

Stoney Wood Quarter

Planning Statement Addendum

DP9 Ltd

August 2026

DP9 Ltd
100 Pall Mall
London
SW1Y 5NQ



Contents

1.	Executive Summary	3
2.	Introduction	4
3.	Reasons for Refusal by the London Borough of Barnet	8
4.	Overview of Proposed Scheme Amendments.....	13
5.	Updates to the Planning Policy Framework	15
6.	Planning Policy Assessment.....	18
7.	Section 106 Heads of Terms	27
8.	Conclusions.....	30



1. Executive Summary

- 1.1 This Planning Statement Addendum has been prepared on behalf of Stoney Wood Developments Limited (the “Applicant”) to summarise changes made to the proposed development since the Original Planning Statement, submitted in December 2025 in support of an application for planning permission for Stoney Wood Quarter.
- 1.2 The application for the development of Stoney Wood Quarter was recommend to be refused by the London Borough of Barnet under delegated powers on 16 March 2026, the Greater London Authority have recovered the application in accordance with section 2A of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) and article 7 of the Town and Country Planning (Mayor of London) Order 2008 (as amended).
- 1.3 The Mayor has therefore confirmed that the Greater London Authority (GLA) have become the Local Planning Authority (LPA), this was confirmed on 30 March 2026 in the Stage 2 report and letter.
- 1.4 The Applicant has entered into a Planning Performance Agreement with the GLA and reviewed the Barnet reasons for refusal and has provided clarifications through a revision to the submitted planning drawings and additional technical justifications in the form of additional information.
- 1.5 This has been reviewed with GLA Officers who have considered that the Barnet reasons for refusal are not justified and that through additional clarifications and very minor revisions to the residential layouts that the reasons for refusal have been overcome.
- 1.6 The Applicant is fully committed to delivery of the Proposed Development which has an important role in securing new affordable and market homes and commercial units for the benefit of the local area.



2. Introduction

- 2.1 This Planning Statement Addendum (the “Statement”) has been prepared by DP9 Limited in support of an application for full planning permission (application reference: 25/2743/FUL and 2026/0196/S3) (the “Application”). The Application has been submitted on behalf of Stoney Wood Developments Limited (the “Applicant”) for the development site of Stoney Wood Quarter, the Fairway, London, NW7 3HJ (the “Site”).
- 2.2 The Application was submitted to the London Borough of Barnet on 01 December 2025 (the “Original Application”) and was validated on 12 December 2025. Since the validation, the Application was refused by the London Borough of Barnet (“Barnet”) on 16 March 2026 with the reasons recommended for refusal being *inter alia*:-
- The development is excessive in density;
 - The development has a poor standard of residential quality;
 - There is a general lack of information / insufficient information has been provided;
 - The highways/transportation impacts being unacceptable;
 - The lack of justification for the proposed housing mix;
 - Unacceptable impact on trees/woodland and ecology; and
 - Lack of a legal agreement to secure planning obligations.
- 2.3 For the reasons set out in this Statement the Applicant strongly disagrees with the merits of the reasons for refusal in planning terms and considers the Proposed Development is in accordance with the Development Plan with the amendments proposed and additional information provided to the GLA as part of this Addendum.
- 2.4 As part of this Addendum, a series of documents have been provided to reflect the amended design. Therefore, the relevant planning considerations associated with the Addendum have been updated where necessary in light of national, regional and local planning policy and guidance. The documents accompanying the Second Addendum are set out below:
- Revised Application Form, amended by DP9;
 - Covering Letter, amended by DP9;
 - Revised Additional CIL Information Form, amended by DP9;
 - Architectural Drawings and Drawing Schedule, amended by London Placemaking;
 - Operational Waste Management Plan, prepared by London Placemaking;



- Design and Access Statement Addendum, prepared by London Placemaking;
- Landscape Strategy, prepared by London Placemaking;
- Townscape and Visual Impact Assessment Addendum, prepared by London Placemaking;
- Transport Assessment Addendum, prepared by Lime Transport;

2.5 To support the Addendum; an Environmental Statement Addendum (“ESA”) has also been prepared by HGH Consulting and covers the following topics:-

- Ecology;
- Trees;
- Air Quality;
- Waste;
- Drainage;
- Energy; and
- Daylight and sunlight.

2.6 For completeness, Table 1 sets out the rationale for why specific documents have been altered for the Addendum.

Table 1 – Application Deliverables and Form of Amendment

Document and Author	Form of Document	Rationale for the Updates
Application Form DP9	New (to supersede)	Amendments have been made to reflect the updated floor areas and figures.
Application Drawings London Placemaking	New (to supersede)	Amendments to some originally submitted drawings; some additional drawings.
Design and Access Statement Addendum London Placemaking	Addendum (to supplement)	Addendum to the Design and Access Statement submitted to include an update on the design alterations as part of the submission and additional information requested by the GLA.
Landscape Strategy London Placemaking	New (to supplement)	Provides detail on the proposed landscaping.



