



PLANNING STATEMENT ADDENDUM

Site: Maple House & Nos 8-16 (even)
& 30-32 High Street and Nos 1-7
Princes Parade, Potters Bar

For: Chase New Homes

Project Ref: 25014

Date: August 2026

Prepared by:

Lauren Whiteley BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

Associate

Barker Parry Town Planning Ltd

33 Bancroft, Hitchin, Herts SG5 1LA

T: 01462 420224 / E: office@barkerparry.co.uk



RTPI

Chartered Town Planners

Contents Page



Section	Title	Page
1.0	Introduction	2
2.0	Planning Policy Context	3
3.0	Planning Assessment	5
4.0	Conclusion	16

1.0 **Introduction**

1.1 This Planning Statement Addendum has been prepared on behalf of Chase (Canada) Ltd ("the applicant") in relation to full planning application S62A/2026/0159 at Maple House, Nos 8-16 (even) & 30-32 High Street and Nos 1-7 Princes Parade, EN6 5BA ("the site").

1.2 The application was submitted to the Secretary of State under S62A of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) and validated on 6 August 2026. The application has the following description of development:

Partial demolition of existing buildings (with retention of existing two-storey car park and substation) and redevelopment of the site to provide a mixed-use development comprising residential apartments (class C3) and flexible commercial floorspace (class E) across 4 blocks and associated internal roads, parking, drainage, landscaping, amenity space and associated works.

1.3 The date by when representations must be made is 11 September 2026.

1.4 Since the application was submitted, there has been a material change in planning policy with an updated National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) published on 17 August 2026. This Planning Statement Addendum considers the national decision-making policies in the Framework and comments on any material changes relevant to the determination of the planning application.

2.0 **Planning Policy Context**

2.1 As noted, an updated NPPF was published on 17 August 2026.

2.2 The policies in the updated Framework are material considerations which must be taken into account in decision-making from the day of its publication (Paragraph 1 of Annex A).

2.3 Paragraph 2 of Annex A also states that development plan policies which are materially inconsistent with the national decision-making policies in the Framework should be given very limited weight.

2.4 The following national decision-making policies in the 2026 NPPF are of relevance to the proposed development:

- DM3 (Determining development proposals)
- DM4 (Emerging development plan proposals)
- DM5 (Development viability)
- DM6 (Use of planning conditions and obligations)
- DM7 (Relationship with other regulatory regimes)
- S3 (Presumption in favour of sustainable development)
- S4 (Principle of development within settlements)
- CC2 (Mitigation of climate change)
- CC3 (Adaptation to climate change)
- HO7 (Meeting the need for homes)
- HO8 (Providing affordable homes)
- HO13 (Build out of residential and strategic sites)
- TC2 (Development in town centres)
- L2 (Making effective use of land)
- L3 (Achieving appropriate densities)
- DP3 (Key principles for well-designed places)

- DP4 (The design process)
- TR3 (Locating development in sustainable locations)
- TR4 (Street design, access and parking)
- TR6 (Assessing transport impacts)
- HC3 (Community facilities and public service infrastructure serving new development)
- P2 (Ground conditions)
- P3 (Living conditions and pollution)
- P5 (Maintaining public safety and security)
- F4 (Assessing flood risk for decision-making)
- F5 (The sequential test)
- F7 (Ensuring development is safe from flooding)
- F8 (Sustainable drainage systems and watercourses)
- N2 (Improving the natural environment)
- N3 (Trees in new development)
- HE4 (Securing the conservation of heritage assets)
- HE5 (Assessing effects on heritage)
- HE6 (Proposals affecting designated heritage assets)
- HE7 (Decisions on non-designated heritage assets)

3.0 **Planning Assessment**

3.1 This section provides an update on the key planning considerations in light of the updated NPPF.

Principle of Development

3.2 NPPF Policy S3 states that decisions on development proposals should apply a presumption in favour of sustainable development.

3.3 With regards to development within settlements, NPPF Policy S4 states that proposals should be approved unless the benefits of doing so would be substantially outweighed by any adverse effects, when assessed against the national decision-making policies in this Framework. As discussed throughout this section, the benefits of approving this development are not substantially outweighed by adverse effects, particularly when having regard to the circumstances included in Policy S4 (2).

