



APPENDIX 2.2

**MEETING NOTE ON ES CONTENT AND SCOPE TO LB
BARNET (OCTOBER 2017) AND EMAIL CORRESPONDENCE
WITH THE PLANNING OFFICER (NOVEMBER 2017)**



meeting notes

Attendees

Adam Vine (AV)	Meadow Residential
Lee Goldberg (LG)	Meadow Residential
James Cheung (JC)	AFK
Terry Garner	London Borough of Barnet (LBB)
Harriett Beattie	LBB
Calum Cockerill (CC)	Quod
Neil Wells (NW)	Quod

Project: Pentavia Retail Park, Mill Hill

Meeting Title:

Location:

Date & Time:

Environmental Impact Assessment
Meeting

LBB Offices

10 October 2017 @ 10.00

Action

a) Introduction

1. The purpose of the meeting was to discuss and agree a strategy for the supporting environmental information required for the upcoming planning application for the redevelopment of the Pentavia Retail Park, London, NW7 2ET (the 'Site').

b) Background

2. An application for full planning permission (Ref:16/6420/FUL) was submitted to LBB in September 2016 for the following:

"Redevelopment of site including the demolition of all existing buildings and construction of 695 new Build to Rent Class C3 residential units, 2,046 sqm ancillary Class C3 Build to Rent facilities; 846 sqm Class A1 Retail; 570 sqm Class A3 and A4 food; and 289 sqm Class D1 Community; new vehicular and pedestrian access off Bunns Lane; open space, landscaping; car parking; acoustic mitigation and highway/pedestrian improvements." (the Submitted Scheme)

3. This planning application was accompanied by a voluntary Environmental Statement (ES) (dated September 2016) as the proposals fell within the description of development in Schedule 2, paragraph 10(b) for 'urban development projects' and exceeded the associated threshold, 'the development includes more than 150 dwellings'. The Submitted Scheme ES (and subsequent ES Addendum) was based on

the formal Scoping Opinion issued by the LBB on the 28th July 2016 which included comments from the LBB's statutory consultees.

4. In response to consultation comments from LBB and other statutory consultees (e.g. the Greater London Authority (GLA)) during the determination period of the submitted application, amendments have been made to the scheme design (the 'Development') and a new planning application is proposed to be submitted to LBB.

c) Proposed Development

5. The proposed revisions to the Pentavia Retail Park scheme include:
 - Increased articulation in rooflines and elevational treatments for the buildings. Building heights are reduced across most of the Site particularly near Bunn's Lane, and a 15 storey tower is introduced in the south of the Site;
 - A more traditional rectangular plan form / building configuration;
 - An increase in unit numbers from 685 to approximately 718 units (numbers to be confirmed);
 - Removal of the proposed Bunn's Lane vehicular access (new pedestrian access retained) and introduction of landscape buffer to Bunn's Lane; and
 - A change to construction phasing.

d) Requirement for EIA

6. Discussions between the project team and LBB Planning Department regarding the Development and upcoming planning application raised questions as to whether an ES would be required to support the planning application. It was proposed by LBB that the Development may not require an EIA if the Development could provide integral mitigation that addressed all the effects previously identified within the Submitted Scheme ES and ES Addendum.
7. CC made the point that as the Development falls within the description of development in Schedule 2, paragraph 10(b), and exceeds one of the thresholds specified and is located in an AQMA with other nearby sensitivities. Proceeding to submit an application without a formal negative screening opinion and Environmental Statement (ES) would leave the Applicant at risk of challenge.
8. In addition, CC explained that the purpose of the ES is to report findings of an EIA process, which is a systematic assessment of the likely significant effects of the Development, to inform the decision-making process in relation to the planning application and not to ensure that even effect of the Development can or is mitigated. The Submitted ES identified significant effects associated with the Submitted Scheme,

therefore it is reasonable to assume that an ES for this Development would identify similar effects, as it is of similar size and quantum. CC also mentioned that given the public interest and comments on the Submitted Scheme, interested parties would most likely be looking for an ES to accompany the new application.