Document and Author	Form of Document	Rationale for the Updates
Planning Statement Addendum (this document) DP9	Addendum (to supplement)	Addendum Planning Statement to assess key changes of the Addendum submission.
Transport Assessment Addendum Lime Transport	Addendum (to supplement)	Addendum Transport Assessment to assess the Addendum submission design amendments.
ES Addendum HgH	Addendum (to supplement)	Provides assessment of the design changes and further information in relation to ecology, trees, waste, drainage, energy and daylight and sunlight and further provides additional clarifications as appendices.

2.7 Additional responses have been provided following GLA Stage 1 in response to air quality, circular economy, drainage and green infrastructure, energy and whole life carbon which have been provided separately for technical officer review.

2.8 The Statement is structured as follows:-

- **Section 1** sets out an executive summary of the updates since submission of the Original Application and what the Addendum submission will be covering;
- **Section 2** is the introduction to the Statement, listing the information that this Statement will include and describes the structure of the document;
- **Section 3** provides a rebuttal against the Barnet reasons for refusal;
- **Section 4** provides a brief description of the Addendum and the changes that have been made to the development as well as describing the additional information being submitted;
- **Section 5** identifies key changes to the Development Plan and the wider material considerations of relevance to the proposals;
- **Section 6** assesses the acceptability of the Addendum in planning terms in the context of the Development Plan and any other material considerations.



- **Section 7** provides updated Section 106 heads of terms which have been agreed with the GLA and Barnet;
- **Section 8** provides conclusions.

2.9 This Statement includes an overview of any relevant changes to the conclusions made, or information set out, in the Original Planning Statement which should be read alongside this Statement.



3. Reasons for Refusal by the London Borough of Barnet

- 3.1 The Barnet reasons for recommending refusal are listed at Table 2. Following validation of the Application, there was no written or verbal communication from Barnet with the Applicant at all until the GLA confirmed that the Stage II referral had been made. The Applicant is disappointed that Barnet did not seek to request any additional information during their consideration of the Application.
- 3.2 Whilst it is recognised that they are under no obligation to do so, it is the Applicant's view that many of their concerns and reasons for refusal could have been readily addressed particularly with the submission of additional information or clarifications on technical points.
- 3.3 This section of this Statement deals with rebuttals to reasons 1, 2, 4, 5, 6 and 7. Reason 3 and 8 are not considered relevant as further information has been provided to the GLA as well as an agreed list of heads of terms (set out at section 7 of this Statement).

Table 2 – Reasons for Refusal

1.	Design and Density The proposed development, due to its excessive density, resulting massing and unresolved site edge relationships, would fail to respond sensitively to the suburban character of the area and would give rise to an incongruous and visually harmful form. In the absence of adequate verified modelling, CGIs and sections, the applicant has not demonstrated that the scheme would achieve high quality design or have an acceptable impact upon the amenities of adjoining occupiers. The proposal therefore fails to provide a context appropriate design led response to the site and surrounding area, or respect the amenities of adjoining occupiers, contrary to Section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2024), Policies D1, D3 and D4 of the London Plan (2021), and Policy CDH01 of the Barnet Local Plan (2025).
2.	Quality of Accommodation The development, by reason of the siting, layout and internal arrangement of the proposed buildings, together with the absence of sufficient design and technical information, would result in a poor standard of residential accommodation for future occupiers. Cumulatively, the proposal fails to demonstrate that acceptable standards of internal space, outlook, daylight, privacy and tranquillity would be achieved. The development is therefore contrary to Policies D6, D11 and D13 of the London Plan (2021), Policy CDH01 of the Barnet Local Plan (2025), and Part C of the GLA's Housing Design Standards LPG (2023).



3.	General insufficient/lack of information Inaccurate and insufficient information has been submitted with regards to plans and sections, air quality, noise, proposed commercial floorspace, drainage and SuDS strategy, and the refuse and recycling strategy, to enable the Local Planning Authority to fully consider the impacts of the development or to determine whether the proposal would deliver an acceptable, functional and policy compliant form of development. In the absence of this essential information, the Authority cannot be satisfied that the scheme would avoid unacceptable effects on character and appearance of the site and surroundings, residential amenity, environmental quality, flood risk, or service and waste management operations. The proposal is therefore contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework (2024); Policies D1, SD7, SI1, SI12 and SI13 of the London Plan (2021); and Policies CDH01, TOW01, ECC02, ECC03, ECC04 and ECC05 of the Barnet Local Plan (2025).
4.	Highways & Transport Insufficient and unreliable information has been submitted to demonstrate that the development would not give rise to unacceptable highways, parking or servicing impacts. The Local Planning Authority therefore cannot be satisfied that the development would operate safely or acceptably within the local transport network, contrary to Policies T2, T4, T6 and T7 of the London Plan (2021) and Policies TRC01, TRC02 and TRC03 of the Barnet Local Plan (2025).
5.	Housing Mix No robust justification has been provided to support the development's departure from the evidence-based housing mix required by the Barnet Local Plan (2025). As such, the development fails in this location, to provide an appropriate mix of dwelling sizes to meet identified local housing needs. Accordingly, the development is contrary to Section 5 of the
6.	Trees & Woodlands The proposed development, by virtue of its layout and landscaping strategy, would lead to the unacceptable loss of protected trees and priority woodland subject to a Tree Preservation Order, and would place undue pressure on retained trees, resulting in likely harmful pruning and/or poor amenity conditions for future occupiers. The loss and deterioration of this woodland would materially harm the character, appearance and environmental quality of the site and surrounding area, contrary to Section 15 of the NPPF (2024), Policies D4, G1, G5, G6 and G7 of the London Plan (2021), and Policies CDH02, CDH07, ECC01 and ECC07 of the Barnet Local Plan (2025).



