
**Local Development
Framework
Draft Sustainability
Appraisal Framework of
Barnet's Core Strategy
Direction of Travel**

November 2009

Contents page

Introduction	1
Non technical summary	2
The Sustainability Appraisal process.....	2
Summary of the likely significant effects of the plan or programm.....	2
Appraisal of the Core Strategy objectives	3
Appraisal of the Core Strategy Direction of Travel policie	4
Summary of appraisal of alternative Core Strategy policy options	8
Difference the appraisal has made.....	10
The next stage.....	11
Your comments	12
Appraisal Methodology	13
Approach taken for Sustainability Appraisal	13
Who was consulted and when.....	13
Difficulties encountered in compiling information or carrying out the assessment.....	14
Background	15
The purpose of the Sustainability Appraisal	15
The Local Development Framework and Core Strategy.....	15
The Core Strategy Objectives	16
Barnet's core objectives	16
Assessment of Core Strategy objectives	18
Commentary on the appraisal of the objectives	19
Sustainability objectives	21
Barnet's Places	21
Town Centre Floorspace Needs Assessment – April 2009	21
Barnet's People	22
Barnet's Deprivation	22
A Safer Barnet.....	23
Barnet's Economy	23
Barnet's homes	24
Barnet's environment	24
Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA).....	24
Barnet's transport.....	25
Links to other strategies	26
Barnet's Sustainable Community Strategy 2008 - 2018 - Barnet - A Successful City-Suburb.....	26
Barnet's Local Area Agreement.....	26
Three Strands Approach	26
Barnet's Corporate Plan	27
Barnet's other Strategies and Plans	27
Sustainability issues in Barnet	29
Economic Issues	29
Environmental Issues	29
Social Issues	31
The SA framework targets and indicators	32
Appropriate Assessment	34
Equalities Impact Assessment.....	35
Summary of key findings	36
Plan Issues and Options	37
Alternative options.....	37
Plan policies	70

1. Introduction

- 1.1.1 This is the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) of Barnet's Direction of Travel Core Strategy as required by the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act. It is the second stage in the Sustainability Appraisal process and follows the publication of the first Scoping Report in October 2007 and the subsequent commentary on the Issues and Options in June 2008 when an update to the Scoping report was also published.
- 1.1.2 This report is the first major draft of the final Sustainability Appraisal Report and is key to the development of the proposed policies for the Core Strategy. This report will inform a large part of the final Sustainability Appraisal report that will be submitted to the Secretary of State.
- 1.1.3 The aim of the SA is to ensure sustainable development is fully integrated within the emerging Core Strategy and forms a key part of evaluation of the Direction of Travel. This report sets out the SA process to date and its findings and should be used to help to inform public consultation on the Core Strategy – Direction of Travel. The report complies with the requirements of the SEA Directive and the guidance provided by Communities and Local Government (CLG) and the Planning Advisory Service (PAS).
- 1.1.4 In line with guidance and the iterative nature of the process the report draws on and repeats information contained in the Scoping Report and the commentary on the Issues and Options for the Core Strategy.

2. Non technical summary

2.1 The Sustainability Appraisal process

- 2.1.1 Planning Policy Statement 12 (PPS12) on Local Development Frameworks (2004) requires Sustainability Appraisal (SA) to be undertaken in preparing all local development documents. In addition, the SEA Directive (2001/42/EC), implemented in the UK by the SEA Regulations 2004, requires Strategic Environmental Assessment or 'SEA' to be undertaken on all plans and programmes where they are likely to have significant environmental impacts.
- 2.1.2 Recent amendments to the procedures contained in the Town and Country Planning Regulations 2008 have increased the flexibility for local authorities in developing local development documents. Linked to this, the recommended SA process has now been updated as part of the Plan Making manual (Planning Advisory Service). As of September 2009 the SA guidance has been simplified to replace the 2005 ODPM guidance although the SEA ODPM guidance (September 2005) still stands.
- 2.1.3 Under new Regulation 25, it is recommended that 'in commenting on options it would help the public if the performance of different options in the sustainability appraisal is indicated. This is so that they can then see (with the benefit of technical evidence) how different options fare and can in turn use this to assist their own feedback on the options.' This report contains the recommendations of the SA of the Core Strategy Issues and Options document in line with the above advice.
- 2.1.4 The aim of the SA is to ensure sustainable development is fully integrated within the emerging Core Strategy. This report provides the results of the SA process to date and publishes its key findings to inform public consultation on the Core Strategy Direction of Travel. This report also includes the main findings of the SA Scoping Report which was prepared in June 2008.
- 2.1.5 The report is structured as follows (in line with guidance¹):
- Appraisal methodology; which sets out the approach taken to the appraisal and how it relates to the guidance, who was consulted and any difficulties encountered
 - Background; which sets out the purpose of the Sustainability Appraisal and the Core Strategy and the Core Strategies objectives
 - Sustainability objectives, evidence base and context; links to other strategies, sustainability issues in Barnet, the SA objectives, targets and indicators
 - Plan Issues and Options; these are the main strategic alternatives considered, how the preferred strategic alternatives were chosen and any proposed mitigation measures
 - Plan policies, the appraisal of the policies in the Direction of Travel, any proposed mitigation measures considered and the uncertainties and risks
 - Implementation, proposals for monitoring

2.2 Summary of the likely significant effects of the plan or programme

- 2.2.1 Development by its very nature has an impact on the place and the people, who live, work and visit Barnet. The policies in the LDF aim to make this impact acceptable in planning terms. Sustainability Appraisal is a method for checking that the policies in the plan also have an acceptable impact in the wider sense on the environment, the economy and the

¹ Strategic Environmental Assessment Guidance September 2005, figure 7. ODPM

social well being of the borough. The process of appraisal is intended to influence the development of LDF policies and the following tables set out a summary of the sustainability appraisal and the significant effects of the proposed Direction of Travel objectives (table 1.1), policies (table 1.2) and any alternatives to those policies (table 1.3).

2.3 Appraisal of the Core Strategy objectives

2.3.1 The objectives were appraised against the Sustainability Objectives. The table detailing the full results is set out in section 5.

2.3.2 **(1) To manage housing growth to meet housing objectives**

This objective has a negative impact on three of the Sustainability objectives. Providing 25,000 new homes is unlikely to reduce traffic levels, which also has an effect on air quality and contributions to climate change. It is also likely to impact biodiversity and flood risk. Equally meeting growth targets in town centres could put pressure on the historic environment. Finally, regeneration of the housing estates could lead to short term impacts on community cohesiveness.

2.3.3 **(2) To meet social infrastructure needs**

This objective has either positive impacts or no link with the Sustainability Appraisal objectives.

2.3.4 **(3) To promote Barnet as a place of economic growth and prosperity**

A question has been raised over the possible negative impact that this objective might have on congestion, air quality and contributions to climate change. In particular the growth in retail at Brent Cross could lead to increases in car emissions. But at the same time the objective is encouraging growth and prosperity in the town centres which are the most accessible locations in the borough.

2.3.5 **(4) To reduce the need to travel**

This objective on its own has either positive impacts or no link with the Sustainability Appraisal Framework objectives despite the possible negative implications raised by other Core Strategy objectives for growth and economic growth.

2.3.6 **(5) To promote strong and cohesive communities**

This objective has either positive impacts or no link with the Sustainability Appraisal objectives.

2.3.7 **(6) To promote healthy living and well being**

This objective has either positive impacts or no link with the Sustainability Appraisal objectives.

2.3.8 **(7) To Protect and Enhance the Suburbs**

There is a need for a balance with this objective as it could have an impact on sustained economic growth which is why it has been questioned. Overprotection of the suburbs may restrict sustained economic growth in particular in the town centres. This is a balance that will need to be monitored. The same question is raised over encouraging inward investment. This possible conflict highlights the wider tension within the Core Strategy between conservation and growth.

2.3.9 **(8) To ensure efficient use of land and natural resources**

There is a question over whether the promotion of mixed use development in the town centres will have an effect on protecting the historic environment as it could lead to pressure on historic buildings in the town centres. More importantly the objective does not mention water either as a resource or in relation to flooding issues.

2.3.10 **(10) To enhance and protect our green and natural open spaces**

This objective has either positive impacts or no link with the Sustainability Appraisal objectives.

2.4 Appraisal of the Core Strategy Direction of Travel policies

- 2.4.1 The table below summarises the significant effects identified through the sustainability appraisal of the Core Strategy Direction of Travel policies. The full appraisal is set out in the tables in Section 12.

Table 2.1 - Summary of significant effects of Core Strategy policies

Policy	Summary of appraisal
<p>CS 1 – Barnet's place shaping strategy & CS 2 - Distribution of Growth in Meeting Housing Aspirations</p>	<p>Identifying the growth areas and town centres for growth will help to encourage and accommodate inward investment in these parts of the borough. Attracting investment to the town centres will be of particular importance as this will help to maintain the level of provision that they provide for residents. However only focusing the investment in these locations could attract it away from other parts of the borough, in particular the town centres not identified. This is the key sustainability consideration with the growth locations as it could lead to an imbalance in the long term. All the services investment related to the growth will be focused in the west and not the east or north. This could lead to a gradual degradation to services and town centres in these areas. In the long term this could create new disparities across the borough resulting in underinvestment in the west and north allowing an unsustainable use of land to continue in town centres and other locations. Also the growth in the west could result in an overall reduction in the effect of traffic on the environment across the borough as a whole as this is the most accessible location for growth to occur but there could be localised increases.</p> <p>The quality of design is another factor identified by the sustainability appraisal as it could impact health, crime, the sustainable use of land, the quality of the landscape and its effect on the historic environment. The quality of design will ensure that the development remains a successful place to live for its lifetime. Extreme examples of this failure of design are the developments of the 1960s and 1970s which have been demolished and rebuilt. Good design will prevent this happening again and is important particularly as the density is expected to increase in growth areas. The SA recommended that the design / climate change / flood risk / density issues could be taken forward through Development Management DPD policy or the individual Area Action Plans/Town Centre Frameworks.</p>
<p>CS3 – Protecting and Enhancing Barnet's Character</p>	<p>Generally this is a positive policy which will protect the character of suburban Barnet. One obvious tension is the potential for over protection which could have a variety of impacts. Over restrictive guidance could reduce the scope for commercial development to happen reducing inward investment in these areas. Care needs to be taken as combined with the focus for growth in the west of the borough this could have implications for employment growth, provision of services and delivery of housing in the character areas in the east and north.</p> <p>Considering the design restrictions on flatted development should also be carefully considered as they provide a housing type that is in limited supply in the borough and should not be overly restricted as they are an efficient use of land. Equally increased character protection through conservation areas status increases the cost of home ownership and reduces homeowner's ability to make their homes flexible to changing lifestyle requirements. This has both affordability and social impacts which could lead to people leaving an area.</p>
<p>CS4 – Promoting Barnet's Town Centres</p>	<p>Supporting the existing town centres can only be a sustainable use of land and encouraging an increase in the mix uses and services can only be socially positive. Environmentally, supporting the town centres helps to encourage less driving, resulting in less air pollution and consequently lower climate change</p>

Policy	Summary of appraisal
	<p>emissions whilst supporting walking and cycling which contributes to improving resident's health. There is a question mark over whether ensuring a mix of land uses including flexible workspaces could lead to businesses thinking that loss of office space is acceptable in the town centres. Also it is not clear exactly how the plan will realise development opportunities in the town centres identified. It is assumed that the Town Centre strategies would provide this guidance but it is not clear what status they will have, SPD or Development Management DPD.</p> <p>The impact of the regenerated Brent Cross with its additional 55,000m2 when it is fully open giving 110,000m2 gross retail floorspace will provide a regional shopping centre that will compete with the existing town centres. Whether this has fully been taken into account is unclear, in particular with the referenced Town Centre Frameworks. The development time period for Brent Cross may negate this concern. There is no priority hierarchy for town centre regeneration identified when it is clear that some town centres are performing at a lower level than others. Again this could be clarified in the Town Centre strategies or the DM DPD.</p>
<p>CS5 – enhancing and protecting Barnet's open spaces</p>	<p>Open space is an important part of Barnet's character and this policy will have a completely positive effect as it aims to maintain it. The policy has identified the increases in publicly accessible open space in the growth areas. It is important that the policy ensures that access is improved given the wealth of open space in the borough as there are still areas of deficiency. Protecting back and front gardens is also important as cumulatively this will have a considerable impact on biodiversity, run off and above all character if development is not controlled. How this is done could be clarified at a lower level in the Development Management DPD.</p> <p>There is an issue with continued protection of all green belt as there is a possibility that it has an effect on increasing development pressure elsewhere in the borough and London through over intensification of land leading to wider negative impacts on the cities population. The LDF process could offer the opportunity for the review of the boundary in some locations. But changing the principle of the greenbelt has fundamental implications for the whole of the country as the greenbelt has contributed to protecting the country side from suburban sprawl for over 60 years. It should be noted that the Outer London commission which was established to review policy for outer London for the revision to the London Plan rejected this option in July 2009 at a sub regional level as it recognised that Outer London could grow without the need to develop on this land.</p>
<p>CS6 – Promoting a Strong and Prosperous Barnet</p>	<p>Generally this policy has a positive impact in particular on skills development and training. It encourages employment growth in town centres in the most accessible locations although it doesn't refer to the largest increase in employment floorspace in the borough at Brent Cross. Innovative proposals such as home hubs will help to reduce peoples need to drive. There is a big emphasis on training and skills development through the Skills Development Group which will be useful to mitigate some of the potential for disparity in employment growth because of the town centre focus. In town centres there could be a presumption to increase the density or intensity of use of a site where it is highly accessible such as a town centre. Further detail could be provided in the Development Management DPD.</p> <p>With regards to protecting employment space the policy could clarify what modern business space needs are as not all business in the borough is modern yet it still contributes to the economic prosperity of the borough. Eg a buiders yard versus a modern light industrial unit. Suggesting that we will only protect a certain type of space may introduce uncertainty for some businesses as landowners will see opportunities to increase their return, particularly on</p>

Policy	Summary of appraisal
	industrial land which represents the same amount of floorspace as office space yet maybe considered less modern.
<p>CS7 – Providing Quality Homes in Barnet</p>	<p>Ensuring that the right mix of housing in terms of numbers of bedrooms and tenure mix is very important and will help to ensure the most sustainable use of land is delivered. This is especially important given the very high levels of additional homes planned for Barnet as it will really make a difference to the overall mix of housing in the borough when the growth areas are completely built out. The results of the sub regional SHMA are awaited as they will provide the evidence base for this. The amount of affordable housing demanded by policy is equally important and the affordable housing viability study will ensure that the maximum viable amount of housing is required by policy.</p> <p>There are potential impacts on the sustainability appraisal environmental objectives because of the very high housing targets for Barnet as this will increase the levels of traffic, the level of emissions and air pollution from cars and buildings, the amount of waste produced and the potential increased level of run off. There is no way that this can be avoided. The mitigation proposed in policy CS8 is not guaranteed to reduce car travel and managing parking may not be enough either. The environmental policies could be enhanced with a minimum level of the Code for Sustainable Homes expected and a minimum level of run off to reduce surface water flooding could be demanded to mitigate some of these impacts.</p>
<p>CS8 – providing integrated and efficient travel</p>	<p>Without more detail managing car parking provision in a balanced way will have a questionable impact if any at all. Without active management car use will increase in the long term as personal affluence does. Issues of increased congestion and the impacts that this has on economic growth and the attractiveness of the borough as a place to live and work could be affected. Also air pollution will continue to affect resident's health. The whole borough is an Air Quality Management Zone like the rest of London and the principle cause of this is road transport. Particulates, nitrogen dioxide and sulphur dioxide are the principle emissions which regularly exceed EU levels and subsequently harm human health.</p> <p>Equally the question of delivery of public transport improvements needs to be addressed. Generally it is not clear how the many parts of this policy will actually deliver the significant improvements in public transport use needed. This is a question that could be answered by the infrastructure delivery plan. However the policy makes it very clear that in an outer London borough such as Barnet people will always need to use their car. Trying to minimise this use as far as possible is the only approach. Examining why people need to use their cars could help to better inform the direction of this policy. After all 25% of households in borough do not own a car.</p>
<p>CS 9 – Enabling Integrated Community Facilities and Uses</p>	<p>It is very clear that facilities should be in accessible locations. Creating multi use community hubs by combining a number of facilities in one location will help to reduce the need to drive and therefore the effect of traffic on the environment. It is also a much more efficient use of land and buildings. The appraisal noted that the growth areas and town centres will be the focus for improvements in community facilities so residents in these locations will benefit the most. But provision in the suburban hinterland also needs to be considered to ensure that every resident has reasonable access as presumably enhancements should be considered in these locations. There is potential for defining minimum standards for distance from or coverage of, possibly in the Development Management DPD to ensure that this is achieved. It was also noted that new religious schools whilst providing a positive contribution to educating the boroughs residents did not address their location.</p>

Policy	Summary of appraisal
CS10 – Improving health and well being in Barnet	It is not clear what NHS Barnet's plans are for the future of healthcare in Barnet so the access to services has been questioned. Once plans are clearer policy can make a more spatial response. The need to control the development of specialist residential care homes is clearly evidenced and the policy direction for services for older people is made clear in the Joint Services Needs Assessment. This aims to support people's ability to live independently for longer thereby reducing demand for residential care homes. The policy still ensures that we make adequate provision locally which is positive as it reduces the need for patients, family and friends to travel as far thereby reducing associated congestion, air pollution and climate change emissions. The one question raised by the appraisal was how planning will tackle unhealthy lifestyles.
CS11 – Making Barnet a safer place	This policy has a significant positive effect on the sustainability appraisal social objectives. Any impacts are heavily influenced by the Metropolitan Police proposals contained in the Asset Management Plan. This provides the basis for reorganising the structure of policing facilities. There will be an improvement in the coverage of 'front counter' services and a centralisation of operational facilities. Socially this creates obvious improvements for community access to the police service and a reduction in access for another which relates to the detention of criminals. But whether this centralisation will cause a negative impact is not clear.
CS 12 – Ensuring the efficient use of natural resources	The main point is that these policies need to have more detail or set out where that detail will be if not in the Core Strategy. The level of reduction of emissions is not detailed in that there is no target. The locations for the development of decentralised heat should be identified if possible. This is particularly important given the level of growth planned in the west of the borough. The level of the Code for Sustainable Homes (CSH) to be used or BREEAM could be set out as this will help to define what level of carbon emissions reduction will be achieved. It could also be related to decentralised energy as this provides greater potential to reduce emissions overall thereby a higher level of energy efficiency or renewables could be required. There is the same problem with the water efficiency policy as it does not define a level to be achieved or an amount of surface water run off that will be met. Again the CSH defines this. This could be contained in the Development Management DPD.
CS 13 – Dealing with our Waste	The main point emerging is the positive effect that these policies will have on reducing congestion and its impact on air quality. The positive impact of carrying out the NLWP is also noted.
CS 14 – Delivering the Core Strategy	Helping to provide the infrastructure required will have a positive effect on the social, environmental and economic aspects of the sustainability appraisal. It will help to meet the needs of residents, help to encourage economic growth and should reduce the impacts of growth on the environment. For example if a new children's centre is built in an accessible location then this provides the opportunity for people to train or give them time to work which helps improve the quality and accessibility of the workforce. Equally a new health centre will help to improve health and probably most importantly planning obligations provide affordable housing. Improving the transport infrastructure helps to reduce congestion through either road improvements or public transport improvements which will help to encourage businesses to locate in Barnet. Further work needs to be done to set out what will be included in the infrastructure delivery plan.

2.5 Summary of appraisal of alternative Core Strategy policy options

2.5.1 The table below sets out a summary of the conclusions of the Sustainability Appraisal of the alternative options that were identified as part of the policy development process contained in the Direction of Travel. The full appraisal is set out in the tables in Section 11.

Table 2.2 – Summary of appraisal of alternative Core Strategy policy options

Alternative policy	Summary of appraisal
<p>Alternative CS 1 / CS 2: Allow growth to take place across all parts of Barnet</p>	<p>In the short term there would be a boost to the local economy as investment flowed into the borough but over time this could reduce as the initial attractions for that investment were diminished. Barnet's suburban character would be impacted through over development which is one of the features that makes it an attractive place to live in the first place. Improving infrastructure may be harder as it would be less focused and more spread across the borough than just concentrating on the growth areas. Also cross borough growth would increase congestion as it would not be the most accessible locations and people would have to drive more. This is one of the most significant effects of this alternative dispersed growth policy and would lead to greater congestion, air pollution and contributions to climate change. Growth will lead to an increase in contributions to climate change as more people increase energy demands in dwellings and on the transport system. Finally development would naturally be attracted to the easier sites leaving the areas that need regeneration and employment growth could also take place in locations that would impact on existing employment clusters thereby increasing economic disparity.</p>
<p>Alternative CS 3: Design and Access Statements should set out how they respect local character, distinctiveness and sustainability</p>	<p>Design and Access statements help to clearly set out how a development will affect people and be used by people. It will cover its design and how that affects its wider environment written in a clear way to justify the proposal to help those affected by the proposal to comment. Going through this process should help to improve design considerations in a proposal thereby enhancing the quality of landscapes and townscapes. But a question is raised by the appraisal as to whether this is quite a detailed policy which might sit better in the Development Management DPD rather than at the strategic level.</p>
<p>Alternative CS 4: Allow further shopping and commercial town centre related development to meet projected demand in any town centre in Barnet OR Allow further shopping and commercial town centre related development to meet projected demand in existing out of centre retail parks in Barnet OR Allow retail expenditure to go outside Barnet</p>	<p>Allowing retail growth to spread across the borough could impact the larger centres who are in competition with equivalent sized centres in neighbouring boroughs. This may result in them being unable to attract the right schemes because they are going to the smaller centres for various reasons eg land values are less. This could lead to stagnation of the larger town centres with vacant units. Equally allowing growth to the out of centre retail centres could have the same effect. Allowing growth to migrate to neighbouring centres out of the borough would have the most significant negative effect on all centres in the borough. However encouraging mixed use development in the smaller town centres could be positive provided the scale was in keeping.</p> <p>A large number of people currently walk to their town centre in the borough therefore any policy that reduces the attractiveness of any town centre in the borough is likely to encourage people to drive more. The out of centre option in particular. In the long term the cross borough retail growth option could have negative effects on all town centres reducing individual attractiveness of certain</p>

Alternative policy	Summary of appraisal
<p>OR</p> <p>Allow substantial mixed-use development in all town centres</p>	<p>centres. The only positive could be the mixed use option as this could lead to the introduction of more community related uses in town centres.</p>
<p>Alternative CS 6 Allow the redevelopment of employment sites when mixed use development is proposed incorporating residential uses and replacement employment use</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Allow the redevelopment of existing employment sites only if there is no proven need for other priority commercial uses</p>	<p>It is not clear whether allowing mixed use development would provide the right sort of employment accommodation. Mixing uses could reduce the ability for sites to deliver flexible accommodation for employment purposes. Equally allowing loss of employment space where there is no proven need is likely to hit those locations where need is more marginal. This could increase disparities in the economic performance of the borough making regeneration harder in those areas which need to protect their employment use the most.</p> <p>However allowing mixed use development that provides employment on site will provide people with a greater opportunity to travel less and as road transport has the greatest effect on air quality this could be positive.</p>
<p>Alternative CS 7: Introduce a flexible sliding scale for affordable housing with a 50% target on sites of 25 units or more, and a lower target on sites of 10 to 24 units</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Retain the existing approach to affordable housing with a 50% target on sites of 10 units or more</p> <p>Seek mixed and balanced communities by delivering affordable housing in areas where that tenure is underrepresented</p> <p>Prioritise new family sized homes outside of the growth areas</p>	<p>Reducing the amount of affordable housing provided reduces the ability to provide those in need in Barnet's population with a home. Evidence of need shows that we cannot build enough homes to meet the need so therefore we have to try and maximise the amount of affordable housing provided on site. Maintaining the 50% target increases the ability to do this even if not every site achieves the target. The introduction of a sliding scale has the opposite effect as it will reduce the amount overall although that may be debatable if it discourages housing development from coming forward in the first place. However rigidly applying this to every site will restrict this and have a negative impact.</p> <p>With regards to the sliding scale option there is evidence to suggest that the boroughs supply of smaller housing schemes has fallen off because of the impact of the 50% affordable housing target. This option could therefore be positive in encouraging more investment. However setting the threshold at 25 units should be questioned as an arbitrary cut off point.</p> <p>The location of affordable housing is questioned and could be positive or negative. It is uncertain whether providing affordable housing in areas where it is already unrepresented will be economic particularly if land values are high in these locations therefore you could end up with less affordable housing delivered overall. Work on viability will help to clarify this. Prioritising family sized homes has a similar effect as it could reduce the overall amount of housing delivery. Evidence work on the sub regional SHMA and affordable housing viability will inform this further.</p>
<p>Alternative CS 8 Restrict ability to travel in ways that make non public transport usage less attractive</p>	<p>In principle restricting travel by private vehicle could have a negative impact on the economic growth and access to services. It could reduce the ability of people to make choices about how they commuted and travelled. This would make the borough less attractive to employers. Public transport in a large outer London borough like Barnet does not adequately cover the whole borough therefore the private car is necessary in parts to access various community services. There are obvious environmental benefits. But it should be noted that there could be detrimental effects in the long</p>

Alternative policy	Summary of appraisal
	term if congestion grows beyond the capacity of the roads if alternatives are not in place.
Alternative CS9: Protect existing community facilities (including sport, leisure and recreation) where fully utilised, from displacement by development, ensuring re-provision of facilities	Allowing under used community facilities to be lost could increase the distances that people have to drive thereby increasing the effects of traffic on the environment and in particular air quality. Ensuring sufficient coverage is important as allowing community uses to be lost to higher land value uses because they are not fully utilised could leave gaps in provision which would have social and economic impacts as services and jobs would be lost.
Alternative CS12: Climate change should be the overriding principle for new development	If more stringent carbon reduction targets were implemented then it could discourage development of employment schemes which could have a detrimental effect on the number of jobs created in the borough. The same applies for the delivery of housing which could also be constrained leading to less affordable housing and associated infrastructure benefits. There would be obvious benefits to the environment though but a more balanced approach could bring wider benefits.

2.6 Difference the appraisal has made

- 2.6.1 The SA is intended to be an iterative process that makes recommendations on the policy development process as it progresses in order to improve the content of the Core Strategy in terms of its impacts on the sustainability objectives. During this stage of development the following changes were made in light of comments made by the appraisal. Further changes will occur as the Core Strategy moves forward to the next stage and likewise these will also be appraised and recommendations made for mitigation.

Table 2.3 – Difference the appraisal has made

Policy	Difference the appraisal made to the Core Strategy Direction of Travel policies
CS 1 – Barnet's place shaping strategy & CS 2 - Distribution of Growth in Meeting Housing Aspirations	The appraisal process helped to clarify the policy as it highlighted the relationship of density to the growth areas which was missing in an earlier policy iteration. The plan will rely on the density matrix set out in the London plan but taking forward the emerging approach which aims to optimise density as opposed to maximise it. Defining what optimised density is in relation to the London Plan density matrix will need to be defined.
CS3 – Protecting and Enhancing Barnet's Character	The appraisal process helped to clarify the policy as previously some of the areas identified for protection of their character were the town centres which were also identified for housing growth. Although not necessarily an issue it didn't really fit the ethos of this policy so it was revised. The Town centre strategies for these centres would be cover the design guidance in these locations.
CS4 – Promoting Barnet's Town Centres	In an earlier iteration of the policy it was queried whether crime was addressed as this is an issue for town centres and it wasn't identified in this policy. There were a number of opportunities

Policy	Difference the appraisal made to the Core Strategy Direction of Travel policies
	elsewhere in the plan but it was clarified in the policy under safety which was introduced.
CS5 – enhancing and protecting Barnet's open spaces	The appraisal did not highlight any changes
CS6 – Promoting a Strong and Prosperous Barnet	The appraisal process highlighted the need to identify which town centres were appropriate for new mixed use commercial floorspace as previously the policy just identified all the town centres.
CS7 – Providing Quality Homes in Barnet	The appraisal did not highlight any changes
CS8 – providing integrated and efficient travel	As part of the Sustainability Appraisal process it helped by highlighting that car clubs had not been referenced which has now been rectified. It also helped to clarify the policy on car parking although not necessarily in a positive way and it also recommended that the policy should consider crime and reducing the fear of crime on public transport was important.
CS 9 – Enabling Integrated Community Facilities and Uses	The SA made a difference by highlighting the opportunity that community facilities can provide for special groups in the borough such as the young, elderly and disabled. The EQIA should have highlighted these issues.
CS10 – Improving health and well being in Barnet	At an earlier stage of policy development this policy included text that referred to 'making travel modes safer'. The SA recommended that this be moved to the policy related to integrated travel.
CS11 – Making Barnet a safer place	The appraisal did not highlight any changes
CS 12 – Ensuring the efficient use of natural resources	The results of the appraisal have not had any impact on the development of the policies. The only significant change is the identification of a threshold for the requirement of a Carbon reduction strategy. An additional policy has been added that relates to supporting retro fitting of the housing stock although it is not clear whether this will be a requirement.
CS 13 – Dealing with our Waste	The appraisal did not highlight any changes
CS 14 – Delivering the Core Strategy	The appraisal did not highlight any changes

2.7 The next stage

2.7.1 The Sustainability Appraisal process will continue alongside the development of policy. The next stage is submission which is when a formal period of consultation will be held on the Core Strategy. Changes to policy will be appraised at this stage and a final sustainability appraisal report published.

