

**Council**  
**Tuesday 2 March 2010**  
**Item 5.1**  
**Report from Cabinet**  
**22 February 2010**

- 5.1.2 – Council Budget and Council Tax 2010/11**
- 5.1.3 – Colindale Area Action Plan**

# Report of Cabinet

22 February 2010

## Cabinet Members:

\* Cllr Lynne Hillan (Chairman)

### Councillors:

Melvin Cohen, LL B	* Helena Hart	* Joanna Tambourides
* Richard Cornelius	Sachin Rajput	* Daniel Thomas
* Andrew Harper	* Robert Rams	* Daniel Webb

\* denotes Member present

## 1. COUNCIL BUDGET AND COUNCIL TAX 2010/11 (Report of the Leader of the Council Agenda Item 5 and Report of the Budget and Performance Overview and Scrutiny Committee – Agenda item 6):

*(Note – copies of the appendices referred to in this report are being sent separately to all members of the Council)*

### INTRODUCTION

The Leader of the Council presented her recommendations on the 2010/11 Budget and Council Tax

The new Corporate Plan for the period 2010/11 to 2013/14 was being considered at a later meeting. It would revise the Council's priorities and targets and how the authority went about meeting them. It would provide the forward planning aspect of the budget-making framework and was being formulated alongside the Council's budget for the coming financial year.

The Council's budget was a financial expression of its services and levels of provision but also a conditioner of them. It linked the priorities and objectives of the Council as expressed in the Corporate Plan having regard to resources available and taxation consequences of spending decisions.

The Leader pointed out that Council was required by law to set its budget having considered its estimates of expenditure and income, and for its call on the collection fund to be sufficient to meet its budget needs. This had to be done before 11 March 2010, and the meeting of the Council had been arranged for 2 March 2010 to achieve this.

The Council Tax had been calculated and set in accordance with the requirements of the Local Government and Finance Act 1992.

The Local Government Act 2003 required the Chief Finance Officer to report to Council as part of the budget process on the robustness of the estimates and the adequacy of the proposed financial reserves, although the final decision on the level and utilisation of reserves rested with the Council. The Chief Finance officer's report is contained in full within this report to Council.

It was a requirement of the Local Government Act 2003 that the Council should have regard to the Chief Finance Officer's report on the adequacy of balances when making the budget calculations. Any decision by Council on the level of reserves that differed from that of the Chief Finance Officer would need to be recorded in the decision to demonstrate the Council had fulfilled this statutory requirement.

Financial Regulations (Part 1, Section 2) within the Council Constitution stated the following:

*“Cabinet will finalise its recommendations to Council on the budget, Council Tax and rent levels taking account of the results of budget consultation. This will normally be in February, following announcement of the Final Local Government Finance Settlement.”*

As stated above, Cabinet's recommendations to Council must be made in time for Council to set the budget and Council Tax before 11 March of the preceding financial year to the financial year to which the recommended budget and Council Tax related.

The budget that Cabinet recommended to Council had to be based on reasonable estimates of expenditure and income, and take account of:-

- outturn forecasts for the current year;
- guidance from the Chief Finance Officer on the appropriate level of reserves, balances and contingencies;
- financial risks associated with proposed budget developments, reductions and ongoing projects;
- affordability of prudential borrowing over the period of the council's financial forward plan;
- medium term plans and forecasts of resources
- any use of balances to finance recurrent expenditure is supported by an explanation of how funding will be dealt with in the medium and longer term.
- recommendations from the external auditor on matters such as the level of reserves and provisions.

The budget recommended by Cabinet to Council would incorporate the latest projection of income from fees and charges. During the year Cabinet Resources Committee might approve changes to fees and charges, including the introduction of new charges.

## **COUNCIL BUDGET & COUNCIL TAX 2010/11**

## **The Budget Process**

The Leader's report stated that the Council had taken a strategic multi-year approach to budget development for many years. Barnet also had a Medium Term Financial Strategy to formalise the Council's financial aims and intentions and consult local stakeholders as to whether these are consistent with their needs. The strategy was included as Appendix C to the Leader's report.

A preliminary assessment of the 2010/11 budget had been set out in the Financial Forward Plan approved by Council in March 2009 based on information available at the time on Government grants and local spending requirements. This had included a forecast that further budget reductions of £12.538m were needed to achieve a Council Tax increase of 2.5%. Based on past years' budget experience, the plan had included a £5m contingency for new budget pressures. This model had been used as the base for the 2010/11 Budget and Forward Plan.

The Chancellor's Pre-Budget Report in November 2009 had confirmed that the Government would stick to planned levels of overall departmental spending in 2010/11, and announced that public sector current expenditure will grow by an average of 0.8 per cent a year in real terms from 2011/12 until 2014/15. This was significantly lower than in recent years. The Government had given a commitment to ensure that in 2011/12 and 2012/13, 95 per cent of NHS front line spending rises in line with inflation, spending on front line schools rises by 0.7 per cent a year in real terms and that sufficient funding will be provided to enable the number of police officers to be maintained. To free up resources for this, £11 billion of savings were to be found through smarter government, £5 billion from targeting and prioritising spending, a one per cent cap on public sector pay settlements in 2011/12 and 2012/13 delivering £3.4 billion of savings a year by 2012/13 and reforms to public sector pensions delivering a further £1 billion of savings a year.

There remained significant uncertainty about funding for most areas of local government beyond 2011, and the commitment to protect funding for some parts of the public sector would increase the likely reductions in funding to other local government services. Given the commitments in the MTFs, the financial position of the Council would be much tighter and savings well above the level of previous years would be needed if large increases in the level of the local Council Tax were to be avoided. This presented a major challenge given that over the seven year period 2003/04 to 2010/11 the Council had already taken £96m out of the base budget.

The Council had already embarked on a strategy to take early action in planning for future years budgets by:-

- reducing the Council's overall cost base
- challenging existing budget provision and containing inflationary pressures through further efficiency savings
- enhancing the approach to Value for Money across the Council
- continuing the policy led delivery of budget
- reviewing fees & charges

In addition, plans were actively being developed for taking forward the first phase of the Future Shape programme which would transform the way services in Barnet were provided in future. The results of the programme would have significant implications that would impact on the MTFs and Financial Forward Plan.

The results of the budget process had been presented for public consultation at Cabinet on 12 January 2010. The Budget and Performance Overview and Scrutiny Committee had reviewed the budget headlines on 28 January 2010, and their comments were submitted to Cabinet under cover of separate report.

Public consultation had consisted of four strands:

- A series of face to face events, via the Leader Listens, Area Forums, and a Leader Listens Business Breakfast
- An online Budget Simulator (575 respondents)
- An online qualitative survey on the Budget Headlines (18 respondents)
- Letters sent out to all business rate payers inviting them to comment and take part in the consultation on the Budget Headlines.

The consultation process had shown that residents were most interested in reducing budgets in the following areas:

- Democratic Services (9.61%)
- Mobile CCTV unit (6.67%)
- Council website (6.61%)
- Planning (6.51%)
- Planning, Housing and Regeneration Directorate (6.16%).

In addition, 120 respondents had opted to reduce Support Services in some form. There were several comments that citizens would have liked the option to increase spending in some areas.

Respondents broadly agreed that the Budget Headlines had identified the right level of savings and that Council Tax should be frozen next year. Of those who had disagreed with the freeze, respondents had wanted to see increased expenditure in Adult Social Services and Children's Services. In terms of the council introducing charges for services they did not currently charge for, respondents tended to disagree with this concept or say they 'did not know'. The results of the Budget Consultation were set out in Appendix G to the Leader's report.

### **Revised Requirements for 2009/10**

The period 6 budget monitor reported to Cabinet Resources Committee on 8 December had forecast balances of £15.768m at 31 March 2010, and an update would be reported to Cabinet Resources Committee on 23 February 2010 forecasting balances net of directorate overspends and allocations of £15.513m. The position is discussed below in the Chief Financial Officers assessment of the budget in terms of balances and reserves.

The current position on the HRA was also set out later in the Leader's report. Any variations would be met from the accumulated HRA balance.

### **The National Framework & 2010/11 Settlement for Barnet**

The Local Government Minister had announced the final settlement on 26 November 2009. As expected, there were no changes to the provisional figures for 2010/11 formula grant announced in the previous year as part of the three year grant settlement. The only new information was that the government had reduced Revenue Support Grant by 30% which was compensated for by a 10% increase in the Non Domestic Rates element due to a surplus on the collection of business rates. Consultation on this had closed on 7 January 2009. The Final Settlement figures had been published on 20 January 2010.

The Comprehensive Spending Review 2010 which would set out a new 3 year grant settlement for local government from 2011/12 – 2013/14 had been postponed until after the general election, which had to be held by June 2010. The settlement was expected to be extremely challenging for local authorities, irrespective of the political control of the new administration.

Barnet's adjusted increase of 2.9% (2.8% cash increase) had compared favourably to the borough average increase of 2.0% (1.6% for Inner London and 2.1% for Outer London. However it was noted that the overall Formula Grant allocated to Barnet remained one of the lowest in Greater London when adjusted per head of resident population.

The Settlement had continued the system of 'floors' without ceilings. All authorities above the floor contributed a fixed proportion of their excess above their floor to finance the floor authorities. The minimum grant increases for education and social services authorities was 1.5% in 2010/11.

A summary of Barnet's grant settlement was given as set out below. The percentage increase had been adjusted for prior year grant changes to enable a like for like comparison.

Grant Elements	2009/10	2010/11	2011/12
	£'000	£'000	
Relative Needs Amount	90,606	93,300	
Relative Resource Amount	(62,109)	(62,219)	
Central Allocation	64,561	66,679	
Floor Damping	(1,108)	(3,204)	
<b>Formula Grant</b>	<b>91,950</b>	<b>94,556</b>	
Cash Increase £'000	1,893	2,642	
Adjusted Increase %	2.21%	2.90%	

Barnet contributed to the cost of the grant floors as it was above the minimum grant increase for 2010/11. Even so, increasing pressure on a base budget of around £260m would always greatly exceed the increase in grant funding on a base budget of around £94m.

