

---

# **Local Development Framework**

## **Issues and Options Report Core Strategy**

### **Sustainability Appraisal**

---

**June 2008**

# Contents

<b>Abbreviations .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Executive Summary .....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>Purpose of the SA .....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>1.0 Introduction .....</b>	<b>3</b>
1.1 Aims .....	4
1.2 Consultation .....	5
1.3 Sustainability Appraisal .....	5
1.4 Habitat Directive Assessment .....	6
1.5 Equality Impact Assessment .....	6
<b>2.0 SA Methodology .....</b>	<b>3</b>
2.1 SA Objectives .....	3
2.2 Sustainability Commentary .....	9
2.3 Outputs .....	9
<b>3.0 Results .....</b>	<b>10</b>

## Abbreviations

AA	Appropriate Assessment
CLG	Communities and Local Government
DPD	Development Plan Document
EHRC	Equality and Human Rights Commission
EqIA	Equality Impact Assessment
HDA	Habitat Directive Assessment
LDD	Local Development Document
LDF	Local Development Framework
NEET	Neither in Employment, Education or Training
PPS	Planning Policy Statement
SA	Sustainability Appraisal
SEA	Strategic Environmental Assessment
UDP	Unitary Development Plan

## Executive Summary

This report presents the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) commentary on the Issues and Options Report of the Core Strategy Development Plan Document.

The Sustainability Commentary provides a clear easy to understand appraisal of the Core Strategy Issues and Options. Reference to technical papers, the London Plan, Planning Policy Guidance and Statements have been deliberately avoided in order that this document clearly highlight the sustainability impacts of the 80 options proposed in the Core Strategy Issues and Options. The positive and negative effects in terms of the sustainability (economic, environment and social) impact of each option are highlighted. Each option is accompanied by a summary with a symbol which highlights a positive, negative or uncertain impact.

The first step of the SA Commentary has been to assess the compatibility of the 15 Core Strategy objectives against the 22 SA objectives. No incompatibilities were discovered using this process. The SA framework has been applied to each option to assess the level of sustainability impact and determine whether it is positive, negative or uncertain. The results show mixed impacts from the 80 options proposed in the Core Strategy Issues and Options. Although the majority of options had a positive impact nearly half of the options generated a negative economic, environmental or social impact.

## Purpose of the SA

The Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 introduced a new system of plan making in England which replaces the current Unitary Development Plan (UDP). The main component of the new system is the Local Development Framework (LDF). The LDF is a portfolio of planning documents which are prepared by the local authority to provide the long-term planning strategy for the area.

One of the most important objectives of the LDF is to ensure that sustainable development is delivered by local authorities. Sustainable development is development that contributes to the environmental, social and economic well-being of a community. Another aspect of sustainable development is that it is expected to be prudent in the use of natural resources. To ensure that local authorities are meeting their sustainable development objectives, legislation requires that LDF documents undergo a Sustainability Appraisal (SA) and a Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA).

The Core Strategy is the key Development Plan Document within the Local Development Framework (LDF). It sets out the LDF's aims and objectives, and lays out the core policies that will govern land use. The Core Strategy sets out the long term spatial and strategic vision for development in the borough.

## 1.0 Introduction

The main objective of the Core Strategy Sustainability Appraisal (SA) is to make a formal assessment of the social, environmental and economic objectives that are endorsed by the council. The council is required under European Law to undertake a Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) in relation to any new plans it produces. A SEA is a formal procedure which seeks to make an assessment of the environmental impacts of plans. Government guidance allows the integration of both SA and SEA to form a report which is referred by the single term of a Sustainability Appraisal.

The Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, specifies that a SA should be produced for documents in the LDF including the Core Strategy. The purpose of the SA is to ensure that sustainability considerations are incorporated into the LDF process. Sustainability Appraisals must make an assessment of possible impacts of various policies on the social, environmental and economic characteristics of an area. Measures should be formulated to alter policies or mitigate any conflicting effects that are identified from plans.

The Core Strategy sustainability appraisal has been prepared for the Issues and Options consultation. Issues and Options is the first production stage of the Core Strategy. This document represents Stage B1 of the Sustainability Appraisal process.

The various stages in the SA process are listed below in Table 1

**Table 1:** The Sustainability Appraisal Process

DPD Stage	SA Stages and Tasks
<p><b>Stage 1: Pre-production-Evidence gathering</b></p>	<p>Stage A – Setting the context and objectives, establishing the baseline and deciding on the scope</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A1: Identifying other relevant policies, plans and programmes, and sustainable development objectives</li> <li>• A2: Collecting baseline information</li> <li>• A3: Identifying sustainability issues and problems</li> <li>• A4: Developing the SA framework</li> <li>• A5: Consulting on the scope of the SA</li> </ul>

<p><b>Stage 2: Production</b></p>	<p>Stage B - Developing and refining options and assessing effects</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>B1: Testing the DPD objectives against the SA framework</b></li> <li>• B2: Developing the DPD options</li> <li>• B3: Identifying sustainability issues and problems</li> <li>• B4: Evaluating the effects of the DPD</li> <li>• B5: Considering ways of mitigating adverse effects and maximising beneficial effects</li> <li>• B6: Proposing measures to monitor the significant effects of implementing the DPD</li> </ul>
	<p>Stage C - Preparing the Sustainability Appraisal Report</p>
	<p>Stage D – Consulting on the preferred options of the DPD and SA Report</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• D1: Public participation on the preferred options of the DPD and the SA Report</li> <li>• D2(i): Appraising significant changes</li> </ul>
<p><b>Stage 3: Examination</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• D2(ii): Appraising significant changes resulting from representations</li> </ul>
<p><b>Stage 4: Adoption and monitoring</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• D3: Making decisions and providing information</li> </ul>
	<p>Stage E: Monitoring the significant effects of implementing the DPD</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• E1: Finalising aims and methods for monitoring</li> <li>• E2: Responding to adverse effects</li> </ul>

## 1.1 Aims

The issues and options report for the Core Strategy contains 15 objectives (set out in Table 2) which are in accordance with the Borough’s Sustainable Community Strategy (SCS). The vision within this document ensures that Barnet’s character as a successful city suburb is maintained and it remains an area where people want to live and enjoy a high quality of life. The 15 Core Strategy objectives are also in accordance with the London Plan (Consolidated with Alterations since 2004), Planning Policy Statement 1 (PPS1) –Delivering Sustainable Development and the UK Government Sustainable Development Strategy 2005. By ensuring that the Core Strategy objectives meet the objectives of these documents, Barnet’s LDF will be assured to meet high standards of sustainable development with the promotion of social, environmental and economic considerations that will ensure that all residents have an equal opportunity to share in Barnet’s success.

## **1.2 Consultation**

Consultation is a key requirement of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act (2004). In order to comply with this Act, the Core Strategy is supported by a consultation process which accords with Barnet's Statement of Community Involvement. Extensive public consultation is designed to allow for public opinions to be raised, considered and discussed as the Core Strategy moves forward and policies are developed. Consultation should take place early enough in the process for people to be able to have a genuine input into decision making rather than being asked for their views on proposals that have already been decided upon.

## **1.3 Sustainability Appraisal**

The planning system put in place by the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires that Local Development Documents, which include DPDs and SPDs, are subject to a Sustainability Appraisal (SA) incorporating Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA). The SA process needs to be fully integrated into the planning system to ensure that conclusions from the appraisal inform planning outcomes.

The SA incorporates the requirements of PPS 12 –Local Spatial Planning and the SEA Directive and should be based on the methodology set out in the ODPM (now DCLG) document 'Sustainability Appraisal of Regional Spatial Strategies and Local Development Documents' (November 2005).

### **1.3.1 Previous Stage**

The first stage in the SA process (Pre-Production) (Stage A) involved production of a SA Scoping Report in October 2007. The Scoping Report set the context and baseline information in order to provide a starting point from which to appraise the effects of implementing the Core Strategy. To provide a sound basis for analysis, the report also identified relevant plans and programmes, key sustainability issues in Barnet and set out a SA Framework through which the appraisal can take place. The Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report was published in October 2007 and subject to consultation with the statutory environment agencies - English Heritage, the Environment Agency and Natural England. Following statutory consultation with the statutory environment agencies the Scoping Report including the SA Framework was revised.

### **1.3.2 Present Stage**

This Sustainability Commentary report represents the second stage in the SA process (Production) (Stage B1). This stage involves testing the DPD objectives against the SA framework.

### **1.3.3 Next Stage**

Following consultation on the Core Strategy Issues and Options, and the associated Sustainability Commentary, a set of ‘preferred options’ will be developed. The SA Framework (ie the 22 SA objectives in Table 3) will be used in predicting and evaluating the effects of the ‘preferred options’. The results will be published in a SA Report which will be available for comment as part of the statutory consultation on the Core Strategy at the ‘preferred options’ stage.

#### **1.4 Habitat Directive Assessment**

As part of the SA process, a screening assessment must be undertaken to determine whether or not there is a need to undertake a Habitat Directive Assessment (HDA), also known as an Appropriate Assessment (AA). This is in accordance with Article 6(3) and (4) of the European Communities (1992) Council Directive 92/43/EEC on the conservation of natural habitats and of wild fauna and flora (‘Habitats Directive’). The EU Habitats Directive and Birds Directive are implemented in the UK through the Conservation (Natural Habitats & C) Regulations 1994 (as amended).

The screening assessment identifies whether the plan or project is likely to have a significant effect on European designated conservation sites, either alone or cumulatively. Such designated sites include Special Protection Areas (SPAs), Special Areas for Conservation (SACs) and RAMSAR sites (wetlands of international importance designated under the Ramsar convention). If it is unlikely that the plan or project will have a significant effect upon these sites, then there is no need to proceed to an HDA.

The first stage screening results of the HDA are being presented as a separate document alongside this Sustainability Commentary.

Barnet’s HDA screening concluded that a full HDA is not required for the Core Strategy as there will be no likely significant effect on the integrity of Natura 2000 sites arising from Issues and Options.

#### **1.5 Equality Impact Assessment**

Legislation requires authorities to consider the impacts of policies and strategies upon certain equality target groups. These are the Race Relations (Amendment) Act 2000; Disability Discrimination (Amendment) Act 2005; Equality Act 2006 and Gender Equality Duty 2007. An Equality Impact Assessment (EqIA) takes into account all of the existing enforced legislation and also impending and probable future legal requirements therefore ensuring that it is line with diversity groups highlighted by the recently established Equality and Human Rights Commission (EHRC). It also is line with the requirements of the Equality Standard for Local Government and a best value indicator.

An EqIA has been undertaken alongside the SA commentary. It has focused on the impacts on six equality target strands. These are as follows:

- Age
- Disability
- Faith
- Gender

- Race
- Sexuality

The assessment has considered the impacts of the options identifying any positive and/or negative/adverse impacts. Where significant negative impacts are identified, then an action plan aimed at minimising these impacts will be developed

## 2.0 SA Methodology

### 2.1 SA Objectives

This stage of the SA has included a comparison of the Core Strategy’s objectives (Table 2) with the 22 SA objectives (Table 3) derived from the SA Framework.

**Table 2:** Core Strategy Objectives

	Objectives
1	Timely and viable infrastructure: to create the conditions to maintain and enhance a successful city-suburb and growth locations by delivering Barnet’s physical and social infrastructure requirements to accommodate sustainable growth through the Barnet Financing Plan and other financial mechanisms, including the Community Infrastructure Levy.
2	Economic prosperity: to ensure economic prosperity for London as a successful global city by managing the suburban environment valued by those working for the knowledge economy and locally by providing appropriate employment locations for investment, creating the conditions for all sections of the community including the disadvantaged to develop the skills required to access the labour market and gain financial independence.
3	High quality housing growth: to manage increases in the supply of housing to ensure local and regional housing needs are met, regeneration of poor quality housing estates are delivered and provide access to affordable and decent new homes. This would seek to maximise the choice between tenure and types, including family housing, support people’s aspirations for low cost home ownership and so successful mixed and balanced communities are created and opportunities for home ownership.
4	Movement: to keep Barnet moving in a sustainable way which provides choice by encouraging the use of convenient and reliable transport, and reducing the need to travel by promoting home working and new technologies, whilst recognising that car ownership is important to many and ensuring it is appropriately planned for.
5	Strong and cohesive communities: to create the conditions for communities to become confident and cohesive by providing facilities through which residents can play a part, diversity is valued and local pride is promoted.
6	Community Safety: To create the conditions for a safer and more secure Barnet by designing out crime and reducing anti-social behaviour, particularly in known ‘hotspots’.

7	Flourishing and vibrant town centres: to protect, enhance and create the conditions for growth of a balanced and vibrant network of commercially successful and attractive suburban town centres by enabling a diverse range of shops and services to be provided in convenient and accessible locations, securing environmental improvements, town centre enhancements and successful regeneration.
8	Health and well-being: to secure a healthier Barnet by addressing the environmental factors underpinning health and well-being with healthcare agencies and other partners to deliver a complete range of new and improved health and social care facilities.
9	Enhance the historic environment: to respect and enrich Barnet's distinctive built heritage by protecting the historic environment and enhancing the high quality suburban character of townscapes and conservation areas.
10	A bright future for children and young people: to extend and develop opportunities for children and young people to have a bright and healthy future by providing the highest quality educational, community and leisure facilities in inclusive and safe environments that can be shared by the wider community.
11	Environmentally responsible development that addresses climate change: to minimise the impact of climate change by requiring high quality environmentally sensitive design and constructions in appropriate locations which meet economic and social sustainability objectives.
12	Supporting the vulnerable: to promote opportunities for vulnerable people by maximising choice and promoting independence, and planning for appropriate facilities to meet their future needs.
13	Protection of cherished open spaces: to improve access to, and enhance the quality of the Green Belt, Metropolitan Open Land and other open spaces by providing clean, green and safe places for the enjoyment of people who live, visit and work in Barnet.
14	Natural environment: to protect and enhance local biodiversity within both developed and undeveloped areas that allows sustainable development and growth alongside.
15	Sustainable waste and recycling: to minimise waste and maximise re-use and recycling and promote an appropriate framework for integrated waste management.