2.8 Your comments

2.8.1 If you have any comments on the draft Sustainability Appraisal please send them to:

Planning, Housing and Regeneration
London Borough of Barnet,
Building 2, North London Business Park,
Oakleigh Road South,
London,
N11 1NP

3. Appraisal Methodology

Which sets out the approach taken to the appraisal and how it relates to the guidance, who was consulted and any difficulties encountered

3.1 Approach taken for Sustainability Appraisal

- 3.1.1 The formal appraisal of the Direction of Travel took the form of a matrix. This follows the approach identified in the guidance published as part of the Plan Making manual on the Planning Advisory Service website and the content of the SEA guidance published in 2005.
- 3.1.2 The matrix utilises the objectives and is known as the Sustainability Framework, although in this document it is generally referred to as the 'sustainability objectives'. It is used to assess the impact of the Direction of travel policy – predicting the significant effects. As the guidance states, we are only required to assess the likely significant effects of the Core Strategy, not all possible effects. The matrix will do this in terms of positive or negative, the timeframe, – short to long term and whether the effect will be permanent or temporary. At a later stage consideration will be given to the cumulative effects of various options when combined.
- 3.1.3 Following assessment of the significant effects of the Direction of Travel mitigation will be considered. This should consider both whether it is possible to mitigate adverse impacts and also to maximise positive impacts. Alternatives to policy wording may be suggested. The final sustainability appraisal report for the submission Core Strategy will indicate how these suggestions were incorporated. This will be detailed in the non technical summary under, 'what difference has the appraisal made'.
- 3.1.4 The appraisal was carried out internally by officers of the Planning and Housing section.

3.2 Who was consulted and when

- 3.2.1 As required by the SEA Regulations the statutory consultees were consulted for the Scoping Report. Letters were sent in October 2007 and responses were received from all three statutory consultees. The Environment Agency and English Heritage provided substantial comments raising the following issues:
- The absence of an SFRA from the evidence base
 - Various amendments to the objectives and suggestions for indicators
 - Amendments and suggestions to widen the scope of the baseline data
 - The identification of a number of further environmental problems affecting the historic environment
 - English Nature noted the requirement to comply with the appropriate assessment regulations
- 3.2.2 In June 2008 the Sustainability Appraisal was published alongside the Issues and Options consultation.

3.3 Difficulties encountered in compiling information or carrying out the assessment

3.3.1 The update to the Scoping Report published in June 2008 identified the following gaps in evidence base.

Table 3.1 – Gaps in the evidence base

Gap	When
Strategic Flood Risk Assessment	Completed August 2008
Barnet Town Centres (Retail and Other Uses) Study (PPS6)	Completed April 2009
Open Space, Sport and Recreation Assessment of needs and opportunities (PPG17)	Completed November 2009
Habitats Directive Assessment (screening)	Completed June 2008
Employment Land Review (PPG4)	Completed July 2009
Biodiversity Action Plan	Underway
Characterisation Study	Underway
Strategic Housing Market Assessment	Underway
Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment	Completed summer 2009
Joint Strategic Needs Health Assessment	Completed March 2009

- 3.3.2 Many policies are specific and only have an impact on their aspects of the sustainability objectives in the matrix ie a social policy generally only impacts the social objectives, therefore it is better to try and look at things cumulatively. At the same time it should be noted that the relationship between policies is complex and it depends on what actual development comes forward in order to implement them. This is where monitoring is key to help determine the impacts and effects of policy implementation.
- 3.3.3 Much of the appraisal cannot be assessed in quantitative terms as the data for the future predictions is not available, therefore the analysis produces a broad based qualitative prediction. Further data will improve the findings of the appraisal in particular on flooding, biodiversity and energy use. The same data will be used as part of the evidence base for the LDF. *It should be noted that the regulations identify that the SA can only be based on information that can reasonably be required taking into account current knowledge and methods of assessment. (Art 5 of SEA Directive)*

4. Background

Which sets out the purpose of the Sustainability Appraisal and the Core Strategy and the Core Strategies objectives

4.1 The purpose of the Sustainability Appraisal

- 4.1.1 The Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 includes a requirement that SA is undertaken for all 'Development Plan Documents' and 'Supplementary Planning Documents'² which form part of the LDF. The purpose of SA is to promote sustainable development through better integration of sustainability considerations in the preparation and adoption of plans.
- 4.1.2 The Office of the Deputy Prime Minister (ODPM) summarised the aim of SA as follows: *"The purpose of SA is to promote sustainable development through the integration of social, environmental and economic considerations into the preparation of revisions of Regional Spatial Strategies and for new or revised Development Plan Documents (DPDs) and Supplementary Planning Documents (SPDs)"*³.
- 4.1.3 Recent amendments to the procedures contained in the Town and Country Planning Regulations 2008 have increased the flexibility for local authorities in developing local development documents. Linked to this, the recommended SA process has also been slightly amended. The Plan-making Manual (Planning Advisory Service) sets out that, under new Regulation 25, it is recommended that 'in commenting on options it would help the public if the performance of different options in the sustainability appraisal is indicated. This is so that they can then see (with the benefit of technical evidence) how different options fare and can in turn use this to assist their own feedback on the options.'
- 4.1.4 Therefore an important component of this Sustainability Appraisal Report will be the assessment of the policies selected as part of the Direction of Travel Core Strategy and any possible alternatives. Section four sets out the appraisal of the alternative options.
- 4.1.5 As part of the Issues and Options a Sustainability Appraisal commentary was carried out. This looked at the sustainability effects of potential policy directions for the Core Strategy in June 2008. This has helped to inform the appraisal of the Direction of Travel policies and the relevant recommendations have been included as part of the appraisal in section 12.
- 4.1.6 This Issues and Options consultation resulted in 22,000 comments being made. These responses helped to shape the Direction of Travel. As part of this a number of alternative options were considered and appraised. This is set out in section four, plan issues and options and the appraisal of the final approach is contained in the following section.

4.2 The Local Development Framework and Core Strategy

- 4.2.1 The Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 introduced a new system of plan-making in England. The Local Development Framework (LDF) will replace the Unitary Development Plan (UDP) (adopted May 2006). It will embody spatial planning – the practice of 'place shaping' to deliver positive social, economic and environmental outcomes and provide the overarching local policy framework for delivering sustainable development in Barnet. The LDF is described as a 'folder' of separate documents, the most important of which is the

² Note that the amendment to the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act September 2008 removed the requirement to carry out a Sustainability Appraisal for Supplementary Planning Documents

³ Sustainability Appraisal of Regional Spatial Strategies and Local Development Frameworks, ODPM, November 2005

Core Strategy. This will contain the 'vision' for the LDF and the most fundamental, cross-cutting objectives and policies that the local authority and its partners will seek to deliver.

4.2.2 The Core Strategy will contribute to achieving the vision and objectives of Barnet's Sustainable Community Strategy and will help our partners and other organisations to deliver relevant parts of their programmes. It will cover the physical aspects of location and land use traditionally covered by planning but also address other factors that make places attractive and distinctive as well as sustainable and successful. It will help to shape the kind of place that Barnet will be in the future, balancing the needs of residents, businesses and future generations. However the LDF is a portfolio of planning documents which collectively will deliver the planning strategy for Barnet. For the purposes of the Sustainability Appraisal the relevant documents are:

- Core Strategy
- Development Management
- Site Allocations

4.3 The Core Strategy Objectives

4.3.1 A series of core objectives have been developed in order to deliver the LDF vision:

4.4 Barnet's core objectives

We have developed a series of core objectives in order to deliver the LDF vision. These are:

A To manage housing growth to meet housing aspirations

- to promote the development of the major growth areas, priority estates and town centres in order to provide in the range of 25,000 new homes by 2026 to meet local and regional housing needs
- to regenerate the priority housing estates at Dollis Valley, Grahame Park, Stonegrove - Spur Road and West Hendon to replace 3,000 existing homes with a greater range of accommodation that provides access to affordable and decent new homes
- to provide a range of housing, including family and extra care accommodation, that enables choice between types and tenures, as well as over lifetimes and within neighbourhoods

B To meet social infrastructure needs

- to ensure provision for community needs arising from housing growth including education, health, social care and integrated community facilities
- to develop new schools through Primary Schools Capital Investment Programme and Building Schools for the Future
- to provide community facilities to meet the changing needs of Barnet's diverse communities

C To promote Barnet as a place of economic growth and prosperity

- to support the continued vitality and viability of 20 town centres, focusing commercial investment in our priority centres of Chipping Barnet, Edgware, Finchley Central, New Barnet, North Finchley and Whetstone
- to ensure that the regeneration of Brent Cross - Cricklewood creates a new metropolitan town centre and commercial district of greater than sub-regional reach

- to ensure that in the borough's main commercial areas including designated employment locations and town centres there are sufficient opportunities available to help business grow and prosper
- to ensure that residents are equipped with the skills to access the 21,000 jobs that the regeneration of the major growth areas will deliver by 2026/27

D To reduce the need to travel

- to keep Barnet moving in a sustainable way which provides choice by encouraging the use of convenient, reliable and affordable transport including the private car, public transport, cycling and walking
- 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.

E To promote strong and cohesive communities

- to enable communities to become confident and cohesive by providing facilities through which residents can play a part, diversity is valued and local pride is promoted.
- to create the conditions for a safer and more secure Barnet by designing out crime and reducing anti-social behaviour, particularly in known 'hotspots'.

F To promote healthy living and well-being

- to secure a healthier Barnet by addressing the factors underpinning poor health and well-being
- to provide opportunities for vulnerable people to live more independent lives by planning for appropriate facilities and support services that can meet their future needs.

G To protect and enhance the suburbs

- 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.

H To ensure efficient use of land and natural resources

- to promote mixed use development of previously developed land in the major growth areas and larger town centres
- to reduce energy demand through highest possible standards for design and construction
- to minimise waste and maximise re-use and recycling and promote an appropriate framework for integrated waste management.

I To enhance and protect our green and natural open spaces

- to improve access to, and enhance the quality of the Green Belt, Metropolitan Open Land and other open spaces as places for recreation and biodiversity
- to create new and enhanced public open spaces in support of Barnet's growth, including at least 22 ha in the three major growth areas

5. Assessment of Core Strategy objectives

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. The objectives were updated as part of the Direction of Travel and the total number was reduced from 14 to 11. Table 4 illustrates the outcome of this comparison.

Table 4 - Compatibility of Core Strategy objectives against the SA objectives

Core Strategy objective	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22
A	√	√	√	√	X	0	?	?	X	?	0	X	0	√	0	0	0	√	√	0	0	?
B	√	√	√	√	√	√	0	0	0	√	0	0	0	√	0	√	√	0	√	0	0	√
C	√	√	√	√	?	√	0	0	?	√	0	?	0	√	0	0	0	0	√	0	√	√
D	√	0	√	√	√	0	0	0	√	0	0	√	√	0	0	0	0	0	√	0	0	0
E	√	√	√	√	√	0	0	0	√	√	0	√	0	0	0	√	√	0	√	√	√	√
F	√	0	√	0	0	0	0	0	0	√	0	0	0	√	0	√	√	0	√	0	√	√
G	?	0	?	X	0	√	√	0	0	√	0	0	0	√	0	0	0	√	√	0	√	√
H	√	√	√	√	√	√	0	?	√	?	√	√	√	√	?	√	√	√	√	0	0	0
I	√	0	√	√	√	√	√	√	0	√	0	0	0	√	0	0	0	0	√	√	√	√
Sustainability objectives																						
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
Questionable impact	?

6. Commentary on the appraisal of the objectives

6.1 To manage housing growth to meet housing objectives

- 6.1.1 This objective has a negative impact on three of the Sustainability objectives. Providing 25,000 new homes is unlikely to reduce traffic levels, which also has an effect on air quality and contributions to climate change. It is also likely to impact biodiversity and flood risk. Equally meeting growth targets in town centres could put pressure on the historic environment. Finally, regeneration of the housing estates could lead to short term impacts on community cohesiveness.

6.2 To meet social infrastructure needs

- 6.2.1 This objective has either positive impacts or no link with the Sustainability Appraisal objectives

6.3 To promote Barnet as a place of economic growth and prosperity

- 6.3.1 A question has been raised over the possible negative impact that this objective might have on congestion, air quality and contributions to climate change. In particular the growth in retail at Brent Cross could lead to increases in car emissions. But at the same time the objective is encouraging growth and prosperity in the town centres which are the most accessible locations in the borough.

6.4 To reduce the need to travel

- 6.4.1 This objective on its own has either positive impacts or no link with the Sustainability Appraisal objectives despite the possible negative implications raised by other Core Strategy objectives for growth and economic growth.

6.5 To promote strong and cohesive communities

- 6.5.1 This objective has either positive impacts or no link with the Sustainability Appraisal objectives.

6.6 To promote healthy living and well being

- 6.6.1 This objective has either positive impacts or no link with the Sustainability Appraisal objectives.

6.7 To Protect and Enhance the Suburbs

- 6.7.1 There is a need for a balance with this objective as it could have an impact on sustained economic growth which is why it has been questioned. Overprotection of the suburbs may restrict sustained economic growth in particular in the town centres. This is a balance that will need to be monitored. The same question is raised over encouraging inward investment. This possible conflict highlights the wider tension within the Core Strategy between conservation and growth.

6.8 To ensure efficient use of land and natural resources

- 6.8.1 There is a question over whether the promotion of mixed use development in the town centres will have an effect on protecting the historic environment as it could lead to pressure on historic buildings in the town centres. More importantly the objective does not mention water either as a resource or in relation to flooding issues.

6.9 To enhance and protect our green and natural open spaces

- 6.9.1 This objective has either positive impacts or no link with the Sustainability Appraisal objectives.

7. Sustainability objectives

Evidence base and context; links to other strategies, sustainability issues in Barnet, the SA framework targets and indicators

Barnet's context and evidence base

7.1 Barnet's Places

- 7.1.1 Barnet is the fourth largest London borough by area (86.7 sq km) and home to a growing and diverse population. 38% of the borough is undeveloped, 28% is green belt and 8% is metropolitan open land (which includes around 200 parks, allotments, playing fields and agricultural land).
- 7.1.2 The rest of the borough is made up of suburban areas with a population density of 3,863 people per square kilometre. This is lower than for London as a whole (4,812 people p/sq km) but nearly ten times the figure for England (394 people p/sq km).
- 7.1.3 We expect significant growth in Barnet's population and economy over the next twenty years. Work is well underway on planning of the Opportunity Areas (Brent Cross - Cricklewood and Colindale) and Area of Intensification (Mill Hill East) identified in the London Plan. The development of these areas will deliver 20,000 new homes by 2026.

7.2 Town Centre Floorspace Needs Assessment – April 2009

- 7.2.1 Qualitative assessment was made of the convenience store provision in the borough. The major centre of Edgware and all of the district centres have at least one convenience store. The larger centres have more convenience units and contain larger stores with a more varied product range. Many of the food stores are operated by national multiples. Many of the centres also have a range of other convenience uses, such as independent butchers, bakers, greengrocers and delicatessens. The local and neighbourhood centres in Barnet also have some convenience goods provision, with small anchor food stores in the local centres of East Barnet, West Hendon and Friern Barnet. Eight out of centre convenience stores were also identified in the LB Barnet.
- 7.2.2 Our convenience goods assessment indicates a mixed performance by food stores in Barnet. Some centres are performing really well, largely as a result of strong anchor convenience stores, for example, North Finchley, New Barnet and Golders Green. Others show a more average performance, for example Brent Cross, Edgware, Brent Street, Chipping Barnet, East Finchley, Colindale - The Hyde and Whetstone. Whereas some, according to the survey results are performing less well, for example, Finchley Church End, Mill Hill, Temple Fortune, Burnt Oak, Cricklewood, and Hendon Central. There is also a mixed performance by the out of centre stores.
- 7.2.3 The forecasts show limited convenience goods capacity in the Borough in the short term (to 2011). By 2016 global capacity is forecast for 3,233 sqm net of convenience goods floorspace, increasing to 5,028 sqm net by 2021. Most of the convenience capacity is arising in the East (North Finchley) and North (Chipping Barnet and New Barnet) sub areas of the Borough. Some capacity also arises in the West (Edgware) sub-area beyond 2016. This capacity will however more than be met by stores already in the pipeline and as such the consultants considered that there is little quantitative need to plan further significant convenience goods provision in the London Borough of Barnet over the LDF period. The provision of a single new superstore in New Barnet and a replacement Tesco Extra as part of the new Brent Cross Cricklewood town centre would more than meet the identified capacity.

- 7.2.4 The analysis highlights a good comparison shopping provision in Brent Cross, Edgware major centre and district centres including North Finchley, Chipping Barnet, Mill Hill, Temple Fortune and Whetstone. The remaining district centres have some comparison goods provision although this is more focused on everyday household goods. The smaller centres in the hierarchy do not have such a significant comparison shopping function. They provide more specialist comparison shopping and everyday household items.
- 7.2.5 Retail warehousing provision in LB Barnet also contributes to the comparison shopping offer. The retail parks provide for much of shopper's bulky goods needs. The analysis indicates that town centre type retailers are not dominating the out of centre provision in the Borough and the Council should continue to ensure that this is the case. The assessment of comparison goods also shows a mixed performance. According to the survey certain centres such as Brent Cross, Mill Hill and North Finchley are trading very well, whereas others such as Brent Street, Burnt Oak, Finchley Church End and Cricklewood have a low level of trading. The retail parks are under performing, whereas the free standing DIY stores are performing well.
- 7.2.6 For comparison goods on the basis of current market shares, increases in population and disposable income will increase the available comparison spend, creating capacity for additional retail floorspace. We forecast a comparison goods capacity of 11,356 sqm net by 2011, increasing to 47,917 sqm net by 2016 and 81,024 sqm net by 2021. This is a very significant amount of floorspace, it will however largely be absorbed by the development of the new Brent Cross Cricklewood town centre.

7.3 Barnet's People

- 7.3.1 With a 2008 population of 331,500 Barnet is the second most populous borough in London. Based on GLA figures which factor in the house building growth Barnet's population is projected to reach 384,615 by 2026, an increase of 16% on present levels. According to GLA estimates, Barnet could be the most populous London Borough by 2012.
- 7.3.2 The growth in Barnet's population will change our existing communities, attracting a much younger and diverse population. Over the next ten years there will be a marked increase in the number of children aged between 5-14 years old and number of people over the age of 65.
- 7.3.3 Barnet has the second largest population of children and young people in London. In 2008 almost 84,000 children, aged 0 – 19, lived in Barnet who are more diverse than the adult population. Our young population is becoming increasingly diverse, 40% of Primary school pupils in the borough and 37% of Secondary school pupils have English as a second language.
- 7.3.4 The 2001 Census records that nearly 73% of Barnet's population described their health as good. Residents are healthier overall measured by mental illness, death rates from major causes, sickness benefit claimants and alcohol related hospital admissions.
- 7.3.5 Nearly a third of Barnet's population belongs to a black and minority ethnic minority group. Projections are that this will grow to 36% by 2018. Barnet has the largest Jewish community in the UK and one of the largest populations of Chinese.
- 7.3.6 Barnet has a historical legacy of new communities being welcomed and feeling involved. The borough is considered a place where people from different backgrounds get on well. National Indicator 1 measures community cohesion. Barnet is the place with the greatest diversity of communities that has scored highly on this indicator. Nearly 84% of residents agreed in the 2008 Place Survey that their local area is a place where people from different backgrounds get on well.

7.4 Deprivation in Barnet

- 7.4.1 Barnet has six areas within the top 10% most deprived nationally. Overall deprivation is substantially higher in Burnt Oak and Colindale than the rest of the borough. One area in Colindale has over a fifth of its working age population in employment deprivation (i.e. involuntarily excluded from work)
- 7.4.2 Whilst Barnet is a generally prosperous borough there is significant deprivation in certain areas with a wide gap between the richest and the poorest. According to CACI Paycheck data for 2008 10.5% of Barnet households have incomes in excess of £75,000 a year while 11.6% have incomes less than £15,000.
- 7.4.3 The average life expectancy of residents is almost 2 years above the English average, though it is about a year below this in the most deprived wards..
- 7.4.4 By developing our understanding of lifestyles and related public health challenges in Barnet's disadvantaged areas we have developed an innovative preventative screening programme for the 5,000 residents identified most at risk of cardio-vascular disease

7.5 A Safer Barnet

- 7.5.1 Our annual resident's survey 2008 reveals that in most wards residents feel safe in the day. During the evening all wards show at least a small percentage of respondents who feel unsafe, with the majority having between 15% and 25%. An exception is Underhill where 50% of those asked stated they felt fairly or very unsafe in the evening. Other wards with over 25% stating they felt unsafe at evening were Edgware, Burnt Oak, Colindale, West Hendon and Woodhouse.

7.6 Barnet's Economy

- 7.6.1 Barnet has the most town centres in London. There are 20 major, district and local town centres which vary in size and purpose as well as performance.
- 7.6.2 The town centres provide a total area of retail floorspace that is only exceeded by Westminster and Kensington and Chelsea and is the greatest of any outer London borough. Brent Cross is London's only self contained regional shopping centre. It is planned to become a sustainable new Town Centre as part of the Brent Cross - Cricklewood redevelopment complementing the role of other town centres nearby.
- 7.6.3 Barnet's resident population is well qualified with 35% of the adult population having a university degree or equivalent – 4% higher than the London average and 15% higher than the England average. Studies have identified a need for more vocational and intermediate courses to ensure residents and businesses can take advantage of future growth.
- 7.6.4 The borough has a large number of VAT-registered businesses, the third highest in London, and the fifth highest in Great Britain
- 7.6.5 Barnet has proportionately fewer manufacturing jobs than London or Great Britain as a whole, but rather more in distribution, hotels & restaurants, public administration, education & health.
- 7.6.6 Halcrow were contracted to carry out a study into the supply and demand for employment land in Barnet. The Barnet Employment Land Review was published in July 2009 and assesses the employment land in terms of quality and quantity and then estimates the future requirements for employment land. The report identifies the policy background for Barnet and the context of employment growth in the opportunity areas.
- 7.6.7 There is 4.8 million square foot of office space in the borough and it is dominated by small office users. This results in high rents. There is 4.7 million square foot of industrial floorspace. All the current employment land was surveyed with a visual site survey which looked at age, quality, image, accessibility including parking provision and potential

conflicts with neighbouring users. (where are the results?) The results showed that the land was either good or average on most indicators.

- 7.6.8 Employment demand was assessed using three different scenarios. These forecast growth of between 8% and 17%. Under all the scenarios demand for office space grows whilst it falls for industrial space.
- 7.6.9 As part of the survey employment land was surveyed for fitness for purpose which led to 3% being identified as appropriate for release for other uses. When this is combined with the projections for demand a level of need can be identified. The maximum growth level leads to a need for 11 hectares of land and the report recommends number of sites which should be protected or released.

7.7 Homes in Barnet

- 7.7.1 Barnet is typical of many outer London suburbs in having a high proportion of owner occupied housing, a strong private sector rented sector, and a smaller supply of social rented sector. The housing stock, which is predominantly an older stock of over 50 years in age, is mainly in a good condition.
- 7.7.2 About 62% of the stock comprises houses (terraced, semi-detached or detached) and 38% are flats and maisonettes. Almost 60% have 3 or more bedrooms, and only a very small percentage contain only one bedroom. Housing tenure in Barnet is similar to other outer London boroughs, with 72% in owner occupation, but unlike the rest of London more housing rented privately rather than in the social rented sector compared with other outer London boroughs at 16% and 13% respectively.
- 7.7.3 Barnet's private rented sector is dominated by 1 and 2 bed units. This would suggest that this is flatted development. The owner occupied stock is dominated by 3 and 4+ bed units which are typically houses.
- 7.7.4 The 2006 Housing Needs Survey estimated that 5.4% of all households in Barnet are overcrowded while 32.7% under-occupy their dwelling.
- 7.7.5 There are several affordability indexes that compare earnings of the people who work in an area with the price of local housing. The larger the ratio of prices to earnings then the more expensive the housing is for the local workforce. According to these indexes Barnet experiences high financial barriers to owner occupation compared with the rest of the country. In 2007 Barnet had the 28th highest affordability ratio of England's 355 districts.
- 7.7.6 Over 3,000 units will be replaced at Dollis Valley, Grahame Park, Stonegrove - Spur Road and West Hendon. Regenerating our largest and most deprived housing estates forms a central part of Barnet's future

7.8 Barnet's Environment

- 7.8.1 On average residents produce around 431 kg of waste each per year. Household waste recycled has increased from 9% to 30.7% from 2000 to 2008, which has helped to decrease the overall level of municipal waste going to landfill from 72% in 2000 to 53% in 2008.
- 7.8.2 Domestic CO2 emissions in Barnet are near the national average. Reflecting its housing stock Barnet has the fourth highest per capita domestic emissions in London.
- 7.8.3 Barnet is rich in green spaces and biodiversity containing 68 Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation, including 7 which are local nature reserves. The Brent Reservoir, (also known as Welsh Harp) which lies partly in the borough, is a Site of Special Scientific Interest.

7.9 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA)

- 7.9.1 The North London Boroughs of Barnet, Camden, Enfield, Hackney, Haringey, Islington and Waltham Forest jointly procured the services of consultants to carry out the assessment which was published in August 2008. The study was carried out in line with guidance set out by Planning Policy Statement 25: Development and Flood Risk and the final report was agreed with the Environment Agency.
- 7.9.2 A source pathway receptor model was used to assess those flood sources which had the greatest consequences for each of the boroughs. The following risks were identified. The Dollis Brook and Silk Stream are the two dominant watercourses within the west of Barnet draining south and these and their associated tributaries create the primary source of fluvial flood risk. The Brent Reservoir is considered to present a low risk. Surface water or pluvial flooding presents a low to moderate risk to the borough with a number of flooding events recorded in the Edgware area by both Barnet and Thames Water. Sewer flooding was noted for being low risk however this assessment is based on the limited information provided by Thames Water.
- 7.9.3 It should be noted that the Environment Agency are currently spending £1.8million to protect 746 properties from flooding attributed to the Edgwarebury Brook in the Silk Stream catchment.

7.10 Barnet's Transport

- 7.10.1 Barnet is characterised by high car ownership but also has high public transport usage. Many of Barnet's residents travel to work in central London and use the radial underground services of the Northern and Piccadilly Lines but orbital routes are less well served by public transport and therefore people travelling within the borough or to adjoining areas often have little choice but to rely on private transport.
- 7.10.2 About 146,000 residents are employed either full or part time. Of these 59,600 work in the borough (of whom 39% drive to work) with 86,300 working outside the borough (of whom 42% drive). A further 47,300 people commute into the borough (66% of whom drive).
- 7.10.3 A fuller description of the borough can be found in the Scoping Report 2008

8. Links to other strategies

8.1 Barnet's Sustainable Community Strategy 2008 - 2018 - Barnet - A Successful City-Suburb

- 8.1.1 The Local Strategic Partnership has revised the borough's Sustainable Community Strategy (SCS) for the period 2008 to 2018. The Sustainable Community Strategy 2008 - 2018 sets out the strategic vision for Barnet as a place and provides the vehicle for considering and deciding how to address difficult cross-cutting issues such as maintaining the quality of life that makes the borough an attractive place to live. The four SCS themes inform the Core Strategy:
- Growing successfully
 - Safer, stronger and cleaner Barnet
 - Investing in children and young people
 - Healthier Barnet (including older people)
- 8.1.2 Our spatial vision as a successful city-suburb in a successful London is highlighted in Barnet's Sustainable Community Strategy and delivered through the Local Area Agreement (LAA). Table 1 sets out how the four themes and eighteen ambitions of the SCS are reflected in the Core Strategy - Direction of Travel

8.2 Barnet's Local Area Agreement

- 8.2.1 The Local Area Agreement (LAA) sets out improvement targets for the priorities of a local area. The Council and its public sector partners are under a duty to co-operate to agree LAA targets and have regard to them in exercising day to day functions. A total of 35 LAA targets have been selected from a set of 198 National Indicators to reflect Barnet's priorities of 'driving success' and 'tackling disadvantage'. Barnet's LAA runs until March 2011.

8.3 Three Strands Approach

- 8.3.1 The Council and its partners have a prominent role in place-shaping and Barnet's spatial development priorities are currently defined in the innovative Three Strands Approach to planning, development and regeneration. The purpose of the Core Strategy is to guide the growth identified in the borough to ensure that the qualities that make Barnet an attractive place to live are maintained and enhanced. Three Strands provides the spatial vision that underpins the Core Strategy and the Local Development Framework. The three strands are:
- **Strand 1.** Absolute protection of the Green Belt, Metropolitan Open Land and other valued open space from inappropriate development.
 - **Strand 2.** Enhancement and protection of Barnet's suburbs, town centres and historic areas.
 - **Strand 3.** Growth that is sustainable so as to achieve successful regeneration and high quality development.
- 8.3.2 The Core Strategy sets out the major areas across the borough where development and regeneration is expected and the policies developed for them.
- 8.3.3 The Three Strands Approach allows for growth in housing and employment to be accommodated within Barnet's existing built up area, and concentrates new development in the most accessible locations around public transport nodes and town centres where social and physical infrastructure is to be improved. This broad approach can meet the sustainable design principles for a compact city in making the best use of development sites, respecting local character of the built and green environment, providing for a mix of

uses, being safe, attractive and accessible to all users. It can also contribute to the adaptation to and mitigation of the effects of climate change. Most importantly, the green belt and the one-third of the borough that comprises green open spaces, is protected from future urbanisation and development to ensure a high quality suburb.

8.4 Barnet's Corporate Plan

8.4.1 The Council's Corporate Plan which is updated annually sets out our priorities and work programme for the year ahead. It forms part of a wider partnership to ensure Barnet excels as a successful city suburb. The Corporate Plan supports the themes and ambitions of the Sustainable Community Strategy and highlights the priority objective of progressing the LDF in order to assist in shaping Barnet as a successful city suburb.

8.4.2 The 2009/10 Corporate Plan contains six priority outcomes:

- a bright future for children and young people;
- clean, green and safe;
- promoting independence;
- strong and healthy; and
- a successful city-suburb.
- More choice, better value.

