1998.

8. **Crime and Disorder**

Section 17 of the CDA requires local authorities to consider the crime and disorder implications of their decision. As specified earlier in this report, the crime prevention officer of the metropolitan police was consulted on this application and responded advising that the application has taken designing out crime into account in the design of the proposal. The Secured by Design Officer raises no objections to the proposal subject to appropriate conditions and the applicant securing final secured by design accreditation. These matters have therefore been carefully considered and are secured by condition to ensure the proposal is in full accordance with Section 17 of the CDA.

9. **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. There are no material considerations against the proposal which would outweigh the presumption in favour of the grant of planning permission. 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 in Appendix HR1.

APPENDIX HR1 – 21/4722/FUL

CONDITION(S) and INFORMATIVES

1. This development must be begun within three years from the date of this permission.

Reason: To comply with Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

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

P_S1_500_01	Site Redline Plan
P_S1_500_09	Site Plan
P_S1_500_10	Ground Floor Masterplan
P_S1_500_20	Street Elevations
P_S1_B1_500_10	Block 1 + 2 Ground Floor Plan
P_S1_B1_500_11	Block 1 + 2 First Floor Plan
P_S1_B1_500_12	Block 1 + 2 Second Floor Plan
P_S1_B1_500_13	Block 1 + 2 Third Floor Plan
P_S1_B1_500_20	Block 1 Elevations
P_S1_B1_500_21	Block 1 Elevations
P_S1_B1_500_30	Block 1 Sections
P_S1_B1_500_40	Block 1 + 2 Typical Bay (1)
P_S1_B1_500_41	Block 1 + 2 Typical Bay (2)
P_S1_B2_500_20	Block 2 Elevations
P_S1_B2_500_21	Block 2 Elevations
P_S1_B2_500_30	Block 2 Sections
P_S1_B3_500_10	Block 3 Ground Floor Plan
P_S1_B3_500_11	Block 3 First Floor Plan
P_S1_B3_500_12	Block 3 Second Floor Plan
P_S1_B3_500_13	Block 3 Third Floor Plan
P_S1_B3_500_14	Block 3 Fourth Floor Plan
P_S1_B3_500_20	Block 3 Elevations
P_S1_B3_500_21	Block 3 Elevations
P_S1_B3_500_30	Block 3 Sections
P_S1_B3_500_40	Block 3 Typical Bay
P_S1_B4_500_10	Block 4 Ground Floor Plan
P_S1_B4_500_11	Block 4 First Floor Plan
P_S1_B4_500_12	Block 4 Second Floor Plan
P_S1_B4_500_13	Block 4 Third Floor Plan
P_S1_B4_500_14	Block 4 Fourth Floor Plan
P_S1_B4_500_20	Block 4 Elevations
P_S1_B4_500_21	Block 4 Elevations
P_S1_B4_500_30	Block 4 Sections
P_S1_B4_500_40	Block 4 Typical Bay

HHMC-GLH-00-XX-DR-LA-1000 External Works - GA Plan
HHMC-GLH-00-XX-DR-LA-1001 External Works - Soft Landscape Proposals
HHMC-GLH-00-XX-DR-LA-1002 External Works - Tree Felling & Retention Plan

P_S1_500_70 Existing Site Plan
P_S1_500_71 Existing Street Elevations
P_S1_500_72 Existing Elevations Meritage Centre
P_S1_500_73 Existing Elevations Meritage Centre
P_S1_500_74 Existing Elevations - Church End
P_S1_500_75 Existing Elevations - Church End
P_S1_500_76 Existing Elevations - Church End
P_S1_500_77 Existing Elevations - Church Terrace

P_S1_500_80 Extent of Demolitions - Site Plan

Supporting Documents:

- Design and Access Statement
- A Heritage, Townscape and Visual Impact Assessment
- Drainage Strategy (SuDs) and Foul Water Assessment
- Energy Report
- Breeam Pre-assessment (Meritage Site Respite Day Centre)
- Breeam Pre-assessment (Meritage Site GP Surgery)
- Breeam Pre-assessment (Meritage Student Accommodation)
- DN06 Shared Living Accommodation Adaptive Thermal Comfort Report
- DN06 Student Adaptive Thermal Comfort Report
- GLA Carbon Emissions Reporting Spreadsheet for MC site
- External Lighting Statement
- Utility Infrastructure Report
- Ventilation Planning Statement
- Noise Report
- Arboricultural Impact Assessment Report
- Air Quality Assessment
- Daylight and Sunlight Report
- Daylight and Sunlight Report (within the Development)
- Flood Risk Summary Rev.2
- Geo-Environmental Desk Study Rev.2
- Phase 2 Ground Investigation and Assessment
- Circular Economy Statement
- Fire Strategy Report
- Fire Statement
- Consultation Report
- Desk Based Archaeology Assessment
- Noise Impact Assessment
- Health Impact Assessment
- Ecological Appraisal Report
- Transport Assessment
- Environmental Statement

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning and so as to ensure that the development is carried out fully in accordance with the plans as assessed in accordance with Policies CS NPPF and CS1 of the Local Plan Core Strategy DPD (adopted

September 2012) and Policy DM01 of the Local Plan Development Management Policies DPD (adopted September 2012).

