

No.	Consultee Details	Consultation Response
1	Environment Agency	<p>Having commented previously on this plan we are pleased to see that our previous comments have been taken on board. Section 10.2 and 10.3 of the Baseline Report now refers to the West London Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (Level 1) and that the Dollis Brook corridor is within the functional floodplain. In addition section 10.9 summarises the Water Framework Directive status of the Dollis Brook, and section 10.10 references the Brent Catchment Management Plan and Brent Catchment Partnership.</p> <p>Paragraph 8.3 supporting Policy LE1 makes reference to Table 3 of the Planning Practice Guidance and the appropriateness of development types in each flood zone. We welcome the reference to Table 3 of the PPG and that only 'water compatible' development being appropriate in the functional floodplain. To clarify further, 'Essential infrastructure' is appropriate in this zone also, but only if it passes the Sequential and Exceptions Test.</p> <p>We support the inclusion of the WFD action measures for the Dollis Brook in paragraph 8.4. Please note that further feasibility studies may need to be undertaken on these measures to determine their practical delivery.</p> <p>We welcome the reference in Policy LE1 to encouraging and supporting proposals that seek to improve the biodiversity and water quality of the Dollis Brook. This is an improvement. However we still think the policy could be stronger by requiring proposals to fully consider measures to improve the biodiversity and water quality of the Dollis Brook, because as it stands although encouraged and supported this appears optional. Biodiversity Net Gain is a new tool that is currently in the process of being mandated through the Environment Bill, and is already included in paragraphs 170 and 174 of the National Planning Policy Framework, so there are policy drivers and initiatives happening that would support a stronger approach.</p>
2	Historic England	<p>We strongly support the Neighbourhood Plan's approach to the historic environment. The Plan is well evidenced and sets a good framework to ensure the conservation and enhancement of the historic environment. We have no further comments to make. If any specific heritage issues arise as a result of the consultation please not hesitate to contact us.</p>
3	Canal & River Trust	<p>I can confirm that as the Canal & River Trust has no land or water space within the Neighbourhood Plan Area, we have no comments to make.</p>
4	Highways England	<p>Highways England has been appointed by the Secretary of State for Transport as strategic highway company under the provisions of the Infrastructure Act 2015 and is the highway authority, traffic authority and street authority for the strategic road network (SRN). The SRN is a critical national asset and, as such, Highways England works to ensure that it operates and is managed in the public interest, both in respect of current activities and needs, as well as in providing effective stewardship of its long-term operation and integrity. We will therefore be concerned with proposals that have the potential to impact the safe and efficient operation of the SRN.</p>

		Having examined the West Finchley Neighbourhood Development Plan documents, we are satisfied that its policies will not materially affect the safety, reliability and / or operation of the SRN (the tests set out in DfT C2/13 para's 9 & 10 and MHCLG NPPF para 109). Based on this, Highways England does not offer any comments on the consultation at this time.
5	TfL	<p>We have commented on previous drafts of the Neighbourhood Plan and we are pleased to note that a number of points have been taken on board including the addition of references to the delivery of Healthy Streets, Vision Zero and Good Growth and the removal of a reference to bus lay-bys which are not supported by TfL. However, there is still some ambiguity about the approach to parking and TfL would prefer a much stronger commitment to encourage alternatives to car use with the aim of facilitating the efficient movement of people, rather than traffic. This will be necessary to prevent higher congestion as the population grows, and in some instances supporting measures such as controlled parking zones may be necessary to ensure existing residents who own cars can continue to park reliably and safely near their homes.</p> <p>The reference to the government's intention to ban the sale of petrol and diesel vehicle by 2040 is now out of date, as the government have announced they wish to bring this forward to at least 2035. While a switch to electric vehicles is welcomed, it should be noted that this does not address the congestion issues highlighted above.</p> <p>In policy T3 – West Finchley Underground station the existing waiting facilities are considered to be of a good standard and so it is not clear what is being suggested. The Wentworth Avenue entrance already provides step free access to the southbound platform although the access is by gate which is only open in the morning peak except for those with a RADAR key. There could be staffing and revenue protection considerations if the Wentworth Avenue access were to be opened for a longer time period. Although there are no current plans or resources available to do this, TfL may consider carrying out a trial of extended opened hours at some time in the future</p>
6	Thames Water	<p>New Charging Schedule</p> <p>For information, the way water and wastewater infrastructure will be delivered has changed. From the 1st April 2018 all off site water and wastewater network reinforcement works necessary as a result of new development will be delivered by the relevant statutory undertaker. Local reinforcement works will be funded by the Infrastructure Charge which is a fixed charge for water and wastewater for each new property connected. Strategic water and wastewater infrastructure requirements will be funded through water companies' investment programmes which are based on a 5 year cycle known as the Asset Management Plan process.</p> <p>Specific Comments Draft Policy A5 Utilities Infrastructure</p> <p>Thames Water support Policy A5 and its requirement for proposals to provide evidence of capacity within both water and sewage networks. However, in light of the changes which took effect in April 2018, and which are set out above, to strengthen Policy A5 we would request</p>

