

GREATER LONDON AUTHORITY

Development, Enterprise and Environment

Harriet Beattie
London Borough of Barnet
Development Management & Building
Control Service
Barnet House
1255 High Road
London
N20 0EJ

Our ref: D&P/3967/01
Your ref: 16/4545/FUL
Date: 12 December 2016

Dear Ms Beattie,

Town & Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended); Greater London Authority Acts 1999 and 2007; Town & Country Planning (Mayor of London) Order 2008.

National Institute for Medical Research, The Ridgeway, London NW7 1AA
Local planning authority reference: 16/4545/FUL

I refer to the copy of the above planning application, which was received from you on 5 August 2016. On 12 December 2016 the Mayor considered a report on this proposal, reference D&P/3967/01. A copy of the report is attached, in full. This letter comprises the statement that the Mayor is required to provide under Article 4(2) of the Order.

The Mayor considers that the application does not fully comply with the London Plan, for the reasons set out in paragraph 53 of the above-mentioned report; but that the possible remedies set out in that paragraph could address these deficiencies.

If your Council subsequently resolves to make a draft decision on the application, it must consult the Mayor again under Article 5 of the Order and allow him fourteen days to decide whether to allow the draft decision to proceed unchanged, or direct the Council under Article 6 to refuse the application, or issue a direction under Article 7 that he is to act as the local planning authority for the purpose of determining the application and any connected application. You should therefore send me a copy of any representations made in respect of the application, and a copy of any officer's report, together with a statement of the decision your authority proposes to make, and (if it proposed to grant permission) a statement of any conditions the authority proposes to impose and a draft of any planning obligation it proposes to enter into and details of any proposed planning contribution.

Please note that the Transport for London case officer for this application is Alex Lloyd, e-mail alexlloyd@tfl.gov.uk telephone 020 3054 6706.

Yours sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Colin Wilson'.

Colin Wilson

Senior Manager– Development & Projects

cc Andrew Dismore, London Assembly Constituency Member
Tony Devenish, Chair of London Assembly Planning Committee
National Planning Casework Unit, DCLG
Alex Williams, TfL
Mr Adam Donovan, Deloitte Real Estate, Athene Place, 66 Shoe Lane, London EC4A 3BQ

12 December 2016

National Institute for Medical Research, The Ridgeway

in the London Borough of Barnet

planning application no. 16/4545/FUL

Strategic planning application stage 1 referral

Town & Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended); Greater London Authority Acts 1999 and 2007; Town & Country Planning (Mayor of London) Order 2008.

The proposal

Redevelopment of the site to provide 462 new residential units following demolition of all existing buildings. New residential accommodation to consist of 450 self-contained flats within 19 blocks ranging from three to nine storeys with basement car parking levels and 12 two storey houses with lower ground floor levels. Associated car and cycle parking spaces to be provided. Provision of new office (B1a) and leisure (D2) floorspace and a new publicly accessible café (A3). Reconfiguration of the site access and internal road arrangements and provision of new publicly accessible outdoor amenity space. New associated refuse and recycling arrangements. The application is accompanied by an Environmental Statement.

The applicant

The applicant is **Barratt London** and the architect is **Hawkins\Brown**.

Strategic issues summary:

Land use: Redevelopment of a previously developed site in Green Belt for residential and commercial use is supported; development would not have further impact on openness of Green Belt. Applicant should confirm that the employment floorspace is flexible and affordable to meet the needs of SMEs (paras 14-21).

Housing: 462 units proposed. Notwithstanding the applicant's affordable housing offer of 20% intermediate units (17.5% by habitable room), the assumptions in the applicant's viability assessment, which contends that no affordable housing is viable, should be challenged. All options must be explored to increase the affordable housing provision. (paras 22-29).

Design: Design is high quality and proposals are supported. (paras 35-40).

Climate change: Carbon reduction target met, proposals comply with London Plan climate change policy (para. 43).