**Table 3: SA Objectives**

Objectives		
1	To encourage sustained economic growth and promote economic prosperity	E C O N O M I C
2	To offer everybody the opportunity for rewarding and satisfying employment	
3	To encourage and accommodate both indigenous and inward investment	
4	To reduce disparities in economic performance and promote regeneration	
5	To reduce the effect of traffic on the environment	E N V I R O N M E N T
6	To maintain and enhance the quality of landscapes, townscapes and local distinctiveness	
7	To conserve and enhance the borough's existing biodiversity and seek to increase where possible	
8	To reduce the risk of flooding for people and property	
9	To improve air quality	
10	To conserve and where appropriate enhance the historic environment and cultural assets	
11	To achieve sustainable management of waste	
12	To reduce contributions to climate change and reduce vulnerability to climate change	
13	To increase energy efficiency and the proportion of energy generated from renewable sources	
14	To encourage sustainable use of land	
15	To achieve sustainable water resources management	
16	To improve the Health of Barnet's population	S O C I A L
17	To improve the education and skills of the population	
18	To provide Barnet's population with the opportunity to live in a decent affordable home	
19	To provide good quality surroundings for all	
20	To reduce crime and the fear of crime	
21	To improve accessibility for all to services and facilities	
22	To encourage a sense of community; identity and welfare	

Each of the Core Strategy objectives were compared against each of the SA objectives to determine the extent to which they could be considered as compatible. Table 4 illustrates the outcome of this comparison.

**Table 4: Compatibility of Core Strategy objectives against the SA objectives**

Core Strategy objectives	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22
1	√	√	√	√	0	√	0	0	0	√	0	0	0	√	0	0	0	√	√	√	√	√
2	√	√	√	√	0	√	0	0	0	√	0	0	0	√	0	√	√	√	√	√	√	√
3	√	0	√	√	0	√	0	0	0	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	0	√	√	√	√	√
4	√	√	√	√	√	0	0	0	√	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	√	0	√	0
5	√	√	√	√	√	√	0	0	√	√	0	√	√	√	0	√	√	√	√	√	√	√
6	√	√	√	√	0	√	0	0	0	√	0	0	0	√	0	√	√	√	√	√	√	√
7	√	√	√	√	√	√	0	0	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	0	0	0	√	√	√	√
8	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√
9	√	0	0	√	√	√	√	0	0	√	0	0	0	√	0	0	0	√	√	√	0	√
10	√	0	√	√	√	√	√	0	√	√	0	0	0	√	0	√	√	√	√	√	√	√
11	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	0	0	0
12	√	√	√	√	0	√	0	0	0	√	0	0	0	√	0	√	√	√	√	√	√	√
13	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	0	√	√	0	√	0	√	0	√	0	0	√	0	√	√
14	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	0	√	√	0	√	0	√	0	√	0	0	√	0	√	√
15	0	0	0	0	√	0	0	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	0	0	0	√	0	0	0
<b>Sustainability objectives</b>																						
To encourage sustained economic growth and promote economic prosperity																						
To offer everybody the opportunity for rewarding and satisfying employment																						
To encourage and accommodate both indigenous and inward investment																						
To reduce disparities in economic performance and promote regeneration																						
To reduce the effect of traffic on the environment																						
To maintain and enhance the quality of landscapes, townscapes and local distinctiveness																						
To conserve and enhance the borough's existing biodiversity and seek to increase where possible																						
To reduce the risk of flooding for people and property																						
To improve air quality																						
To conserve and where appropriate enhance the historic environment and cultural assets																						
To achieve sustainable management of waste																						
To reduce contributions to climate change and reduce vulnerability to climate change																						
To increase energy efficiency and the proportion of energy generated from renewable sources																						
To encourage sustainable use of land																						
To achieve sustainable water resources management																						
To improve the Health of Barnet's population																						
To improve the education and skills of the population																						
To provide Barnet's population with the opportunity to live in a decent affordable home																						
To provide good quality surroundings for all																						
To reduce crime and the fear of crime																						
To improve accessibility for all to services and facilities																						
To encourage a sense of community; identity and welfare																						

Key	Symbol
Compatible	√
Incompatible	x
No link	0

## 2.2 Sustainability Commentary

During the pre-production of the Core Strategy Issues and Options, the SA Framework set out in the SA Scoping Report was applied to each potential option. This involved the following stages:

- Agreeing a set of criteria which could be used to determine the possible impacts of individual options. These considered whether an effect was local ie within Barnet or regional within North London and surrounding areas;
- Initial evaluation of issues and options with separation of options into those which could be considered as discrete alternatives, including where possible the identification of the 'do nothing' option.
- Evaluation of the selected options against the economic, environment and social groups of the SA Framework. This work was undertaken by the Planning and Housing Policy Group.
- Interactive sessions with individuals responsible for producing the Issues and Options to discuss findings, understand any discrepancies and where necessary to refine the Issues and Options.

## 2.3 Outputs

### 2.3.1 Compatibility of Objectives

The results of the comparison of the 15 Core Strategy objectives and the 22 SA objectives were recorded as a matrix (Table 4). No incompatibilities were identified.

### 2.3.2 Sustainability Commentary

The Sustainability Commentary was prepared to meet the requirements of ODPM guidance (para 3.39) '*as each option is refined, a commentary on the key sustainability issues and problems arising must be prepared, with recommendations on how each of the options could be improved, eg through mitigation measures*'. Outputs from the interactive sessions referred to above were recorded as the Sustainability Commentary in which the 80 options were individually assessed.

The Sustainability Commentary provides a clear easy to understand appraisal of the Core Strategy Issues and Options. Reference to technical papers, Planning Policy Guidance and Statements have been deliberately avoided as the intention of this document is to highlight the impacts of the 80 options proposed in the Core Strategy Issues and Options. The positive and negative effects in terms of economic, environment and social impacts of each option are highlighted. Each option is accompanied by a summary with a symbol which highlights a positive, negative or uncertain impact. An uncertain impact could be caused by a combination of positive and negative impacts or it could just be uncertain in its own right. Unless all impacts are positive a recommendation to mitigate the impact has been proposed.

Although the majority of options had a positive impact nearly half of the options generated a negative economic, environmental or social impact. A breakdown of the 240 local and 3

regional impacts reveals:

- *Within the theme of growing successfully the number of positive impacts matched those of the uncertain and negative impacts.*
- *Within the theme of delivering the infrastructure to accommodate growth and ensure sustainable development over half of the impacts were positive*
- *Within the theme of meeting housing aspirations although over half of the impacts were positive this section had the highest number of uncertain impacts.*
- *Within the theme of planning for vitality and viability of a network of suburban town centres over half of the impacts were positive*
- *Within the theme of planning, development and growth to be environmentally sensitive over half of the impacts were either uncertain or negative.*
- *There were 36 negative impacts arising from options. The majority of negative impacts were for environmental reasons.*

### 3.0 Results

The Sustainability Commentary highlights that LDF evidence gathering is ongoing. This is highlighted as a recommendation on a large proportion of the 80 options. As the evidence base is still being formulated particularly on key issues of suburban character, town centres, housing markets, employment land and biodiversity. It is therefore difficult to gauge a generic 'do nothing' scenario at this stage in the SA process.

The Sustainability Commentary on the various options is presented in the following table, issue by issue. For each option an overall summary is provided as follows:




↑	Local net positive impact	↑↑	Regional net positive impact
↕	Local uncertain or combination of positive and negative impacts	↕↕	Regional uncertain or combination of positive and negative impacts
↓	Local net negative impact	↓↓	Regional net negative impact




The definition of local, regional and widespread used in this assessment are set out below;










<b>Local</b>	This refers to Barnet and its neighbouring authorities i.e. Brent, Camden, Enfield, Haringey, Harrow and Hertsmere
<b>Regional</b>	The rest of London and the South East










Each of the Core Strategies aims and objectives were compared against each of the SA objectives to determine the extent to which they could be considered as compatible.







These summary scores have been reached by combining results from initial screening of components of individual options and the resulting interactive sessions without any form of weighting. They are provided at this stage only as an indication of the likely overall effect of a given options. Recommendations relevant to the future development of the borough have been provided where applicable to mitigate any uncertain or negative impacts. Where there are only positive economic, environmental and social impacts the recommendation remains blank.










<b>Theme 1 – Growing successfully</b>	
<b>Issue 1a: Business opportunities and economic prosperity</b>	
<b>Option 1.01</b>  <b>Should existing employment sites be protected from changes of use and being converted or re-developed for residential development?</b>	<b>Commentary</b>  Employment uses can provide much needed local services from affordable business premises. The retention of existing employment land provides stability for existing businesses and opportunities for inward and indigenous investment, a positive <b>economic</b> impact. The protection of existing employment opportunities helps to safeguard local access to work and has a positive <b>environmental</b> impact in reducing the impact of longer journeys to work. Proximity to business services reduces the effect of vehicles making longer trips, a positive <b>environmental</b> impact. The retention of protection will decrease opportunities for residential development. Failure to unlock a new source of supply will have a negative <b>social</b> impact on the provision of decent and affordable homes. If housing opportunities do not increase there will be negative <b>environmental</b> impacts for the existing lower density suburbs as local development pressures will mount.  <i>The social and environmental impacts are uncertain. The economic impact is positive</i>
	<b>Recommendations</b>  <b>Ensure that as a key part of the LDF evidence base an Employment Land Survey is commissioned to develop better understanding of employment sites</b>
<b>Summary</b>	<b>Social</b>  <b>Environmental</b>  <b>Economic</b> 










<p><b>Option 1.02</b></p> <p><b>Should we only allow the redevelopment of employment sites when mixed use development is proposed incorporating residential uses and replacement employment use?</b></p>	<p>Mixed use developments in accessible locations encourage the sustainable use of land, providing a positive <b>environmental</b> impact. In locations with poor public transport access a mixed use scheme may have a negative <b>environmental</b> impact if it generates more traffic. Combining residential and employment uses within close proximity may create opportunities for new forms of urban living / working and help promote local prosperity, a positive <b>economic</b> impact. Increased access to flexible and modern workspaces (incorporating ICT) may remove the need for commuting and reduce the effect of traffic on the <b>environment</b>. New forms of urban living may have a positive <b>social</b> impact in engendering a clear sense of community identity. Not all employment uses are compatible with residential development. An industrial process such as waste management may be forced to relocate because of its proximity to new homes in a mixed use scheme. This may reduce the opportunities for sustainable waste management, a negative <b>environmental</b> impact. Mixed use developments in employment locations with poor public transport accessibility may prove to be unattractive for inward investment, a negative <b>economic</b> impact. Delivering a new source of housing supply will have a positive <b>social</b> impact on the provision of decent and affordable homes. This new supply will have a positive <b>environmental</b> impacts for the existing lower density suburbs as local development pressures will be diverted.</p> <p><i>The social impact is positive. The economic and environmental impacts are uncertain</i></p>
	<p><b>Recommendations</b></p> <p><b>Ensure that Core Strategy sets sustainable locational criteria for mixed use developments</b></p>
<p><b>Summary</b></p>	<p><b>Social</b>  <b>Environmental</b>  <b>Economic</b> </p>
<p><b>Option 1.03</b></p> <p><b>Should we allow the redevelopment of existing employment sites only if there is no proven need for other priority commercial uses, in particular, waste management, transport facilities or logistics/warehousing?</b></p>	<p>Employment uses may be sensitive to economic cycles and once the opportunity has been lost it cannot be regained for investment in new employment uses, a negative <b>economic</b> impact. The land can have potential as a flexible resource for land transfers facilitating infrastructure development elsewhere enabling inward investment, a positive <b>economic</b> impact. This option provides protection on the basis of no proven need. Waste management and transport facilities are required for the functioning of a modern urban economy. An industrial process such as waste management may be forced to relocate because of its proximity to new homes in a mixed use scheme. This may reduce the opportunities for sustainable waste management, a negative <b>environmental</b> impact. The release of such land may provide a positive <b>social</b> impact by increasing the opportunity for other uses such as residential to address need. Uses providing local services from affordable business premises will be displaced and more vehicle miles will be expended in service continuation creating a negative <b>environmental</b> impact.</p> <p><i>The economic and environmental impacts are uncertain. The social impact is positive.</i></p>
	<p><b>Recommendations</b></p> <p><b>Ensure that as a key part of the LDF evidence base an Employment Land Survey is commissioned to develop better understanding of employment sites</b></p>







Summary	<p><b>Social</b>  <b>Environmental</b>  <b>Economic</b> </p>
<b>Issue 1b: Improving the skills of local residents and ensuring economic prosperity</b>	
<p><b>Option 1.04</b></p> <p><b>Should the Council identify specific locations (in addition to existing ones) for further and higher education facilities in the borough working with providers and partners, including Middlesex University and Barnet College?</b></p>	<p>The degree of impacts depends on the new services that will be provided. Educational institutions within the borough have catchment areas that extend beyond Barnet. The expansion of existing facilities may have a positive <b>economic</b> impact if they help to attract inward investment. If courses are affordable and attractive this may reduce the need for students to travel outside the borough reducing commuting, a positive <b>environmental</b> impact. Affordable and attractive education will generate more traffic from outside the borough, a negative <b>environmental</b> impact. Increased accessibility to education will have a positive <b>social</b> impact if the option encourages NEETs, young people between the ages of 16-19 who are neither in employment, education, or training), to develop new life and work skills that will improve access to employment opportunities.</p> <p><i>The environmental impact is uncertain. The social and economic impact is positive.</i></p>
	<p><b>Recommendations</b></p> <p><b>Ensure that Core Strategy sets sustainable locational criteria for educational facilities.</b></p>
Summary	<p><b>Social</b>  <b>Environmental</b>  <b>Economic</b> </p>
<p><b>Option 1.05</b></p> <p><b>Should the Council encourage the expansion of further and higher education institutions in order to expand the knowledge economy as the borough grows?</b></p>	<p>Barnet's knowledge economy is linked to the learning outcomes of individual residents. Many residents already have professional qualifications and their link with educational institutions in Barnet is uncertain. The expansion of such institutions may provide a positive <b>economic</b> impact by attracting inward investment in new knowledge based industries and may provide more opportunities for people to live and work in the borough. Affordable, accessible and attractive education will increase choice in the knowledge economy, enabling continuous professional development to be accessed locally, providing a positive <b>environmental</b> impact where this reduces traffic. If courses are affordable and attractive this will increase choice and help residents to join the knowledge economy by improving their professional skills, a positive <b>social</b> impact therefore increasing opportunities to access rewarding and satisfying employment, a positive <b>economic</b> impact.</p> <p><i>All impacts are positive.</i></p>
	<p><b>Recommendations</b></p>
Summary	<p><b>Social</b>  <b>Environmental</b>  <b>Economic</b> </p>







