

Report of Cabinet

11 October 2005

Cabinet Members:

*Cllr Brian Salinger (Chairman)

Councillors:

* Fiona Bulmer	* Anthony Finn BSc	\$ Lynne Hillan
* Melvin Cohen, LL B	Econ FCA	* John Marshall
\$ Katia David BSc	* Mike Freer	* Matthew Offord
MBA JP	* Christopher Harris	
	BA BSc MPhil	

* denotes Member present

\$ denotes Member absent on Council business

1. **UNITARY DEVELOPMENT PLAN – DECISION TO ADOPT (Cab Dec 16/6/2003 – 4) (Report of the Cabinet Member for Planning & Licensing Services – Agenda Item 4):**

Cabinet considered the report of the Cabinet Member for Planning & Licensing Services which has been circulated separately to all members of the Council.

In introducing his report the Cabinet Member made a statement in relation to press reports about Barnet Football Club and the Green Belt section of the Plan. He indicated that the Council had received no formal objection from Barnet Football Club to the advertised post-inquiry modifications. The Council had however received a request from the Chairman of the Club to advise him of the latest position on the UDP. A meeting had taken place with the Chairman and he had been advised of the latest proposed changes to the Green Belt section of the Plan as a result of formal representation from GOL. The Chairman had discussed an alternative form of wording with an officer and this had been taken away for further consideration. Upon further consideration, including discussion with Legal officers and reference back to the Inspector's report, the proposed wording had not been considered appropriate and alternative wording had been included as set out on page 51 of the Cabinet Member's report. The Cabinet Member stated that he was satisfied with the latest proposed changes to paragraph 5.3.22 contained in his report.

For the reasons set out in the Cabinet Member's report, Cabinet

RESOLVED TO RECOMMEND

That Council

- a) **agree the schedule of proposed modifications to the draft UDP set out in Appendix A to the Cabinet Member's report;**
- b) **agree that these modifications will not materially affect the Plan; and**
- c) **agree to give notice to adopt the Plan in accordance with the Town and Country Planning (Development Plan) England Regulations 1999.**

AGENDA ITEM: 5 Page nos. 42 – 67

Meeting	Cabinet
Date	11 October 2005
Subject	Unitary Development Plan – decision to adopt
Report of Summary	<p>Cabinet Member for Planning and Licensing</p> <p>The Council’s modifications to the draft UDP have been advertised in accordance with Government Regulations and a number of objections have been received. The council must decide whether to make changes that would materially alter the Plan in which case the changes must be advertised for a period of six weeks. If the Council decides to make no material changes it can proceed to adopt the Plan.</p>

Officer Contributors	Head of Planning
Status (public or exempt)	Public
Wards affected	All
Enclosures	Appendix A
For decision by	Council
Function of	Council
Reason for urgency / exemption from call-in (if appropriate)	N/A

Contact for further information: Ros Ward, 0208 359 4657

1. RECOMMENDATIONS

1.1 That Cabinet recommend the Council to

- a) agree the schedule of proposed modifications to the draft UDP set out in Appendix A;**
- b) agree that these modifications will not materially affect the Plan; and**
- c) agree to give notice to adopt the Plan in accordance with the Town and Country Planning (Development Plan)England Regulations 1999.**

2. RELEVANT PREVIOUS DECISIONS

- 2.1 Council on 28 June2005 agreed Post Inquiry Modifications to the UDP and agreed to advertise them in accordance with the Regulations with the intention to proceed to adopt the Plan later this year.

3. CORPORATE PRIORITIES AND POLICY CONSIDERATIONS

- 3.1 The UDP is the land use and planning development plan for the borough over the next 3 to 6 years and will guide future development and changes of use. It will ensure that many of the council's five key priorities and other key objectives are delivered, in particular: to ensure a Cleaner & Greener borough, delivering a first class education service, supporting the vulnerable in our community and delivering regeneration, including Cricklewood, Brent Cross and West Hendon.

4. RISK MANAGEMENT ISSUES

- 4.1 Failure to have an up to date development plan in place will affect the regeneration at Cricklewood, Brent Cross and West Hendon, the effective delivery of which will be severely hindered without the appropriate policy framework. It will weaken the council's legal position to defend development control decisions and deliver high quality development and sustainable communities. In addition, it will affect Barnet's Planning Delivery Grant (PDG) settlement for next year and future years.
- 4.2 Making any significant material modification to the draft UDP which is contrary to the Inspector's recommendation risks re-opening the Public Local Inquiry (PLI). A re-opened PLI could delay adoption of the UDP by up to one year, which in turn would have an adverse effect on production of the replacement development plan – the Local Development Framework (LDF). On the other hand, not agreeing with an objection made by the Government Office for London risks a Direction from the Secretary of State.

5. FINANCIAL, STAFFING, ICT AND PROPERTY IMPLICATIONS

- 5.1 The cost of advertising adoption of the UDP and printing the document will be met from the Planning Service's budget and PDG allocation 2005 / 06. Placing the document on the council's web page should reduce the costs compared with production of the previous UDP.
- 5.2 It is estimated that potentially £200,000 PDG award could be lost if adoption of the UDP is delayed significantly beyond the target date of the end of 2005. This will have an adverse effect upon the budget for 2006/07.

6. LEGAL ISSUES

- 6.1 None

7. CONSTITUTIONAL POWERS

- 7.1 Constitution, Part 3: Responsibility for Functions – Section 3.8 reserves to full Council certain statutory framework policies including "Plans and Strategies comprising the UDP"

8 BACKGROUND INFORMATION

- 8.1 The preparation of the Council's UDP has reached the final stage in the process, which is adoption of the Plan, (subject to any directions or legal challenges). The Post Inquiry Modifications have been advertised and some objections have been received as a result of the six-week public consultation. Those objections are set out in Appendix A.
- 8.2 The Council must decide whether to make any changes to the UDP as a result of consultation. If any modifications are made that materially affect the content of the UDP there has to be another period of consultation which could result in a new Public Local Inquiry. If, however, the changes are not material, the council can proceed to adopt the Plan.
- 8.3 The objectors comprise three statutory consultees, including the Government Office for London (GOL), the Mayor of London / GLA and the Highways Agency, as well as Tesco, amenity and special interest groups. Many of the amenity and interest groups' objections relate to issues already addressed at previous consultation stages and by the Inspector. Some word changes can be made for clarification but none of them will materially affect the Plan.

Tesco

- 8.4 The objections by Tesco relate to three issues: (i) the Brent Cross town centre boundary, (ii) the convenience retail assessment, and (iii) the Eastern Lands Development Framework Addendum.
- (i) The Inspector considered the appropriate **boundary of the Brent Cross town centre** at the Public Local Inquiry and recommended that it should be drawn to include the concentration of retail and associated uses to the north of the A406 North Circular Road, based on the existing shopping centre, and also to the south of the North Circular Road nearest the proposed railway station. The Council's agreed post Inquiry modification therefore accords with the Inspector's recommendation and no change is proposed.
 - (ii) Tesco considers that the methodology to be used to **assess additional convenience floorspace** at the new Brent Cross town centre should take account of existing convenience floorspace and it needs to be specified in the UDP. This change is not necessary as such a methodology is required in order to satisfy government guidance contained in PPS 6.
 - (iii) The third objection relates to the **Development Framework Addendum on the Eastern Lands**. Tesco considers that the Council did not engage sufficiently with the company which is a major land owner. In terms of status, the Development framework is supplementary planning guidance to the UDP and not a primary policy consideration. However, the council has held meetings with Tesco and will continue to work with Tesco and other stakeholders. Therefore, no change to the UDP text is necessary.

8.5 Highways Agency

- 8.6 The Highways Agency objects to the restriction of car parking applying only to the town centre north of the North Circular Road. This ceiling was agreed at the previous inquiry into the expansion of Brent Cross to the north of the North Circular Road and the Inspector did not recommend that this should apply to the further expansion to the south which will require car parking in accordance with Policy C8 of the UDP.

8.7 Government Office for London (GOL)

- 8.8 The Government Office for London made a number of objections as follows:
- (i) The Council's modification relating to Barnet Football Club does not reflect Government guidance contained in PPG 2. A change to the text to clarify this can be made without materially affecting the Plan.
 - (ii) The change made to **Policy TCR1** does not comply with government guidance contained in PPS6 in relation to town centre hierarchies, in this case the position regarding Brent Cross. Changes can be made to the text of both Chapters 11 on town centres and 13 on Cricklewood/Brent Cross and West Hendon that would remedy this and not materially affect the Plan.
 - (iii) There are three objections relating to housing policy. One relates to the **borough's housing target** and another to **housing mix**. Changes can be

made to the text to clarify these issues without materially affecting the Plan. The third objection relates to **affordable housing**. GOL considers that the threshold for affordable housing should be reduced from 15 to 10 units. This reverses the Inspector's recommendation, and GOL's position at the Revised Deposit version. The council considers that the issue of affordable housing was thoroughly examined by the Inspector who recommended that the council should negotiate 50% affordable housing on sites of 15 units and above, in accordance with Government guidance in PPG 3. Reducing the threshold to 10 units could have a reverse impact, for example some developers could refrain from submitting proposals for housing on small sites on viability grounds, and there would be more valuable time spent negotiating with developers on such sites and would not produce a significant gain in affordable housing, that would be better spent on larger sites. GOL had not originally seemed to have taken into account the large increase in overall housing development projected in the borough, which will provide very significant amounts of housing to meet the identified needs. The Council should not make the change suggested by GOL as it is considered not necessary, not in line with the Government Inspector's Report and would materially affect the plan.

- (iv) GOL objects to the **car parking standards** in respect of housing and employment that do not conform to government guidance and to the London Plan. The Council considers that the situation in the borough warrants different standards and that no change should be made to the Plan.

8.9 The Mayor of London - Greater London Authority (GLA)

- 8.11 The Mayor of London – GLA has made a number of objections. These relate to issues of open space, transport and housing. Changes can be made to the text in order to clarify the Plan in relation to **open space** and **transport** without materially affecting the Plan. The objection in relation to the threshold for **affordable housing** is similar to GOL's and the Council's response is the same: to make no change. The Mayor / GLA objected to the higher threshold at the Pre-Inquiry Changes stage, which was considered at the PLI. The Mayor of London – GLA's objections relating to **housing mix** cannot be made without materially affecting the Plan; this is an issue for the future Barnet LDF.