8.4.3 All six priorities in the Corporate Plan 2009/10 to 2012/13 are embedded within the Core Strategy.

- In providing a bright future for children and young people the Core Strategy addresses spatial aspects of our programme for improvements to the schools estate, provision of children's centres and commissioning of youth services.
- In meeting the clean green and safe priority it sets out how we can conserve natural resources and reduce carbon emissions. It emphasises that reducing need to travel is our first priority in improving movement around Barnet. In making Barnet a safer place we address need to make town centres places which engender civic pride.
- In helping to promote independence and to support vulnerable adults it promotes increased housing choice including extra care housing and the need for lifetime homes
- In order to keep Barnet strong and healthy the Core Strategy sets out policy on improving delivery of clinical care as well as highlighting the role of planning in targeting unhealthy lifestyles and addressing health inequalities
- In supporting a successful city suburb it sets out distribution of growth in regeneration schemes in the North West London Luton Corridor and through a programme of town centre frameworks. The emerging Infrastructure Delivery Plan will set out the physical, social and green infrastructure required for the proposed growth and who will provide it and when it will be provided.
- In providing more choice, better value the Core Strategy sets out the need to make more efficient use of community facilities in order to improve service delivery. Further integration of services such as libraries and children's centres in 'hubs' is highlighted as the way forward.

8.5 Barnet's other Strategies and Plans

8.5.1 The Core Strategy also reflects the spatial dimensions of the Children and Young People's Plan, Older Adults Strategy, Housing Strategy, Health and Well-being Framework and the Safer Communities Strategy. These policies, programmes and strategies have all been

considered as important markers in the development of the Core Strategy and form part of the evidence base.

9. Sustainability issues in Barnet

- 9.1.1 As part of the sustainability appraisal it is necessary to identify the key sustainability issues facing the borough from the baseline data collected as part of the Scoping Stage. The issues have been identified from a number of sources.
- 9.1.2 The issues have been set out under the headings of economic, environmental and social. There are of course issues that cut across more than one category identified. To avoid duplication the cross cutting issues have been limited to one category.

9.2 Economic Issues

- 9.2.1 In the financial year 2006/07 the percentage of people in employment in Barnet was 71.2%, which is slightly higher than the percentage for London. Projections suggest that the population of Barnet will reach 367,400 by 2021 with growth focused predominately in the west of the borough.
- 9.2.2 However Barnet's economy has been stagnating with the loss of 5,000 jobs between 2001 and 2007 with only the public sector growing in this period when the national economy was growing as a whole and London grew by 1.5%. The main sectoral strengths are retail, business services and health and social services. There is a high proportion of small firms providing 32% of employment. There is only minor specialisation in Barnet's economy with retail providing one the greatest specialisation with over 30% more employed in this sector – more than would be expected in an equivalent economy.
- 9.2.3 There is a wide skills gap. Barnet has a high level of very skilled people of employment age in comparison to other boroughs - nearly 60% of those employed who live in the borough work in professional or managerial roles. Equally it has a sector that lacks the skills necessary to gain employment. This can be evidenced by the six super output areas that are within the 10 per cent most deprived nationally.
- 9.2.4 Parts of the borough suffer from poor transport accessibility especially in Mill Hill, High Barnet and East Barnet. There is a high dependency on travelling by car and commuting by car. Barnet is a major net exporter of labour. With 47,400 people commuting into Barnet in 2001, almost double (85,800) commuted out of the borough to work although this is similar to other outer London boroughs.
- 9.2.5 The conflict between opposing land uses, in particular balancing housing needs with the protection of employment land and open space – Barnet hosts a range of employment land, but this is declining. With a stagnating economy the pressure on releasing employment land is high yet giving in to this pressure will only reduce opportunities to new and developing businesses.
- 9.2.6 The need to support development in existing centres and ensure the health of town centres – in accordance with Barnet's Three Strands Approach. Intensified mixed use development is likely to take place in town centres, whilst protecting and maintaining the suburban and more rural areas of the borough.

9.3 Environmental Issues

- 9.3.1 Over the next two decades we will build over 28,000 new homes and regenerate our areas of concentrated deprivation. Many of these new builds will attract younger and more ethnically diverse communities and in 20 years the boroughs population is likely to exceed 380,000. With this growth come new business, retail and leisure facilities and significant employment opportunities.
- 9.3.2 We need to understand what tackling climate change means in an aspirational, growth area. There is a clear tension between the benefits of an economically vibrant and

developing community and the environmental impact of the activities of that community. We must increase awareness, facilitate behaviour change and demonstrate the longer term economic benefits of good environmental practice.

- 9.3.3 Because of poor air quality the whole of Barnet has been designated an Air Quality Management Zone. The air pollution targets set by DEFRA are exceeded along large stretches of the main roads that cross the borough, such as the A406 and the A1. The Council fails on particulates (PM10) and nitrogen dioxide. In part this pollution is down to congestion as the A406 suffers significant congestion, in particular between its junctions with the A5 and A1 and at the eastern side of the borough adjacent to Enfield. This congestion has an adverse knock on effect on many borough roads.
- 9.3.4 Car ownership within Barnet is relatively high compared to London and outer London with the 2001 census identifying that 26.1% of Barnet households had access to a car or van which is less than the outer London average of 28.6%. The 2001 census revealed that over 59,000 Barnet residents chose to drive to work.
- 9.3.5 Improved public transport and cycling facilities could help to mitigate this issue. However there are relatively few cyclists in Barnet, (0.6% of trips undertaken by Barnet residents are by cycling). A possible reason for this low level of cyclists could be the high number of traffic casualties in the borough. 147 people were killed or seriously injured in road traffic accidents in 2007/08 – this is nearly double the England average. There is significant potential for cycling though with 31% (38,000) of Barnet residents travelling less than 5km to work in 2001.
- 9.3.6 London is responsible for 8% of the UK's CO2 emissions. Barnet's carbon footprint is higher than the London average at 12.31 tonnes compared with the average 11.38 tonnes (2005 data). Given the residential nature of the borough just over half of these emissions come from households with the remaining half split equally between transport and industry/commerce. The average SAP rating for the energy efficiency rating for Council owned property increased to just over 70 in 2007/08 which almost matches the best result in England but council property only makes up 13% of the total housing stock. Private home ownership is high at around 70%.
- 9.3.7 Barnet has a green and open character and benefits from having 2,466 hectares of green belt, 690 hectares of metropolitan open space and over 200 parks – 16 of which are 'premier parks'. With expected growth of the population at 12% over 15 years there may be pressure to carry out development on greenfield sites. We also need to ensure greater access to those areas that are lacking in good quality open spaces. Adjacent development will also increase pressure on biodiversity and habitats which may need greater protection.
- 9.3.8 We need to minimise waste arisings and deal with waste locally and in sustainable manner – need to increase waste recycling in order to reach more sustainable levels. Just over 30% of household waste was recycled in 2007/08 with 438 kg of waste collected per head of population. New major developments will provide opportunities to implement better recycling facilities.
- 9.3.9 Flood risk and managing surface water run off through the use of Sustainable Drainage Systems – Barnet lies within the Brent River catchment which flows into the Thames at Brentford. There are over 14,000 meters of water courses in the Borough.
- 9.3.10 There will be a greater need to protect the 18 conservation areas and 1,300 nationally listed buildings in the borough with the expected growth in population. Conservation of the historic environment is important because these areas and buildings are an integral part of the borough's heritage and development.
- 9.3.11 Noise nuisance and vibration – some adjacent uses such as housing and employment land can pose difficulties in terms of their compatibility. This can lead to complaints regarding noise pollution. The number of complaints received by Environmental Health Officers each

year is increasing significantly and as the borough's population grows this issue is only set to increase.

9.4 Social Issues

- 9.4.1 The growth in the borough will change our existing communities, attracting a much younger and diverse population. Over the next 10 years there will be a marked increase in the number of children aged between 5-14 years old and number of people over 65. Making housing choice for older people more attractive as well as locally accessible could make the housing stock in Barnet more flexible. Owner occupation is high, accounting for around 70% of households. The housing stock in the Borough comprises apartments (39%), semi-detached (31%), terraced dwellings (18%) and detached homes (11%).
- 9.4.2 Health inequalities exist in Barnet spatially and by gender. Men in affluent wards such as Hampstead Garden Suburb have an average life expectancy which is up to seven years longer than their counterparts in Colindale. In an attempt to counter this trend Barnet is piloting a project known as 'Finding the 5000' which will through social marketing target people in the most deprived areas of Barnet tackle the high rates of Coronary Vascular Disease (CVD) that occur in Barnet's social housing stock.
- 9.4.3 We are faced with an imbalanced housing stock with 1 household in 3 considered to under-occupy, while the demands for increased housing choice, affordable housing, and family homes to meet aspirations of home ownership are increasing.
- 9.4.4 Between 2001 and 2004 statistics revealed that deprivation in Barnet had increased. In 2007 new statistics revealed that this trend is continuing. This data released in December 2007 shows that Barnet just comes within the 36% most deprived local authority areas in the country. We have six super output areas within the 10 per cent most deprived nationally with much of the highest deprivation existing in the western part of the borough. The growth areas identified in this part of the borough gives us the opportunity to address issues of inequality and deprivation.
- 9.4.5 The infrastructure to support growth including schools, healthcare, community facilities, parks, utilities, improvements to transport connectivity needs to be developed on a collective understanding of how the needs of our residents are changing.
- 9.4.6 Crime and fear of crime have significant effects on the quality of people's lives in the borough along instances of recorded crime are actually falling in the borough.
- 9.4.7 An increasing population will mean increased pressure on community facilities. There will be a greater need for the efficient distribution of goods and services.
- 9.4.8 Educational attainment in the borough is high. Just under 70% of pupils achieved more than 5 GCSEs at A-C level. The average in England is 63%. However there will be a large growth in population over the plan period and we need to ensure sufficient that the quality and quantity of all education facilities is maintained within the borough for all age groups.

10. The SA framework targets and indicators

10.1.1 The establishment of SA objectives and criteria is central to the SA process. The SA framework, based on these objectives, provides a way in which sustainability effects can be described, assessed and compared. Sustainability objectives are distinct from those of the Core Strategy, but in some cases may overlap. The table below sets out the objectives:

Objective	Sub-Objectives – Will the Policy.....?
Economic	
To encourage sustained economic growth and contribute to economic prosperity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improve business development • Enhance the image of the area as a business location • Improve the health of Barnet's town centres • Increase economic activity
To offer the opportunity for rewarding and satisfying employment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Help reduce unemployment, in particular in the wards of the borough where it is the highest • Promote flexible forms of working
To encourage and accommodate both indigenous and inward investment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Encourage indigenous business • Encourage inward investment • Make land and property available for business development
To reduce disparities in economic performance and promote regeneration	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Promote regeneration; reducing disparity with surrounding areas
Environmental	
To reduce the effect of traffic on the environment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Promote the use of calming measure to reduce traffic volume • Increase the proportion of journeys using modes other than the car • Encourage walking or cycling • Reduce the need to travel • Improve access to public transport
To maintain and enhance the quality of landscapes, townscapes and local distinctiveness	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improve the landscape and ecological quality and character of open spaces • Minimise visual intrusion and protect views • Help to preserve and record archaeological features
To conserve and enhance the borough's existing biodiversity and seek to increase where possible	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure the protection and enhancement of the Special Areas of Conservation • Protect and enhance the borough's Sites of Special Scientific Interest and Sites of Metropolitan Importance for Nature Conservation • Encourage protection and enhancement of and increase number of tree • Conserve and enhance species diversity; and in particular avoid harm to protected species • Encourage the use of green roofs, landscaping or open space to improve biodiversity.
To reduce the risk of flooding for people and property	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minimise the risk of flooding from rivers and watercourses to people and property • Reduce surface water run-off and promote the use of sustainable

Objective	Sub-Objectives – Will the Policy.....?
	urban drainage systems (SUDS) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Take a sequential approach to the location of new development away from areas at highest risk of flooding
To improve air quality	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improve air quality • Achieve the objectives of the Air Quality Management Plan • Contribute to a reduction in the levels of NO2 and PM10 in the borough.
To conserve and where appropriate enhance the historic environment and cultural assets	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Protect and enhance conservation areas and other sites, features and areas of historic and cultural value. • Protect listed buildings and historic parks and garden • Help preserve and record archaeological features • Maintain and strengthen local distinctiveness and sense of place
To achieve sustainable management of waste	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase the re-use of materials • Increase rates of recycling and composting, or recovery of energy from waste • Reduce hazardous waste • Reduce waste in the construction industry
To reduce contributions to climate change and reduce vulnerability to climate change	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limit emissions of greenhouse gases • Ensure that the borough is prepared for the impacts of climate change
To increase energy efficiency and the proportion of energy generated from renewable sources	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lead to an increased proportion of energy needs being met from renewable energy sources • Increase energy efficiency in the Borough's housing stock
To encourage sustainable use of land	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minimise development on Greenfield sites • Ensure that where possible; new development occurs on derelict, vacant and underused previously developed land and buildings • Ensure land is remediated as appropriate
To achieve sustainable water resources management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improve the quality and quantity of water in Barnet • Reduce the demand for water
Social	
To improve the health of Barnet's population	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assist in tackling health inequalities in the borough • Improve access to health services, in particular to a GP • Encourage healthy lifestyles and provide opportunities for sport and recreation • Promote access to healthy eating
To improve the education and skills of the population	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improve the exam performance of pupils in Barnet's schools • Reduce the number of adults with no qualifications • Help fill the skills gap • Promote high quality, multi purpose educational facilities
To provide Barnet's population with the opportunity to live in a decent affordable home	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase access to good quality and affordable housing • Encourage mixed use and range of housing type and tenure • Reduce the number of unfit homes • Reduce homelessness
To provide good quality surroundings for all	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improve the satisfaction of people with their neighbourhoods as places to live • Improve residential amenity and sense of place

Objective	Sub-Objectives – Will the Policy.....?
To reduce crime and the fear of crime	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduce anti social behaviour by designing out crime • Reduce the fear of crime
To improve accessibility for all to services and facilities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improve access to key community services • Improve the level of investment in key community services • Improve access to green and open spaces • Improve access to public transport
To encourage a sense of community; identity and welfare	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Encourage engagement in community activities • Foster a sense of pride in an area • Improve community cohesion • Encourage people to respect and value their contribution to society • Increase the ability of people to influence decisions

10.1.2 Indicators to monitor these objectives will be identified at the next stage of reporting of the Sustainability Appraisal process.

10.2 Appropriate Assessment

10.2.1 Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA), Appropriate Assessment (AA) and Sustainability Appraisal (SA) are all methods of impact assessment. SEA and AA focus on the environmental impacts whilst SA is wider incorporating the social and economic aspects. AA is related to habitat sites though whilst SEA aims to assess the predicted impacts of a plan or projects objectives on the baseline data.

10.2.2 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).

10.2.3 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.

10.2.4 The conclusion of the screening are as follows:

- I. London Borough of Barnet's Core Strategy sets out the council's spatial vision, objectives and key planning policies, which will determine how Barnet develops over the next 10 years or so. This HDA has identified a range of indirect, and/or in combination impacts, which could possibly affect No? Natura 2000 sites within a 15KM radius of the borough.
- II. The assessment has screened these impacts against the sites qualifying features and can conclude that there will be no significant adverse impact on the integrity of Natura 2000 sites as a result of Barnet's Core Strategy. Therefore in accordance with guidance, a Habitat Directive Assessment is not necessary and does not need to be undertaken.

10.3 Equalities Impact Assessment

- 10.3.1 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.
- 10.3.2 The EqIA process is not just a legal requirement, under a number of acts including the Race Relations [Amendment] Act 2000. It actually helps to improve policies, strategies, procedures, functions, projects, reviews and organisational change for the whole community and not just minority groups. The EqIA will help to anticipate and recommend ways to avoid any discriminatory or negative consequences or particular groups, on the grounds of race, disability, gender, age, faith of sexuality. It will highlight the likely impact of the policy or project on the target groups and to take action to improve the policies where appropriate as a result or to demonstrate the potential benefits.
- 10.3.3 The EqIA is aimed at target groups which are deemed to be at particular risk of discrimination and inequality of opportunity. As set out in the GLA's guidance on EqIAs, these groups are:
- Black and minority ethnic people
 - Disabled People
 - Women
 - Young people and children
 - Older people
 - Lesbians
 - Gay men
 - Bisexuals
 - Trans people; and
 - People from different faith groups.
- 10.3.4 In addition, EqIA targets a number of groups where plans and policies may create inequality.
- Gender
 - Race
 - Disability
 - Age
 - Faith; and
 - Sexuality

- 10.3.5 The groups are not homogeneous and people within these groups have different and individual needs. Many will be members of several of the targeted groups. Their experience of unlawful discrimination can involve a variety of factors.

10.4 Summary of key findings

- 10.4.1 The assessment has found that the Direction of Travel policies will have a significantly positive impact on the equalities target groups identified. New development will bring a variety of benefits to the equality target groups, mainly focussed around better access to a wider range and choice of homes, jobs, services and community facilities. Improved transport infrastructure will support this process by ensuring affordable and safe access from residential areas to its services and facilities, and to areas beyond the borough boundary.

11. Plan Issues and Options

These are the main strategic alternatives considered, how the preferred strategic alternatives were chosen and any proposed mitigation measures

11.1 Alternative options

- 11.1.1 As part of the development of the policies within the Direction of Travel alternative policy options were considered. The sustainability appraisal helped to determine the policy direction. The tables below set out the appraisal.

Appraisal of alternative option to CS1 & CS2: Allow growth to take place across all parts of Barnet

Objective	+ve/-ve effects	Perm/Temp/Sec	Commentary
1. To encourage sustained economic growth and promote economic prosperity	+?	Long term impacts	In the short term allowing growth across the borough could have a positive effect on economic growth but it could lead to an over supply of land and buildings across a number of sectors of the economy. There may be great changes in the spread of businesses across the borough and the impact would depend on how it was controlled in areas where there was previously no growth.
2. To offer everybody the opportunity for rewarding and satisfying employment	+?	Long term impacts	In the short term it would offer more people the opportunity of employment but in the long term as the over supply increases rents and wages might have to fall to maintain any growth. This may lead to dissatisfaction with employment.
3. To encourage and accommodate both indigenous and inward investment	+?	Long term impacts	In the short term there would be a boost to the local economy as investment flowed into the borough but over time this could reduce as the initial attractions for that investment were diminished. Barnet's suburban character would be impacted through over development which is one of the features that makes it an attractive place to live in the first place. Improving infrastructure may be harder as it would be less focused and more spread across the borough.
4. To reduce disparities in economic performance and promote regeneration	-		Development would naturally be attracted to the easier sites leaving the areas that need regeneration. Employment growth could also take place in locations that would impact on existing employment clusters thereby increasing economic disparity.
5. To reduce the effect of traffic on the environment	-		Allowing growth across the borough would increase congestion as it would not be the most accessible locations and people would have to drive. This is one of the most significant effects of this alternative policy would lead to greater congestion and pollution.
6. To maintain and enhance the quality of landscapes, townscapes and local distinctiveness	?		Allowing growth to occur all over would lead to increasing pressure on the quality of landscapes and townscapes and could impact local distinctiveness.
7. To conserve and enhance the borough's existing biodiversity and seek to increase where possible	-		Allowing growth across the borough could have significant impacts on biodiversity particularly if green belt were included.

Objective	+ve/-ve effects	Perm/Temp/Sec	Commentary
8. To reduce the risk of flooding for people and property	-		Allowing growth across the borough could lead to an overall increase in the amount of development that occurs which without any mitigation would lead to an increase in run and the likelihood of flooding.
9. To improve air quality	-		As above allowing growth across the borough would increase congestion as it would not be the most accessible locations and people would have to drive. This is one of the most significant effects of this alternative policy would lead to greater congestion and pollution.
10. To conserve and where appropriate enhance the historic environment and cultural assets	?		Developing across the borough could lead to increased pressure on the historic environment depending on where that development were to occur.
11. To achieve sustainable management of waste	?-		Allowing growth across the borough would lead to an increase in the overall amount of waste but it could lead to opportunities for the development of new waste management facilities.
12. To reduce contributions to climate change and reduce vulnerability to climate change	-		Growth will lead to an increase in contributions to climate change as more people increase energy demands in dwellings and on the transport system. Dispersed growth is only going to exacerbate this effect through greater transport emissions.
13. To increase energy efficiency and the proportion of energy generated from renewable sources	O?		Depending on other policies there is the potential to reduce emissions through energy efficiency above the building regulation targets and increase the amount of energy produced from renewable sources.
14. To encourage sustainable use of land	-	Long term impact	Growth across the borough will have a negative effect as it will lead to an over supply of land and buildings across a number of sectors of the economy which is not a sustainable use of land.
15. To achieve sustainable water resources management	O?		Growth will impact on the demands for water use through the increase in the boroughs population which will require mitigation measures.
16. To improve the Health of Barnet's population	+ ?		Growth wherever it occurs can provide the opportunity to increase the provision of health services and open spaces. Improving infrastructure may be harder though as it would be less focused and more spread across the borough.
17. To improve the education and skills of the population	+ ?		As part of the growth the amount of education space will increase. Improving infrastructure may be harder though as it would be less focused and more spread across the borough.

Objective	+ve/-ve effects	Perm/Temp/Sec	Commentary
18. To provide Barnet's population with the opportunity to live in a decent affordable home	+		Growth across the borough would provide opportunity for both market housing and affordable housing of various market types although access to them may be more restricted.
19. To provide good quality surroundings for all	+?		It is not guaranteed that the design will be good to provide good quality surroundings for all but has to be assumed. Optimising as opposed to maximising density will help.
20. To reduce crime and the fear of crime	+		Provides the opportunity to reduce the impact of crime through good design.
21. To improve accessibility for all to services and facilities	+		Provides the opportunity to provide new services as part of the development which will improve peoples access to them. Will also deliver public transport improvements, new areas of open space and children's play space.
22. To encourage a sense of community; identity and welfare	-?		Growth across the borough will have an impact on more of Barnet's residents than if it was concentrated in certain locations.

11.2 Policy CS 3 – Protecting and enhancing Barnet's character

11.2.1 The following alternative option was identified for this policy :

1. **Design and Access Statements should set out how they respect local character, distinctiveness and sustainability**

Objective	+ve/-ve effects	Perm/Temp/Sec	Commentary
	1		
1. To encourage sustained economic growth and promote economic prosperity	0		This policy option will not have a significant effect on this objective.

Objective	+ve/-ve effects	Perm/Temp/Sec	Commentary
	1		
2. To offer everybody the opportunity for rewarding and satisfying employment	0		None of the policy options will have an effect on this objective.
3. To encourage and accommodate both indigenous and inward investment	0		This policy option will not have a significant effect on this objective.
4. To reduce disparities in economic performance and promote regeneration	0		This policy option will not have a significant effect on this objective.
5. To reduce the effect of traffic on the environment	0		This policy option will not have a significant effect on this objective.
6. To maintain and enhance the quality of landscapes, townscapes and local distinctiveness	+/?		<p>This option will have a significantly positive effect on this objective as it helps to clearly set out how a development will affect people and be used by people. It will cover its design and how that affects its wider environment written in a clear way to justify the proposal to help those affected by the proposal to comment. Going through such a process should help to improve design considerations thereby enhancing the quality of landscapes and townscapes.</p> <p>A question is raised by the appraisal as this is quite a detailed policy which might sit better in the Development Management DPD.</p>
7. To conserve and enhance the borough's existing biodiversity and seek to increase	0		This policy option will not have a significant effect on this objective.

Objective	+ve/-ve effects	Perm/Temp/Sec	Commentary
	1		
where possible			
8. To reduce the risk of flooding for people and property	0		This policy option will not have a significant effect on this objective.
9. To improve air quality	0		This policy option will not have a significant effect on this objective.
10. To conserve and where appropriate enhance the historic environment and cultural assets	+/?		<p>This option will have a significantly positive effect on this objective as it helps to clearly set out how a development will affect people and be used by people. It will cover its design and how that affects its wider environment written in a clear way to justify the proposal to help those affected by the proposal to comment. Going through such a process should help to improve design considerations thereby enhancing the quality of landscapes and townscapes.</p> <p>A question is raised by the appraisal as this is quite a detailed policy which might sit better in the Development Management DPD.</p>
11. To achieve sustainable management of waste	0		This policy option will not have a significant effect on this objective.
12. To reduce contributions to climate change and reduce vulnerability to climate change	0		This policy option will not have a significant effect on this objective.
13. To increase energy efficiency and the proportion of energy generated from renewable sources	0		This policy option will not have a significant effect on this objective.

Objective	+ve/-ve effects	Perm/Temp/Sec	Commentary
	1		
14. To encourage sustainable use of land	0		This policy option will not have a significant effect on this objective.
15. To achieve sustainable water resources management	0		This policy option will not have a significant effect on this objective.
16. To improve the Health of Barnet's population	0		This policy option will not have a significant effect on this objective.
17. To improve the education and skills of the population	0		This policy option will not have a significant effect on this objective.
18. To provide Barnet's population with the opportunity to live in a decent affordable home	0		This policy option will not have a significant effect on this objective.
19. To provide good quality surroundings for all	+/?		<p>This option will have a significantly positive effect on this objective as it helps to clearly set out how a development will affect people and be used by people. It will cover its design and how that affects its wider environment written in a clear way to justify the proposal to help those affected by the proposal to comment. Going through such a process should help to improve design considerations thereby enhancing the quality of landscapes and townscapes.</p> <p>A question is raised by the appraisal as this is quite a detailed policy which might sit better in the Development Management DPD.</p>
20. To reduce crime and the fear of crime	0		This policy option will not have a significant effect on this objective.

Objective	+ve/-ve effects	Perm/Temp/Sec	Commentary
	1		
21. To improve accessibility for all to services and facilities	+/?		<p>This option will have a significantly positive effect on this objective as it helps to clearly set out how a development will affect people and be used by people. It will cover its design and how that affects its wider environment written in a clear way to justify the proposal to help those affected by the proposal to comment. Going through such a process should help to improve design considerations thereby enhancing the quality of landscapes and townscapes.</p> <p>A question is raised by the appraisal as this is quite a detailed policy which might sit better in the Development Management DPD.</p>
22. To encourage a sense of community; identity and welfare	0		This policy option will not have a significant effect on this objective.

11.3 Policy CS 4 – Promoting Barnet's town centres

11.3.1 The following alternative options were identified for this policy

1. Allow further shopping and commercial town centre related development to meet projected demand in any town centre in Barnet
2. Allow further shopping and commercial town centre related development to meet projected demand in existing out of centre retail parks in Barnet
3. Allow retail expenditure to go outside Barnet
4. Allow substantial mixed-use development in all town centres

Objective	+ve/-ve	Perm/Temp/Sec	Commentary
-----------	---------	---------------	------------

	1	2	3	4	
1. To encourage sustained economic growth and promote economic prosperity	- ?	-	- -	-?	The impact of option 2 and 3 is clear. Allowing out of centre retail parks to grow will have a negative effect on the existing town centres as will allowing retail trade to go to centres outside the borough. However options 1 and 4 are not so clear cut, spreading investment across all the town centres could lead to growth in some of the smaller centres at the expense of the larger ones, equally allowing mixed use development to increase could lead to an over representation detracting from a town centres predominantly retail function. So overall the result is probably negative but could be positive for some centres.
2. To offer everybody the opportunity for rewarding and satisfying employment	-?	-	--	-?	As for objective 1 above. Ensuring healthy town centres will ensure continued employment in these locations and this sector provides a not insignificant proportion of the jobs in Barnet.
3. To encourage and accommodate both indigenous and inward investment	+/-	-?	--	+/-	The impact of options 2 and 3 is clear as it would reduce the amount of inward investment in the borough. Although 2 would allow some but only concentrated in two locations in the borough. Options 1 and 4 are not so clear cut as there would be inward investment but it would be spread across the borough and potentially not targeted enough to optimise its effect which is why the effect could be positive or negative.
4. To reduce disparities in economic performance and promote regeneration	+/-	-?	--	+/-	As for objective 3 above. Spreading investment in town centres throughout the borough could reduce the regenerative benefits of that investment if it is spread too thin.
5. To reduce the effect of traffic on the environment	+/-	--	--	+/-	Options 2 and 3 would lead to increased journeys by car either to the retail parks or to town centres outside the borough. The effects of Options 1 and 4 is hard to determine as it is not certain which centres would attract the investment. If its those with less public transport then the result would be negative and vice versa if it's the more accessible centres.
6. To maintain and enhance the quality of landscapes, townscapes and local distinctiveness	?-	--	--	-	The effects would be negative for each option. Option 1 could lead to impacts on the smaller town centres from overdevelopment at the expense of larger town centres. Option 2 would allow development in areas of little quality at the expense of larger town centres. Option 3 would allow investment to go to other boroughs reducing the ability to enhance existing centres in Barnet. Finally option 4 could have a

Objective	+ve/-ve effects				Perm/Temp/Sec	Commentary
	1	2	3	4		
						negative effect on centres across Barnet from development of an inappropriate scale.
7. To conserve and enhance the borough's existing biodiversity and seek to increase where possible	0	0	0	0		These policies have no impact on this objective
8. To reduce the risk of flooding for people and property	?	0	0	?		It would depend on which town centres were in areas at risk from flooding. Inappropriate development in town centres is likely to have a negative effect given the potential scale.
9. To improve air quality	+/-	--	--	+/-		As above for response to objective 5.
10. To conserve and where appropriate enhance the historic environment and cultural assets	-/+	-	-	-		It is likely that all the options would have a negative effect on the historic environment. It is not clear for option 1 as it would depend which town centres attracted the investment but options 2 and 3 would see investment migrate away which would be negative as it would provide little options for enhancement. Option 4 would have a negative impact on the smaller centres although this would depend on the scale of the development.
11. To achieve sustainable management of waste	0	0	0	0	Both short and long term growth in waste from construction and increase in population.	None of the options have any direct impact on this objective. It should be noted that the management of waste could be better controlled if kept to the town centres in the borough.
12. To reduce contributions to climate change and reduce vulnerability to climate change	?	--	-	?		Options 2 and 3 would lead to increased journeys by car either to the retail parks or to town centres outside the borough. The effects of Options 1 and 4 is hard to determine as it is not certain which centres would attract the investment. If its those with less public transport then the result would be negative and vice versa if it's the more accessible centres.