3. a) No development shall take place until details of the levels of the building(s), road(s) and footpath(s) in relation to the adjoining land and highway(s) and any other changes proposed in the levels of the site have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

b) The development shall thereafter be implemented in accordance with the details as approved under this condition and retained as such thereafter.

Reason: To ensure that the development is carried out at suitable levels in relation to the highway and adjoining land having regard to drainage, gradient of access, the safety and amenities of users of the site, the amenities of the area and the health of any trees or vegetation in accordance with policies CS NPPF, CS1, CS5 and CS7 of the Local Plan Core Strategy (adopted September 2012), Policies DM01, DM04 and DM17 of the Development Management Policies DPD (adopted September 2012), and Policies D4, D5, D8 and G7 of the London Plan 2021.

4. a) A scheme of hard and soft landscaping, including details of existing trees to be retained and size, species, planting heights, densities and positions of any soft landscaping, shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to the occupation of the hereby approved development.

b) All work comprised in the approved scheme of landscaping shall be carried out before the end of the first planting and seeding season following occupation of any part of the buildings or completion of the development, whichever is sooner, or commencement of the use.

c) Any existing tree shown to be retained or trees or shrubs to be planted as part of the approved landscaping scheme which are removed, die, become severely damaged or diseased within five years of the completion of development shall be replaced with trees or shrubs of appropriate size and species in the next planting season.

Reason: To ensure a satisfactory appearance to the development in accordance with Policies CS5 and CS7 of the Local Plan Core Strategy DPD (adopted September 2012), Policy DM01 of the Development Management Policies DPD (adopted September 2012), the Sustainable Design and Construction SPD (adopted October 2016) and The London Plan 2021.

5. a) No development shall take place until details of the location, extent and depth of all excavations for services (including but not limited to electricity, gas, water, drainage and telecommunications) in relation to trees on and adjacent to the site have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

b) The development shall thereafter be implemented in accordance with details approved under this condition.

Reason: To safeguard the health of existing tree(s) which represent an important amenity feature in accordance with CS5 and CS7 of the Local Plan Core Strategy (adopted September 2012), Policy DM01 of the Development Management Policies DPD (adopted September 2012) and The London Plan 2021.

6. a) No site works or development (including any temporary enabling works, site clearance and demolition) shall take place until a dimensioned tree protection plan in accordance with Section 5.5 and a method statement detailing precautions to minimise damage to trees in accordance with Section 6.1 of British Standard BS5837: 2012 (Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction - Recommendations) have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

b) No site works (including any temporary enabling works, site clearance and demolition) or development shall take place until the temporary tree protection shown on the tree protection plan approved under this condition has been erected around existing trees on site. This protection shall remain in position until after the development works are completed and no material or soil shall be stored within these fenced areas at any time. The development shall be implemented in accordance with the protection plan and method statement as approved under this condition.

Reason: To safeguard the health of existing trees which represent an important amenity feature in accordance with Policy DM01 of the Development Management Policies DPD (adopted September 2012), Policies CS5 and CS7 of the Local Plan Core Strategy DPD (adopted September 2012) and The London Plan 2021.

7. a) Prior to the occupation of the hereby approved development, details of a Landscape and Ecological Management Plan for all landscaped areas for a minimum period of 25 years have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

b) The Landscape and Ecological Management Plan shall include details of long term design objectives, management responsibilities, maintenance schedules and replacement planting provisions for existing retained trees and any new soft landscaping to be planted as part of the approved landscaping scheme.

c) The approved Landscape Management Plan shall be implemented in full in accordance with details approved under this condition.

Reason: To ensure a satisfactory appearance to the development in accordance with Policy DM01 of the Development Management Policies DPD (adopted September 2012), Policies CS5 and CS7 of the Local Plan Core Strategy (adopted September 2012) and The London Plan 2021.

8. Before the development hereby permitted commences, the applicant shall submit for approval details of measures to improve biodiversity on the site as set out within Preliminary Ecological Appraisal Report August 2021 clause 5.5 Biodiversity Enhancements.

This shall be in accordance with guidance set out within BS42040:2013: Biodiversity – Code of practice for planning and development, and guidance documents provided by the Chartered Institute of Ecology and Environmental Management (CIEEM) and the Royal Town Planning Institute (RTPI) for approval. The development shall be implemented in full accordance with these details.

Reason: Pursuant to section 197 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 in accordance with local planning policy DM01. Policies CS5 and CS7 of the Local Plan Core Strategy DPD (adopted September 2012) and Policy G6 and G7 of the London Plan 2021.