8.12 Summary

- 8.13 Final consideration is for the Council to adopt the UDP. Section 15 (2A) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 requires a borough's UDP to be in 'general conformity' with the London Plan. The Council must consider whether, in its opinion, the UDP does conform generally to the London Plan. This is in accordance with Government regulations and advice which explain that 'general conformity' does not mean complete conformity in every respect.

8.14 The Council has taken account of the strategic policies of the London Plan and has made changes to the UDP at several stages following objections from the GLA. At this stage, following the minor changes to be made, the Council considers that the UDP is in general conformity with the London Plan and can be adopted.

8.15 Final Adoption Stages – six weeks post formal decision

8.16 Once the Council has issued a notice to adopt the UDP there is a six-week period for legal challenge before it can be formally adopted. During this period the Secretary of state can decide whether to direct the Council to make changes to the Plan. If a direction is made, the Council may challenge this in the High Court, or accept the changes directed by the Secretary of State without further consultation.

9 LIST OF BACKGROUND PAPERS

- 9.1 Barnet Unitary Development Plan, Revised Deposit Draft (March 2001).
- 9.2 The Inspector's Report into objections to the London Borough of Barnet's UDP (November 2004).
- 9.3 The London Borough of Barnet's List of Proposed Modifications Based on the Inspector's Report. (June 2005).
- 9.4 Statement of Decisions and Reasons in Response to the Inspector's Report into Barnet's UDP Public Local Inquiry. (June 2005)
- 9.5 LB Barnet Cabinet and Council Reports (31st May and 28th June 2005)

BS: JEL
BT: CH

SUMMARY OF OBJECTIONS TO POST INQUIRY MODIFICATIONS REPORT (2005) AND COUNCIL'S RESPONSE.				
Objector / Client Name	Mod. Ref. No.	Summary of Objections and Suggested Change	Council's response	Does this Materially Affect Content of the UDP
Antony Powell, Met Police, Barnet	54	The Council has not used the correct title, which should read ' Police Crime Prevention Design Advisors'	Agree to change para 4.3.14 to read.....issues may be referred to the Police Crime Prevention Design Advisors	No
Antony Powell, Met Police, Barnet	55	Circular 5/94 'Planning Out Crime' has been cancelled, and PPG1 replaced by PPS1. Remove the reference to Circular 5/94 to read 'It is the shared objective of the council, the Police and our community safety partners to reduce both crime and the fear of crime amongst the community, in line with advice contained in Planning Policy Statement 1: Delivering Sustainable Development and Safer Places: The Planning System and Crime Prevention.	Agree to change para 4.3.15 as suggested.	No
Paul Robinson, Highways Agency	388	Object specifically to inclusion of the words 'north of the North Circular Road' Recommend the policy states that no additional parking, within all of the new town centre, is provided to cater specifically for leisure use, relying instead on the existing off-street parking at Brent Cross and out-of-hours shared use with the additional parking that will result from the business development. Allowing parking at leisure developments would increase overall level of parking in the area, and may increase the number of vehicle trips in surrounding roads.	Do not agree. The Development Framework specifically recommends no further car parking for retail and leisure uses in town centre north only. This has been subject to extensive consultation and has reflected the views of both the GLA and TfL the two bodies directly responsible for setting parking standards in London's spatial planning strategy, matters of precise parking numbers for the regeneration area are a matter for the planning application.	No

Chris Price, Network Rail	372	Given the scale of development proposed in West Hendon and likely impact upon Hendon Mainline Station in terms of user numbers, mitigation measures may be necessary. Suggest amending final point of Policy C1 (A) to read...'measures to improve transport links to, and facilities at Hendon (Mainline) Station'.	Agree to amend Policy C1(A) as suggested.	No
Derek Chandler, Golders Green Station Action Group	317 & 318	Objection relates to possible redevelopment of Golders Green bus and Underground Station and its listing in the UDP schedule of proposals (h22). It should be made clear that the works access road has definitely been excluded from any redevelopment proposals, and the site's entry in the UDP be modified fully and clearly. Suggest producing a map of sufficient detail to show the works access road has been excluded, and, production of sentences clearly setting out the modified version and explaining the use categories without acronyms or unexplained terms.	Agree To Change. Modify the wording for proposal site h22 to read.....' <i>redevelopment of underground station, trainlines, station forecourt and bus station, excluding the works access road. Proposal to provide an integrated transport interchange, including an element of mixed-retail, uses A3, A4, A5 and small-scale business use on an area of 1.7 hectares</i> '. Please note the use classes will be explained in the UDP glossary.	No
Eli Abt, Abt Architecture & Planning	160 & 162	The proposed exceptions to Parking Policy M14 and associated text, are contrary to Government and regional policy and are unsustainable, retrograde and unjustified. Suggest policy should read....'the council will expect development to provide on-site parking in accordance with the parking standards at Annex 4 of the London Plan'.	The UDP parking standards conform with the London Plan with the exception of residential and B1 standards	No
Cluttons	81	The new text adopts a very restrictive stance. Suggest that reference should be made to the fact that in very special circumstances (some) development may be able to occur in Green Belts, in accordance with Section 3, para 3.1 of PPG2.	No Change. The new text is taken from another council strategy	No
Cluttons	18	Policy GBEnv4 should afford protection to interests of acknowledged importance, but it should also recognise and differentiate between the most important sites and those which are of lesser value. Suggest the text makes reference to paragraph 25 of PPS7, and recognise and differentiate between the most important sites for protection and those which are of lesser value.	No Change. The council has followed the Inspector's advice.	No

RPS Planning for Hammerson/Standard Life and CRL	379	Policy C6 now includes to the need for 55,000sq.m of comparison retail floorspace as identified by the North West London Retail Assessment (April 2004) undertaken by GVA Grimley and RPS. Policy C6 does not fully acknowledge that the retail needs assessment has now been carried out. Suggest the retail assessment is specifically referenced within the supporting text. There may be capacity for additional comparison floorspace, above that identified due to the emerging residential schemes at RAF East Camp, Grahame Park Estate and Stonegrove. Suggested change to paragraph 1.15 "The North West London Retail Assessment, commissioned by the Council, the GLA and the principal landowners, for the Development Framework, has demonstrated both capacity and need for significant new retail floorspace taking into account trends in expenditure and population as well as requirements of other centres.	Agree to refer specifically to NW London Retail Needs Assessment within the reasoned justification to Policy C6. Do not accept proposed change to Paragraph 13.1.15 as it will address through LDF.	No
RPS Planning for Hammerson/Standard Life and CRL	321	The configuration of the new town centre boundary in relation to site proposal 31 creates a small area of land that falls between the two designations and is therefore unallocated. This area of land should be included within the town centre designation. Suggested change is that the town centre boundary of site proposal 31 on the proposals map should be amended to fall flush with the Eastern Lands boundary (Site Proposal 37), thereby removing the current 'void' area of land between the two designations.	Agree to change - the boundary of the Eastern Lands needs revision.	No

Government Office for London	93	The statement "there may be very special circumstances for allowing redevelopment of the stadium due to the need for the club to provide better facilities" and that "any redevelopment proposal should not harm the Green Belt over and above that caused by the existing stadium". The statement does not accurately reflect the guidance given in PPG2 which explains that there is a general presumption against inappropriate development in Green Belts and that such development should not be approved, except in very special circumstances. The onus is then placed upon the applicant to demonstrate that very special circumstances exist. Suggested change: The paragraph should be redrafted to make clear the manner in which the Council will consider proposals explaining that any future application will be considered in accordance with para 3.2 of PPG2.	Agree to change para 5.3.22 to read.... Permanence is an important feature of green belts and MOL. PPG 2 advice states that their boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances. In Barnet the green belt boundaries are the same as those which were established in Barnet's Unitary Development Plan adopted in 1991. There is no proposal to change the green belt boundary of Barnet Football Club at South Underhill. It has been established that there is potential for a limited expansion to the east and south of the stadium. Any planning application to extend the existing stadium will need to be considered in accordance with paragraph 3.2 of PPG 2. The boundary of MOL at the former Friern Barnet Hospital, Compton School and at the Temple Fortune Sports Club have been revised to take into account recent development at the site.	No
Government Office for London	183 & 184	The site unit threshold within Policy H4 for qualifying sites does not fully reflect advice in PPG3 (para 10). Suggest amendment to the policy to ensure securing an appropriate dwelling mix in all new housing developments and by deletion of the reference to a 15 dwellings and above threshold.	Do not agree	
Government Office for London	171, 174 & 176	Paragraph 8.3.3 if read in isolation could be interpreted by the reader as being a target figure to be aimed for as opposed to a minimum one to be met as stated in Part 1 policy GH1. Suggest making it clear that the 17,780 additional homes figure is a minimum one.	Agree to change para 8.3.3 to state a minimum provision of 17,780 new homes by 2016	No

Government Office for London	160 & 162	RPG9 "Regional Planning Guidance for the South East" (Policy T3c) sets the range of acceptable parking standards for employment generating development in outer London to 1:100 -1:600 per m ² of floor space. Also stated in annex 4 of the London Plan. Suggest amending the car parking standard for B1 development in low accessibility locations in line with the UDP inspector's recommendation 7.85(v) so as to reflect the advice in RPG9 and the London Plan which makes it clear that the standard for B1 uses be set no lower than at one space per 100 sqm. Also that confirmation is sought that the residential standards applying are maximum.	Do Not Agree	No
Government Office for London	265, 268 & 269	Policy TCR(I) identifies the existing Brent Cross Regional Shopping Centre within the first tier of preferred locations for new retail uses which may entail development of new floorspace. Para 11.3.3 and 11.3.4 infers that the existing Brent Cross Regional Shopping Centre is recognised as a type of town centre. Suggest deleting the inferred references to the existing Brent Cross Regional Shopping Centre in chapter 11 as being a type of town centre and a preferred location for expansion of new retail floorspace. The plan should rely solely on what is said in chapter 13 to explain both the current and propsoed future status of Brent Cross. Alternatively if reference is retained in Chapter 11, the current status of the Brent Cross Regional Shopping Centre should be made clear and cross references made in Chapter 13.	Agree To Change	No

