

Barnet Local Plan Examination – actions arising during the course of examination (week 5)

Date	Action	Deadline
8.11.22	Council to add the appeal decision related to site no.2 (North London Business Park) to the examination library.	15.11.22
8.11.22	Council to review the visualisations provided by Mr Bishop (Barnet Society) relating to previous proposal for Site 44 – High Barnet station and refused planning application Site 45 – Land at Whalebones Subject to confirmation by Council (and TfL in case of Site 44) these can be added to the examination library.	15.11.22
8.11.22	Council to add the planning application details/drawings for B/04834/14, 21/3676/FUL and 20/1719/FUL to the examination website.	15.11.22
8.11.22	Barnet to add application details/drawings for appeal EB_SDG_04 relating to Site 45 to the examination website.	15.11.22
8.11.22	Barnet to provide a Statement of Common Ground (SoCG) with the developer for Site 45. If an SoCG cannot be agreed, Barnet to provide a note on the proposed way forward for development on the site.	30.11.22
8.11.22	<p>Note on Site Allocations (continued):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review and respond to the Ramblers' Association's representations on the approach to footpath connections for site allocations in Annex 1 and the strategic walking network. Consider any resulting modifications. • Site 2 – provide an update on the status of the pending planning application for NLBP. Clarify status of S73 application (22/1573/S73). Liaise with developer for timescales for commencement and build-out trajectory. Deliverable or developable ? • Site 3 – Further justification for allocation and assumptions required. Liaise with Council's assets disposal team. Deliverable or developable ? • Site 4 – more cautious approach on density to reflect on constraints. Liaise with Council's 	

	<p>assets disposal team. Deliverable or developable ?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site 67 – GNLP - Liaise with developer on design led approach that can support increased capacity on basis of reduction in main town centre uses - timescales for commencement and build-out trajectory. • Site 23 – Confirm whether the red line needs changing to exclude the listed building. Provide an update on the status of application ref.21/2602/FUL. • Site 24 – Liaise with TfL on design led but cautious approach given heritage assets - timescales for commencement and build-out trajectory. Consider modifications to refer to the community garden in development specification. • Site 25 – Reflect on site’s residential capacity and considerations of Planning Committee report and reasons for refusal as scheme is now subject to appeal • Site 26 – clarify difference in numbers between Reg 19 and Exam 36. Liaise with Council’s assets disposal team on design led work that informed capacity. Consider whether assumptions achievable. Deliverable or developable? Reflect on whether the relationship with the entrance to Cherry Tree Wood can be articulated. • Site 30 – Liaise with TfL regarding the design led approach that has informed calculation of the unit number, and clarify the intended distribution of development across different parts of the site. Consider whether assumptions achievable. Review boundary to the site to ensure roadway running between west and east is included. Consider whether suitable for Very Tall buildings. Consider whether amendment required to remove text in brackets from MM359. • Site 59 – clarify the unit numbers in terms of Density Matrix as part of overall review of Central densities. Bring down to conversion number. • Site 62 –Consider appropriateness of tall buildings. • Site 55 – Liaise with TfL on any design led work that informed capacity. Further justification for allocation, assumptions and 	
--	---	--