7.	Ecology Insufficient information has been submitted to demonstrate that the development would avoid harm to biodiversity and protected species. In the absence of required bat roost inspections, badger sett protection measures, updated reptile surveys and a robust mitigation strategy, the Local Planning Authority cannot rule out the risk of offences under relevant wildlife legislation. Further, the scheme would also result in the loss of priority woodland, grassland and riparian habitat, and the submitted Biodiversity Net Gain assessment shows a net loss of habitat and hedgerow units, breaches of statutory trading rules and no credible pathway to achieving the mandatory 10% net gain. The Authority is therefore not satisfied that significant ecological harm would be avoided, mitigated or compensated, contrary to paragraph 187 of the NPPF (2024), Policies G5, G6 and G7 of the London Plan (2021) and Policy ECC07 of the Barnet Local Plan (2025).
8.	Legal Agreement The application does not include a formal undertaking to secure the planning obligations which would be necessary for the development to be found acceptable. Therefore, the proposal is considered contrary to Policy DF1 of the London Plan (2021); Chapter 12 of the Barnet Local Plan (2025); and the Barnet Planning Obligations SPD (2025).

Rebuttal

- 3.4 Addressing each relevant reason for refusal in turn, it is considered that there are no valid reasons that the Proposed Development is not in accordance with the Development Plan as a whole and there are no material considerations that indicate that the application should be refused.

Reasons 1, 2 and 5: Design, Density and Residential Quality

- 3.5 This Original submission and Addendum submission and supporting documents clearly illustrate objectively that the design and density is acceptable and the site has been optimised through the design led approach. Barnet's own Urban Design Officers acknowledge this and go as far as saying that the architectural approach is welcome.
- 3.6 The LPA's assessment conflates a number of "design shortcomings" which are based on a lack of information – this information was eminently obtainable and has subsequently been provided as part of this Addendum and is assessed further at section 6 of this Statement.



- 3.7 The LPA offer a series of reasons why the residential quality is not acceptable, it is noted that there were some technical errors contained on the submitted drawings with regard to the correct application of space standards (for example, by a factor of 200mm which was the amount of error present in the submitted drawings), these have now been rectified in the submitted plans.
- 3.8 Other subjective statements are made by Barnet whilst ignoring submitted information (particularly with regard to separation distances and internal daylight quality, there is no reference in the report to the submitted internal daylight report). They also assert that people passing by ground floor windows (which include defensible space) would make occupants feel uncomfortable. This is a condition which exists throughout the entirety of London in streets with houses and flats and is unfounded and not based on the evidence before the LPA.
- 3.9 The Applicant strongly disagrees with the LPA that the development is too dense, the original application and addendum submission clearly demonstrate that the site is being optimised through the design led approach and is in accordance with the Development Plan.

Reason 4: Highways and Transportation

- 3.10 The transport reasons for refusal are all overcome by the heads of terms which have been agreed with the GLA and TfL. The Transport Statement Addendum addresses all of the technical reasons given to justify the refusal on highways and transportation grounds.
- 3.11 The parking ratio is considered to be appropriate, a package of measures to enhance the bus system and therefore public transport access are in the final stages of being agreed with TfL which when balanced together create a proportionate set of achievable solutions to increase the site's access to public transport.
- 3.12 Restricting car ownership as far as possible including through the implementation of a controlled parking zone (which residents of the development will not be eligible to apply for), provision of a mobility hub and enhanced buses are all considered acceptable in planning and highways terms.
- 3.13 The detailed commentary regarding trip generation assumptions have been fully resolved and the Transport Assessment is now considered to be robust and agreed.



Reason 6 and 7: Trees, Woodland and Ecology

- 3.14 The LPA's assessment of the impact on trees is considered to be flawed. The delegated report fails to mention that the 2015 permission for development allowed the complete removal of trees on Site and a Tree Preservation Order (TPO) was made by the Council to the entire woodland four days before the LPA resolved to refuse permission under delegated powers.
- 3.15 The Applicant feels that the Council made the TPO to bolster the reasons for refusal and does not agree with the TEMPO assessment which was carried out by the Council, a request has been made to receive a copy of the assessment but this has not been produced. The Council have made the TPO permanent now on the 2nd of July 2026 despite representation from the Applicant about the validity of the assessment. The Applicant is exploring whether an appeal against this decision can be brought forward.
- 3.16 Notwithstanding the TPO, the officer report completely fails to give any weight to the replacement trees which are being provided. The trees which are to be removed have now been valued using the CAVAT method as well as the new trees which are being put back. This has highlighted that there is a deficit and accordingly a financial contribution is being made to compensate for the loss of trees. The Addendum provides further information in relation to trees, and a fuller assessment is provided at section 6 of this Statement.
- 3.17 In terms of ecology, further detail has now been provided regarding badger setts and other protected species and these measures now fully cover off the mitigation hierarchy and with further conditions are acceptable in ecology terms. This is addressed further at section 6 of this Statement.