Government Office for London	191 & 194	GLA's evidence on thresholds in London (Thresholds for Application of Affordable Housing Requirements, Three Dragons et al, March 2003) suggests that in terms of development economics, thresholds lower than 15 are capable of delivering affordable housing without adversely affecting overall supply. PPG3, Consultation Paper on Proposed Change to Policy Guidance Note 3, Housing (ODPM July 2003) suggests that in some instances a reduction of the threshold to 10 could be acceptable. The Secretary of State has considered the appropriate threshold for affordable housing within the Borough in the light of the Inspector's recommendations, the changed policy context, the significant need in the borough. The Secretary of State has concluded that in these particular circumstances, the policy should be modified to provide a threshold of 10 dwellings (or 0.4 ha).	Do Not Agree	No
Chris Thomas Ltd, on behalf of Outdoor Advertising Assoc.	64	Object to modifications in respect of Policy D21, para 4.3.34. All advertisements must be considered in the interests of amenity and safety alone, and it is unduly onerous to restrict advertising hoardings to those which screen derelict or vacant sites or enhance the appearance of an area. The Inspector's recommended changes are contrary to PPG19. Suggest that a more realistic policy is required, based upon PPG19. Reversion to Barnet's Revised UDP version would be an improvement, although it will not be supported where PPG19 indicates otherwise.	Agree to change	No
Tesco	367	Tesco Stores Ltd (Tesco) objects to the proposed modifications to the UDP proposals map to exclude the land south west of the A406/A41 Hendon Way junction (also known as the Eastern Lands) and including the existing Tesco store, from within the boundary of the proposed new "town center" at Brent Cross. The basis of this objection is set out in the representations submitted to the modification number 382. As a consequence Tesco also objects to the proposed modifications of Policy Gcrick. It should be made clear that in referring to the proposed new "town centre", the Policy refers to the town center boundary – including the Eastern Lands.	Do not agree	No

Tesco	380	<p>Tesco supports a) the need for a further study for the "Eastern Lands". b) supports the proposed modification to policy C6 however the supporting text needs clarification. There is a good deal of uncertainty regarding the potential need for further convenience retailing in the area (paragraphs IR 13.55 and 13.56). Tesco's own research indicates that there is a need for some additional convenience floorspace at Brent Cross. However, further work is necessary to establish the precise scale of such need and whether this is sufficient to justify an additional new foodstore at Brent Cross or whether the identified need could be met by the enlargement of the existing convenience provision at Brent Cross. Any further study should pay due regard to existing convenience floorspace already trading, including the existing Tesco.</p> <p>b) supports the proposed modification to policy C6 however the supporting text needs clarification. There is a good deal of uncertainty regarding the potential need for further convenience retailing in the area (paragraphs IR 13.55 and 13.56). Tesco's own research indicates that there is a need for some additional convenience floo</p>	Do not agree	No
-------	-----	--	--------------	-----------

Tesco	360	<p>The Adopted "Cricklewood, Brent Cross and West Hendon Regeneration Area Development Framework" Contains little guidance on the potential for future development of the area of land to area south west of the A406/A41 Hendon Way junction (also known as the eastern Lands). This was recognised by the Inspector at IR para.13.65. One of the Inspector's recommendations was that a further study be undertaken into the future of the land and Tesco supports this and believes that existing uses should be integrated into the new town center at Brent Cross or wider Regeneration Area. With reference to the Draft Addendum: eastern Lands Addendum" to the "Cricklewood, Brent Cross and West Hendon Regeneration Area Development Framework"; it is Tesco's view that the Draft Addendum has not engaged all stakeholders nor paid due regard to existing uses. Any future additions to the Adopted Development Framework should only be undertaken after fully and proper consultation with all stakeholders including major landowners. Furthermore the proposed wording of paragraph 13.1.13 suggests that the UDP will be adopted</p>	Do not agree	No
-------	-----	---	--------------	-----------

Tesco	325	Tesco Stores Ltd objects to the proposed modifications to the UDP Proposals Map exclude the Cricklewood Eastern Lands (including the Tesco store) from within the boundary to the proposed new “town centre” at Brent Cross. The basis of this objection is set out in the representations submitted modification number 382. The view is that the Council should revert to the definition of the town centre as contained in the Amended Unitary Development Plan proposals map dated January 2003. Tesco believes that the new proposal included in the Schedule of Proposals regarding the Eastern Lands should be a separate entry but be amalgamated with Site 31 for the proposed new town centre at Brent Cross included. Suggested amendment: reference to new Site Proposal 37 should be deleted, Site 31 should include all land within the proposed town center at Brent Cross – including the existing Shopping Centre together with areas to the south of the North Circular Road including the Eastern Lands	Do not agree	No
Tesco	382	Tesco Stores Ltd objects to the proposed modifications to the UDP Proposals Map. The Company has the view that the Council should revert to the proposals map as contained in the Amended Unitary Development Plan dated January 2003. The existing Tesco store already forms part of the range of commercial uses at Brent Cross and a variety of retail attractions already established in the area. Existing linkages between the area south west of the A406/A41 Hendon Way junction (Eastern Lands) and the existing centre at Brent Cross are relatively weak. However, these linkages are no worse than other areas south of the A406 further west. The Inspector at IR para. 13.65 acknowledged that the Eastern Lands might be integrated into both the proposed town centre or the wider Regeneration Area. The Inspector recommended further study into the future of this land. The Eastern Lands should be part of the boundary of the new town centre at Brent Cross. Recommendation: amended proposals map accordingly.	Do not agree	No

Tesco	321	Tesco Stores Ltd objects to the proposed modifications to the UDP Proposals Map. The Company has the view that the Council should revert to the proposals map as contained in the Amended Unitary Development Plan dated January 2003. As a consequence Tesco objects to the proposed modifications to the description of Site 31 - Brent Cross Regional Shopping Centre. The Council should revert to the definition of the town centre as contained in the Amended UDP Proposals Map dated Jan 2003 that includes the Eastern Lands. Recommended amendment Site 31 should refer to proposed town centre at Brent Cross including the existing shopping centre together with the Eastern Lands. Site 31 should be amended to include Tesco Stores as one of the landowners in the area.	Do not agree	No
Tesco	264	Tesco Stores Ltd objects to the proposed modifications to the UDP Proposals Map to exclude the Eastern Lands (see objections to modifications no.382). Tesco therefore objects to the proposed modification to the wording of table 11.2 in relation to Brent Cross/Cricklewood and specifically to the definition of the proposed new "town centre". The Council should revert to the definition of town centre as contained in the Amended UDP proposals map. Suggested amendment:- site: Land North and South of the A406, including the existing shopping centre and the land to th south west of the A406/A41 Hendon Way junction".	Do not agree	No
North Finchley Agenda 21 Group	48	Policy GBEnv4. The addition of nineteen categories made the policy clearer and the addition of the words "seek to" removes any teeth that the policy had. Revert to the original wording, as a minimum, the words "seek to" in the modified wording should be removed.	Do not agree	No
North Finchley Agenda 21 Group	51	Policy D5. Modified wording is too weak, particularly in the light of the move to higher density development. Revert to the original wording. As a minimum, the word "should" in Line 1 should be replaced with "are to".	Do not agree	No
North Finchley Agenda 21 Group	52	Policy D7. Modified wording is too weak, particularly in the light of the move to higher density development. Revert to the original wording. As a minimum, the word "should" in Line 1 should be replaced with "are to".	Do not agree	No
North Finchley Agenda 21 Group	57	Para.4.3.17 The modified wording is not specific enough. Delete the word "guideline".	Do not agree	No

North Finchley Agenda 21 Group	60	Para 4.3.23. The revision ignores the Inspector's recommendation 4.47 (i) that the text be amended with a reference to the likely programme for a Council sponsored survey.... The need to identify "important" hedgerows was raised early in the Deposit Draft UDP process and yet there appears to have been no progress on the survey or a desire to timetable one. Amend the modification to read "The Council will complete a survey of such hedgerows by the end of July 2006 and maintain up to date records in order to implement this Regulation. Meantime, applications that involve removal of or damage to hedgerows will be refused".	Do not agree	No
North Finchley Agenda 21 Group	61	Para 4.3.30 There is justification to make it more difficult to develop "so called" landmark buildings which may adversely impact on surrounding areas, landscape and cause wind tunnels and other environmental damage. Instead the wording is more permissive. The wording should not be modified. Revert to the original wording.	Do not agree	No
North Finchley Agenda 21 Group	82	Policy GBEnv4. The addition of nineteen categories made the policy clearer and the addition of the words "seek to" removes any teeth that the policy had. Revert to the original wording, as a minimum, the words "seek to" in the modified wording should be removed.	Do not agree	No
North Finchley Agenda 21 Group	96	Para 5.3.40. The modification is too permissive and too vague. Delete existing modification and amend to read "When considering development proposals which may affect a site of importance for nature conservation, steps are to be taken to avoid any adverse impact on the nature conservation value of the site".	Do not agree	No
North Finchley Agenda 21 Group	97	The modification should be strengthened. At the end of the existing modification add the words "in accordance with Policy O14 below".	Do not agree	No
North Finchley Agenda 21 Group	102	Policy O16. Modified wording is too weak. Revert to the original wording.	Do not agree	No
North Finchley Agenda 21 Group	103	Paras 5.3.48a. Modified wording weakens the paragraph by deleting the sentence on tree planting schemes. Reinstate the sentence reading "The Council will seek to obtain tree planting schemes from development proposals where appropriate".	Do not agree	No
North Finchley Agenda 21 Group	104	A timetable should be set for the production of the Local Biodiversity Action Plan for the Borough. Add the words "by the end of December 2006" after "a Local Biodiversity Action Plan for the borough" in the penultimate sentence.	Do not agree	No

North Finchley Agenda 21 Group	109	Para 6.1.14 Modified wording is too narrow. Amend modification to read "To maintain a adequate level of public open space suitable for passive and active participation in both formal and informal outdoor recreation activities".	Do not agree	No
North Finchley Agenda 21 Group	114	Para 6.3.17 Modified wording needs to be more protective of Town Centres. In the last sentence of the modified paragraph after the words "...the character of the area" add the words "and limited in height to that of the existing traditional development and also be of sympathetic high quality design".	Do not agree	No
North Finchley Agenda 21 Group	116	Para 6.3.19. Modificaton needs to strengthen the justification for an open space strategy. After "...PPG17" in the first modified sentence add the words "that stresses the importance of open space and trees in particular in combating and reducing air pollution".	Do not agree	No
North Finchley Agenda 21 Group	117	Para 6.3.21. After the words "...Commercial development" in the modification add the words "and the importance of open space and trees in particular in combating and reducing air pollution".	Agree additional words	No
North Finchley Agenda 21 Group	118	The modification detracts from the impact of the paragraph. Replace deleted sentence in 6.3.22 with "The Council wil encourage new development to secure improvements in the amount, quality and distribution of public open spaces".	Do not agree	No
North Finchley Agenda 21 Group	115	L10. Section iii should continue to specify public transport, walking and cycling in support of the "modal shift" from car use that the Transport Policy Best Value Review and the Draft Consultation Local Implementaion Plan hopes will resolve traffic congestion and cope with the dramatic rise in car ownership in the Borough expected as a result of existing growth compounded by the housing development and population increase projected to occur by 2016. Revert to the existing wording of section iii and add "other means of transport" so that it now reads: "iii the development is easily accessible by public transport, walking, cycling and other means of transport; and".	Do not agree	No
North Finchley Agenda 21 Group	143	Para 7.3.5 The modification requires expanding to include access by cycling and walking as a key determinant. After the words "(i.e on-street parking condition), " insert the words "ease of access by cycling and walking".	Agree to change	No