Transport: The applicant's transport assessment should be revised to reflect the likely resident trip modes and to promote sustainable travel. Further discussion on the level of resident parking is necessary. Reviews of the wider pedestrian and cycle environment should be undertaken to inform any necessary improvements. (paras 44-48).

Recommendation

That Barnet Council be advised that the application does not yet fully comply with the London Plan for the reasons set out in paragraph 53 of this report. Possible remedies are set out in that paragraph to ensure full compliance with the London Plan.

Context

1 On 5 August 2016 the Mayor of London received documents from Barnet Council notifying him of a planning application of potential strategic importance to develop the above site for the above uses. With the agreement of the applicant, the application was registered as a complete referral on 2 November 2016 following receipt of viability information. Under the provisions of The Town & Country Planning (Mayor of London) Order 2008 the Mayor has until 13 November 2016 to provide the Council with a statement setting out whether he considers that the application complies with the London Plan, and his reasons for taking that view. The Mayor may also provide other comments. This report sets out information for the Mayor's use in deciding what decision to make.

2 The application is referable under Categories 1A, 1B, 1C and 3D of the Schedule to the Order 2008:

Category 1A:

"Development which comprises or includes the provision of more than 150 houses, flats, or houses and flats.

Category 1B:

"Development (other than development which only comprises the provision of houses, flats, or houses and flats) which comprises or includes the erection of a building or buildings—

(c) outside Central London and with a total floorspace of more than 15,000 square metres.

Category 1C:

"Development which comprises or includes the erection of a building of one or more of the following descriptions—

(c) the building is more than 30 metres high and is outside the City of London."

Category 3D:

Development—

(a) on land allocated as Green Belt or Metropolitan Open Land in the development plan, in proposals for such a plan, or in proposals for the alteration or replacement of such a plan; and

(b) which would involve the construction of a building with a floorspace of more than 1,000 square metres or a material change in the use of such a building.

3 Once Barnet Council has resolved to determine the application, it is required to refer it back to the Mayor for his decision as to whether to direct refusal; take it over for his own determination; or allow the Council to determine it itself.

4 The Mayor of London's statement on this case will be made available on the GLA website www.london.gov.uk.

Site description and relevant history

5 The site comprises a 19 hectare L-shaped piece of land in Mill Hill, fronting the Ridgeway and extending northwards towards the base of the Totteridge Valley. The whole of the site is designated as Green Belt and the southern part of the site is within the Mill Hill Conservation Area.

6 The National Institute of Medical Research (NIMR, now known as the Francis Crick Institute) have occupied the buildings for medical and research purposes since the 1930s. However, the NIMR is currently in the process of moving into the new Francis Crick Institute at St Pancras and the Medical Research Council has sold the site to Barratt London, using the sale to part-fund the move. The Council have adopted a planning brief for the site (March 2016) which sets the parameters for a residential led, mixed use development.

7 The built development is concentrated in the southern portion of the land closest to the road, and is dominated by the Main Building – a nine storey cruciform building dating from 1937. There are over 30 other buildings, generally one to three storeys in height, in three clusters on the site. The northern part of the site consists of open green fields and playing fields. The site is semi-rural in character, particularly in the north, and is surrounded by fields and isolated low rise buildings. Along the Ridgeway, there are clusters of residential and institutional buildings including several schools.

8 The site is served by one bus route and is approximately 1.3 kilometres from Mill Hill East underground station. It has a score of 1b on TfL’s public transport accessibility level (PTAL) scale (where one is lowest and six is highest).

Details of the proposal

9 It is proposed to redevelop the site for a residential-led mixed use development comprising 462 residential units and 2,000 sq.m. of employment floorspace. The development would involve the removal of the northern cluster of buildings and the landscaping of this part of the site as open space. The nine-storey cruciform building would be demolished and the central part rebuilt to a similar design.

Case history

10 In May 2016 a pre-application meeting was held with GLA officers and a report was issued on 18 May 2016 (ref: D&P/3967/pre-application). The applicant was advised that the principle of the infill development on previously developed land in Green Belt was acceptable. The scale and layout of the development proposed, along with the proposed additional open land and public access, was considered to be appropriate development and the principle of a residential-led mixed use development was supported. The applicant was requested to further address matters relating to affordable housing, urban design, inclusive access, sustainable development and transport.