Area Based Grant (ABG) was the amalgamation of former specific grants and new money for new initiatives. As with Formula Grant, ABG came with no conditions and was not ring-fenced. A significant difference to formula Grant was that ABG had no floor protection so the base budget could be reduced as in 2010/11.

The following table set out the latest ABG allocations. In line with the decision by Cabinet Resources Committee on 28 April 2008, budget recommendations were based on local priorities rather than changes in the ABG allocation. Therefore, additional ABG in 2009/10 was only reflected in service estimates where a spending priority was recommended. The provisional 2010/11 figures reflected new grants being amalgamated into ABG which hid a base budget reduction in 2010/11 of £0.295m.

<b>Area Based Grant Allocations</b>	<b>Base Budget</b>	<b>New Grant</b>	<b>Total</b>
	<b>£</b>	<b>£</b>	<b>£</b>
<b>2008/09 Original</b>	<b>13,154,630</b>	<b>945,930</b>	<b>14,100,560</b>
<b>2008/09 Revised</b>	<b>13,154,630</b>	<b>1,011,500</b>	<b>14,166,130</b>
<b>2009/10</b>	<b>13,872,850</b>	<b>449,810</b>	<b>14,322,660</b>
<b>2009/10 Increase over 2008/9 Original</b>	<b>718,220</b>	<b>(496,120)</b>	<b>222,100</b>
<b>2010/11 Provisional</b>	<b>21,380,880</b>	<b>752,240</b>	<b>22,133,120</b>
<b>2010/11 Increase*</b>	<b>(295,420)</b>	<b>302,430</b>	<b>7,010</b>

\* Excludes Supporting People Grant transferred to ABG in 2010/11 of £7,803,450

The estimated Dedicated Schools Grant for Barnet was £213.417. This figure was subject to change dependent on pupil numbers and would not be confirmed by DCSF until May or June.

The Government's guide to the Settlement was available at their website, at the following address: <http://www.local.odpm.gov.uk/finance/0910/simpguids.pdf>

### **Capping**

The Minister's statement on the Settlement on 26 November 2009 had included an expectation that the average Band D Council Tax percentage increase would

be at a 16 year low. This effectively set a cap at 3%, although current indications were that in the light of the continuing economic recession, the vast majority of Councils would either be freezing the Council Tax or recommending an increase well below 3%.

### **Council Budget 2010/11**

Following receipt of the Provisional Local Government Finance Settlement, Cabinet's draft budget proposals had been announced at Cabinet on 12 January 2010. Incorporating £11.92m of efficiency savings and budget reductions, a provisional Council Tax freeze (0% increase) was proposed. The budget being recommended to Council on 2 March 2010 was set out in detail in Appendix B to the Leader's report. The recommendation for a Council Tax freeze was unchanged from that announced at Cabinet in January; however a number of adjustments were proposed to the final budget to take account of changes in levies and other developments since the budget headlines had been agreed. These changes were detailed as below.

#### **Specific grant and subsidy changes (+£251,000)**

This comprised two items: a reduction of £401,000 in housing benefit administration grant and additional temporary accommodation savings identified which would partially offset the reduction in subsidy included within the draft budget.

#### **Levies and subscriptions (+£117,750)**

Changes in levies and subscriptions were included as notified. As previously reported the Government had been consulting on proposals which would see a significant redistribution of the special grant for the national bus travel concession away from London. At the time of finalising this report the final levy had not yet been confirmed.

The proposed North London Waste Authority levy for 2010/11 was £8.329m, a reduction of £409,000 on the 2009/10 levy. This reduction was due to the application of revenue balances of £9.726m. As this support would only be available on a once off basis, the forecast was that the NLWA levy would rise steeply in 2011/12, in Barnet's case by £2.351m to £10.68m. Accordingly, the difference between the final levy and the provisional levy as included within the draft budget would be set aside in an earmarked reserve and applied in 2011/12 to cushion the impact of this increase.

#### **Capital financing (-£1,260,340)**

Following a detailed review of the base budget in the light of new regulations and Barnet policy on the calculation of Minimum Revenue Provision which came into effect from 2010/11 and re-profiling of the capital programme the capital financing requirement had reduced by £1,260,340.

#### **Free personal care at home commitment (+£850,000)**



Cabinet were reminded that that the Personal Care at Home Bill was currently at the Committee stage. The legislation would enable the Government to introduce regulations requiring personal care to be provided free to people with the highest needs in their own homes. The Government had pledged to introduce such regulations from October 2010 at an estimated cost of £670 million a year, to be funded by £420 million from existing Department of Health budgets and £250 million from local authority budgets. The cost estimates were highly uncertain at this stage and it remained to be seen whether the legislation would complete its passage unamended. The LGA in particular was sponsoring an amendment which would see a limit placed on the total financial contribution of local government to implementing the Bill's provisions. Based on the proposals in their current form the estimated cost to Barnet would be £850,000 in 2010/11 (£1.7m in 2011/12 and a full year) and it was proposed that this sum be held in the central contingency until such time as the legislation was enacted and detailed regulations issued.

### **Other changes**

A number of further budget adjustments were proposed:

- Sheltered Housing + £300,000 - following a successful legal challenge further consultation would now be required before the savings proposals agreed in the 2009/10 budget could be implemented.
- Office accommodation +£390,000 – rents would rise from 2010/11 as a result of the expiry of the rent free period on NLBP
- Audit fees -£150,000 – to reflect the expected reduction in external audit fees
- Business continuity +£130,000 – this was required to meet one-off costs associated with the planned move to a new data centre which could not be capitalised. This cost would be met from the Capital Projects reserve.
- Playbuilder scheme +£41,000 – a budget was required for repairs and maintenance costs for new play equipment in Council parks.
- Replacement of Pericles IT systems – the one-off revenue cost in 2010/11 would be £940,000. This would be met from the housing benefit subsidy reserve.

The impact of these changes was to increase the budget requirement from £152.064m to £153.851m. After taking account of the Council's share of the projected Collection Fund surplus as at 31<sup>st</sup> March 2010 and the increase in the tax base this left scope for a contribution to reserves of £1.332m.

In addition, Cabinet noted that in January 2010, negotiations concluded the terms of the transfer of responsibility and funding for all remaining learning disability clients from NHS Barnet to LB Barnet in accordance with the requirements of the Department of Health. It was proposed that an amendment would be made to the 2010/11 budgets to reflect the financial implications of this transfer once the necessary ratification had been received from NHS Barnet and LB Barnet. The agreed funding to be transferred in 2010/11 is £9.311m, with the key condition of

the transfer being that the funding receivable from NHS Barnet was fully attributable to spend incurred on individuals with learning disabilities, with the result that this transfer would not impact on the Council's bottom line position.

## **Inflation and Interest Rates**

The latest RPI (December) available at the time of finalising this report stood at 2.4%, a sharp increase of 2.1% over November. The main driver of this increase was mortgage interest costs and house price reductions dropping out and being replaced by increases. These elements were excluded from the CPI and RPI-X. The December RPI-X was 3.8% and was a better indicator of Council costs.

In accordance with expectations of continuing public sector pay restraint, the draft budget did not incorporate any additional provision on top of the 1% funding already in the base for pay awards. In the event that the final pay award was less than 1% any excess would be clawed back in-year to the central contingency. An additional 1% increase in employers' national insurance contribution rates from April 2011 had been announced in the Chancellor's November pre budget report. It was estimated that this would cost around £1m and this change has been reflected in the FFP from 2011/12 onwards.

Setting the budget was an extremely complex exercise, made more so by the recession. There are several significant issues and proposals that have been considered in detail as part of the budget process with the aim of setting a robust and balanced budget to achieve the Corporate Plan objectives and align with the Medium Term Financial Strategy. These are reported in more detail below as part of the Chief Finance Officer's assessment of the Council's financial standing.

---

## **Chief Finance Officer's Report on Balances and Reserves**

The Leader's report contained the Chief Finance Officer's report in full as set out below

- 9.33 *The Local Government Act 2003 places a duty on the Chief Finance Officer to report to Council as part of the budget process on the robustness of the estimates and the adequacy of the proposed financial reserves.*
- 9.34 *Professional guidance published in January 2003 and November 2008 by CIPFA recommends that account should be taken of several key financial assumptions underpinning the budget alongside the council's financial management arrangements. The Council's Financial Regulations reflect this guidance as set out above in Constitutional Powers, paragraph 8.1 (iii)*
- 9.35 *The Chief Finance Officer's review, recommendations for General Fund and Housing Revenue Account balances and impact on decisions that Council must make on the 2010/11 Budget follow.*

### Services' record in delivering budget developments & reductions

- 9.36 *Barnet has a history of poor grant settlements with the council on the grant floor in four out of the eight years to 2010/11. In 2003/04 the settlement did not even provide sufficient grant to achieve the required level of "passporting" to the Schools Budget, which required an additional contribution to be made from Council Tax. From 2006/07 to 2009/10 the council has received only the minimum grant increase, which has been insufficient to meet inflationary pressures let alone pressures from increased service demands and the cost of new capital investment.*
- 9.37 *Over the seven year period 2003/04 to 2010/11, the Council has budgeted to deliver efficiency savings, service reductions and increased income totalling £96m in order to compensate for the poor grant settlements and deliver low Council Tax increases. Because the Schools Budget is ring-fenced, these budget reductions had to be delivered entirely from the non-schools budget.*
- 9.38 *Achieving base budget reductions in excess of £12m annually over eight years is a significant undertaking. Some slippage in this is inevitable, and in respect to budget reductions accepted between 2003/04 and 2010/11 a total of £6m (7%) has been added back to the base budget in subsequent years. However, £5.7m relates to the first four years which reflects the significant improvement in estimating and forecasting in recent years. In addition, since 2004/05, budget management control has ensured that any saving not achieved in year has been covered by making compensatory savings (see 'Capacity to Manage In-Year Budget Pressures' below). Progress in implementing savings proposals is also now routinely monitored and reported to Cabinet Resources Committee.*
- 9.39 *Delivering savings of the level budgeted for in recent years is a substantial executive and management undertaking, which until December 2005 was not helped by having to respond to annual Government grant settlements just three months prior to the start of the financial year. Given this context I do not consider that slippage of this order gives any real cause for concern, but slippage has nonetheless occurred and is, therefore, a factor that must be taken into account in making a recommendation to Council on the level of General Fund balances.*
- 9.40 *The risks associated with non delivery of the £3m of Future Shape savings included in the draft budget merit particular consideration. To a degree, these risks are inherent by virtue of the ambitious transformational nature of the programme. An additional risk arises from the fact that at the time of finalising this report detailed business cases and project plans for those work streams which will contribute to the 2010/11 savings target have not yet been fully developed and subject to detailed validation. This risk can be mitigated through robust project management disciplines which ensure that project plans, savings and cost estimates are subjected to detailed scrutiny and challenge and that there is a clear framework for managing benefits delivery. Additional mitigation of the risks on the cost side of the*