		<p>that text as set out below is included in the supporting paragraphs to encourage developers to make early contact with Thames Water through our pre-planning service:</p> <p><i>“Developers need to consider the net increase in water and waste water demand to serve their developments and also any impact the development may have off site further down the network, if no/low water pressure and internal/external sewage flooding of property is to be avoided.</i></p> <p><i>Thames Water encourages developers to use our free pre-planning service https://www.thameswater.co.uk/preplanning). This service can tell developers at an early stage if we will have capacity in our water and/or wastewater networks to serve their development, or what we’ll do if we don’t.</i></p> <p><i>The developer can then submit this as evidence to support a planning application and we can prepare to serve the new development at the point of need, helping avoid delays to housing delivery programmes.”</i></p> <p>Policy RD 5 – Basement Developments</p> <p>Thames Water support Policy RD5 in relation to basement development, but request that the Policy is strengthened by requiring all basement development to incorporate a positive pumped device or other suitable flood prevention device to avoid the risk of sewage backflows which can cause sewer flooding. This is because the wastewater network may surcharge to ground level during storm conditions. Such measures are required in order to comply with the NPPF which highlights the need to avoid flooding and also in the interests of good building practise as recognised in Part H of the Building Regulations.</p>
7	Labour London Assembly Member for Barnet and Camden	<p>As the London Assembly Member for Barnet and Camden, I have seen the contribution neighbourhood development plans can make in protecting and enhancing local communities with a strong heritage in design, which has had particular success in parts of Camden. I therefore write to express my support for the proposals in West Finchley.</p> <p>The area in question between the Northern Line and Dollis Brook has a considerable local character and history, according a special status to the mainly family homes. It is important to have a framework to protect these much desired and needed family homes from ever more applications for 8subdivision into flats, as expressed in the Council’s own planning documents.</p> <p>Given the generally low provision of public transport in the area (with the exception of the 326 bus and the nearby West Finchley station) it is important to ensure that overintensification does not occur here, as an overly dense population cannot be supported by local infrastructure.</p> <p>Local residents will be particularly keen to ensure that greenspaces are protected, such as the Dollis Valley Greenwalk, Nethercourt Avenue Allotments and the grass verges on Nether Street.</p>