Objective	+ve/-ve effects				Perm/Temp/Sec	Commentary
	1	2	3	4		
13. To increase energy efficiency and the proportion of energy generated from renewable sources	-	-?	-	+		Spreading investment across all town centres could lead to less opportunities for the introduction of decentralised heating systems as larger town centres are likely to support this better than others because of the wider mix of uses. Conversely introducing mixed use development into the smaller town centres may provide the opportunity in these locations. Allowing retail sales to leave the borough will reduce any opportunity for introducing energy in the first place and out of centre locations may not provide a wide enough mix of uses although this is not necessarily a problem.
14. To encourage sustainable use of land	-	-	--	+	Long term implications if low quality design.	Allowing retail growth to spread across the borough could impact the larger centres who are in competition with equivalent sized centres in neighbouring boroughs. This may result in them being unable to attract the right schemes because they are going to the smaller centres for various reasons. This could lead to stagnation of the larger town centres with vacant units. Equally allowing growth to the out of centre retail centres could have the same effect. Allowing growth to migrate to neighbouring centres would have the most significant negative effect on all centres in the borough. However encouraging mixed use development in the smaller town centres could be positive provided the scale was in keeping.
15. To achieve sustainable water resources management	O?	O?	O	O?		Growth will impact on the demands for water use through the increase in the boroughs population which will require mitigation measures.
16. To improve the Health of Barnet's population	?	-	-	+	LT	A large number of people currently walk to their town centre in the borough therefore any policy that reduces the attractiveness of any town centre in the borough is likely to encourage people to drive more. The out of centre option in particular. In the long term the cross borough retail growth option could have negative effects on all town centres reducing individual attractiveness of certain centres. The only positive could be the mixed use option as this could lead to the introduction of more health related uses in town centres.

Objective	+ve/-ve effects				Perm/Temp/Sec	Commentary
	1	2	3	4		
17. To improve the education and skills of the population	O?	-?	- ?	+		As above the mixed use option might lead to greater opportunities for educational uses in town centres. The out of centre and extra borough retail migration policy will have a negative effect as they will reduce any opportunities for education and in particular skills training to a minimum.
18. To provide Barnet's population with the opportunity to live in a decent affordable home	O	O	O	O		None of the policy options will have an effect on this objective.
19. To provide good quality surroundings for all	+?	-	-	?		Spreading retail growth across the borough will provide the opportunity to improve the quality of design in town centres but this it could spread investment too thinly to realise any comprehensive solutions in a particular town centre. Allowing growth to go to out of centre locations which lack historic character will not help to improve surroundings likewise allowing investment out of the borough. Allowing mixed use development in town centres particularly the smaller ones could have an impact on their character.
20. To reduce crime and the fear of crime	+	-	-	+		Both the options where development will occur in the town centres will help to introduce measures which help to reduce the fear of crime.
21. To improve accessibility for all to services and facilities	+	-	-	+		Allowing growth across the borough while questionable in terms of spreading investment will maintain these centres whereas allowing out of centres to grow and allowing investment out of the borough will lead to a degradation of existing centres thereby reducing services locally.
22. To encourage a sense of community; identity and welfare	+ ?	-	-	+?		Obviously the options which could lead to a decline in local centres will be detrimental to each community which identifies with a certain centre. The other two options are questioned as they may not help to support the town centres in the best possible way.

11.4 Policy CS 5 – Enhancing and Protecting Barnet's open spaces

11.4.1 This policy relates to maintaining and enhancing the quality of the open spaces, playspace provision and greenspace environment. We consider that there are no reasonable alternatives to this option.

11.5 Policy CS 6 –Promoting a strong and prosperous Barnet

11.5.1 The following alternative options were identified for this policy:

1. **Allow the redevelopment of employment sites when mixed use development is proposed incorporating residential uses and replacement employment use**
2. **Allow the redevelopment of existing employment sites only if there is no proven need for other priority commercial uses**
3. **Identify specific locations (in addition to existing ones) for further and higher education facilities in Barnet**

Objective	+ve/-ve effects			Perm/Temp/ Sec	Commentary
	1	2	3		
1. To encourage sustained economic growth and promote economic prosperity	+?	?-	○		<p>Allowing mixed use intensification of employment sites could have a positive impact as it would re-provide employment space. It is assumed that this would improve and modernise the employment space which would increase the rental cost of the space. Question is raised as care would be needed to ensure that there is no conflict between the employment space and residential uses. Equally it is questioned whether the variety of employment spaces will be retained.</p> <p>Providing reliable evidence of need when other uses land uses have a higher land value has been questioned in the past which is why it is questioned here. This could lead to unnecessary loss in employment space which cannot be regained once it has been converted.</p> <p>Specific locations for education are not relevant to this objective.</p>
2. To offer everybody the opportunity for rewarding and satisfying employment	+	?-	○		<p>Allowing mixed use intensification of employment sites should provide a variety of new employment sites which could provide greater opportunity for people with jobs.</p> <p>Allowing redevelopment of employment sites where need is proven to be lacking is considered risky as undoubtedly some viable employment sites will be lost.</p> <p>Specific locations for education are not relevant to this objective.</p>

Objective	+ve/-ve effects			Perm/Temp/Sec	Commentary
	1	2	3		
3. To encourage and accommodate both indigenous and inward investment	+	+	+		All the options are positive. Allowing mixed use led redevelopment will probably be the most positive in encouraging inward investment.
4. To reduce disparities in economic performance and promote regeneration	+/-	-?	0		<p>It is not clear whether allowing mixed use development would provide the right sort of employment accommodation. Mixing uses could reduce the ability for sites to deliver flexible accommodation for employment purposes.</p> <p>Allowing loss of employment space where there is no proven need is likely to hit those locations where need is more marginal. This could increase disparities in the economic performance of the borough making regeneration harder in those areas which need to protect their employment use the most.</p> <p>If the specific locations identified for education facilities are located in areas in need for regeneration this could help to reduce economic disparities by providing a centre for further education and training which could encourage young people into work.</p>
5. To reduce the effect of traffic on the environment	+	?	?		<p>Allowing mixed use development that provides employment on site will provide people with a greater opportunity to travel less.</p> <p>Allowing loss of employment space where there is no proven need could lead to a loss of employment spaces in accessible locations if this is not a consideration.</p> <p>Specific locations for new education facilities will need to consider their accessibility to public transport.</p>
6. To maintain and enhance the quality of landscapes, townscapes and local distinctiveness	+?	+?	?		<p>Allowing mixed use development that provides employment on site could provide the opportunity to improve the quality of townscape in these locations.</p> <p>Equally allowing loss of employment space could also provide the opportunity to improve the quality of townscape if the sites are in these locations although it would seem more likely that the more marginal sites would be out of centre.</p> <p>It would depend on where the new further educational facilities are as access is not determined.</p>

Objective	+ve/-ve effects			Perm/Temp/Sec	Commentary
	1	2	3		
7. To conserve and enhance the borough's existing biodiversity and seek to increase where possible	0	0	0		These policies have no impact on this objective
8. To reduce the risk of flooding for people and property	-?	?	?		<p>Generally mixed use development will intensify the amount of surface water run off from a site as it intensifies the land use. This will not always be the case and can be mitigated.</p> <p>Redeveloping employment space may or may not have a negative effect on run off depending on other policy approaches.</p> <p>Again it will depend on where the education use is going to be located.</p>
9. To improve air quality	+	?	?		<p>Allowing mixed use development that provides employment on site will provide people with a greater opportunity to travel less and as road transport has the greatest effect on air quality this could be positive.</p> <p>Allowing loss of employment space where there is no proven need could lead to a loss of employment spaces in accessible locations if this is not made a consideration.</p> <p>Specific locations for new education facilities will need to consider their accessibility to public transport as this could reduce car journeys.</p>
10. To conserve and where appropriate enhance the historic environment and cultural assets	+?	+?	?		<p>Allowing mixed use development that provides employment on site could provide the opportunity to improve the quality of the historic environment in these locations.</p> <p>Allowing loss of employment space could allow the opportunity to enhance the historic environment but only in specific locations.</p> <p>It would depend on where the new further educational facilities are as to whether its within a historic building.</p>
11. To achieve sustainable management of waste	0	0	0		None of the options have any direct impact on this objective.

Objective	+ve/-ve effects			Perm/Temp/Sec	Commentary
	1	2	3		
12. To reduce contributions to climate change and reduce vulnerability to climate change	+	?	?		<p>Allowing mixed use development that provides employment on site will provide people with a greater opportunity to travel less and as road transport has the greatest effect on emissions which contribute to climate change this could be positive. Also mixed use development is best for applying low carbon sources of energy.</p> <p>Allowing loss of employment space where there is no proven need could lead to a loss of employment spaces in accessible locations if this is not made a consideration.</p> <p>Specific locations for new education facilities will need to consider their accessibility to public transport as this could reduce car journeys.</p>
13. To increase energy efficiency and the proportion of energy generated from renewable sources	+	+	?		<p>As above mixed use development provides the greatest opportunity for increasing energy efficiency and applying low carbon sources of energy. This will need to be applied by other policies in the plan.</p> <p>Allowing a loss of employment space provides the opportunity to make a redevelopment more energy efficient.</p>
14. To encourage sustainable use of land	+?	+/-?	0		<p>Redeveloping employment sites for mixed use is a sustainable use of land particularly where it intensifies the land use in more accessible locations. However if it results in the loss of premises that are not easily replaced then it may not be as sustainable.</p> <p>Allowing redevelopment of employment sites where need is proven to be lacking is questioned elsewhere in the appraisal. This would be an unsustainable use for land is lost to another use because it gives the landowner a higher return. In particular if this affects smaller facilities as this is an area identified in the Employment Land Study as needing provision then this would have a negative impact.</p> <p>Specific locations for education are not relevant to this objective.</p>
15. To achieve sustainable water resources management	0	0	0		None of the options have any direct impact on this objective.

Objective	+ve/-ve effects			Perm/Temp/Sec	Commentary
	1	2	3		
16. To improve the Health of Barnet's population	0	0	0		None of the options have any direct impact on this objective.
17. To improve the education and skills of the population	0	0	+		The policy regarding facilities for higher and further education will obviously have a positive impact on this sustainability objective although it should be noted that Middlesex University has now relocated its main campus to Hendon and Barnet College's expansion plans are being advanced through the Colindale AAP.
18. To provide Barnet's population with the opportunity to live in a decent affordable home	0	0	0		None of the policy options will have an effect on this objective.
19. To provide good quality surroundings for all	+	+	?		<p>Allowing mixed use development that provides employment on site could provide the opportunity to improve the quality of parts of the borough particularly as some employment sites can be less attractive.</p> <p>Allowing loss of employment space could allow the opportunity to enhance the quality of the boroughs surroundings.</p> <p>It would depend on where the new further educational facilities are as to whether the surroundings are being improved.</p>
20. To reduce crime and the fear of crime	?	?	0		Both options which lead to redevelopment of employment space could improve the built environment and help to reduce crime and fear of crime.
21. To improve accessibility for all to services and facilities	+?	?	0		<p>The option for promoting mixed use development could make provision for community services although it is not clear whether this would be the case.</p> <p>Allowing redevelopment of employment sites may lead to more services and facilities but its not possible to judge that this would be the case.</p>

Objective	+ve/-ve effects			Perm/Temp/Sec	Commentary
	1	2	3		
22. To encourage a sense of community; identity and welfare	0	0	0		None of the policy options will have an effect on this objective.

11.6 Policy CS 7 – Providing quality homes and housing choice in Barnet

11.6.1 The following alternative options were identified for this policy:

1. Retain the existing approach to affordable housing with a 50% target on sites of 10 units or more
2. Introduce a flexible sliding scale for affordable housing with a 50% target on sites of 25 units or more, and a lower target on sites of 10 to 24 units
3. Review design guidance for extensions to existing housing to reflect greater diversity and specific community and cultural needs of a changing population
4. Seek mixed and balanced communities by delivering affordable housing in areas where that tenure is underrepresented
5. Prioritise new family sized homes outside of the growth areas

Objective	+ve/-ve effects					Perm/Temp/Sec	Commentary
	1	2	3	4	5		
1. To encourage sustained economic growth and promote economic prosperity	0?	0?	0	0?	0		The provision of housing and what type that housing is does not have a direct effect on economic growth. It should be noted that housing is a significant cost for homeowners and providing more affordable housing could help encourage greater economic prosperity which is why it is questioned. The location of that affordable housing is also questioned. It is uncertain whether providing affordable housing in areas where it is already unrepresented will be economic particularly if land values are high in these areas.

Objective	+ve/-ve effects					Perm/Temp/Sec	Commentary
	1	2	3	4	5		
2. To offer everybody the opportunity for rewarding and satisfying employment	0	0	0	0	0		These policies have no significant impact on this objective
3. To encourage and accommodate both indigenous and inward investment	-?	+?	0	-/?	?0		<p>Reducing the requirement to provide affordable housing will encourage further inward investment in the borough because it makes it more attractive to developers to bring forward development as the requirement has a big impact on the profit margin. Maintaining the affordable housing target at 50% will restrict this and would have a negative impact.</p> <p>With regards to the sliding scale option there is evidence to suggest that the boroughs supply of smaller housing schemes has fallen off because of the impact of the 50% affordable housing target. This option could therefore be positive in encouraging more investment. However setting the threshold at 25 units should be questioned as an arbitrary cut off point.</p> <p>Its unlikely that changing guidance in relation to extensions will have a significant effect on investment in the borough.</p> <p>The location of affordable housing is questioned. It is uncertain whether providing affordable housing in areas where it is already unrepresented will be economic particularly if land values are high in these areas. Work on viability will help to clarify this.</p> <p>Encouraging family sized homes outside of the growth areas may not be meeting needs because of the high amount of family homes already found in these locations. The sub regional SHMA will provide further evidence on this.</p>
4. To reduce disparities in economic performance and promote regeneration	+	+	0	-/?	0		As above reducing the requirement to provide affordable housing will encourage further inward investment in the borough because it makes it more attractive to developers to bring forward development as the requirement has a big impact on the profit margin. This would encourage regeneration. The same applies for the sliding scale option. However encouraging the provision of affordable housing outside the regeneration areas could have a negative effect but only if it is profitable to do so.
5. To reduce the effect of traffic on	0	0	0	0	0		These policies have no significant impact on this objective

Objective	+ve/-ve effects					Perm/Temp/Sec	Commentary
	1	2	3	4	5		
the environment							
6. To maintain and enhance the quality of landscapes, townscapes and local distinctiveness	0	0	0	0	0		Policy for affordable housing targets will not have a significant effect on the quality of the landscape. Requiring relevant standards to be set out in Design and Access Statements will help to maintain and enhance the borough however it will depend on other policies for application. More specifically it relates to policy implementation and is therefore a matter for the Development Management DPD.
7. To conserve and enhance the borough's existing biodiversity and seek to increase where possible	0	0	0	0	0		These policies have no significant impact on this objective
8. To reduce the risk of flooding for people and property	0	0	0	0	0		These policies have no significant impact on this objective
9. To improve air quality	0	0	0	0	0		These policies have no significant impact on this objective
10. To conserve and where appropriate enhance the historic environment and cultural assets	0	0	0	0	0		These policies have no significant impact on this objective
11. To achieve sustainable management of waste	0	0	0	0	0		These policies have no significant impact on this objective
12. To reduce contributions to climate change and reduce vulnerability to climate change	0	0	0	0	0		These policies have no significant impact on this objective

Objective	+ve/-ve effects					Perm/Temp/Sec	Commentary
	1	2	3	4	5		
13. To increase energy efficiency and the proportion of energy generated from renewable sources	0	0	0	0	0		These policies have no significant impact on this objective
14. To encourage sustainable use of land	0	0	0	0	0		These policies have no impact on this objective. Ensuring the right amount of affordable housing is achieved is a sustainable use of land wherever the location.
15. To achieve sustainable water resources management	0	0	0	0	0		These policies have no significant impact on this objective
16. To improve the Health of Barnet's population	0	0	0	0	0		These policies have no significant impact on this objective. The quality of the affordable housing will have an impact on health.
17. To improve the education and skills of the population	0	0	0	0	0		These policies have no significant impact on this objective
18. To provide Barnet's population with the opportunity to live in a decent affordable home	+	?-	0	+/- ?	-		Reducing the amount of affordable housing provided reduces the ability to provide those in need in Barnet's population with an home. Evidence of need shows that we cannot build enough homes to meet the need so therefore we have to try and maximise the amount of affordable housing provided on site. Maintaining the 50% target increases the ability to do this even if not every site achieves the target. The introduction of a sliding scale has the opposite effect as it will reduce the amount overall although that may be debatable if it discourages housing development from coming forward in the first place. The location of affordable housing is questioned and could be positive or negative. It is uncertain whether providing affordable housing in areas where it is already unrepresented will be economic particularly if land values are high in these locations therefore you could end up with less affordable housing overall. Work on viability will help to clarify this. Prioritising family sized homes has a similar effect as it could reduce the overall amount of housing delivery and would not be meeting a potential need for smaller homes. The sub regional SHMA will provide further evidence on need.
19. To provide good quality surroundings	0	0	0	0	0		These policies have no impact on this objective

Objective	+ve/-ve effects					Perm/Temp/Sec	Commentary
	1	2	3	4	5		
for all							
20. To reduce crime and the fear of crime	0	0	0	0	0		These policies have no significant impact on this objective
21. To improve accessibility for all to services and facilities	0	0	0	0	0		These policies have no significant impact on this objective
22. To encourage a sense of community; identity and welfare	0	0	0	0	0		These policies have no significant impact on this objective

11.7 Policy CS 8 – Providing integrated and efficient travel

11.7.1 The following alternative options were identified for this policy:

- **Restrict ability to travel in ways that make non public transport usage less attractive**

Objective	+ve/-ve effects	Perm/Temp/Sec	Commentary
1. To encourage sustained economic growth and promote economic prosperity	?	Possible LT congestion issues	In principle restricting travel by private vehicle could have a negative impact on the economic growth as it could reduce the ability of people to make choices about how they commuted. This could lead to employers having to move out of the borough if they could not attract the right employees because they could not travel how they wanted eg from restricting office parking spaces to just disabled only. It should be noted though that not restricting car use could have a detrimental effect if it grows beyond the capacity of the roads which could eventually lead to severe congestion if alternatives are not in place. The extent of the effect would of course depend on the levels of restrictions imposed on non public transport use which are not set out which is why the impact it is questioned.
2. To offer everybody the opportunity for rewarding and satisfying employment	- 0		As above this policy will not have a significant impact on this objective although it should be noted that if it discourages employers from locating in the borough then it could reduce the overall amount of employment on offer.
3. To encourage and accommodate both indigenous and inward investment	-?		As above restricting travel by private vehicle could have a negative impact on the economic growth as it could reduce the ability of people to make choices about how they commuted. This could lead to employers relocating out of the borough if their level of private car parking was restricted. This does depend on how much neighbouring boroughs are restricting office car parking though.
4. To reduce disparities in economic performance and promote regeneration	-		As above this would depend on where and how the restrictions were applied as it could be utilised to encourage regeneration in parts of the borough that need it.
5. To reduce the effect of traffic on the environment	+		Restricting non public transport uses would be very beneficial to reducing the effect of traffic on the environment as it should reduce the number of vehicle miles driven. It would reduce air pollution, climate change emissions and noise impacts.

Objective	+ve/-ve effects	Perm/Temp/Sec	Commentary
6. To maintain and enhance the quality of landscapes, townscapes and local distinctiveness	O/?		This policy would not have a significant impact on this objective although if the impact of the car on the urban environment can be reduced then this would enhance the quality of the boroughs townscape.
7. To conserve and enhance the borough's existing biodiversity and seek to increase where possible	O		This policy would have no impact on this objective.
8. To reduce the risk of flooding for people and property	O		This policy would have no impact on this objective.
9. To improve air quality	+		Restricting non public transport uses would be very beneficial to reducing the effect of traffic on the environment as it should reduce the number of vehicle miles driven. This would obviously reduce air pollution.
10. To conserve and where appropriate enhance the historic environment and cultural assets	O		This policy would have no impact on this objective.
11. To achieve sustainable management of waste	O		This policy would have no impact on this objective.
12. To reduce contributions to climate change and reduce vulnerability to climate change	+		Restricting non public transport uses would be very beneficial to reducing the effect of traffic on the environment as it should reduce the number of vehicle miles driven. This would obviously reduce air pollution.
13. To increase energy efficiency and the proportion of energy generated from renewable sources	O		This policy would have no impact on this objective.
14. To encourage sustainable use of land	O		This policy would have no impact on this objective.
15. To achieve sustainable water resources management	O		This policy would have no impact on this objective.
16. To improve the Health of Barnet's population	O		This policy would have no impact on this objective.
17. To improve the education and skills of the population	O		This policy would have no impact on this objective.

Objective	+ve/-ve effects	Perm/Temp/Sec	Commentary
18. To provide Barnet's population with the opportunity to live in a decent affordable home	0		This policy would have no impact on this objective.
19. To provide good quality surroundings for all	0		This policy would have no impact on this objective.
20. To reduce crime and the fear of crime	0		This policy would have no impact on this objective.
21. To improve accessibility for all to services and facilities	-?		This policy could have a negative effect on the ability of people to access services if access to non public transport were to be restricted. Public transport in a large outer London borough like Barnet does not adequately cover the whole of the borough therefore the private car is necessary in parts to access services. Restricting peoples parking at the services in question or as part of residential developments could restrict peoples ability to access them. Whether sufficient restrictions could be implemented to do this is questionable and certain services could always be excepted such as GPs surgeries.
22. To encourage a sense of community; identity and welfare	0		This policy would have no impact on this objective.

11.8 Policy CS 9 – Enabling integrated community facilities and users

11.8.1 The following alternative options were identified for this policy:

- **Protect existing community facilities (including sport, leisure and recreation) where fully utilised, from displacement by development, ensuring re-provision of facilities**

Objective	+ve/-ve effects	Perm/Temp/Sec	Commentary
1. To encourage sustained economic growth and promote economic prosperity	?	Possible LT congestion issues	This option could encourage economic development by developing under used community facilities but whether this would be on a scale great enough to sustain economic growth is not clear.

Objective	+ve/-ve effects	Perm/Temp/Sec	Commentary
2. To offer everybody the opportunity for rewarding and satisfying employment	0		This policy would have no impact on this objective.
3. To encourage and accommodate both indigenous and inward investment	+		This policy could encourage investment in the borough by providing land for development where community uses are not used to their full potential.
4. To reduce disparities in economic performance and promote regeneration	+/-		Allowing under used community facilities to be developed could help to promote regeneration but could also increase disparities as they can perform a function even when underutilised so their loss could also increase disparities.
5. To reduce the effect of traffic on the environment	?/-		Allowing under used community facilities to be lost could increase the distances that people have to drive thereby increasing the effects of traffic on the environment. However this would depend in the location of the community facility so this is not always be the case if it is in a more accessible public transport location.
6. To maintain and enhance the quality of landscapes, townscapes and local distinctiveness	?/-		It would depend on what replaces the community facilities as there could be effect on the environment
7. To conserve and enhance the borough's existing biodiversity and seek to increase where possible	0		This policy would have no impact on this objective.
8. To reduce the risk of flooding for people and property	0		This policy would have no impact on this objective.
9. To improve air quality	?/-		Allowing under used community facilities to be lost could increase the distances that people have to drive thereby increasing the effects of traffic on the environment and in particular air quality. However this would depend in the location of the community facility so this is not always be the case if it is in a more accessible public transport location.
10. To conserve and where appropriate enhance the historic environment and cultural assets	0		This policy would have no impact on this objective.
11. To achieve sustainable management of waste	0		This policy would have no impact on this objective.

Objective	+ve/-ve effects	Perm/Temp/Sec	Commentary
12. To reduce contributions to climate change and reduce vulnerability to climate change	-/?		Allowing under used community facilities to be lost could increase the distances that people have to drive thereby increasing the effects of traffic on the environment and in particular emissions which contribute to climate change. However this would depend in the location of the community facility so this is not always be the case if it is in a more accessible public transport location.
13. To increase energy efficiency and the proportion of energy generated from renewable sources	0		This policy would have no impact on this objective.
14. To encourage sustainable use of land	+		This option could be positive for the sustainable use of land where community uses are underused and will be positive.
15. To achieve sustainable water resources management	0		This policy would have no impact on this objective.
16. To improve the Health of Barnet's population	-/?		It would depend on whether the underused community facilities were health related or provided a health benefit such as space for keep fit classes for instance. Most community halls for instance provide space for such a service so it could be detrimental in that instance.
17. To improve the education and skills of the population	-/?		As above it would depend on whether the underused community facilities were related to providing an educational element such as night classes.
18. To provide Barnet's population with the opportunity to live in a decent affordable home	0		This policy would have no impact on this objective.
19. To provide good quality surroundings for all	0		This policy would have no impact on this objective.
20. To reduce crime and the fear of crime	0		This policy would have no impact on this objective.
21. To improve accessibility for all to services and facilities	--		This policy has the most significant effect on this objective as it will impact the amount of community space in the borough by removing those facilities that are not fully utilised. This will reduce access to services and facilities potentially across the borough.
22. To encourage a sense of community; identity and welfare	-		This policy could potentially remove a number of community facilities which would have an impact on the sense of community that can be developed by such facilities.

11.9 Policy CS10: Improving health and well being in Barnet.

11.9.1 This policy focuses on improving supporting NHS Barnet, supporting healthier neighbourhoods and ensuring that residential care homes are not over supplied. We consider that there are no reasonable alternatives to this option.

11.10 Policy CS11: Making Barnet a safer place

11.10.1 This policy focuses on working with the Metropolitan Police to provide remodelling of its estate and ensuring appropriate design principles are incorporated transport, town centres and public areas. We consider that there are no reasonable alternatives to this option.

11.11 Policy CS12: Ensuring the efficient use of natural resources

11.11.1 The following alternative options were identified for this policy:

- **Climate change should be the overriding principle for new development**

Objective	+ve/-ve effects	Perm/Temp/Sec	Commentary
1. To encourage sustained economic growth and promote economic prosperity	-		Ensuring climate change were the overriding principle would have a significant impact on the development of new employment, retail, community and residential development. Ensuring significant energy efficiency and generation from renewable energy would have significant cost implications. Achieving zero carbon status in non residential for example is expensive because it takes into account un regulated emissions which are hard to mitigate. For example a modern office has a high electrical energy demand or another example would be a restaurant. This is why PPS1 supplement requires viability to be a consideration. Therefore Barnet would require an evidence base to go further than current standards.
2. To offer everybody the opportunity for rewarding and satisfying employment	-		As above if Barnet were to include more stringent carbon reduction targets then it could discourage development of employment schemes which could have a detrimental effect on the number of jobs created in the borough.
3. To encourage and accommodate both indigenous and inward investment	-		As above more stringent carbon targets in the borough would discourage development in the borough and it would migrate to neighbouring boroughs where targets were less punitive.
4. To reduce disparities in economic performance and promote regeneration	-		As above if there were punitive climate change emissions targets then it would reduce the opportunities for regeneration in parts of the borough which could increase economic disparities.

Objective	+ve/-ve effects	Perm/Temp/Sec	Commentary
5. To reduce the effect of traffic on the environment	?/+		Presumably if climate change were the overriding consideration then transport use would have to be curbed with car parking restrictions introduced for new development. Although this would encroach on other policy in the plan so it is questioned.
6. To maintain and enhance the quality of landscapes, townscapes and local distinctiveness	O/?	LT	This policy would have no impact on this objective although in the long term it could have an effect if investment in the town centres diminishes.
7. To conserve and enhance the borough's existing biodiversity and seek to increase where possible	+		A policy that dealt with climate change would increase the protection for all green spaces across the borough which would have a significant positive effect on protecting and enhancing the boroughs biodiversity.
8. To reduce the risk of flooding for people and property	+		Presumably as part of responding to climate change adapting to the effects of climate change would also be important. Therefore reducing the amount of flood risk in the borough would be an important policy consideration.
9. To improve air quality	?/+		Presumably if climate change were the overriding consideration then transport use would have to be curbed with car parking restrictions introduced for new development. This would contribute to improving air quality. Although this would encroach on other policy in the plan so it is questioned.
10. To conserve and where appropriate enhance the historic environment and cultural assets	O/?		This policy would have no impact on this objective although in the long term it could have an effect if investment in the town centres diminishes.
11. To achieve sustainable management of waste	+		As part of making climate change the overriding principle of the plan working towards the sustainable management of waste would be a key feature with the possibility of innovative collection technologies such as the envac vacuum system required for installation.
12. To reduce contributions to climate change and reduce vulnerability to climate change	++		This policy would have the most significant effect on this objective as it would be maximising reductions in carbon emissions. It would also be aiming to tackle adapting to climate change too.
13. To increase energy efficiency and the proportion of energy generated from renewable sources	++		As above this policy would have the greatest impact on this objective as it would aim to maximise the contribution from renewable energy in developments although it should be noted that increasing energy efficiency of dwellings (up to a point) is a more economic way of reducing emissions.