Reason 3 and 8: Lack of Information and Legal Agreement

- 3.18 These reasons are not relevant as the additional information (which could have been requested by the LPA during their consideration of the application to clarify matters which were not clear or understood, including through Regulation 25 of the EIA Regulations) have now been provided.
- 3.19 A legal agreement is being prepared in negotiation with the GLA and their solicitors. A list of heads of terms which have been agreed and will be formalised in a section 106 legal agreement are included at section 7 of this Statement.



4. Overview of Proposed Scheme Amendments

4.1 The amendments to the Proposed Development are very minor in nature; some very minor alterations to the submitted layouts of residential units are proposed to address comments made by the GLA Officers and additional information has been requested to fully assess and understand the impact of the Proposed Development. It is materially unaltered when compared to the submitted Application.

4.2 In summary, the minor alterations which are proposed are as follows:-

- Internal layout changes as a result of detailed design development;
- Façade development and other external changes as a result of detailed construction design development;
- A reduction in cycle parking quantum and location;
- Increased plant space; and
- Revised split of ancillary residential and commercial uses.

4.3 The Addendum has resulted in some minor changes in the areas of the Proposed Development, as outlined in the table below. The additional areas are a result of increases to the ancillary residential spaces and plant equipment, whilst there has been a reduction in commercial uses.

Land Use	Originally Submitted	Addendum Submission	Change
Commercial, Business and Service (Class E)	597 sqm	499 sqm	-98 sqm
Residential (Class C3)	42,461 sqm	43,402 sqm	+941 sqm
Total	43,058 sqm	43,901 sqm	+843 sqm

4.4 Additional information that has been requested is as follows:-

- One additional townscape view location;
- Further detail on public transport access improvement;
- Site levels and boundary treatments;
- Further details related to trees and landscaping;
- Details on operational waste management;
- The relationship of the proposed development and neighbouring buildings;



- Further analysis of privacy and overlooking within the development; and
- Details of residential quality.

4.5 Several additional technical memos have been responded to separately in relation to air quality, green infrastructure, whole life carbon and circular economy which have been issued separately.



5. Updates to the Planning Policy Framework

- 5.1 Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (as amended) requires planning applications to be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.
- 5.2 As outlined in the Original Planning Statement, the Development Plan for the Site comprises the following documents:-
- The London Plan, published in March 2021; and
 - The Barnet Local Plan, adopted in February 2025.
- 5.3 In terms of emerging policy, the following is relevant to the Proposed Development since the Application was submitted.
- 5.4 At a national level, a new NPPF concluded consultation in March 2026. This consultation draft represents a significant proposed change in the approach to national planning policy. It proposes to introduce non-statutory National Decision Making Policies (NDMPs). The draft also proposes to introduce a presumption in favour of approving development proposals unless the benefits of doing so would be substantially outweighed by any adverse effects.
- 5.5 The Government are currently considering responses to the consultation and the NPPF is expected to be published in summer 2026 when it would take immediate effect for decision making.
- 5.6 In parallel, Government concluded consultation on the Design and Placemaking Planning Practice Guidance in March 2026. It frames the guidance around seven features of well designed places and seeks to set national standards for design, particularly for new residential development. Government are reviewing consultation feedback and it is expected to be formally published in summer 2026 in parallel with the new NPPF.
- 5.7 Separately there are a range of changes being made to the National Planning Practice Guidance to align with the new NPPF.
- 5.8 Whilst the new NPPF does not perform the same function as Development Plan documents for the purposes of decision making, it is clear that there is a significant



change to the approach the Government expect decision makers to take in relation to development.

5.9 There is also a recognition that there is a genuine housebuilding emergency in London.

5.10 On 26 March 2026, the Government and Mayor of London put in place a series of measures to support housebuilding in the Capital. These measures propose inter alia:

- A new time limited planning route which amends the affordable housing thresholds for “fast track” from 35% to 20% on private land, alongside changes to grant funding eligibility;
- A new City Hall Developer Investment Fund and programme/regime of affordable housing grant funding;
- Temporary and targeted relief to the Community Infrastructure Levy for Borough Residential charges, which commence prior to 31 March 2030;
- Alterations to detailed residential design guidance which constrains density.