		The plan also makes important distinctions about the future of life in West Finley, such as a commitment to ensuring adequate electric vehicle charging facilities.
8	Henry Planning Ltd.	<p>I object to the requirement for a basement impact assessment (BIA) for new basements.</p> <p>The council have already considered the need for BIA's in the residential design guidance (2017) and considered there was no justification for requiring BIA's for planning applications in Barnet. This is because the evidence demonstrated through building regulation work that by virtue of the prevailing soil conditions in Barnet (more clay than inner London soil conditions), there was no need for BIA's beyond what is required by the Building Regulations.</p> <p>To add a requirement that all proposed basements should include a BIA in any planning application submission only adds unnecessary and expensive burden on applicants seeking basement extensions. Building Regulations adequately ensure basements are built to required standards.</p> <p>And it is my understanding that Neighbourhood Plans cannot introduce more restrictive requirements beyond those required by Local Plan Policy. The introduction of a requirement for a BIA adds an additional requirement beyond existing adopted Local Plan policies.</p>
9	Barnet Cycling Campaign	<p>We will confine our response to the implications on transport and give our suggestions of how local infrastructure should be improved.</p> <p>Share with care</p> <p>1. We query the wording of the objective "To support proposals that promote responsible cycling in the Neighbourhood Plan area, while ensuring that other users of shared paths and roads are protected." This could imply that drivers on the roads need protection from cyclists, when the reverse is the case.</p> <p>2. We support ensuring that both cyclists and pedestrians on shared paths take responsibility for their own and each other's safety. To this end, we support upgrading the Dollis Valley Greenwalk to dual use, with separate lanes for pedestrians and cyclists.</p> <p>3. We also support publicity to raise awareness that cyclists should slow down and make pedestrians aware of their presence. Pedestrians also need to be aware of the dangers to cyclists of dogs and dog leads.</p> <p>Low Traffic Neighbourhood</p> <p>4. We propose that West Finchley should have a Low Traffic Neighbourhood (LTN) scheme, which prevents through traffic in residential areas, but retains permeability for active travel (bus, walking & cycling), and retains access for residents' cars.</p> <p>5. LTNs are a standard feature in modern developments, but can be introduced with care to established streets, which were based on the outdated principle of dispersing traffic across a network of streets.</p>

		<p>6. The LTN would enable the plan's policies, objectives and the needs of residents:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) To improve air quality, reduce the number of car trips, and to encourage active travel. b) To improve public transport accessibility for all residents, including elderly, disabled and young residents. c) To allow Year 4 pupils at Moss Hall Primary School to travel safely to Finchley Lawn Tennis Club in Brent Way. d) To ensure attractive street environments that prioritise people rather than cars, and are safe and well designed for all road users. <p>7. An LTN could be provided by:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) Preventing motor traffic from accessing Brent Way south of Fursby Avenue; and b) Installing a bus gate on Nether Street south of the junction with Courthouse Gardens. c) The bus gate should use CCTV enforcement and allow permitted vehicles: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Local buses; ▪ Blue badge holders; ▪ Licensed taxis whilst on duty; ▪ Cyclists (not motorcycles / mopeds); and ▪ Emergency vehicles <p>Parking</p> <p>8. We support the proposal that parking should not dominate or overburden residential streets to the detriment of other road users, including cyclists and pedestrians.</p> <p>Station</p> <p>9. We support all of the proposals to improve West Finchley Underground Station, including:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) The creation of improved cycle parking facilities; b) Improved waiting room facilities; c) Step free access; and d) Improved public realm and landscaping.
10	Friends of Windsor Open Space	<p>I am dismayed to think that the Dollis Valley Green Walk will disappear completely to be replaced by a Loop.</p> <p>The loop will no longer give priority to pedestrians but to cyclists and scooters.</p> <p>This scheme ignores pedestrians whether they are young or old or disabled in favour of cyclists.</p> <p>If cycling is forbidden on pavements why is it allowed on footpaths?</p> <p>This is a dangerous scheme and allows numbers of cyclists at any one time on the footpaths throughout the 17 mile loop.</p> <p>The Dollis Valley Green Walk was created for pedestrians and the bylaws stipulated no cycling and no horse riding.</p> <p>Could someone inform me as to when they were changed?</p> <p>More concrete, more light and noise pollution and what ever happened to Conservation of the environment?</p> <p>This is a perfect plan to implement cycling throughout Barnet with funding from TFL without having to provide proper cycling routes on main roads.</p> <p>I disapprove of this plan for all the above reasons.</p>