Objective	+ve/-ve effects	Perm/Temp/Sec	Commentary
14. To encourage sustainable use of land	?		Because such a policy could have a detrimental effect on the level of development activity in the borough it could have an impact on the use of land. Development that involves a more intensive use of capital which involves a complicated mix of uses for example would be reduced. As already noted in the appraisal it could also reduce the amount of regeneration coming forward.
15. To achieve sustainable water resources management	+		As part of a comprehensive approach to climate change consideration would have to be given to the management of water. Rainwater harvesting and grey water recycling would be required to aim for the sustainable use of water resources.
16. To improve the Health of Barnet's population	+/?		Reducing emissions through reducing the amount of road traffic would have an impact as it would help to reduce emissions in the area which have an impact on peoples health. However it is questioned as there maybe an overall reduction in development which could reduce the contributions to health care facilities for example and other benefits such as improvements to open spaces.
17. To improve the education and skills of the population	-/?		As above it would depend on what the impact was on the overall levels of development was as these would be making a contribution to skills levels in the borough either through financial contributions to facilities or training schemes.
18. To provide Barnet's population with the opportunity to live in a decent affordable home	-		Unless this policy was tested to ensure it was viable it could have an impact on the level of housing growth in the borough as development would be likely to go to neighbouring boroughs. This would reduce the amount of affordable housing coming forward in the borough.
19. To provide good quality surroundings for all	-	LT	This policy could have an impact on this objective if the level of investment in development in the borough declines which could lead to a slow degradation in the boroughs urban and particularly suburban environment.
20. To reduce crime and the fear of crime	?		Lack of investment in the wider borough in particular in the town centres could have an impact on ability to introduce design solutions which help to reduce crime and the fear of crime.
21. To improve accessibility for all to services and facilities	-	LT	Because of the financial implications of such a policy there maybe an overall reduction in development which could reduce the contributions to facilities and services that residents need. This could have a significant negative social impact in the long term.
22. To encourage a sense of community; identity and welfare	-	LT	As above as the environment of the borough gets degraded over time through a lack of investment it could also start to have a significant negative impact on the sense of community that the borough currently has.

11.12.1 The table below sets out a summary of the conclusions of the Sustainability Appraisal of the alternative options.

Alternative policy	Summary of appraisal
<p>CS 1 / CS 2: Allow growth to take place across all parts of Barnet</p>	<p>In the short term there would be a boost to the local economy as investment flowed into the borough but over time this could reduce as the initial attractions for that investment were diminished. Barnet's suburban character would be impacted through over development which is one of the features that makes it an attractive place to live in the first place. Improving infrastructure may be harder as it would be less focused and more spread across the borough than just concentrating on the growth areas. Also cross borough growth would increase congestion as it would not be the most accessible locations and people would have to drive more. This is one of the most significant effects of this alternative dispersed growth policy and would lead to greater congestion, air pollution and contributions to climate change. Growth will lead to an increase in contributions to climate change as more people increase energy demands in dwellings and on the transport system. Finally development would naturally be attracted to the easier sites leaving the areas that need regeneration and employment growth could also take place in locations that would impact on existing employment clusters thereby increasing economic disparity.</p>
<p>CS 4: Allow further shopping and commercial town centre related development to meet projected demand in any town centre in Barnet OR Allow further shopping and commercial town centre related development to meet projected demand in existing out of centre retail parks in Barnet OR Allow retail expenditure to go outside Barnet OR Allow substantial mixed-use development in all town centres</p>	<p>Allowing retail growth to spread across the borough could impact the larger centres who are in competition with equivalent sized centres in neighbouring boroughs. This may result in them being unable to attract the right schemes because they are going to the smaller centres for various reasons eg land values are less. This could lead to stagnation of the larger town centres with vacant units. Equally allowing growth to the out of centre retail centres could have the same effect. Allowing growth to migrate to neighbouring centres out of the borough would have the most significant negative effect on all centres in the borough. However encouraging mixed use development in the smaller town centres could be positive provided the scale was in keeping.</p> <p>A large number of people currently walk to their town centre in the borough therefore any policy that reduces the attractiveness of any town centre in the borough is likely to encourage people to drive more. The out of centre option in particular. In the long term the cross borough retail growth option could have negative effects on all town centres reducing individual attractiveness of certain centres. The only positive could be the mixed use option as this could lead to the introduction of more community related uses in town centres.</p>

<p>CS 6 Allow the redevelopment of employment sites when mixed use development is proposed incorporating residential uses and replacement employment use OR Allow the redevelopment of existing employment sites only if there is no proven need for other priority commercial uses</p>	<p>It is not clear whether allowing mixed use development would provide the right sort of employment accommodation. Mixing uses could reduce the ability for sites to deliver flexible accommodation for employment purposes. Equally allowing loss of employment space where there is no proven need is likely to hit those locations where need is more marginal. This could increase disparities in the economic performance of the borough making regeneration harder in those areas which need to protect their employment use the most. However allowing mixed use development that provides employment on site will provide people with a greater opportunity to travel less and as road transport has the greatest effect on air quality this could be positive.</p>
<p>CS 7: Introduce a flexible sliding scale for affordable housing with a 50% target on sites of 25 units or more, and a lower target on sites of 10 to 24 units OR Retain the existing approach to affordable housing with a 50% target on sites of 10 units or more</p> <p>Seek mixed and balanced communities by delivering affordable housing in areas where that tenure is underrepresented</p> <p>Prioritise new family sized homes outside of the growth areas</p>	<p>Reducing the amount of affordable housing provided reduces the ability to provide those in need in Barnet's population with a home. Evidence of need shows that we cannot build enough homes to meet the need so therefore we have to try and maximise the amount of affordable housing provided on site. Maintaining the 50% target increases the ability to do this even if not every site achieves the target. The introduction of a sliding scale has the opposite effect as it will reduce the amount overall although that may be debatable if it discourages housing development from coming forward in the first place. However rigidly applying this to every site will restrict this and have a negative impact.</p> <p>With regards to the sliding scale option there is evidence to suggest that the boroughs supply of smaller housing schemes has fallen off because of the impact of the 50% affordable housing target. This option could therefore be positive in encouraging more investment. However setting the threshold at 25 units should be questioned as an arbitrary cut off point.</p> <p>The location of affordable housing is questioned and could be positive or negative. It is uncertain whether providing affordable housing in areas where it is already unrepresented will be economic particularly if land values are high in these locations therefore you could end up with less affordable housing delivered overall. Work on viability will help to clarify this. Prioritising family sized homes has a similar effect as it could reduce the overall amount of housing delivery. Evidence work on the sub regional SHMA and affordable housing viability will inform this further.</p>
<p>CS 8 Restrict ability to travel in ways that make non public transport usage less attractive</p>	<p>In principle restricting travel by private vehicle could have a negative impact on the economic growth and access to services. It could reduce the ability of people to make choices about how they commuted and travelled. This would make the borough less attractive to employers. Public transport in a large outer London borough like Barnet does not adequately cover the whole borough therefore the private car is necessary in parts to access various community services. There are obvious environmental benefits. But it should be noted that there could be detrimental effects in the long term if congestion grows beyond the capacity of the roads if alternatives are not in place.</p>
<p>CS9: Protect existing community facilities (including sport, leisure and recreation) where fully utilised, from displacement by development, ensuring re-provision of facilities</p>	<p>Allowing under used community facilities to be lost could increase the distances that people have to drive thereby increasing the effects of traffic on the environment and in particular air quality. Ensuring sufficient coverage is important as allowing community uses to be lost to higher land value uses because they are not fully utilised could leave gaps in provision which would have social and</p>

	economic impacts as services and jobs would be lost.
CS12: Climate change should be the overriding principle for new development	If more stringent carbon reduction targets were implemented then it could discourage development of employment schemes which could have a detrimental effect on the number of jobs created in the borough. The same applies for the delivery of housing which could also be constrained leading to less affordable housing and associated infrastructure benefits. There would be obvious benefits to the environment though but a more balanced approach could bring wider benefits.

12. Plan policies

The appraisal of the policies in the Direction of Travel, any proposed mitigation measures considered and the uncertainties and risks

- 12.1.1 We are only required to assess the likely significant effects of the plan, not all possible effects. Annex II of the SEA Directive sets out general criteria of significance. Statutory consultees and other stakeholders involved in scoping will have informed views on the significance of potential effects.
- 12.1.2 Ultimately, the significance of an effect is a matter of judgment and should require no more than a clear and reasonable justification. Guidance encourages us not to treat effects as significant just in order to forestall any possible criticism. The appraisal has been carried out with these points in mind.
- 12.1.3 The section is set out as follows:
- Policy text from the Direction of Travel, this copies the policy from the Core Strategy
 - A summary of the relevant commentary of the Issues and Options sustainability appraisal 2008 ('the commentary'), this sets out the main recommendations from the commentary and how they were taken on board
 - Important issues emerging from the appraisal for each policy, this will summarise the most important points from the appraisal matrix
- 12.1.4 The following symbols were used in the appraisal:

Symbol	Significance
++	A very positive effect
+	A positive effect
+? -?	An uncertain positive or negative effect
?	Uncertain effect or lack of information to predict the effect
-	A negative effect
--	A very negative effect

12.1.5 Policies CS1 and CS2 will be appraised together given their similar emphasis.

Policy CS1– Barnet's Place Shaping Strategy – Protection, Enhancement and Growth – The Three Strands Approach

A

Barnet's place shaping strategy is to concentrate housing growth in well located areas that provide opportunities for growth, creating a sustainable quality environment that will have positive economic impacts on the deprived neighbourhoods that surround them. The key diagram sets out the areas where we expect housing growth and illustrates the need to provide more orbital public transport links between such areas.

The Council, along with its partners, will focus major housing and economic growth in the most suitable locations and manage it to ensure that we deliver sustainable development, while continuing to conserve and enhance the distinctiveness of Barnet as a place to live work and visit.

As our focus of housing and employment growth we will promote opportunities on the west side of the borough in the strategically identified North West London – Luton Coordination Corridor. We will promote the following **growth** areas in the west of the Borough

- Brent Cross – Cricklewood
- Colindale
- Mill Hill East

Major **growth** will be complimented by **Protection** of

- Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land that covers over one third of Barnet,

Enhancement of

- our six largest town centres (Chipping Barnet, Edgware, Finchley Central, New Barnet, North Finchley and Whetstone) where we will promote mixed use development in accordance with the place making policies set out within the Core Strategy and
- the historic suburban environment comprising 18 conservation areas and areas of special locally distinctive character.

Policy CS 2 - Distribution of Growth in Meeting Housing Aspirations On the basis of our Three Strands Approach we expect that in the range of 28,000 new homes will be provided within the lifetime of this Core Strategy 2011/12 to 2026/27	
A	<p>As our focus of growth we will promote opportunities on the west side of the borough in the strategically identified North West London – Luton Coordination Corridor. We will promote the following growth areas in the Corridor</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Brent Cross - Cricklewood - 7,500 new homes • Colindale - 10,000 new homes • Mill Hill East - 2,000 new homes
B	<p>We will also promote the following sustainable locations with good access to public transport as the main focus of enhancement and major infill housing development :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Through a programme of town centre strategies we will develop frameworks for the town centres of Chipping Barnet, Edgware, Finchley Central, New Barnet, North Finchley and Whetstone which will provide for residential uses above ground floor level, • North London Business Park and Oakleigh Road South - develop 400 new homes by 2019/20 as part of a mixed use development in accordance with adopted Planning Brief of June 2006 • major transport routes including the A5 (Edgware Road - Burnt Oak Broadway), A1000 (Great North Road - High Road), A504 (Hendon Lane - Finchley Lane), A598 (Finchley Road) and A110 (Cat Hill - East Barnet Road)
C	<p>We will, in order to meet the Decent Homes standard, and deliver a greater range and variety of accommodation, also promote the regeneration of housing estates at</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Grahame Park - developing 3,400 new mixed tenure homes by 2024/25 as replacement for 1,342 homes that will be demolished (net increase of 2,058) • West Hendon - developing 2,171 new mixed tenure homes by 2026/27 as replacement for 684 homes that will be demolished (net increase of 1,487 homes) • Stonegrove and Spur Road - developing 999 new mixed tenure homes as replacement for 603 homes that will be demolished (net increase of 396 homes) by 2020/21 and • Dollis Valley - developing 950 to 1, 0004 new mixed tenure homes (net increase of 544 to 594 homes) by 2026/7
D	<p>Our strategic approach on further development opportunity sites will be set within the context of the density matrix in the existing London Plan. We will seek to optimise rather than simply maximise housing density to reflect local context, public transport accessibility and provision of social infrastructure.</p>

12.2 Summary of the commentary of the Issues and Options sustainability appraisal 2008

12.2.1 The commentary has assessed the options that relate to the location of development. The appraisal of options 3.01 to 3.04 make the following recommendations:

⁴ Subject to a new masterplan

- ensure that through the Core Strategy planned growth mitigates short term upheaval and local community benefits from regeneration,
- ensure that the Core Strategy supports an appropriate variety of house types in town centres to provide a range of attractive housing options
- ensure that deliverable and developable sites identified in the Site Allocations DPD are in sustainable locations
- 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

12.2.2 The above recommendations are covered elsewhere in the Core Strategy. In response to the first point short term upheaval is not considered in the CS but will be covered by the Development Management DPD. Policy CS14 covers infrastructure. Policy CS4 covers building residential in town centres in line with London plan density levels. Policy CS7 covers providing a mix of housing that meets identified housing priorities and the approach for affordable housing. The transport policy CS8 covers improving transport access which is related to policy CS2 which identifies where the growth is going to occur in the borough. Given the scale of the borough there are large parts with low public transport accessibility which may not change in the short/medium term. These areas will be given further protection from intensification where their character justifies it. This protection is not balanced with a need to provide housing across the borough as most of the growth is located in the west of the borough as these locations generally have the highest levels of public transport accessibility. However as the commentary identifies allowing housing growth across the borough would be detrimental to wider sustainability objectives.

Objective	+ve/-ve effects				Perm/Temp/Sec	Commentary
	A	B	C	D		
1. To encourage sustained economic growth and promote economic prosperity	+	+	+	+		<p>It is cited that 200 jobs are created for every new 1000 properties built. If this is the case then Barnet's housing targets will help to contribute to achieving this in the borough in the locations identified.</p> <p>The locations identified are in the west of the borough where the greatest levels of deprivation and highest unemployment occur. Employment growth is part of the wider growth planned in the locations identified in the policy which could help to provide jobs and skills training in the locations where they are required. Their good public transport accessibility will also help people without access to private transport.</p>
2. To offer everybody the opportunity for rewarding and satisfying employment	+	+	+	+		<p>The locations identified are in the west of the borough where the greatest levels of deprivation and highest unemployment occur. Employment growth is part of the wider growth planned in the locations identified in the policy which could help to provide jobs and skills training in the locations where they are required. Their good public transport accessibility will also help people without access to private transport.</p>
3. To encourage and accommodate both indigenous and inward investment	+?	+?	+?	+?		<p>Identifying the growth areas and town centres for growth will help to encourage and accommodate inward investment in these parts of the borough. Attracting investment to the town centres will be of particular importance as this will help to maintain the level of provision that they provide for residents. However only focusing the investment in these locations could attract it away from other parts of the borough, in particular the town centres not identified. This is why the policy is questioned.</p>

Objective	+ve/-ve effects				Perm/Temp/Sec	Commentary
	A	B	C	D		
4. To reduce disparities in economic performance and promote regeneration	+?	+	++ ?	+		<p>These policies have the greatest significant effect on this sustainability objective as they identify where regeneration is going to occur in the borough. Broadly this will happen in the west of the borough which contains most deprivation so it should benefit those residents most. Conversely the policy also concentrates the growth in the west of the borough which should be questioned as it could widen disparities between other marginal areas of the borough as all the investment in facilities and services will happen in these locations.</p> <p>There is a question raised over the quality of this regeneration as there is nothing in the policy on design or density but this could be addressed by policy in the Development Management DPD.</p>
5. To reduce the effect of traffic on the environment	+/-	+/-	+/-	+/-		The locations identified are the most accessible in the borough – although not quite for the regeneration of the housing estates. This could result in an overall reduction in the effect of traffic on the environment across the borough but there could be localised increases where the growth occurs which is why it is has a mixed impact.
6. To maintain and enhance the quality of landscapes, townscapes and local distinctiveness	?-	?-	?-	+		It is not clear from the policy that the quality of development will be high and enhance the local distinctiveness. This could be addressed by policy in the Development Management DPD. Optimising density as opposed to maximising it will help in contributing to designing a better quality of townscape. The quality of the town centres not identified could fall as investment drops off in these locations.
7. To conserve and enhance the borough's existing biodiversity and seek to increase where possible	0	0	0	0		These policies have no impact on this objective

Objective	+ve/-ve effects				Perm/Temp/Sec	Commentary
	A	B	C	D		
8. To reduce the risk of flooding for people and property	? O	?O	?O	+/-		<p>This is related to other policies in the plan but is an important consideration as the developments in Brent Cross are in areas that are at risk from flooding and growth areas are associated with intensification of development. This is why it is questioned.</p> <p>Reducing density can help to reduce the amount of land covered with hard surfacing which reduces the amount of run off. However this could be improved by related policy on run off.</p>
9. To improve air quality	+/-	+/-	+/-	+/-	This is only likely to have a positive effect in the long term.	<p>Developing in town centres and the growth areas will help to reduce peoples need to travel and thereby reduce their transport related emissions. Developing in the most accessible centres first will enhance this positive effect. However there could be localised increases where traffic growth occurs which is why it has a mixed impact.</p>
10. To conserve and where appropriate enhance the historic environment and cultural assets	?	?	?	O		<p>It depends on which of the town centres or regeneration areas have historic value and how that will be affected by any development that may occur in these areas. The quality of the town centres not identified could fall as investment drops off. The Town Centre Frameworks will provide further detail on this.</p>
11. To achieve sustainable management of waste	O-	O -	O -	O	Both short and long term growth in waste from construction and increase in population.	<p>The significant redevelopment in the growth areas provides opportunities to introduce high quality waste management processes which encourages people to recycle more or the inclusion of small facilities on site.</p>
12. To reduce contributions to climate change and reduce vulnerability to climate change	-	-	-	O		<p>Growth will lead to an increase in contributions to climate change as more people increase energy demands in dwellings and on the transport system. Growth in opportunity areas intensifies the use of land which has the potential to increase run off and vulnerability to the possible increased rainfall associated with climate change. Mitigation measures should be incorporated into development to reduce the impact of development. This could be taken forward through Development Management DPD policy or the individual Area Action plans.</p>
13. To increase energy efficiency and the proportion of energy generated from renewable sources	O?	O?	O?	O?		<p>A question is indicated as it depends on other policies as there is the potential to reduce emissions through energy efficiency above the building regulation targets and increase the amount of energy produced from renewable sources. This is particularly the case where such comprehensive levels of development are happening in the growth and regeneration areas in the west of the borough.</p>

Objective	+ve/-ve effects				Perm/Temp/Sec	Commentary
	A	B	C	D		
14. To encourage sustainable use of land	+ ?	+	+	+	Long term implications if low quality design and growth locations.	All the growth is identified to take place on brown field land generally in the west of the borough therefore it is a sustainable use of land. Growth in the opportunity areas will intensify land use and consist of a mix of land uses which helps to meet other sustainable development considerations. The quality of design needs to be considered otherwise the areas developed could degrade and lose value. Optimising density as opposed to maximising it will encourage a more sustainable use of land. Design could be taken forward through Development Management DPD policy or the individual Area Action Plans/Town Centre Frameworks. A question is raised over the investment that will occur in the west of the borough as this could be detrimental to investment elsewhere leading to continued unsustainable land use across the rest of the borough.
15. To achieve sustainable water resources management	O?	O?	O?	O		Growth will impact on the demands for water use, particularly in the west of the borough through the increase in the boroughs population in this location which will require mitigation measures.
16. To improve the Health of Barnet's population	+ ?	+	+	+	Long term fall in quality in services east and north	Provides the opportunity to increase the provision of health services and open spaces. In the areas of regeneration this could have a greater benefit to the population by improving the quality of the existing social housing stock that is being replaced. There is evidence to suggest that low quality housing can have an impact on mental health for example. A question arises over whether concentrating all the growth in the west will lead to a gradual decline through underinvestment in services in the east and north of the borough.
17. To improve the education and skills of the population	+	+	+	O		As part of the growth the amount of education space will increase although this will depend on policy CS14 which deals with delivery of infrastructure. As above there could be issues of increasing imbalance where the growth solely occurs in the west of the borough.

Objective	+ve/-ve effects				Perm/Temp/Sec	Commentary
	A	B	C	D		
18. To provide Barnet's population with the opportunity to live in a decent affordable home	++ ?	++	++	O?		<p>Growth provides the opportunity for both market housing and affordable housing of various market types. This is probably the most significant contribution that this policy makes to the framework. However it does only occur in the west of the borough where affordability issues are lowest which is why there's questionmark.</p> <p>Density is questioned as maximising it would obviously provide the greatest amount of housing but this could be outweighed by other considerations such as quality of design, delivery of infrastructure/community facilities, open space and various commercial land uses required to make mixed use development a success.</p>
19. To provide good quality surroundings for all	+?	+?	+	+		As already identified design issues are not covered by this policy but it is assumed to be positive. Optimising as opposed to maximising density will help. Design could be taken forward through Development Management DPD policy or the individual Area Action Plans/Town Centre Frameworks. There are potential issues if the town centres not identified fall in quality.
20. To reduce crime and the fear of crime	+	+	+	+		Provides the opportunity to reduce the impact of crime through comprehensive redevelopment in the growth areas, town centres and regeneration areas. Again would rely in design consideration being introduced in Development Management DPD policy or the individual Area Action Plans/Town Centre Frameworks.
21. To improve accessibility for all to services and facilities	+?	+	+	+		Provides the opportunity to provide new services as part of the development which will improve peoples access to them. This of course relies on other policies in the plan, in particular CS14. Also covers other policy areas such as transport and the ability to deliver public transport improvements, new areas of open space and children's play space. However new services in the west are not accessible to those in the east or north of the borough so it could lead to an imbalance developing in the long term.
22. To encourage a sense of community; identity and welfare	+ ?	+?	+?	+?		Whether a new development encourages a sense of community will depend on the design, the amount of community space and mechanisms put in place to encourage this sort of participation. In particular the impact on existing communities should be considered particularly in the estates identified for regeneration.

12.3 Important issues emerging from the appraisal for policy CS1 – Barnet's Place Shaping Strategy & CS2 – Distribution of growth in Meeting Housing Aspirations

- 12.3.1 Identifying the growth areas and town centres for growth will help to encourage and accommodate inward investment in these parts of the borough. Attracting investment to the town centres will be of particular importance as this will help to maintain the level of provision that they provide for residents. However only focusing the investment in these locations could attract it away from other parts of the borough, in particular the town centres not identified. This is the key sustainability consideration with the growth locations as it could lead to an imbalance in the long term. All the services investment related to the growth will be focused in the west and not the east or north. This could lead to a gradual degradation to services and town centres in these areas. In the long term this could create new disparities across the borough resulting in underinvestment in the west and north allowing an unsustainable use of land to continue in town centres and other locations. Also the growth in the west could result in an overall reduction in the effect of traffic on the environment across the borough as a whole as this is the most accessible location for growth to occur but there could be localised increases.
- 12.3.2 The quality of design is another factor identified by the sustainability appraisal as it could impact health, crime, the sustainable use of land, the quality of the landscape and its effect on the historic environment. The quality of design will ensure that the development remains a successful place to live for its lifetime. Extreme examples of this failure of design are the developments of the 1960s and 1970s which have been demolished and rebuilt. Good design will prevent this happening again and is important particularly as the density is expected to increase in growth areas. The SA recommended that the design / climate change / flood risk / density issues could be taken forward through Development Management DPD policy or the individual Area Action Plans/Town Centre Frameworks.

12.4 The difference the appraisal process made

- 12.4.1 The appraisal process helped to clarify the policy as it highlighted the relationship of density to the growth areas which was missing in an earlier policy iteration. The plan will rely on the density matrix set out in the London plan but taking forward the emerging approach which aims to optimise density as opposed to maximise it. Defining what optimised density is in relation to the London Plan density matrix will need to be defined.

Policy CS 3 - Protecting and Enhancing Barnet's Character	
	<p>We will ensure that development in Barnet respects local context and distinctive local character and provides</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Safe and attractive building layouts o Vibrant, attractive and accessible public spaces o Sustainable and adaptable buildings and spaces of the highest quality <p>that further enhance the borough's high quality suburbs and historic areas</p>
A	<p>In order to further protect the borough's high quality suburbs we will seek, outside of the existing conservation areas, to identify places of special locally distinctive character. The draft Barnet Characterisation Study forms the baseline for the identification of places with a consistent and coherent architectural character. Further detailed assessment will set out the boundaries of such areas, why they are worthy of protection and how they will be protected.</p>
B	<p>Within established residential streets where buildings have been identified as having a clear rhythm and cohesive character we will encourage development of a similar scale in order to address needs for family accommodation.</p>
C	<p>We will produce detailed design guidelines for those areas of the borough where:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • further flatted development will not detract from the dominant character of the street (such as the main thoroughfares identified in the Key Diagram) and

D

We will produce detailed design guidelines for those areas of the borough where:

- the residential typology remains dominant but the character has been undermined by inappropriate flatted development

12.5 Summary of the commentary of the Issues and Options sustainability appraisal 2008

12.5.1 The commentary considers this issue in depth under options 3.06 – 3.17. The following recommendations are made:

- Ensure that as a key part of the LDF evidence base the character of Barnet's suburbs is appraised and assessed.
- 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.
- Ensure that a better understanding of cultural needs is developed through the LDF evidence base

12.5.2 The character of the borough has been assessed and the report is in draft form with policy recommendations expected in the final version. The other recommendation on SHMA is also under way sub regionally and will recommend the range of housing need in the borough once it is completed.

Objective	+ve/-ve effects				Perm/Temp/Sec	Commentary
	A	B	C	D		
1. To encourage sustained economic growth and promote economic prosperity	? O	? O	? O	? O		This policy does not have a significant effect on the economic growth as it relates mainly to the suburban hinterland. Any emerging policy informed by the characterisation study would have to ensure that the areas identified by the characterisation study do not restrict growth in employment areas by introducing strict controls on design.
2. To offer everybody the opportunity for rewarding and satisfying employment	O	O	O	O		These policies have no significant impact on this objective.
3. To encourage and accommodate both indigenous and inward investment	?	O	O	O		As above would have to ensure that the character area study does not provide over restrictive guidance and allows enough scope for commercial development to happen otherwise inward investment will be reduced in some of the character areas. This could impact employment growth, provision of services and delivery of housing.
4. To reduce disparities in economic performance and promote regeneration	?	O	O	O		As above, the policies shouldn't have a significant effect on the objective although it depends on how tight the guidelines are for design in the character areas in particular in the locations where there is greatest deprivation. Although these are generally located in the west of the borough where the growth will occur and this policy relates to the suburban hinterlands.
5. To reduce the effect of traffic on the environment	O	O	?	O		The design of development and protecting the suburban character does not have a significant effect on reducing the amount of traffic. The only factor questioned depends on where the flatted development is located. This should be a development management consideration as it's a level of design related detail that could be covered in this level of document.
6. To maintain and enhance the quality of landscapes, townscapes and local distinctiveness	++	+	+	+		These policies will have an obvious considerable positive effect on this objective in particular that which designates the areas of local distinction.
7. To conserve and enhance the borough's existing biodiversity and seek to increase where possible	+?	+?	?	+		The policy is questioned in terms of its impact on biodiversity although in principle it should be positive. There is no mention of back gardens and the back gardens of suburbia will contain a large part of the boroughs biodiversity so ensuring their protection helps to conserve this. The impact of flatted development can be high on gardens.

Objective	+ve/-ve effects				Perm/Temp/Sec	Commentary
	A	B	C	D		
8. To reduce the risk of flooding for people and property	+?	+?	?	+		As above protecting biodiversity in front and back gardens will also help to reduce the risk of surface water run off but it is questioned because it is not specifically mentioned in the policy. Will need to ensure that the design constraints also respond to issues of surface water run off.
9. To improve air quality	0	0	0	0		These policies have no impact on this objective
10. To conserve and where appropriate enhance the historic environment and cultural assets	++	+	+	+		These policies will have a significant positive effect on this sustainability objective in particular that which designates the areas of local distinction. It should be noted that this will depend on their architectural and historic integrity.
11. To achieve sustainable management of waste	0	0	0	0		These policies have no significant impact on this objective
12. To reduce contributions to climate change and reduce vulnerability to climate change	?0	?0	?0	?0		Ensuring local areas of distinctive character are identified will help to respond to design and conservation but could restrict responding to climate change. Citing an extreme example, large scale demolition of historic buildings in order to make them more sustainable would not be acceptable under this policy. Of course there is no reason why the policy cannot be flexible enough to allow climate change mitigation measures such as energy efficiency measures like secondary double glazing or insulation, renewable energy equipment and porous paving for run off and heritage guidance exists to advise on this.
13. To increase energy efficiency and the proportion of energy generated from renewable sources	?0	?0	?0	?0		As above, Ensuring local areas of distinctive character are identified will help to respond to design and conservation but could restrict responding to climate change. Citing an extreme example, large scale demolition of historic buildings in order to make them more sustainable would not be acceptable under this policy. Of course there is no reason why the policy cannot be flexible enough to allow climate change mitigation measures such as energy efficiency measures like secondary double glazing or insulation, renewable energy equipment and porous paving for run off and heritage guidance exists to advise on this.

