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

Our ref: D&P/3967/02
Your ref: 16/4545/FUL
Date: 2 May 2017

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 Direction under Section 2A of the 1990 Act

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

I refer to your letter of 24 April 2017 informing me that Barnet Council is minded to refuse planning permission for the above planning application. I refer you also to the notice that was issued on 24 April 2017 under the provisions of article 5(1)(b)(i) of the above Order.

Having now considered a report on this case, reference D&P/3967/02 (copy enclosed), I hereby direct (under the powers conferred by Section 2A of the 1990 Act) that I will act as the local planning authority for the purposes of determining the above planning application.

My reasons are as follows:

(i) the proposed development would have a significant impact on the implementation of the London Plan - as set out within the above-mentioned report; and

(ii) there are sound planning reasons for my intervention - as set out within the above-mentioned report.

I must also have regard to targets identified in development plans. As set out in the attached report, I recognise that whilst Barnet Council has taken a positive approach to approving new homes in the borough during the last three years, it is currently significantly under-delivering against its annualised housing completions targets and the borough's affordable housing targets.

In my view the proposed development has potential to make an important contribution to housing and affordable housing supply in response to London Plan policies 3.3 and 3.11. Having regard to

the above, and noting the potential contribution of the proposed development, I wish to fully consider this case as the local planning authority.

The application represents EIA development for the purposes of the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2011. I have taken the environmental information made available to date into consideration in formulating my decision.

I would be grateful if you could provide me, as soon as reasonably practicable, any information relevant to the application that has not already been provided. In due course I will notify you of the date of the Representation Hearing, and I will consult you on any draft planning obligation and planning conditions.

Yours sincerely

Sadiq Khan
Mayor of London

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

GREATER**LONDON**AUTHORITY

planning report D&P/3967/02

2 May 2017

National Institute for Medical Research, The Ridgeway

in the London Borough of Barnet

planning application no. 16/4545/FUL

Strategic planning application stage II 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 460 new residential units following demolition of all existing buildings. New residential accommodation to consist of 448 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 cafe (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 applicant
The applicant is **Barratt London** and the architect is **Hawkins\Brown.**

Key dates
GLA pre-application meeting: 4 May 2016

Stage 1 representations issued: 12 December 2016

Barnet Council committee meeting: 22 February 2017

Strategic issues summary
Barnet Council has resolved to refuse permission for this application. The Mayor must consider whether the application warrants a direction to take over determination of the application under Article 7 of the Town and Country Planning (Mayor of London Order) 2008 ("Order").

Having regard to the details of the application, the matters set out in the committee report, and the Council's draft decision notice, the development **has a significant impact on the implementation of the London Plan**, and there are **sound planning reasons for the Mayor to intervene** in this particular case, and issue a direction under Article 7 of the Order that the Mayor is to be the local planning authority for the application.

The Council's decision
In this instance, Barnet Council has resolved to refuse permission.

Recommendation
That Barnet Council be directed that the Mayor will act as the local planning authority for the purposes of determining the above application.

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. This was referred to the Mayor under Categories 1A, 1B, 1C and 3D of the Schedule to the 2008 Order:

- *1A "Development which comprises or includes the provision of more than 150 houses, flats, or houses and flats."*
- *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."
- *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.

2 On 12 December 2016, the Mayor considered planning report D&P/3967/01, and subsequently advised Barnet Council that whilst the scheme was broadly supported in strategic planning terms the application did not yet comply with the London Plan for the reasons set out in paragraph 53 of the report but that the possible remedies set out in that paragraph could address these deficiencies.

3 A copy of the above-mentioned report is attached. The essentials of the case with regard to the proposal, the site, case history, strategic planning issues and relevant policies and guidance are as set out therein, unless otherwise stated in this report. On 22 February 2017, Barnet Council resolved to refuse planning permission for the application, against officers' recommendation, and on 24 April 2017 it advised the Mayor of this decision. Under the provisions of Article 5 of the Order, the Mayor may allow the draft decision to proceed unchanged, or issue a direction under Article 7 that he is to act as the local planning authority for the purpose of determining the application. The Mayor has until 7 May 2017 to notify the Council of his decision and to issue any direction.