9. a) No development or site works shall take place on site until a 'Demolition and Construction Management and Logistics Plan' has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The Demolition and Construction Management and Logistics Plan submitted shall include, but not be limited to, the following:

- i. details of the routing of construction vehicles to the site, hours of access, access and egress arrangements within the site and security procedures;
- ii. site preparation and construction stages of the development;
- iii. details of provisions for recycling of materials, the provision on site of a storage/delivery area for all plant, site huts, site facilities and materials;
- iv. details showing how all vehicles associated with the construction works are properly washed and cleaned to prevent the passage to mud and dirt onto the adjoining highway;
- v. the methods to be used and the measures to be undertaken to control the emission of dust, noise and vibration arising from construction works;
- vi. Dust Management Plan – to ensure suitable and efficient means of suppressing dust, including the adequate containment of stored or accumulated material so as to prevent it becoming airborne at any time and giving rise to nuisance;
- vii. noise mitigation measures for all plant and processors;
- viii. details of contractors compound and car parking arrangements;
- ix. details of interim car parking management arrangements for the duration of construction;
- x. details of a community liaison contact for the duration of all works associated with the development.

For major sites, the Statement shall be informed by the findings of the assessment of the air quality impacts of construction and demolition phases of the development.

b) The development shall thereafter be implemented in accordance with the measures detailed within the statement.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety, noise and good air quality in accordance with Policies DM04 and DM17 of the Development Management Policies DPD (adopted September 2012), the Sustainable Design and Construction SPD (adopted October 2016) and Policies SI 1, SI 7, D14 and T7 of the London Plan 2021.

10. All Non-Road Mobile Machinery (NRMM) of net power of 37kW and up to and including 560kW used during the course of the demolition, site preparation and construction phases shall comply with the emission standards set out in chapter 7 of the GLA's supplementary planning guidance "Control of Dust and Emissions During Construction and Demolition" dated July 2014 (SPG), or subsequent guidance.

Unless it complies with the standards set out in the SPG, no NRMM shall be on site, at any time, whether in use or not, without the prior written consent of the local planning authority.

The developer shall keep an up to date list of all NRMM used during the demolition, site preparation and construction phases of the development on the online register at <https://nrmm.london/>

Reason: In the interest of good air quality in accordance with London Plan 2021.

11. Part 1 - Before development commences other than for investigative work:

a) A desktop study (Preliminary Risk Assessment) shall be carried out which shall include the identification of previous uses, potential contaminants that might be expected, given those uses, and other relevant information. Using this information, a diagrammatical representation (Conceptual Model) for the site of all potential contaminant sources, pathways and receptors shall be produced. The desktop study (Preliminary Risk Assessment) and Conceptual Model shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority. If the desktop study and Conceptual Model indicate no risk of harm, development shall not commence until approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

b) If the desktop study and Conceptual Model indicate any risk of harm, a site investigation shall be designed for the site using information obtained from the desktop study and Conceptual Model. This shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority prior to that investigation being carried out on site. The investigation must be comprehensive enough to enable:

- a risk assessment to be undertaken,
- refinement of the Conceptual Model, and
- the development of a Method Statement detailing the remediation requirements.

The risk assessment and refined Conceptual Model shall be submitted, along with the site investigation report, to the Local Planning Authority.

c) If the risk assessment and refined Conceptual Model indicate any risk of harm, a Method Statement detailing the remediation requirements, using the information obtained from the site investigation, and also detailing any post remedial monitoring shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority prior to that remediation being carried out on site.

Part 2

d) Where remediation of contamination on the site is required completion of the remediation detailed in the method statement shall be carried out and a report that provides verification that the required works have been carried out, shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority before the development is occupied.

Reason: To ensure the development can be implemented and occupied with adequate regard for environmental and public safety in accordance with Policy CS NPPF of the Local Plan Core Strategy DPD (adopted September 2012), DM04 of the Development Management Policies DPD (adopted September 2012), the Sustainable Design and Construction SPD (adopted October 2016).

12. The level of noise emitted from all of the external and louvred building plant and substation plant hereby approved shall be at least 5dB(A) below the background level, as measured from any point 1 metre outside the window of any room of a neighbouring residential property.

If the noise emitted has a distinguishable, discrete continuous note (whine, hiss, screech, hum) and/or distinct impulse (bangs, clicks, clatters, thumps), then it shall be at least 10dB(A) below the background level, as measured from any point 1 metre outside the window of any room of a neighbouring residential property.

Reason: To ensure that the proposed development does not prejudice the amenities of occupiers of neighbouring properties in accordance with Policies DM04 of the Development Management Policies DPD (adopted September 2012) and The London Plan 2021.

13. a) No development other than demolition works shall commence on site in connection with the development hereby approved until a report has been carried out by a competent acoustic consultant that assesses the likely noise impacts from the development of all of the external and louvred building plant and substation plant and mitigation measures for the development to reduce these noise impacts to acceptable levels, and has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

The report shall include all calculations and baseline data, and be set out so that the Local Planning Authority can fully audit the report and critically analyse the content and recommendations.

b) The measures approved under this condition shall be implemented in their entirety prior to the commencement of the use/first occupation of the development and retained as such thereafter.