North Finchley Agenda 21 Group	145	Para 7.3.9 The modification selectively quotes from the last bullet point in Paragraph 5.11 of the Mayor's Transport Strategy and the extract should be expanded. After the words "between 2001 and 2011 " insert: " with greater traffic reductions in sensitive locations".	Do not agree	No
North Finchley Agenda 21 Group	146	Policy M2 The modification excessively weakens the policy. All development should require a transport assessment including an assessment of the incremental effect of the development. The extent and detail of the assessment required will depend on the nature of the development. Delete the word "full" in Line 2 of the modification and delete the words in line 2 "where it will have significant transport implications".	Do not agree	No
North Finchley Agenda 21 Group	147	Para 7.3.11 The word "Green" should be reinstated as a description of the "Travel Plans" as it reinforces the need for a sustainable approach to travel. Reinststate the description "Green Travel Plans" in place of "Travel Plans" throughout the modified paragraph.	Do not agree	No
North Finchley Agenda 21 Group	149	Policy M3 .The word "Green" should be reinstated as a description of the "Travel Plans" as it reinforces the need for a sustainable approach to travel. Reinststate the description "Green Travel Plans" in place of "Travel Plans" in Line 2.	Do not agree	No
North Finchley Agenda 21 Group	150	Para 7.3.13 The modification should be amended to reinstate and amend the sentences describing the design effect of recent developments on access to them by foot and cycle. Reinststate the sentence in Line 3 and 4 "Recent developments have been planned giving priority to access by car". Reinststate the sentence in Lines 4 & 5 amended to read: "Often this has meant that developments have been difficult or even dangerous to access on foot or by cycle".	Do not agree	No
North Finchley Agenda 21 Group	151	Para. 7.3.14. The paragraph should include a reference to the provision of segregated cycle lanes. Para. 7.3.15 deleted sentence in this modification is an integral part of the description and should be reinstated as follows:- para.7.3.14 after "pedestrians and cyclists, which includes safe access routes," in Line 4 add "and segregated cycle ways where possible,". In Para 7.3.15, reinststate the sentence "This can be achieved with multiple entrances to the site and footpaths which allow pedestrians to make shortcuts to the site" and add ", where possible safety requirements are satisfied."	Do not agree	No

North Finchley Agenda 21 Group	157	Policy M10. The modification excessively weakens the policy.Change the words "seek to secure" to the word "require" in Line 5.	Do not agree	No
North Finchley Agenda 21 Group	158	M13. The modification excessively weakens the policy.Change the words "seek to secure" to the word "require" in Line 5.	Do not agree	No
North Finchley Agenda 21 Group	160	Para 7.3.50 The modification should also refer to consideration of car free developments. In Line 4 of the last paragraph the modification after the Table, after the words "In assessing parking provision, the Council will have regard to "insert the words "opportunities for car free developments,".	Do not agree	No
North Finchley Agenda 21 Group	218	Para 8.3.64 The modification should clarify that the marketing of employment premises has to be on realistic terms and not on terms that would put off prospective employment users as a means of justifying conversion to residential use. In Line 5 of the modified paragraph after the words "actively marketed" insert the words "on realistic terms".	Agree to change. Amend paragraph 10.3.16a, line 6, to read...'actively marketed at a realistic price.....'	No
North Finchley Agenda 21 Group	309	The New Barnet Gas works site should be redeveloped for wholly business use so as to assist with sustainability objectives including the provision of local employment opportunities and reducing the need to travel. It is an important issue in East and New Barnet because of the loss of employment site to housing development in Lancaster Road and other locations. Amend last paragraph of modified 11.3.2a to read "This is an edge of Town Centre location suitable for wholly employment use and a revised planning brief is to be prepared".	Do not agree	No
North Finchley Agenda 21 Group	262	The New Barnet Gas works site should be redeveloped for wholly business use so as to assist with sustainability objectives including the provision of local employment opportunities and reducing the need to travel. It is an important issue in East and New Barnet because of the loss of employment site to housing development in Lancaster Road and other locations. Amend last paragraph of modified 11.3.2a to read "In addition, the following edge of Town Centre site has been identified as wholly suitable for business use".	Do not agree	No

North Finchley Agenda 21 Group	124	The modification should be amended to be more specific as to the meaning of the word "vacant". In Line of the modification insert he word "continually" between the words "remain" and "vacant" so as to read: "The criteria requires that at least 50% of plots on an allotment site would need to remain continually vacant despite...."	Agree to change as suggested	No
North Finchley Agenda 21 Group	129	Policy L18. The modification should be clearer Amend modification to read "...where an overriding community, sport and/or recreation benefit can be provided in place of the playing fields".	Do not agree	No
North Finchley Agenda 21 Group	131	Policy L20. The modification excessively weakens the policy. Delete the word significant" in Line 2 and revert to the word "unacceptable".	Do not agree	No
North Finchley Agenda 21 Group	135	Policy L26. The modification should clarify whom the provision is for. At the end of the modified sentence add the words "for the community".	Do not agree	No
North Finchley Agenda 21 Group	137	Paragraph 7.1.4 The modification is not balanced and should also advise how many households do not have access to a car. After the words "and" in Line 1 of the modification add the word "although" to read "...and although 73%". After the words "...had access to a car (10th highest in London)." add the words ",27% did not."	Do not agree	No
North Finchley Agenda 21 Group	140	Para 7.1.13 The modification selectively quotes from Paragraph 3.158 of the London Plan. The whole paragraph should be included. At the end of the existing modification add the sentence: "The Mayor is committed to making public transport and the pedestrian environment accessible to everyone, especially disabled people (see chp.40 of the Mayor's Transport Strategy)".	Do not agree	No
David Howard, New Barnet Community Assoc.	191	There is a chronic shortage of affordable homes in the borough, which will only be provided if it is mandatory requirement. Suggest that Barnet adopts the Mayor's London plan standards for affordable housing, and ensures a significant proportion is available for rent.	No change. The Mayor's strategic target has been adopted by Barnet.	No
David Howard, New Barnet Community Assoc.	309	Albert Road Gasworks is not a town centre site and any reference should be removed.	Do not agree	No
David Howard, New Barnet Community Assoc.	160-163	Car parking proposals are inadequate. Suggest minimum of two spaces per property, plus one additional space for third and fourth bedrooms.	Do not agree	No

David Howard, New Barnet Community Assoc.	216	Density levels will not be prescriptive until LDF becomes operational, by which time irreparable harm will have been done to Barnet. Suggest using density matrix in London Plan until then or a more restrictive matrix through LDF within three months	Do not agree	No
Janet Matthewson for Keep Barnet FC Alive	93	The modified wording which states 'presumption is overridden' undermines the findings of the Planning Inspector and undermines the Statement of Common Ground issued at the Inquiry, without any justification or explanation. The modifications are confusing and fail to give a clear indication of the council's stance in relation to the football club and its future in the borough. KBA believes the inability of Barnet FC to redevelop within the current footprint is proven. With promotion gained to the football League, Barnet FC has only three years to comply with Football League criteria or face expulsion. This could lead to permanent confinement to Ryman League due to the problems of ground capacity and pitch slope.	See GOL's objection.	No
Philippa Edmunds, Freight on Rail	20	Additional relevant text from PPG 13 should be included, and reference made to the safeguarding of transport land for possible later transport use even where there are no current plans for such use.	Agree to change para 3.1.5. After... 'reduce the need to travel', add'The Government recognises that land use planning can help promote sustainable distribution, including where feasible, the movement of freight by rail and water'.	No
Philippa Edmunds, Freight on Rail	33 & 34	The benefits to air quality of the use of rail for freight distribution should be mentioned.	Agree to include chart showing benefits to air quality	No
Philippa Edmunds, Freight on Rail	164	Paragraph 7.3.53 .Current and modified wording is ambiguous and misleading in terms of the speed of freight trains. Object to blanket statements about the slow speed of freight trains and interference with passenger services.	Do not agree. The suggested change does not relate to modified text, and therefore, it is not possible to make the amendment.	No
Philippa Edmunds, Freight on Rail	362	para 13.1.4a. It is important that the policies in the SRA Strategic Plan of Jan 2002 and the Freight Strategy of May 2001, which were further endorsed by the SRA Strategic Rail Freight Interchange Policy March 2004 Paragraphs 6.9 and 6.10 which state the need for fail freight interchanges, should be retained in the current wording.	Do not agree	No

Philippa Edmunds, Freight on Rail	386	Policy C7. We believe that the current wording, should be retained rather than the modified wording, which does not place strong enough conditions on the Council. Reference to enhanced rail freight facilities for businesses in North London should be expanded to London and the South East.	Agree to include reference to South East England.	No
Philippa Edmunds, Freight on Rail	392	Policy C10, which deals with employment uses within Cricklewood Regeneration Area should refer to 'rail linked waste transfer'.	Agree to change Policy C10, criterion 'C' as suggested	No
Finchley Society	37	Para 3.3.27, The Council says that it is following the Inspector's recommendation to refer to the possible implications of climate change, but adding the reference in 3.3.27 rather than 3.3.30. The text of the modified 3.3.27, however, includes no reference	Agree	No
Finchley Society	47	Policy GBEnv2, The drafting needs improvement. Suggest 'The Council will <i>insist</i> on high quality . . . open environment <i>utilising</i> environmentally . . . construction. <i>In assessing design and construction standards the Council will set criteria which will seek to improve amenity</i> .	Do not agree	No
Finchley Society	48	Policy GBEnv4 The Council should have rejected the Inspector's recommendation. He is wrong in thinking that a policy of protecting means automatically protecting in all circumstances. All cases must be considered on their merits. 'Seek to' implies that the Council does not have powers. It does.	Do not agree	No
Finchley Society	147	Para 7.3.12 The Council is wrong to reject the Inspector's recommendation. There should be a separate Policy on travel to school. The revised wording of 7.3.12, though welcome, is not strong enough. Indeed, the reference in 9.3.10 to a policy M3a implies there is to be a new policy.	Do not agree	No
Finchley Society	209	Para 8.3.48, The Council should have rejected the Inspector's recommendation, and retained the sentence. That sentence said 'may also need' and did not deny that the tests in Circular 1/97 must be met.	Do not agree	No
Finchley Society	246	Chapter 10, The Council is wrong to reject the Inspector's recommendation to update the employment data. When the UDP finally appears it will be hard to defend a decision based on data already eight years out of date	Do not agree	No