5.11 This represents a significant policy intervention which signifies the MHCLG and the GLA’s recognition of a genuine housebuilding “emergency” in London. Paragraph 6 of the joint announcement is clear that:

“The Government and Mayor are clear that ensuring schemes progress and housebuilding is accelerated is the priority, and local planning authorities are strongly encouraged to support applications that meet these minimum levels of social and affordable housing and conform to the eligibility criteria under the time limited route”

5.12 These measures are formalised in the Support for Housebuilding LPG formally published by the GLA on the same day as the announcement. Point (a), (b) and (d) are implemented immediately. Point (c) requires further changes to legislation. At the time of writing this Statement:

- The Town and Country Planning (Mayor of London) (Amendment and Transitional Provision) Order 2026 was made on 24 March 2026. Some of the Mayor’s powers have been amended by this legislation, with effect from the 11th of May 2026. These introduce a new 50 unit threshold for applications of Potential Strategic Importance and allows for development in the Green Belt / Metropolitan Open Land to be called in by the Mayor where that right did not previously exist;
- The English Devolution and Community Empowerment Bill, currently in the House of Lords, enables additional planning powers for the Mayor which removes the requirement for Mayoral decision making on planning applications to be held by a



Hearing (currently required by section 2F of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) which would be altered by the Bill.

- The CIL measures are yet to be made law and the Government have indicated the legislation will be made prior to the summer parliamentary recess.

5.13 In addition to the Support for Housebuilding LPG, the Greater London Authority are in the process of preparing a new Spatial Development Strategy for London in a new London Plan. Consultation is expected to begin in the Summer of 2026 with formal publication of the Plan expected in 2027.

5.14 An assessment, where relevant of the Addendum against the Development Plan is provided at section 6 of this statement.



6. Planning Policy Assessment

6.1 This Statement considers the changes to the design as shown in the various documents submitted for the Addendum submission. The assessment will be made against the Development Plan alongside the other materials listed in Section 5 and the Original Planning Statement.

6.2 The key planning considerations addressed in this section are as follows:

- Design Changes and Residential Quality
- Unit and Tenure Mix
- Quantum of Commercial Development
- Trees, woodlands and ecology
- Daylight and Sunlight
- Townscape
- Landscaping and Ecology
- Transport and Highways

6.3 This section provides a summary of the relevant policies, grouped into sections and topics, followed by an assessment of the Addendum in turn against the Development Plan and any other relevant material considerations. This section draws on the findings and conclusions of the submitted reports, described at section 2.

Summary of Changes to the Design and Residential Quality

6.4 The policy position has largely remained the same and is outlined in section 6 of the Original Planning Statement. The one change is that certain residential quality standards within the Housing Design Standards LPG to do with the number of units per core and dual aspect.

6.5 The Addendum Proposals will deliver 463 high quality homes with exemplar amenities. All units now comply with space standards and have been designed to manage overlooking and privacy. Further analysis relating to boundary treatments and the relationship with neighbouring buildings at Fairway Court and the Fairway/Northway Schools has been provided to show how the development responds to its neighbours and safeguards amenity.

6.6 Additional changes involve minor design updates made as the detailed design has progressed. These involve minor internal layout changes and façade development and are considered to be acceptable and in accordance with the Development Plan.



Unit and Tenure mix

- 6.7 The policy position has not changed and is outlined in sections 6 of the Original Planning Statement. The Support for Housebuilding LPG has been adopted which is a significant material consideration in the assessment of the development. Further justification has been requested for the proposed housing mix within the development.
- 6.8 Policy H1 of the London Plan seeks to increase housing supply in London by setting borough housing targets. It allocates to Barnet a ten-year housing target of 23,640 for the period 2019/20 to 2028/29. The proposal would deliver 463 homes, which would make a significant contribution towards meeting this target, just under one fifth of one year's housing supply.
- 6.9 Policy H10 of the London Plan and Policy HOU2 of the Local Plan require that schemes should generally consist of a range of unit sizes to meet current and projected housing needs. Policy HOU2 of the Local Plan highlights the particular need for 2 bed and family housing within the borough, and this includes a table of preferred dwelling size distribution (Table 7 in the Local Plan), which in turn responds to findings from Barnet's Strategic Housing Market Assessment 2018 (SHMA).
- 6.10 A comparison of the proposed market housing mix against the Local Plan preferred mix is provided below:

Unit size	Local Plan	Proposed
1 bed	6%	-
2 bed	24%	22% (56 units)
3 bed +	70%	78% (195 units)

- 6.11 Policies H4, H5 and H6 of the London Plan and the Mayor's Affordable Housing and Viability SPG seek to maximise the delivery of affordable housing. Policy H5 sets out the 'threshold approach' to planning applications whereby schemes that meet or exceed the relevant threshold of affordable housing by habitable room without public subsidy, meet the relevant tenure mix and meet other relevant policy requirements and obligations to the satisfaction of the borough and the Mayor, are eligible to follow the Fast Track Route (FTR) set out in the SPG. This means that they are not required to submit a viability assessment or be subject to a late-stage viability review.



6.12 The proposal provides 50% affordable housing by habitable room, split 70% Discount Market Rent (DMR) and 30% London Living Rent (LLR) significantly exceeding the 35% threshold set by the recent Government and GLA support for housebuilding measures. The scheme delivers a genuinely affordable tenure mix, with larger family homes prioritised within the lower-cost LLR tenure. The additional affordable housing delivered above the 35% threshold is focused on 1 bed DMR homes, allowing the scheme to maximise affordable delivery while protecting genuinely affordable family housing.