Reason: To ensure that the proposed development does not prejudice the amenities of occupiers of neighbouring properties in accordance with Policy DM04 of the Development Management Policies DPD (adopted September 2012), the Sustainable Design and Construction SPD (adopted April 2016) and Policies D13 and D14 of the London Plan 2021.

14. a) No development other than demolition works shall commence on site in connection with the development hereby approved until an overheating report is carried out which assesses the overheating in the proposed development in line with current best practice and provides mitigation measures which shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

b) The measures approved under this condition shall be implemented in their entirety prior to the commencement of the use/first occupation of the development and retained as such thereafter.

Reason: To prevent the future occupiers of the building from overheating in line with the London Plan.

15. a) Notwithstanding the details submitted with the application and otherwise hereby approved, prior to first occupation, details of:

- (i) A Refuse and Recycling Collection Strategy, which includes details of the collection arrangements and whether or not refuse and recycling collections would be carried out by the Council or an alternative service provider;
- (ii) Details of the enclosures, screened facilities and internal areas of the proposed building to be used for the storage of recycling containers, wheeled refuse bins and any other refuse storage containers where applicable; and

(iii) Plans showing satisfactory points of collection for refuse and recycling, have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

b) The development shall be implemented and the refuse and recycling facilities provided in full accordance with the information approved under this condition before the development is first occupied and the development shall be managed in accordance with the information approved under this condition in perpetuity once occupation of the site has commenced.

Reason: To ensure a satisfactory appearance for the development and satisfactory accessibility; and to protect the amenities of the area in accordance with Policy CS14 of the Local Plan Core Strategy (adopted September 2012), Policy DM01 of the Development Management Policies DPD (adopted September 2012) and the Sustainable Design and Construction SPD (adopted October 2016); and Policies D6 and SI7 of the London Plan 2021.

16. Before the development hereby permitted is occupied a full Delivery and Servicing Plan (DSP) shall be submitted to and agreed by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In the interest of highway safety in accordance with London Borough of Barnet's Local Plan Policy CS9 of Core Strategy (Adopted) September 2012 and Policy DM17 of Development Management Policies (Adopted) September 2012.

17. Prior to first occupation, details of car parking management plan shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development thereafter shall only be operated in accordance with the approved parking management plan.

Reason: In the interest of highway safety in accordance with London Borough of Barnet's Local Plan Policy CS9 of Core Strategy (Adopted) September 2012 and Policy DM17 of Development Management Policies (Adopted) September 2012.

18. Before the relevant block/building of the development hereby permitted is occupied the associated car parking space(s) shown on the plans hereby approved shall be provided and shall not be used for any purpose other than parking of vehicles in connection with the approved development.

Reason: To ensure that adequate and satisfactory provision is made for the parking of vehicles in the interests of pedestrian and highway safety and the free flow of traffic in accordance with London Borough of Barnet's Local Plan Policy CS9 of Core Strategy (Adopted) September 2012 and Policy DM17 of Development Management Policies (Adopted) September 2012.

19. a) Before the development hereby permitted is first occupied cycle parking spaces and cycle storage facilities shall be provided in accordance with London Plan Standards (for all Use Classes) and a scheme to be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

b) The development shall thereafter be implemented in accordance with the details as approved under this condition and the spaces shall be permanently retained thereafter.

Reason: To ensure that cycle parking facilities are provided in accordance with the minimum standards set out in Policy T5 and Table 10.2 of The London Plan (2021) and in the interests of promoting cycling as a mode of transport in accordance with London Borough of Barnet's Local Plan Policy CS9 of Core Strategy (Adopted) September 2012 and Policy DM17 of Development Management Policies (Adopted) September 2012.

20. a) Prior to the first occupation or commencement of the use of the development hereby permitted, full details of the Electric Vehicle Charging facilities to be installed in the development shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority and approved in writing.

b) The development shall be implemented in full accordance with the details approved by this condition prior to the first occupation of the development or the commencement of the use and thereafter be maintained as such in perpetuity.

Reason: To ensure that the development makes adequate provision for electric vehicle charging points to encourage the use of electric vehicles in accordance with policy T6 of the London Plan 2021.

21. Prior to commencement of the development dimensions of parking arrangements and swept path analysis shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In the interest of highway safety in accordance with London Borough of Barnet's Local Plan Policy CS9 of Core Strategy (Adopted) September 2012 and Policy DM17 of Development Management Policies (Adopted) September 2012.

22. Prior to commencement of the development, details of any highways to be stopped under Section 247 of the Town and Country Planning Act shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In the interest of highway safety in accordance with London Borough of Barnet's Local Plan Policy CS9 of Core Strategy (Adopted) September 2012 and Policy DM17 of Development Management Policies (Adopted) September 2012.

23. No construction work resulting from the planning permission shall be carried out on the premises at any time on Sundays, Bank or Public Holidays, before 8.00 am or after 1.00 pm on Saturdays, or before 8.00 am or after 6.00pm on other days unless previously approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure that the proposed development does not prejudice the amenities of occupiers of adjoining residential properties.