*equation can be provided by ensuring that expenditure is only committed as and when detailed business cases are signed off by the One Barnet Programme Board and presented to Cabinet for approval and that project costs and cashable savings are closely monitored and reported in-year as projects progress.*

- 9.41 *On the other side of the coin is the risk that the cost of budget developments and pressures has been underestimated. The draft budget provides significant resources (£16.4m) to address identified pressures, which is a very significant enhancement on the sums provided in recent years. This includes an additional £2.5m for pressures on Children's safeguarding and Adults services and additional £1.05m contingency to meet potential shortfalls in income as a result of the recession and general pressures which cannot be contained within base budgets. Nevertheless, there remains a substantial risk that this will prove insufficient in the event that service demands and inflationary pressures intensify further.*
- 9.42 *The risk associated with service developments has been assessed as low in recent years as the level of service developments (excluding base budget pressures and the cost of prudential borrowing) has not been material (e.g. £1.0m in both 2006/07 and 2007/08 and £3m in 2008/09). However, the introduction of free personal care is a significant development involving a high degree of uncertainty at the present time which could impact on the delivery of the 2010/11 budget should current implementation costs prove to be significantly underestimated. This uncertainty arises from the lack of accurate data about the potential number of beneficiaries, particularly in respect of self-funders and residential care switchers. There is also a lack of clarity about the basis of Government estimates of the cost of re-ablement. It is proposed that this risk be addressed by earmarking a contingency sum of £250,000 to meet any additional costs.*
- 9.43 *Developments are also provided for within the capital programme, where the risk of overspending or failure to deliver planned external funding contributions translates into revenue budget pressures through increased prudential borrowing and/or reductions in interest earnings on unused capital receipts. Over recent years there have been some overspends on capital projects, but there have also been improvements in the reporting of capital monitoring to Cabinet Resources Committee. Under the auspices of the Capital & Assets Group (now superseded by the Investment Appraisal Board) the initial estimating of projects before admission to the capital programme has been improved and project management and review disciplines have been strengthened. There has also been closer monitoring of capital receipts delivery in recent years (a factor which has assumed greater importance in the light of the economic recession) and the establishment of the Major Projects Team within the Commercial Services directorate has resulted in significant improvements in the delivery of large projects and programmes (most notably PSCIP).*

9.44 *In summary there remain significant risks to the council's ability to deliver efficiencies and developments within budget. Tighter budgeting in recent years has improved the delivery of savings and reduced the risk of slippage. Even so, slippage is still a possibility and would require a call on balances if compensatory savings were not identified.*

#### Budget Risks

9.45 *Budget risks are set out in detail in Appendix A.*

9.46 *In assessing the adequacy of reserves and balances, the risks arising from the current legal action to recover cash placed on deposit with the Icelandic banks require careful consideration. Members will be aware that the total sums deposited with Landsbanki and Glitnir total some £27.4m. At the time of finalising this report, no actual loss has been sustained. The Council expects to learn of the position of its claim before the end of the 2009/10 financial year, but this may well be the subject of further legal challenge and there is no firm indication as to the date when this matter is likely to be resolved.*

9.47 *In May 2009, CIPFA's Local Authority Accounting Panel issued guidance on the level of impairment to be recognised in the 2008/09 Accounts by local authorities who had deposits with Icelandic Banks. This guidance was itself predicated on legal opinions obtained by the Local Government Association, who have been working closely with the Administrators of the banks concerned, which indicated that Councils would be recognised as secured creditors and that the following sums were likely to be recovered:*

- *95% of the deposit placed with Landsbanki being returned, plus all the interest accrued on the deposit up to 14 November.*
- *100% of the deposits placed with Glitnir Bank being returned, plus all the interest accrued on the deposits up to 14 November.*

9.48 *On the basis of this advice, impairment loss of £4.306m was recognised in the 2008/09 accounts. At a late stage in the 2008/09 closedown process, revised guidance was issued by CIPFA recommending that the assumed return rate for Landsbanki be reduced from 95% to 83%. The Statement of Accounts was not amended as it was agreed with the external auditors that the adjustment would not be material. This adjustment will be made in closing the 2009/10 accounts.*

9.49 *Following the submission of formal claims to Landsbanki on the 30<sup>th</sup> of October 2009, the Landsbanki Winding Up Board (WUB) confirmed it had accepted all local authority claims as having "priority status". On the 10<sup>th</sup> of December 2009, the Local Government Association (LGA) advised that the Glitnir Winding Up Board (WUB) had accepted all local authority claims as "general unsecured" claims, rather than "priority" claims. This decision contradicts the LGA's original legal advice that local authority deposits have priority status under Icelandic law, notwithstanding the*

*assumption that such a decision would be subject to challenge by other non-priority creditors. Bevan Brittan, the solicitors acting on behalf of the LGA, are already challenging this decision.*

- 9.50 *The difference in terms of overall recovery from Glitnir is 100% in the event of priority status being secured or around 25-30% if treated as general unsecured creditors. On this basis, the potential loss to the Council over and above the impairment already recognised in the accounts would be £10.356m. However, as it is anticipated that ultimately the courts will reach a single view on priority creditor status for both Glitnir and Landsbanki, the risk of reduced recovery from Landsbanki, currently estimated at 83%, now also arises. The worst case financial position under that scenario is that the further loss to the Council would be nearer to £18m (based on recovery of 31% for both banks).*
- 9.51 *In early December 2009 following advice received by the LGA, the Council submitted a formal request to DCLG to capitalise any potential loss based on the position as known at that time. Notification was received on 29 January 2010 that the Council's capitalisation bid had been unsuccessful. It is likely that the LGA will provide a summary legal challenge to this decision on behalf of all Councils in a similar position. However, the current position is that in the event that the Council's claims for either Glitnir or Landsbanki are confirmed as having unsecured status, between £10.4m and £18m will have to be found from reserves and balances.*

#### Capacity to Manage In-Year Budget Pressures

- 9.52 *Following on from the Section 11 Notice in February 2004 the Council's financial standing, measured in terms of the level of balances, has considerably improved. The gross General Fund and HRA budgets in 2010/11 are £903.4m, but in terms of assessing financial risks it is more appropriate to combine this figure with fees and charges, income and specific grants, which produces a total just over £1.56bn. In commercial terms this represents a significant level of "turnover" and variances from budget are inevitable, particularly when a significant amount of expenditure (e.g. adult and children's services) and income (e.g. local land charges and planning fees) is demand-led. It should be borne in mind, however, that even just a 1% variance equates to nearly £15m.*
- 9.53 *In considering the council's capacity to manage in-year budget pressures I have reviewed the budget volatility reported in budget monitoring during the current and previous five years. The position (excluding schools and the HRA) is summarised below, although it should be recognised that improvements in interest earnings have contributed significantly to the underspends shown, especially in the last four financial years:-*

<i>Outturn Year</i>	<i>Overspends</i>	<i>Underspends</i>	<i>Net</i>	<i>Interest Benefit included in Underspends</i>
	<i>£m</i>	<i>£m</i>	<i>£m</i>	<i>£m</i>
<i>2004/05</i>	<i>15.4</i>	<i>(16.5)</i>	<i>(1.1)</i>	<i>(1.76)</i>
<i>2005/06</i>	<i>8.9</i>	<i>(12.0)</i>	<i>(3.1)</i>	<i>(4.30)</i>
<i>2006/07</i>	<i>4.9</i>	<i>(7.0)</i>	<i>(2.1)</i>	<i>(4.25)</i>
<i>2007/08</i>	<i>3.7</i>	<i>(16.3)</i>	<i>(12.6)</i>	<i>(7.93)</i>
<i>2008/09</i>	<i>1.10</i>	<i>(2.51)</i>	<i>(1.41)</i>	<i>(5.93)</i>
<i>2009/10</i>	<i>2.70</i>	<i>(1.23)</i>	<i>1.47</i>	<i>0</i>

9.54 *As with the delivery of budget developments and reductions, I do not consider these in-year variances to be exceptional and management action has always enabled some savings to be identified in-year to compensate for overspends. Nonetheless, variances have occurred and are, therefore, a factor that must be taken into account in making a recommendation to Council on the level of General Fund balances.*

#### *Relevant External Audit comments*

9.55 *The Council was served with a Section 11 Notice by the External Auditor in February 2004, as part of the Annual Audit Letter for 2003/04. The primary concern of the External Auditor at that time was the level of balances and insurance provision. Subsequent annual External Audit reports have highlighted the Council's positive and rapid progress in rebuilding balances and provisions but have also emphasised the need to maintain adequate balances.*

9.56 *The External Auditor's report for 2008/09 noted that the Authority had produced good financial results for the year, including the generation of a substantial net surplus, broadly in line with medium term financial plans. Even so, it should be noted that as at 31<sup>st</sup> March 2009, Barnet's combined balances and reserves represented only 3.19% of gross expenditure and income which, in contrast to the cash position, ranked the council only 21st out of the 33 London boroughs (see Appendix F). Whilst an improvement on the 2007/08 position, Barnet continues to work with relatively low balances compared to the rest of London when the size of each authority is taken into account.*

9.57 *Members are also reminded of previous years' comments by External Audit that the Council should continue to maintain adequate levels of reserves as a cushion against unplanned expenditure in future years still holds true.*

#### *General Fund Balances*

9.58 The Council entered 2009/10 in a strong financial position with general balances of £17.482m (excluding school balances). This position provides the Council with more flexibility to meet the challenges it faces. The latest monitoring report to Cabinet Resources Committee shows that directorates are currently projecting a £1.464m call on the General Fund due to net overspending and agreed allocations. On this basis General Fund Balances would reduce from £17.482m to £15.513m by 31 March 2010. It should be noted that this forecast does not take account of any variances against central expenses budgets.