3.4 The site was identified as a candidate site for allocation in the draft Hertsmere Local Plan which underwent Regulation 18 consultation earlier this year. However, given this is at an early stage of preparation, limited weight can be attached to it (as per NPPF Policy DM4).

3.5 Notwithstanding this, the proposed development is aligned with the aspirations of the emerging allocation which is for redevelopment of the site to provide main town centre uses at ground floor and residential above. The applicant attended a meeting with Hertsmere Borough Council Policy Officers on 25 August 2026 regarding the Local Plan process and emerging allocation for the site. Policy Officers confirmed during this meeting that they consider the application accords with the emerging spatial strategy.

- 3.6 The proposed development would not have a substantial adverse impact in relation to the application of policies HC7, HC8, N8, N4 or L2(1)(d) of the NPPF.
- 3.7 The proposal does not involve the whole or partial loss of undeveloped land as specified in S4 (2)(b).
- 3.8 Moreover, it does not fail to comply with one of the national decision-making policies which state that development proposals should be refused in specific circumstances.
- 3.9 A full consideration of the planning benefits is included in the concluding section of this Statement. In summary, there are no adverse effects that would substantially outweigh the significant benefits of the proposed development, and it therefore follows that planning permission should be granted in accordance with Policy S3.

Design

- 3.10 NPPF Policy DP3 requires development proposals to respond to their context so that they integrate with and enhance their surroundings; such as through the arrangement of development plots and buildings, the use of materials and architectural features, and the restoration, reuse and integration of heritage assets. This should not preclude innovation or change where it is appropriate, especially where an increased scale or density of development is justified in accordance with Policies L2 and L3.
- 3.11 The information submitted with the application demonstrates the contextual analysis undertaken prior to submission of the application to inform the design and ensure the scheme successfully integrates and enhances its surroundings.

- 3.12 It can be demonstrated that the proposed development reflects the principles set out in DP3 (2) with regard to liveability, climate, nature, movement, built form, public space and identity.
- 3.13 Moreover, in accordance with NPPF Policy DP4, the application was subject to extensive pre-application discussions with Officers prior to submission of the application, including presentation to Design Review Panel, the feedback from which shaped the proposals.
- 3.14 The submitted Design and Access Statement includes a section on designing out crime which details the design measures to be incorporate to mitigated potential safety risks in accordance with NPPF Policy P5.

Density

- 3.15 In accordance with NPPF Policy L2, substantial weight should be given to the benefits of the proposal given it makes better use of vacant and underutilised land and buildings through the redevelopment of an underutilised retail and business site (criterion b).
- 3.16 NPPF Policy L3 requires development proposals within settlements to contribute to an increase in density of the area in which they are situated.
- 3.17 As confirmed as part of the application, the proposed development has a density of 180 dwellings per hectare (dph), which increases to 202 dph when also accounting for the conversion of the existing Canada Life Building to 74no residential units under a separate prior approval.
- 3.18 The proposal therefore makes efficient use of land.

Residential Amenity

3.19 NPPF Policy P3 states that development proposals should be appropriate for their location, including in regard to pollution on health, living conditions and the natural environment. Within this context, the development proposals meet the criteria in (2) as follows:

- The proposals provide healthy living conditions for future occupiers and users for the reasons set out in Paragraphs 5.50 – 5.57 of the original Planning Statement;
- The proposals would not give rise to, or contribute to, unacceptable impacts on neighbouring residents or occupiers. A Daylight Sunlight Report was submitted with the application concluding the impact of the proposed scheme would be minimal, with neighbouring properties retaining very good daylight and sunlight amenity. Moreover, the development would not give rise to unacceptable levels of air, noise, artificial light, water soil or other forms of pollution;
- The application was submitted with an Air Quality Assessment confirming adherence with the relevant requirements;
- The application was supported by a Noise Impact Assessment which confirms the site is suitable in terms of noise levels and details the mitigation measures proposed to ensure an acceptable noise environment;
- There is unlikely to be any adverse impact on artificial light on local amenity given the nature of the town centre location. A lighting scheme can be secured by condition as necessary;
- It is not considered the proposed development would have an unacceptable adverse effect on water quality.