24. a) No development other than demolition work shall take place unless and until a Drainage Strategy detailing all drainage works to be carried out in respect of the development hereby approved and all Sustainable Urban Drainage System features to be included in the scheme has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

b) The development hereby approved shall not be first occupied or brought into use until the drainage works and Sustainable Urban Drainage System features approved under this condition have been implemented in their entirety.

Reason: To ensure that the development provides appropriate drainage infrastructure and to comply with Policy CS13 of the Local Plan Core Strategy (adopted September 2012), the Sustainable Design and Construction SPD (adopted October 2016) and Policies SI 12 and SI 13 of the London Plan 2021.

25. No development shall be occupied until confirmation has been provided that either:- all water network upgrades required to accommodate the additional flows to serve the development have been completed; or - a development and infrastructure phasing plan has been agreed with Thames Water to allow development to be occupied. Where a development and infrastructure phasing plan is agreed no occupation shall take place other than in accordance with the agreed development and infrastructure phasing plan.

Reason: The development may lead to no / low water pressure and network reinforcement works are anticipated to be necessary to ensure that sufficient capacity is made available to accommodate additional demand anticipated from the new development.

26. Prior to the occupation of the site an External Lighting Strategy and Assessment together with full details, specifications and plans of any proposed external lighting to be installed as part of the development shall be submitted and approved in writing to the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be implemented in full accordance with the approved details prior to the first occupation of the relevant part of the development and thereafter be maintained as such.

Reason: To ensure that appropriate lighting is provided as part of the development in accordance with Policies CS NPPF and CS1 of the Local Plan Core Strategy (adopted September 2012), Policy DM01 and DM04 of the Barnet Development Management Policies (adopted) September 2012.

27. A crime prevention strategy shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to the occupation of the development. The strategy shall demonstrate how the development meets 'Secured by Design' standards. The development shall thereafter be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure that satisfactory attention is given to security and community safety in accordance with policy DM02 of the Development Management Policies (2012).

28. No demolition or development shall take place until a stage 1 written scheme of investigation (WSI) has been submitted to and approved by the local planning authority in writing. For land that is included within the WSI, no demolition or development shall take place other than in accordance with the agreed WSI, and the programme and methodology of site evaluation and the nomination of a competent person(s) or organisation to undertake the agreed works.

If heritage assets of archaeological interest are identified by stage 1 then for those parts of the site which have archaeological interest a stage 2 WSI shall be submitted to and approved

by the local planning authority in writing. For land that is included within the stage 2 WSI, no demolition/development shall take place other than in accordance with the agreed stage 2 WSI which shall include:

A. The statement of significance and research objectives, the programme and methodology of site investigation and recording and the nomination of a competent person(s) or organisation to undertake the agreed works.

B. Where appropriate, details of a programme for delivering related positive public benefits.

C. The programme for post-investigation assessment and subsequent analysis, publication & dissemination and deposition of resulting material. This part of the condition shall not be discharged until these elements have been fulfilled in accordance with the programme set out in the stage 2 WSI.

Reason: This pre-commencement condition is necessary to safeguard the archaeological interest on this site. Approval of the WSI before works begin on site provides clarity on what investigations are required, and their timing in relation to the development programme.

29. a) Notwithstanding the details shown and submitted in the drawings otherwise hereby approved, the development is not to commence (other than for Demolition, Groundwork's and Site Preparation Works) until details of the materials to be used for the external surfaces of the building(s) and hard surfaced areas, permitted by this permission shall have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

b) The development shall thereafter be implemented in accordance with the materials as approved under this condition.

Reason: To safeguard the character and visual amenities of the site and Conservation Area and to ensure that the building is constructed in accordance with Policies CS NPPF and CS1 of the Local Plan Core Strategy (adopted September 2012), Policy DM01 of the Development Management Policies DPD (adopted September 2012) and Policy D4 of the London Plan 2021.

30. Notwithstanding the details shown in the drawings submitted and otherwise hereby approved the development is not to commence (other than for Demolition, Groundwork's and Site Preparation Works) until details (necessary details specified in brackets) of the following features and elements of the works have been submitted to the Local Planning Authority and approved in writing:

- Brick bonding (annotated plans at a scale of not less than 1:50).
- External windows and doors (annotated plans at a scale of not less than 1:50).
- Balconies including the balustrading to balconies and at roof level (annotated plans at a scale of not less than 1:50).
- External gates and external doors and their canopies (annotated plans at a scale of not less than 1:50).
- Brick detailing including arches, recessed panels, blind windows, brick aprons and window heads (annotated plans at a scale of not less than 1:50).
- Rainwater goods (annotated plans at a scale of not less than 1:50).
- MVHR (Mechanical Ventilation with Heat Recovery) and other external air extraction, intake and ventilation points (annotated plans at a scale of not less than 1:50).
- Gates and bollards at the site vehicular access points (annotated plans at a scale of not less than 1:50).

The development shall be implemented in full accordance with the approved details prior to the first occupation of the dwellings hereby approved.