4 The Council's draft decision notice includes the following reasons for refusal:

1. The proposed development, by reason of its appearance, specifically the modern residential design and use of flats roofs, is out of character with the Mill Hill Conservation Area and has a negative impact when viewed from the Green Belt land to the north, contrary to policies 7.8 and 7.16 of the London Plan (2016), policies CS5 and CS7 of the Local Plan Core Strategy DPD (adopted September 2012) and policies DM01, DM06 and DM15 of the Development Management Policies DPD (adopted September 2012).

2. The proposal will result in the loss of trees of special amenity value with

associated loss of nature conservation value, contrary to policies 7.19 and 7.21 of the London Plan (2016), policies CS5 and CS7 of the Local Plan Core Strategy DPD (adopted September 2012) and policies DM01 and DM16 of the Development Management Policies DPD (adopted September 2012).

5 The environmental information for the purposes of the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2011 has been taken into account in the consideration of this case.

6 The Mayor's decision on this case, and the reasons, will be made available on the GLA's website www.london.gov.uk.

Article 7: Direction that the Mayor is to be the local planning authority

7 The initial policy test regarding the Mayor's power to take over and determine applications referred under categories 1 and 2 of the schedule to the Order is a decision about who should have jurisdiction over the application, rather than whether planning permission should ultimately be granted or refused.

8 The policy test consists of the following three parts, all of which must be met in order for the Mayor to take over the application:

a) significant impact on the implementation of the London Plan;

b) significant effects on more than one borough; and

c) sound planning reasons for his intervention.

9 Parts (a) and (b) of the test identify the impact an application would have on the Mayor's policies and the geographical extent of the impact, whilst part (c) deals with the reasons for the Mayor's intervention, having regard to the Council's draft decision on the application. These tests are intended to ensure that the Mayor can only intervene in the most important cases.

10 As set out above, the application is for 460 homes. Article 7(4) of the Order sets out that where a development falls within Category 1A of the Schedule, namely that over 150 homes will be delivered, part (b) does not apply.

11 This report considers the extent to which the policy tests under Article 7(1) apply in this case and whether, therefore, the Mayor should direct that he is to be the local planning authority and apply the tests set out under Article 7(3) of the Order. This report does not consider the merits of the application, although regard has been given to the key planning issues in respect of assessing the policy test in Article 7(1) as set out below.

Policy test 7(1)(a):Significant impact on implementation of the London Plan

12 There are significant impacts on the implementation of the London Plan for the reasons set out in the following paragraphs.

<u>London Plan policy context - housing and affordable housing</u>

13 London Plan Policy 3.3 'Increasing Housing Supply' recognises the pressing need for new homes in order to promote opportunity and provide a real choice for all Londoners in ways that meet their needs at a price they can afford. Part B of this policy states that the Mayor will seek to ensure that the housing need identified in paragraphs 3.16a and 3.16b of the London Plan is met particularly through provision consistent with at least an annual average of 42,000 net additional homes across London. Moreover, London Plan Policy 3.11 seeks provision of at least 17,000 net

affordable homes per year in London. Table 1 below sets out pan-London delivery against these London Plan targets during the last three years.

Net completions	**FY2013 -2014**	**FY2014 -2015**	**FY2015 -2016**	**Total**	**Delivery**
Homes target	*32,210*	*32,210*	*42,000*	*106,420*	**43% under target**
Homes delivered	**26,562**	**30,329**	**31,009**	**60,603**	
Affordable homes target	*13,200*	*13,200*	*17,000*	*43,400*	**54% under target**
Affordable homes delivered	**6,943**	**7,786**	**5,299**	**20,028**	

Table 1: Delivery against pan-London housing and affordable housing targets (source: London Development Database).

14 Based on Table 1 it is evident that the delivery of new homes and net additional affordable housing on a pan-London basis is significantly below the London Plan target.

15 At a borough level, London Plan Table 3.1 allocates Barnet a target of 23,489 homes between 2015 and 2025. In monitoring delivery against this target, Barnet has been assigned an annual target of 2,349 new homes per year. The Barnet Core Strategy seeks a borough wide target of 40% affordable homes, equating to a numerical target of 940 affordable homes per year based on the current London Plan target.