Objective	+ve/-ve effects				Perm/Temp/Sec	Commentary
	A	B	C	D		
14. To encourage sustainable use of land	?	?	?	?		<p>Balancing the design and conservation requirements against the needs of development is important to make the best use of land. Over protection of a buildings historic character can lead to underused or derelict buildings. Equally over protecting against home owners aspirations to make extensions to their homes through area wide design restrictions can be socially restricting. There is need for a balance though as over development in the suburbs undermines the very qualities that's makes them a success in the first place. The policies will need to make sure that they are flexible enough to ensure that they take this into consideration but this is a question that will be answered in the Development Management DPD which is why it is questioned here.</p> <p>Considering the design restrictions on flatted development should be carefully considered as they provide a housing type that is in limited supply in the borough and should not be overly restricted as they are an efficient use of land.</p>
15. To achieve sustainable water resources management	?0	?0	?0	?0		This is probably not relevant as water resources are not directly impacted by design issues.
16. To improve the Health of Barnet's population	?0	?0	?0	?0		Design of development can have an impact on peoples health in the long term but this policy does not go into the detail on this.
17. To improve the education and skills of the population	0	0	0	0		These policies have no significant impact on this objective.
18. To provide Barnet's population with the opportunity to live in a decent affordable home	?0	?0	?0	? +/-		<p>Whilst the policies do not have a direct effect on providing Barnet's population with the opportunity for living in an affordable home as the level of development in the suburbs that relate to this policy is not significant they could help to ensure that the home is decent in a well designed development.</p> <p>However they could have a strong effect on the value of a home which is directly related to affordability. Character protection (or conservation areas) has a complicated relationship with a homes value. In a location such as Hampstead Garden suburb values are considerably higher because of the overall quality of surroundings and the obvious limit on supply ie very little or no more development. Therefore designating a certain character area for further protection will help to increase its value but it increases the cost of homes and reduces affordability. Any improvements will have to meet more stringent design criteria. It could reduce the ability of the individual home owners to increase the size of their property in</p>

Objective	+ve/-ve effects				Perm/Temp/Sec	Commentary
	A	B	C	D		
						<p>response to changing family requirements which could lead to them moving out of a neighbourhood where they have built up a network of connections which could impact community spirit and identity if it becomes common.</p> <p>Equally considering the design restrictions on flatted development should be carefully considered as they provide a housing type that is in limited supply in the borough and should not be overly restricted as they are an efficient use of land.</p>
19. To provide good quality surroundings for all	+	+	+	+		These policies should provide a basis for ensuring the quality of development and character of the borough is maintained. It's not clear how prescriptive this will be but presumably this will be set out in the Development Management DPD.
20. To reduce crime and the fear of crime	?0	?0	?0	?0		Providing design that makes development safer is referred to in the policy aim but it does not set out clearly how it will be provided.
21. To improve accessibility for all to services and facilities	0	0	0	0		These policies have no impact on this objective although access issues could be part of design.
22. To encourage a sense of community; identity and welfare	+	+	+	+		Good design and local distinctiveness should help to give people a sense of pride in their surroundings but reducing the ability of the individual home owners to increase the size of their property in response to changing family requirements could lead to them moving out of a neighbourhood in which they have built up a network of connections which could impact community spirit and identity if it becomes common.

12.6 Important issues emerging from the appraisal for policy CS3 – Protecting and Enhancing Barnet's Character

- 12.6.1 Generally this is a positive policy which will protect the character of suburban Barnet. One obvious tension is the potential for over protection which could have a variety of impacts. Over restrictive guidance could reduce the scope for commercial development to happen reducing inward investment in these areas. Care needs to be taken as combined with the focus for growth in the west of the borough this could have implications for employment growth, provision of services and delivery of housing in the character areas in the east and north.
- 12.6.2 Considering the design restrictions on flatted development should also be carefully considered as they provide a housing type that is in limited supply in the borough and should not be overly restricted as they are an efficient use of land. Equally increased character protection through conservation areas status increases the cost of home ownership and reduces homeowners ability to make their homes flexible to changing lifestyle requirements. This has both affordability and social impacts which could lead to people leaving an area.

12.7 The difference the appraisal process made

- 12.7.1 The appraisal process helped to clarify the policy as previously some of the areas identified for protection of their character were the town centres which were also identified for housing growth. Although not necessarily an issue it didn't really fit the ethos of this policy so it was revised. The Town centre strategies for these centres would be cover the design guidance in these locations.

Policy CS 4 – Promoting Barnet's Town Centres	
A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> We will realise development opportunities for the town centres of Edgware, North Finchley, Finchley Church End, Chipping Barnet, New Barnet and Whetstone. We will pursue the individual planning objectives for each centre as set out in their Town Centre Strategies through the delivery of environmental, design, transport and community safety measures.
B	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> We will promote Brent Cross / Cricklewood as a new metropolitan town centre and an Outer London Development Centre following successful mixed use regeneration which delivers an additional 55,000m² (net) of comparison floorspace and 370,000 m² of office floorspace.
C	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> We will promote successful and vibrant centres throughout Barnet to serve the needs of residents, workers and visitors and ensure that new development is of an appropriate scale and character for the centre in which it is located.
D	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> We will ensure that food, drink, entertainment uses do not have a harmful effect on residents and the local area.
E	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> We will ensure the efficient use of land and buildings in town centres, encouraging a mix of compatible uses including retail, managed and flexible workspace, leisure and residential that add to the vibrancy of the area whilst respecting character
F	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In order for them to compete with other centres and particularly out of centre retail parks and shops we will support retail uses in town centres by improvements to the public realm, the public transport network, short-trip parking and accessibility by cyclists and pedestrians.
G	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> We will seek to protect and enhance more 'local' neighbourhood centres and parades of shops in terms of their potential contribution to sustainable suburbs and shopping

H

- We will, where appropriate, use S106 contributions to ensure the provision of 'affordable shops' in new retail development

12.8 Summary of the commentary of the Issues and Options sustainability appraisal 2008

12.8.1 The commentary assesses the options for town centres with options 4.01 – 4.18. The following recommendations are made:

- 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.
- 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.
- 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.

12.8.2 Supporting the town centres was the broad conclusion made by the commentary but it does not identify a preferred approach as to which town centres should be prioritised and whether there should be a focus on night time uses in some centres.

Objective	+ve/-ve effects								Perm/Temp/Sec	Commentary
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H		
1. To encourage sustained economic growth and promote economic prosperity	+?	+	+	+?	+?	++	+	+		<p>All these policies will help to protect and support the existing centres in the borough. However the problem is identifying which of the town centres is the priority and whether the planning policies will respond to what is actually on the ground and can deliver the opportunities. The supporting text identifies the problems in Brent Street, Burnt Oak, Cricklewood, Colindale - The Hyde, Finchley Church End, New Barnet and Hendon Central District Centres but this is not acknowledged in the policy. However this could be set out in the lower level Development Management DPD.</p> <p>The Town Centres strategy and full retail study need to be assessed. The policy that ensures the efficient use of land and buildings provides some potential improvements that could be implemented to deliver economic growth. Another question mark is over protecting residents against food, drink and entertainment uses and whether this will restrict the growth in these uses. Also it is not clear exactly how the plan will realise development opportunities in the town centres identified.</p>
2. To offer everybody the opportunity for rewarding and satisfying employment	+?		+	+?	+ ?	++	+			<p>As above the direction of these policies will help to support business growth in the borough. Retail is a very important source of employment in Barnet and with Brent Cross a strong source of future jobs growth it should be one of the key considerations of the plan. The impact of the regenerated Brent Cross with an additional 55,000m2 giving a total of 110,000m2 retail floorspace needs to ensure that it doesn't impact other town centres.</p> <p>The identification of the town centre frameworks provides an opportunity to identify the opportunities to improve the ability of these town centres to respond to this challenge and improve their offer and capacity.</p>

Objective	+ve/-ve effects								Perm/Temp/Sec	Commentary
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H		
3. To encourage and accommodate both indigenous and inward investment	+?	++	+	+?	+ ?	++	+	+		<p>As above all these policies will help to encourage and accommodate inward investment. The problem is identifying which of the town centres is the priority, if there should be a priority, and whether the planning policies will respond to what is actually on the ground. The Town Centre frameworks and retail study need to be assessed further to ascertain whether priorities are identified and the impact of Brent Cross is fully taken into account.</p> <p>Also should there be policy for out of centre locations.</p>
4. To reduce disparities in economic performance and promote regeneration	+?	?	+	+	+ ?	+	+	+		<p>Generally the policies are positive but there is a lack of detail which would help clarify the policy approach giving certainty to businesses and developers. The first point is whether the regeneration of Brent Cross will have an impact on the rest of the borough and increase economic disparities. The retail study submitted with the application should be assessed in comparison to the Retail Study and any other relevant information.</p> <p>Secondly ensuring a mix of landuses including flexible workspaces could lead to businesses thinking that loss of office space is acceptable in the town centres. This needs to be clarified and the town centres where this might occur identified. Also disparities in economic performance are not identified. Identifying affordable retail space might help to improve regeneration but there is a danger that it will create a false market. It is also hard to actually implement successfully as experiences with affordable workspaces has shown.</p>
5. To reduce the effect of traffic on the environment	+	-	+	+	+	++	+	+		<p>The policies will all be positive as they are aiming to support the town centres in particular the policy where there will be improvements in the public realm. This will help encourage people to continue using town centres over out of centre locations where they are more likely to have to drive. Over half of visits to town centres are by people who walk. The development of Brent Cross will have a negative impact as it will encourage increased car use although the new public transport facilities provides some</p>

Objective	+ve/-ve effects								Perm/Temp/Sec	Commentary
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H		
										mitigation.
6. To maintain and enhance the quality of landscapes, townscapes and local distinctiveness	+?	?	+	+	+	+	+	+	Long term impact of Brent Cross.	All the policies aim to support and realise the potential of the town centres which should help to maintain their quality. Design principles are not set out which is the only question. It is assumed that the Town Centre strategies would provide this guidance but it is not clear what status they will have, SPD or DM DPD. As already identified it is questionable what the impact of Brent Cross will be and how this will affect existing town centres.
7. To conserve and enhance the borough's existing biodiversity and seek to increase where possible	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		These policies have no impact on this objective
8. To reduce the risk of flooding for people and property	0 ?	?	0	0	0	0	0			Generally these policies do not have an impact on this objective as they are encouraging development opportunities in the town centres. These will all be on existing brown field sites and could provide the opportunity to improve surface water run off. If any town centres are in areas of existing flood risk this should be identified in the Town Centre Strategies. Brent Cross provides an opportunity to reduce run off in this location as it is in an area of flood risk.
9. To improve air quality	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+		The policies will all be positive as they are aiming to support the town centres in particular the policy where there will be improvements in the public realm. This will help encourage people to continue using town centres over out of centre locations where they are more likely to have to drive to. Over half of visits to town centres are by people who walk. Maintaining the town centres reduces the need to travel by car and therefore the impact that this has on air quality. As noted above Brent Cross will encourage further driving which will have a negative impact on air quality.

Objective	+ve/-ve effects								Perm/Temp/Sec	Commentary
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H		
10. To conserve and where appropriate enhance the historic environment and cultural assets	+?	O	++	+	+	+	+	+		This should all be positive as maintaining and supporting the town centres will help to keep historic buildings in use and maintain any conservation areas. Again more detail will presumably be contained in the Town Centre Strategies. Supporting town centre uses will help to maintain and encourage the growth of cultural facilities in these locations. Out of centre locations should be identified.
11. To achieve sustainable management of waste	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O		These policies have no impact on this objective.
12. To reduce contributions to climate change and reduce vulnerability to climate change	?- +	-	?- +	?- +	?- +	?- +	?- +	?+ +		These policies will have a positive and negative impact on the climate change issue. There will be higher emissions associated with a growth in the town centres and Brent Cross but these are the most sustainable locations for growth, particularly retail growth. Apart from the emissions associated with the shop units themselves how people get to their town centre is also key. Parking is an issue, although nearly half of people visiting town centres walk some will drive and parking is seen as key by both traders and shoppers alike when asked. Success in mitigating the impact of both will depend on other policies in the plan, which is why there is uncertainty in the assessment.
13. To increase energy efficiency and the proportion of energy generated from renewable sources	?+ -	+	O	O	O	O	O	O		As noted elsewhere in the sustainability appraisal development and regeneration provides opportunities to increase the energy efficiency of buildings in the borough but this is reliant on other policies in the plan.
14. To encourage sustainable use of land	+	+	+	+	++	+	+	+		Supporting town centres helps to maintain them. The existing town centres are already a sustainable land use and developing them further with compatible uses will only help to support this.
15. To achieve sustainable water resources management	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O		These policies have no impact on this objective.

Objective	+ve/-ve effects								Perm/Temp/Sec	Commentary
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H		
16. To improve the Health of Barnet's population	++	+	+	+	+	+	+	+		Encouraging a mix of uses should ensure continued and increased provision of health services which will be positive. More importantly maintaining the existing town centres through policy and the Town Centre Frameworks will help to encourage people to continue walking which helps fitness and their health.
17. To improve the education and skills of the population	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		These policies have no impact on this objective.
18. To provide Barnet's population with the opportunity to live in a decent affordable home	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		These policies have no impact on this objective.
19. To provide good quality surroundings for all	+	+	++	+	+	++	+	+		These policies should generally have a very positive effect on the development of the town centres particularly as they aim to maintain development of appropriate scale and character and improve the public realm. Further design detail will presumably be contained in the Town Centre Strategies.
20. To reduce crime and the fear of crime	?	?	?	+	?	?	?	?		Town centres are usually crime hotspots but this is not reflected in the policies or context for them which is why it is questioned at this stage although there is no evidence base. However design and crime is referenced elsewhere in the CS.
21. To improve accessibility for all to services and facilities	+	+	+	+	++	+	+	+		The policies will help to maintain and improve the level of access to services in the town centres across the borough through encouraging a mix of compatible uses.
22. To encourage a sense of community; identity and welfare	+	+	+	+	+	+	++	+		These policies should help to improve the sense of community across the borough by aiming to maintain and enhance the existing town centres. In particular the policy that aims to protect the more local neighbourhood centres will help to do this.

12.9 Important issues emerging from the appraisal for policy CS4 – Promoting Barnet's Town Centres

- 12.9.1 Supporting the existing town centres can only be a sustainable use of land and encouraging an increase in the mix uses and services can only be socially positive. Environmentally, supporting the town centres helps to encourage less driving, resulting in less air pollution and consequently lower climate change emissions whilst supporting walking and cycling which contributes to improving resident's health. There is a question mark over whether ensuring a mix of land uses including flexible workspaces could lead to businesses thinking that loss of office space is acceptable in the town centres. Also it is not clear exactly how the plan will realise development opportunities in the town centres identified. It is assumed that the Town Centre strategies would provide this guidance but it is not clear what status they will have, SPD or Development Management DPD.
- 12.9.2 The impact of the regenerated Brent Cross with its additional 55,000m² when it is fully open giving 110,000m² gross retail floorspace will provide a regional shopping centre that will compete with the existing town centres. Whether this has fully been taken into account is unclear, in particular with the referenced Town Centre Frameworks. The development time period for Brent Cross may negate this concern. There is no priority hierarchy for town centre regeneration identified when it is clear that some town centres are performing at a lower level than others. Again this could be clarified in the Town Centre strategies or the DM DPD.

12.10 The difference the appraisal process made

- 12.10.1 In an earlier iteration of the policy it was queried whether crime was addressed as this is an issue for town centres and it wasn't identified in this policy. There were a number of opportunities elsewhere in the plan but it was clarified in the policy under safety which was introduced.

Policy CS5 - Enhancing and Protecting Barnet's Open Spaces	
In order to create a greener Barnet the Council will enhance and protect Barnet's Open Spaces by	
A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Protecting designated open spaces, including Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land, and other suitable land with the potential to be used as open space
B	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Meeting increased demand for open space and tackling deficiencies and under provision by ○ • Securing additional on-site open space or other open space improvements in the identified growth areas including 11.27 ha of new provision at Brent Cross – Cricklewood, 5.5 ha of new provision at Mill Hill East and 5 ha at Colindale.
C	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ • Securing improvements to open spaces including the facilities provided such as children's play and sports facilities and improvements to access arrangements, where opportunities arise, from all developments that create an additional demand for open space
D	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ • Maintaining and improving the greening of the environment through the protection of back gardens, front gardens, incidental greenspace and trees
E	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ • Protecting existing Sites of Nature Conservation Importance and working with our partners including the London Wildlife Trust to improve protection and enhancement of biodiversity in Barnet
F	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Ensuring that development protects existing site ecology and makes the fullest contributions to enhancing biodiversity, both through on-site measures and by contribution to local biodiversity improvements

G

- • Enhancing local food production through the protection of allotments and encouraging diversification of existing agricultural land.

12.11 Summary of the commentary of the Issues and Options sustainability appraisal 2008

- 12.11.1 The only relevant option raised in the Issues and Options commentary is 5.02, it did not consider potential policies for open spaces and improving open spaces. The following recommendation was made:
- Ensure that as a key part of the LDF Evidence Base Barnet's Biodiversity Action Plan sets out local priorities for habitats and species
- 12.11.2 Barnets biodiversity action plan is not considered and is not referenced in the evidence base.

Objective	+ve/-ve effects							Perm/Temp/Sec	Commentary
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G		
1. To encourage sustained economic growth and promote economic prosperity	O?	O	O	O	O	O	O	In the long term maintaining the current level of protection could lead to increasing pressure on all other parts of the borough for development partic from housing.	Protecting open space reduces the potential for development which could potentially impact economic development by reducing the amount of land available. However this land has never been available because of its designation as green belt or MOL. The only part of this policy that could have a significant effect is encouraging diversification of existing agricultural land which could help economic growth. Its not clear how this would be done and whether any planning restrictions could be relaxed to do this.
2. To offer everybody the opportunity for rewarding and satisfying employment	O	O	O	O	O	O	O		These policies have no impact on this objective.
3. To encourage and accommodate both indigenous and inward investment	O	O	O	O	O	O	O		These policies have no impact on this objective.
4. To reduce disparities in economic performance and promote regeneration	O	O	O	O	O	O	O		These policies have no impact on this objective.
5. To reduce the effect of traffic on the environment	O	+	+	O	O	O	O		Increasing the amount of open space in the growth areas and improving existing open space could help to reduce the distance people need to travel which could help to reduce the effect of traffic on the environment.
6. To maintain and enhance the quality of landscapes, townscapes and local distinctiveness	+	+	+	++	+	+	+		All aspects of this policy will have a positive effect on this objective as they are helping to improve and maintain the quality of landscapes. In particular the identified provision of new open space in the growth areas is welcome. Of particular importance is the protection of back/front gardens and incidental green space as this is potentially the hardest type of space to protect.
7. To conserve and enhance the borough's existing biodiversity and seek to increase where possible	++	++	+	++	++	++	+		These policies will have the greatest significant effect on this objective. The only query is whether encouraging diversity in agricultural uses could have a detrimental effect on biodiversity.

Objective	+ve/-ve effects							Perm/Temp/Sec	Commentary
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G		
8. To reduce the risk of flooding for people and property	+	+	+	++	+	+	+		Protecting open spaces will have a positive effect as it is protecting land that reduces the rate of run off. Back and front gardens in particular will have a considerable impact on this as cumulatively they can have a considerable effect although front gardens are now covered by the national removal of permitted development rights.
9. To improve air quality	+	+	+	++	+	+	+		Continuing protection will have a positive effect on this objective as open space helps to 'soak' up the amount of pollution. In particular trees are very good carbon sinks.
10. To conserve and where appropriate enhance the historic environment and cultural assets	+	+	+	+	+	+	+		Although possibly not relevant for all of this policy as it will depend on where the open space is but open space is a fundamental part of Barnet's character and therefore a major part of its cultural assets. Some of the open spaces will be historic.
11. To achieve sustainable management of waste	0	0	0	0	0	0	0?		None of this policy will have a significant effect on this objective apart from the last one which relates to diversification on agricultural land. There is potential for the management of certain types of waste such as compost in areas of open space and green belt.
12. To reduce contributions to climate change and reduce vulnerability to climate change	+	+	+	+	+	+	+		Protecting open space and trees and increasing them will have a positive effect on this objective as they are very effective at soaking up emissions.
13. To increase energy efficiency and the proportion of energy generated from renewable sources	0	0	0	0	0	0	0?		Depending on the quality of land there is a possibility that the agricultural land can be used to grow biofuels or some other energy crop.
14. To encourage sustainable use of land	?+	+	+	+	0	+	+	Long term impacts	The main issue is whether the continued protection of all green belt land is sustainable as there is a possibility that its continued protection has an effect on increasing development pressure elsewhere in the borough and London through over intensification of land leading to negative impacts on the cities population. The LDF process could offer the opportunity for the review of the boundary in some locations. However changing the principle of the greenbelt has fundamental implications for the whole of the country as the greenbelt has helped

Objective	+ve/-ve effects							Perm/Temp/Sec	Commentary
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G		
									to protect the country side from suburban sprawl for over 60 years.
15. To achieve sustainable water resources management	+	0	0	0	0	+	0?		Some of the protected open spaces and green belt includes water resources therefore their continued protection will be positive but new space will not have an impact. Protecting biodiversity provides ground cover which intercepts rainfall reducing run off rates.
16. To improve the Health of Barnet's population	+	+	+	+	+	+	+		Protecting open space, increasing it and most importantly improving access to it will encourage people to use open space for exercise and leisure activities. This increases the possibility of improving the health of boroughs residents. Areas of open space deficiency should be targeted as the most important.
17. To improve the education and skills of the population	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		These policies have no impact on this objective.
18. To provide Barnet's population with the opportunity to live in a decent affordable home	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		These policies have no impact on this objective.
19. To provide good quality surroundings for all	+	+	+	+	+	+	+		All aspects of this policy will have a positive effect on this objective as they are helping to improve and maintain the quality of the surroundings.
20. To reduce crime and the fear of crime	0	+	+	0	0	+	0		Depending on the open space improvements they will need to consider how they can be designed to reduce crime and the fear of crime which should be identified as part of the policy. Biodiversity can be used to design out crime.
21. To improve accessibility for all to services and facilities	+	+	+	0	0	0	0		The policies that relate to improving and protecting open space will help with this policy.

Objective	+ve/-ve effects							Perm/Temp/Sec	Commentary
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G		
22. To encourage a sense of community; identity and welfare	+	+	+	0	0	+	0		Protecting and expanding open space will help to encourage people to use these spaces more which will help to strengthen a sense of community. Open spaces also provide the opportunity for community events such as festivals.

12.12 Important issues emerging from the appraisal for policy CS5 – enhancing and protecting Barnet's open spaces

- 12.12.1 Open space is an important part of Barnet's character and this policy will have a completely positive effect as it aims to maintain it. The policy has identified the increases in publicly accessible open space in the growth areas. It is important that the policy ensures that access is improved given the wealth of open space in the borough as there are still areas of deficiency. Protecting back and front gardens is also important as cumulatively this will have a considerable impact on biodiversity, run off and above all character if development is not controlled. How this is done could be clarified at a lower level in the Development Management DPD.
- 12.12.2 There is an issue with continued protection of all green belt as there is a possibility that it has an effect on increasing development pressure elsewhere in the borough and London through over intensification of land leading to wider negative impacts on the cities population. The LDF process could offer the opportunity for the review of the boundary in some locations. But changing the principle of the greenbelt has fundamental implications for the whole of the country as the greenbelt has contributed to protecting the country side from suburban sprawl for over 60 years. It should be noted that the Outer London commission which was established to review policy for outer London for the revision to the London Plan rejected this option in July 2009 at a sub regional level as it recognised that Outer London could grow without the need to develop on this land.

12.13 The difference the appraisal process made

- 12.13.1 There were no suggestions for the appraisal to make.

Policy CS6 – Promoting a Strong and Prosperous Barnet	
<p>The Council and its partners will ensure a strong and prosperous Barnet that provides opportunity for economic advancement.</p> <p>We will support businesses by :</p>	
A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Safeguarding existing employment sites that meet the needs of modern business. Development that improves the quality of existing employment provision will be encouraged.
B	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Encouraging new mixed use commercial floorspace in our larger town centres (Edgware, North Finchley, Finchley Church End, Chipping Barnet, New Barnet and Whetstone) where access to public transport is good
C	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ In order to support small to medium enterprises new employment provision should include a range of unit sizes and types such as flexible workspaces and home working hubs
D	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Through the Skills Development Group building an understanding about the experience of local businesses and their skills needs
E	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Encouraging partnership working between providers of further and higher education and local business
F	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Requiring major developments to provide financial contributions for training and to deliver employment and training initiatives in line with the Skills Development Plan
G	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Working in partnership with the Skills Development Group in delivering the skills agenda required for a growing borough in a successful city-suburb of London

12.14 Summary of the commentary of the Issues and Options sustainability

appraisal 2008

- 12.14.1 At issues and options stage, six options were appraised that relate to the policy identified in CS6. Of greatest significance was the appraisal of three options that dealt with the redevelopment of employment land and the potential for delivery of other uses on this land. The conclusions in the commentary identified uncertainty on the impacts across the three options on the economic, environmental and social topic areas of the sustainability objectives matrix. The options were not ranked in any order of preference and the following recommendations were made:
- Ensure that as a key part of the LDF evidence base an Employment Land Survey is commissioned to develop better understanding of employment sites
 - Ensure that Core Strategy sets sustainable locational criteria for mixed use developments
 - Ensure that Core Strategy sets sustainable locational criteria for educational facilities
- 12.14.2 The employment land survey was completed in July 2009. The results identified that the long term expectation for demand was not significant from actual occupiers. The predicted future demand for businesses based on modelling past growth predicts demand ranging from 1.5 - 13 hectares of land depending on the employment growth scenario used. The study concluded that protecting employment land was necessary. The commentary makes the point that once the employment opportunity has been lost it cannot be regained.
- 12.14.3 The second recommendation regarding sustainable locational criteria for mixed use developments has been incorporated in CS1.
- 12.14.4 The commentary identifies the positive impacts that expanding higher education will bring to the borough. This is carried through into the Direction of Travel but the recommendation that the core strategy sets sustainable locational criteria for educational facilities has not been reflected in policy but the Development Management DPD could provide this level of detail.

Objective	+ve/-ve effects							Perm/Temp/Sec	Commentary
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G		
1. To encourage sustained economic growth and promote economic prosperity	++	++	++	+	+	+	+	Perm depending on if it can respond to modern business needs. Temp? How will the partnerships be maintained?	<p>The policy needs to clarify what modern business space needs are as not all business in the borough is modern yet it still contributes to the economic prosperity of the borough. E.g. a builder's yard versus a modern light industrial unit. Suggesting that we will only protect a certain type of space may introduce uncertainty for some businesses as landowners will see opportunities to increase their return, particularly on industrial land which represents the same amount of floorspace as office space yet maybe considered less modern.</p> <p>Providing funding for training through the Skills Development Group and Plan is positive. It should be noted that a very large part of the growth in employment floorspace will happen in the west of the borough where deprivation is higher but will other parts of the borough benefit from this funding.</p>
2. To offer everybody the opportunity for rewarding and satisfying employment	++	+	+	+	+	+	+		<p>Protecting the widest variety of employment space provides the greatest opportunity to offer everybody a job not just modern business space.</p> <p>Providing funding for training through the Skills Development Group and Plan is positive and will help people to get work.</p>
3. To encourage and accommodate both indigenous and inward investment	++	++	+	++	+	++	++		<p>The policy provides the encouragement for redevelopment of business space to developers which provides assurance. The Employment Land Survey provides an assessment of the spaces which will be protected and those suitable for release.</p> <p>With regards to the town centres identified as less accessible there is a question mark because it could lead to the landowners considering other land uses to employment ie residential.</p> <p>Providing a plan for skills training will help to improve the abilities of local residents thereby providing a better qualified workforce which could help to attract further investment into the borough.</p>

Objective	+ve/-ve effects							Perm/Temp/Sec	Commentary
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G		
4. To reduce disparities in economic performance and promote regeneration	++	+	++	?	?	+	?		Supporting modern business space will help to support regeneration and help Barnet compete with other locations in north London and the wider south east. The policy help to promote regeneration in high public transport locations but there is a question over the impact on existing space elsewhere where access is not so good. This could actually increase disparities in economic performance across the borough particularly given the significant growth in floorspace expected as part of Brent Cross / Cricklewood.
5. To reduce the effect of traffic on the environment	?	++	+	0	0	0	0		Generally this will be positive as it encourages employment growth in town centres in the most accessible locations. Equally the largest increase in floorspace in the borough will be located at Brent Cross which is reasonably accessible. Innovative proposals such as home hubs could also help to reduce peoples need to drive.
6. To maintain and enhance the quality of landscapes, townscapes and local distinctiveness	+	++	++	0	0	0	0		Safeguarding existing employment areas could help to maintain existing townscapes in particular in those centres identified as accessible. It is questioned though what the impact might be in other centres. Encouraging space for small business will help to maintain local distinctiveness and the large number of small businesses in Barnet.
7. To conserve and enhance the borough's existing biodiversity and seek to increase where possible	?	0	0	0	0	0	0		This policy does not have a significant effect on this policy.
8. To reduce the risk of flooding for people and property	++	0	0	0	0	0	0	Should note risk of flooding could increase in long term with climate change	It will depend on whether the employment space is located in areas of flood risk.
9. To improve air quality	?	++	0	0	0	0	0		Generally this will be positive as it encourages employment growth in town centres in the most accessible locations. Equally the largest increase in floorspace in the borough will be located at Brent Cross which is reasonably accessible. Innovative proposals such as home hubs could also help to reduce peoples

Objective	+ve/-ve effects							Perm/Temp/Sec	Commentary
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G		
									need to drive. All the above should help to reduce road travel thereby reducing emissions.
10. To conserve and where appropriate enhance the historic environment and cultural assets	0	?0	0	0	0	0	0		It depends on whether there is any historic environment to be enhanced in the locations. Town centres are the most likely place where employment space could help to improve the environment.
11. To achieve sustainable management of waste	+?	0	0	0	0	0	0	Demolition of any building would create a temporary increase in waste but it could be recycled.	A depends on whether employment sites will be protected or safeguarded as redevelopment could lead to an increase in waste from demolition.
12. To reduce contributions to climate change and reduce vulnerability to climate change	+?	+	+	0	0	0	0		Reducing emissions will depend on whether the areas to be safeguarded are energy efficient buildings that incorporate mitigation measures. Accessibility to public transport will help to reduce transport emissions as will encouraging home working hubs.
13. To increase energy efficiency and the proportion of energy generated from renewable sources	+	+	?/-	0	0	0	0		Replacing old and energy inefficient business premises with modern premises could help to reduce emissions. In particular new mixed use space provides the opportunity to reduce emissions and could provide the opportunity for CHP or decentralised energy. It should noted that a large number of small units could result in a higher use of energy and home hubs and home working is more energy intensive than large scale office working.
14. To encourage sustainable use of land	+	+	+	0	0	0	0		It is assumed that meeting the needs of modern business will result in a more efficient use of land. In town centres there could be a presumption to increase the density or intensity of use of a site where it is highly accessible such as a town centre. Further detail could be provided in the Development Management DPD.
15. To achieve sustainable water resources management	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		This policy does not have any significant impact upon this objective.
16. To improve the Health of Barnet's	0	+	0	0	0	0	0		Providing business space in town centres could help to encourage people to walk and use public transport more which

Objective	+ve/-ve effects							Perm/Temp/Sec	Commentary
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G		
population									can help to improve fitness.
17. To improve the education and skills of the population	○	○	○	+	+	++	+		These policies are significantly positive because they will help to improve the education and skills of the borough in particularly the financial contributions to training through the Skills Development Group and its strategy.
18. To provide Barnet's population with the opportunity to live in a decent affordable home	○	○	○	○	○	○	○		This policy does not have any significant impact upon this objective.
19. To provide good quality surroundings for all	○	○	○	○	○	○	○		This policy does not have any significant impact upon this objective.
20. To reduce crime and the fear of crime	○	○	○	○	○	○	○		This policy does not have any significant impact upon this objective.
21. To improve accessibility for all to services and facilities	○	○	○	○	○	○	○		This policy does not have any significant impact upon this objective.
22. To encourage a sense of community; identity and welfare	○	○	○	○	○	○	○		This policy does not have any significant impact upon this objective.