Reason: To safeguard the character and visual amenities of the site and wider area and to ensure that the development is constructed in accordance with policies CS5 and DM01 of the Barnet Local Plan and The London Plan 2021.

31. Notwithstanding the details shown on the plans submitted and otherwise hereby approved, the relevant phase of the development shall not be occupied until details are submitted to the Local Planning Authority and approved in writing which specify the details of all boundary treatments to be installed as part of the development. These details shall include materials, type and siting of all boundary treatments. The development shall be implemented in full accordance with the approved details and specifications and shall be permanently retained as such thereafter.

Reason: To safeguard the privacy and amenities of the future occupiers and in the interests of the appearance of the development, in accordance with policies DM01 and DM02 of the Barnet Local Plan.

32. a) The Healthcare/GP Surgery in Block 1 and Supported Care in Block 4, are required to meet the BREEAM 'Very Good' rating.

b) Before the development is first occupied the developer shall submit certification of the selected generic environmental standard.

Reason: To ensure that the development is sustainable and complies with Strategic and Local Policies in accordance with Policy DM02 of the Development Management Policies DPD (adopted September 2012), the Sustainable Design and Construction SPD (adopted April 2013) and Policies 5.2 and 5.3 of the London Plan 2021.

33. Prior to commencement of the development hereby permitted (other than for Demolition, Groundwork's and Site Preparation Works), a scheme for the provision of communal/centralised satellite and television reception equipment to be installed on all blocks hereby permitted shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be implemented in accordance with the details approved and the equipment shall thereafter be retained and made available for use by all occupiers of the development.

Reason: To ensure that the development makes appropriate provision for such equipment, so as to not impact adversely on the character of the area, in accordance with policies CS5 and DM01 Barnet Local Plan.

34. Prior to the commencement (apart from demolition and enabling works) of works on each building/block, details of any roof level structures shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority for that phase. This shall include details of roof level plant, water tanks, ventilation/extraction equipment, flues, television reception equipment, solar photovoltaic panels, any other built structure.

The details shall include a justification for the height and size of the roof level structures, their location, height above parapet level, specifications and associated enclosures, screening devices and cladding.

The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details and no roof level structures shall be installed other than those approved.

Reason: In the interests of good design and also to ensure that the Local Planning Authority is satisfied that any roof-level structures do not have a harmful impact on the character and appearance of the area, in accordance with Policies CS05 and DM05 of the Barnet Local Plan (2012) and The London Plan 2021.

35. Notwithstanding the provisions of any development order made under Section 59 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (or any Order revoking and re-enacting that Order) the following operations shall not be undertaken without the receipt of prior specific express planning permission in writing from the Local Planning Authority on the buildings hereby approved:

- The installation of any structures or apparatus for purposes relating to telecommunications on any part the development hereby approved, including any structures or development otherwise permitted under Part 24 and Part 25 of Schedule 2 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 (as amended) or any equivalent Order revoking and re-enacting that Order.

Reason: To ensure that the development does not impact adversely on the character of the area and to ensure the Local Planning Authority can control the development in the area so that it accords with policies CS5 and DM01 Barnet Local Plan.

36. No development shall be occupied until confirmation has been provided that either:- all water network upgrades required to accommodate the additional flows to serve the development have been completed; or - a development and infrastructure phasing plan has been agreed with Thames Water to allow development to be occupied. Where a development and infrastructure phasing plan is agreed no occupation shall take place other than in accordance with the agreed development and infrastructure phasing plan.

Reason: The development may lead to no / low water pressure and network reinforcement works are anticipated to be necessary to ensure that sufficient capacity is made available to accommodate additional demand anticipated from the new development.

37. The new building block 4 shall be used as supported accommodation, Use Class C2 only and for no other purpose, of the Schedule to the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 1987 (as amended), or in any provision equivalent to that Class in any statutory instrument revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification.

Reason: To ensure the development is implemented in accordance with the permission sought and to enable the Local Planning Authority to retain control of the use of the floorspace within the Use Class specified so that occupation of the premises is for community use only and does not prejudice the amenities of future residential occupiers in accordance with policies DM01 and DM13 of the Barnet Local Plan.

INFORMATIVES

1. In accordance with paragraphs 38-57 of the NPPF, the Local Planning Authority (LPA) takes a positive and proactive approach to development proposals, focused on solutions. The LPA has produced planning policies and written guidance to assist applicants when submitting applications. These are all available on the Council's website. A pre-application advice service is also offered and the Applicant engaged with this prior to the submissions of this application. The LPA has negotiated with the applicant/agent where necessary during the application process to ensure that the proposed development is in accordance with the Development Plan.

2. The Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) applies to all 'chargeable development'. This is defined as development of one or more additional units, and / or an increase to existing floor space of more than 100 sq m. Details of how the calculations work are provided in guidance documents on the Planning Portal at www.planningportal.gov.uk/cil.

The Mayor of London adopted a CIL charge on 1st April 2012 and updated from 1st April 2019 setting a rate of £60 per sq m on all forms of development in Barnet except for education and health developments which are exempt from this charge.