11	Resident	<p>Having read the West Finchley Neighbourhood Development Plan and supporting documents on the Planning Consultation pages, I believe it meets the Basic Conditions as required by Paragraph 8(2) of schedule 4B of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/1990/8/schedule/4B/paragraph/8).</p> <p>I would therefore like to make a representation in support of the West Finchley Neighbourhood Development Plan.</p>
12	Resident	<p>I should like to state my unequivocal support for the West Finchley Neighbourhood Forum.</p> <p>I have been a member of the West Finchley Residents Association since its inception, and also of the Forum.</p> <p>I have a long-standing interest in the West Finchley Neighbourhood and the projected Forum. This house (285) on Nether Street has been my home since 1946. I have seen many physical changes in this neighbourhood—the now-total infilling of the built-up area, with attendant loss of gardens; the devastating loss of much-needed trees through the impact of Dutch Elm disease, not to mention through felling; the sinking of over-deep house foundations in places where the effect is to divert the flow of ground-water to flood other properties or reduce soil water from plants in other gardens; and so on. The social change has been positive.</p> <p>I am impressed by the insight, thoughtfulness and thoroughness that has been put into the planning of the West Finchley Forum. I am sure LBB Planning Department will be too.</p>
13	Resident	<p>I live in the proposed Neighbourhood Plan area and I believe that this plan fulfils the Basic Conditions as required by the Town and Country Planning Act and the Localism Act.</p>
14	Resident	<p>I saw one of the Regulation 16 Consultation fliers on a lamp-post in my neighbourhood.</p> <p>Having read the West Finchley Neighbourhood Development Plan and supporting documents on the Planning Consultation pages, I believe it meets the Basic Conditions as required by Paragraph 8(2) of schedule 4B of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/1990/8/schedule/4B/paragraph/8).</p> <p>I would therefore like to make a representation in support of the West Finchley Neighbourhood Development Plan.</p>
15	Resident	<p>I am one of the residence of the area and I do agree with the plan provided. This plan does meet the basic conditions. Also, I do not agree with the referendum area being extended beyond the neighbourhood area as its a West Finchley neighbourhood development and should concern people living in the area.</p>
16	Resident	<p>I read the West Finchley Neighbourhood Development Plan and the document on the Plan Consultation pages, I fully support all the proposals and really believe that they would be beneficial to my local area.</p>

17	Resident	<p>I live in the designated West Finchley Neighbourhood Area and I believe that this proposed Neighbourhood Plan meets the Basic Conditions as required by the Town and Country Planning Act.</p> <p>I would therefore like to make a representation in support of the West Finchley Neighbourhood Plan.</p>
18	Resident	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · As a West Finchley resident, I have long appreciated the character and distinctiveness of the area. I propose that should West Finchley be deemed to have a special status, all residents of the area should have to pay an extra levy in council tax to maintain any changes to Barnet Council /national planning regulations. This could be handled by a simple vote of West Finchley council tax levy of how much extra residents are willing to pay for their community special status. The funds allocated could then be prioritised to see where West Finchley residents think the funds are allocated. This would improve accountability and has fairness as its principle, in terms of other Barnet residents not having to subsidise the wants of the West Finchley residents. It is very easy to request a long list of items, but someone has to pay for it, and the residents of West Finchley are the ones who should in my view pay for this benefit. Recommendation 1: A new West Finchley Council tax levy for West Finchley residents - Barnet council being leaders in this form of direct democracy could pilot this tax increase - it would also greatly in my view encourage ownership of residents on local community matters and proposals put forward. · West Finchley character assessment is not does not seem to be a wholly factual document, but one based on the opinion of the writers/interested parties - examples given below. · I completely disagree with the negative slant taken in the West Finchley character assessment on loft conversions on semi-detached properties. Many loft conversions are used by FAMILIES who value extra space. FAMILIES add to the character of the community and they should be encouraged to come into West Finchley, buy properties with potential for loft extension and improve the properties. Someone has to provide leadership in improving properties, someone has to be first. In a semi-detached property, if one side is converted (e.g. hip to gable) there will be the opportunity for the other owner to improve their property too (and then be symmetrical). Please do not hinder any home owners from improving their properties outside of normal planning rules, this will put off higher quality people coming into the area because of the burden of more regulation. Perhaps with a West Finchley levy, funds raised could fund grants for property owners without a loft conversion to be encouraged to create a loft extension to create symmetry to the overall building – if the priority of concern on this issue is high. - Recommendation 2 - Remove all reference to loft conversions in character assessment - Loft extensions add to the character of the community, as do the families they bring into our community. · I believe that it is the residents who look after their properties, those who maintain them, who improve them (including by creating larger dwellings in the form of loft conversions) are the people who are improving the quality of the environment for all residents. The properties with decrepit windows (and those that are poorly maintained, reduce the quality of the environment for all. I believe property owners who look after their property and have them in a clean orderly state should be rewarded perhaps by a council tax rebate from

the West Finchley levy. This would incentivise what **everyone** would agree as being better practice. This is far more important in my view than anything proposed in the “West Finchley Neighbourhood Development Plan”.