	£m
Balances @ 31 March 2009	17.482
Forecast Variations in 2009/10	(1.464)
Allocations agreed from balances	(505)
Forecast Balances @ 31 March 2010	15.513

9.59 The recommendation of £10m as a minimum General Fund balance was uplifted to a target of at least £15m in 2008/09 to meet identified risks at that time. Since 2006/07 Barnet's gross turnover has increased substantially. In the light of the risks being reported now, the economic recession and the prospect of a very significant tightening of grant settlements from 2011/12 onwards, the council needs to continue to consolidate and if possible, strengthen its financial standing.

9.60 This is the fifth year of the council formally determining the appropriate level of General Fund balances. The £10m minimum was set at a time when the council's finances and balances needed rebuilding which has been achieved and more. To consolidate and embed the current financial strength further, the minimum balance should be maintained at £15m, to provide a permanent flexibility and buffer against short term overspending, unforeseen pressures and budget risks, whilst also enabling the council to take forward the Future Shape programme.

9.61 In order to ensure balances can be maintained at the recommended level consideration should be given to requiring any residual 2009/10 service overspends at year end to be carried forward to 2010/11 and met from within directorates' cash limited budgets. The council should also continue to identify in year savings and any windfall gains in 2010/11 to build up reserves and balances further where opportunities are presented.

#### General Fund Specific Reserves

9.62 The Capital Projects reserve provides for one-off expenditure across the capital programme that does not meet the test for capitalisation, and is also available to meet exceptional costs in delivering capital receipts. The Restructure and Reorganisation Reserve provides for severance costs should the necessary Ministerial Directions to capitalise not be obtained and to meet any exceptional costs associated with organisational



restructuring. The other significant reserves are for litigation costs and for smoothing of interest receipts. Most of these reserves are likely to be exhausted within a couple of years and Cabinet may need to make further provisions for these in later years of the Financial Forward Plan, in accordance with the policy set out in the Medium Term Financial Strategy.

9.63 In light of the comments above about the risks associated with sums deposited with the Icelandic banks, it would be prudent at this time to set aside a significant sum in a specific reserve to provide flexibility to deal with further impairment costs should they arise. The headlines provides for a £2.2m contribution to balances in recognition of the likely requirement to write back grant income for prior years in closing the 2009/10 accounts. Current indications are that due to lower than expected capital financing costs in 2009/10 and underspends against other central expenses budgets there will be scope for absorbing the grant loss in 2009/10 without any call on balances. This sum can therefore be used to establish an Icelandic banks reserve. In addition, there is headroom within the 2010/11 draft budget for a contribution of £1.332m to such a reserve and scope for a further contribution of £0.4m from grant income from the Local Authority Business Growth Initiative which is currently subsumed within the central contingency. £3.5m of the balance on the interest reserve can also be redesignated, which would allow an initial reserve of £7.432m to be established. Any surplus of General Fund balances over and above the recommended minimum level of £15m should also be transferred to this reserve in closing the 2009/10 accounts.

<b>General Fund Specific Reserves 2010/11 (£'000)</b>	<b>Estimated Opening Balance @ 01.04.10</b>	<b>Committed</b>	<b>Budgeted Changes</b>	<b>Estimated Closing Balance @ 31.03.11</b>
	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000
Capital Projects	5,100	0	(130)	4,970
Restructure Reserve	4,000		(2,000)	2,000
Interest Reserve	4,733		(3,500)	1,233
Litigation	5,000	0		5,000
N. London Waste Authority Levy	0		2,039	2,039
Housing Benefit Subsidy	2,820		(1,380)	1,440
Icelandic Bank Reserve	0		7,432	7,432
Other	3,691	(1,152)		2,539
	<b>25,344</b>	<b>(1,152)</b>	<b>2,461</b>	<b>26,653</b>
<u>Committed in Later Years</u>				
PFI Street Lighting	3,213	0		3,213
Local Elections	450	(450)		0
Lottery	60	(15)		45
<b>Totals</b>	<b>29,067</b>	<b>(1,617)</b>	<b>2,461</b>	<b>29,911</b>

### Summary & Recommendations of the Chief Finance Officer

- 9.64 *The Council is required by the Local Government Act 2003 to take into account advice from its Chief Finance Officer on the level of balances and reserves. It is also required to take into account any relevant advice provided by the External Auditor.*
- 9.65 *LAAP Bulletins are intended to provide guidance that represents good financial management and which should be followed as a matter of course. LAAP Bulletins 55 and 77 are guidance notes on “Local Authority Reserves & Balances” that advise that if the advice of the Chief Finance Officer is not accepted, this should be recorded formally in the minutes of the Council meeting that approves the council budget. LAAP 55, Section 7.2 of this guidance states:-*
- 9.66 *The level and utilisation of reserves will be determined formally by the Council, informed by the advice and judgement of the CFO. To enable the Council to reach its decision, the CFO should report the factors that influenced his/her judgement (in accordance with paragraph 6.2) and ensure that the advice given is recorded formally. Where the Chief Finance Officer’s advice is not accepted this should be recorded formally in the minutes of the council meeting.*
- 9.67 *There is no formula for calculating the appropriate level of balances, but it should be determined after taking into account the financial risks facing the council and the opportunities for the council to explore initiatives such as Future Shape and the Barnet Financing Plan. The council can certainly be managed with lower balances, but this creates a serious risk of every adverse budget variation during the year becoming a crisis. The council’s decision making would be continually overshadowed by a weak financial position, diverting executive and management attention from all the other corporate priorities around service delivery.*
- 9.68 *The level of council balances will also have a direct link to the council’s score on Use of Resources as part of CAA in future. Within that context, a low level of balances also reduces the council’s ability to take risks and so reduces the opportunity to make innovative improvements to service delivery and deliver further efficiency savings.*
- 9.69 *Having taken into account the budget risks and forecast level of balances and specific reserves at 31 March 2010, the Chief Finance Officer’s recommendation is that General Fund balances should not be allowed to fall below £15m by 31 March 2011. This is in the light of the risks set out in this report and the economic recession. Also, any drawing from balances to meet recurrent expenditure must be made good in the following year’s base budget. Failure to do so***

**would compound the risks in that year and weaken the Council's financial standing should the minimum level be breached.**

- 9.70 The Chief Finance Officer further recommends that a specific reserve for the Icelandic Banks of £7.432m be established and that any surplus of General Fund balances over and above the minimum recommended level of £15m be transferred to this reserve in closing the 2009/10 accounts.**
- 9.71 Cabinet also needs to continue its rigorous budget monitoring during the coming year and ensure that any windfalls and underspends are clawed back to the centre to further strengthen the Council's financial position. Formal consideration should be given to a change of policy requiring any residual 2009/10 overspends at year end to be carried forward as a charge against directorates' 2010/11 budgets.**
- 9.72 In responding to these recommendations, Cabinet and the Council must decide what it considers to be the appropriate level of balances given all the factors set out by the Chief Finance Officer. If it considers an appropriate level to be less than the £15m recommended then it must recognise that this decision must be recorded at the Council meeting that sets the 2010/11 budget and Council Tax."**

---

### Prudential Borrowing

The Leader's report stated that the Prudential Code enabled councils to borrow without Government approval, subject to the cost of borrowing being affordable in future years. The grant settlement outlined in the Leader's report made no provision for any increase in any borrowing over 2010/11. Nevertheless, the Financial Forward Plan provided for affordable prudential borrowing as set out in Appendix C to the Leader's report, over the next three years. Provision for the additional cost of this borrowing had been contained within the recommended budget. The Council should recognise this considerable achievement and approve the level of prudential borrowing set out in Appendix E to the Leader's report.

### Housing Revenue Account

The Local Government & Housing Act 1989 required the Housing Revenue Account (HRA) to be maintained as a ring-fenced account and prescribed the debits and credits for it. Any surpluses generated from the HRA could be used to support the account when it failed to break even and for any one year a budget could be set such that there was a drawing on balances, but it was not permissible for an overall HRA budget deficit to be set. It was for the Council to determine what level of balances should be maintained. At 31 March 2009 the

HRA balances were £3.76m, and forecast to be £3.42m at 31 March 2010 at the Cabinet Resources Committee on Feb 2010.

The principal items of expenditure within the HRA were management and maintenance costs, together with charges for capital expenditure (depreciation and interest). This was substantially met by rent and service charge income from dwellings, garages and commercial premises. However, the national housing subsidy system was a mechanism for redistributing resources between local housing authorities, and in 2010/11 Barnet had to contribute £11.9m to the pool – this contribution was increasing annually. The Government's Review of Council Housing Finance was completed in autumn 2009, and was expected to make a formal offer to the council in the very near future.

It had been the practice in earlier years to use some of the surpluses generated from the HRA to finance capital investment in the housing stock as capital resources were scarce. This could only be done in future if the level of balances was high enough to meet any contingencies that might arise. The immediate issue for the HRA was, therefore, to return to a position of budget surplus to maintain a healthy position and generate further resources for capital investment.

The financial forward plan for the HRA currently showed a draw down on balances for most years. This position could not be sustained in the long term and the Council, together with Barnet Homes, was reviewing the business plan with a view to bringing the HRA back into surplus in future years. There is clearly a high risk with the HRA at present and the position will need to be closely monitored.

Council should, taking account of all matters set out in this report, determine what it considers to be the appropriate level of General Fund balances and note the position on the HRA balance.

### **Greater London Authority**

The Greater London Authority (GLA) precept incorporated the following budget requirements:-

- Mayor's Office
- GLA Assembly
- Corporate administration
- Transport for London
- London Development Agency
- Metropolitan Police Authority
- London Fire & Emergency Planning Authority
- 2012 Olympics and Paralympic Games

The Mayor had issued his draft budget for consultation on 10 December 2009, proposing a freeze in the precept. His final budget had been considered by the London Assembly on 10 February 2010, and approved without change.