Strategic planning issues and relevant policies and guidance

11 The relevant issues and corresponding policies are as follows:

- Land use principles *London Plan*
- Green Belt *London Plan*
- Housing *London Plan; Housing Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG); Housing Strategy; Shaping Neighbourhoods: Play and Informal Recreation SPG; Shaping Neighbourhoods: Character and Context SPG*
- Affordable housing *London Plan; Housing SPG; Housing Strategy; draft Affordable Housing and Viability SPG*
- Density *London Plan; Housing SPG*
- Urban design *London Plan; Shaping Neighbourhoods: Character and Context, SPG; Housing SPG; London Housing Design Guide; Shaping Neighbourhoods: Play and Informal Recreation SPG*

- Access *London Plan; Shaping Neighbourhoods: Accessible London: Achieving an Inclusive Environment SPG*
- Sustainable development *London Plan; Sustainable Design and Construction SPG; Mayor's Climate Change Adaptation Strategy; Mayor's Climate Change Mitigation and Energy Strategy; Mayor's Water Strategy*
- Transport *London Plan; the Mayor's Transport Strategy*

12 For the purposes of Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, the development plan in force for the area is the Barnet Local Plan Core Strategy and Development Management Policies (2012), and the 2016 London Plan (Consolidated with Alterations since 2011).

13 The following are also relevant material considerations:

- The National Institute of Medical Research Planning Brief (March 2016)
- The National Planning Policy Framework and Technical Guide to the National Planning Policy Framework

Principle of development

14 The site is designated as Green Belt. In accordance with national guidance, the London Plan (Policy 7.16) affords the strongest protection to Green Belt land and resists inappropriate development. National guidance on Green Belt is set out in paragraphs 79-92 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). The NPPF (paragraph 80) states that the Green Belt serves five purposes:

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

15 The NPPF reiterates that new building on Green Belt is inappropriate in principle, except in certain circumstances which are identified in paragraphs 89-90. The final point in paragraph 89 of the NPPF identifies that the following would not be inappropriate development:

“limited infilling or the partial or complete redevelopment of previously developed sites (brownfield land), whether redundant or in continuing use (excluding temporary buildings), which would not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt and the purpose of including land within it than the existing development.”

16 The current proposals would involve the redevelopment of a previously developed site. The proposed developed area would be entirely within the southern portion of the site where the existing buildings and carparks are clustered, and would consist of the rebuilding of the existing nine storey main building in the same position, plus a number of individual blocks of between 2 and 6 storeys. The extent of the proposed developed area thus constitutes “limited infilling” as defined in paragraph 89 of the NPPF.

17 Having regard to the impact of the proposals on the openness of the Green Belt, it is acknowledged that there would be taller (up to 6 storey) buildings on areas to the north and west where currently only hardstanding exists. Balanced against this however is the fact that the existing northern cluster of buildings would be entirely removed and this substantial piece of

land, amounting to approximately 1.5 hectares of developed land, would be returned to publicly accessible open space (including the removal of the existing boundary fence). The total footprint of built development on the site would thus be reduced by 8%, and the amount of hardstanding would be reduced by 24%. This will enhance the openness of the Green Belt.

18 In terms of impact on the purpose of including land within the Green Belt, the development would have no further impact on the five purposes identified in the NPPF, and would indeed improve the way in which the land meets these purposes by reducing the spread of built development on the site. The proposals would improve and enhance public access to land within the Green Belt. It is intended that a new 24 hour pedestrian access would be made available through the site from the Ridgeway to the new open land to the north and the playing fields beyond. The existing public footpath from Burtonhole Lane to the east would also be retained. The s106 legal agreement associated with any planning permission should secure this 24 hour public access through the site in perpetuity (and clearly set out when any exceptions apply).