- There could be an additional tax for residents who annex off a part of their property and rent it out in West Finchley. This would to raise funds for conservation aims.
- Section 4.23 West Finchley character assessment : Urban structure and built form, Figure 19 is a very biased take on windows . It could easily have written “Larger panels and detailing when appropriately carried out tend to contribute toward the successful integration of alterations and modern materials”. If people want larger paneling of windows that should be their own choice. One way to encourage symmetry would be to offer a grant from the West Finchley levy, to update to certain types of windows. Modern living appreciates the creation of more natural light into the house. This should be applauded and encouraged in my view. Recommendation 3 - Remove all reference to type of windows that is suitable for "character of West Finchley" - I would hope we could all agree that conservation of energy is a characteristic of our community. Installing Double glazing is not only good for the West Finchley environment, but for the wider planet. Please do not make it cost prohibitive to replace windows - E.g. As in Figure 20 (84 Wesbury Road), it will lead to owners not replacing windows and having single pane glass "steel windows" - even when secondary glazing could be an option. Please do not send a message of "style over substance " - this is what happened in Grenfell Tower!
- Figure 35 of street signs show one for Chesterfield road, an old rusty street sign. Whist I have a preference to replacing the street signs with "heritage" signs, I would certainly prefer clean modern street signs over old rusty signs where it is difficult to read the road name. Care must also be taken to those with visual disabilities that the old signs are appropriate. In any case, if there is a cost difference of these signs, in my view that cost should be passed on to West Finchley residents.
- All comments submitted to the Locality forum, do not seem to have been incorporated and no list of all the comments are available. Therefore the documents seem to be selected with a certain viewpoint to present. Recommendation 4 - Please request all comments from consultations to be submitted to Barnet council for consideration.
- Overgrown and unkempt gardens should be discouraged in West Finchley – or preferably rewarding well kept front gardens /driveways.
- With the shortage of parking in West Finchley, owners should be encouraged to create driveways. Grants /awards could be given to incentivise the creation of plant areas within drivesways.

Recommendation 5: All reference to driveways to be removed from documents. Recommendation 6: Offer incentive to owners with driveways to allow other local residents to park in their drive - this will alleviate traffic congestion, if West Finchley finally gets Controlled parking zones to deter commuters parking and walking to West Finchley station.(Recommendation 7)

- Similarly, those owners who maintain their driveways who actually clean and sweep them should be incentivised.
- Sometimes there are people who own properties that cannot maintain them – perhaps some support can be given to them to help them bring their properties to a decent standard.