Finchley Society	259	11.1.13a, It is good to see, at last, a reference to the Friern Bridge Retail Park. But the reference is grudging and inadequate. What does 'do not constitute the town centre network' mean? Should it read 'are not a part of'?	Agree. Amend to read... 'Out-of-centre retail facilities can be found in a number of locations across the borough, including Friern Bridge Retail Park and along the Edgware Road. These do not form part of the town centre network'.	No
Greater London Authority	150, 152	Policy M4, fails to include Inspector's recommendation to place more emphasis on action that can be taken directly by the council, such as identification and implementation of cycling routes. Suggest policy is strengthened to reflect Inspector's comments and London Plan Policy 3C21	Agree to change	No
Greater London Authority	155	Policy M8 (Impact on roads), should be updated to reflect Inspector's recommendation on road hierarchy, in particular to de-designate the A1000/A598 as Tier 2 roads, to include GLA roads and roads for which SoS is responsible, and Tier 2 and 3 roads and examine status of A5. Suggest updating in line with Inspector's recommendation to reflect London Plan policy 3C17	Agree to change in line with Inspector's recommendation.	No
Greater London Authority	126	Policy L16, which deals with loss of allotments, should be expanded from 'areas deficient in open space' to read 'areas that are deficient of all open spaces, whether publicly accessible or not'.	Do not agree	No
Greater London Authority	156	Policy M9 (Strategic Road Network) Policy should be updated in line with Inspector's recommendation to reflect London Plan policy 3C15	Agree to change. Replace wording of second sentence with... 'The council will support significant road improvement schemes as identified through the review of road hierarchy in Barnet'.	No
Greater London Authority	160 - 163	Policy M14 and Appx 7.1 (Parking Standards), Barnet has failed to uphold the Inspector's recommendation to make clear that residential parking standards are maximum, and the minimum standard for Class B1 be set at one space per 100sq.m. The policies and standards relating to car parking should be updated to reflect London Plan policy 3C22, and specifically that residential standards should be maximum, and employment standards should comply fully with Table A4.1 of the London Plan (one space per 100 – 600sq.m)	Do not agree	No

Greater London Authority	149	M3 (Green Travel Plans) does not include Inspector's recommendation for separate policy on safe travel to schools. This appears to be adequate with London Plan policy 3C.2 requirement.	No change necessary	No
Greater London Authority	172	The London Plan does not specify that 50% of new housing should be affordable. LB Barnet should consider rewording the proposed modification to para 8.1.9b for clarity.... <i>The London Plan requires each borough to set a target for the proportion of additional provision, which is to be affordable, based on an assessment of housing need and a realistic assessment of supply. In setting targets, boroughs should take account of regional and local assessments of need, the Mayor's strategic target for affordable housing provision, and within that, the London-wide objective of 70% social housing and 30% intermediate provision, and the promotion of mixed and balanced communities. Within this framework, it is considered by LB Barnet that the appropriate target for Barnet is 50%.....</i>	Agree to change	No
Greater London Authority	184	Policy H4 (Dwelling Mix), the housing threshold should be reduced to 10 units, consistent with other recent SoS directions.	Do not agree	No
Greater London Authority	185	Paras 8.3.17 a & b (Affordable Housing), amend the reference... the level of affordability to the housing authority will be taken into account in order to maximise the supply of affordable housing from the limited Social Housing Grant <i>available from the local authority</i> to read ' <i>available for projects within the local authority</i> '. (Note; the Local Authority Social Housing Grant regime has been abolished).	Agree to change	No
Greater London Authority	186	Para 8.3.18 (Affordable Housing), Reference should be made to the GLA's London-wide Housing Requirement Study (December 2004) which supplements Barnet's Housing Needs Survey (2001).	Agree to change	No
Greater London Authority	189	Para 8.3.19 (Affordable Housing and Social Mix), delete the reference to ' <i>suitability for affordable housing in terms of the mix of the area</i> ' (existing social mix may impact on the appropriate split between social housing and intermediate housing, but should not determine whether or not affordable housing is provided on a specific site)	Do not agree	No
Greater London Authority	191	Paragraph 8.3.21(Affordable Housing), the threshold for affordable housing should be reduced from 15 units to 10.	Do not agree	No

Greater London Authority	206	Paragraph 8.3.42 (Accessible and Wheelchair Housing). The 10 unit threshold for wheelchair housing should be removed and replaced by wording to the effect that feasibility constraints should be demonstrated and justified through an access statement	Do not agree	
Greater London Authority	244	Paragraph 10.1.2 (Warehouse Clubs). Warehouse clubs are not considered acceptable uses within industrial areas. Rewrite last line of 10.1.2 to read... <i>Similar uses are defined as those not falling within any use class, that do not share many characteristics of a retail outlet, such as bona fide cash and carry businesses, builders' merchants, haulage yards, bus garages and MOT Testing Stations'</i>	Do not agree	No
Ann Inglis, Access in Barnet	204, 205& 206	The title 'Accessible and Wheelchair Housing' is inaccurate as it refers only to Lifetime Homes standards. There is no requirement proposed for the development of a stock of houses to accommodate wheelchairs as their primary function. A requirement for a percentage of wheelchair housing must be included. As a result of the council's proposals, all bedrooms could legitimately be located on a first floor and only a bed space required to be located on the access floor.	Do not agree	No
Ann Inglis, Access in Barnet	104	The council must address the needs of disabled users of the borough's open spaces, i.e footpaths, car-parking provision etc.	No change. Issues are addressed in Barnet's SPG on Accessible and Inclusive Environments.	No

SUMMARY OF OBJECTIONS TO POST INQUIRY MODIFICATIONS REPORT (2005) AND COUNCIL'S RESPONSE.

Objector / Client Name	Mod. Ref. No.	Summary of Objections and Suggested Change	Council's response	Does this Materially Affect Content of the UDP
Antony Powell, Met Police, Barnet	54	The Council has not used the correct title, which should read ' Police Crime Prevention Design Advisors'	Agree to change para 4.3.14 to read.....issues may be referred to the Police Crime Prevention Design Advisors	No
Antony Powell, Met Police, Barnet	55	Circular 5/94 'Planning Out Crime' has been cancelled, and PPG1 replaced by PPS1. Remove the reference to Circular 5/94 to read 'It is the shared objective of the council, the Police and our community safety partners to reduce both crime and the fear of crime amongst the community, in line with advice contained in Planning Policy Statement 1: Delivering Sustainable Development and Safer Places: The Planning System and Crime Prevention.	Agree to change para 4.3.15 as suggested.	No
Paul Robinson, Highways Agency	388	Object specifically to inclusion of the words 'north of the North Circular Road' Recommend the policy states that no additional parking, within all of the new town centre, is provided to cater specifically for leisure use, relying instead on the existing off-street parking at Brent Cross and out-of-hours shared use with the additional parking that will result from the business development. Allowing parking at leisure developments would increase overall level of parking in the area, and may increase the number of vehicle trips in surrounding roads.	Do not agree. The Development Framework specifically recommends no further car parking for retail and leisure uses in town centre north only. This has been subject to extensive consultation and has reflected the views of both the GLA and TfL the two bodies directly responsible for setting parking standards in London's spatial planning strategy, matters of precise parking numbers for the regeneration area are a matter for the planning application.	No

Chris Price, Network Rail	372	Given the scale of development proposed in West Hendon and likely impact upon Hendon Mainline Station in terms of user numbers, mitigation measures may be necessary. Suggest amending final point of Policy C1 (A) to read...'measures to improve transport links to, and facilities at Hendon (Mainline) Station'.	Agree to amend Policy C1(A) as suggested.	No
Derek Chandler, Golders Green Station Action Group	317 & 318	Objection relates to possible redevelopment of Golders Green bus and Underground Station and its listing in the UDP schedule of proposals (h22). It should be made clear that the works access road has definitely been excluded from any redevelopment proposals, and the site's entry in the UDP be modified fully and clearly. Suggest producing a map of sufficient detail to show the works access road has been excluded, and, production of sentences clearly setting out the modified version and explaining the use categories without acronyms or unexplained terms.	Agree To Change. Modify the wording for proposal site h22 to read.....' <i>redevelopment of underground station, trainlines, station forecourt and bus station, excluding the works access road. Proposal to provide an integrated transport interchange, including an element of mixed-retail, uses A3, A4, A5 and small-scale business use on an area of 1.7 hectares</i> '. Please note the use classes will be explained in the UDP glossary.	No
Eli Abt, Abt Architecture & Planning	160 & 162	The proposed exceptions to Parking Policy M14 and associated text, are contrary to Government and regional policy and are unsustainable, retrograde and unjustified. Suggest policy should read...'the council will expect development to provide on-site parking in accordance with the parking standards at Annex 4 of the London Plan'.	The UDP parking standards conform with the London Plan with the exception of residential and B1 standards	No
Cluttons	81	The new text adopts a very restrictive stance. Suggest that reference should be made to the fact that in very special circumstances (some) development may be able to occur in Green Belts, in accordance with Section 3, para 3.1 of PPG2.	No Change. The new text is taken from another council strategy	No
Cluttons	18	Policy GBEnv4 should afford protection to interests of acknowledged importance, but it should also recognise and differentiate between the most important sites and those which are of lesser value. Suggest the text makes reference to paragraph 25 of PPS7, and recognise and differentiate between the most important sites for protection and those which are of lesser value.	No Change. The council has followed the Inspector's advice.	No