16 Table 2 below sets out delivery against the above-mentioned borough level targets during the last three years.

Net completions	**FY2013 -2014**	**FY2014 -2015**	**FY2015 -2016**	**Total**	**Delivery**
Homes target	*2,254*	*2,254*	*2,349*	*6,858*	**43% under target**
Homes delivered	**1,070**	**1,146**	**1721**	**3,937**	
Affordable homes target	*902*	*902*	*940*	*2743*	**71% under target**
Affordable homes delivered	**285**	**359**	**143**	**787**	

Table 2: Delivery against London Plan housing target and Core Strategy affordable housing target (source: London Development Database).

17 From Table 2 it is evident that Barnet Council has delivered significantly less than the London Plan annual monitoring target for net new homes over the last three years, and has also significantly under-delivered on its Core Strategy affordable housing target.

Potential contribution of this scheme to London Plan objectives – housing and affordable housing

18 The proposal will deliver 460 new homes which would equate to nearly 20% of the Council's annual housing target. As set out within the consultation stage report ref: D&P/3967/01, the proposed redevelopment of a previously developed site to provide a significant amount of housing is supported by London Plan Policy 3.3 (increasing housing supply).

19 Currently, the application proposes to provide 92 units as affordable housing units, plus a contribution of £4.56 million towards the provision of off-site affordable housing via a payment in lieu. Notwithstanding the comments in paragraph 32 below, the delivery of affordable housing will contribute to Barnet's annual affordable housing delivery target.

Test 7(1)(a) Conclusion

20 Noting that Barnet Council's recent delivery of housing and affordable housing is significantly under target, the proposed development has the potential to make a positive

contribution to strategic housing and affordable housing targets in the borough by optimising the use of a previously developed site.

21 Having regard to the above, and the London-wide shortfall against strategic housing and affordable housing targets more generally, this application has potential to make an important contribution to housing and affordable housing supply in response to London Plan policies 3.3 and 3.11. Accordingly, there are significant impacts on the implementation of the London Plan.

Policy test 7(1)(c): Sound planning reasons for intervening

22 Notwithstanding part (a), part (c) of the policy test is whether the Mayor considers there to be sound planning reasons to intervene. Having regard to the potential contribution that the proposed development could make to strategic housing and affordable housing targets, the conclusion under Test 7(1)(a) that there are significant impacts on the implementation of the London Plan (in respect of housing and affordable housing supply); the Barnet Council committee report and officer recommendation for approval of this application; Barnet Planning Committee's draft reasons for refusal; and the other matters the Mayor must take account of which are examined in more detail below, there are sound reasons for the Mayor to take over this application in order to fully consider the case as the Local Planning Authority.

Matters the Mayor must take account of

23 The Mayor must take account of the Council's current and past performance against development plan targets for new housing and affordable housing. The Mayor must also take account of any other targets set out in the development plan which are relevant to the subject matter of the application. In this case the relevant development plan targets relate to supply of net additional homes and net additional affordable homes. The relevant targets in this regard are set out within paragraph 15 above. Whilst paragraphs 13 to 17 above present the position in terms of recent delivery against these development plan targets (i.e. in terms of new build completions), Table 3 below sets out the Council's performance in terms of planning approvals for housing and affordable housing in the borough.

Net approvals	**FY2013 -2014**	**FY2014 -2015**	**FY2015 -2016**	**Total**	**Performance against target**
Homes target	*2,255*	*2,254*	*2,349*	*6,858*	**53% over target**
Homes consented	**2,537**	**1,985**	**5,934**	**10,459**	**(+3637 units)**
Affordable homes target	*902*	*902*	*940*	*2744*	**72% under target**
Affordable homes consented	**126**	**34**	**619**	**779**	**(-1965 units)**

Table 3: Performance against London Plan housing target and Core Strategy affordable housing target in terms of planning approvals (source: London Development Database).

24 Table 3 demonstrates that the Council is currently performing well in securing planning approvals for additional housing, and this will contribute to the future pipeline supply of housing in the borough. However, it is notable that the total percentage of affordable homes secured in this period is just 7%. Whilst the lower figures could be accounted for by long-term programmes of estate renewal, the overall approvals fall considerably short of the 40% target within Barnet Council's Core Strategy and represents a significant undersupply of affordable housing in the pipeline.