The London Borough of Barnet adopted a CIL charge on 1st May 2013 setting a rate of £135 per sq m on residential and retail development in its area of authority. All other uses and ancillary car parking are exempt from this charge.

Please note that Indexation will be added in line with Regulation 40 of Community Infrastructure Levy.

Liability for CIL will be recorded to the register of Local Land Charges as a legal charge upon your site payable should you commence development. Receipts of the Mayoral CIL charge are collected by the London Borough of Barnet on behalf of the Mayor of London; receipts are passed across to Transport for London to support Crossrail, London's highest infrastructure priority.

You will be sent a 'Liability Notice' that provides full details of the charge and to whom it has been apportioned for payment. If you wish to identify named parties other than the applicant for this permission as the liable party for paying this levy, please submit to the Council an 'Assumption of Liability' notice, which is also available from the Planning Portal website.

The CIL becomes payable upon commencement of development. You are required to submit a 'Notice of Commencement' to the Council's CIL Team prior to commencing on site, and failure to provide such information at the due date will incur both surcharges and penalty interest. There are various other charges and surcharges that may apply if you fail to meet other statutory requirements relating to CIL, such requirements will all be set out in the Liability Notice you will receive. You may wish to seek professional planning advice to ensure that you comply fully with the requirements of CIL Regulations.

If you have a specific question or matter you need to discuss with the CIL team, or you fail to receive a 'Liability Notice' from the Council within 1 month of this grant of planning permission, please email us at: cil@barnet.gov.uk.

Relief or Exemption from CIL:

If social housing or charitable relief applies to your development or your development falls within one of the following categories then this may reduce the final amount you are required to pay; such relief must be applied for prior to commencement of development using the 'Claiming Exemption or Relief' form available from the Planning Portal website: www.planningportal.gov.uk/cil.

You can apply for relief or exemption under the following categories:

1. Charity: If you are a charity, intend to use the development for social housing or feel that there are exception circumstances affecting your development, you may be eligible for a reduction (partial or entire) in this CIL Liability. Please see the documentation published by the Department for Communities and Local Government at https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/6314/19021101.pdf

2. Residential Annexes or Extensions: You can apply for exemption or relief to the collecting authority in accordance with Regulation 42(B) of Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations (2010), as amended before commencement of the chargeable development.

3. Self Build: Application can be made to the collecting authority provided you comply with the regulation as detailed in the legislation.gov.uk

Please visit:

<http://www.planningportal.gov.uk/planning/applications/howtoapply/whattosubmit/cil> for further details on exemption and relief.

3. A Planning Obligation under Section 106 of the Town & Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) relates to this permission.

4. The applicant is advised that any development or conversion which necessitates the removal, changing, or creation of an address or addresses must be officially registered by the Council through the formal 'Street Naming and Numbering' process.

The London Borough of Barnet is the Street Naming and Numbering Authority and is the only organisation that can create or change addresses within its boundaries. Applications are the responsibility of the developer or householder who wish to have an address created or amended.

Occupiers of properties which have not been formally registered can face a multitude of issues such as problems with deliveries, rejection of banking / insurance applications, problems accessing key council services and most importantly delays in an emergency situation.

Further details and the application form can be downloaded from: <http://www.barnet.gov.uk/naming-and-numbering-applic-form.pdf> or requested from the Street Naming and Numbering Team via street.naming@barnet.gov.uk or by telephoning 0208 359 4500.

5. Applicants and agents are encouraged to sign up to the Considerate Contractors Scheme (www.ccscheme.org.uk) whereby general standards of work are raised and the condition and safety of the Borough's streets and pavements are improved.

6. The submitted Construction Method Statement shall include as a minimum details of:

- o Site hoarding
- o Wheel washing
- o Dust suppression methods and kit to be used
- o Site plan identifying location of site entrance, exit, wheel washing, hoarding, dust suppression, location of water supplies and location of nearest neighbouring receptors. Explain reasoning if not applicable.
- o Confirmation whether a mobile crusher will be used on site and if so, a copy of the permit and indented dates of operation.
- o Confirmation of the following: log book on site for complaints, work in accordance with British Standards BS 5228-1:2009+A1:2014 and best practicable means are employed; clear contact details on hoarding. Standard construction site hours are 8am-6pm Monday - Friday, 8am-1pm Saturday and not at all on Sundays and Bank Holidays. Bonfires are not permitted on site.
- o For major developments only: provide a copy of an asbestos survey; For smaller developments -confirmation that an asbestos survey has been carried out.
- o For major developments only: confirmation that all Non Road Mobile Machinery (NRMM) comply with the Non Road Mobile Machinery (Emission of Gaseous and Particulate Pollutants) Regulations 1999.

The statement shall have regard to the most relevant and up to date guidance including: Guidance on the assessment of dust from demolition and construction, Institute of Air Quality Management, January 2014.