Heritage

- 3.20 NPPF Policy HE4 states that harm to, or loss of, the significance of a designated heritage asset should have a clear and convincing justification in accordance with the policies in the Framework.
- 3.21 In compliance with NPPF Policy HE5, the application is accompanied by a Heritage Statement which assesses the significance of the heritage assets affected by the proposal and potential effect.
- 3.22 It was agreed with Officers at pre-application stage, that the development would cause “less-than-substantial harm” to the Cask and Stillage Pub, at the lower end of the spectrum. This was the term used in Paragraph 215 of the previous (December 2024) version of the NPPF, upon which the harm was assessed.
- 3.23 On this basis, it is not considered Paragraphs (5) or (6) of NPPF Policy HE6 are relevant given they relate to substantial harm to a designated heritage asset.
- 3.24 Paragraph (4) of HE6 requires the harm to designated heritage assets to be weighed against any public benefits resulting from the proposal. This assessment is undertaken in the original Planning Statement, and we maintain the conclusion that the public benefits would significantly outweigh the ‘less-than-substantial’ harm to the designated heritage asset.

Housing Mix

- 3.25 As per NPPF Policy HO7, substantial weight should be given to the benefits of providing homes which will contribute towards meeting the evidence accommodation needs of the community.

- 3.26 The proposed housing mix is considered appropriate having regard to local housing need, and will provide accommodation for a range of different groups included in Policy HO1, whilst also being appropriate for the town-centre location and ensuring the development makes efficient use of land.

Affordable Housing

- 3.27 NPPF Policy HO8 states that development proposals should meet or exceed up-to-date development plan requirements for the proportion and mix of affordable housing tenures relevant to the location.
- 3.28 Policy DM5 does however acknowledge that there may be circumstances in which a viability assessment demonstrates that it would not be possible for development to proceed on a policy compliant basis. In such circumstances, proposals may be justified to ensure that the proposed development makes the maximum possible contribution to affordable housing and other infrastructure.
- 3.29 A Viability Assessment has been submitted with the application which concludes that the proposed scheme incurs a deficit even when affordable housing contributions are reduced and therefore no affordable housing is proposed.
- 3.30 It is considered that the proposal accords with the criteria listed in DM5 (2) which states that viability assessments may be justified in a number of circumstances.
- 3.31 The Hertsmere Local Plan comprises the Core Strategy which was adopted in January 2013, and Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Plan document which was adopted in November 2016. The viability

information is therefore considerably out of date and did not account for the type of development proposed as part of this application.

3.32 The viability challenges of redeveloping a brownfield site for residential use in a flatted typology are reflected in the Council's own emerging evidence base. HDH Planning & Development has been appointed by the Council to undertake a whole-borough viability assessment to support the new Local Plan. Whilst this is subject to a round of consultation and future examination, the initial viability assessment suggests that flatted development, both under and over 6 storeys, is unviable.

3.33 A viability assessment is therefore justified in the context of the proposed scheme given the changes in circumstances since the current Local Plan, and supporting information, was prepared and adopted.

3.34 We also consider that the viability assessment fully complies with the requirements in DM5 (4).

Commercial Floorspace

3.35 NPPF Policy TC2 states that substantial weight should be given to the benefits of supporting the overall vitality and viability of the town centre, including where this can be achieved through the diversification of uses, intensification and provision of residential accommodation.

3.36 The proposal is for a residential-led, mixed-use development, including the provision of flexible Class E floorspace, thus supporting the vitality and viability of the town centre.

Landscaping

- 3.37 NPPF Policy HC3 states that where the development plan does not set locally-specific standards for recreational land and facilities, all development proposals should use the relevant national standards and best practice to identify improvements in the quantity and quality of provision which should be provided or contributed towards, as appropriate to the nature of the development and taking into account existing levels of provision in the area.
- 3.38 The Planning Statement sets out the open space and play space requirements for the scheme and how the scheme achieves an appropriate quantity and quality of on-site provision suitable for a town centre location in proximity to other existing facilities. A financial contribution towards offsite play provision for older children is proposed and included in the draft legal agreement.

