

Mill Hill Preservation Society founded 1949



Patron: Lady Hobson OBE JP
President: Dr Michael Worms BSc PhD
Vice Chairman: Kevin Green
Hon. Architect: John Living AAdip CMdip RIBA
Hon. Solicitor: Robert Cottingham MA
Hon. Treasurer: Wendy Living BA ACA JP
Administrator & Membership Secretary: Kim Thompson

...making change worthwhile

For the attention of **Andrew Dillon**, Principal Planning Officer, Major Project Team
London Borough of Barnet
Development Management & Building Control Service
Barnet House
1255 High Road
London N20 0EJ

20th August 2019

Your Ref: **19/3208/S73**
Our ref: JL /pg / MHPS Planning

Dear Andrew Dillon,

TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990

SITE: National Institute for Medical Research The Ridgeway London NW7 1AA

PROPOSAL: Minor Material Amendment to condition 2 (Approved Plans), Condition 26 (Play Equipment), Condition 32 (Car Parking), Condition 44 (Inclusive Design), Condition 45 (Energy Statement) and Condition 49 (Accessible Units) of Planning Permission for 16/4545/FUL dated 22/12/2017, to provide for the following design changes: Amendments to the approved floor plans of Blocks A, B and C to allow for the provision of 52 additional homes (within the same building mass of the original approved scheme, with no change to above-ground building volume or floorspace); Amendments to the basement floor plan of the Cruciform Cluster (Blocks A-C) to enlarge the basement, in order to provide a pro-rata increase in the provision of car parking spaces (52 additional spaces); Associated floor plan amendments to Blocks A-C and basement to accommodate pro-rata changes to cycle parking, refuse storage, private amenity space etc; Minor changes to elevations of Blocks A-C as a result of floor plan amendments; Pro-rata increase in the provision of affordable housing (to maintain 35% by habitable rooms); and Minor alterations to the floor plans of Blocks J1 and J2, to allow for an increase in M4(3) wheelchair adaptable units within these blocks

PLANNING REFERENCE: 19/3208/S73

MHPS society has received a few comments following our letter of objection on this scheme. These show to us that our letter is open to some misunderstanding and I am writing to clarify a couple of points. I hope the timing is not too late...

In our letter where it says...

“3.0 Design & Car Parking: *It is clear from examining the submission that there will be a gain of 28 one-bedroom units, a gain of 29 two-bedroom units and a loss of 5 three-bedroom units. It is unfortunate that the development will be dominated by one and two bedroom units and the Society believes this site, rather than other local ones under consideration, is more appropriate for family and ‘downsizer’ units. “*

Just to be clear, these words are meant to mean that MHPS would prefer the scheme to stay as it was approved by the Mayor.

We do not like the proliferation of 1 and 2 bedroom units in new local developments; I know LBB prefer larger units (although I cannot quote you the policy as I am away on holiday). This site is particularly attractive for larger units, unlike others in the Borough.

Car parking: On the addition of the car parking spaces, whilst the traffic report shows that the extra journeys to and from the site would be 'reasonable proposal', CAAC have pointed out to the Society the extent of the increase plan area for parking is over that which would be normally be allowed on a Green Belt site, and is therefore unacceptable.

Additionally: The 'Conclusion' in our letter is geared towards the rebuilding of the cruciform building rather than the whole scheme – hence our comment that “the Society would not wish to be obstructive over minor changes.” This refers to the changes to the roof and front elevation design, and the minor changes to the back elevation. The change in layout and matching window locations is reasonable and will not overpower the original competition scheme proposals. As set out in previous letters, to which we refer, the density of the site is too high for the locality and the addition of extra flats adds further to the weight of our previous arguments. The loss of three bedroom units is not something that we generally support.

I trust these clarifications are helpful, and will negate any misunderstandings

Yours sincerely

John Living: Honorary Architect
Mill Hill Preservation Society
On behalf of the Committee and the Planning Group