		<p>- Recommendation 8 -Protections should be put in place so that a small active group do not take away the rights of other residents with the the small group's advocacy. [e.g. getting a restriction /regulation on windows that can be replaced - which in my view will directly lead to owners not replacing windows at all and having the standards in West Finchley going down]. There has to be some protection against these lobby groups that do not solely campaign on issues with consensus in the community, but want to sweep their tastes and views on the rest of us. This comment is made despite the fact that there are many things being proposed that I agree with.</p> <p>Create further regulation on areas where there is actual hard caused by residents and owners on other residents . e.g Japanese Knot weed is a problem in the area and is not being tackled. It can be cleared in one garden but if not cleared in the neighbouring garden - this will never be solved. As a Local Authority, please focus the energy on putting in regulations on things that matter like for this - It is not even mentioned in the West Finchley Character assessment. (hopefully it is not considered part of the character of West Finchley to have Japanese Knotweed since before 1930!). Recommendation 9: On areas like Japanese knot weed, if identified put the onus on owners to take action or allow the council to solve the problem and pass the cost on to the appropriate people. There could also be funds allocated from the proposed West Finchley council tax levy fund.</p> <p>Recommendation 10: RE "Character assessment document section 4.2.5 Re Public realm;-in a similar vain to Augustus' will, West Finchley residents should be encouraged to donate their property to the proposed West Finchley levy fund - this could be done by giving a council tax/ West Finchley levy holiday for those donating their West Finchley asset in Trust to the council (with of course any considerations on themselves / their family members continuing to live there until death).</p>
19	Resident	<p>As a resident of West Finchley and a member of The Finchley Society Planning Committee, I welcome this proposal. It will be a real asset for the future of the area and benefit all the residents.</p>
20		<p>I wish to correct some statements in the NDP. <i>The Greenwalk is mostly a shared cycle/pedestrian route.</i> While Barnet Council have placed the blue cycle signs on some sections this has been illegally done as their bylaws do not permit cycling along any of Dollis Valley Greenwalk (DVGW)</p> <p>In the Barnet Council website is the by-laws at https://www.barnet.gov.uk/your-council/policies-plans-and-performance/council-bylaws</p> <p>In the by-laws for Pleasure Grounds (attached or you may wish to download from Barnet Council's website) it clearly states that, "8(iii) A person shall not except of any lawful or privilege ride any bicycle, tricycle or other similar machine in any part of the pleasure ground" and in the First Schedule Part 1 "Dollis Brook Riverside Walk" is included.</p> <p>Barnet Council have not conformed to their own by-laws when they illegally built a cycleway in Dollis Brook Riverside Walk. In the Help-A-</p>

London-Park competition around 2010, Dollis Valley Greenwalk (DVGW) was the recipient of £400,000 as one of the runner-up parks. At no time before this or in the "improvements" for the Dollis Valley Greenwalk area was there any mention of cycling which had previously not been permitted (DD367 attached).

Then Transport for London (TfL) gave free money to Barnet Council for off-road cycling and Barnet Council tried to squeeze in a cycleway (The inappropriately named "shared path" - all public footpaths are shared, that's what they being public allows - to be shared by others on foot). The contract for the works in Dollis Brook Riverside Walk (part of which falls inside this neighbourhood plan) was let before there was an informal public "survey" which later was referred to as a "consultation" took place. It was not a valid survey as it was designed to get a so-called agreement as the contract had already been let. It consisted of two council staff members standing by Lovers Walk bridge and asking anyone who came along if they thought the path which had broken asphalt should be upgraded to a "shared path". No mention was made of it including cycling unless you specifically asked if they were going to permit cycling. Then I was told that if introducing cycling was not agreed Barnet Council would have to close this section of DVGW. It was totally biased, and misinformed the public.

The resulting path has been a disaster for pedestrians and the natural environment. It is not built to London Cycling Design Standards with inadequate forward visibility, below minimum width especially at the allotments with high fencing either side of a 2.5m path. When sufficient space could not be found the side of the brook where the DVGW path was a new path and bridge was formed. This forced it's way through vegetation and an area of space at the back of the tennis courts that was a quiet natural oasis as there was only a natural footpath, that was not a through path. This area had a uniqueness about it, as it was a natural space, with no formal path, where you could be in natural surrounds. It was a safe area to be alone without the personal safety concerns, which may be in other areas like Totteridge Common, with the tennis courts just through the greenery. But there was no consideration of how the area was being used, just space for the cycleway so Barnet Council could claim the LIP money from TfL.