<p><b>Option 1.06</b></p> <p>Should the Council seek financial contributions for training from major development in order to overcome skill shortages in local service industries?</p>	<p>The <b>economic</b> impact of training initiatives focused on local skill shortages will be positive and allow new and existing growth sectors to thrive. This option should provide a positive <b>social</b> impact by helping to improve the education and skills of residents. Barnet NEETs and young people who have missed out on training opportunities will have greater opportunities to get a foot on the jobs ladder and eventually access rewarding and satisfying employment, a positive <b>economic</b> impact. With access to the local jobs market the impact of traffic on the <b>environment</b> should be reduced by shorter commuting distances.</p> <p><i>All impacts are positive</i></p>
	<p><b>Recommendations</b></p>
	<p><b>Social</b>  <b>Environmental</b>  <b>Economic</b> </p>
<p><b>Theme 2 – Delivering the infrastructure to accommodate growth and ensure sustainable development</b></p>	
<p><b>Issue 2a: Balancing Barnet’s changing travel needs</b></p>	
<p><b>Option 2.01</b></p> <p>Should the car, given its wider reliance and choice of movement qualities remain as an important movement mode in a growing and changing borough?</p>	<p>Recognition of the car as a popular mode of transport in Barnet for accessing services and facilities has a positive <b>social</b> impact. The failure to provide attractive and affordable alternative modes of travel to the car will exacerbate traffic congestion creating a negative <b>environmental</b> impact. The car provides a flexible travel mode which is essential to keeping Barnet moving. Recognition of the mode will help to encourage sustained economic growth, a positive <b>economic</b> impact.</p> <p><i>The environmental impact is negative. The economic and social impacts are positive.</i></p>
	<p><b>Recommendations</b></p> <p><b>Ensure that Core Strategy sets sustainable locational criteria that makes the car less attractive as a mode of travel.</b></p>
<p><b>Summary</b></p>	<p><b>Social</b>  <b>Environmental</b>  <b>Economic</b> </p>
<p><b>Option 2.02</b></p> <p>Should we encourage changes in car use, for example, the use of hybrid/electric vehicles, and car pooling, as part of Green Travel Plans?</p>	<p>Reducing car usage and emissions should have a positive impact for the <b>environment</b> in reducing the effects of traffic. Vehicles that are ‘cleaner greener and smaller’ will reduce emissions and have a positive <b>social</b> impact on the health of Barnet’s population. Smaller vehicles will have a positive <b>environmental</b> impact by requiring less space for parking, a more sustainable use of land. Smaller cars can also contribute to an improved street scene. Car pooling should help reduce traffic and congestion helping people to move around the borough, therefore providing a positive <b>economic</b> impact.</p> <p><i>All impacts are positive.</i></p>
	<p><b>Recommendations</b></p>
<p><b>Summary</b></p>	<p><b>Social</b>  <b>Environmental</b>  <b>Economic</b> </p>










<p><b>Option 2.03</b></p> <p><b>Should transport capacity in the borough be increased for example on orbital and east / west routes?</b></p>	<p>People need to move around a growing and changing borough and increased east-west linkages will allow the benefits of regeneration to be spread within Barnet, helping to promote economic prosperity, a positive <b>economic</b> impact. Improved linkages will provide a positive <b>social</b> impact by improving access to services and facilities. The creation of new capacity through road improvements will have a negative impact on the <b>environment</b> in terms of land used and increased emissions from traffic. The degree of impact will be determined by the type of transport capacity with private vehicles being the most damaging mode.</p> <p><i>Economic and social impacts are positive. Environmental impact is negative.</i></p>
	<p><b>Recommendations</b></p> <p><b>Ensure that Core Strategy links improvements to capacity with making car trips less attractive.</b></p>
<p><b>Summary</b></p>	<p><b>Social</b>      <b>Environmental</b>      <b>Economic</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;">    </p>
<p><b>Option 2.04</b></p> <p><b>Should the ability to travel be restricted in ways that make non-public transport usage less attractive such as limited parking provision?</b></p>	<p>Non public transport usage includes cycling and walking. Making such physical activity less attractive will have a negative <b>social</b> impact on the health of residents. Reducing car usage and emissions should have a positive impact for the <b>environment</b> in reducing the effects of traffic. In the absence of alternative modes that are attractive and affordable there will be negative <b>economic</b> impacts if restrictions reduce access to rewarding and satisfying employment. Similarly there will be a negative <b>social</b> impact on access to services. New restrictions may exacerbate road congestion, impact on amenity and contribute to accidents as car users change their travel behaviour through travelling earlier or by unsuitable routes instead of accessing alternative modes of travel</p> <p><i>The environmental impact is uncertain. The economic and social impacts are negative</i></p>
	<p><b>Recommendations</b></p> <p><b>Ensure that Core Strategy emphasises reductions in trips by vehicular traffic whilst encouraging walking and cycling.</b></p>
<p><b>Summary</b></p>	<p><b>Social</b>      <b>Environmental</b>      <b>Economic</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;">    </p>
<p><b>Option 2.05</b></p> <p><b>Should parking be increased in town centres to help short-trip shoppers/users?</b></p>	<p><b>Car parking is an unsustainable use of land. Open areas of car parking increase the risk of flooding. Short trips by car are a major cause of pollution. These all create negative environmental impacts. Promoting such spaces can provide a positive economic impact in its contribution to the economic vitality of town centres by supporting local services. It also provides a positive social benefit and improves connectivity between town centres and their residential hinterlands. Flexibility for long and short term use enables people to pay, play and stay, encourages less town centre trips. This contributes to a sense of place as town centres are multi-function places and engenders community cohesion.</b></p> <p><i>The environmental impact is negative. The economic and social impacts are positive.</i></p>










	<p><b>Recommendations</b> Ensure that as a key part of the LDF evidence base a Town Centres Floorspace Needs Assessment is commissioned to develop better understanding of town centres.</p>
Summary	<p><b>Social</b>  <b>Environmental</b>  <b>Economic</b> </p>
Option 2.06	<p><b>Should major investment in roads be deployed or should some road space in the borough be reallocated for example to bus lanes in order to encourage more alternative modes of travel?</b></p> <p>Major investment in roads will have negative <b>environmental</b> impacts if it increases the number of trips made by private cars. Major investment will also cause disruption to traffic and cause an uncertain <b>economic</b> impact on helping people to move around the borough. More sustainable modes of travel could be accommodated by designating more road space to them in bus and cycle lanes creating <b>environmental</b> benefits of using existing transport corridors. Safe walking and cycling routes have positive <b>social</b> impacts from encouraging physical activity. Losing road space will have a negative <b>social</b> impact if it fails to improve access to services and facilities.</p> <p><i>The economic and social impacts are uncertain. The environmental impact is negative.</i></p>
	<p><b>Recommendations</b> Ensure that Core Strategy links improvements to capacity with making car trips less attractive.</p>
Summary	<p><b>Social</b>  <b>Environmental</b>  <b>Economic</b> </p>
Option 2.07	<p><b>In providing a choice of means of travel what alternative methods for sustainable movement should be promoted?</b></p> <p>Reducing reliance on the car as a mode of transport has <b>economic</b> benefits if alternative transport is accessible, attractive and affordable, taking people to the places they want to go. This makes inward investment more attractive. Cycling, walking, bus and tube travel all offer alternatives to car usage but of these only cycling and walking has a positive <b>environmental</b> and <b>social</b> impact in that it does not pollute and helps to promote a healthier lifestyle. Getting people out of their cars also encourages people to get to know their areas better, promoting a greater sense of community identity, a positive <b>social</b> impact. The ability for higher proportions of residents to work from home with access to ICT at local flexible workspaces will reduce the effects of traffic and have a positive <b>environmental</b> impact.</p> <p><i>All impacts are positive.</i></p>
	<p><b>Recommendations</b></p>
Summary	<p><b>Social</b>  <b>Environmental</b>  <b>Economic</b> </p>
Option 2.08	<p><b>Should traffic congestion be addressed through localised increases in road capacity?</b></p> <p>Although local increases in capacity may alleviate local congestion problems and have positive <b>social</b> and <b>economic</b> effects locally in terms of improved access to services and opportunities for employment, increased capacity may only increase the number of cars that travel on Barnet's roads and therefore move the problem on elsewhere. This option will therefore have a negative <b>environmental</b> impact.</p> <p><i>The economic and social impacts are positive. The environmental impact is negative.</i></p>







	<p><b>Recommendations</b></p> <p>Ensure that Core Strategy links improvements to capacity with making car trips less attractive.</p>
Summary	<p><b>Social</b>      <b>Environmental</b>      <b>Economic</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;">    </p>
<p><b>Option 2.09</b></p> <p>What more can be done to improve mobility in the borough?</p>	<p>Improved mobility has positive <b>social</b> and <b>economic</b> impacts enabling people to access new opportunities for work, retail provision, open space and community facilities throughout the borough and the option seeks to improve on the current situation. The impact of more people making more trips around the borough from unspecified modes of transport may have an uncertain impact on the <b>environment</b>.</p> <p><i>The economic and social impacts are positive. The environmental impact is uncertain.</i></p>
	<p><b>Recommendations</b></p> <p>Ensure that Core Strategy links improvements to capacity with making car trips less attractive.</p>
Summary	<p><b>Social</b>      <b>Environmental</b>      <b>Economic</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;">    </p>
<b>Issue 2b: Providing community services for sustainable communities</b>	
Summary	
<p><b>Option 2.10</b></p> <p>Should the Council encourage the joint use of new and existing community facilities? What uses can be sensitively located together?</p>	<p>Joint use has positive <b>environmental</b> benefits as it entails more efficient use of land and helps reduce car trips. However greater intensity of use will have a negative <b>environmental</b> impact on residential amenity from increased noise and traffic. Joint use is also likely to result in improved viability of resources and help to increase <b>social</b> cohesion by facilitating the use of space for different groups of faith, age and gender. Community facilities can contribute to the local distinctiveness of an area. Community facilities that provide specialist services to young people, the elderly and disabled may have a positive <b>economic</b> impact by helping them to access jobs and training.</p> <p><i>The environmental impact is uncertain. The economic and social impacts are positive.</i></p>
	<p><b>Recommendations</b></p> <p>Ensure that Core Strategy sets sensitive and sustainable locational criteria for joint use of community facilities.</p>
Summary	<p><b>Social</b>      <b>Environmental</b>      <b>Economic</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;">    </p>







<p><b>Option 2.11</b></p> <p><b>Should the Council protect existing community facilities as well as sport, leisure and recreation facilities, where fully utilised, from displacement by development, ensuring re-provision of facilities in those instances where development takes place?</b></p>	<p>Sustainable communities need community facilities that are well used and cherished. Facilities that are not fully utilised may still be popular as flexible venues that meet changing demands and therefore have a major role to play in the community. Sports, leisure and recreation facilities need to be attractive, affordable and accessible in order to promote physical activity which has a positive <b>social</b> impact on health. Community facilities that provide specialist services to young people, the elderly and disabled may have a positive <b>economic</b> impact by helping them to access jobs and training. The removal of under utilised facilities may have negative <b>social</b> and <b>environmental</b> impacts by causing people, including those with limited mobility, to travel further to use alternative services.</p> <p><i>All impacts are uncertain.</i></p>
	<p><b>Recommendations</b></p> <p><b>Ensure that a better understanding of the use of community facilities is developed as part of the LDF evidence base including the Town Centres Floorspace Needs Assessment.</b></p>
<p><b>Summary</b></p>	<p><b>Social</b>  <b>Environmental</b>  <b>Economic</b> </p>
<p><b>Option 2.12</b></p> <p><b>Should community facilities only be allowed in specific locations where they are accessible by public transport and where there are on-street parking constraints, such as town centres or growth areas?</b></p>	<p>If they are to be successful, community facilities such as schools and hospitals need to be accessible by different modes of transport including the car. Parking restrictions will help ease congestion and help keep traffic moving, a positive <b>economic</b> impact. Around schools restrictions can have <b>environmental</b> and <b>social</b> benefits by helping to protect local amenity and promoting more sustainable forms of travel as well as improving child safety. Around hospitals parking provision needs to be more flexible to account for a variety of users including patients, visitors and shift-workers. Town centres provide good transport links which allow a greater range of people to access a variety of services on a one trip basis, a positive <b>social</b> impact. Such locations are therefore more suitable to larger facilities. Local community facilities such as primary healthcare within residential areas can still be suitable locations if only accessed by walking or cycling.</p> <p><i>All impacts are positive.</i></p>
<p><b>Summary</b></p>	<p><b>Social</b>  <b>Environmental</b>  <b>Economic</b> </p>
<p><b>Option 2.13</b></p> <p><b>Should the Council plan spatially for healthier lifestyles and assist in tackling wider community issues around healthier neighbourhoods and counter growing obesity problems?</b></p>	<p>Access to a range of healthy choices including attractive and affordable recreation and leisure facilities, open space and allotments can help increase physical activity and combat obesity –inducing environments. This will improve health and have a positive <b>social</b> impact. Healthy residents have more <b>economic</b> opportunities by accessing rewarding and satisfying employment. Ensuring local access to shops selling affordable and healthy produce will have a positive <b>social</b> impact. Access to health advice may encourage people to walk and cycle rather than drive. It may also encourage greater self-sufficiency encouraging individuals and communities to grow their own fruit and vegetables. This will have a positive <b>environmental</b> impact.</p> <p><i>All impacts are positive.</i></p>
	<p><b>Recommendations</b></p>