A summary of the precept was given as set out below:-

<b>GLA Functions</b>	<b>2010/11</b>	<b>2009/10</b>	<b>Increase</b>
	<b>£</b>	<b>£</b>	<b>%</b>
Metropolitan Police Authority	216.83	224.34	(3.35)
London Fire & Emergency Planning Authority	59.58	53.41	11.55
Transport for London	4.02	4.06	(0.99)
Greater London Authority	10.91	9.50	14.84
London Development Agency	0.00	0.00	-
Olympic Surcharge	20.00	20.00	-
Surplus on Borough Collection Funds	(1.52)	(1.49)	2.01
<b>Total GLA Group</b>	<b>309.82</b>	<b>309.82</b>	<b>0.00</b>

### **Collection Fund**

On the statutory date (15 January 2010) the Chief Finance Officer had forecast the collection of previous years' Council Tax, as at 31 March 2010. This calculation identified a surplus on the Collection Fund of £2.554m, which had been allocated between Barnet and the GLA – Barnet's share being £1,998,030. The surplus resulted from more new properties being completed than forecast when setting the 2009/10 tax base together with continued improvements in collection following investment in new staff and systems. The estimated collection rate for 2010/11 remained 98.5%.

### **Council Taxbase**

There were two measures of the taxable capacity of the Authority. The first was the Inland Revenue Valuation Office list, which was adjusted for discounts and exemptions on the Council Tax system and was used by Government in Formula Grant calculations. The second was used for tax setting purposes and was a calculation made by the Chief Finance Officer, representing the estimated taxable capacity for the year ahead and incorporating the estimated collection rate.

Under delegated powers, the Chief Finance Officer had determined the 2010/11 taxbase to be 137,446 (Band D Equivalents) – the calculation being set out below:-

<b>Council Taxbase</b>	<b>Band D Equivalent</b>	
	<b>2009/10</b>	<b>2010/11</b>
Number of properties	160,013	160,835
Estimated discounts	(18,908)	(18,050)
Estimated other changes	(2,692)	(3,478)
<b>Total Relevant Amounts</b>	<b>138,413</b>	<b>139,307</b>
Estimated non-collection (1.5%)	(2,076)	(2,089)
Contribution on lieu of MoD	268	228
<b>Council Taxbase</b>	<b>136,605</b>	<b>137,446</b>

### Council Tax

The calculation of the Council Tax for Barnet was as set out below:-

<b>BUDGET</b>	<b>2009/10</b>	<b>2010/11</b>
	£	£
<b>Total Service Expenditure</b>	<b>260,099,570</b>	<b>269,231,570</b>
<b>Contribution to / (from) reserves</b>	<b>(1,000,000)</b>	<b>2,460,870</b>
<b>Area Based Grant</b>	<b>(14,322,660)</b>	<b>(22,133,120)</b>
<b>BUDGET REQUIREMENT</b>	<b>244,776,910</b>	<b>249,559,320</b>
Formula Grant	(17,243,208)	(11,989,459)
Business Rate Income	(74,706,428)	(82,566,755)
Collection Fund Transfers	(758,430)	(1,998,060)
<b>DEMAND ON COLLECTION FUND</b>	<b>152,068,844</b>	<b>153,005,046</b>
Council Taxbase	136,605	137,446
<b>BASIC AMOUNT OF TAX</b>	<b>1,113.20</b>	<b>1,113.20</b>

The provisional GLA precept was £42,583,520, making the total estimated demand on the Collection Fund £195,588,566.

The Council was required to set levels of Council Tax for each category of dwelling. As there were no special items within Barnet's or the GLA's budgets affecting parts of the borough, there were only eight amounts of tax to set, as set out below:-

<b>Council Tax Band</b>	<b>Barnet</b>	<b>GLA</b>	<b>Aggregate</b>
	£	£	£
<b>A</b>	742.13	206.55	948.68
<b>B</b>	865.82	240.97	1,106.79
<b>C</b>	989.51	275.40	1,264.91
<b>D</b>	1,113.20	309.82	1,423.02
<b>E</b>	1,360.58	378.67	1,739.25
<b>F</b>	1,607.96	447.52	2,055.48
<b>G</b>	1,855.33	516.37	2,371.70
<b>H</b>	2,226.40	619.64	2,846.04

Individual Council Tax bills would reflect occupancy status with discounts for low occupancy (one or no adults) and exemptions for specific circumstances. In addition, some residents would be eligible for Council Tax Benefit. In 2009/10, approximately 21% (19% 2008/09) of Council Tax payers had claimed a full or partial Council Tax rebate.

### **Medium Term Financial Strategy & Financial Forward Plan**

The revised Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS) was attached at Appendix C to the Leader's report for approval by Cabinet. It provided a framework for future years' financial plans.

Forward financial planning was critical to support council performance and achieve its priorities. It was also a requirement under the Prudential Framework that decisions on the budget must be taken in the context of the Forward Plan, with particular attention being paid to the affordability of prudential borrowing over a period of at least 3 years.

An update on the Financial Forward Plan was attached at Appendix D to the Leader's report. Some key assumptions had had to be made in constructing this forward plan (e.g. estimated pay awards, inflation, levies, pension contributions, prudential borrowing, investment income), along with targets for efficiency savings and budget reductions. Quite small changes in these variables could have a significant impact on the final Council Tax figures.

The Settlement had announced Barnet's provisional grant figure for 2010/11 which was incorporated into the Financial Forward Plan.

## **HOUSING REVENUE ACCOUNT**

The Housing Revenue Account (HRA) is a statutory ring-fenced account covering all revenue expenditure and income relating to the housing stock. The Council is required to construct a budget to ensure that the account for the year does not show a debit balance. 2010/11 will be the sixth year of management of the housing stock by Barnet Homes, and the summary HRA is shown in Appendix B.

### **Rent Restructuring**

The Government introduced rent restructuring and convergence for local authority and registered social landlords (RSLs) over a 10-year period starting April 2002. All rents would be calculated on the same basis, with 70% based on average earnings for the region (adjusted for numbers of bedrooms) and 30% based on the valuation as at January 1999.

The Government consulted during the summer of 2005 on a 3-year review of rent restructuring, and implemented its proposals in 2006/07. These involved a re-calculation of base formula rents in line with those used for housing association properties, together with higher weightings for properties with three or more bedrooms.

Rents move towards a target figure for each property. This year, the Government has brought forward the deadline for convergence to 2012/13 for the purposes of calculating the guideline and formula rents by setting the guideline rent increase at 3.1%. However the increase to any individual property is limited to inflation (deemed to be -1.4%) plus 0.5% plus £2 per week (on a 52 week basis), and thus in reality the overall rent increase will average around 1.5%. Should rents be increased by less this would lead to a reduction in services.

### **Housing Subsidy**

At the time of writing the Government had not issued the final subsidy determination for 2010/11. Unusually the draft was not issued until 9 December 2009 and consultation closed on 25 January 2010. Thus the figures for the guideline rent above and the allowances as described below could change in the final determination.

The management allowance has been set at £668.87 per dwelling, an increase of 3.1%, while the maintenance allowance has increased by 6.0% to £1,294.57 per dwelling. The guideline rent increase reflects the restructuring referred to above.

The Major Repairs Allowance (MRA) is also paid as part of housing subsidy. Barnet's allocation has increased by £315,000 from 2009/10 to £8,858,800. However Barnet had been able to bring forward £1.2m MRA allocation into 2009/10 with the approval of the government and thus the 2010/11 allocation would be reduced by this amount.



## Service Charges

Service charges for tenants had been introduced in 2003/04 for specific services (mainly caretaking), and it was proposed that these be held at the 2009/10 level. Charges for these services would not generally recover the full cost of their provision.

Utility prices remained volatile. However there was a reduction in the gas contract prices which enabled heating and hot water charges to be reduced by 15% for those properties connected to the Grahame Park boiler house and by 10% for all other properties. The Council was undertaking a review of heating charges during 2010/11 which would reflect these price changes and fuel efficiencies resulting from the Decent Homes programme.

## HRA Summary & Working Balance

Total expenditure for 2010/11 was estimated at £54.162m, including payment of £11.905m to the Government in respect of housing subsidy. The proposed average rent increase of 1.5% was estimated to raise £691,000, before the effect of reduction in property numbers was taken into account.

It was proposed that rents for the Council's hostels be increased in accordance with the general rent increase. Rents for the Council's shared ownership schemes would also be raised in line with the general rent increase. It was also recommended that rents on garages be increased by 2.5%.

The HRA for 2010/11 shows an estimated contribution to balances of £435,740, thus the estimated balance at 31 March 2011 is some £3.8m.

## HRA Minimum Revenue Provision (MRP)

Unlike the General Fund, there was no requirement for the HRA to be charged with the MRP or its depreciation equivalent. The Government's removal of this legal requirement, combined with subsidy changes resulted in there being no equivalent reduction in debt unless a voluntary charge was made – without subsidy, which had to be found from within HRA resources. Barnet's current policy was to not make a charge which was robust from a legal perspective. The option of making a charge remained a consideration for the council should it prove beneficial to do so.

## Reform of Council Housing Finance

During 2009/10 the Government had issued a consultation paper on the reform of council housing finance, which had proposed dismantling the existing HRA subsidy system, replacing it with a self-financing system. This would be based on a 30-year business plan but would involve the redistribution of housing debt (some £18bn nationally) across all authorities. This would be based on a Net Present Value calculation based on the business plan.

The Council's joint response with Barnet Homes had supported this in principle, but had concerns as to what the detail of such a proposal might entail. In particular the Council would almost certainly have to take on more debt as a result. Whilst this would be met through housing rents there was concern that as debt is pooled within local authorities there could be an adverse effect on the General Fund.

An announcement of the self-financing offer is expected in February, with possible implementation as soon as April 2011. However the forward plan HRA projections and the capital programme assume that the present system continues.

## **CAPITAL PROGRAMME**

### **Introduction**

The capital programme set out the plans for investment in buildings, roads, equipment, other assets and capital grants over 2009/10 to 2012/13 and beyond.