6.13 The proposed affordable housing offer is summarised below.

Unit type	DMR Units	LLR Units	DMR Hab Rooms	LLR Hab Rooms
1 bed	167	-	662	-
2 bed	-	-	-	-
3 bed	-	34	-	204
4 bed	-	9	-	63
5 bed	-	2	-	14
Total	167	45	662	281

6.14 This demonstrates that the proposed market housing mix almost completely aligns with the preferred Local Plan mix, with the small shortfall in 1 and 2 bed accommodation provided as additional 3 bed accommodation, which LBB has the greatest need for. The market housing mix therefore accords with Policy H10 of the London Plan and Policy HOU2 of the Local Plan.

6.15 The proposed affordable rents have been benchmarked against GLA guidance and local market evidence to ensure the homes remain genuinely affordable to the intended households.

6.16 DMR homes will be provided at a minimum 20% discount to market rent in accordance with GLA guidance. The proposed rents have been tested against GLA affordability criteria. The maximum chargeable gross rents by unit type have been calculated, assuming tenants would spend 40% of their net annual income (70% of gross income) on housing costs. The required discounts and resulting rental costs are set out below.

6.17 The proposed affordable housing strategy represents a robust and evidence-led response to identified housing need within LBB. The scheme delivers a substantial 50% affordable housing provision by habitable room, significantly exceeding the 35% threshold adopted in recent Government and GLA supporting housebuilding measures.



- 6.18 The tenure and housing mix has been carefully structured to ensure that the greatest affordability benefits are directed toward households in greatest need. In particular, all 3, 4 and 5 bed affordable homes are provided as LLR accommodation, reflecting clear evidence within the LBB SHMA that demand for genuinely affordable family housing is most acute amongst larger households.
- 6.19 The additional affordable housing delivered above the recently introduced 35% Time Limited Route for public land is focused on 1 bed DMR homes, which households with an income cap of £67,000 are able to afford, enabling the scheme to maximise overall affordable housing delivery while maintaining viability and safeguarding the delivery of lower-cost family accommodation. This approach strikes an appropriate and justified balance between housing need, affordability, viability and efficient site optimisation.
- 6.20 The discount and maximum gross rent has been generated on the basis of local market rents and the current £67,000 household income cap set by the GLA, demonstrating that the DMR homes are most suited as 1 beds.
- 6.21 The proposed tenure allocation is informed by the SHMA, which assessed the number of homes needed by unit type for households able to afford LLR but not 80% of market rent (equivalent to DMR in this case) against households able to afford DMR, as set out below.

	Able to afford LLR not "affordable rent"		Able to afford "affordable rents" (assumed 80% of median market rent)	
Unit type	LLR Need (No.)	LLR Need (%)	AR Need (No.)	AR Need (%)
1 bed	20	1%	380	15%
2 bed	450	33%	1,330	53%
3 bed	520	39%	570	23%
4 bed	280	21%	170	7%
5+ bed	80	6%	50	2%
Total	1,350	100%	2,500	100%

- 6.22 The SHMA clearly indicates that the need for housing among those able to afford LLR but unable to afford 80% of market rent is the greatest in case of larger family units, with 66% of households within this target demographic needing 3, 4 and 5 bed homes. Then, when compared to LLR, the need among those able to afford DMR increases



considerably for 1 bed homes. The proposed tenure allocation responds directly to this evidence.

Unit type	LLR Benchmark	LLR Discount	Max Gross DMR	DMR Discount
1 bed	£995	-£955	£1,560	-£390
2 bed	£1,105	-£1,495	£1,560	-£1,040
3 bed	£1,216	-£2,084	£1,560	-£1,740
4 bed	£1,326	-£2,174	£1,560	-£1,940
5 bed	£1,437	-£2,563	£1,560	-£2,440

6.23 The above figures (which describe rent levels per calendar month) demonstrate that LLR delivers materially greater affordability benefits for larger family homes than DMR. The proposed approach therefore ensures that the homes providing the greatest discounts are directed toward households most affected by affordability pressures within the borough.

6.24 Therefore, all 3, 4 and 5 bed affordable homes have been allocated to the lower-cost LLR tenure, ensuring the greatest affordability benefits are targeted towards larger households with the highest level of need. 1 bed homes have been allocated to DMR, which households with an income cap of £67,000 are able to afford, enabling the scheme to maximise affordable housing delivery overall.

6.25 It is therefore considered that the variance from table 7 of the Local Plan is justified and is in accordance with the Development Plan.

Quantum of Commercial Floorspace and the need for Retail Impact Assessment

6.26 The lack of a retail impact assessment was one of the LPA's reasons for refusal. The total amount of commercial floorspace has reduced to 499 sqm since submission of the Application therefore such an assessment is not required.