Issues raised at consultation stage

25 Notwithstanding the above, when considering whether to take over the application the Mayor should also have regard to the following strategic planning issues which were raised at consultation stage:

- **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.

Principle of development

26 At consultation stage it was accepted that the proposals constituted limited infill of a previously developed site, and did not reduce the openness of the Green Belt, thus meeting one of the criteria for an exception to inappropriate development as defined in the NPPF.

27 The proposed employment floorspace was supported at Stage 1, and it was noted that the flexible space could particularly meet the needs of SMEs. The applicant was requested to confirm how the employment floorspace offered would be affordable for a range of SMEs and start-up companies. The applicant subsequently agreed to a Section 106 obligation to secure SME-accessible floorspace, having due regard to the encouragement of SMEs in the area, including flexibility in regards to lease lengths, size of leasable areas, access requirements and payment terms. This approach is supported.

Housing and affordable housing

28 At consultation stage, the proposal was to provide 462 residential units, as follows:

Unit size	**Market**	**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 proposal was subsequently revised to reduce the height of one block, necessitating the omission of two market 3 bedroom homes, giving a total of 460 units. This does not alter the conclusions of the housing assessment as set out within the Stage 1 report.

30 At the consultation stage, the application proposed 92 affordable shared ownership units, representing 20% of the scheme by unit or 17.5% by habitable room. The affordable housing offer was made in spite of the fact that the applicant's financial viability assessment (FVA) concluded that no affordable housing was viable. Notwithstanding this, the Mayor considered that the assumptions within the FVA should be robustly interrogated with a view to increasing the amount of affordable housing, with particular regard to the applicant's Alternative Use Value (AUV) approach and its growth assumptions.

31 The applicant's FVA was independently assessed by consultants appointed by Barnet Council. Following negotiations, the applicant agreed to provide an additional off-site contribution towards affordable housing of £4.56 million, whilst the on-site affordable housing provision remains at 92 intermediate units (17.5% by habitable room).

32 It is noted that the Council's independent assessors considered this offer to represent the maximum reasonable amount of affordable housing on this site. However, the applicant and the Council's consultant did not reach full agreement on the methodology or inputs for the FVA. A further viability assessment should therefore be undertaken and robustly interrogated using the guidance and methodology within the Mayor's draft Housing and Viability SPG, to further increase the affordable housing provision. All options for increasing the on-site affordable housing should also be explored, including the potential for grant funding. Should the Mayor decide to issue a direction to take over determination of the application, these matters would need to be addressed to ensure that the site delivers the maximum reasonable amount of affordable housing in compliance with the London Plan.

Design

33 At the consultation stage the overall approach to the design was supported and it was noted that the proposals would not adversely affect the openness of the Green Belt or the character and appearance of the conservation area. The Council's planning officers, in their report to committee, concurred with this view. It is noted that Historic England and local residents/amenity groups have raised concerns about the impact of the proposals on the character and appearance of the Mill Hill Conservation Area. This was included as a reason for refusal on the Council's draft decision notice. The decision maker has a duty to pay special attention to the preservation of the character and setting of heritage assets and this has been considered in the reporting of the proposals to date. The impact on heritage assets, including the conservation area, would be fully considered in the Stage 3 report should the Mayor decide to take over the determination of the application.

Inclusive access

34 As requested at consultation stage, a parking management plan to manage the provision of Blue Badge spaces was proposed to be secured by condition, along with a condition securing the implementation of an inclusive design and access strategy. A condition was also proposed requiring details of the children's playspace and equipment within the development, including provision for facilities suitable for disabled children.

Climate change

35 As requested at the consultation stage, the Council in its committee report has proposed conditions relating to compliance with the submitted Energy Strategy, which confirms that the

development will achieve a 35% reduction in carbon emissions above a 2013 Building Regulations compliant development. The applicant has also confirmed its commitment to ensuring the development is designed to allow future connection to a district heating network, should one become available, although this has not been specifically secured within the Council's proposed conditions or s106 heads of terms. It is recommended that any future planning permission secures this within the conditions or associated s106 agreement.

Transport

36 At the consultation stage, revisions to the applicant's Transport Assessment were required in order to reflect the site's potential to support sustainable travel patterns. Further discussion on the level of parking proposed in the development was also required. At this stage, 566 parking spaces were proposed – 462 residential spaces, 51 visitor spaces and 19 commercial spaces.