Like the other paths that were upgraded, The new path was built for cyclists - not pedestrians or consideration of the area being Green Belt and a Site of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC). Of necessity it is wider. It is also very hard, which cyclists like as their wheels roll over the surface. However, for pedestrians who interact with the path surface by foot-strike it is too hard with the force of a foot-strike going through the body, and a greater force than walkers if one is running. This places much force on joints in the body, and for obese people this force is greater. The outcomes for the pedestrian may be various joint and muscle pain. New materials can be used which include recycled rubber, a more pedestrian-friendly option. Once cycling is introduced with the added speed and bulkiness of cycles, the atmosphere of the footpath changes. It is no longer safe for children to wander and explore in case they get in the way of a fast cyclist. Elderly pedestrians stop going along DVGW for fear they will be hit by a cyclist. DVGW is also a Metropolitan Walk and Green Chains (wildlife corridor). It needs

		<p>to be valued as for pedestrians and wildlife and not converted to a transport corridor.</p> <p>It would appear that Lovers Walk has not been included as a Local Green Space. I would hope that it would be included as part of it is within a SINC (until Brent Way), and part is also in Green Belt. Both when it is within a SINC and outside the SINC there are trees along it. On the other side of Nether Street it has very tall and interesting brick fences, that hopefully can be protected. Because it is a boundary it runs the risk of being ignored for all neighbourhood plans.</p> <p>Additional Comments Forgot to add that Barnet Council have LIP money from TfL to replace Lovers Walk Bridge and the next one downstream. They require a little maintenance but not total replacement. Lovers Walk bridge is appropriate in its surroundings and has a charm that a new bridge will not have if the bridge immediately upstream is evidence of plans. Replacement would likely involve placing piles into the brook bed, and disruption to wildlife and pedestrians, for an unnecessary project. Both Barnet Council and TfL seem to have financial problems so why waste money unnecessarily.</p> <p>Many people can not enjoy the health and well-being benefits of the Dollis Brook area, including the DVGW and the playgrounds due to the lack of any toilets. Consideration must be given to providing a public toilet in this area. The design should be to ensure safety for users - cubicle door opening outward directly to the open space with no corridors.</p>
21	Liberal Democrat Group	<p>I'm writing on behalf of the Liberal Democrat Group, in response to the proposed Neighbourhood Development Plan for West Finchley that has been drawn up by the West Finchley Neighbourhood Forum.</p> <p>Firstly, we would like to state that after reviewing the plan and supporting documents, we believe that the plan meets the Basic Conditions as required by Paragraph 8(2) of schedule 4B of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/1990/8/schedule/4B/paragraph/8).</p> <p>Furthermore, we believe that this initiative is strongly to be welcomed. The plan does a good job of summarising the local character of the area, and will be a very positive guide for all stakeholders as new planning applications are brought forward. It is great to see a local civic-minded group taking up their own proposals for the preservation and improvement of their area, as has happened here.</p> <p>Our Group would therefore like to make a representation in support of the West Finchley Neighbourhood Development Plan.</p>
22	Resident	<p>Having read the West Finchley Neighbourhood Development Plan and supporting documents on the Planning Consultation pages, I believe it meets the Basic Conditions as required by Paragraph 8(2) of schedule 4B of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/1990/8/schedule/4B/paragraph/8).</p> <p>I would therefore like to make a representation in support of the West Finchley Neighbourhood Development Plan. It is an excellent initiative</p>

		and one that the local ward councillors have been fully supportive of since the Neighbourhood Forum was established.
23	London Borough of Barnet	<p>The Council generally welcomes the draft Neighbourhood Plan and appreciates the hard work that the Forum have put into the document. The draft is legible, well presented with photos and maps and focuses on issues which are of most concern to residents in the West Finchley Neighbourhood. Recognising that neighbourhood plans can have an important role in explaining what the planning system can do (as well as what it can't) the Council has previously highlighted that it would like to see more justification in the supporting text for the draft Plan's policies.</p> <p>The Council is pleased to see changes made on the draft Neighbourhood Plan as a result of the Regulation 14 consultation. As highlighted at our meeting on 19th December 2019, the Council still has a number of concerns about the Regulation 15 submission document. The response on Regulation 14 is attached as part of this submission.</p> <p>General Conformity with London Plan and Barnet's Local Plan As highlighted in the National Planning Policy Framework 2019 (para 29) neighbourhood plans must be in general conformity with the strategic policies that cover the area. These are set out in Barnet's development plan which comprises the Local Plan 2012 and the London Plan 2016 (Consolidated with alterations since 2011).</p> <p>The Council highlights that Barnet's Local Plan -Reg 18 Preferred Approach was approved for consultation on 6th January 2020. The Reg 18 document sets out the Council's preferred policy approach together with draft development proposals for 67 sites. It is Barnet's emerging Local Plan with consultation, at the time of writing, underway. The Local Plan 2012 remains the statutory development plan for Barnet until such stage as the replacement plan is adopted and as such the Neighbourhood Plan should take account of the 2012 document together with emerging policies and draft site proposals in the Reg 18 Local Plan.</p> <p>At the time of writing the London Plan (2016) is the development plan in terms of strategic planning policy for the purposes of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act (2004). However due to the advanced nature of the Draft London Plan increasing weight should be attached to those policies which the Inspector's Report published in October 2019 considered sound. Nevertheless, the London Plan 2016 remains the statutory development plan until such stage as the replacement plan is adopted. Account therefore needs to be taken of emerging policies.</p> <p>The comments below summarise our views on the submission Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>Permitted Development As previously mentioned in the Council's Regulation 14 response, this is a key issue and continues to be so. A Neighbourhood Plan is unable to withdraw permitted development rights. The West Finchley Neighbourhood Plan should therefore recognise the reality of these rights throughout the document.</p>