The recommended capital programme was set out later in the report. Decisions on the level of capital expenditure depended on the availability of various sources of funding. This included capital grants, capital receipts, developer contributions and borrowing.

Government supported investment in two ways. Capital grants that were generally ring fenced to specific programmes (such as schools) or projects and was real funding to the council. This was in contrast to notional capital allocations that fed into either Revenue Formula Grant or Housing Subsidy (referred to as supported borrowing). With below inflation revenue grant increases the reality was that the cost of borrowing is not funded by Government grant.

As such, the council could no longer base capital investment decisions on notional Government figures and must determine the level of investment in accordance with the self-regulatory Prudential Framework. Local authorities may determine the amount of capital investment they could fund by 'unsupported' prudential borrowing based on affordability, prudence, sustainability and good practice. Recently, the council had used prudential borrowing to modernise and maintain its infrastructure. This level of borrowing was not sustainable.

### **Capital Programme**

New capital proposals were supported by a full business case, which detailed the contribution schemes would make to achieve the Council's priorities, all the available options for implementing the project and financial implications of each. The relative merits of each proposal were assessed within the context of available capital resources to produce a prioritised capital programme.

Provision for revenue costs (running costs and borrowing) was included in the revenue budget. Updated reports would be submitted to Members to confirm final costs. New regulations on minimum revenue provision require the council to

agree the policy for repayment of capital. The policy was included as part of the Treasury Management Strategy, and the revenue budget and forward plan allowed for the increase in the statutory cost for the repayment of borrowing based on asset life rather than the previous 4% Minimum Revenue Provision on the capital financing requirement. The change was welcomed in that it required the repayment of debt over the life of the asset.

The capital programme was now extremely reliant on external grants and prudential borrowing to fund capital borrowing. The only area of the current capital programme that capital receipts were expected to fund a significant part was PSCIP and Regeneration and the risks around this are outlined under the risks in Appendix A to the Leader's report. There was a need for a fundamental review of the capital programme following the spending review.

Reference had already been made to the prudent assumptions made on capital receipts that will be available to support the programme. The planned funding of the capital programme was included in Appendix D to the Leader's report. General Fund borrowing was used to fund, on average, nearly 32% of the annual programme. The historical level of annual borrowing was not sustainable and Cabinet might need to consider using significant capital receipts generated in future years to repay borrowing rather than fund further expansion of the capital programme.

The programme had been subject to considerable slippage in previous years with some £50m of 2008/09 capital budget now included in the 2009/10 programme. The capital monitor to Cabinet Resources Committee for 2009/10 had so far rescheduled £31m of capital expenditure. Inevitably, delay still represented a significant risk, especially where the projects are funded by time-limited capital grants or the investment is budgeted to generate revenue savings. The updated capital programme reflected the latest estimates of slippage carried forward from 2009/10, but clearly until the accounts were closed the figures for each project were only provisional. This would require a review of project budgets during the first cycle of budget monitoring of 2010/11 and a re-statement of budgets in 2010/11 in the first budget monitor reported to Cabinet Resources Committee.

The HRA programme for the improvement of homes was managed by Barnet Homes. It had entered into partnering agreements with the major contractors who would deliver the bulk of the programme until 2010/11. Funding was via the ALMO Decent Homes borrowing, other supported borrowing, the Major Repairs Allowance, capital receipts and contributions from leaseholders. Decent Homes borrowing approvals had been confirmed to 2010/11 and two of their partners would complete their programmes by 31 March 2010. The programme post-2011 assumed that there is no further supported borrowing.

The General Fund Housing programme totalled £6.8m in 2010/11. It included expenditure supporting housing association projects.

## **PRUDENTIAL CODE & BORROWING LIMITS**

The Prudential Framework gave freedom to local authorities to invest as long as their capital plans were affordable, prudent and sustainable. The CIPFA Prudential Code set out the indicators that local authorities must use and the factors that they must take into account to show that they had fulfilled these objectives.

The principal constraint on capital investment will be the financial impact on the Council Tax and rent levels of the housing revenue account, which would be reflected in the indicators of affordability. It would be for the Council to decide on an appropriate level of borrowing in relation to its net capital financing costs and the level of Council Tax and housing rents.

For 2010/11, Government had provided local authorities with a mix of revenue support for capital financing costs based on notional capital allocations and capital grants via the single capital pot, but it had still to decide whether to continue with the current arrangements or change the balance between revenue support for borrowing and capital grants as part of the CSR. The Council had lobbied for capital support to be provided as capital grants because successive below inflation settlements had resulted in there being no grant increase for new capital financing costs.

The financial indicators under the Prudential Code and the 2010/11 Treasury Management Strategy & Annual Plan requiring Council approval were set out in Appendix C to the Leader's report along with full details of their calculation and purpose.

Accordingly and for the reasons given in the Leader's report, Cabinet

**RESOLVED TO RECOMMEND –**

- 1 That council agrees to the prudential borrowing as set out in Appendix E to the Leader's report.**

### **Balances**

- 2. Council agree that the minimum level of General Fund balances should be £15m after taking account of all matters set out in the Chief Finance Officer's report on reserves and balances.**

### **Revenue Budget and Council Tax**

- 3 The forecast revenue outturn for the year 2009/10 and the estimates of income and expenditure for 2010/11 be approved**

- 4 That it be noted that the Chief Finance Officer under his delegated powers has calculated the amount of 137,446 (band D equivalents) as the Council Tax base for the year 2010/11 in accordance with Regulation 3 of the Local Authorities (Calculation of Council Tax Base) Regulations 1992 made under Section 33(5) of the Local Government Finance Act 1992.
- 5 That the following amounts be now calculated by the Council for the year 2010/11 in accordance with Sections 32 to 36 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992:-
- (a) £903,373,810 being the aggregate of the amounts which the Council estimates for the items set out in Section 32(2)(a) to (e) of the Act;
  - (b) £653,814,490 being the aggregate of the amounts which the Council estimates for the items set out in Section 32(3)(a) to (c) of the Act;
  - (c) £249,559,320 being the amount by which the aggregate at 5(a) above exceeds the aggregate at 5(b) above, calculated by the Council, in accordance with Section 32(4) of the Act, as its budget requirement for the year;
  - (d) £96,554,274 being the aggregate of the sums which the Council estimates will be payable for the year into its general fund in respect of redistributed non-domestic rates, revenue support grant or additional grant increased or reduced (as appropriate) by the amount of the sums which the Council estimates will be transferred in the year from:-
    - (i) its collection fund to its general fund and;
    - (ii) its general fund to its collection fund in accordance with Sections 97(3) and (4) and 98 (4) and (5) respectively of the Local Government Finance Act 1988;
  - (e) £1,113.20 being the amount at 5 above less the amount at 5(d) above, all divided by the amount at 4 above, calculated by the Council, in accordance with Section 33(1) of the Act, as the basic amount of its Council Tax for the year 2010/2011;

**London Borough of Barnet Valuation Bands (£)**

A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
742.13	865.82	989.51	1,113.20	1,360.58	1,607.96	1,855.33	2,226.40

being the amounts given by multiplying the amount at 5(e) above by the number which, in the proportion set out in Section 5(1) of the Act, is applicable to dwellings listed in a particular valuation band divided by the number which is in that proportion is applicable to dwellings listed in valuation band D, calculated by the Council, in accordance with Section 36(1) of the Act, as the amounts to be taken into account for the year in respect of categories of dwellings listed in different valuation bands.

- 6 That it be noted that for the year 2010/11 the Greater London Authority has stated the following amounts in precepts issued to the Council, in accordance with Section 40 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992, for each of the categories of the dwellings shown below:-

**Greater London Authority Valuation Bands (£)**

A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
206.55	240.97	275.40	309.82	378.67	447.52	516.37	619.64

- 7 That, having calculated the aggregate in each case of the amounts at 5(e) and 6 above, the Council, in accordance with Section 30(2) of the Local Government Finance Act 1992, hereby sets the following amounts as the amounts of Council Tax for the year 2010/11 for each of the categories dwellings shown below: -

**Council Tax for Area (£)**

A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
948.68	1,106.79	1,264.91	1,423.02	1,739.25	2,055.48	2,371.70	2,846.04

- 8 (i) That in accordance with Section 38(2) of the Act the Chief Executive be instructed to place a notice in the local press of the amounts set under recommendation 7 above pursuant to Section 30 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992 within a period of 21 days following the Council's decision.

**Housing Revenue Account and Rents**

- 9 That the Housing Revenue Account estimates for 2010/11 be approved.
- 10 That, with effect from 1 April 2010:-
- (a) The rent of all Council dwellings be changed in line with the proposals outlined in this report, producing an average increase of 1.5%
- (b) That the rents of all properties relet for whatever reason be moved upwards to the formula rent. Where formula rent is below actual rent no reduction will be made.
- (c ) That service charges for all tenants of all flats and maisonettes based on the services they receive be held at the following charges (per week, 48 week basis):-
- |                      |       |
|----------------------|-------|
| Caretaking           | £5.44 |
| Caretaking Plus      | £7.03 |
| Block Lighting       | £0.87 |
| Grounds Maintenance  | £0.56 |
| Quarterly Caretaking | £1.09 |
| Communal Digital TV  | £0.72 |
- (d) That there is a decrease of 15% on the charge for space and water heating for those properties served by the Grahame Park boiler house, and a reduction of 10% for other properties

- (e) That, with effect from 1 April 2010, the rents of Council garages be increased by 2.5%.
- (f) That the Chief Executive be instructed to take the necessary action including the service of the appropriate Notices.

#### **Treasury Management, Capital Prudential Code and Borrowing Limits**

- 11 The Prudential Indicators set out in Appendix E be recommended for approval to Council and that the Chief Finance Officer be authorised to raise loans, as required, up to such borrowing limits as the Council may from time to time determine and to finance capital expenditure from financing and operating leases subject to:
  - (i) the appropriate provision having been made in the estimates for 2010/11.
  - (ii) authorisation (where necessary) of the expenditure by the appropriate Government Department;

#### **Capital**

- 12 That the capital programmes be approved, and that the Chief Officers be authorised to take all necessary action to implement them.
- 13 The Chief Finance Officer be authorised to adjust capital project budgets in 2010/11 throughout the capital programme after the 2009/10 accounts are closed and the amounts of slippage and budget carry forward required are known.
- 14 That where slippage results in the loss of external funding and a new pressure being placed on prudential borrowing, the relevant Director report on options for offsetting this impact by adjusting other capital projects.