	<p>deliverability required. Clarify any relationship with the planning permission 19/4293/FUL (southern part of site 56)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site 56 – provide further justification on development and assumptions of northern part, liaising with TfL on early design work to mitigate any impacts to trees and access, including the footbridge over the Northern line. • Site 57 – review the application of the central densities of the Density Matrix and the design led assumptions of the North Finchley SPD. Clarify any ownership issues. • Site 58 – correct the rounding on indicative capacity. Reflect on the consistency of the approach to parking on this site and across Annex sites, and the consistency of terminology, with particular focus on TfL sites. • Site 60 – review application of the central densities of the Density Matrix and the design led assumptions of the North Finchley SPD. Clarify any ownership issues. • Site 61 – Clarify any ownership issues. Progress SoCG with promoter of North Finchley regeneration. Reflect on unit numbers. • Site 64 – Clarify any ownership issues. Progress SoCG with promoter of North Finchley regeneration. Reflect on unit numbers. • Site 66 – Clarify any ownership issues. Progress SoCG with promoter of North Finchley regeneration. Reflect on unit numbers including implementation of 15/06414/FUL conversion to 21 flats and local heritage asset. • Site 1 – provide an update on the status of the site, confirm whether any planning application has been submitted and/or determined. • Site 65 – Liaise with Council's assets disposal team. Deliverable or developable ? Justification needed for deliverability. • Site 44 – Resolve rounding issue. Liaise with TfL on early design work informing capacity, Provide justification for the 1-5 year time period or consider modifications. 	
--	---	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site 47 – Resolve rounding issue. Provide commentary regarding appropriate building heights and the surrounding context. Check boundary of Map 3E in Exam 34 with regards to Waitrose and reflect on extent of that boundary and potential to make reference to adjoining site as part of a more comprehensive development. • Site 50 – provide justification for the site’s deliverability, particularly in view of the access issues. Clarify what the access solution could be to make the site developable • Site 53 - Clarify wording regarding guidance on building heights. Consider whether need for operational infrastructure should be based on more conservative figure. Scenario setting could provide context for any future opportunities to increase capacities if infrastructure not needed. • Site 54 – Barnet House review any consequential modifications arising from permission APP/N5090/W/21/3289161 • Site 48 – Liaise with Council’s assets disposal team. Deliverable or developable ? More cautious approach with heritage assets Clarify what is happening with the library should the development go ahead. • Site 46 – provide an update on status of currently pending planning application and clarify deliverability of development with the developer and the interaction of development with the North London Studios. • Site 49 – provide an update on planning application going to committee and design led work behind 185 Units including 175 SOPH. Consider 224 unit capacity as upper end. Look at boundary of site and provide comments on public access to western part. Work with the developer to see if the site can be deliverable and if so, provide justification. Reflect on para 149(g) of NPPF. Consider referring to Policy HOU04 in dev specification. • Site 16 – correct the rounding and reflect on the New Barnet Framework and reference to provision of a public square • Site 18 – Liaise with Council’s assets disposal team. Deliverable or developable ? 	
--	--	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site 21 – reflect on what is sought to be achieved in light of the unique challenges of the gasholder site, particularly regarding justification for community floorspace. Modification to make clear that 201 dwellings is not a ceiling if innovative design-led solutions respond to challenges. • Site 52 – consider deletion of site as nearly completed and any consequential modifications. • Site 43 – reflect on a more cautious approach given context of heritage assets. • Site 45 – add further detail to the proposal based on outcome of SoCG and a Note which provides justification for the site and sets out an appropriate indicative capacity in context of appeal decision. • Site 51 – consider whether a more cautious approach is needed with regards to listed building and reconsider MM374 with regards to retention of public house. 	
9.11.22	Upload Matter 10 written statement from Teresa Villiers MP	15.11.22
9.11.22	<p>Matter 11 Note: Housing Land</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Barnet to provide narrative behind any rounding and changes in Table 5. • Update Table 5 following work and actions undertaken for Matter 10. • Review table 5(a) and Housing Trajectory. General rule is that rounding in Table 5 should lead to a number below the total in the Housing Trajectory • Provide justification for the reduction from 3 to 2.5 student units. Review the approach with regard to care homes and the housing supply trajectory. Signpost to London Plan ratios. • Check consistency of terminology used reading across different policies, e.g. references to Cricklewood Town Centre Growth Area in GSS01 and to the Cricklewood Growth Area in other policies. • Review the position on windfalls across Cricklewood, Edgware and Colindale Growth Areas together with Mill Hill East. Avoid double-counting. 	30.11.22

- Reflect on additional 50 units windfall in Town Centres and consider removing 650 homes in total.
- Review supporting text for priority locations in light of any removal of windfalls. Review the approach on town centre intensification.
- Review the 600 homes figure proposed by MM44 for existing transport nodes, particularly in context of any changes to assumptions for site allocation nos 55 and 56
- Review the 950 figure WLO figure as not clear from which station locations this capacity is being realised.
- Review the 4,560 Estates figure. Provide clarification with respect to the Grahame Park Estate and the gap in the build-out rates in Trajectory.
- Provide update on changes to total figures for GSS11 following Note for that policy.
- Review 2,800 other sites figure and remove capacity behind car park redevelopment windfall for GSS12.
- Remove first 3 years of windfall from Plan period assumptions as permission should have already been granted for those developments.