9. It was discussed that on 16th May 2017, the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017 came into force. Therefore, new application would fall under the 2017 EIA Regulations.
10. In light of the above, the LBB Officers stated that a proportionate and scoped down ES that only deals with the significant effects of the Development should be submitted with the planning application. To achieve this, the LBB Officers agreed that a continuous scoping exercise could be undertaken with the LBB through the following procedure via email correspondence. Draft technical assessments will be carried out for the Development and should the results confirm that significant effects are likely then an ES chapter will be prepared and included within the ES. Technical assessments that confirm no significant effects, will support the planning application as standalone documents.
11. The Submitted ES comprised the following technical chapters:
 - Socio-Economics (Chapter 6);
 - Traffic and Transportation (Chapter 7);
 - Townscape, Heritage and Visual Impact Assessment (Chapter 8);
 - Air Quality (Chapter 9);
 - Noise and Vibration (Chapter 10);
 - Water Resources and Flood Risk (Chapter 11);
 - Ground Conditions and Contamination (Chapter 12);
 - Wind Microclimate (Chapter 13); and
 - Daylight, Sunlight and Overshadowing (Chapter 14).
12. These were discussed to appraise whether significant effects are likely to arise as a result of the proposed Development. The following technical topics were identified as not being likely to give rise to significant effects and were agreed to not be included within the ES for the proposed Development:
 - Archaeology;
 - Ecology;
 - Waste;

Quod EP

- Water Resources and Flood Risk (previously included in the Submitted ES but no significant effects were reported); and
 - Ground Conditions and Contamination (previously included in the Submitted ES but no significant effects were reported).
13. It was agreed that the Submitted ES chapters for Water Resources and Flood Risk and Ground Conditions and Contamination will be appended to the ES for the proposed Development (as part of the justification to scope the topics out). An updated Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy will be produced to support the forthcoming planning application.
14. It was agreed that all other technical topics should have testing undertaken prior to confirming their inclusion with any ES, including Light Pollution and Built Heritage to ensure that the Development would not affect the Observatory (light spill) nor the setting of surrounding Conservation Areas.

From: [Calum Cockerill](#)
To: "[Griffiths, Carl](#)"
Cc: [Aisling Webb](#)
Subject: Mill Hill: Overshadowing Assessment
Date: Friday, November 24, 2017 4:13:00 PM
Attachments: [Overshadowing Images.pdf](#)
Importance: High

Afternoon Carl,

Please find attached the revised overshadowing plots for the current proposed development which demonstrate that the impacts on the neighbouring residential gardens remain comfortably compliant even though the architectural form of the scheme differs from the previous option.

In terms of the neighbouring daylight and sunlight, I can confirm that the properties which were assessed as part of the original ES chapter (Palmerstone Court, 17 & 19 Grahame Park, Farm House Court) all continue to fully comply in all three daylight disciplines. However as you can appreciate the form of the scheme is much different from previous and therefore we have considered the impacts to a few additional properties (80-82 Bunns Lane & 27-30 Lancaster Close), which also comfortably comply with all three daylight disciplines.

Internal daylight and sunlight levels have been considered as part of the detailed design for the Development and ensure that building standards are met, however this is a planning consideration and not an environmental issue that must be considered by the ES.

On the basis of the above, we do not intend to provide a Daylight, Sunlight and Overshadowing chapter within the Environmental Statement for fore coming planning application. Notwithstanding, the application will be supported by a detailed Daylight, Sunlight and Overshadowing report which assesses both the internal and external aspects, and which will also address the potential for solar glare effects on the nearby M1 motorway and rail tracks.

If you can confirm that you are satisfied with the above I would appreciate it.

Kind Regards,

Calum



Calum Cockerill
Senior Consultant
calum.cockerill@quod.com

Main: 0203 597 1096
Mobile: 07702 868005
Direct: 0203 597 1096
www.quod.com

Ingeni Building
17 Broadwick Street
London
W1F 0AX