7. In complying with the contaminated land condition parts 1 and 2, reference should be made at all stages to appropriate current guidance and codes of practice. This would include:

- 1) The Environment Agency CLR & SR Guidance documents (including CLR11 'Model Procedures for the Management of Land Contamination');
- 2) National Planning Policy Framework (2012) / National Planning Practice Guidance (2014);
- 3) BS10175:2011 - Investigation of potentially contaminated sites - Code of Practice;
- 4) Guidance for the safe development of housing on land affected by contamination, (2008) by NHBC, the EA and CIEH;
- 5) CIRIA report C665 - Assessing risks posed by hazardous ground gases to buildings;
- 6) CIRIA report C733 - Asbestos in soil and made ground: a guide to understanding and managing risks.

Please note that in addition to the above, consultants should refer to the most relevant and up to date guidance and codes of practice if not already listed in the above list.

8. The applicant is advised that written schemes of investigation will need to be prepared and implemented by a suitably qualified archaeological practice in accordance with Historic England Greater London Archaeology guidelines. They must be approved by the Local Planning Authority before any on-site development related activity occurs.

9. Demolition should be carried out by an approved contractor and residents notified at least seven days before commencement.

10. The applicant is advised to engage a qualified acoustic consultant to advise on the scheme, including the specifications of any materials, construction, fittings and equipment necessary to achieve satisfactory internal noise levels in this location.

In addition to the noise control measures and details, the scheme needs to clearly set out the target noise levels for the habitable rooms, including for bedrooms at night, and the levels that the sound insulation scheme would achieve.

The Council's Sustainable Design and Construction Supplementary Planning Document requires that dwellings are designed and built to insulate against external noise so that the internal noise level in rooms does not exceed 30dB(A) expressed as an Leq between the hours of 11.00pm and 7.00am, nor 35dB(A) expressed as an Leq between the hours of 7.00am and 11.00pm (Guidelines for Community Noise, WHO). This needs to be considered in the context of room ventilation requirements.

The details of acoustic consultants can be obtained from the following contacts: a) Institute of Acoustics and b) Association of Noise Consultants.

The assessment and report on the noise impacts of a development should use methods of measurement, calculation, prediction and assessment of noise levels and impacts that comply with the following standards, where appropriate:

- 1) BS 7445(2003) Pt 1, BS7445 (1991) Pts 2 & 3 - Description and measurement of environmental noise;
- 2) BS 4142:2014 - Method for rating industrial noise affecting mixed residential and industrial areas;
- 3) BS 8223: 2014 - Guidance on sound insulation and noise reduction for buildings: code of practice;
- 4) Department of Transport: Calculation of road traffic noise (1988);
- 5) Department of Transport: Calculation of railway noise (1995);
- 6) National Planning Policy Framework (2012)/ National Planning Policy Guidance (2014).

Please note that in addition to the above, consultants should refer to the most relevant and up to date guidance and codes of practice if not already listed in the above list.

11. GLAAS Informative:

Written schemes of investigation will need to be prepared and implemented by a suitably qualified professionally accredited archaeological practice in accordance with Historic England's Guidelines for Archaeological Projects in Greater London. This condition is exempt from deemed discharge under schedule 6 of The Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015.

I envisage that the archaeological fieldwork would comprise the following:

Evaluation

An archaeological field evaluation involves exploratory fieldwork to determine if significant remains are present on a site and if so to define their character, extent, quality and preservation. Field evaluation may involve one or more techniques depending on the nature of the site and its archaeological potential. It will normally include excavation of trial trenches. A field evaluation report will usually be used to inform a planning decision (pre-determination evaluation) but can also be required by condition to refine a mitigation strategy after permission has been granted.

Evaluation trenches should be focussed on open areas between existing buildings, and in gardens of the terraced housing that previously existed on the site.

12. Cadent Gas Ltd own and operate the gas infrastructure within the area of your development. There may be a legal interest (easements and other rights) in the land that restrict activity in proximity to Cadent assets in private land. The applicant must ensure that

the proposed works do not infringe on legal rights of access and or restrictive covenants that exist.

If buildings or structures are proposed directly above the apparatus the development may only take place following diversion of the apparatus. The applicant should apply online to have apparatus diverted in advance of any works, by visiting cadentgas.com/diversions.

Prior to carrying out works, including the construction of access points, please register on www.linesearchbeforeudig.co.uk to submit details of the planned works for review, ensuring requirements are adhered to.

13. Tree and shrub species selected for landscaping planting should provide long term resilience to pest, diseases and climate change. The diverse range of species and variety will help prevent rapid spread of any disease. In addition to this, all trees, shrubs and herbaceous plants must adhere to basic bio-security measures to prevent accidental release of pest and diseases and must follow the guidelines below.

"An overarching recommendation is to follow BS 8545: Trees: From Nursery to independence in the Landscape. Recommendations and that in the interest of Bio-security, trees should not be imported directly from European suppliers and planted straight into the field, but spend a full growing season in a British nursery to ensure plant health and non-infection by foreign pests or disease. This is the appropriate measure to address the introduction of diseases such as Oak Processionary Moth and Chalara of Ash. All non-British trees to be planted must have been held in quarantine."

SITE LOCATION PLAN – Reference: 21/4722/FUL