RPS Planning for Hammerson/Standard Life and CRL	379	<p>Policy C6 now includes to the need for 55,000sq.m of comparison retail floorspace as identified by the North West London Retail Assessment (April 2004) undertaken by GVA Grimley and RPS. Policy C6 does not fully acknowledge that the retail needs assessment has now been carried out. Suggest the retail assessment is specifically referenced within the supporting text. There may be capacity for additional comparison floorspace, above that identified due to the emerging residential schemes at RAF East Camp, Grahame Park Estate and Stonegrove. Suggested change to paragraph 1.15 "The North West London Retail Assessment, commissioned by the Council, the GLA and the principal landowners, for the Development Framework, has demonstrated both capacity and need for significant new retail floorspace taking into account trends in expenditure and population as well as requirements of other centres.</p>	<p>Agree to refer specifically to NW London Retail Needs Assessment within the reasoned justification to Policy C6. Do not accept proposed change to Paragraph 13.1.15 as it will address through LDF.</p>	No
RPS Planning for Hammerson/Standard Life and CRL	321	<p>The configuration of the new town centre boundary in relation to site proposal 31 creates a small area of land that falls between the two designations and is therefore unallocated. This area of land should be included within the town centre designation. Suggested change is that the town centre boundary of site proposal 31 on the proposals map should be amended to fall flush with the Eastern Lands boundary (Site Proposal 37), thereby removing the current 'void' area of land between the two designations.</p>	<p>Agree to change - the boundary of the Eastern Lands needs revision.</p>	No

Government Office for London	93	The statement "there may be very special circumstances for allowing redevelopment of the stadium due to the need for the club to provide better facilities" and that "any redevelopment proposal should not harm the Green Belt over and above that caused by the existing stadium". The statement does not accurately reflect the guidance given in PPG2 which explains that there is a general presumption against inappropriate development in Green Belts and that such development should not be approved, except in very special circumstances. The onus is then placed upon the applicant to demonstrate that very special circumstances exist. Suggested change: The paragraph should be redrafted to make clear the manner in which the Council will consider proposals explaining that any future application will be considered in accordance with para 3.2 of PPG2.	Agree to change para 5.3.22 to read.... Permanence is an important feature of green belts and MOL. PPG 2 advice states that their boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances. In Barnet the green belt boundaries are the same as those which were established in Barnet's Unitary Development Plan adopted in 1991. There is no proposal to change the green belt boundary of Barnet Football Club at South Underhill. It has been established that there is potential for a limited expansion to the east and south of the stadium. Any planning application to extend the existing stadium will need to be considered in accordance with paragraph 3.2 of PPG 2. The boundary of MOL at the former Friern Barnet Hospital, Compton School and at the Temple Fortune Sports Club have been revised to take into account recent development at the site.	No
Government Office for London	183 & 184	The site unit threshold within Policy H4 for qualifying sites does not fully reflect advice in PPG3 (para 10). Suggest amendment to the policy to ensure securing an appropriate dwelling mix in all new housing developments and by deletion of the reference to a 15 dwellings and above threshold.	Do not agree	
Government Office for London	171, 174 & 176	Paragraph 8.3.3 if read in isolation could be interpreted by the reader as being a target figure to be aimed for as opposed to a minimum one to be met as stated in Part 1 policy GH1. Suggest making it clear that the 17,780 additional homes figure is a minimum one.	Agree to change para 8.3.3 to state a minimum provision of 17,780 new homes by 2016	No

Government Office for London	160 & 162	RPG9 "Regional Planning Guidance for the South East" (Policy T3c) sets the range of acceptable parking standards for employment generating development in outer London to 1:100 -1:600 per m ² of floor space. Also stated in annex 4 of the London Plan. Suggest amending the car parking standard for B1 development in low accessibility locations in line with the UDP inspector's recommendation 7.85(v) so as to reflect the advice in RPG9 and the London Plan which makes it clear that the standard for B1 uses be set no lower than at one space per 100 sqm. Also that confirmation is sought that the residential standards applying are maximum.	Do Not Agree	No
Government Office for London	265, 268 & 269	Policy TCR(l) identifies the existing Brent Cross Regional Shopping Centre within the first tier of preferred locations for new retail uses which may entail development of new floorspace. Para 11.3.3 and 11.3.4 infers that the existing Brent Cross Regional Shopping Centre is recognised as a type of town centre. Suggest deleting the inferred references to the existing Brent Cross Regional Shopping Centre in chapter 11 as being a type of town centre and a preferred location for expansion of new retail floorspace. The plan should rely solely on what is said in chapter 13 to explain both the current and proposed future status of Brent Cross. Alternatively if reference is retained in Chapter 11, the current status of the Brent Cross Regional Shopping Centre should be made clear and cross references made in Chapter 13.	Agree To Change	No

Government Office for London	191 & 194	GLA's evidence on thresholds in London (Thresholds for Application of Affordable Housing Requirements, Three Dragons et al, March 2003) suggests that in terms of development economics, thresholds lower than 15 are capable of delivering affordable housing without adversely affecting overall supply. PPG3, Consultation Paper on Proposed Change to Policy Guidance Note 3, Housing (ODPM July 2003) suggests that in some instances a reduction of the threshold to 10 could be acceptable. The Secretary of State has considered the appropriate threshold for affordable housing within the Borough in the light of the Inspector's recommendations, the changed policy context, the significant need in the borough. The Secretary of State has concluded that in these particular circumstances, the policy should be modified to provide a threshold of 10 dwellings (or 0.4 ha).	Do Not Agree	No
Chris Thomas Ltd, on behalf of Outdoor Advertising Assoc.	64	Object to modifications in respect of Policy D21, para 4.3.34. All advertisements must be considered in the interests of amenity and safety alone, and it is unduly onerous to restrict advertising hoardings to those which screen derelict or vacant sites or enhance the appearance of an area. The Inspector's recommended changes are contrary to PPG19. Suggest that a more realistic policy is required, based upon PPG19. Reversion to Barnet's Revised UDP version would be an improvement, although it will not be supported where PPG19 indicates otherwise.	Agree to change	No
Tesco	367	Tesco Stores Ltd (Tesco) objects to the proposed modifications to the UDP proposals map to exclude the land south west of the A406/A41 Hendon Way junction (also known as the Eastern Lands) and including the existing Tesco store, from within the boundary of the proposed new "town center" at Brent Cross. The basis of this objection is set out in the representations submitted to the modification number 382. As a consequence Tesco also objects to the proposed modifications of Policy Gcrick. It should be made clear that in referring to the proposed new "town centre", the Policy refers to the town center boundary – including the Eastern Lands.	Do not agree	No

Tesco	380	Tesco supports (a) the need for a further study for the "Eastern Lands". (b) supports the proposed modification to policy C6 but the supporting text needs clarification. There is an uncertainty regarding the need for further convenience retailing in the area. Tesco's research shows there is a need for some additional convenience floorspace at Brent Cross. Further work is necessary on the scale of need and whether this is sufficient to justify an additional foodstore, or whether the identified need could be met by the enlargement if the existing convenience provision at Brent Cross. The study should take account of the existing convenience floorspace already trading, including Tesco.	Do not agree	No
Tesco	360	The Adopted "Cricklewood, Brent Cross and West Hendon Regeneration Area Development Framework" Contains little guidance on the potential for future development of the area of land to area south west of the A406/A41 Hendon Way junction (also known as the eastern Lands). This was recognised by the Inspector at IR para.13.65. The Inspector's recommended that a further study be undertaken into the future of the land believes that existing uses should be integrated into the new town center at Brent Cross or wider Regeneration Area. With reference to the Draft Addendum: eastern Lands Addendum" to the "Cricklewood, Brent Cross and West Hendon Regeneration Area Development Framework"; it is Tesco's view that the Draft Addendum has not engaged all stakeholders nor paid due regard to existing uses. Furthermore the proposed wording of paragraph 13.1.13 suggests that the UDP will be adopted before any subsequent additions are made to the Adopted Development Framework. This would appear to be inconsistent with the material accompanying the Draft Eastern Lands Addendum. This should be clarified.	Do not agree	No

Tesco	325	<p>Tesco Stores Ltd objects to the proposed modifications to the UDP Proposals Map exclude the Cricklewood Eastern Lands (including the Tesco store) from within the boundary to the proposed new "town centre" at Brent Cross. The basis of this objection is set out in the representations submitted modification number 382. The view is that the Council should revert to the definition of the town centre as contained in the Amended Unitary Development Plan proposals map dated January 2003. Tesco believes that the new proposal included in the Schedule of Proposals regarding the Eastern Lands should be a separate entry but be amalgamated with Site 31 for the proposed new town centre at Brent Cross included. Suggested amendment: reference to new Site Proposal 37 should be deleted, Site 31 should include all land within the proposed town center at Brent Cross – including the existing Shopping Centre together with areas to the south of the North Circular Road including the Eastern Lands.</p>	Do not agree	No
Tesco	382	<p>Tesco Stores Ltd objects to the proposed modifications to the UDP Proposals Map. The Company has the view that the Council should revert to the proposals map as contained in the Amended Unitary Development Plan dated January 2003. The existing Tesco store already forms part of the range of commercial uses at Brent Cross and a variety of retail attractions already established in the area. Existing linkages between the area south west of the A406/A41 Hendon Way junction (Eastern Lands) and the existing centre at Brent Cross are relatively weak. However, these linkages are no worse than other areas south of the A406 further west. The Inspector at IR para. 13.65 acknowledged that the Eastern Lands might be integrated into both the proposed town centre or the wider Regeneration Area. The Inspector recommended further study into the future of this land. The Eastern Lands should be part of the boundary of the new town centre at Brent Cross. Recommendation: amended proposals map accordingly.</p>	Do not agree	No

Tesco	321	Tesco Stores Ltd objects to the proposed modifications to the UDP Proposals Map. The Company has the view that the Council should revert to the proposals map as contained in the Amended Unitary Development Plan dated January 2003. As a consequence Tesco objects to the proposed modifications to the description of Site 31 - Brent Cross Regional Shopping Centre. The Council should revert to the definition of the town centre as contained in the Amended UDP Proposals Map dated Jan 2003 that includes the Eastern Lands. Recommended amendment Site 31 should refer to proposed town centre at Brent Cross including the existing shopping centre together with the Eastern Lands. Site 31 should be amended to include Tesco Stores as one of the landowners in the area.	Do not agree	No
Tesco	264	Tesco Stores Ltd objects to the proposed modifications to the UDP Proposals Map to exclude the Eastern Lands (see objections to modifications no.382). Tesco therefore objects to the proposed modification to the wording of table 11.2 in relation to Brent Cross/Cricklewood and specifically to the definition of the proposed new "town centre". The Council should revert to the definition of town centre as contained in the Amended UDP proposals map. Suggested amendment:- site: Land North and South of the A406, including the existing shopping centre and the land to th south west of the A406/A41 Hendon Way junction".	Do not agree	No
North Finchley Agenda 21 Group	48	Policy GBEnv4.The addition of nineteen categories made the policy clearer and the addition of the words "seek to" removes any teeth that the policy had. Revert to the original wording, as a minimum, the words "seek to" in the modified wording should be removed.	Do not agree	No
North Finchley Agenda 21 Group	51	Policy D5. Modified wording is too weak, particularly in the light of the move to higher density development. Revert to the original wording. As a minimum, the word "should" in Line 1 should be replaced with "are to".	Do not agree	No
North Finchley Agenda 21 Group	52	Policy D7. Modified wording is too weak, particularly in the light of the move to higher density development. Revert to the original wording. As a minimum, the word "should" in Line 1 should be replaced with "are to".	Do not agree	No
North Finchley Agenda 21 Group	57	Para.4.3.17 The modified wording is not specific enough. Delete the word "guideline".	Do not agree	No