19 The development is not thus inappropriate development, as it meets one of the criteria for exceptional development as defined in the NPPF. The proposals are in accordance with the NPPF and London Plan Policy 7.16.

Employment

20 The NIMR has been a significant employer in Barnet for a number of decades, and its relocation thus represents the loss of a large site in employment use. The site is not designated as an employment site, and it is recognised that the NIMR was a specialist employer. However, there is a local desire to retain employment uses on the site, and as such it is proposed to include approximately 2,000 sq.m. of flexible office floorspace (including a gym and café) within the development, concentrated at ground floor level in the main building. This is in accordance with the aims of Barnet Council's planning brief. GLA officers note that the site, despite its previous history, does not fall into one of the categories that are generally considered to support viable office uses as outlined in paragraph 4.12 of the London Plan. However the applicant has carried out an employment study which has concluded that 2000 sq.m. of commercial floorspace is viable on the site and is in discussions with a potential occupier for this space. The provision of employment-generating space within the scheme is thus supported.

21 It is noted that Barnet Council's planning brief, whilst not introducing a formal requirement for an element of affordable workspace within the scheme, does envisage that the employment floorspace should be provided as a range of new spaces that are flexible and affordable, providing the conditions for start-ups to grow and to enable small to medium enterprises to prosper. The applicant's proposals for flexible office workspace to meet the needs of SMEs would be consistent with the aims of the planning brief. The applicant should provide further commentary to confirm how the employment floorspace offered would be affordable for a range of SMEs and start-up companies.

Housing and affordable housing

Affordable housing

22 London Plan Policies 3.11 and 3.12 require the maximum reasonable amount of affordable housing to be delivered in all residential developments above ten units. London Plan Policy 3.11 suggests that 60% of new housing should be for social/affordable renting and 40% for intermediate housing products. At the local level, Barnet Council's affordable housing policy seeks to achieve a borough-wide target of 40% affordable housing in new development.

23 The applicant has submitted a viability appraisal in support of the current proposals, which concludes that no affordable housing is viable within the scheme. However, the applicant has offered to provide 92 affordable units on site (20% by unit; 17.5% by habitable room) in the form of intermediate or discount market sale units.

24 The assumptions on the affordability of the intermediate units are as follows:

Intermediate	
One-bedroom	Maximum single income of £42,757
Two-bedroom (3 person)	Gross household income of £65,518
Two-bedroom (4 person)	Gross household income of £67,627
Three-bedroom	Gross household income of £79,787

25 Notwithstanding the applicant’s affordable housing offer, GLA officers require the applicant’s financial viability assessment to be robustly interrogated to ensure that this forms the basis for establishing the maximum reasonable amount of affordable housing. In its FVA, the applicant has sought to establish the benchmark land value of the site with reference to an Alternative Use Value (AUV) based on offers received from a “Care Village” provider. As set out in the Mayor’s adopted Housing SPG and the draft Affordable Housing and Viability SPG, the GLA considers that an Existing Use Value plus (EUV+) approach is usually the most appropriate for establishing the site value, and an AUV approach should only be used where there is an extant, implementable planning permission. The applicant has not explained why an EUV approach to establishing the site value has not been used in this instance. Whilst there are documented offers for the site from a Care Village provider, GLA officers note that there is no planning permission for such an alternative use, no guarantee that such a use would gain planning permission and could be implemented on this site, and that the offers are caveated and “subject to planning permission”. An AUV approach is not therefore appropriate and GLA officers request that an FVA is submitted which is based on an EUV approach, which the GLA will then have independently assessed.

26 Given that an offer of affordable housing is being made despite the applicant’s FVA suggesting that no affordable housing is viable, the applicant should provide a scenario test, setting out its growth assumptions.

27 The applicant’s FVA is being assessed by independent assessors appointed by the Council and discussions are ongoing. It is noted that there is currently disagreement between the parties regarding some of the inputs in the appraisal. GLA officers will work with the Council to ensure that the scheme includes the maximum reasonable amount of affordable housing, having regard to the points above. Officers will update the Mayor at stage 2 as to the results of the independent viability review and the subsequent negotiations on affordable housing.