37 Following the receipt of a number of local objections regarding the parking provision and potential for overspill, the scheme was revised to increase the number of parking spaces within an enlarged basement level. The total number of spaces now proposed is 613: 543 residential spaces, 51 visitor spaces and 19 commercial spaces, an increase of 47 spaces.

38 The revised residential parking provision proposed would exceed the London Plan maximum standard by 15%: 613 spaces are proposed, whereas the London Plan maximum standard for residential development of this scale allows for 516 spaces. The proposed level of parking is unacceptable in the context of promoting sustainable development, and this will require further resolution should the Mayor decide to take over the application for his own determination, or in any future planning application. The electric vehicle charging points proposed would also need to be increased in line with London Plan standards.

39 A minimum financial contribution of £150,000, up to a maximum of £300,000 (subject to viability review) towards the implementation of step free access at Mill Hill East underground station was agreed by the applicant and the Council. This contribution is important in terms of making the area more accessible for residents and visitors, and this should be secured by way of a s106 agreement associated with any planning approval should the Mayor decide to take over the application. The funding of the new bus shelters, including the bus "Countdown" features should also be secured.

Response to consultation

40 Barnet Council publicised the application by sending notifications to 5,554 addresses, as well as issuing site notices. The Council received 84 responses from local residents, of which 66 were objections, 12 were in support and 6 were neutral comments.

41 The grounds for objection included:

Design, character and appearance

- Nine storey development is too high for this semi-rural area. Other blocks should also be reduced in height.
- The main building is a historic landmark and should be retained and converted.
- Scale of development is inappropriate in Green Belt and in local townscape.
- Proposal will detrimentally impact on views.
- Proposed new buildings are characterless and the design is uninspiring and unimaginative.
- The loss of the boundary fencing will have a detrimental impact on the rural character of Burtonhole Lane.

Impact on Green Belt

- Footprint of the buildings will be increased by over 30 per cent compared to existing site, contrary to NPPF policy on development on Green Belt.
- No tarmac surfaces should be implemented on Green Belt land.

Impact on residential amenity

- The nine storey building and balconies on the K blocks will cause loss of privacy.
- Proposed buildings will overshadow lower blocks in the same development.
- Impact of construction noise and traffic.

Impact on local area and environment

- The proposed density is excessive; 462 homes is too many for this site.
- Mill Hill is becoming overcrowded.
- Proposal will impact on public safety and will lead to increase in crime and disorder in the area.
- The application does not address the already strained local services (schools, doctors surgeries etc).
- Proposals will have further impact on local bus and train services.
- Proposals will increase pollution, noise disturbance, light pollution and wind.
- Proposals will have a detrimental impact on wildlife and natural habitats.
- Land requires decontamination.
- Proposed additional traffic will increase accidents.

Highways impacts

- Proposals will exacerbate existing congestion on local roads.
- An inadequate amount of parking spaces are proposed for the 460 units.
- Public transport in the area will not support a development with a lower level of parking.
- Approaches to the site are up steep inclines, making cycling unrealistic for most people.
- Speed bumps and speed cameras should be installed on local roads.
- New public access would lead to potential for increased traffic and parked cars on Burtonhole Lane, which would block this narrow road.

Land use and specific proposals

- Lack of affordable homes in the proposals.
- Lack of jobs in the proposals.
- No new medical centre is proposed.
- Opening up Green Belt will attract more people, causing traffic congestion.
- Site should be used as a concert hall or exhibition space.
- Unclear as to the retention of the house on Fir Island.

42 Issues raised in support include the following:

- Proposals will help address the housing shortage and will bring new people to the area, providing impetus to improved amenities.
- The current site is an eyesore.
- The development will provide much needed housing, including a variety of flats and affordable housing.
- The publicly accessible green space is a positive impact
- The new cafe will be a beneficial addition.