<p><b>Summary</b></p>	<p><b>Social</b>  <b>Environmental</b>  <b>Economic</b> </p>
<p><b>Option 2.14</b></p> <p><b>Should the Core Strategy require a greater contribution towards special needs housing and life time homes to accommodate older and disabled residents?</b></p>	<p>A varied housing stock helps people to make their lifetime housing journey within areas in which they want to live. Lifetime Homes are adaptable to peoples changing circumstances over the course of their lives. Allowing people to stay in their own homes when they want to has <b>social</b> benefits. Having access to different and attractive forms of independent housing contributes to balanced communities. It has a positive <b>economic</b> impact as it allows mobility within the local housing market enabling people to “downsize” when necessary. The housing stock needs to be responsive to demographic change if it is to be used more efficiently. The sustainable use of the housing stock has a positive <b>environmental</b> impact.</p> <p>When people require more specialist care special needs housing provides a different option. If special needs housing does not address local need and displaces opportunities for general housing it represents an unsustainable use of land. This is a negative <b>environment</b> impact. An increase in residential care provision will increase the number of vulnerable people living in the borough and places a greater burden on local health provision. This has a negative <b>social</b> impact as the health of Barnet’s overall population will deteriorate and access to services will become more restricted.</p> <p><i>All impacts are uncertain.</i></p>
	<p><b>Recommendations</b></p> <p><b>Ensure that as a key part of the LDF Evidence Base the provision of new housing is linked to proven need as set out in the Strategic Housing Market Assessment.</b></p>
<p><b>Summary</b></p>	<p><b>Social</b>  <b>Environmental</b>  <b>Economic</b> </p>
<p><b>Theme 3 – Meeting housing aspirations</b></p>	
<p><b>Issue 3a: The number and distribution of new housing development</b></p>	
<p><b>Option 3.01</b></p> <p><b>The council, along with its partners is focusing major housing and economic growth on the west side of the borough in the strategically identified London – Luton – Bedford coordination corridor where regeneration potential and brownfield site availability is greatest. Is this a sustainable approach to planned growth or are there alternative locations where growth should go?</b></p>	<p>Planned regeneration will help to reduce economic and social disparities with increased access to new homes and jobs will have positive <b>economic</b> and <b>social</b> benefits for Barnet and the North London sub-region. Planned rather than piecemeal regeneration will also help ensure the timely delivery of infrastructure. Substantial construction activity will have a negative impact on the local <b>environment</b>. There may also be an uncertain <b>social</b> impact on community cohesion. With increased housing opportunities in the corridor, as well as the <b>social</b> benefit of addressing housing need there will be positive <b>environmental</b> impacts for the existing lower density suburbs as local development pressures will be diverted. The focus of growth will change these places and therefore create uncertain local impacts. However the sub-region will benefit from the positive impacts of regeneration.</p> <p><i>The local social, economic, and environmental impacts are all uncertain.</i></p> <p><i>The regional social, economic, and environmental impacts are all positive.</i></p>







	<p><b>Recommendations</b></p> <p><b>Ensure that through the Core Strategy planned growth mitigates short-term upheaval and local community benefits from regeneration.</b></p>
Summary	<p><b>Social</b>  <b>Environmental</b>  <b>Economic</b> </p> <p><b>Social</b>  <b>Environmental</b>  <b>Economic</b> </p>
<p><b>Option 3.02</b></p> <p><b>Should the focus of enhancement and major infill housing development be within sustainable locations such as the town centres of Chipping Barnet, Edgware, Finchley Central, New Barnet, North Finchley and Whetstone, and major arterial corridors with good public transport accessibility? If not, what other locations should we consider for inclusion/exclusion?</b></p>	<p>Town centre developments add to local vitality and prosperity as new residents will support local services providing a positive <b>economic</b> impact. Local access to public transport and shops in town centres will benefit the <b>environment</b> by reducing car trips. The focus of growth on higher density town centres will help preserve the <b>environmental</b> character of lower density suburbs and increase housing opportunities in town centres. People with families may find the suburbs more attractive but less affordable than the town centres. There will be an uncertain <b>social</b> impact as high density housing will only help address need for small flatted accommodation rather than homes for families. To deliver stable communities there is a need for connectivity between the town centres and their suburban hinterlands. A focus on town centre flatted housing may cause polarisation as a housing journey from town centre flat to suburban house is not an affordable option creating a negative <b>social</b> impact.</p> <p><i>The economic and environmental impacts are positive. The social impact is uncertain</i></p>
	<p><b>Recommendations</b></p> <p><b>Ensure that the Core Strategy supports an appropriate variety of house types in town centres to provide a range of attractive housing options.</b></p>
Summary	<p><b>Social</b>  <b>Environmental</b>  <b>Economic</b> </p>
<p><b>Option 3.03</b></p> <p><b>Should growth be allowed to take place across all parts of the borough?</b></p>	<p>Negative <b>economic</b> and <b>environmental</b> impacts will arise from unfocused borough-wide development. The vitality and viability of town centres will be affected by reduced opportunities for mixed used development in such locations. Parts of the borough with poor public transport may be developed and this is likely to increase car trips. Such growth will also increase pressures on greenfield sites which will be preferred to previously developed land in areas requiring renewal. This will have a negative <b>economic</b> and <b>social</b> impact if it makes regeneration less viable. This growth will not divert development pressures from the lower density suburbs. Increased densities will change the character of suburbs and make them unattractive as places to live and stay. Piecemeal development will affect the timely delivery of required infrastructure and have a negative <b>social</b> impact.</p> <p><i>All impacts are negative.</i></p>
	<p><b>Recommendations</b></p> <p><b>Ensure that deliverable and developable sites identified in the Site Allocations DPD are in sustainable locations.</b></p>







<p><b>Summary</b></p>	<p><b>Social</b>      <b>Environmental</b>      <b>Economic</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;">    </p>
<p><b>Option 3.04</b></p> <p><b>Should the focus of housing growth and strategic development be targeted in order to protect the high quality suburbs?</b></p>	<p>The suburbs are noted for lower density housing. It is part of their distinctiveness. Inappropriate housing growth can imbalance character and impact on the <b>environment</b>. Many suburbs lack accessible transport links and are considered unsustainable locations for housing growth. There is a danger that the protection of the suburbs will increase their attraction as a desirable and exclusive place to live, making them increasingly unaffordable for future generations. This will have a negative <b>social</b> impact by undermining their original purpose as family homes with gardens. If they become unaffordable as family housing there will be greater future pressures for replacement with higher densities. To deliver stable communities there will be a need to ensure connectivity between the town centres and the suburbs, enabling people who access the housing market in higher density town centres (ie flats) to continue their housing journey into a house with a garden in the lower density suburbs and vice versa. The targeted focus of housing growth will have a positive <b>economic</b> and <b>social</b> impact in making regeneration more attractive and allowing for planned and timely delivery of infrastructure.</p> <p><i>The economic and environmental impacts are positive. The social impact is negative.</i></p>
	<p><b>Recommendations</b></p> <p><b>Ensure that within the Core Strategy the protection of the suburbs is balanced with the need to provide decent and affordable housing to meet the needs of all communities. Housing development should be accessible or should be capable of being made accessible by a choice of means of transport</b></p>
<p><b>Summary</b></p>	<p><b>Social</b>      <b>Environmental</b>      <b>Economic</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;">    </p>
<p><b>Option 3.05</b></p> <p><b>Should we only consider housing development when it is accessible or can be made accessible by a choice of means of transport?</b></p>	<p>If housing developments are to be successful they have to be accessible by different modes of transport including the car. Access to a decent affordable home will have a positive <b>social</b> impact. Parking restrictions will help reduce car usage and ease congestion, therefore having a positive <b>economic</b> impact. Car parking is also an inefficient use of land and has a negative <b>environmental</b> impact. Open areas of car parking can increase flood risk. Areas with high levels of public transport accessibility provide potential for reducing car trips and the impact of traffic on the <b>environment</b>.</p> <p><i>All impacts are positive.</i></p>
<p><b>Summary</b></p>	<p><b>Social</b>      <b>Environmental</b>      <b>Economic</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;">    </p>
<p><b>Issue 3b – Sustainable design principles</b></p>	







<p><b>Option 3.06</b></p> <p><b>Should we, as part of Strand 2 of the Three Strands Approach, seek to ‘enhance’ the borough’s high quality suburbs and historic areas further by protection from intensive development and infill?</b></p>	<p>Whilst enhancing what is good about the historic <b>environment</b> has a positive impact it is necessary to provide good quality surroundings for all. It is uncertain if this option can deliver this <b>social</b> objective. Many of the boroughs suburbs lack accessible transport links and are considered unsustainable locations for housing growth. There is a danger that the protection and enhancement of the suburbs will increase their attraction and make them unaffordable for future generations. This will have a negative <b>social</b> impact by undermining their original purpose as family homes with gardens. Suburban family houses with gardens will become unaffordable and more susceptible to future pressures for replacement with flats. To deliver stable communities there will be a need to ensure connectivity between the town centres and the suburbs, enabling people who access the housing market in high density town centres to continue their housing journey in the lower density suburbs and vice versa. The enhanced suburbs will serve as a location for attracting further prosperity to the borough, a positive <b>economic</b> impact.</p> <p><i>The economic and environmental impacts are positive. The social impact is uncertain</i></p>
	<p><b>Recommendations</b></p> <p><b>Ensure that as a key part of the LDF evidence base the character of Barnet’s suburbs is appraised and assessed.</b></p>
<p><b>Summary</b></p>	<p><b>Social</b>  <b>Environmental</b>  <b>Economic</b> </p>
<p><b>Option 3.07</b></p> <p><b>Should we expect different standards of design in different parts of the borough to reflect variations in the quality of local environments?</b></p>	<p>Area focused standards of design will help preserve and enhance what is good in the historic <b>environment</b>. Ensuring that high standards of design are applied, helping to maintain and enhance the quality of landscapes and townscapes enables higher quality environments to be delivered across the borough, providing good quality surroundings for all, a positive <b>social</b> impact. The renewal of an area can provide opportunities for innovative design and promote a positive <b>economic</b> impact. Good standards of design produce places that are well-used by people and are logical and easy to read. These locations can promote areas as being desirable areas to live and invest in. High quality surroundings can make communities feel more uplifted and it can transform the way people live and behave encouraging a greater sense of community identity, a positive social benefit. Promoting high standards of design provides design proposals that are fit for purpose that take account of people’s needs and seeks to be inclusive to ensure that everybody enjoys the benefits of well designed schemes and areas. Such focus can promote local distinctiveness and provide the <b>social</b> benefit of good quality surroundings for all. It could also help the <b>economic</b> renewal of those locations that have suffered from under investment due to the quality of their environments.</p> <p><i>All impacts are positive.</i></p>
<p><b>Summary</b></p>	<p><b>Recommendations</b></p> <p><b>Social</b>  <b>Environmental</b>  <b>Economic</b> </p>







<p><b>Option 3.08</b></p> <p><b>Should good basic or high quality design be sought everywhere?</b></p>	<p>Good design considers the long-term use of buildings, spaces and materials used, recycling opportunities, waste reduction and strategies to promote efficient energy use by using renewable energy sources. This will have a positive <b>environmental</b> impact. Well-designed schemes ensure that inclusive design features are incorporated into the scheme from the outset. This will have a positive <b>social</b> impact as it will create a barrier-free environment that will give access to everyone to use. Aspirational standards can drive forward good practice throughout the borough rather than a few specific places so that step changes can consistently raise the bar for development quality. Well designed places where people want to live and work will attract investment and have a positive <b>economic</b> impact</p> <p><i>All impacts are positive.</i></p>
<p><b>Summary</b></p>	<p><b>Recommendations</b></p> <p><b>Social</b>  <b>Environmental</b>  <b>Economic</b> </p>
<p><b>Option 3.09</b></p> <p><b>Should we provide more detailed guidance to developers and residents on urban design throughout the borough?</b></p>	<p>Borough-wide design guidance will help promote Barnet as a distinctive place and will contribute towards a sense of community by allowing people to have their say on urban design, a positive <b>social</b> impact. Detailed guidance can drive innovation and this will help to encourage and accommodate both indigenous and inward investment, a positive <b>economic</b> impact. Specific guidance will also highlight the environmental characteristics of areas providing design led solutions to increase energy efficiency and water management. This will have a positive <b>environmental</b> impact. The focus on design led solutions helps to maintain and enhance the quality of landscapes and townscapes highlighting the distinctiveness of places, a positive <b>environmental</b> impact.</p> <p><i>All impacts are positive.</i></p>
<p><b>Summary</b></p>	<p><b>Recommendations</b></p> <p><b>Social</b>  <b>Environmental</b>  <b>Economic</b> </p>
<p><b>Option 3.10</b></p> <p><b>Should we provide more detailed guidance to developers and residents on urban design in specific targeted development locations?</b></p>	<p>Design guidance in specific targeted development locations will contribute towards community cohesion allowing people to have their say on urban design, a positive <b>social</b> impact. Detailed guidance ensures that development fits its unique local context and adds a positive contribution to its existing environment. This will help to provide a <b>social</b> benefit by creating good quality surroundings for all. The focus on locations also helps to maintain and enhance the quality of landscapes and townscapes highlighting the distinctiveness of places, a positive <b>environmental</b> impact. Increasing the attractiveness of an area will promote inward investment, a positive <b>economic</b> impact. Specific guidance will also highlight the environmental characteristics of areas providing design led solutions to increase energy efficiency and water management. This will have a positive <b>environmental</b> impact.</p> <p><i>All impacts are positive.</i></p>
	<p><b>Recommendations</b></p>