12.15 Important issues emerging from the appraisal of Policy CS6 – Promoting a Strong and Prosperous Barnet

- 12.15.1 Generally this policy has a positive impact in particular on skills development and training. It encourages employment growth in town centres in the most accessible locations although it doesn't refer to the largest increase in employment floorspace in the borough at Brent Cross. Innovative proposals such as home hubs will help to reduce peoples need to drive. There is a big emphasis on training and skills development through the Skills Development Group which will be useful to mitigate some of the potential for disparity in employment growth because of the town centre focus. In town centres there could be a presumption to increase the density or intensity of use of a site where it is highly accessible such as a town centre. Further detail could be provided in the Development Management DPD.
- 12.15.2 With regards to protecting employment space the policy could clarify what modern business space needs are as not all business in the borough is modern yet it still contributes to the economic prosperity of the borough. Eg a buiders yard versus a modern light industrial unit. Suggesting that we will only protect a certain type of space may introduce uncertainty for some businesses as landowners will see opportunities to increase their return, particularly on industrial land which represents the same amount of floorspace as office space yet maybe considered less modern.

12.16 The difference the appraisal process made

- 12.16.1 The appraisal process highlighted the need to identify which town centres were appropriate for new mixed use commercial floorspace as previously the policy just identified all the town centres.

Policy CS 7 - Providing Quality Homes and housing choice in Barnet	
The Council will aim to create mixed and balanced communities in Barnet by	
A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Seeking to ensure a mix of housing products in the affordable and market sectors to provide choice for all households and enable Barnet residents to progress on a housing journey that can meet the aspirations of home ownership
B	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Seeking a range of dwelling sizes and types of housing including lifetime homes that meets our identified housing priorities and does not undermine suburban character or local distinctiveness
C	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Seeking a variety of housing types including family homes and provide housing related support options that maximise the independence of vulnerable residents including young people, people with disabilities, older people, homeless people and other vulnerable adults.
D	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Securing an appropriate level and mix of affordable housing for Barnet that will support our objectives of widening home ownership and providing family homes. This level will be based on a borough wide assessment of viability of affordable housing and will have regard to the Mayor's strategic housing target that 50% of housing provision should be affordable and that the threshold for negotiating provision should be set at 10 units. With regard to the London Plan objective of a 70:30 social rented to intermediate ratio, we will negotiate an appropriate affordable mix which delivers wider sustainable development and regeneration objectives.
E	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ On sites which are suitable for the provision of an element of affordable housing, the council may exceptionally accept the provision of off-site housing, or a commuted payment instead of such provision.

F	<p>Within the Site Allocations DPD we will seek to identify land to meet the long term needs of Gypsies and Travellers, having regard to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Potential of site for good management ○ Impact on local environment, character and amenity ○ Access to essential services including water and waste disposal.
G	<p>We will monitor the delivery of additional housing against the target (of 20,055 new homes by 2016/17) set within the London Plan and will seek to maintain supply at the rate necessary to meet or exceed the target. In seeking to maintain the housing supply we will adjust the type and mix of housing sought, having regard to the financial viability of development, the housing market and the needs of different groups.</p>

12.17 Summary of the commentary of the Issues and Options sustainability appraisal 2008

12.17.1 The commentary tackles this wider issue under the following questions 3.18 – 3.25. The following recommendations were made:

- 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.
- Ensure that as a key part of the LDF evidence a Strategic Housing Market Assessment is commissioned to assess need and demand for housing
- 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.

12.17.2 The recommendations are for a SHMA to be completed and the results of this study are awaited. The questions in the commentary attempt to consider where smaller units as opposed to family units should be provided to ensure the most efficient use of land. The results emphasise the need for a choice of both housings types and tenures.

12.17.3 The commentary then goes onto to tackle affordable housing under options 3.26 – 3.35. The following recommendations were made:

- 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.
- Ensure that the effects of payment in lieu are assessed through the Annual Monitoring Report.

12.17.4 The SHMA is underway at a sub regional scale and the results will be considered in the submission version of the Core Strategy. The commentary has not highlighted the need for a viability assessment of the delivery of the affordable housing policy. This would have helped to inform part of the commentary. The commentary does not make clear that a reduction in delivery of affordable housing will have a negative impact on the social objectives in the sustainability appraisal.

Objective	+ve/-ve effects							Perm/Temp/Sec	Commentary
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G		
1. To encourage sustained economic growth and promote economic prosperity	○	○	○	+	○	○	+		The provision of housing and what type that housing is does not have a direct effect on economic growth. Indirectly there is evidence to suggest that an increase in the number of homes leads to an increase in the number of jobs therefore ensuring that the housing target is met will contribute to this economic growth.
2. To offer everybody the opportunity for rewarding and satisfying employment	○	○	○	○	○	○	○		These policies have no impact on this objective
3. To encourage and accommodate both indigenous and inward investment	○	○	○	+	+	○	+		Assessing the viability of the affordable housing target will ensure that the maximum affordable housing possible is achieved without impacting overall housing delivery. This will encourage inward investment in the borough and help to meet housing targets.
4. To reduce disparities in economic performance and promote regeneration	○	○	○	○	○	○	○		There is no significant effect from these policies.
5. To reduce the effect of traffic on the environment	○	○	○	○	○	○	-		Meeting the levels of growth predicted for Barnet will increase the levels of traffic in the borough. There is no way that this can be avoided. The mitigation proposed in policy CS8 is not guaranteed to reduce car travel and parking standards will be managed which does not guarantee a reduction in spaces.
6. To maintain and enhance the quality of landscapes, townscapes and local distinctiveness	○	○	○	○	○	○	○		The only question is raised relates to housing growth which could have an impact on the quality of the landscape unless sufficiently strong design standards are introduced to control it but this relates to another policy in the plan.
7. To conserve and enhance the borough's existing biodiversity and seek to increase where possible	○	○	○	○	○	○	+?-		General housing growth could have a mixed impact on biodiversity depending on where the growth happens to be in the borough. It could have a negative impact where development affects an area of local biodiversity. Or it could create a new area of biodiversity where there is a deficiency. But more detail is needed on where biodiversity issues exist in the borough. It should be noted that all the growth areas intend to provide new areas of open space.

Objective	+ve/-ve effects							Perm/Temp/Sec	Commentary
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G		
8. To reduce the risk of flooding for people and property	○	○	○	○	○	○	+?-		The level of growth will lead to intensification of previously developed sites – brownfield land. Unless appropriate measures are taken then surface water run off and flood risk will increase adding to fluvial flood risk that already exists in the borough and possibly creating new areas of flood risk. However the redevelopment of existing brownfield areas of land provides the opportunity to reduce the flooding risk created by the original development.
9. To improve air quality	○	○	○	○	○	○	-		Meeting the levels of growth predicted for Barnet will increase the levels of traffic in the borough which will have a negative effect on air quality. There is no way that this can be avoided. The mitigation proposed in policy CS8 is not guaranteed to reduce car travel and parking standards will be managed which does not guarantee a reduction in spaces.
10. To conserve and where appropriate enhance the historic environment and cultural assets	○	○	○	○	○	○	+?-		The general housing growth policies could have a mixed impact on the historic environment depending on where the growth happens to be in the borough. It could have a negative impact where development affects the historic environment. Or it could help to bring historic buildings back into use. More detail is needed on the site specifics of where the relationship between growth in the borough happens and the historic environment.
11. To achieve sustainable management of waste	○	○	○	○	○	○	+?-		Growth presents opportunities and challenges to managing waste. In the short term the development will create a large amount of waste through its construction. But in the long term large areas of new development provide opportunities for managing waste in new and innovative ways such as the Brent Cross development which proposes the envac system of collection (an underground vacuum driven system of collection). But requiring this sort of solution may not be practical in all cases therefore it is questioned in the appraisal.
12. To reduce contributions to climate change and reduce vulnerability to climate change	○	○	○	○	○	○	-?		The growth projected for Barnet will increase the contributions to climate change through carbon emissions. Given the level of growth this is unavoidable. The only solution would be extremely high energy efficiency targets/renewable energy targets which are not proposed elsewhere in the CS. But the levels of growth do at least provide the opportunity to reduce emissions and develop far more energy efficient housing than the existing stock of Barnet.

Objective	+ve/-ve effects							Perm/Temp/Sec	Commentary
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G		
13. To increase energy efficiency and the proportion of energy generated from renewable sources	○	○	○	○	○	○	+?		As above the growth projected for Barnet will increase the contributions to climate change through carbon emissions. Given the level of growth this is unavoidable. But the levels of growth provide the opportunity to reduce emissions and develop far more energy efficient housing than the existing stock of Barnet. They also provide the opportunity to increase the proportion of energy generated from renewable sources. However the question remains because other policies within the CS do not do this.
14. To encourage sustainable use of land	+	+	+	+ ?	+	?	+?		Ensuring that the right mix of housing in terms of numbers of bedrooms and tenure mix is important and will help to ensure that the most sustainable use of land is delivered. This is especially important given the very high levels of additional homes planned for Barnet as it will really make a difference to the overall mix of housing in the borough. The results of the sub regional SHMA are awaited.
15. To achieve sustainable water resources management	○	○	○	○	○	○	-		As with other objectives the very high level of housing growth that is planned will have a negative impact on the sustainable use of water resources in the borough. The level of growth will undoubtedly have an impact on water use by increasing it. The new development could provide the opportunity to manage water in a more sustainable way and reduce the amount used per household.
16. To improve the Health of Barnet's population	○	+	+	+	○	○	+		The level of growth will help to improve the amount of housing in the borough and in particular provide family housing. This will respond to overcrowding in the borough with over 3,000 currently on the list. Overcrowded households can have a negative effect on people's health, particularly mental health.
17. To improve the education and skills of the population	○	○	○	○	○	○	○		These policies have no impact on this objective
18. To provide Barnet's population with the opportunity to live in a decent affordable home	○	○	○	++	○	○	○		This is one of the key objectives to be met by these policies, in particular the affordable housing policies. The affordable housing viability study will ensure that the maximum viable amount is provided.

Objective	+ve/-ve effects							Perm/Temp/Sec	Commentary
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G		
19. To provide good quality surroundings for all	○	○	○	○	○	○	+?-		The level of growth identified in Barnet provides the opportunity to improve the quality of urban design in the borough in particular in the areas for regeneration. The results of the character study may be able to help identify where improvements can be made to the public realm and urban design of the borough. The intensification of the borough could also have a negative effect on the quality of residents surroundings in particular where in fill development occurs.
20. To reduce crime and the fear of crime	○	○	○	○	○	○	+?-		As above the growth and regeneration in the borough provides the opportunity to design development that creates a safer environment for people.
21. To improve accessibility for all to services and facilities	○	○	○	○	○	○	+?		With growth there should be delivery of new services and facilities which will help to improve peoples access. This will depend on the accurate identification of what services are needed to meet the needs and when and where they are provided. This is dealt with by other policies in the plan.
22. To encourage a sense of community; identity and welfare	○	○	○	○	○	○	+?	Long term	The scale of growth in Barnet will be creating new communities which in time will develop their own character and spirit but this will be over the long term.

12.18 Important issues emerging from the appraisal for policy CS7 – Providing Quality Homes in Barnet

- 12.18.1 Ensuring that the right mix of housing in terms of numbers of bedrooms and tenure mix is very important and will help to ensure the most sustainable use of land is delivered. This is especially important given the very high levels of additional homes planned for Barnet as it will really make a difference to the overall mix of housing in the borough when the growth areas are completely built out. The results of the sub regional SHMA are awaited as they will provide the evidence base for this. The amount of affordable housing demanded by policy is equally important and the affordable housing viability study will ensure that the maximum viable amount of housing is required by policy.
- 12.18.2 There are potential impacts on the sustainability environmental objectives because of the very high housing targets for Barnet as this will increase the levels of traffic, the level of emissions and air pollution from cars and buildings, the amount of waste produced and the potential increased level of run off. There is no way that this can be avoided. The mitigation proposed in policy CS8 is not guaranteed to reduce car travel and managing parking may not be enough either. The environmental policies could be enhanced with a minimum level of the Code for Sustainable Homes expected and a minimum level of run off to reduce surface water flooding could be demanded to mitigate some of these impacts.

Policy CS8 – Providing integrated and efficient travel	
We will promote the delivery of integrated transport infrastructure and the increased availability of travel choices in order to support growth, relieve pressure on Barnet's transport network and reduce the environmental impact of travel.	
Promoting transport choice	
A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ We will make public transport, especially buses, a more attractive travel option by promoting a review of Barnet's bus network in order to better match demand and capacity, particularly on orbital routes.
B	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ We will seek a network of 'express' services in the borough joining town centres, stations and key interchange points including Edgware, Chipping Barnet, Golders Green and North Finchley
C	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ We will promote public transport provision that is accessible to people with physical or sensory impairment
D	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ We will make walking and cycling a more attractive option through improvements to off-road walking and cycling routes, making maximum use of the 'green' routes provided by Barnet's open spaces and rivers.
E	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ We will continue to make travel safer and attractive by improving street lighting and security coverage at transport interchanges and around bus stops.
More efficient use of the local road network	
F	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ In order to enable traffic to flow more smoothly we will prioritise the reduction of congestion. For significant trip-generating developments we will require travel plans to accompany proposals
G	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ We will continue to work with schools to develop travel plans and will implement improvements in the neighbourhoods around our schools.
H	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ We will continue to invest in improvements to the condition of roads and footways in the borough to ensure that the local road network operates efficiently.

I	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ We will continue to manage a parking regime which balances the environmental desirability of reducing car use while recognising that many Barnet residents will continue to travel by car
J	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ We will promote the use of low emission vehicles including electric cars through provision of charging points utilising 'green energy' in public places and in new development
K	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ We will promote the use of car clubs in new development as an alternative to the private car
Reducing the need to travel	
L	We will continue to influence behaviour in order to reduce the need to travel
M	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ We will promote modern ways of working through provision of e-infrastructure in major residential development and through encouraging access to flexible workspace such as enterprise hubs in town centres and employment sites which enables home workers to be fully productive
N	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Public transport on the A5 corridor ○ Rapid Transit Service at Brent Cross - Cricklewood a dedicated bus service which will link the key places in the growth area ○ A new rail station at Brent Cross - Cricklewood (Staples Corner) ○ Improvements to Brent Cross underground and Cricklewood stations ○ Improvements to the strategic road network, especially the A406 (North Circular Road). ○ Town centre development and enhancement programmes to improve the public realm, public transport services, short-trip parking and accessibility ○ Improvements to rail services in the borough including upgrades to the Northern Line, Thameslink and bus enhancements ○ Targeted increases in road capacity in order to improve conditions for users including motorists, cyclists and pedestrians and to reduce congestion

12.19 Summary of the commentary of the Issues and Options sustainability appraisal 2008

12.19.1 The commentary makes the following recommendations:

- Ensure that Core Strategy sets sustainable locational criteria that makes the car less attractive as a mode of travel.
- Ensure that Core Strategy links improvements to capacity with making car trips less attractive.
- Ensure that Core Strategy emphasises reductions in trips by vehicular traffic whilst encouraging walking and cycling.
- 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.

12.19.2 These are broadly taken forward in the direction of travel although the Core Strategy does not state that car use will be made less attractive, instead it emphasises the alternatives to the car including public transport and cycling/walking and the more efficient use of the road network. Whilst this may appear a compromise it is actually a positive alternative to the recommendation and all the others have been taken on board including that which ensures that core strategy links improvements to capacity with making alternatives to the

car more attractive.

Objective	+ve/-ve effects														Perm/Temp/Sec	Commentary		
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N				
1. To encourage sustained economic growth and promote economic prosperity	+	+	+	+	+	0	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	?	Long term there could be issues with congestion and air pollution as affluence continues to rise so will car ownership.	Reducing the need to travel could reduce congestion which will reduce journey times which will should help further economic growth. Encouraging modern ways of working should also help but its not clear how planning policy can do this. Without more detail managing car parking provision in a balanced way will have a questionable impact. Providing green charging points depends on people using them.
2. To offer everybody the opportunity for rewarding and satisfying employment	00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		There is no part of this policy that impacts this objective.
3. To encourage and accommodate both indigenous and inward investment	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	++	++			Modern ways of working and improving the capacity of the public transport network to reduce congestion and the need to travel will all help to encourage investment from business to locate grow and expand in Barnet. In particular in the town centres. Journey times and congestion is one of the top reasons identified internationally as an issue for London as a whole as a business location compared to other world cities.	

Objective	+ve/-ve effects														Perm/Temp/Sec	Commentary
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N		
6. To maintain and enhance the quality of landscapes, townscapes and local distinctiveness	+?	+?	+?	+?	+?	+?	+?	+?	+?	+?	+?	+?	+?	+?	In the long term unless serious investment in public transport infrastructure occurs the quality of the suburban landscape will be degraded by the domination of the car.	If the policies manage to reduce the need to travel and reduce the volume of traffic then this will benefit the quality of the landscape. Cars currently dominate the suburban environment and reducing the level of built environment engineering associated with them would make a significant benefit to the townscape and wider attractiveness of the borough. However current levels of growth would appear to reduce the chances of any reduction in volume of car usage.
7. To conserve and enhance the borough's existing biodiversity and seek to increase where possible	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	Temp impacts on current levels of biodiversity is unlikely to make a difference.	There is unlikely to be any direct effect on biodiversity unless new transport infrastructure is provided in areas protected for biodiversity.
8. To reduce the risk of flooding for people and property	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	-		Roads cover a large proportion of the borough and make a significant contribution to surface water run off. Whilst there is no possibility that the area of tarmac will be reduced there is nothing to suggest that it will not be increased. Mitigation measures should be included such as permeable paving where transport improvements are proposed otherwise they will have a negative impact.

Objective	+ve/-ve effects														Perm/Temp/Sec	Commentary
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N		
9. To improve air quality	?+	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	+		The question of delivery of public transport improvements needs to be addressed. Generally it is not clear whether the many parts of this policy will actually deliver significant improvements in air quality. The whole borough is an Air Quality Management Zone like the rest of London and the principle cause of this is road transport. Particulates, oxides of nitrogen and sulphur are the principle emissions which regularly exceed EU levels and subsequently harm human health. It will take both major technological improvements and reductions in congestion to reverse this trend.
10. To conserve and where appropriate enhance the historic environment and cultural assets	0	0	0	0	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		There is little impact on this objective apart from the opportunity it presents to improving the public realm of town centres and urban spaces which could be related positively to the historic environment.
11. To achieve sustainable management of waste	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		These policies have very little impact on this objective.
12. To reduce contributions to climate change and reduce vulnerability to climate change	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+		This is related to SA objectives 5 and 9. Transport emissions are a big contributor to climate change therefore anything to reduce them will help reduce their contribution to climate change.

Objective	+ve/-ve effects														Perm/Temp/Sec	Commentary				
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N						
																				The question of delivery needs to be addressed to ensure that the improvements to the infrastructure happen to both reduce congestion and encourage alternatives to the car.
13. To increase energy efficiency and the proportion of energy generated from renewable sources	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	These policies have no impact on this objective.
14. To encourage sustainable use of land	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	?	In the long term reducing the need to travel could help to reduce the amount of land needed for transport uses as it covers a large amount of land in the borough however whether this is realistic is debatable.
15. To achieve sustainable water resources management	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	These policies have no impact on this objective.
16. To improve the Health of Barnet's population	+?	+?	+?	+	+?	+?	+?	+	+?	+?	+?	+?	+?	+?	+?	+?	+?	+?	+?	The predominant principle behind reducing the need to travel will be reducing the need to drive which will benefit Barnet's population as it may encourage them to exercise more which will directly improve their health but it is not possible to be certain of this.

Objective	+ve/-ve effects														Perm/Temp/Sec	Commentary	
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N			
																	Any policy that improves the conditions for walking and cycling should encourage more people to get around the borough this way which has obvious health benefits. The comments on air pollution in response to objective 9 are important as this has an impact on peoples health in the borough which could wipe out any gains from encouraging people to not use their cars.
17. To improve the education and skills of the population	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	These policies have no impact on this objective apart from developing travel plans for schools which will help to educate schools children in the benefits of using alternatives to the car.
18. To provide Barnet's population with the opportunity to live in a decent affordable home	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	These policies have no impact on this objective.
19. To provide good quality surroundings for all	0	0	0	0	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	0	Policies that improve the public realm will help to improve the quality of surroundings. All the transport improvements should be aiming to improve their environment through design.

Objective	+ve/-ve effects														Perm/Temp/Sec	Commentary
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N		
20. To reduce crime and the fear of crime	0	0	0	0	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		Improving safety and perceived safety is important to encourage people to use alternatives.
21. To improve accessibility for all to services and facilities	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	0	0	+	+		Any improvements to the capacity of the network and public transport will help to improve peoples access to services in particular to those in the town centres.
22. To encourage a sense of community; identity and welfare	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	0	+		Using public transport is a more social experience therefore any improvements to it which encourages people to use it more could possibly increase peoples sense of community.

12.20 Important issues emerging from the appraisal for policy CS8 – providing integrated and efficient travel

- 12.20.1 Without more detail managing car parking provision in a balanced way will have a questionable impact if any at all. Without active management car use will increase in the long term as personal affluence does. Issues of increased congestion and the impacts that this has on economic growth and the attractiveness of the borough as a place to live and work could be affected. Also air pollution will continue to affect residents health. The whole borough is an Air Quality Management Zone like the rest of London and the principle cause of this is road transport. Particulates, oxides of nitrogen and sulphur are the principle emissions which regularly exceed EU levels and subsequently harm human health.
- 12.20.2 Equally the question of delivery of public transport improvements needs to be addressed. Generally it is not clear how the many parts of this policy will actually deliver the significant improvements in public transport use needed. This is a question that could be answered by the infrastructure delivery plan. However the policy makes it very clear that in an outer London borough such as Barnet people will always need to use their car. Trying to minimise this use as far as possible is the only approach. Examining why people need to use their cars could help to better inform the direction of this policy. After all 25% of households in borough do not own a car.

12.21 The difference the appraisal process made

- 12.21.1 As part of the Sustainability Appraisal process it helped by highlighting that car clubs had not been referenced which has now been rectified. It also helped to clarify the policy on car parking although not necessarily in a positive way and it also recommended that the policy should consider crime and reducing the fear of crime on public transport was important.

Policy CS 9 – Enabling Integrated Community Facilities and Uses	
The Council will work with our partners to ensure that community facilities including schools, libraries, leisure centres and pools, community meeting places and facilities for younger and older people, are provided for Barnet's communities. We will:	
A	○ Ensure that our programmes for youth services including improvements to the schools estate through the Primary Schools Capital Investment Programme and Building Schools for the Future address the needs of a growing, more diverse and increasingly younger population
B	○ Support new religious schools that want to enter the maintained sector, meet proven demand within the borough and are capable of providing an appropriate learning environment
C	○ Support the retention and enhancement of existing community facilities ensuring their efficient use and the provision of multi-purpose community hubs that can provide a range of services to the community at a single accessible location
D	○ Expect development that increases the demand for community facilities and services to make appropriate contributions towards new and accessible facilities, particularly within the growth areas of the Borough or improving existing provision, particularly within town centres;

12.22 Summary of the commentary of the Issues and Options sustainability appraisal 2008

- 12.22.1 The 'commentary' that relates to community uses is covered by the options 2.09 to 2.14. it makes the following recommendations:
- Ensure that Core Strategy sets sensitive and sustainable locational criteria for joint use of community facilities.
 - 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.
 - 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.
- 12.22.2 The Direction of Travel is taking these recommendations forward but is still in the process of understanding the use and needs of the community with an online survey of users and managers of community centres. A sub regional SHMA has been commissioned and results are awaited.

Objective	+ve/-ve effects				Perm/Temp/ Sec	Commentary
	A	B	C	D		
1. To encourage sustained economic growth and promote economic prosperity	+	+	+	+	Community facilities provide a secondary benefit but provided community facilities can meet growth and changing demands it will be a permanent effect.	Community facilities provide the support necessary for people to be economically active. A school educates the next generation of employees, a childrens centre provides childcare support and training allowing parents to work, a library educates and a health centre provides medical expertise. These are all obvious secondary benefits but are important to supporting economic growth both in Barnet and more importantly at the regional and national scale. The quality of the services provided is dependant on our delivery partners but the spatial coverage of services can be affected by planning.
2. To offer everybody the opportunity for rewarding and satisfying employment	0	0	0	0		More indirect than above so not relevant to these policies although.
3. To encourage and accommodate both indigenous and inward investment	+	+	+	+		The support and enhancement of existing community facilities will have a considerable impact on encouraging inward investment, particularly housing. Community facilities eg having a new doctors surgery nearby is a selling point for a property as are other facilities. Equally making use of Section 106 to gain further funds for community facilities has direct benefits.
4. To reduce disparities in economic performance and promote regeneration	+	0	?	+		The policy has to ensure that the facilities that are located in accessible locations to public transport as well as provided necessary car parking eg for disabled users. S106 contributions will help to train people eg in childrens centres which will help to improve their employment opportunities. Positive to ensure that they provide youth services in the right locations. The growth locations are likely to provide the greatest number of new community facilities so it should be questioned whether the distribution will be sufficient to address any disparities in economic performance.
5. To reduce the effect of traffic on the environment	+	?	+	+		The policy is very clear that facilities should be in accessible locations. Combining a number of facilities in one location will help to reduce the need to drive and therefore the effect of traffic on the environment. There is potential for defining minimum standards for distance from, possibly in the Development Management DPD. The religious school policy does not address location.

Objective	+ve/-ve effects				Perm/Temp/ Sec	Commentary
	A	B	C	D		
6. To maintain and enhance the quality of landscapes, townscapes and local distinctiveness	○	○	○	○		These policies have no significant impact on this objective.
7. To conserve and enhance the borough's existing biodiversity and seek to increase where possible	○	○	○	○		These policies have no significant impact on this objective.
8. To reduce the risk of flooding for people and property	○	○	○	○		These policies have no significant impact on this objective.
9. To improve air quality	○	?	+	+		As above both policies are very clear that facilities should be in accessible locations and combined as hubs where possible. This could help to reduce the need to drive and therefore the effect on air quality from transport emissions. There is potential for defining minimum standards for distance from, possibly in the Development Management DPD. This is particularly important given that development in the borough is expected in the growth areas and town centres. Beyond these areas is the suburban hinterland in which it is expected that there will be little change, or little change in demand for new community facilities. However there maybe need for enhancements and improvements to facilities which without the growth to provide finance for capital improvements via S106 might reduce ability to deliver this. The new religious schools policy does not address location.
10. To conserve and where appropriate enhance the historic environment and cultural assets	○	○	○	○		These policies have no direct impact on this objective unless facilities are located in a conservation area.

Objective	+ve/-ve effects				Perm/Temp/ Sec	Commentary
	A	B	C	D		
11. To achieve sustainable management of waste	0	0	0	0		These policies have no significant impact on this objective.
12. To reduce contributions to climate change and reduce vulnerability to climate change	+	?	+	+		As above both policies are very clear that facilities should be in accessible locations. If they are then this could help to reduce the need to drive and therefore the contributions to climate change from transport emissions. There is potential for defining minimum standards for distance from, possibly in the Development Management DPD. The religious school policy does not address location.
13. To increase energy efficiency and the proportion of energy generated from renewable sources	0	0	0	0		These policies have no significant impact on this objective.
14. To encourage sustainable use of land	+	+	++	+		The provision of multi purpose community hubs is an efficient use of land particularly if community halls/space, health, education and training facilities can be co-located on one site. This is one of the major benefits of this policy and will lead to a much more efficient use of land. There is scope for certain community spaces such as halls to be used more intensively and co-locating with other facilities will help to achieve this. Schools are another example where use at the weekend could be encouraged.
15. To achieve sustainable water resources management	0	0	0	0		These policies have no significant impact on this objective.
16. To improve the Health of Barnet's population	0	0	+?	+		Ensuring that there is an adequate coverage of health facilities will enable the population to access their services better which should help to improve the health of Barnet's population. Ensuring that new facilities are delivered in the growth areas is vital to make sure that needs are met in these locations. Elsewhere it is important that services are not degraded but enhanced.