#### **Contracts**

- 15 That authorisation be given to allow tenders to be sought for contracts listed in Appendix I to the Leader's report.

#### **Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS)**

- 16 That the MTFS attached at Appendix C to the Leader's report is approved.
- 17 That it be noted that the current annual level of prudential borrowing cannot be sustained long term, and that Cabinet must also seriously consider using significant capital receipts generated in future years to repay borrowing rather than fund further expansion of the capital programme.

**2. COLINDALE AREA ACTION PLAN (Report of the Cabinet Member for Planning and Environmental protection)**

Cabinet considered the attached report of the Cabinet Member and for the reasons given in the report

**RESOLVED TO RECOMMEND**

- 1. That the Colindale Area Action Plan (AAP), (Appendix A, separately circulated) having been the subject of an Examination in Public, be formally adopted as a Local Development Framework Development Plan Document.**
- 2. That the Colindale AAP be adopted as a statutory Local Development Framework Development Plan Document for the purposes of informing any future proposals for redevelopment in the area and being a material consideration for the purposes of determining future planning applications.**

*Note: Appendix A is available on the web site at*

*<http://committeepapers.barnet.gov.uk/democracy/reports/reportdetail.asp?ReportID=8976>*

*Hard copies will be available at the Council meeting and may be inspected on request to Peter Alsop 020 8359 5658*



**AGENDA ITEM: 9**

Page nos. 57 – 118 (&amp; separate App. A)

Meeting	Cabinet
Date	22 February 2010
<b>Subject</b>	<b>Colindale Area Action Plan</b>
Report of	Cabinet Member for Planning and Environmental Protection
Summary	The final stage in the Local Development Framework process for the preparation of the Colindale Area Action Plan has now been completed. The AAP has been the subject of an Examination in Public (EiP) and the independent planning Inspector's binding report on the Examination has been received confirming that the plan has been found to be sound. This Cabinet report seeks formal approval of the AAP by Cabinet prior to submission to full Council for adoption as a Development Plan Document as part of the Local Development Framework.

Officer Contributors	Stewart Murray - Director of Planning, Housing and Regeneration Peter Alsop - Principal Planning Officer
Status (Public or Exempt)	Public
Wards Affected	All
Enclosures	Appendix A - Colindale Area Action Plan ( <b>separate document</b> ) Appendix B - Inspectors Report on the Examination into the Colindale Area Action Plan
For Decision by	Council (recommendation 1.1) on recommendation of Cabinet
Function of	Council
Reason for urgency/exemption from call-in (if appropriate)	Not Applicable

Contact for Further information: Peter Alsop, Major Developments, Planning, Housing and Regeneration, Telephone 0208 359 4658

## **1. RECOMMENDATIONS**

### **1.1 That Cabinet recommend Council**

- (a) That the Colindale Area Action Plan (AAP), (Appendix A, separately circulated) having been the subject of an Examination in Public, be formally adopted as a Local Development Framework Development Plan Document.**
- (b) That the Colindale AAP be adopted as a statutory Local Development Framework Development Plan Document for the purposes of informing any future proposals for redevelopment in the area and being a material consideration for the purposes of determining future planning applications.**

### **1.2 That subject to adoption by Council the Colindale AAP be published on the Barnet web site and hard copies be available for purchase.**

## **2. RELEVANT PREVIOUS DECISIONS**

- 2.1 On 1 December 2003 (decision item 11), Cabinet approved the Colindale Development Framework for strategic planning guidance purposes. Whilst not formally adopted the draft framework began the process of coordinated area action planning and most importantly has helped inform major planning applications within the locality namely in relation to Beaufort Park and Grahame Park Estate where re-development is well underway.
- 2.2 The revised Local Development Scheme (LDS), which contains the programme for the preparation of the Local Development Framework (LDF) and other Area Action Plans (AAPs) was approved by Cabinet on the 26<sup>th</sup> February 2007 (decision item 6) and subsequently by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government on 12<sup>th</sup> June 2007. Colindale is identified in the approved LDS as a statutory Area Action Plan (AAP) and will therefore be a Development Plan Document within the LDF.
- 2.3 The Colindale AAP Preferred Options Report was approved by Cabinet Member Delegated Powers on the 29 August 2008 for public consultation (DPR640).
- 2.4 The Colindale AAP Submission Document was approved by Cabinet on the 8<sup>th</sup> June 2009 (Decision Item 9) for publication and submission to the Secretary of State for independent Examination in Public.
- 2.5 On the 21<sup>st</sup> October 2009 Cabinet approved Core Strategy Direction of Travel (Decision item 9).

### **3. CORPORATE PRIORITIES AND POLICY CONSIDERATIONS**

- 3.1 The Mayor for London in his published London Plan (Consolidated with Alterations since 2004) identifies Colindale as an Opportunity Area with a capacity for 10,000 new homes and 500 new jobs (page 301).
- 3.2 In November 2004 the Council approved its "Three Strands Approach", setting out a vision and direction for future development, regeneration and planning within the Borough. An updated edition was published in June 2008. The approach, which is based around the three strands of Protection, Enhancement and Growth, will protect Barnet's high quality suburbs and deliver new housing and successful sustainable communities whilst protecting employment opportunities. The third strand 'Growth' responds to Barnet's significant growth potential and sets out how and where sustainable strategic growth, successful regeneration and higher density can take place across the borough. The Three Strands Approach establishes Colindale as one of three strategic opportunity areas for high quality sustainable growth within Barnet
- 3.3 The Local Development Framework (LDF) is the collection of local development documents produced by the local and strategic planning authority which collectively delivers the spatial planning strategy for its area. The Council is currently preparing its Core Strategy which is the key plan within the Local Development Framework. The Core Strategy Direction of Travel document was published on the 9<sup>th</sup> November 2009. This document identifies Colindale as an AAP area. The Colindale AAP has been prepared in the full light of the parallel progress being made with the Barnet Core Strategy. With the London Plan providing the regional spatial strategy for both the Colindale AAP and the Core Strategy, both are being prepared within the same strategic and corporate policy context which will ensure conformity and consistency.
- 3.4 The Council adopted the Unitary Development Plan (UDP) on 18 May 2006. It provides the policy framework and development plan for the borough. The UDP identifies Colindale as a Major Regeneration Area.
- 3.5 This report supports the following priorities of the Corporate Plan: 'A bright future for children and young people'; 'Clean, green and safe'; 'Strong and healthy' and particularly the delivery of a 'successful city-suburb'. The Colindale AAP will provide the opportunity to make fundamental and long lasting improvements to the character of the area and provide a holistic master plan to guide development to 2021 and beyond. The AAP will ensure a sustainable community is created in Colindale.

### **4. RISK MANAGEMENT ISSUES**

- 4.1 The Colindale AAP will form part of the suite of documents that make up the LDF and will therefore be part of the development plan as a material consideration in determining planning applications. Failure to replace the UDP (adopted in 2006) with an up-to-date development plan will hinder delivery of sustainable growth, proper planning of infrastructure and protection and enhancement of what makes Barnet distinctive as a place. As the UDP

- 4.2 Without an AAP to guide future development of this important growth area, there are increased risks of speculative, incremental and unplanned development that may not be in the interests of the wider community or follow the established UDP and LDF policy framework.
- 4.3 Without the guidance of an AAP, the council may lose the opportunity of ensuring holistic redevelopment and the delivery of the necessary infrastructure improvements and wider community benefits through Section 106 planning contributions, without which any development would detrimentally impact upon the surrounding community and suburbs and not be sustainable.
- 4.4 Failure to meet LDS milestones on submission and adoption will reduce future awards of Planning and Housing Delivery Grant for timely delivery of priority LDF documents. This is a Government as well as Council priority.

## **5. EQUALITIES AND DIVERSITY ISSUES**

- 5.1 The AAP will provide a framework to ensure the delivery of a raft of necessary community facilities and infrastructure including educational and healthcare facilities; a range and mix of housing including affordable housing; highways and public transport improvements; and open space provision for future and existing residents from all of Barnet's diverse communities. The AAP sets the requirement for developments in Colindale to meet Building for Life criteria in order to provide high quality new homes. Any new buildings and public spaces within future development will also be required to be compliant with disability legislation.
- 5.2 The AAP is accompanied by an Equalities Impact Assessment (EqIA) which provides a more detailed look at the implications of the plan and policies on diversity and equality for the GLA's target groups. The EqIA has ensured that the policies contained within the AAP contribute to improving the lives of local communities. The EqIA ensured that equalities considerations were built into the policy development process.

## **6. USE OF RESOURCES IMPLICATIONS (Finance, Procurement, Performance & Value for Money, Staffing, IT, Property, Sustainability)**

- 6.1 The preparation of the Colindale AAP has been undertaken by a team of master planning, highways and property consultants overseen and co-ordinated by officers from the Planning, Housing and Regeneration (PHR) service. The preparation of the AAP has been financed partly by Housing and Planning Delivery Grant and partly via a Planning Process Agreement formally adopted in 2007 with Fairview New Homes Ltd who are a key landowner and developer working in partnership with the Council. Fairview are the owners of the former Colindale Hospital and Brent Works sites on Colindale Avenue. A planning

- 6.2 The AAP recognises that Barnet has successfully secured Growth Area Funding for the delivery of infrastructure related to growth and regeneration in the borough. The 8<sup>th</sup> December 2009 Cabinet Resources Committee approved an allocation of £2,248,844 to Colindale. The AAP anticipates that this money will be spent on transport related and/or open space infrastructure that will assist in supporting the implementation of the Colindale spatial strategy.
- 6.3 Adoption of the AAP will move forward the production of Barnet's LDF and will thereby secure significant contributions to the next round of Housing & Planning Delivery Grant – a key measure of planning policy performance.