Summary	Social 	Environmental 	Economic 
Issue 3c – Low density suburbs			
Option 3.11  Should we continue our existing approach to protecting and enhancing the suburbs and built environment?	<p>Whilst enhancing what is good and distinctive about Barnet’s suburban <b>environment</b> has a positive impact it is necessary to provide good quality surroundings for all. It is uncertain if this option can deliver this <b>social</b> objective. Many of the boroughs suburbs lack accessible transport links and are considered unsustainable locations for housing growth. There is a danger that the protection and enhancement of the suburbs will increase their attraction and make them increasingly unaffordable for future generations. Suburban family houses with gardens will become unaffordable and more susceptible to future pressures for replacement with flats. Exclusive rather than inclusive suburbs will have a negative <b>social</b> impact. The enhanced suburbs will serve as a location for attracting further prosperity to the borough, a positive <b>economic</b> impact.</p> <p><i>The economic and environmental impacts are positive. The social impact is uncertain</i></p>		
	<p><b>Recommendations</b></p> <p>Ensure that as a key part of the LDF evidence base the character of Barnet’s suburbs is appraised and assessed.</p>		
Summary	Social 	Environmental 	Economic 
Option 3.12  Should we be more specific about the character of the suburbs that are to be respected and enriched?	<p>More specific evidence on suburban character will help to protect and enhance the distinctive qualities of Barnet’s suburbs. This will have a positive <b>environmental</b> effect. Promoting a distinctive suburban identity will have <b>social</b> benefits. Not all areas outside the targeted housing growth areas have a distinctive suburban character. Being specific about the high quality suburbs will also provide opportunities to highlight the less attractive areas as places for inward investment and renewal, a positive economic impact.</p> <p><i>All impacts are positive.</i></p>		
	<p><b>Recommendations</b></p> <p>Ensure that as a key part of the LDF evidence base the character of Barnet’s suburbs is appraised and assessed.</p>		
Summary	Social 	Environmental 	Economic 










<p><b>Option 3.13</b></p> <p><b>Should the Core Strategy seek to resist loss of gardens in lower density suburbs where this erodes the character of areas and reduces the supply of large single housing plots, particularly when there is sufficiently identified brownfield sites allocated to meet the Borough’s housing targets.</b></p>	<p>Gardens as well as the buildings they are attached to contribute to the overall distinctiveness of the suburbs and this gives them a positive <b>environmental</b> impact. Gardens soften the landscape, promote biodiversity and act as a valuable tool to mitigate flooding. Their contribution to mitigating the impact of climate change has an <b>environmental</b> benefit. Restrictions on the development of gardens may have a negative <b>social</b> impact in restricting the housing supply in places where people want to live. The enhanced suburbs will serve as a location for attracting further prosperity to the borough, a positive <b>economic</b> impact. In order to protect lower density suburbs and deliver homes to meet ever increasing need there will be greater pressures for higher density development on brownfield and greenfield sites in Barnet. The areas that have higher density development as a result of lower densities elsewhere may suffer negative <b>economic, environmental</b> and <b>social</b> impacts.</p> <p><i>All impacts are uncertain</i></p>
	<p><b>Recommendations</b></p> <p><b>Ensure that as a key part of the LDF evidence base the character of Barnet’s suburbs is appraised and assessed.</b></p>
<p><b>Summary</b></p>	<p><b>Social</b>  <b>Environmental</b>  <b>Economic</b> </p>
<p><b>Option 3.14</b></p> <p><b>Should we protect large properties as family houses with gardens to provide a sustainable mix of sizes and to preserve the character of an area and Barnet suburbs generally?</b></p>	<p>Large family suburban houses that are attractive and affordable provide an important component of a balanced housing supply. Their availability may fulfil the suburban aspirations of the residents living in higher density development within the Borough. Larger accommodation can provide greater opportunities for extended families of faith and ethnic groups to stay within Barnet. This has a <b>social</b> benefit in contributing to mixed and balanced communities. Protection of large family period properties may have a negative <b>social</b> impact if it does not address housing need. If accommodation is not accessible by local families then they will be compelled to continue their housing journeys outside Barnet. This will impact on community cohesiveness. The under occupation of large accommodation has a negative <b>environmental</b> impact as it is not an efficient use of land.</p> <p><i>All impacts are uncertain</i></p>
	<p><b>Recommendations</b></p> <p><b>Ensure that as key parts of the LDF evidence base the character of Barnet’s suburbs is appraised and assessed together with a Strategic Housing Market Assessment to assess need and demand for housing.</b></p>
<p><b>Summary</b></p>	<p><b>Social</b>  <b>Environmental</b>  <b>Economic</b> </p>







<p><b>Option 3.15</b></p> <p><b>Should we allow conversions into smaller units if this helps preserve the character of a former family house?</b></p>	<p>Conversions may provide a more efficient use of an unaffordable family house. The opportunity to convert and refurbish houses will attract investment and have an <b>economic</b> benefit. Access to smaller affordable units will help people who want to live and stay within their suburban community to downsize from period house to period conversion. This will have <b>social</b> benefits as it contributes to more vibrant suburban areas with a mixture of different households and age groups. The local <b>environment</b> will benefit from the retention of distinctiveness. Conversions may provide opportunity to improve energy efficiency of older properties. Conversions may have a similar negative <b>environmental</b> impact on an area's character as that of new build through noise or parking.</p> <p><i>The economic and social impacts are positive. The environmental impact is uncertain.</i></p>
	<p><b>Recommendations</b></p> <p><b>Ensure that as key parts of the LDF evidence base the character of Barnet's suburbs is appraised and assessed together with a Strategic Housing Market Assessment to assess need and demand for housing.</b></p>
<p><b>Summary</b></p>	<p><b>Social</b>  <b>Environmental</b>  <b>Economic</b> </p>
<p><b>Option 3.16</b></p> <p><b>Should we expect Design and Access Statements submitted with planning applications to set out how they have sought to respect and contribute to local character and distinctiveness and sustainability targets?</b></p>	<p>Pre-application discussions can contribute to good quality proposals and effective community engagement which is capable of delivering sustainable development. Design and Access Statements can help deliver high quality designs that consider how the proposal contributes to the landscape and townscape. Statements can seek to use resources effectively. The <b>environmental</b> impact is positive. Design and Access statements examine and will assess access for disabled people. Improving access is a positive social impact. It also helps local communities to better understand design and access in a local context, encouraging a greater sense of identity. The <b>economic</b> impact is also positive because proposals that produce high quality designs are likely to attract inward investment..</p> <p><i>All impacts are positive.</i></p>
<p><b>Summary</b></p>	<p><b>Recommendations</b></p> <p><b>Social</b>  <b>Environmental</b>  <b>Economic</b> </p>










<p><b>Option 3.17</b></p> <p><b>Should we review design guidance for extensions to existing housing to reflect greater diversity and specific community and cultural needs of a changing population?</b></p>	<p>The opportunity to extend houses will attract investment and have an <b>economic</b> benefit. Responding to cultural needs and providing clear guidance is an integral part of place shaping, helping to develop community identity, this has positive <b>social</b> impacts. The potential for making better use of the housing stock has <b>environmental</b> benefits. Providing homes especially for extended families contributes towards creating stable communities encouraging people to stay in the borough. Stability supports community infrastructure and contributes to the distinctiveness of neighbourhoods. This has to be balanced against the negative <b>environmental</b> impact on local character if extensions are poorly designed. Another consideration is the future use of such properties; very large properties can become unaffordable and therefore not accessible to all communities. Very large properties will remain susceptible to conversion.</p> <p><i>The economic benefit is positive. The social and environmental impacts are uncertain</i></p>
	<p><b>Recommendations</b></p> <p><b>Ensure that a better understanding of cultural needs is developed through the LDF evidence base.</b></p>
<p><b>Summary</b></p>	<p><b>Social</b>      <b>Environmental</b>      <b>Economic</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;">    </p>
<p><b>Issue 3d – Meeting the housing needs of the diverse communities in Barnet</b></p>	
<p><b>Option 3.18</b></p> <p><b>Should we set a preferred mix of dwelling sizes and types of housing for all tenures with a presumption to include a significant element of family housing unless the developer can demonstrate a demand for smaller homes that does not undermine suburban character or local distinctiveness?</b></p>	<p>Housing demand is prone to fluctuation but there will always be a need for a mix of types of unit in order to provide mixed and balanced communities. Any preferred mix will be based on robust evidence arising from the Strategic Housing Market Assessment. The provision of new affordable and attractive family accommodation has a positive <b>social</b> impact if it allows people to continue their housing journey within stable communities and helps to alleviate overcrowding. Reducing the number of overcrowded properties will have a positive <b>environmental</b> impact. Family housing may have an uncertain <b>economic</b> impact as it places greater demands than small flats on community infrastructure such as schools.</p> <p><i>The economic impact is uncertain. The social and environmental impacts are positive.</i></p>
	<p><b>Recommendations</b></p> <p><b>Ensure that as key parts of the LDF evidence base the character of Barnet's suburbs is appraised and assessed together with a Strategic Housing Market Assessment to assess need and demand for housing.</b></p>
<p><b>Summary</b></p>	<p><b>Social</b>      <b>Environmental</b>      <b>Economic</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;">    </p>







<p><b>Option 3.19</b></p> <p><b>What weight should be given to meeting housing need?</b></p>	<p>If housing need is not addressed it will get worse and there will be negative <b>environmental</b> and <b>social</b> impacts from people living in overcrowded households or simply living in places they can afford but don't want to live. If the housing market becomes static and people can't start their housing journey there will be a negative <b>economic</b> impact. Large numbers of people in need of the right housing in the right place at the right time will constitute a transient population which has a negative <b>social</b> impact on community cohesion.</p> <p><i>The social, economic and environmental impacts are all uncertain</i></p>
	<p><b>Recommendations</b></p> <p><b>Ensure that as a key part of the LDF evidence a Strategic Housing Market Assessment is commissioned to assess need and demand for housing.</b></p>
<p><b>Summary</b></p>	<p><b>Social</b>  <b>Environmental</b>  <b>Economic</b> </p>
<p><b>Option 3.20</b></p> <p><b>Should the council seek a more appropriate mix of affordable housing tenures, particularly to support its housing strategy objective of encouraging people to progress through the housing journey from rented to full home ownership?</b></p>	<p>The housing journey will help to promote prosperity, if it is an attractive and affordable route, a positive <b>economic</b> impact. Home ownership is considered to have a positive <b>social</b> impact although it is not suitable as a tenure for all. Owner occupation may not be the housing solution for all and if people access it at the wrong time there will be a negative <b>social</b> impact. Providing the right homes with the right tenures in the right places will help to reduce commuting distances and traffic and have a positive <b>environmental</b> impact.</p> <p><i>The environmental impact is positive. The economic and social impacts are uncertain.</i></p>
	<p><b>Recommendations</b></p> <p><b>Ensure that as a key part of the LDF evidence a Strategic Housing Market Assessment is commissioned to assess need and demand for housing.</b></p>
<p><b>Summary</b></p>	<p><b>Social</b>  <b>Environmental</b>  <b>Economic</b> </p>
<p><b>Option 3.21</b></p> <p><b>Should the council adopt recent London Plan tenure mix of low cost home ownership, intermediate as well as rented?</b></p>	<p>The housing journey will help to promote prosperity, if it is an attractive and affordable route, a positive <b>economic</b> impact. Home ownership is considered to have a positive <b>social</b> impact although it is not suitable as a tenure for all. Owner occupation may not be the housing solution for all and if people access it at the wrong time there will be a negative <b>social</b> impact. Providing the right homes with the right tenures in the right places will help to reduce commuting distances and traffic and have a positive <b>environmental</b> impact.</p> <p><i>The economic and environmental impacts are positive. The social impact is negative</i></p>
	<p><b>Recommendations</b></p> <p><b>Ensure that as a key part of the LDF evidence a Strategic Housing Market Assessment is commissioned to assess need and demand for housing.</b></p>










	Social 	Environmental 	Economic 
<p><b>Option 3.22</b></p> <p><b>Given the higher density planned areas for growth in Colindale, Brent Cross/Cricklewood and Mill Hill East should we prioritise new family-sized homes elsewhere in the borough even if this reduces the overall number of units we can deliver for smaller households (but could increase the number of bed-spaces and residential floor space)?</b></p>	<p>Higher density housing in those locations that have good public transport accessibility is a more sustainable use of land, a positive <b>environmental</b> impact. The provision of family housing elsewhere will require more land, putting pressure on greenfield sites and the lower density suburbs. This will affect local distinctiveness, a negative <b>environmental</b> impact. The presence of family accommodation contributes to mixed and balanced communities allowing residents to continue their housing journey within stable neighbourhoods and encouraging a sense of community, identity and welfare. The absence of family homes will have a negative <b>social</b> impact. If smaller units dominate there may be improved economies of scale for developers, making inward investment more attractive but to promote regeneration there needs to be a variety of attractive housing types that can address housing need. The absence of family homes will have an uncertain <b>economic</b> impact. Growing households will eventually outgrow their homes and be compelled to move out of their areas because of a lack of housing choice. A transient population will discourage community identity and have a negative <b>social</b> impact.</p> <p><i>The economic and environmental impacts are uncertain. The social impact is negative</i></p>		
	<p><b>Recommendations</b></p> <p><b>Ensure that as a key part of the LDF evidence a Strategic Housing Market Assessment is commissioned to assess need and demand for housing.</b></p>		
<p><b>Summary</b></p>	Social 	Environmental 	Economic 
<p><b>Option 3.23</b></p> <p><b>Should we expect smaller homes to be delivered throughout Barnet?</b></p>	<p>If smaller units dominate there may be improved economies of scale for developers, making inward investment more attractive, a positive <b>economic</b> impact. The opportunity to downsize to smaller homes at the end of a housing journey while others will make their start with this form of accommodation. This provides a sustainable use of the housing stock, a positive <b>environmental</b> impact. The best locations for such homes are those areas with good public transport accessibility. Developing homes in locations with poor public transport access will increase car traffic and have a negative <b>environmental</b> impact. A supply of small homes around the borough may enable “downsizers” to stay within their neighbourhoods contributing to community cohesion, a positive <b>social</b> impact. Smaller homes are also likely to be more affordable, another positive <b>social</b> impact, and may therefore help promote prosperity, a positive <b>economic</b> impact.</p> <p><i>The economic and social impacts are positive. The environmental impact is uncertain</i></p>		
	<p><b>Recommendations</b></p> <p><b>Ensure that as a key part of the LDF evidence a Strategic Housing Market Assessment is commissioned to assess need and demand for housing.</b></p>		