Objective	+ve/-ve effects				Perm/Temp/ Sec	Commentary
	A	B	C	D		
17. To improve the education and skills of the population	+	+	+	+		S106 contributions will help to train people eg in childrens centres, youth centres which will help to improve their education as will support for new religious schools. Community facilities can also provide this service. New religious schools will provide a positive contribution to educating the boroughs residents.
18. To provide Barnet's population with the opportunity to live in a decent affordable home	0	0	0	0		These policies have no significant impact on this objective.
19. To provide good quality surroundings for all	+	+	+	+		Improving and maintaining community facilities will help to maintain peoples satisfaction with their surroundings.
20. To reduce crime and the fear of crime	0	0	0	0		These policies have no significant impact on this objective.
21. To improve accessibility for all to services and facilities	+	+?	++	++		This policy has a significant positive effect on this objective. It is essential that the range and coverage of the community facilities provided adequately meets the needs of the community. As previously mentioned there is potential for defining minimum standards for distance from or coverage of, possibly in the Development Management DPD to ensure that this is achieved. The growth areas and town centres will be the focus for improvements in community facilities so residents in these locations will benefit the most. Provision in the suburban hinterland also needs to be considered to ensure that every resident has reasonable access though.
22. To encourage a sense of community; identity and welfare	+	+	+	+		Community spaces help to create a sense of community in particular multi-use centres. Combining services in hubs will help to improve the coverage of facilities

12.23 Important issues emerging from the appraisal for policy CS 9 – Enabling Integrated Community Facilities and Uses

12.23.1 It is very clear that facilities should be in accessible locations. Creating multi use community hubs by combining a number of facilities in one location will help to reduce the need to drive and therefore the effect of traffic on the environment. It is also a much more efficient use of land and buildings. The appraisal noted that the growth areas and town centres will be the focus for improvements in community facilities so residents in these locations will benefit the most. But provision in the suburban hinterland also needs to be considered to ensure that every resident has reasonable access as presumably enhancements should be considered in these locations. There is potential for defining minimum standards for distance from or coverage of, possibly in the Development Management DPD to ensure that this is achieved. It was also noted that new religious schools whilst providing a positive contribution to educating the boroughs residents did not address their location.

12.24 The difference that SA made

12.24.1 The SA made a difference by highlighting the opportunity that community facilities can provide for special groups in the borough such as the young, elderly and disabled. The EQIA should have highlighted these issues.

Policy CS10 – Improving Health and Well Being in Barnet	
We will improve health and well-being in Barnet by	
A	o Supporting the plans of NHS Barnet to deliver modern primary care
B	o Supporting healthier neighbourhoods through targeting of unhealthy lifestyles such as obesity and addressing health inequalities in terms ill health and access to health facilities as identified in the Joint Strategic Needs Assessment
C	o Supporting the remodelling of residential care homes to other forms of special accommodation in order to widen housing choice and to reduce over supply
D	o Ensuring that additional residential care homes in the Borough, in the absence of demonstrable evidence of local need supported by NHS Barnet and the Council's Adult Social Services, will not be regarded favourably

12.25 Summary of the commentary of the Issues and Options sustainability appraisal 2008

12.25.1 The assessment of option 2.13 in the commentary is the only one relevant. It asked the question, 'should the Council plan spatially for healthier lifestyles and assist in tackling wider community issues around healthier neighbourhoods and counter growing obesity problems?' The 'commentary' made no recommendations as all the impacts would be positive if the council were to improve access to healthy choices and open spaces.

Objective	+ve/-ve effects				Perm/Temp/Sec	Commentary
	A	B	C	D		
1. To encourage sustained economic growth and promote economic prosperity	0	0	0	0		The policy has no significant impact on this objective.
2. To offer everybody the opportunity for rewarding and satisfying employment	0	0	0	0		The policy has no significant impact on this objective.
3. To encourage and accommodate both indigenous and inward investment	0	0	0 ?	0 ?		The policy has no significant impact on this objective but a question mark relates to the provision of specialist residential care homes as the policy appears to restrict this depending on local supply which might reduce investment from this source but oversupply can be equally negative and a waste of resources.
4. To reduce disparities in economic performance and promote regeneration	0	0	0	0		The policy has no significant impact on this objective.
5. To reduce the effect of traffic on the environment	?	0	+	+		These policies could have a mixed effect. It is not clear what NHS Barnet's plans are for the future of healthcare in Barnet. Ensuring that local needs are met for residential care homes is important as it helps to reduce the need for family and friends to travel as far. But it should be noted that over providing in Barnet draws people in from further afield increasing the distances travelled.
6. To maintain and enhance the quality of landscapes, townscapes and local distinctiveness	0	0	0	0		The policy has no significant impact on this objective.
7. To conserve and enhance the borough's existing biodiversity and seek to increase where possible	0	0	0	0		The policy has no significant impact on this objective.

8. To reduce the risk of flooding for people and property	○	○	○	○		The policy has no significant impact on this objective.
9. To improve air quality	?	○	+	+		These policies could have a mixed effect. It is not clear what NHS Barnet's plans are for the future of healthcare in Barnet. Ensuring that local needs are met for residential care homes is important as it helps to reduce the need for family and friends to travel as far. But it should be noted that over providing in Barnet draws people in from further afield increasing the distances travelled.
10. To conserve and where appropriate enhance the historic environment and cultural assets	○	○	○	○		The policy has no significant impact on this objective.
11. To achieve sustainable management of waste	○	○	○	○		The policy has no significant impact on this objective.
12. To reduce contributions to climate change and reduce vulnerability to climate change	?	○	+	+		These policies could have a mixed effect. It is not clear what NHS Barnet's plans are for the future of healthcare in Barnet. Ensuring that local needs are met for residential care homes is important as it helps to reduce the need for family and friends to travel as far. But it should be noted that over providing in Barnet draws people in from further afield increasing the distances travelled.
13. To increase energy efficiency and the proportion of energy generated from renewable sources	○	○	○	○		The policy has no significant impact on this objective.
14. To encourage sustainable use of land	?	○	+	+		It is not clear what NHS Barnet's plans are for the future of healthcare in Barnet. Sharing facilities with other community uses should be considered. Restricting over provision of specialised care/residential care ensures that use of existing provision is maximised in particular by local residents.
15. To achieve sustainable water resources management	○	○	○	○		The policy has no significant impact on this objective.
16. To improve the Health of Barnet's population	+	+	○	+		It is not clear what NHS Barnet's plans are for the future of healthcare in Barnet but in principle it should be positive. These policies have the most impact on this objective. It is hard to know how unhealthy lifestyles will be tackled by the planning system which is why it is questioned.
17. To improve the education and skills of the population	○	○	○	○		The policy has no significant impact on this objective.

18. To provide Barnet's population with the opportunity to live in a decent affordable home	○	○	+	○		These policies have no impact on this objective apart from that which aims to remodel housing choice to provide further specialist accommodation providing further housing choice for Barnet's residents.
19. To provide good quality surroundings for all	○	○	○	○		The policy has no significant impact on this objective.
20. To reduce crime and the fear of crime	○	○	○	○		The policy has no significant impact on this objective.
21. To improve accessibility for all to services and facilities	?	○	○	+		It is not clear what NHS Barnet's plans are for the future of healthcare in Barnet so the access to services is questioned. Ensuring overprovision is reduced will help provide land for other services.
22. To encourage a sense of community; identity and welfare	○	○	○	○		The policy has no significant impact on this objective.

12.26 Important issues emerging from the appraisal for policy CS10 – Improving health and well being in Barnet.

12.26.1 It is not clear what NHS Barnet's plans are for the future of healthcare in Barnet so the access to services has been questioned. Once plans are clearer policy can make a more spatial response. The need to control the development of specialist residential care homes is clearly evidenced and the policy direction for services for older people is made clear in the Joint Services Needs Assessment. This aims to support peoples ability to live independently for longer thereby reducing demand for residential care homes. The policy still ensures that we make adequate provision locally which is positive as it reduces the need for patients, family and friends to travel as far thereby reducing associated congestion, air pollution and climate change emissions. The one question raised by the appraisal was how planning will tackle unhealthy lifestyles.

12.27 The difference the appraisal process made

12.27.1 At an earlier stage of policy development this policy included text that referred to 'making travel modes safer'. The SA recommended that this be moved to the policy related to integrated travel.

Policy CS 11 – Making Barnet a safer place	
We will aim to make Barnet a safer place. We will:	
A	o Work with our partners to tackle crime, fear of crime and anti-social behaviour
B	o Work with the Metropolitan Police to provide re-modelling of its estate as a basis for an effective and responsive police service in Barnet;
C	o Encourage appropriate security and community safety measures in buildings, spaces and the transport system
D	o Require development to demonstrate that they have incorporated design principles which contribute to community safety and security
E	o Ensure that through the town centre strategy programme we promote safer and more secure town centre environments which encourage community ownership and engender pride
F	o Promote safer streets and public areas including open spaces

12.28 Summary of the commentary of the Issues and Options sustainability appraisal 2008

12.28.1 There is no policy option assessed on crime and safety addressed by the commentary. However the implications of mixed use development in town centres is considered and also the impact of night time uses on crime and anti social behaviour.

Objective	+ve/-ve effects						Perm/Temp/Sec	Commentary
	A	B	C	D	E	F		
1. To encourage sustained economic growth and promote economic prosperity	○	○	○	○	○	○		The policy has no significant impact on this objective. There could be secondary benefits from improving the design of development to improve safety and this could help to maintain economic growth.
2. To offer everybody the opportunity for rewarding and satisfying employment	○	○	○	○	○	○		The policy has no significant impact on this objective.
3. To encourage and accommodate both indigenous and inward investment	○	○	○	+	+	○		Improving design and safety will have a beneficial effect as it will help to encourage more inward investment. In particular the town centres will benefit from this.
4. To reduce disparities in economic performance and promote regeneration	○	○	○	○	○	○		The policy has no significant impact on this objective.
5. To reduce the effect of traffic on the environment	○	?	○	○	○	○		The only question is over the remodelling of the police estate which could have impacts as it may increase the distances that people have to drive.
6. To maintain and enhance the quality of landscapes, townscapes and local distinctiveness	○	○	○	○	○	○		The policy has no significant impact on this objective.
7. To conserve and enhance the borough's existing biodiversity and seek to increase where possible	○	○	○	○	○	○		The policy has no significant impact on this objective.
8. To reduce the risk of flooding for people and property	○	○	○	○	○	○		The policy has no significant impact on this objective.
9. To improve air quality	○	?	○	○	○	○		As above the only question is over the remodelling of the police estate which could have impacts as it may increase the distances that people have to drive.
10. To conserve and where appropriate enhance the historic environment and cultural assets	○	○	○	○	○	○		The policy has no significant impact on this objective.

Objective	+ve/-ve effects						Perm/Temp/Sec	Commentary
	A	B	C	D	E	F		
11. To achieve sustainable management of waste	○	○	○	○	○	○		The policy has no significant impact on this objective.
12. To reduce contributions to climate change and reduce vulnerability to climate change	○	?	○	○	○	○		As above the only question is over the remodelling of the police estate which could have impacts as it may increase the distances that people have to drive.
13. To increase energy efficiency and the proportion of energy generated from renewable sources	○	?	○	○	○	○		Remodelling the estate provides the opportunity to improve the energy efficiency of the new buildings in the police estate.
14. To encourage sustainable use of land	○	+	○	○	○	○		Re-modelling of the police estate potentially provides a more sustainable use of land presumably by using less of it.
15. To achieve sustainable water resources management	○	○	○	○	○	○		The policy has no significant impact on this objective.
16. To improve the Health of Barnet's population	○	○	○	○	○	○		The policy has no significant impact on this objective.
17. To improve the education and skills of the population	○	○	○	○	○	○		The policy has no significant impact on this objective.
18. To provide Barnet's population with the opportunity to live in a decent affordable home	○	○	○	○	○	○		The policy has no significant impact on this objective.
19. To provide good quality surroundings for all	○	○	○	○	○	○		The policy has no significant impact on this objective.
20. To reduce crime and the fear of crime	+	○	+	+	+	+		These policies have the biggest impact on this objective as they are directly related to it.
21. To improve accessibility for all to services and facilities	○	+	○	○	○	○		The proposals contained in the Asset Management Plan provide the basis for reorganising the structure of policing facilities. There will be an improvement in the coverage of 'front counter' services and a centralisation of operational facilities. This creates an obvious improvement in access for one aspect of the police service, the public facing aspect, and a reduction in access for another, to those who are actually affected or involved in criminal activities.

Objective	+ve/-ve effects						Perm/Temp/Sec	Commentary
	A	B	C	D	E	F		
22. To encourage a sense of community; identity and welfare	+	0	0	0	+	+		The aspirations to reduce the fear of crime, promote safer streets and tackle anti social behaviour will all help to improve and build on the sense of community that Barnet has.

12.29 Important issues emerging from the appraisal for policy CS11 – Making Barnet a safer place

- 12.29.1 This policy has a significant positive effect on the sustainability social objectives. Any impacts are heavily influenced by the Metropolitan Police proposals contained in the Asset Management Plan. This provides the basis for reorganising the structure of policing facilities. There will be an improvement in the coverage of 'front counter' services and a centralisation of operational facilities. Socially this creates obvious improvements for community access to the police service and a reduction in access for another which relates to the detention of criminals. But whether this centralisation will cause a negative impact is not clear.

Policy CS 12 – Ensuring the efficient use of natural resources	
We will seek to minimise Barnet's contribution to climate change and ensure that through the efficient use of natural resources the borough develops in a way which respects environmental limits and improves quality of life.	
A	○ We will promote the highest environmental standards for development through our SPD on Sustainable Design and Construction and continue working to deliver exemplary levels of sustainability throughout Barnet.
B	○ We will support retro-fitting of the housing stock where it does not impact on the character or amenity of an area.
C	○ We will expect all development to be energy-efficient and seek to minimise any wasted heat or power. We will require a Carbon Reduction Strategy in support of major development.
D	○ We will maximise opportunities for implementing new district-wide networks supplied by decentralised energy (including renewable generation) in partnership with key stakeholders in areas of major mixed use growth including town centres.
E	○ We will make Barnet a water efficient borough and minimise the potential for fluvial and surface flooding by ensuring development does not cause harm to the water environment, water quality and drainage systems.
F	○ We will improve air and noise quality by requiring Air Quality Assessments and Noise Impact Assessments from development in line with Barnet's SPD on Sustainable Design and Construction.

12.30 Summary of the commentary of the Issues and Options sustainability appraisal 2008

- 12.30.1 The relevant questions assessed by the commentary are covered by options 5.01 – 5.07. The following recommendations were made:
- Ensure that as a key part of the LDF Evidence Base Barnet's Biodiversity Action Plan sets out local priorities for habitats and species.
 - Monitor impacts of climate change through the Core Output Indicators of the Annual Monitoring Report.
- 12.30.2 The commentaries recommendations could have gone further for example recommending the need for further evidence to be gathered on the delivery of sustainable infrastructure in existing applications. This would have been in line with the policy guidance produced by government in the supplement to planning policy statement one.

Objective	+ve/-ve effects						Perm/Temp/Sec	Commentary
	A	B	C	D	E	F		
1. To encourage sustained economic growth and promote economic prosperity	○	○	○	○	○	○		The policy has no significant impact on this objective.
2. To offer everybody the opportunity for rewarding and satisfying employment	○	○	○	○	○	○		The policy has no significant impact on this objective.
3. To encourage and accommodate both indigenous and inward investment	○	○	○	○	○	○		The policy has no significant impact on this objective.
4. To reduce disparities in economic performance and promote regeneration	○	○	○	○	○	○		The policy has no significant impact on this objective.
5. To reduce the effect of traffic on the environment	○	○	○	○	○	○		The policy has no significant impact on this objective.
6. To maintain and enhance the quality of landscapes, townscapes and local distinctiveness	○	○	○	○	○	○		The policy has no significant impact on this objective.
7. To conserve and enhance the borough's existing biodiversity and seek to increase where possible	○	○	○	○	○	○		The policy has no significant impact on this objective.
8. To reduce the risk of flooding for people and property	○	○	○	○	+?	○		The later part of the Policy is relevant however it does not provide detail on how the policy will be implemented. This could be contained in the Development Management DPD. For example will Barnet require a particular level of water efficiency from housing? Will the policy require a level of surface water run off to be achieved.
9. To improve air quality	○	○	○	○	○	+		The later part of the Policy is relevant to this objective and will have a positive impact where development that creates air quality issues exists. Further detail will be contained in the Development Management policies.
10. To conserve and where appropriate enhance the historic environment and cultural assets	○	○	○	○	○	○		The policy has no significant impact on this objective.
11. To achieve sustainable management of waste	○	○	○	○	○	○		The policy has no significant impact on this objective.

Objective	+ve/-ve effects						Perm/Temp/Sec	Commentary
	A	B	C	D	E	F		
12. To reduce contributions to climate change and reduce vulnerability to climate change	+?	+ ?	+?	+?	○	○		The principle impact of these policies is positive and should help to reduce emissions. However the policies need more detail. The level of reduction of emissions is not detailed in that there is no target. Also the locations for the development of decentralised heat should be identified if possible. This is particularly important given the level of growth planned in the borough, particularly in the west. The level of the Code for Sustainable Homes that will be used or BREEAM could be set out as this will help to define what level of carbon emissions reduction will be achieved. It could also be related to decentralised energy as this provides greater potential to reduce emissions overall thereby a higher level of energy efficiency or renewables could be required in these locations.
13. To increase energy efficiency and the proportion of energy generated from renewable sources	+?	+?	+?	+?	○	○		As above the principle impact of these policies is positive and should help to reduce emissions. However the policies need more detail. The level of reduction of emissions is not detailed in that there is no target. Also the locations for the development of decentralised heat should be identified if possible. This is particularly important given the level of growth planned in the borough and the scale of that development should already have been set out in the relevant SPD or Area Action Plans. The level of the Code to be used or BREEAM could be set out as this will help to define what level of carbon emissions reduction will be achieved. It could also be related to decentralised energy as this provides greater potential to reduce emissions overall thereby a higher level of energy efficiency or renewables could be required in these locations.
14. To encourage sustainable use of land	○	○	○	○	○	○		These policies have no impact on this objective.

Objective	+ve/-ve effects						Perm/Temp/Sec	Commentary
	A	B	C	D	E	F		
15. To achieve sustainable water resources management	0	0	0	0	+?	0		The later part of the Policy is the only one that has a positive impact however it does not define the level of water efficiency that will be expected.
16. To improve the Health of Barnet's population	0	0	0	0	0	0		These policies have no impact on this objective.
17. To improve the education and skills of the population	0	0	0	0	0	0		These policies have no impact on this objective.
18. To provide Barnet's population with the opportunity to live in a decent affordable home	0	0	0	0	0	0		These policies have no impact on this objective.
19. To provide good quality surroundings for all	0	0	0	0	0	0		These policies have no impact on this objective.
20. To reduce crime and the fear of crime	0	0	0	0	0	0		These policies have no impact on this objective.
21. To improve accessibility for all to services and facilities	0	0	0	0	0	0		These policies have no impact on this objective.
22. To encourage a sense of community; identity and welfare	0	0	0	0	0	0		These policies have no impact on this objective.

12.31 Important issues emerging from the appraisal for Policy CS 12 – Ensuring the efficient use of natural resources

12.31.1 The main point is that these policies need to have more detail or set out where that detail will be if not in the Core Strategy. The level of reduction of emissions is not detailed in that there is no target. The locations for the development of decentralised heat should be identified if possible. This is particularly important given the level of growth planned in the west of the borough. The level of the Code for Sustainable Homes (CSH) to be used or BREEAM could be set out as this will help to define what level of carbon emissions reduction will be achieved. It could also be related to decentralised energy as this provides greater potential to reduce emissions overall thereby a higher level of energy efficiency or renewables could be required. There is the same problem with the water efficiency policy as it does not define a level to be achieved or an amount of surface water run off that will be met. Again the CSH defines this. This could be contained in the Development Management DPD.

12.32 The difference the appraisal process made

12.32.1 The results of the appraisal have not had any impact on the development of the policies. The only significant change is the identification of a threshold for the requirement of a Carbon reduction strategy. An additional policy has been added that relates to supporting retro fitting of the housing stock although it is not clear whether this will be a requirement.

CS 13 – Dealing with our Waste	
The Council will encourage sustainable waste management by	
A	○ Promoting waste prevention, re-use, recycling, composting and resource efficiency over landfill
B	○ Requiring developments to provide waste and recycling facilities which fit current and future collection practices and targets
C	○ Designating sites through the NLWP to meet an aggregated apportionment target across the seven North London boroughs. These sites will be the principle locations considered suitable for waste facilities
D	○ Safeguarding a Waste Management Facility in the Brent Cross / Cricklewood Regeneration Area

12.33 Summary of the commentary of the Issues and Options sustainability appraisal 2008

12.33.1 The commentary did not consider the issue of waste and waste management.

Objective	+ve/-ve effects				Perm/Temp/Sec	Commentary
	A	B	C	D		
1. To encourage sustained economic growth and promote economic prosperity	○	○	+?	+?		Whilst not directly related there is a possibility that working jointly on the NLWP will lead to new waste facilities in the sub region or Barnet. This could provide opportunities for new businesses and therefore employment in the borough.
2. To offer everybody the opportunity for rewarding and satisfying employment	○	○	○	○		These policies have no impact on this objective.
3. To encourage and accommodate both indigenous and inward investment	○	○	○	○		These policies have no impact on this objective.
4. To reduce disparities in economic performance and promote regeneration	○	○	○	○		These policies have no impact on this objective.
5. To reduce the effect of traffic on the environment	+	+	+	+		Encouraging people to minimise waste and recycle more would help to reduce the vehicle miles from refuse collection vehicles which would have a significant benefit as they produce a greater amount of pollution than cars. Ensuring that there is a range of sites available will help to improve the accessibility and possibly reduce the amount of miles travelled.
6. To maintain and enhance the quality of landscapes, townscapes and local distinctiveness	○	○	○	○		These policies have no impact on this objective.
7. To conserve and enhance the borough's existing biodiversity and seek to increase where possible	○	○	○	○		These policies have no impact on this objective.
8. To reduce the risk of flooding for people and property	○	○	○	○		These policies have no impact on this objective.
9. To improve air quality	+	+	+	+		Related to the point above reducing vehicles miles by encouraging people to produce less waste and providing more waste management will help contribute to improving air quality.

Objective	+ve/-ve effects				Perm/Temp/Sec	Commentary
	A	B	C	D		
10. To conserve and where appropriate enhance the historic environment and cultural assets	0	0	0	0		These policies have no impact on this objective.
11. To achieve sustainable management of waste	+	+	+	+		These policies will have the greatest impact on this objective. Ensuring that waste minimisation is encouraged and a site is safeguarded in the Brent Cross Cricklewood area will help to achieve the sustainable management of waste. However the North London Waste Plan is a DPD in its own right and has its own sustainability appraisal therefore no further detail is required here.
12. To reduce contributions to climate change and reduce vulnerability to climate change	0	0	0	0		These policies have no impact on this objective.
13. To increase energy efficiency and the proportion of energy generated from renewable sources	0	0	0	0		These policies have no impact on this objective.
14. To encourage sustainable use of land	0	0	0	0		These policies have no impact on this objective.
15. To achieve sustainable water resources management	0	0	0	0		These policies have no impact on this objective.
16. To improve the Health of Barnet's population	0	0	0	0		These policies have no impact on this objective.
17. To improve the education and skills of the population	0	0	0	0		These policies have no impact on this objective.
18. To provide Barnet's population with the opportunity to live in a decent affordable home	0	0	0	0		These policies have no impact on this objective.
19. To provide good quality surroundings for all	0	0	0	0		These policies have no impact on this objective.
20. To reduce crime and the fear of crime	0	0	0	0		These policies have no impact on this objective.

Objective	+ve/-ve effects				Perm/Temp/Sec	Commentary
	A	B	C	D		
21. To improve accessibility for all to services and facilities	○	○	○	○		These policies have no impact on this objective.
22. To encourage a sense of community; identity and welfare	○	○	○	○		These policies have no impact on this objective.

12.34 Important issues emerging from the appraisal for policy CS 13 – Dealing with our Waste

12.34.1 The main point emerging is the positive effect that these policies will have on reducing congestion and its impact on air quality. The positive impact of carrying out the NLWP is also noted.

CS 14 - Delivering the Core Strategy	
The Council will work with Barnet's Local Strategic Partnership and other partners to deliver the vision, objectives and policies of this Core Strategy. We will:	
A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Work with relevant providers to ensure that necessary infrastructure is secured to support Barnet's growth and provide the facilities needed for the borough's communities. Information on the key infrastructure schemes in Barnet up to 2026 are set out in the Core Strategy Implementation Framework
B	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Use planning obligations and other suitable funding mechanisms, where appropriate, to secure infrastructure, facilities and services to meet needs generated by development and mitigate the impact of development;
C	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Work with neighbouring boroughs to co-ordinate delivery across boundaries;
D	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Monitor the implementation of the Core Strategy against the indicators set out in Appendix X and publish the results in our Annual Monitoring Report.

12.35 Summary of the commentary of the Issues and Options sustainability appraisal 2008

12.35.1 This commentary does not cover this issue.

Objective	+ve/-ve effects				Perm/Temp/S ec	Commentary
	A	B	C	D		
1. To encourage sustained economic growth and promote economic prosperity	+	+	+	○		Helping to provide the infrastructure required to meet the needs of residents will also help to encourage economic growth. For example if a new children's centre is built then this also provides the opportunity for people to train or give them time to work which helps improve the quality and accessibility of the workforce. Improving the transport infrastructure helps to reduce congestion through either road improvements or public transport improvements which will help to encourage businesses to locate in Barnet.
2. To offer everybody the opportunity for rewarding and satisfying employment	+	+	+	○		Related to the above. Planning obligations can bring additional benefits such as providing training to local people or providing a proportion of jobs in the construction of the development.
3. To encourage and accommodate both indigenous and inward investment	+	+	+	○		Planning obligations can have an effect on the amount of inward investment if they vary widely from neighbouring boroughs. However in policy terms planning obligations are necessary to mitigate the impact of a development. Therefore if they cannot make development acceptable then the development should not be permitted.
4. To reduce disparities in economic performance and promote regeneration	+	+	+	+		Ensuring investment in infrastructure will help to attract employers to the borough particular improvements to the transport infrastructure. Focusing investment in areas that need regeneration is not identified.
5. To reduce the effect of traffic on the environment	+	+	○	○		Improving the amount of infrastructure investment will also include investment in transport infrastructure which could help to encourage people to use cars less if public transport improvements are provided.
6. To maintain and enhance the quality of landscapes, townscapes and local distinctiveness	+	+	○	○		Infrastructure improvements can also include improvements to maintaining and improving the quality of the boroughs landscape and in particular townscape.
7. To conserve and enhance the borough's existing biodiversity and seek to increase where possible	+	+	○	○		Infrastructure improvements could possibly include improvements to biodiversity.
8. To reduce the risk of	○	○	○	○		These policies have no impact on this objective.

Objective	+ve/-ve effects				Perm/Temp/S ec	Commentary
	A	B	C	D		
flooding for people and property						
9. To improve air quality	?	?	0	0		These policies have no impact on this objective although improving the amount of infrastructure investment will also include investment in transport infrastructure which could help to encourage people to use cars less if public transport improvements are provided.
10. To conserve and where appropriate enhance the historic environment and cultural assets	? +	? +	0	0		Infrastructure improvements could possibly include improvements to the historic, environment and cultural assets.
11. To achieve sustainable management of waste	0	0	0	0		These policies have no impact on this objective.
12. To reduce contributions to climate change and reduce vulnerability to climate change	0	0	0	0		These policies have no impact on this objective.
13. To increase energy efficiency and the proportion of energy generated from renewable sources	0	0	0	0		These policies have no impact on this objective.
14. To encourage sustainable use of land	0	0	0	0		These policies have no impact on this objective.
15. To achieve sustainable water resources management	0	0	0	0		These policies have no impact on this objective.
16. To improve the Health of Barnet's population	+ ?	+ ?	0	0		With infrastructure improvements there is the possibility that health facilities will be included which will help to improve the health of Barnet's population.
17. To improve the	+	+	0	0		As above with infrastructure improvements there is the possibility that education facilities will

Objective	+ve/-ve effects				Perm/Temp/Sec	Commentary
	A	B	C	D		
education and skills of the population						be included which will help to improve provision for Barnet's population.
18. To provide Barnet's population with the opportunity to live in a decent affordable home	○	+	○	○		Planning obligations include affordable housing.
19. To provide good quality surroundings for all	+	+	○	○		As already noted infrastructure improvements can also include improvements to maintaining and improving the quality of the boroughs landscape and in particular townscape which will help to provide good quality surroundings for all.
20. To reduce crime and the fear of crime	○	○	○	○		These policies have no impact on this objective.
21. To improve accessibility for all to services and facilities	+	+	○	○		Infrastructure improvements will help to improve access to services and facilities for all people. Further work needs to be done to set out what will be included in the infrastructure delivery plan.
22. To encourage a sense of community; identity and welfare	○	○	○	○		These policies have no impact on this objective.

12.36 Important issues emerging from the appraisal for policy CS 14 - Delivering the Core Strategy

- 12.36.1 Helping to provide the infrastructure required will have a positive effect on the social, environmental and economic aspects of the sustainability appraisal. It will help to meet the needs of residents, help to encourage economic growth and should reduce the impacts of growth on the environment. For example if a new children's centre is built in an accessible location then this provides the opportunity for people to train or give them time to work which helps improve the quality and accessibility of the workforce. Equally a new health centre will help to improve health and probably most importantly planning obligations provide affordable housing. Improving the transport infrastructure helps to reduce congestion through either road improvements or public transport improvements which will help to encourage businesses to locate in Barnet. Further work needs to be done to set out what will be included in the infrastructure delivery plan.