General

Page 16 Table 1: See previous comment about progress of the draft London Plan. As previously highlighted the baseline dates for the new Local Plan are 2021 to 2036. The Table should reflect the publication of the Reg 18 Local Plan in January 2020. It should also reflect that a new Local Development Scheme was approved in January 2020.

Chapter 5

Page 19 Policy RD1: The Plan can only encourage applicants to have due regard to the Design Guide in formulating proposals. It cannot require compliance. The submission of a proportionate statement is not a national or local requirement for minor or household applications.

Page 19 Policy RD2: The Council requires proposals to reflect 'Secured by Design'. The submission of supporting justification demonstrating how the proposals are resilient to crime is not a national or local requirement for minor or household applications.

Page 20 Policy RD4: The Council's Regulation 14 response to this policy has not been taken forward. The development of driveways is covered by Permitted Development Rights. In the absence of an Article 4 Direction withdrawing such Permitted Development Rights the Council questions the merits of this policy. The Council adopted a domestic vehicle crossover policy in April 2019 which will need to be complied with for crossover approval.

Page 22 Policy RD5: The Council's Regulation 14 response to the requirements for this policy has not been taken forward. The requirements of policy RD5 i.e. a Basement Impact Assessment, a geological and hydrological report, a detailed engineering study, a basement construction method statement and a monitoring report, would appear quite onerous with financial implications, particularly with the lack of specific evidence to support this policy. West Finchley is not in Flood Zone 2 or 3, neither is it in a Critical Drainage Area. This does not accord with the Council's existing approach on basement development. The Council's Local Plan Reg 18 sets out specific policy on Basements (Policy CDH06). It is recommended that Policy RD5 is revised to be more in step with the Council's approach and to reconsider the issues of viability for basement proposals including the resources of the local planning authority to assess this additional information as part of the planning decision process.

Chapter 6

Page 25 Policy A1: Whilst recognising the importance of protecting existing retail the Council considers that this policy is too restrictive and inflexible. Policy would be improved by greater consideration of the Council's approach in the Local Plan Reg 18 – Policy TOW02 – Development Principles in Barnet's Town Centres, Local Centres and Parades.

Chapter 7

Page 31 Policy S2: As highlighted in the Council's Regulation 14 response, the public realm improvements could form part of CIL aspirations as these cannot be controlled through planning.

		<p>Chapter 9 Page 36 Policy T1: The Council supports the provision of electric charging points, however, this requirement is only applied to major developments.</p> <p>Design Guide The underlying approach to encourage good design in the area is supported by the Council.</p> <p>Para 4.5 (c): This contains a specific measurement, yet any backland scheme would need to comply with the highway standards.</p> <p>Para 5.3 (g): There needs to be clarification on where these structures are to be placed.</p> <p>Para 7.2 (e): This does not comply with the Council's current guidance. External illuminated is usually preferable to internal illumination of fascia signs.</p>
--	--	---