<p>Summary</p>	<p><b>Social</b>  <b>Environmental</b>  <b>Economic</b> </p>
<p><b>Option 3.24</b></p> <p><b>Should we expect smaller homes to be delivered only in specific locations where there is higher density development around public transport locations or regeneration areas?</b></p>	<p>A concentration of smaller homes in areas of high public transport accessibility does represent a sustainable use of land, a positive <b>environmental</b> impact. If smaller units dominate there may be better economies of scale for developers, making inward investment more attractive, a positive <b>economic</b> impact. Although smaller homes are likely to be more affordable, another positive <b>social</b> impact, there is also the prospect of an unbalanced housing market if there is an increased price differential between a wide supply of small flats and a narrow supply of family homes. This will restrict choices when people outgrow their small homes and are forced to leave the area. A transient population will impact on prosperity, having a negative <b>economic</b> impact. A transient population will not have a sense of community or identity, a negative <b>social</b> impact.</p> <p><i>The social and economic impacts are uncertain. The environmental impact is positive.</i></p>
	<p><b>Recommendations</b></p> <p><b>Ensure that as a key part of the LDF evidence a Strategic Housing Market Assessment is commissioned to assess need and demand for housing.</b></p>
<p>Summary</p>	<p><b>Social</b>  <b>Environmental</b>  <b>Economic</b> </p>
<p><b>Option 3.25</b></p> <p><b>Should we adopt a policy of relating housing targets to a minimum floor space requirement per unit to ensure high quality standards of internal space?</b></p>	<p>The focus on quality over quantity will reap long term <b>social</b> benefits in providing decent homes where people want to live. rather than simply afford. Enabling households to expand encourages people to stay within their communities contributing to cohesion, identity and welfare, a positive <b>social</b> impact. More generous room sizes enable households to grow without moving home, a positive <b>environmental</b> impact. This also has a positive <b>economic</b> impact on prosperity. Seeking to control market forces on provision of smaller homes may have a negative <b>economic</b> impact in deterring inward investment.</p> <p><i>The environmental and social impacts are positive. The economic impact is uncertain.</i></p>
	<p><b>Recommendations</b></p> <p><b>Ensure that as a key part of the LDF evidence a Strategic Housing Market Assessment is commissioned to assess need and demand for housing. Assess delivery of new homes through Annual Monitoring Reports.</b></p>
<p>Summary</p>	<p><b>Social</b>  <b>Environmental</b>  <b>Economic</b> </p>







<p><b>Option 3.26</b></p> <p><b>Should the Core Strategy only support specialist residential care homes in those parts of the Borough where there is a clear demonstrable evidence of local need, supported by the local PCT and Council’s Adult Social Services?</b></p>	<p>If specialist residential care homes are not addressing local need they are displacing opportunities for delivering decent affordable homes. By having a robust link with need there will be a positive <b>environmental</b> impact as it ensures that it is a sustainable use of land. The clear link with demonstrable local need will have a positive <b>social</b> impact. The link with need also has a positive <b>economic</b> impact in that it sends a clear message to the development industry about investment in residential care homes.</p> <p><i>All impacts are positive.</i></p>
<p><b>Summary</b></p>	<p><b>Recommendations</b></p> <p><b>Social</b>  <b>Environmental</b>  <b>Economic</b> </p>
<p><b>Issue 3e: Affordable housing</b></p>	
<p><b>Option 3.27</b></p> <p><b>Given an expected shift in strategic Mayoral policy direction to the current London-wide target of 50% affordable housing on 10 units or more and the need to be in general conformity with the London Plan should the council consider retaining or changing its existing approach to affordable housing with a different threshold where it is required for new residential development to reflect local circumstances, need and viability of delivery?</b></p>	<p>The affordable housing message is reliant on a clear and consistent message to the development industry. This message has already been subject to several changes in a short period. Further changes will have a uncertain <b>economic</b> impact on attracting inward investment. Likewise the approach to delivery needs to provide a long term solution by being evidence based and capable of withstanding changes in the housing market. There is an uncertain <b>social</b> impact on delivery of affordable homes. There is an uncertain <b>environmental</b> impact as the provision of affordable housing in mixed and balanced communities represents a sustainable use of land. This may be affected by any change in approach.</p> <p><i>All impacts are uncertain</i></p>
<p><b>Summary</b></p>	<p><b>Recommendations</b></p> <p><b>Ensure that as a key part of the LDF evidence a Strategic Housing Market Assessment is commissioned to assess need and demand for housing. Assess delivery of new homes through Annual Monitoring Reports. A longitudinal study may uncover the long term implications of the current policy after several policy changes.</b></p>
<p><b>Summary</b></p>	<p><b>Social</b>  <b>Environmental</b>  <b>Economic</b> </p>
<p><b>Option 3.28</b></p> <p><b>Should we retain the existing UDP policy of 50% affordable housing on sites of 10 or more units?</b></p>	<p>Maintaining the status quo on affordable housing may have an uncertain <b>economic</b> impact on attracting inward investment if policy is inflexible. Policy should be evidence based. There is an uncertain <b>social</b> impact on delivery of affordable homes. There is an uncertain <b>environmental</b> impact as the provision of affordable housing in mixed and balanced communities represents a sustainable use of land. This may be affected by any change in approach.</p> <p><i>All impacts are uncertain</i></p>










	<p><b>Recommendations</b></p> <p>Ensure that as a key part of the LDF evidence a Strategic Housing Market Assessment is commissioned to assess need and demand for housing. Assess delivery of new homes through Annual Monitoring Reports. A longitudinal study may uncover the long term implications of the current policy after several policy changes.</p>
Summary	<p><b>Social</b>  <b>Environmental</b>  <b>Economic</b> </p>
<p><b>Option 3.29</b></p> <p>Should we introduce a more flexible sliding scale with a lower contribution from smaller to medium sized sites (10 to 24 units) and the current 50% on larger sites (25 or more)? A worked example of implementing a progressive contribution for a site of 50 units may only require 30% from the first 10 to 24 units (resulting in 6 affordable units) and 50% from the remaining 25 units (resulting in 12 units) a total of 18 units or 36%.</p>	<p>Developers take time to adapt to policy change. Lower contributions from medium sites may have a positive <b>economic</b> impact in attracting investment but it is uncertain whether the sliding scale will generate more affordable housing or less. The <b>social</b> impact is uncertain. Developers will seek to develop schemes which avoid the threshold of 10 units or that of 25 units to avoid making any or reduced contributions. If developers design housing schemes to circumvent the thresholds there is a risk that sites will not fulfil their potential and this is an inefficient use of the land, a negative <b>environmental</b> impact.</p> <p><i>The economic impact is positive. The social impact is uncertain. The environmental impact is negative.</i></p>
	<p><b>Recommendations</b></p> <p>Ensure that as a key part of the LDF evidence a Strategic Housing Market Assessment is commissioned to assess need and demand for housing. Assess delivery of new homes through Annual Monitoring Reports. A longitudinal study may uncover the long term implications of the current policy after several policy changes.</p>
Summary	<p><b>Social</b>  <b>Environmental</b>  <b>Economic</b> </p>
<p><b>Option 3.30</b></p> <p>Should the 10 unit threshold be raised to 15 units where viability constraints reduce the deliverability of housing supply ?</p>	<p>An increased threshold may have a marginal positive <b>economic</b> impact on inward investment. The return to a threshold of 15 units may cause developers to revert to previous behaviour and develop schemes under the threshold. This will have a negative <b>environmental</b> impact as it does not represent an efficient use of the land. Increased viability will have a positive but marginal <b>social</b> impact on delivery of affordable housing.</p> <p><i>The economic and social impacts are positive. The environmental impact is negative.</i></p>
	<p><b>Recommendations</b></p> <p>Ensure that as a key part of the LDF evidence a Strategic Housing Market Assessment is commissioned to assess need and demand for housing. Assess delivery of new homes through Annual Monitoring Reports. A longitudinal study may uncover the long term implications of the current policy after several policy changes.</p>
Summary	<p><b>Social</b>  <b>Environmental</b>  <b>Economic</b> </p>







<p><b>Option 3.31</b></p> <p><b>Should we seek a greater contribution towards low cost home ownership and affordable housing that supports people and families through the housing journey towards full owner occupation?</b></p>	<p>In order to make a housing journey it has to be an attractive and affordable route which helps to promote <b>economic</b> prosperity. Home ownership is considered to have a positive <b>social</b> impact. A balanced housing market should allow people to make informed choices with a variety of affordable tenures. Owner occupation may not be the housing solution for all and if people access it at the wrong time there will be a negative <b>social</b> impact. There is a positive environmental impact if the housing journey can be made within fewer homes, representing a more sustainable use of the housing stock.</p> <p><i>The environmental impact is positive. The economic and social impacts are uncertain.</i></p>
	<p><b>Recommendations</b></p> <p><b>Ensure that as a key part of the LDF evidence a Strategic Housing Market Assessment is commissioned to assess need and demand for housing. Assess delivery of new homes through Annual Monitoring Reports. A longitudinal study may uncover the long term implications of the current policy after several policy changes</b></p>
<p><b>Summary</b></p>	<p><b>Social</b>  <b>Environmental</b>  <b>Economic</b> </p>
<p><b>Option 3.32</b></p> <p><b>In what circumstances should we accept payment in lieu as opposed to on-site affordable housing in new residential development?</b></p>	<p>Payment in lieu can provide greater flexibility in pooling contributions. Economies of scale may allow more affordable housing to be delivered off-site. It therefore has a positive <b>economic</b> impact. The council may not be able to identify opportunities for spending the pooled contributions on affordable housing, creating an uncertain <b>economic</b> impact. In promoting development elsewhere there is a wider impact on amenity, a negative <b>environmental</b> impact. The off site provision of affordable housing discourages mixed and balanced communities and has a negative social impact on community identity and welfare. Off site delivery requires new sites to be developed and this may delay provision of decent and affordable homes, a negative <b>social</b> impact..</p> <p><i>The economic impact is uncertain. The environmental and social impacts are negative.</i></p>
	<p><b>Recommendations</b></p> <p><b>Ensure that the effects of payment in lieu are assessed through the Annual Monitoring Report.</b></p>
<p><b>Summary</b></p>	<p><b>Social</b>  <b>Environmental</b>  <b>Economic</b> </p>
<p><b>Option 3.33</b></p> <p><b>Where viability is improved or greater public funding is available, should the council seek to secure more contributions to affordable housing, particularly low cost housing?</b></p>	<p>In seeking more contributions this increases opportunities to live in decent and affordable accommodation, this will have a positive <b>social</b> impact. Improved viability will help to promote regeneration and have a positive <b>economic</b> impact. There is a positive <b>environmental</b> impact as the provision of affordable housing within mixed and balanced communities represents a more sustainable use of land.</p> <p><i>All impacts are positive.</i></p>
	<p><b>Recommendations</b></p>










Summary	<p><b>Social</b>  <b>Environmental</b>  <b>Economic</b> </p>
<p><b>Option 3.34</b></p> <p><b>Should we seek mixed and balanced communities by delivering affordable housing in areas where that tenure is under-represented?</b></p>	<p>Affordable housing is underrepresented in the high quality suburbs. In seeking to address housing need in such areas there will be a positive <b>social</b> impact from providing good quality surroundings for all. It may be a less efficient use of resources to develop affordable housing in parts of the borough where that tenure is under-represented and is more expensive, a negative <b>economic</b> impact. There is a positive <b>environmental</b> impact as the provision of affordable housing within mixed and balanced communities represents a more sustainable use of land.</p> <p><i>The environmental and social impacts are positive. The economic impact is uncertain.</i></p>
	<p><b>Recommendations</b></p> <p><b>Ensure that as a key part of the LDF evidence a Strategic Housing Market Assessment is commissioned to assess need and demand for housing.</b></p>
Summary	<p><b>Social</b>  <b>Environmental</b>  <b>Economic</b> </p>
<p><b>Option 3.35</b></p> <p><b>Should we focus on delivering affordable housing where it is most viable to do so and where a greater number of units can be achieved?</b></p>	<p><b>Economic</b> viability is paramount to promoting regeneration and the delivery of affordable homes. It may be a less efficient use of resources to develop affordable housing in parts of the borough where that tenure is under-represented and is more expensive. Maximising the return on affordable housing will help to address housing need and have a positive <b>social</b> impact. There is an uncertain <b>social</b> impact from the delivery of good surroundings for all. There is an uncertain <b>environmental</b> impact if single tenure development impacts on mixed and balanced communities which represent a more sustainable use of land.</p> <p><i>The social and environmental impacts are uncertain. The economic impact is positive.</i></p>
	<p><b>Recommendations</b></p>
Summary	<p><b>Social</b>  <b>Environmental</b>  <b>Economic</b> </p>
<p><b>Theme 4 – Planning for vitality and viability of a network of suburban town centres</b></p>	
<p><b>Issue 4a: The role and function of suburban town centres in Barnet</b></p>	
<p><b>Option 4.01</b></p> <p><b>With the planning policy framework in place and delivery plans at an advanced stage of development should the Council identify Brent Cross/Cricklewood as a new metropolitan town centre, providing it is mixed use and a sustainable centre?</b></p>	<p>As a new metropolitan town centre Brent Cross / Cricklewood will provide a more attractive focus for inward investment. With a raised profile it will have a positive <b>economic</b> impact in helping to promote regeneration. As a sustainable mixed use location it will have a positive <b>environmental</b> impact in using land efficiently and help to further enhance the area's distinctiveness. With a new identity it should help to encourage a sense of community in good quality surroundings thereby providing a positive <b>social</b> impact.</p> <p><i>All impacts are positive.</i></p>
	<p><b>Recommendations</b></p>