Housing choice

28 London Plan Policy 3.8 requires different sizes and types of dwellings to meet different needs. The application is proposing the following mix of units:

Unit size	Private	Intermediate	Total (%)
1 Bedroom	98	48	146 (32%)
2 Bedroom	186	34	220 (48%)

3 Bedroom	74	10	84 (18%)
4/5 Bedroom	12	0	12 (3%)
Total	370 (80%)	92 (20%)	462 (100%)

29 The scheme provides more than 20% family sized units which is welcomed. Barnet Council should confirm that the unit mix meets local need.

Density

30 The site displays the characteristics of a “suburban” site. The London Plan density matrix (Table 3.2) therefore suggests residential densities of between 150 to 250 habitable rooms per hectare and 35-80 units per hectare would be appropriate. The proposed density of the application site (based on the southern developed site which is 9.4 hectares in area) is 49 units per hectare and 144 habitable rooms per hectare, which falls within the appropriate density range, at the lower end of the scale. This is appropriate given the need to preserve openness on the Green Belt site.

Residential quality

31 The new residential units would be provided in both apartment block and house typologies. The internal space within the units would be designed to comply with the nationally described space standards (DCLG Technical housing standards 2015) which are supported by the Mayor’s Housing SPG. Each dwelling would be provided with an external balcony or private amenity space which would comply with the Mayor’s standards (Standard 26 and 27). The apartment blocks would have a maximum of eight units per floor, and the majority of the units would be at least dual aspect. There would be no single aspect north facing units. The residential units would therefore provide good quality of accommodation.

Children’s play space

32 The Mayor’s ‘Shaping Neighbourhoods: Play and Informal Recreation’ SPG sets a benchmark of 10 sq.m. of useable children’s playspace to be provided per child, with particular emphasis on playspace for children under five years old to be provided on-site. Based on the proposed housing mix, a child yield of approximately 52 children could be expected from this development, of which 30 children would be under five, although the applicant should provide a final calculation once the tenure mix is confirmed. This equates to a total playspace requirement of 515 sq.m, of which 257 sq.m. would be doorstep playspace for children under five.

33 The applicant has indicated that a total of 465sq.m. of doorstep play space, exceeding the Mayor’s standards, would be provided within the developed area. The site will also have access to large areas of open space to the north, including a sports pitch, which can be used by older children. It is proposed to provide outdoor fitness equipment in a trail around the northern boundary of the site. The proposed playspace thus meets the Mayor’s SPG requirements and is welcomed.

34 The Council should ensure via appropriate conditions that the detailed design of the playspaces includes suitable landscaping, climbable objects, fixed equipment, facilities for younger and older children and facilities suitable for disabled children and carers.

Urban design

35 The centrepiece of the scheme would be the rebuilt central block of the existing cruciform building, with separated “wings” forming separate blocks. The Council’s adopted planning brief envisages that proposals on the site would “improve, retain, re-use or re-build as per the original the distinctive Main Building, in whole or part”. The applicants have considered the retention of the existing building but have found that it would be inefficient to convert the building into quality residential units whilst retaining the features of interest. The proposed demolition and rebuild has the potential to create a building of higher quality whilst retaining a local landmark, and this is supported.

36 The rest of the development is proposed in individual blocks, mostly built above podium levels, plus a row of 12 detached houses to the north of the site. A key factor in the design of this scheme is the need to preserve the openness of the Green Belt. As such, the layout has been developed with the intention of creating a high degree of visual permeability through the site, with careful regard to key viewpoints from the Ridgeway. This would aid in enhancing the open character of the Green Belt. The layout would also include a large amount of open space and soft landscaping within the developed area, which significantly improves the quality of the landscape. The approach to the layout is thus supported.

37 The site is subject to a significant drop in levels from south to north. The sloping ground offers the opportunity to create terraces of development, containing and concealing most of the car parking below ground. This significantly reduces the amount of required hardstanding and maximises the potential for landscaped open space within the scheme. The landscape strategy shows that where terracing is required, this would be fluidly curved and heavily planted to ensure a soft edge to the rising levels. This would help to link the site into the semi-rural character of the land to the north.