6.27 The Class E uses which are proposed are shown below:-

Class E Use	Size (sqm)
Café	93
Gym	240
Soft Play	166
Total	499 sqm



- 6.28 In review of the NPPF definition of “main town centre uses”, it is clear that the elements which comprise “retail” are the café, gym and soft play which will all be accessible to members of the public and residents of the development. These together total 499 sqm which is under the Barnet Local Plan Policy TOW01 500 sqm threshold for an impact assessment. Therefore it is not required.
- 6.29 Other ancillary residential uses provided at basement level include co-working (207 sqm) and community (93 sqm) accommodation. This accommodation will be for use by residents of the development only and therefore are not town centre uses. Further discussion with GLA officers is ongoing on limiting the use of the Class E uses by condition (as well as the ancillary residential uses) to ensure that the retail elements remain under 500 sqm.
- 6.30 It is considered that the commercial offering will significantly enhance the development and surrounding community which is greatly under-served by convenience and comparison retailing. The addendum and the development are considered to be acceptable in accordance with the Development Plan.

Daylight and Sunlight

- 6.31 The policy position has not changed and is outlined in sections 6 of the Original Planning Statement. Further detailed assessment work has been carried out in relation to the Proposed Development’s impact on the neighbouring Fairway Court due to design changes in the roof slope of Block A, this has resulted in positive but minor changes to the impacts which are reported in the ESA. The addendum also noted that the first floor windows of 17-20 Fairway Court would retain in excess of 27% VSC with eaves removed. All windows experience no more than a minor adverse impact in daylight terms. These impacts are unchanged from the original application.

Townscape

- 6.32 The policy position has not changed and is outlined in section 6 of the Original Planning Statement. The additional view which has been prepared illustrates the development from the west, facing east on the Fairway. The additional view is considered to be an additional moderate beneficial effect on the townscape.

Transport and Highways

- 6.33 The policy position is largely unchanged and is outlined in section 6 of the Original Planning Statement. The new policy which is relevant is the Support for Housing LPG, particularly in relation to cycle parking standards. Enclosed with this submission is a



Transport Statement Addendum prepared by Lime Transport. This responds to comments received from TFL and LBB. This note addresses the below areas, as raised by Officers:

Active travel

- 6.34 Following officer feedback, it was agreed that improvements identified through the Active Travel Zone Assessment should be structured into two categories: (i) strategic network-wide measures to be considered for funding through CIL, and (ii) localised interventions within the immediate walking catchment (defined as the route to the nearest bus stops). It was also agreed that the pedestrian route from the development to the nearest bus stops on Barnet Way is generally acceptable and no enhancements identified.
- 6.35 A night-time assessment as requested by officers has also been provided within Tables 3.1-3.7 of Active Travel Routes Assessment Technical Note (doc ref: 24075d8a), Appendix A of the HSTA (doc ref: 24075d3j).

Trip Generation

- 6.36 Officers outlined that trip generation is based on only two sites which provided a limited outcome. They recommend that a wider range of sites is included, with a preference for data collected in the last 5 years and consider using sites used in recent Barnet applications.
- 6.37 Lime Transport have confirmed that there are a limited number of sites in the TRICS database that have a comparable ratio of parking per dwelling to the Proposed Development and are located within a low PTAL area. The provided assessment delivers the most accurate comparison using the available data.
- 6.38 Officers stated disparity with the TRICS data provided. Lime Transport have confirmed that the TRICS dataset captures trips associated with all journey purposes, including commuting, education, shopping and leisure. Additionally, that Census Journey to Work data is not directly comparable with TRICS multi-purpose trip data and would be expected to indicate lower levels of walking and cycling and higher levels of motorised travel than a dataset reflecting all trip purposes.

Cycle Parking

- 6.39 Lime Transport have amended and improved the cycle parking strategy in line with Support for Housebuilding LPG and the proposals now align with the new standards.



This has resulted in a reduction in cycle parking from 843 long stay / 13 short stay spaces in the Original Submission to 546 long stay / 23 short stay in the Addendum proposals. This has allowed for much higher quality and less dense parking which is considered to be a benefit.

Controlled parking zone implementation

- 6.40 A CPZ is proposed and, therefore, car ownership will be constrained. New residents of the development will be ineligible to apply for permits of any future zone and this will be secured by planning obligations.

Mobility Hub

- 6.41 Lime Transport have clarified that the proposed mobility hub will provide a focal point for sustainable travel, typically combining facilities such as cycle parking, e-bike and/or e-scooter rental, cargo bike rental (managed through the concierge), two car club vehicles, public transport information, cycle repair station, wayfinding signage and public seating.



Public transport proposals

6.42 The Applicant is committed to improving public transport options to the Site. The options considered are:

- Enhancement of existing services
- Diversion of services via The Fairway
- Dedicated shuttle service to Edgware Station

6.43 Improvements to public transport are subject to further negotiation with TFL during the drafting of the s106 and Section 278 agreements. The Applicant is committed to providing a contribution for the improvement of the local bus service. This would be secured through a s106 setting out the amount, purpose and triggers for payment.