<p>Summary</p>	<p><b>Social</b>  <b>Environmental</b>  <b>Economic</b> </p>
<p><b>Option 4.02</b></p> <p><b>Where should we allow further shopping and commercial town centre related development to meet projected demand - within a limited number of the largest town centres?</b></p>	<p>The largest town centres by virtue of their size and longevity with access to existing transport infrastructure and retail have an image as robust, vital and vibrant places. Sites are more likely to become available in these town centres which should therefore provide greater opportunities for retail-led regeneration investment and therefore a positive <b>economic</b> impact. By providing a variety of services the larger town centres provide single trip destinations that can help reduce vehicular traffic providing a positive <b>environmental</b> impact. Town centre retail is more accessible by public transport and therefore those residents without cars will have a better chance of accessing services and facilities that meets their needs. This provides a positive <b>social</b> impact.</p> <p><i>All impacts are positive.</i></p>
<p><b>Recommendations</b></p>	
<p>Summary</p>	<p><b>Social</b>  <b>Environmental</b>  <b>Economic</b> </p>
<p><b>Option 4.03</b></p> <p><b>Should we allow further shopping and commercial town centre related development to meet projected demand in any town centre?</b></p>	<p>Town centres with less access to services and facilities may not be sustainable locations for substantial retail led development. Although opportunities will exist for infill development in smaller town centres any substantial development is likely to cause a negative <b>environmental</b> impact where the new scheme does not complement the existing commercial fabric of the town centre and damages distinctiveness. Inappropriate town centre related development may impact on local shops and discourage sustained economic growth, an uncertain <b>economic</b> impact. This may also have an uncertain <b>social</b> impact on community identity. Substantial development in all town centres provides the opportunity for each one to reinvent themselves as vibrant and vital places that can attract inward investment, a positive <b>economic</b> impact. Spreading investment opportunities across the existing town centre framework rather than focusing on those with the greatest capacity may have a negative <b>economic</b> impact on the prosperity of the larger ones which are competing with town centres in neighbouring boroughs. Widespread investment in all town centres should improve accessibility to services as well as encourage a greater sense of identity, making them attractive and safe places to shop. This will provide a positive <b>social</b> impact.</p> <p><i>The environmental impact is negative. The economic impact is uncertain. The social impact is positive.</i></p>
<p><b>Recommendations</b></p> <p><b>The LDF Evidence Base through the Town Centres Floorspace Needs Assessment will highlight the distinctiveness of town centres and the Core Strategy will ensure that the strategic approach to town centres is not a 'one size fits all' policy.</b></p>	
<p>Summary</p>	<p><b>Social</b>  <b>Environmental</b>  <b>Economic</b> </p>







<p><b>Option 4.04</b></p> <p><b>Should we allow further shopping and commercial town centre related development to meet projected demand at one or more of the borough's existing out of centre retail parks?</b></p>	<p>Out of centre retail parks are a focus for car-borne shopping and their promotion as a place for growth will have a negative <b>environmental</b> effect as it will increase the effect of traffic on the environment. Single use development is a less efficient use of land than the mixed use development that town centres will provide opportunities for. It will also have a negative <b>economic</b> impact on the vitality and viability of the existing town centres by diverting inward investment. Out of centre retail is less accessible by public transport and therefore those residents without cars will not get development that meets their needs. This will have a negative <b>social</b> impact.</p> <p><i>All impacts are negative</i></p>
	<p><b>Recommendations</b></p> <p><b>The LDF Evidence Base through the Town Centres Floorspace Needs Assessment will highlight the relationship between Barnet town centres and retail parks. The Core Strategy will ensure that the strategic approach to town centres is not a 'one size fits all' policy.</b></p>
<p><b>Summary</b></p>	<p><b>Social</b>  <b>Environmental</b>  <b>Economic</b> </p>
<p><b>Option 4.05</b></p> <p><b>Should we allow retail expenditure to go outside the borough?</b></p>	<p>Whilst accepting that there will be cross-boundary expenditure the loss of investment in town centres will have a negative impact on sustained <b>economic</b> growth. An attractive retail offer is often key to mixed use regeneration. Traffic will accompany the departing retail expenditure and trips will be longer. Town centres may lose their historic identity as trading places with retail being replaced by other uses such as residential. Reduced opportunities for mixed uses will represent a less sustainable use of land causing a negative <b>environmental</b> impact. Out of borough retail will be further away for most residents making services less accessible. This will have a negative <b>social</b> impact.</p> <p><i>All impacts are negative</i></p>
	<p><b>Recommendations</b></p> <p><b>The LDF Evidence Base through the Town Centres Floorspace Needs Assessment will assess trends in expenditure and highlight the relationship between Barnet town centres and those of surrounding boroughs.</b></p>
<p><b>Summary</b></p>	<p><b>Social</b>  <b>Environmental</b>  <b>Economic</b> </p>
<p><b>Option 4.06</b></p> <p><b>Should we prioritise growth in retail expenditure to specific suburban town centres (Edgware, North Finchley, Finchley Church End, Chipping Barnet, New Barnet and Whetstone) where there are identified development opportunities?</b></p>	<p>Town centres with greater access to services and facilities can provide sustainable locations for substantial retail led development. New investment will have a positive <b>environmental</b> impact when the new scheme complements the existing commercial fabric of the town centre and enhances distinctiveness. Focused investment on the larger town centres may have a positive <b>economic</b> impact on prosperity as it enables them to compete with town centres in neighbouring boroughs. Town centre retail is more accessible by public transport and therefore those residents without cars will have a better chance of getting development that meets their demands. This will have a positive <b>social</b> impact.</p> <p><i>All impacts are positive.</i></p>







	<b>Recommendations</b>
<b>Summary</b>	<b>Social</b>  <b>Environmental</b>  <b>Economic</b> 
<b>Option 4.07</b>  <b>Should we seek to protect more 'local' neighbourhood centres and parades of shops in terms of their potential contribution to sustainable suburbs and shopping?</b>	<p>Neighbourhood centres and parades can provide greater opportunities for business start-ups as they have greater access to affordable premises, allowing indigenous investment. A positive <b>economic</b> impact. Local services can help to reduce the effect of traffic on the <b>environment</b>, a positive impact. The opportunity to walk and purchase unpackaged food goods such as fruit and vegetables contributes to healthier lifestyles and reduces the impact of waste on the environment, positive <b>social</b> and <b>environmental</b> impacts. Local services also provide easily accessible alternatives to people who are not prepared to travel to town centres. Improved accessibility to services will benefit disabled people and those without access to a car. A closer bond between retailers and their local customers helps to provide a positive <b>social</b> impact by encouraging a sense of community and identity. It also provides opportunity to access specialised food shops that meet cultural demands.</p> <p><i>All impacts are positive.</i></p>
	<b>Recommendations</b>
<b>Summary</b>	<b>Social</b>  <b>Environmental</b>  <b>Economic</b> 
<b>Option 4.08</b>  <b>Should we provide parking to support retail uses in town centres to better able to compete with other centres and particularly out of centre retail parks and shops?</b>	<p>Short trips by car make a significant contribution to traffic and therefore encouraging car use has a negative <b>environmental</b> impact. Car parking is also an inefficient use of land. Open areas of car parking contribute to flash flooding. Promoting the availability of car parking spaces can help provide a positive <b>economic</b> impact in its contribution to the economic vitality of town centres by helping to support local services. It also provides a positive <b>social</b> benefit it that it improves connectivity between town centres and their residential hinterlands. People can pay, play and stay in the town centre. This contributes to a sense of place and engenders community cohesion, providing a positive <b>social</b> impact.</p> <p><i>The environmental impact is negative. The economic and social impacts are positive.</i></p>
	<b>Recommendations</b> <b>The LDF Evidence Base through the Town Centres Floorspace Needs Assessment will assess car parking in order to understand the relationship between Barnet town centres, out-of-centre retail parks and town centres in surrounding boroughs.</b>
<b>Summary</b>	<b>Social</b>  <b>Environmental</b>  <b>Economic</b> 
<b>Issue 4b: Enabling change and enhancing in town centres</b>	







<p><b>Option 4.09</b></p> <p><b>Should we restrict the loss of shopping uses in town centres?</b></p>	<p>Town centres have historically developed as trading places so restricting the loss of shopping uses will have a positive environmental impact on maintaining local distinctiveness. It may also help combat the growth of out-of-centre retail and prevent retail expenditure from leaking outside the borough and this may have a positive <b>economic</b> impact by retaining prosperity. If shopping uses are not viable it may be better to replace them with other uses such as commercial and residential that can still make a contribution to the life of the town centre. Seeking to control market forces may have a negative <b>economic</b> impact on inward and indigenous investment. If alternative uses are more viable this option does not represent an efficient use of land, restrictions may have a negative <b>environmental</b> impact. Restrictions may also reduce opportunities for housing, a negative <b>social</b> impact. Restricting the loss of retail helps to maintain access to services and therefore this will have a positive <b>social</b> impact.</p> <p><i>All impacts are uncertain.</i></p>
	<p><b>Recommendations</b> The LDF Evidence Base through the Town Centres Floorspace Needs Assessment will analyse future supply and demand for town centre uses.</p>
<p><b>Summary</b></p>	<p><b>Social</b>  <b>Environmental</b>  <b>Economic</b> </p>
<p><b>Option 4.10</b></p> <p><b>Should we restrict the loss of shopping uses only in the core of town centres, allowing more flexible approaches and changes of use at the edges of high streets and secondary locations?</b></p>	<p>Town centres have historically developed as trading places so restricting the loss of shopping uses will have a positive <b>environmental</b> impact as it helps to maintain and enhance local distinctiveness. If shopping uses are not viable it may be better to replace them with other uses such as commercial and residential that can still make a contribution to the life of the town centre. This helps to encourage sustained economic growth and has a positive <b>economic</b> impact. This also enables a more efficient use of land and may have a positive <b>environmental</b> impact. It may also increase opportunities to access affordable and decent housing, which represents a positive <b>social</b> impact.</p> <p><i>All impacts are positive</i></p>
<p><b>Summary</b></p>	<p><b>Recommendations</b></p> <p><b>Social</b>  <b>Environmental</b>  <b>Economic</b> </p>
<p><b>Option 4.11</b></p> <p><b>Should we allow a major expansion and concentration of shopping related development in the larger centres (Edgware, North Finchley, Finchley Church End, Chipping Barnet, New Barnet and Whetstone)?</b></p>	<p>Town centres with greater access to services and facilities can provide sustainable locations for substantial retail led development. New retail investment will have a positive <b>environmental</b> impact when the new scheme complements the existing commercial fabric of the town centre and enhances distinctiveness. Focused investment on the larger town centres may have a positive <b>economic</b> impact on prosperity as it enables them to compete with town centres in neighbouring boroughs. Town centre retail is more accessible by public transport and therefore those residents without cars will have a better chance of accessing shops that meet their needs. This represents a positive <b>social</b> impact.</p> <p><i>All impacts are positive.</i></p>
	<p><b>Recommendations</b></p>










<p><b>Summary</b></p>	<p><b>Social</b>  <b>Environmental</b>  <b>Economic</b> </p>
<p><b>Option 4.12</b></p> <p><b>Should we allow substantial, mixed-use development in all town centres?</b></p>	<p>Substantial mixed use development may be more suitable to the larger town centres which have greater access to services and facilities. Town centres with less access to services and facilities may not be sustainable locations for substantial development. Although opportunities will exist for infill mixed use in smaller town centres through utilising space above shops and commercial premises any substantial development is likely to cause a negative <b>environmental</b> impact where the new scheme does not complement the existing commercial fabric of the town centre and damages distinctiveness. Substantial mixed use development incorporating housing in all town centres provides the opportunity for these places to reinvent themselves as vibrant and vital places as well as attract investment, a positive <b>economic</b> impact. This reduces development pressures on the lower density suburbs. Active frontages can have a positive <b>social</b> impact in helping to reduce crime and the fear of crime during the day and evening.</p> <p><i>The economic and social impacts are positive. The environmental impact is negative.</i></p>
	<p><b>Recommendations</b></p> <p><b>The LDF Evidence Base through the Town Centres Floorspace Needs Assessment will analyse future supply and demand for town centre uses.</b></p>
<p><b>Summary</b></p>	<p><b>Social</b>  <b>Environmental</b>  <b>Economic</b> </p>
<p><b>Option 4.13</b></p> <p><b>Should we be flexible in allowing conversions in town centres?</b></p>	<p>Office and commercial space has to be responsive to the changing demands of business. New requirements for affordable and flexible ICT supported space may be generated by home workers and independent professionals. If a town centre is not vital and viable then there will be positive <b>economic</b> benefits of allowing alternative and appropriate uses, such as residential, that can promote activity and inject life into the area. Conversions can have a positive <b>environmental</b> impact providing the opportunity for sustainable re- use of the existing building stock without a major impact on the townscape. They also have a positive <b>social</b> impact in addressing housing need.</p> <p><i>All impacts are positive</i></p>
<p><b>Summary</b></p>	<p><b>Recommendations</b></p> <p><b>Social</b>  <b>Environmental</b>  <b>Economic</b> </p>




<p><b>Option 4.14</b></p> <p><b>Should we protect town centre office and commercial uses from changes of use to residential?</b></p>	<p>Office and commercial space has to be responsive to the changing demands of business. New requirements for affordable and flexible ICT supported space may be generated by home workers and independent professionals. The availability of such space will contribute to sustained economic growth, a positive <b>economic</b> impact. It also provides opportunity for retaining jobs in the town centre. Seeking to control market forces may have a negative <b>economic</b> impact on inward and indigenous investment. The failure to release land for housing will have a negative <b>social</b> impact as the opportunity to address need will be missed. There will be a negative <b>environmental</b> impact because it will reduce opportunities for new homes as part of mixed use development and therefore fail to release development pressures on the low density suburbs. Town centres that are accessible by public transport should be places to work as well as live. The retention of employment opportunities in such locations will help reduce the effects of traffic, a positive <b>environmental</b> impact.</p> <p><i>The social impact is negative. The economic and environmental impacts are uncertain.</i></p>
	<p><b>Recommendations</b></p> <p><b>The LDF Evidence Base through the Town Centres Floorspace Needs Assessment will analyse future supply and demand for town centre uses.</b></p>
<p><b>Summary</b></p>	<p><b>Social</b>      <b>Environmental</b>      <b>Economic</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;">    </p>
<p><b>Option 4.15</b></p> <p><b>Should we allow more mixed use conversions of town centre offices in locations along high streets and main arterial routes to mixed uses including residential, for example, in Finchley Central and Whetstone, where there is significant vacant office accommodation?</b></p>	<p>If a town centre is not vital and viable then there will be positive <b>economic</b> benefits of allowing alternative and appropriate uses, such as a hotel or residential, that can promote activity and inject life into the area. Office space that is affordable, attractive and accessible should form a key component of new mixed use development. Conversions can have a positive <b>environmental</b> impact providing the opportunity for sustainable re- use of the existing building stock without a major impact on the townscape. They also have a positive <b>social</b> impact in addressing housing need. Increasing housing opportunities in locations with high public transport accessibility will have a positive <b>environmental</b> impact by reducing car trips.</p> <p><i>All impacts are positive</i></p>
<p><b>Summary</b></p>	<p><b>Social</b>      <b>Environmental</b>      <b>Economic</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;">    </p>
<p><b>Issue 4c: Managing the evening and night-time and entertainment economy</b></p>	