North Finchley Agenda 21 Group	60	Para 4.3.23. The revision ignores the Inspector's recommendation 4.47 (i) that the text be amended with a reference to the likely programme for a Council sponsored survey.... The need to identify "important" hedgerows was raised early in the Deposit Draft UDP process and yet there appears to have been no progress on the survey or a desire to timetable one. Amend the modification to read "The Council will complete a survey of such hedgerows by the end of July 2006 and maintain up to date records in order to implement this Regulation. Meantime, applications that involve removal of or damage to hedgerows will be refused".	Do not agree	No
North Finchley Agenda 21 Group	61	Para 4.3.30 There is justification to make it more difficult to develop "so called" landmark buildings which may adversely impact on surrounding areas, landscape and cause wind tunnels and other environmental damage. Instead the wording is more permissive. The wording should not be modified. Revert to the original wording.	Do not agree	No
North Finchley Agenda 21 Group	82	Policy GBEnv4. The addition of nineteen categories made the policy clearer and the addition of the words "seek to" removes any teeth that the policy had. Revert to the original wording, as a minimum, the words "seek to" in the modified wording should be removed.	Do not agree	No
North Finchley Agenda 21 Group	96	Para 5.3.40. The modification is too permissive and too vague. Delete existing modification and amend to read "When considering development proposals which may affect a site of importance for nature conservation, steps are to be taken to avoid any adverse impact on the nature conservation value of the site".	Do not agree	No
North Finchley Agenda 21 Group	97	The modification should be strengthened. At the end of the existing modification add the words "in accordance with Policy O14 below".	Do not agree	No
North Finchley Agenda 21 Group	102	Policy O16. Modified wording is too weak. Revert to the original wording.	Do not agree	No
North Finchley Agenda 21 Group	103	Paras 5.3.48a. Modified wording weakens the paragraph by deleting the sentence on tree planting schemes. Reinstate the sentence reading "The Council will seek to obtain tree planting schemes from development proposals where appropriate".	Do not agree	No
North Finchley Agenda 21 Group	104	A timetable should be set for the production of the Local Biodiversity Action Plan for the Borough. Add the words "by the end of December 2006" after "a Local Biodiversity Action Plan for the borough" in the penultimate sentence.	Do not agree	No

North Finchley Agenda 21 Group	109	Para 6.1.14 Modified wording is too narrow. Amend modification to read "To maintain a adequate level of public open space suitable for passive and active participation in both formal and informal outdoor recreation activities".	Do not agree	No
North Finchley Agenda 21 Group	114	Para 6.3.17 Modified wording needs to be more protective of Town Centres. In the last sentence of the modified paragraph after the words "...the character of the area" add the words "and limited in height to that of the existing traditional development and also be of sympathetic high quality design".	Do not agree	No
North Finchley Agenda 21 Group	116	Para 6.3.19. Modificaton needs to strengthen the justification for an open space strategy. After "...PPG17" in the first modified sentence add the words "that stresses the importance of open space and trees in particular in combating and reducing air pollution".	Do not agree	No
North Finchley Agenda 21 Group	117	Para 6.3.21. After the words "...Commercial development" in the modification add the words "and the importance of open space and trees in particular in combating and reducing air pollution".	Agree additional words	No
North Finchley Agenda 21 Group	118	The modification detracts from the impact of the paragraph. Replace deleted sentence in 6.3.22 with "The Council wil encourage new development to secure improvements in the amount, quality and distribution of public open spaces".	Do not agree	No
North Finchley Agenda 21 Group	115	L10. Section iii should continue to specify public transport, walking and cycling in support of the "modal shift" from car use that the Transport Policy Best Value Review and the Draft Consultation Local Implementaion Plan hopes will resolve traffic congestion and cope with the dramatic rise in car ownership in the Borough expected as a result of existing growth compounded by the housing development and population increase projected to occur by 2016. Revert to the existing wording of section iii and add "other means of transport" so that it now reads: "iii the development is easily accessible by public transport, walking, cycling and other means of transport; and".	Do not agree	No
North Finchley Agenda 21 Group	143	Para 7.3.5 The modification requires expanding to include access by cycling and walking as a key determinant. After the words "(i.e on-street parking condition), " insert the words "ease of access by cycling and walking".	Agree to change	No
North Finchley Agenda 21 Group	145	Para 7.3.9 The modification selectively quotes from the last bullet point in Paragraph 5.11 of the Mayor's Transport Strategy and the extract should be expanded. After the words "between 2001 and 2011 " insert: " with greater traffic reductions in sensitive locations".	Do not agree	No

North Finchley Agenda 21 Group	146	Policy M2 The modification excessively weakens the policy. All development should require a transport assessment including an assessment of the incremental effect of the development. The extent and detail of the assessment required will depend on the nature of the development. Delete the word "full" in Line 2 of the modification and delete the words in line 2 "where it will have significant transport implications".	Do not agree	No
North Finchley Agenda 21 Group	147	Para 7.3.11 The word "Green" should be reinstated as a description of the "Travel Plans" as it reinforces the need for a sustainable approach to travel. Reinstating the description "Green Travel Plans" in place of "Travel Plans" throughout the modified paragraph.	Do not agree	No
North Finchley Agenda 21 Group	149	Policy M3 .The word "Green" should be reinstated as a description of the "Travel Plans" as it reinforces the need for a sustainable approach to travel. Reinstating the description "Green Travel Plans" in place of "Travel Plans" in Line 2.	Do not agree	No
North Finchley Agenda 21 Group	150	Para 7.3.13 The modification should be amended to reinstate and amend the sentences describing the design effect of recent developments on access to them by foot and cycle. Reinstating the sentence in Line 3 and 4 "Recent developments have been planned giving priority to access by car". Reinstating the sentence in Lines 4 & 5 amended to read: "Often this has meant that developments have been difficult or even dangerous to access on foot or by cycle".	Do not agree	No
North Finchley Agenda 21 Group	151	Para. 7.3.14. The paragraph should include a reference to the provision of segregated cycle lanes. Para. 7.3.15 deleted sentence in this modification is an integral part of the description and should be reinstated as follows:- para.7.3.14 after "pedestrians and cyclists, which includes safe access routes," in Line 4 add "and segregated cycle ways where possible,". In Para 7.3.15, reinstating the sentence "This can be achieved with multiple entrances to the site and footpaths which allow pedestrians to make shortcuts to the site" and add ", where possible safety requirements are satisfied."	Do not agree	No
North Finchley Agenda 21 Group	157	Policy M10. The modification excessively weakens the policy. Change the words "seek to secure" to the word "require" in Line 5.	Do not agree	No
North Finchley Agenda 21 Group	158	M13. The modification excessively weakens the policy. Change the words "seek to secure" to the word "require" in Line 5.	Do not agree	No

North Finchley Agenda 21 Group	160	Para 7.3.50 The modification should also refer to consideration of car free developments. In Line 4 of the last paragraph the modification after the Table, after the words "In assessing parking provision, the Council will have regard to "insert the words "opportunities for car free developments,".	Do not agree	No
North Finchley Agenda 21 Group	218	Para 8.3.64 The modification should clarify that the marketing of employment premises has to be on realistic terms and not on terms that would put off prospective employment users as a means of justifying conversion to residential use. In Line 5 of the modified paragraph after the words "actively marketed" insert the words "on realistic terms".	Agree to change. Amend paragraph 10.3.16a, line 6, to read...'actively marketed at a realistic price.....'	No
North Finchley Agenda 21 Group	309	The New Barnet Gas works site should be redeveloped for wholly business use so as to assist with sustainability objectives including the provision of local employment opportunities and reducing the need to travel. It is an important issue in East and New Barnet because of the loss of employment site to housing development in Lancaster Road and other locations. Amend last paragraph of modified 11.3.2a to read "This is an edge of Town Centre location suitable for wholly employment use and a revised planning brief is to be prepared".	Do not agree	No
North Finchley Agenda 21 Group	262	The New Barnet Gas works site should be redeveloped for wholly business use so as to assist with sustainability objectives including the provision of local employment opportunities and reducing the need to travel. It is an important issue in East and New Barnet because of the loss of employment site to housing development in Lancaster Road and other locations. Amend last paragraph of modified 11.3.2a to read "In addition, the following edge of Town Centre site has been identified as wholly suitable for business use".	Do not agree	No
North Finchley Agenda 21 Group	124	The modification should be amended to be more specific as to the meaning of the word "vacant". In Line of the modification insert he word "continually" between the words "remain" and "vacant" so as to read: "The criteria requires that at least 50% of plots on an allotment site would need to remain continually vacant despite...."	Agree to change as suggested	No
North Finchley Agenda 21 Group	129	Policy L18. The modification should be clearer Amend modification to read "...where an overriding community, sport and/or recreation benefit can be provided in place of the playing fields".	Do not agree	No
North Finchley Agenda 21 Group	131	Policy L20. The modification excessively weakens the policy. Delete the word significant" in Line 2 and revert to the word "unacceptable".	Do not agree	No