Ecology, Trees and Biodiversity Net Gain

- 3.39 The original Planning Statement provided detail on how the scheme would positively contribute to the natural environment in accordance with NPPF Policy N2 through incorporating green infrastructure and biodiversity enhancements.
- 3.40 The scheme also proposes a net increase of 34 trees, including along routes through the site, and complies with the requirements of NPPF Policy N3.

Highways and Transport

- 3.41 The proposed development is located to support sustainable patterns of movements, enable good accessibility for different users and make the most of existing and proposed transport infrastructure in accordance with NPPF Policy TR3.

3.42 Transport considerations have formed an integral part of the design development, including pre-application discussions with the Local Highways Authority. The scheme proposes a hierarchy of routes to reduce vehicle dominance and give priority to cyclists and pedestrians as per NPPF Policy TR4.

3.43 The application is supported by a Transport Assessment which does not consider there would be a severe adverse impact on the transport network or unacceptable impact on highway safety, as stated in Policy TR6.

Flood Risk and Drainage

3.44 The application is accompanied by a Flood Risk and Drainage Assessment as required by NPPF Policy F4.

3.45 NPPF Policy F5 requires a sequential test to be used in areas known to be at risk now or in the future from any form of flooding, other than sites where a site-specific flood risk assessment demonstrates clearly that, where the site would be at risk of surface water flooding only, the proposed layout, design, and mitigation measures would ensure that occupiers and users would remain safe from current and future surface water flood risk for the lifetime of the development without increasing flood risk elsewhere.

3.46 The application is supported by a Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy. The site is located within Flood Zone 1 and whilst the majority of the site is considered as being at a 'Very Low' susceptibility to surface water flooding, there are some areas located within the site boundary of higher susceptibility. These isolated areas occur within topographical depressions, with the potential for flooding in these areas to be either removed as part of the proposals through the raising of levels, or managed through the

proposed onsite drainage network and SUDS. Accordingly, there is no requirement for a sequential or exception test to be undertaken.

3.47 Moreover, the development does not present a risk from flooding to potential occupiers, users, or visitors, and does not increase flood risk elsewhere in accordance with NPPF Policy F7.

3.48 As per NPPF Policy F8, Sustainable Drainage Systems are incorporated into the scheme and designed in accordance with the relevant standards.

Energy and Sustainability

3.49 The proposed development contributes to climate change mitigation and transition to net zero by meeting the relevant criteria in NPPF Policy CC2.

3.50 The scheme also takes into account the current and potential impacts of climate change over the lifetime of the scheme, as required by NPPF Policy CC3, by being located where the risk of flooding is minimised, incorporates sustainable drainage systems and minimises risk of overheating.

Community Infrastructure Levy and Planning Obligations

3.51 NPPF Policy HC3 requires development to make provision for new community facilities and public service infrastructure necessary for the development to be acceptable in planning terms.

3.52 Further detail of the mechanism for securing this is included within the original Planning Statement, but in summary, a draft legal agreement has been submitted with the planning application and the adopted CIL charging schedule provides a means for other forms of infrastructure improvements

to be funded. Policy HC3 (b) specifically acknowledges that contribution to off-site improvements may be through CIL payments.



4.0 **Conclusion**

- 4.1 This Planning Statement Addendum has been prepared in relation to full planning application S62A/2026/0159 at Maple House, Nos 8-16 (even) & 30-32 High Street and Nos 1-7 Princes Parade, EN6 5BA and specifically to respond to the new NPPF that was published on 17 August 2026.
- 4.2 Policy DM3 of the NPPF is clear that when considering development proposals, applications for development should not be refused which should be clearly approved, having regard to their accordance with the development plan, the policies in this Framework and any other material considerations.
- 4.3 Policy S4 provides explicit support for the principle of development within settlements, stating this should be approved unless the benefits of doing so would be substantially outweighed by any adverse effects.
- 4.4 The significant benefits of the proposed development are set out in the original Planning Statement, which significantly includes the redevelopment of an underused brownfield, town-centre site, to provide 293no residential units contributing towards meeting an identified unmet need in Hertsmere.
- 4.5 The benefits associated with the development are wide ranging and should be afforded significant weight collectively.
- 4.6 There are no adverse effects that would substantially outweigh the significant benefits of the proposed development. It therefore follows that planning permission should be granted.