38 The applicant has submitted verified views to assess the proposal’s impact on the openness of the Green Belt and on the character of the Mill Hill Conservation Area. In the closer townscape views, in general the proposals would enhance openness by increasing visual permeability through the site, and would preserve the character of the conservation area by introducing high quality buildings in place of the dilapidated and heavily altered main buildings. In certain views, such as from Burtonhole Lane, the development would continue to be heavily screened by trees on the boundary and impact on views from outside the site would be negligible. There would be more impact on views from St Vincent’s Lane to the west of the site, as four storey buildings would be built close to the western site boundary in place of the existing hardstanding and car park. However, the built development would be concentrated within the southern portion of the site in line with the northerly spread of development on the other side of the lane (also in the Green Belt) and would also be partially screened by trees. It is not considered that the partial appearance of high quality buildings in this position would adversely impact on the character of the conservation area. The removal of the built development to the north would enhance the overall openness of the Green Belt.

39 In longer views from Totteridge Valley, the built development would recede into the hillside and the existing tree line. The development would not have further impact on these rural views and the openness of the adjacent Green Belt would be preserved.

40 In terms of the architectural design and materials, officers are supportive of the high quality of the layout and design of the buildings and the proposed palette of brown bricks which would complement the materials of the rebuilt main building. The proposals would thus comply with London Plan policies regarding design.

Inclusive access

41 The applicant has prepared a detailed access statement to accompany the application, which addresses key points regarding inclusive access within development, including the building entrances and circulation spaces, the accessibility of the public realm and routes to transport, and accessible dwellings. All residential units would be designed to meet Building Regulation requirement M4(2) and 10% of dwellings would be wheelchair adaptable (meeting Building Regulation requirement M4(3)). 10% of the parking spaces (46 spaces) will be designed and allocated as Blue Badge spaces. The accessible parking spaces are located close to building entrances. A parking management plan should be secured as a means of managing the provision of Blue Badge spaces relative to demand in the future.

42 One of the challenges with this site is the steep gradient of the land which descends towards the north. The applicant has provided information on how level access would be achieved throughout the site via suitably graded accessible routes leading to each building entrance. The inclusive design and accessibility strategy should be conditioned by the Council in any planning approval.

Climate change

43 The applicant has submitted an energy assessment in support of the application. This demonstrates that the proposals will achieve an overall carbon saving of 35% above a 2013 Building Regulations compliant development via energy efficiency savings, the installation of a site heat network supplied by a single energy centre, and renewable energy technology. The carbon dioxide savings meet the target set within Policy 5.2 of the London Plan. The Council should condition the implementation of the energy strategy. The applicant has provided a commitment to ensuring the development is designed to allow future connection to a district heating network, should one become available. This should also be a condition of a planning approval. The proposals comply with London Plan policy regarding climate change.

Transport

44 Whilst the site has a PTAL of 1b, Mill Hill East and Mill Hill Broadway stations are within 1.4 kilometres and 2.4 kilometres from the site respectively which is a short bus journey. These stations will be used by residents for a significant number of trips by sustainable modes (particularly to access Central London jobs).

45 The applicant's transport assessment (TA) has underestimated the likely resident mode share for underground and rail use, which should be increased in line with the 2011 Census level for the local area. The omission of secondary modes (e.g. walk/cycle/bus to and from LU/train stations), results in an inaccurate reflection of trip patterns and the site's contribution to promoting sustainable travel. The TA should therefore be revised, in order for the impacts of the development on the transport network to be fully determined. The level of any necessary mitigation measures will then be assessed, which may include contributions towards step free access at Mill Hill East station and/or additional bus capacity.