Land for Employment, Retail and Leisure

- Reflect on SoCG for Brent Cross in terms of office and retail floorspace and pick up on proposed modifications.
- Reflect on impact of COVID on working patterns and whether the Plan should highlight priority evidence as part of review of (including Employment Land Study).
- Plan needs to be realistic in what the Council can control particularly with the greater flexibility around Use Class E.
- Reflect on approaches in ECY01(a) and (h) and para 9.9.4 in terms of town centre uses and the sequential test.
- Reflect on where any supply will be located for the 7.3 to 13ha industrial land figure proposed, or set out an alternative approach and justification. Set out existing pipeline
- Consider whether MIM29 should be a main modification.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review BSS01 to reflect Brent Cross discussions and consider whether there needs to be a retail floorspace figure. • Reflect on the potential for a retail figure and any alternative approach to silence in the Plan. • Review the approach to the sequential test, and move into TOW01. Review the area of search for sequential testing. • Consider whether offices should be removed from the retail impact assessment test, having regard to NPPF para.90. Review LB Havering Local Plan and London Plan in that respect. 	
9.11.22	<p>Housing Trajectory Note:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review small sites windfall from first three years to clarify if any double-counting within the trajectory. • Provide narrative on small sites delivery and difference between historic trend and uplift generated by London Plan small sites target • Provide an update from London DataHub on completions once it is available. • Update position if necessary when next Housing Delivery Test results published • Provide an update on sites under construction. • Clarify Council's intentions regarding any buffer to supply, with reference to NPPF 74(a) and (b) • Recalculate supply with following sites excluded to provide conservative 5 year supply estimate (notwithstanding and without prejudice to any further justification as to deliverability from the Council or any potential Inspector findings)– Site 1, Site 2, Site 3, Site 4, Site 5, Site 8, Site 18, Site 23, Site 25, Site 26, Site 30, Site 34, Site 39, Site 44, Site 45, Site 48, Site 55, Site 63. • In terms of consents on trajectory – clarify the following - Colindale Gardens Stage 2 and Stage 3 (if outline consent only, clear evidence of deliverability needed), gaps in delivery at Grahame Park, build outs at Dollis Valley (hybrid consent), split completions with gap year at 19/6833/FUL (66 Woodside Park Road), confirm completion at 1,3,4 and 5 The Exchange, Brent Cross Gardens, NW4 	31.12.22

	<p>3RJ. Clarify timeframe for land adjacent to Finchley Memorial Hospital (if outline consent only, clear evidence of deliverability needed)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Undertake engagement with developers to establish which sites may be deliverable. Provide clear justification for deliverability where pursued. Resolve any anomalies. • Reflect on any potential solutions if the Council finds itself in the position where it does not have the 5YHLS. This could include a stepped trajectory or identification of additional sites • Consider setting baseline as 31st March 2022 with 2022/23 as the base year for the trajectory 	
11.11.22	Council to formally request the Inspectors for Main Modifications to the Reg 19 Local Plan	30.11.22
11.11.22	<p>Matter 12 Note:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consider generally for Table 24 the addition of new columns for specific triggers and actions to ensure the effectiveness of monitoring. • Reflect on the detail of potential monitoring indicators for HOU05-7. Consider how to monitor small sites/windfalls, Build to Rent, self-build. • For HOU07 consider indicators such as unauthorised encampments, planning applications received and/or granted. • Set out triggers such as under-delivery against housing targets indicating what extent of under delivery against the annualised target in the MI for a specific number of years could result in either minor interventions to resolve the situation initially such as engagement with landowners and developers to understand delays to delivery, or more serious action depending on the longevity of the situation such as triggering an early review of relevant policies. • Reflect on triggers and actions for the GSS policies 04-12 making linkages with Tables 5 and 5A as appropriate. • Consider monitoring indicators such as proportion of applications refused on basis of specific policies or proportion of successful 	31.12.22

	<p>appeals where conflict with specific policies had been identified. This could be introduced for CDH01, 02 and 03.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Reflect on whether Indicator 17 also should apply to TOW01 and whether the target should be modified to relate to planning permissions granted, noting previous discussions on Class E and permitted development rights.• Consider indicators for TOW04 and GSS08, the latter having potential to cross-refer to housing indicators.• GSS08 indicator to reflect on status of intended housing delivery in town centres relative to Tables 5 and 5A.• Consider monitoring indicators for CHW02.• Reflect on why the jobs figure in GSS01 is not subject to specific monitoring, and cross-refer to evidence for how that number has been arrived at.• Consider an indicator for ECY03, for example relating to the number of local jobs, skills and/or training programmes to which planning approvals have contributed.• Reflect on indicators for ECC02, 02A and 06. Any indicators are likely to be application or appeal focused, such as where planning permission has been granted / appeal successful despite conflict with those policies. Another example is that the Council could consider monitoring flood risk by reference to approvals outside FZ1.• Review open space monitoring indicators. Consider monitoring the provision of open space in hectares, and monitoring of the contribution to improving the quality and accessibility of open spaces. Also consider how delivery of district and local parks would be monitored.• Consider indicators for TRC01 and TRC02 in order to report on status of each listed project in terms of funding and delivery timescales.• Consider monitoring of TRC03 in terms of applications approved contrary to London Plan parking standards, or those in the plan specific to residential development.	
--	---	--