North Finchley Agenda 21 Group	135	Policy L26. The modification should clarify whom the provision is for. At the end of the modified sentence add the words "for the community".	Do not agree	No
North Finchley Agenda 21 Group	137	Paragraph 7.1.4 The modification is not balanced and should also advise how many households do not have access to a car. After the words "and" in Line 1 of the modification add the word "although" to read "...and although 73%". After the words "..had access to a car (10th highest in London)." add the words ",27% did not."	Do not agree	No
North Finchley Agenda 21 Group	140	Para 7.1.13 The modification selectively quotes from Paragraph 3.158 of the London Plan. The whole paragraph should be included. At the end of the existing modification add the sentence: "The Mayor is committed to making public transport and the pedestrian environment accessible to everyone, especially disabled people (see chp.40 of the Mayor's Transport Strategy)".	Do not agree	No
David Howard, New Barnet Community Assoc.	191	There is a chronic shortage of affordable homes in the borough, which will only be provided if it is mandatory requirement. Suggest that Barnet adopts the Mayor's London plan standards for affordable housing, and ensures a significant proportion is available for rent.	No change. The Mayor's strategic target has been adopted by Barnet.	No
David Howard, New Barnet Community Assoc.	309	Albert Road Gasworks is not a town centre site and any reference should be removed.	Do not agree	No
David Howard, New Barnet Community Assoc.	160-163	Car parking proposals are inadequate. Suggest minimum of two spaces per property, plus one additional space for third and fourth bedrooms.	Do not agree	No
David Howard, New Barnet Community Assoc.	216	Density levels will not be prescriptive until LDF becomes operational, by which time irreparable harm will have been done to Barnet. Suggest using density matrix in London Plan until then or a more restrictive matrix through LDF within three months	Do not agree	No
Janet Matthewson for Keep Barnet FC Alive	93	The modified wording which states 'presumption is overridden' undermines the findings of the Planning Inspector and undermines the Statement of Common Ground issued at the Inquiry, without any justification or explanation. The modifications are confusing and fail to give a clear indication of the council's stance in relation to the football club and its future in the borough. KBA believes the inability of Barnet FC to redevelop within the current footprint is proven. With promotion gained to the football League, Barnet FC has only three years to comply with Football League criteria or face expulsion. This could lead to permanent confinement to Ryman League due to the problems of ground capacity and pitch slope.	See GOL's objection.	No

Philippa Edmunds, Freight on Rail	20	Additional relevant text from PPG 13 should be included, and reference made to the safeguarding of transport land for possible later transport use even where there are no current plans for such use.	Agree to change para 3.1.5. After... 'reduce the need to travel', add'The Government recognises that land use planning can help promote sustainable distribution, including where feasible, the movement of freight by rail and water'.	No
Philippa Edmunds, Freight on Rail	33 & 34	The benefits to air quality of the use of rail for freight distribution should be mentioned.	Agree to include chart showing benefits to air quality	No
Philippa Edmunds, Freight on Rail	164	Paragraph 7.3.53 .Current and modified wording is ambiguous and misleading in terms of the speed of freight trains. Object to blanket statements about the slow speed of freight trains and interference with passenger services.	Do not agree. The suggested change does not relate to modified text, and therefore, it is not possible to make the amendment.	No
Philippa Edmunds, Freight on Rail	362	para 13.1.4a. It is important that the policies in the SRA Strategic Plan of Jan 2002 and the Freight Strategy of May 2001, which were further endorsed by the SRA Strategic Rail Freight Interchange Policy March 2004 Paragraphs 6.9 and 6.10 which state the need for fail freight interchanges, should be retained in the current wording.	Do not agree	No
Philippa Edmunds, Freight on Rail	386	Policy C7. We believe that the current wording, should be retained rather than the modified wording, which does not place strong enough conditions on the Council. Reference to enhanced rail freight facilities for businesses in North London should be expanded to London and the South East.	Agree to include reference to South East England.	No
Philippa Edmunds, Freight on Rail	392	Policy C10, which deals with employment uses within Cricklewood Regeneration Area should refer to 'rail linked waste transfer'.	Agree to change Policy C10, criterion 'C' as suggested	No
Finchley Society	37	Para 3.3.27, The Council says that it is following the Inspector's recommendation to refer to the possible implications of climate change, but adding the reference in 3.3.27 rather than 3.3.30. The text of the modified 3.3.27, however, includes no reference	Agree	No
Finchley Society	47	Policy GBEnv2, The drafting needs improvement. Suggest 'The Council will <i>insist</i> on high quality . . . open environment <i>utilising</i> environmentally . . . construction. <i>In assessing design and construction standards the Council will set criteria which will seek to improve amenity</i> .	Do not agree	No

Finchley Society	48	Policy GBEnv4 The Council should have rejected the Inspector's recommendation. He is wrong in thinking that a policy of protecting means automatically protecting in all circumstances. All cases must be considered on their merits. 'Seek to' implies that the Council does not have powers. It does.	Do not agree	No
Finchley Society	147	Para 7.3.12 The Council is wrong to reject the Inspector's recommendation. There should be a separate Policy on travel to school. The revised wording of 7.3.12, though welcome, is not strong enough. Indeed, the reference in 9.3.10 to a policy M3a implies there is to be a new policy.	Do not agree	No
Finchley Society	209	Para 8.3.48, The Council should have rejected the Inspector's recommendation, and retained the sentence. That sentence said 'may also need' and did not deny that the tests in Circular 1/97 must be met.	Do not agree	No
Finchley Society	246	Chapter 10, The Council is wrong to reject the Inspector's recommendation to update the employment data. When the UDP finally appears it will be hard to defend a decision based on data already eight years out of date	Do not agree	No
Finchley Society	259	11.1.13a, It is good to see, at last, a reference to the Friern Bridge Retail Park. But the reference is grudging and inadequate. What does 'do not constitute the town centre network' mean? Should it read 'are not a part of'?	Agree. Amend to read....'Out-of-centre retail facilities can be found in a number of locations across the borough, including Friern Bridge Retail Park and along the Edgware Road. These do not form part of the town centre network'	No
Greater London Authority	150, 152	Policy M4, fails to include Inspector's recommendation to place more emphasis on action that can be taken directly by the council, such as identification and implementation of cycling routes. Suggest policy is strengthened to reflect Inspector's comments and London Plan Policy 3C21	Agree to change	No
Greater London Authority	155	Policy M8 (Impact on roads), should be updated to reflect Inspector's recommendation on road hierarchy, in particular to de-designate the A1000/A598 as Tier 2 roads, to include GLA roads and roads for which SoS is responsible, and Tier 2 and 3 roads and examine status of A5. Suggest updating in line with Inspector's recommendation to reflect London Plan policy 3C17	Agree to change in line with Inspector's recommendation.	No
Greater London Authority	126	Policy L16, which deals with loss of allotments, should be expanded from 'areas deficient in open space' to read 'areas that are deficient of all open spaces, whether publicly accessible or not'.	Do not agree	No

Greater London Authority	156	Policy M9 (Strategic Road Network) Policy should be updated in line with Inspector's recommendation to reflect London Plan policy 3C15	Agree to change. Replace wording of second sentence with...'The council will support significant road improvement schemes as identified through the review of road hierarchy in Barnet'.	No
Greater London Authority	160 - 163	Policy M14 and Appx 7.1 (Parking Standards), Barnet has failed to uphold the Inspector's recommendation to make clear that residential parking standards are maximum, and the minimum standard for Class B1 be set at one space per 100sq.m. The policies and standards relating to car parking should be updated to reflect London Plan policy 3C22, and specifically that residential standards should be maximum, and employment standards should comply fully with Table A4.1 of the London Plan (one space per 100 – 600sq.m)	Do not agree	No
Greater London Authority	149	M3 (Green Travel Plans) does not include Inspector's recommendation for separate policy on safe travel to schools. This appears to be adequate with London Plan policy 3C.2 requirement.	No change necessary	No
Greater London Authority	172	The London Plan does not specify that 50% of new housing should be affordable. LB Barnet should consider rewording the proposed modification to para 8.1.9b for clarity.... <i>The London Plan requires each borough to set a target for the proportion of additional provision, which is to be affordable, based on an assessment of housing need and a realistic assessment of supply. In setting targets, boroughs should take account of regional and local assessments of need, the Mayor's strategic target for affordable housing provision, and within that, the London-wide objective of 70% social housing and 30% intermediate provision, and the promotion of mixed and balanced communities. Within this framework, it is considered by LB Barnet that the appropriate target for Barnet is 50%.....</i>	Agree to change	No
Greater London Authority	184	Policy H4 (Dwelling Mix), the housing threshold should be reduced to 10 units, consistent with other recent SoS directions.	Do not agree	No
Greater London Authority	185	Paras 8.3.17 a & b (Affordable Housing), amend the reference... the level of affordability to the housing authority will be taken into account in order to maximise the supply of affordable housing from the limited Social Housing Grant <i>available from the local authority</i> to read ' <i>available for projects within the local authority</i> '. (Note; the Local Authority Social Housing Grant regime has been abolished).	Agree to change	No

Greater London Authority	186	Para 8.3.18 (Affordable Housing), Reference should be made to the GLA's London-wide Housing Requirement Study (December 2004) which supplements Barnet's Housing Needs Survey (2001).	Agree to change	No
Greater London Authority	189	Para 8.3.19 (Affordable Housing and Social Mix), delete the reference to 'suitability for affordable housing in terms of the mix of the area' (existing social mix may impact on the appropriate split between social housing and intermediate housing, but should not determine whether or not affordable housing is provided on a specific site)	Do not agree	No
Greater London Authority	191	Paragraph 8.3.21 (Affordable Housing), the threshold for affordable housing should be reduced from 15 units to 10.	Do not agree	No
Greater London Authority	206	Paragraph 8.3.42 (Accessible and Wheelchair Housing). The 10 unit threshold for wheelchair housing should be removed and replaced by wording to the effect that feasibility constraints should be demonstrated and justified through an access statement	Do not agree	
Greater London Authority	244	Paragraph 10.1.2 (Warehouse Clubs). Warehouse clubs are not considered acceptable uses within industrial areas. Rewrite last line of 10.1.2 to read... <i>Similar uses are defined as those not falling within any use class, that do not share many characteristics of a retail outlet, such as bona fide cash and carry businesses, builders' merchants, haulage yards, bus garages and MOT Testing Stations'</i>	Do not agree	No
Ann Inglis, Access in Barnet	204, 205& 206	The title 'Accessible and Wheelchair Housing' is inaccurate as it refers only to Lifetime Homes standards. There is no requirement proposed for the development of a stock of houses to accommodate wheelchairs as their primary function. A requirement for a percentage of wheelchair housing must be included. As a result of the council's proposals, all bedrooms could legitimately be located on a first floor and only a bed space required to be located on the access floor.	Do not agree	No
Ann Inglis, Access in Barnet	104	The council must address the needs of disabled users of the borough's open spaces, i.e footpaths, car-parking provision etc.	No change. Issues are addressed in Barnet's SPG on Accessible and Inclusive Environments.	No