46 594 car parking spaces are proposed for the 462 dwellings, amounting to 1.3 spaces per unit. This exceeds the London Plan maximum standard of 516 spaces for this development. Whilst it is accepted that the site has a low PTAL, occupiers may opt to walk or cycle to one of the above stations and as such the development should promote active and sustainable travel. Further discussion on reducing the levels of parking on the site is therefore required. Electric vehicle charging points should be doubled to meet with London Plan standards.

47 The proposed on-site cycle parking is in compliance with London Plan standards. However the applicant should also further consider the wider cycling and pedestrian environment in a cycle level of service assessment (CLOs) and a pedestrian environment review system (PERS). Routes to Mill Hill East/Mill Hill Broadway stations, and the cycling parking facilities at these stations, should be especially considered in order to identify whether improvements are necessary to further encourage sustainable travel.

48 Amendments to site the access points and the location of the two adjacent bus stops are proposed which are acceptable in principle. New bus shelters should be provided by the applicant with 'countdown' features, and designed following TfL accessible bus stop design guidance. The funding for this should be secured via appropriate legal agreement. Conditions and/or s106 obligations should also secure the submission and implementation of final workplace and residential travel plans, construction logistics plan, and a delivery and servicing management plan.

Community Infrastructure Levy

49 In accordance with London Plan policy 8.3 '*Community Infrastructure Levy*', the Mayor has agreed a CIL Charging Schedule which came into operation on 1 April 2012. The rate for Barnet is £35 per square metre of additional floorspace.

Local planning authority's position

50 Barnet Council is still assessing the proposals, and is likely to report the application to its planning committee in January.

Legal considerations

51 Under the arrangements set out in Article 4 of the Town and Country Planning (Mayor of London) Order 2008 the Mayor is required to provide the local planning authority with a statement setting out whether he considers that the application complies with the London Plan, and his reasons for taking that view. Unless notified otherwise by the Mayor, the Council must consult the Mayor again under Article 5 of the Order if it subsequently resolves to make a draft decision on the application, in order that the Mayor may decide whether to allow the draft decision to proceed unchanged, or direct the Council under Article 6 of the Order to refuse the application, or issue a direction under Article 7 of the Order that he is to act as the local planning authority for the purpose of determining the application. There is no obligation at this present stage for the Mayor to indicate his intentions regarding a possible direction, and no such decision should be inferred from the Mayor's statement and comments.

Financial considerations

52 There are no financial considerations at this stage.

Conclusion

53 London Plan policies on Green Belt, housing, affordable housing, urban design, inclusive access, sustainable development and transport are relevant to this application. Whilst the scheme is broadly supported in strategic planning terms the application does not yet fully comply with the London Plan as set out below:

- **Principle of development:** The redevelopment of a previously developed site in Green Belt for residential and commercial use is supported and in compliance with the NPPF and London Plan policy, as the development constitutes limited infill and would enhance the openness of Green Belt. The applicant should confirm that the employment floorspace is flexible and affordable to meet the needs of SMEs
- **Housing and affordable housing:** Notwithstanding the applicant's affordable housing offer of 20% intermediate units, the assumptions in the applicant's viability assessment, which contends that no affordable housing is viable, should be challenged. All options must be explored to increase the affordable housing provision.
- **Urban design:** The approach to the design and layout is supported, having regard to preserving the openness of the Green Belt.
- **Inclusive access:** The Council should condition the implementation of the applicant's detailed access strategy.
- **Climate change:** The proposals are in compliance with London Plan climate change policy.
- **Transport:** The applicant's transport assessment should be revised to reflect the likely resident trip modes and promote sustainable travel. Further discussion on the level of resident parking is necessary. Reviews of the wider pedestrian and cycle environment should be undertaken to inform any necessary improvements.

for further information, contact GLA Planning Unit (Development & Projects Team):

Colin Wilson, Senior Manager – Development & Projects

020 7983 4783 email colin.wilson@london.gov.uk

Sarah Considine, Strategic Planning Manager – Development & Projects

020 7983 5751 email sarah.considine@london.gov.uk

Katherine Wood, Senior Strategic Planner (Case Officer)

020 7983 5743 email katherine.wood@london.gov.uk