Deliveries and Servicing

6.44 As stated in the Trip Generation Technical Note (doc ref: 24075D7a, para 4.1.6), service vehicles are included in the overall vehicle trip generation.

6.45 In addition to the Technical Note, Lime Transport have provided a plan showing The Fairway along the frontage of the site, including the proposed layby (for servicing and deliveries), the proposed footway cross-overs (to allow vehicles to access the on-site infrastructure), and the retention of a 2m wide footway along the entire site frontage.

Trees, Landscaping and Ecology

Landscaping

6.46 Enclosed with this submission is a Landscaping Strategy, including a Landscaping Strategy, as prepared by London Placemaking. These provide details of the proposed landscaping strategy across the Site.

6.47 Details of the trees to be retained are included, in addition to the proposed soft and hard landscaping and maintenance strategy.

Ecology

6.48 Submitted with this addendum are an Ecology Technical Note and Green Infrastructure Technical Note, both prepared by London Placemaking.



- 6.49 The Ecology Technical Note sets out the ecological technical work and mitigation measures that are ongoing and proposed in respect of protected species, in particular bats, badgers and reptiles, together with the assessment of trees for potential bat roost features. Some ongoing survey work will inform the mitigation strategy and will be provided before the application is determined.
- 6.50 The separate Green Infrastructure Note addresses BNG, UGF, arboricultural and CAVAT matters.
- 6.51 To confirm, the scheme has undergone, prior to refusal by the LPA, considerable design development, with biodiversity, urban greening, arboriculture, landscape quality and long-term management treated as core design considerations throughout. This has resulted in improved BNG, UGF scores across the Site.
- 6.52 All trees across the Site have been assessed by chartered arboricultural consultants, Tree Frontiers to determine the CAVAT value. They have confirmed that the scheme removes 79 trees or groups of trees and retains 71. In applying a Community Tree Index (CTI) factor of 150% and a Unit Value Factor (UVF) of £23.56, the assessment concludes that the total CAVAT value of the trees proposed for removal is £263,262. The total estimate value of the replacement trees is £50,097.
- 6.53 Therefore, a shortfall payment of £213,065 would be secured via the section 106 legal agreement; it is envisaged that the final shortfall payment will be confirmed once the final landscaping scheme has been designed and specified.



Section 106 Heads of Terms

- 6.1 The Heads of Terms as set out in the Original Planning Statement provides an overview of the Section 106 obligations that will be required to be entered into when permission is granted for the Proposed Development.
- 6.2 The obligations set out below are in accordance with the Barnet Planning Obligations SPD.
- 6.3 They are necessary to make the application acceptable in planning terms, directly related to the development and fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development. A list of the obligations which have been agreed are set out below:
- Housing:
 - o Build to rent clawback, covenant period and management plan
 - o Affordable housing to secure the DMR and LLR and quantum
 - Training programmes to promote local employment and economic prosperity;
 - o Plan covering employment and skills prior to commencement of construction
 - o 20 per cent local labour target
 - o 1 Barnet resident on an apprenticeship for every £2 million of build cost
 - o 1 unpaid work experience placement for every £2 million of build cost
 - o Local Procurement Plan
 - HUDU contribution £343,200;
 - Trees and Biodiversity Net Gain;
 - o CAVAT contribution of £213,065
 - o Off-site BNG credits mitigation
 - Environmental improvements including air quality
 - Transport
 - o CPZ – feasibility study and contribution of £250 per residential unit
 - o Parking Design and Management Plan
 - o Restrict on-street parking permits
 - o Active Travel Plan measures and improvement and implementation plan
 - o Private shuttle bus/contribution towards TfL bus network
 - o Section 278 Agreement
 - o Travel Plan/Construction Logistics Plan/Monitoring contributions;
 - Energy



- Carbon offset contribution £360,603 (subject to change) - 50 per cent at commencement of development; with the remaining 50 per cent to be paid upon completion based on as-built documentation.
- Be seen requirements – GLA standard wording
- DHN future proofing
- Monitoring costs

6.4 The Applicant is in ongoing discussions in relation to the Legal Agreement and a first draft has been prepared. With this package of measures in place, the Proposed Development is considered to be in accordance with the Development Plan and acceptable in planning terms.



7. Conclusions

- 7.6 Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, requires proposals to be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. This Statement has assessed the Addendum against the Development Plan and other relevant planning policy and guidance at national, regional and local policy level.
- 7.7 The Addendum has made minor design changes and provided clarifications on a number of technical points and has fully addressed the Barnet reasons for refusal.
- 7.8 This Addendum will continue to deliver substantial, and significant public benefits for Barnet, including those outlined at section 8.3 of the Original Planning Statement.
- 7.9 This Planning Statement Addendum and the supporting documents submitted in support of the Addendum as a whole demonstrates the Proposed Development is in accordance with the Development Plan and the NPPF.
- 7.10 When taking into account all relevant material considerations, including the Support for Housebuilding LPG, the application should be determined in accordance with the Development Plan. The scheme as a whole represents an exemplary form of sustainable development, and it is considered on this basis that the Proposed Development should be granted planning permission.