<p><b>Option 4.16</b></p> <p><b>In recognition of licensing policies, should we limit the evening and night-time economy to a few town centres, for example, North Finchley, and if so, which centres, and what should be the criteria, for example, where they reach “Saturation zone” in terms of activities and undesirable impacts?</b></p>	<p>The evening and night-time economy can create vibrancy and add to the <b>economic</b> prosperity of a town centre. It also compliments the day time function of the town centre and guarantees that the town centre is active for a larger part of the day. Anti-social activity associated with later opening will impact on residential amenity and the attractiveness of town centres as places to live. This will have a negative <b>environmental</b> impact on local distinctiveness. Restricting the evening and night-time economy to a few town centres may make them more popular as places to visit and also enable more effective control of behaviour through licencing and policing. Providing safe environments and reducing fear of crime will have a positive <b>social</b> impact.</p> <p><i>The economic and social impacts are positive. The environmental impact is negative.</i></p>
	<p><b>Recommendations</b></p> <p><b>The LDF Evidence Base through the Town Centres Floorspace Needs Assessment will analyse future supply and demand for town centre uses. It will assess potential to accommodate unique roles such as the evening and night-time economy.</b></p>
<p><b>Summary</b></p>	<p><b>Social</b>  <b>Environmental</b>  <b>Economic</b> </p>
<p><b>Option 4.17</b></p> <p><b>Should we encourage more housing development in town centres to increase evening and night-time activities, and if so, should it be allowed only on the edge or also above other uses such as shops and commercial uses?</b></p>	<p>All town centres should be safe places to visit both day and night. Access to good services and facilities day and night will have a positive <b>environmental</b> impact in reducing car trips. Car parking spaces can be utilised over longer periods, providing a more efficient use of land. Living above shops and commercial premises represents an efficient use of land. Active frontages can have a positive <b>social</b> impact in helping to reduce crime and the fear of crime during the day and evening. A vibrant and vital place will also help build local distinctiveness as well as attract investment, a positive <b>economic</b> impact. Anti-social activity will impact on residential amenity and the attractiveness of town centres as places to live. This may have a negative <b>environmental</b> impact on local distinctiveness.</p> <p><i>The economic and social impacts are positive. The environmental impact is uncertain.</i></p>
	<p><b>Recommendations</b></p> <p><b>The LDF Evidence Base through the Town Centres Floorspace Needs Assessment will analyse future supply and demand for town centre uses. It will assess potential to accommodate unique roles such as the evening and night-time economy.</b></p>
<p><b>Summary</b></p>	<p><b>Social</b>  <b>Environmental</b>  <b>Economic</b> </p>

<p><b>Option 4.18</b></p> <p><b>Should some town centres be designated and be the focus of cultural development and leisure such as N12 North Finchley and Chipping Barnet?</b></p>	<p>Providing a clear focus on the role of specific town centres should help to attract inward investment and have a positive <b>economic</b> impact. The evening and night-time economy can create vibrancy and add to the <b>economic</b> prosperity of a town centre. It also compliments their day time function and guarantees that the town centre is active for a larger part of the day. Anti-social activity associated with later opening will impact on residential amenity and the attractiveness of town centres as places to live. This will have a negative <b>environmental</b> impact on local distinctiveness. Restricting cultural development and leisure to a few accessible town centres may make them more popular as places to visit and also enable more effective control of behaviour through licencing and policing. Providing safe environments and reducing fear of crime will have a positive <b>social</b> impact.</p> <p><i>The economic and social impacts are positive. The environmental impact is negative.</i></p>
	<p><b>Recommendations</b></p> <p><b>The LDF Evidence Base through the Town Centres Floorspace Needs Assessment will analyse future supply and demand for town centre uses. It will assess potential to accommodate unique roles such as the evening and night-time economy.</b></p>
<p><b>Summary</b></p>	<p><b>Social</b>  <b>Environmental</b>  <b>Economic</b> </p>
<p><b>Theme 5 – Planning, development and growth to be environmentally sensitive</b></p>	
<p><b>Issue 5a: Choosing sustainable locations for development</b></p>	
<p><b>Option 5.01</b></p> <p><b>Should we expect development to provide evidence that the proposed location is sustainable or that it can be made so as a result of development, for example by improving access to public transport?</b></p>	<p>If developments are to be successful and sustainable they have to be accessible by different modes of transport including the car. Development in locations that provide attractive opportunities for physical activity through cycling or walking will have a positive <b>social</b> impact in improving the health of residents. Parking restrictions combined with use of sustainable urban drainage systems when parking is required can enable more efficient use of available spaces and mitigate impact on flood risk, a positive <b>environmental</b> impact. Using restrictions to reduce car usage will provide a more sustainable use of land. Helping the borough to keep moving by encouraging alternatives to car use will contribute to prosperity and have a positive <b>economic</b> impact.</p> <p><i>All impacts are positive</i></p>
<p><b>Summary</b></p>	<p><b>Social</b>  <b>Environmental</b>  <b>Economic</b> </p>

<p><b>Option 5.02</b></p> <p><b>Should we expect development to contribute to increased biodiversity as well as protecting existing habitats and species?</b></p>	<p>Biodiversity contributes to local distinctiveness, helping to maintain and enhance landscapes in the borough. Protecting habitats and species will have a positive <b>environmental</b> impact in improving air quality and reducing the risk of flooding. Attractive and sustainable schemes on brownfield sites that contain biodiversity as an integral part of the development help to promote regeneration, creating a positive <b>economic</b> impact. Regeneration schemes can destroy habitats and displace species that have emerged on underused sites, causing a negative <b>environmental</b> impact. Biodiversity can serve several functions and provide a positive <b>social</b> impact through helping to provide good quality surroundings for all as well as promoting physical activity and its consequences for improved health.</p> <p><i>The economic and social impacts are positive. The environmental impact is uncertain.</i></p>
	<p><b>Recommendations</b> <b>Ensure that as a key part of the LDF Evidence Base Barnet’s Biodiversity Action Plan sets out local priorities for habitats and species.</b></p>
	<p><b>Social</b>      <b>Environmental</b>      <b>Economic</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;">    </p>
<p><b>Issue 5b: Climate change and living within environmental limits</b></p>	
<p><b>Option 5.03</b></p> <p><b>Should we continue our existing approach to sustainable design and construction, as outlined above in order to make Barnet one of London’s most sustainable and environmentally responsible city-suburbs and borough?</b></p>	<p>The borough’s existing approach to sustainable design and construction has helped to provide a clear and consistent message on helping to combat climate change and provides a framework for local innovation in design. Continuing to encourage step change through demanding standards will have a positive <b>economic</b> impact in providing an incentive for inward investment by encouraging innovative schemes that are environmentally responsive and energy efficient. This approach promotes design standards of the highest quality that enriches local distinctiveness and has a positive <b>environmental</b> impact. By using the approach to provide good surroundings for all there will be a positive <b>social</b> impact.</p> <p><i>All impacts are positive</i></p>
<p><b>Summary</b></p>	<p><b>Social</b>      <b>Environmental</b>      <b>Economic</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;">    </p>
<p><b>Option 5.04</b></p> <p><b>Should we consider climate change to be the overriding principle for new development in Barnet?</b></p>	<p>Addressing climate change is an issue that will extend well beyond the lifetime of the core strategy. It is a global issue on which a sensible balance has to be reached in order to address both short term and long term development needs. Future generations are more likely to benefit from reduced contributions and vulnerability to climate change. This option will have a positive <b>environmental</b> impact. The challenge of addressing both housing need and climate change may have an uncertain <b>social</b> impact on delivering new homes in the right places and at the right time. Higher environmental standards for development will have an uncertain <b>economic</b> impact on inward investment.</p> <p><i>The environmental impact is positive. The economic and social impacts are uncertain.</i></p>
	<p><b>Recommendations</b></p>

<p><b>Summary</b></p>	<p><b>Social</b>  <b>Environmental</b>  <b>Economic</b> </p>
<p><b>Option 5.05</b></p> <p>Should climate change be given equal weighting to other considerations, such as design considerations?</p>	<p>Addressing climate change is intrinsic to sustainable design and construction. Promoting sustainable waste management, reducing the effects of traffic or requiring sustainable urban drainage systems will have a positive <b>environmental</b> impact. An environment with cleaner air and a reduced risk of flooding will have positive <b>social</b> impacts particularly for health and community well-being. In sensitive locations such as conservation areas or Green Belt there may be a negative impact on the historic or open <b>environment</b> from the use of inappropriate sustainable materials used in construction or renewable energy technologies. There will be a positive <b>environmental</b> impact from using locally sourced materials. Requiring high standards of sustainable design and construction may make development unaffordable in the short term and have a negative <b>economic</b> impact by deterring inward investment. Conversely the frontloading of such issues at the planning stage may make Barnet more attractive as a place to work, rest and stay. The <b>economic</b> impact is therefore uncertain.</p> <p><i>The social impact is positive. The economic and environmental impacts are uncertain.</i></p>
	<p><b>Recommendations</b></p> <p><b>Monitor impacts of climate change through the Core Output Indicators of the Annual Monitoring Report.</b></p>
<p><b>Summary</b></p>	<p><b>Social</b>  <b>Environmental</b>  <b>Economic</b> </p>
<p><b>Option 5.06</b></p> <p>Should the Core Strategy be primarily concerned with the mitigation of climate change or prioritise the need to adapt to future impacts?</p>	<p>The benefit of mitigating climate change is that it will help to reduce its impact on future generations. Some immediate short term benefits may be gained such as improved air quality, reduced flood risk and the use of renewable energy. Mitigation will have both short term and long term positive <b>environmental</b> impacts. Mitigation may have a short term negative <b>economic</b> impact in discouraging inward investment but in encouraging local innovation it will have a positive impact on new green industries. Through sustainable design there will be positive environmental and <b>social</b> impacts from increased energy efficiency and a reduced risk of flood risk. Reducing the risks of flooding through design will help improve the mental health of the population. Ensuring homes can through design be appropriately warm and cool will also contribute to well-being.</p> <p><i>The environmental and social impacts are positive. The economic impact is uncertain.</i></p>
	<p><b>Recommendations</b></p> <p><b>Monitor impacts of climate change through the Core Output Indicators of the Annual Monitoring Report.</b></p>
<p><b>Summary</b></p>	<p><b>Social</b>  <b>Environmental</b>  <b>Economic</b> </p>

<p><b>Option 5.07</b></p> <p>Should the Core Strategy prioritise the need to adapt to future impacts?</p>	<p>Design is key to adapting to climate change. This will enable Barnet to adopt tried and tested housing designs that have been developed to provide comfortable living conditions in warmer temperatures. Imported housing designs may have a negative <b>environmental</b> impact on the quality of landscapes and townscapes that provide local distinctiveness. There may be a negative <b>environmental</b> impact on the existing biodiversity if it cannot cope with climate change. The need for adaptation may encourage local innovation and have a positive <b>economic</b> impact on new green industries. The need to source materials from warmer climates may increase building costs and have a negative <b>economic</b> impact for new forms of building. The protection and enhancement of open spaces as well as trees that play a key role in urban cooling will have a positive <b>environmental</b> impact.</p> <p><i>The environmental impact is negative. The economic impact is uncertain. The social impact is positive</i></p>
	<p><b>Recommendations</b></p> <p><b>Monitor impacts of climate change through the Core Output Indicators of the Annual Monitoring Report.</b></p>
<p><b>Summary</b></p>	<p><b>Social</b>  <b>Environmental</b>  <b>Economic</b> </p>

The contents of this document can be made available in your own language on request. For further information, please contact the Planning, Housing and Regeneration Service on 020-8359-4990 or write to the Planning Policy Team, Planning, Housing and Regeneration, Building 4, North London Business Park, Oakleigh Road South, London N11 1NP

Haddii aad la tashigaan ku rabtid luuqaddaada, fadlan u soo qor Planning Policy Team, Planning and Environmental Protection Service, Building 4, North London Business Park, Oakleigh Road South, London N11 1NP. Mahadsanid.

Bu görüşmenin kendi dilinizde yapılmasını istiyorsanız, lütfen şu adrese yazınız:

Planning Policy Team, Planning, Housing and Regeneration, Building 4, North London Business Park, Oakleigh Road South, London N11 1NP. Teşekkür ederim.

اگر آپ کو یہ مشورہ اپنی زبان میں درکار ہو تو، براہ مہربانی اس سچے پر خط لکھیں۔ شکریہ

Planning Policy Team, Planning, Housing and Regeneration, Building 4, North London Business Park, Oakleigh Road South, London N11 1NP.

আপনার যদি এই কনসালটেশন (শলা-পরামর্শ) আপনার নিজস্ব ভাষায় প্রয়োজন হয়, তাহলে অনুগ্রহ করে যাকে লিখবেন তিনি হলেন

Planning Policy Team, Planning, Housing and Regeneration, Building 4, North London Business Park, Oakleigh Road South, London N11 1NP আপনাকে ধন্যবাদ।

જો તમને આ સલાહમંત્રણ તમારી પોતાની ભાષામાં જોઈતી હોય તો, કૃપા કરી લખો: એમા ગૈયડન

Planning Policy Team, Planning, Housing and Regeneration, Building 4, North London Business Park, Oakleigh Road South, London N11 1NP. તમારી આભાર.

اگر شما احتیاج دارید کہ این مشاوره را به زبان خودتان دریافت کنید، لطفاً به آدرس زیر نامه بنویسید:

Planning Policy Team, Planning, Housing and Regeneration, Building 4, North London Business Park, Oakleigh Road South, London N11 1NP. متشکریم.

若你需要以你的母語進行此諮詢，請寫信聯絡

Planning Policy Team, Planning, Housing and Regeneration, Building 4, North London Business Park, Oakleigh Road South, London N11 1NP. 謝謝。

Εάν επιθυμείτε να γίνει αυτή η συζήτηση στη δική σας γλώσσα, παρακαλούμε να στείλετε σχετική επιστολή στην

Planning Policy Team, Planning, Housing and Regeneration, Building 4, North London Business Park, Oakleigh Road South, London N11 1NP.