43 The following statutory consultees and amenity groups have also commented:

- **Affinity Water:** no objection subject to conditions.
- **Highways England:** No objections raised.
- **Natural England:** No comments to make.
- **Environment Agency:** No objections raised, subject to standard advice.
- **Sport England:** No objections raised in its statutory capacity. Objections raised in its non-statutory capacity due to the sports proposals not meeting the increased demand from the development and the lack of facilities to support the community use of the retained playing pitch. Recommend that a condition is attached requiring details of a package of improvement measures for the retained pitch to enhance and enable community sport.
- **London Wildlife Trust:** Recommendations made for the protection of wildlife during construction and the inclusion of measures to promote natural habitat in the completed development. Concerns raised over applicant's assessment of trees and the impact of their loss on wider habitats. Recommendation for a long term tree management plan for the site.
- **Royal Society for the Protection of Birds**: State that development fails to respect the character of the conservation area and fails to be sympathetic to its surroundings. Particular concerns are raised with regard to loss of trees and the impact on the wider ecosystem. Further bat surveys should be carried out. Conditions recommended on measures to protect woodland and manage and enhance biodiversity on the site.
- **Metropolitan Police (Crime Prevention Officer):** No objections raised.
- **North London Branch of Small Businesses:** Support the proposed commercial element which will provide hub working space for local businesses. These should be available for existing local businesses, prioritising SMEs.
- **Thames Water:** No objections subject to conditions.
- **Historic England (Archaeology):** Conditions on archaeology requested.
- **Historic England (Historic buildings and areas):** The new development would make a considerable change, and could cause some harm to the Mill Hill conservation area. The increased height and density of the buildings would result in development being visible from short and long range views. It will result in development with a denser and more urban feel than the remainder of the conservation area. The Mill Hill conservation area does not have a dominant building style but is characterised by a semi-rural feel and development often features pitched roofs. The design principles for the proposed flat roofed blocks do not appear to draw from structures within the wider conservation area. Further opportunity could be taken to respond to the conservation area by drawing from its characteristic variety of built forms and rooflines.
- **Mill Hill Preservation Society:** Clarifications sought over the definition of brownfield land in the application site and the use of the sports field. The increase in floorspace in Green Belt is unacceptable having regard to Green Belt policy and represents overdevelopment. Concern raised about the impact of the proposals on the conservation

area, the massing and the design of the deconstructed wings to the main block, and the banal design of the blocks facing the Ridgeway. Concern that buildings will be visible above the tree line in views from the Totteridge Valley. There should be more affordable housing. Concern raised about parking provision and additional traffic.

- **Mill Hill Neighbourhood Forum:** Object to height of 6 storey buildings. Consider that new buildings facing the Ridgeway should have pitched roofs. Design of the houses is unimaginative. The affordable housing proposals should be stated. Parking provision is inadequate and unrealistic given limited public transport, concerns about overspill parking. Cycle routes need to be improved. Development needs to take account of supporting infrastructure such as schools and GP surgeries. Construction, air quality and contamination need to be controlled.

Representations to the Mayor

44 The Mayor received a direct representation from Andrew Dismore AM prior to the Council's resolution to refuse the application, raising concern about the parking provision on the site and the potential for overspill parking. Revisions were subsequently made by the applicants to increase the parking provision.

Response to consultation

45 Planning issues raised in the consultation responses have been considered in this report, the Mayor's Stage One report, and the Council's committee report and addendum report of 22 February 2017.

Legal considerations

46 Under the arrangements set out in Article 5 of the Town and Country Planning (Mayor of London) Order 2008, the Mayor has the power to issue a direction under Article 7 that he is to act as the local planning authority for the purpose of determining the application. The Mayor may also leave the decision to the local authority. If the Mayor decides to direct that he is to be the local planning authority, he must have regard to the matters set out in Article 7(3) and set out his reasons in the direction.

Financial considerations

47 Should the Mayor take over the application he would be responsible for holding a representation hearing and negotiating any planning obligation. He would also be responsible for determining any approval of details (unless the Council agrees to do so).

Conclusion

48 Having regard to the details of the application, the matters set out in Barnet Council's committee report and the Council's draft decision notice, the development has a significant impact on the implementation of the London Plan, and there are sound planning reasons for the Mayor to intervene in this particular case and issue a direction under Article 7 of the Order.

for further information, contact GLA Planning Unit (Development & Projects Team):
Juliemma McLoughlin, Assistant Director – Planning
020 7983 4271 email juliemma.mcloughlin@london.gov.uk
Sarah Considine, Strategic Planning Manager – Development Decisions
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