## **7. LEGAL ISSUES**

- 7.1 The Council is required to publish the Inspector's recommendations and reasons as soon as practicable after the day on which the plan is adopted by Council. These must be published on the Council's website and made available for viewing at the locations where AAP documents were previously deposited. Anyone who requested to be informed of the AAP's adoption must be notified of the report. Following adoption anyone may challenge the AAP if they do not consider that it meets the condition of the relevant legislation. Applications to the High Court must be made within a 6 week period beginning with the day following the advertisement to adopt.

## **8. CONSTITUTIONAL POWERS**

- 8.1 Constitution - Part 3 – Responsibility for Functions. Section 3 - Responsibility for Executive Functions - details the responsibilities of the Cabinet Member for Planning and Environmental Protection and Cabinet Members in general. The Colindale AAP needs to be reported to Cabinet and onward to Council for formal adoption as part of the Council's LDF.

## **9. BACKGROUND INFORMATION**

- 9.1 Colindale is identified as an Opportunity Area in the adopted London Plan (2008) with a minimum housing target of 10,000 new homes and an indicative employment capacity of 500 jobs. It is also highlighted in the adopted Unitary Development Plan 2006 as an area that could support significant new development and housing provision.
- 9.2 The Council considered that the best way to deliver this level of growth in Colindale was via an Area Action Plan which would provide a robust planning framework to guide the comprehensive redevelopment of key sites in the area and deliver high quality sustainable development in Colindale. In doing so it sets the following vision for the area:

*'By 2021, Colindale will be a vibrant, successful and diverse neighbourhood where people will want to live, work and visit. It will accommodate high quality sustainable developments within four 'Corridors of Change' and a new neighbourhood centre. Colindale will become a successful suburb in North London, providing existing and new communities with high quality local services, improved transport and access to enhanced green space and leisure facilities.'*

- 9.3 An AAP is a Development Plan Document contained within Barnet's statutory development plan (the LDF) that is focused on a specific location or an area which is subject to significant change, and the implementation of policy in that area. They are an important way of stimulating regeneration, and ensuring development of an appropriate scale, mix and quality for key areas of opportunity. The AAP for Colindale is in conformity with the London Plan, the Unitary Development Plan, the Corporate Plan and the Three Strands Approach.
- 9.4 The AAP provides a framework for development of Colindale to 2021 and contains policies and guidance on sustainable development, transport, land use issues. It also sets out the necessary infrastructure to support the proposed housing growth including a new public transport interchange, improvements to the local road network and key junctions, affordable housing, new and expanded primary schools, new health centres, a new 5 hectare public park plus improvements to existing parks, and new community and youth facilities.
- 9.5 The Colindale AAP is a design-led document and sets out an overall Spatial Plan for Colindale beneath which are more detailed plans and guidance focussing on four geographical areas within the AAP area - the four 'Corridors of Change' which are: Colindale Avenue, Aerodrome Road, Edgware Road, and Grahame Park Way. A vision and policy specific to each corridor of change is provided. Each Corridor of Change is supported by site specific planning and urban design guidance in relation to character, quality public realm, ease of movement, sustainability, adaptability, and density.
- 9.6 Once adopted, the AAP will form a material consideration, under Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compensation Act 2004, in the determination of any planning applications for sites within the AAP area.

## **9.1 Examination in Public**

- 9.1.2 Following over two years of work, the last stage in the Local Development Framework process for the preparation of the Colindale AAP has now been completed. The AAP has been the subject of an Examination in Public (EiP) where an independent Planning Inspector has assessed the soundness of the document on behalf of the Secretary of State.
- 9.1.3 The EiP followed the statutory publication of the AAP Submission Document for six weeks last summer. Residents and representatives who responded to the publication were invited to attend a public hearing which was held at Hendon Town Hall on the 17<sup>th</sup> November 2009. The key stakeholders and landowners in the area, along with officers from the London Borough of Brent, attended the

9.1.4 At the hearing the Inspector considered the following specific issues for which the Council prepared individual statements:

- Is the evidence base sufficiently robust and clearly stated in the document?
- Is the AAP founded on a consideration of realistic alternatives?
- The justification for the wording of Policy 6.3 in relation to sustainability which states:

*'Residential development will achieve a minimum of Level 4 as set out in the Code for Sustainable Homes, subject to a viability assessment, and thereafter will keep pace with the government's timetable for development. Code Level requirements will be met through a combination of different possible options. Commercial and community buildings will be required to achieve a BREEAM Excellent rating.'*

- Are the issues and objectives the AAP seeks to meet sufficiently clear?
- What is the timescale for delivery?
- Is the delivery plan and mechanism realistic, clearly elaborated, and funded?
- Does the AAP contain sufficient design guidance to achieve high quality buildings and spaces, and sustainable, mixed communities?
- Is the AAP consistent with the strategies and policies of neighbouring authorities?
- Are there any infrastructure constraints to delivery?
- Have the impacts on green infrastructure been fully assessed and addressed?
- Is the DPD sufficiently flexible to respond to unexpected changes in circumstances?

9.1.5 Following the EiP the Inspector has found the AAP to be sound. The Council has now received the Inspector's final binding report on the examination into the AAP stating that the plan satisfies the requirements of S20(5) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004. In his report the Inspector states that *"my overall conclusion is that the AAP is a high quality plan that is sound, and therefore no changes are necessary to ensure soundness."* A full copy of the Inspector's report is attached at **Appendix B**.

9.1.6 In his report the Inspector also endorsed a schedule of minor changes proposed by the Council to update parts of the text, spatial plans and some of the photos in the document and improve the AAP's overall clarity. These changes are contained in the annex to the Inspector's report. The AAP has been amended to include these changes.

## **9.2 Conclusion**

- 9.2.1 Colindale presents a strategic opportunity to deliver significant levels of new housing and employment around a new sustainable neighbourhood centre. The AAP process has reached its conclusion following over two years of work to develop, test and consult on options for the area. Following the Inspector's binding report and endorsement of soundness, the AAP is now required to be approved by Cabinet and formally adopted by Council as a statutory Local Development Framework document.

## **10. LIST OF BACKGROUND PAPERS**

- 10.1 London Borough of Barnet Unitary Development Plan (May 2006)
- 10.2 The London Plan (Consolidated with Alterations since 2004)
- 10.3 The Three Strands Approach - Protection, Enhancement, Growth (update published June 2008)
- 10.4 Colindale AAP Issues and Options Report (December 2007)
- 10.5 Colindale AAP Preferred Options Report (October 2008)
- 10.6 Colindale AAP Submission Document (June 2009)
- 10.7 Inspector's Report on the Examination into the Colindale AAP dated 5<sup>th</sup> January 2010
- 10.8 Any person wishing to inspect the background papers listed above should contact Peter Alsop on 020 8359 4658.

Legal: CH

CFO: KB



**APPENDIX A - Colindale Area Action Plan (AAP)**

Please refer to separate A3 document.

**APPENDIX B - Inspectors Report on the Examination into the Colindale  
Area Action Plan**



# Report to the London Borough of Barnet

by Douglas Machin BSc DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of  
State for Communities and Local  
Government

The Planning Inspectorate  
Temple Quay House  
2 The Square  
Temple Quay  
Bristol BS1 6PN  
☎ 0117 372 8000

5 January 2010

## PLANNING AND COMPULSORY PURCHASE ACT 2004

### SECTION 20

#### REPORT ON THE EXAMINATION INTO THE COLINDALE AREA ACTION PLAN

Document submitted for Examination on 19 August 2009  
Examination Hearing held on 17 November 2009

File Ref: LDF001060

## **1 Introduction and Overall Conclusion**

- 1.1 Under the terms of Section 20(5) of the Planning & Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, the purpose of the Independent Examination of a Development Plan Document is to determine:
- (a) whether it satisfies the requirements of s19 and s24(1) of the 2004 Act, the regulations under s17(7), and any regulations under s36 relating to the preparation of the document; and
  - (b) whether it is sound.
- 1.2 This report contains my assessment of the Colindale AAP ("the AAP") in terms of the above matters, as required by s20 (7) of the 2004 Act. In line with national policy, the starting point for the Examination is the assumption that the Council has submitted what it considers to be a sound plan. My report considers the legal requirements, and then deals with the relevant matters and issues considered during the Examination in terms of justification, effectiveness and consistency with national policy. My overall conclusion is that the AAP is a high quality plan that is sound, and therefore no changes are necessary to ensure soundness. However, I endorse the minor changes that the Council wishes to make to improve the AAP's clarity, as detailed in Annex 1.

## **2 Legal Requirements**

- 2.1 The AAP is contained within the Council's Local Development Scheme (LDS) with a submission date of February 2009 and an adoption date of March 2010. The AAP was in fact submitted in August of this year to allow the Council to fulfil the requirements for consultation but it could be adopted by March 2010 or shortly after. The content of the AAP reflects the LDS intentions. The Council's Statement of Community Involvement (SCI) has been found sound by the Secretary of State and was formally adopted by the Council before the Examination Hearing. It is evident from the documents submitted by the Council, including the Regulation 30(d) and 30(e) Statements, that the Council has met the requirements as set out in the Regulations. I am satisfied that the AAP complies with the specific requirements of the 2004 Regulations (as amended) including the requirements in relation to the publication of the prescribed documents and the availability of them for inspection and local advertisement.
- 2.2 Alongside the preparation of the AAP it is evident that the Council has carried out a parallel process of sustainability appraisal. I am satisfied that the AAP has had regard to the sustainable community strategy for the area. In accordance with the Habitats Directive, I am also satisfied that as a result of the scoping exercise carried out there is no need for an Appropriate Assessment. The Greater London Authority (GLA) has indicated that the AAP is in general conformity with the London Plan 2008. Accordingly, the legal requirements have all been satisfied.

## **3 Justified, Effective and Consistent With National Policy**

## **Matter 1 – Is the evidence base sufficiently robust and clearly stated in the document?**

- 3.1 I am satisfied that the AAP is founded on a robust and credible evidence base that comprises evidence of participation as set out in the Statement of Consultation and Conformity, and research based evidence as set out in a Baseline Report, a Sustainability Appraisal and many other relevant topic based reports. One small criticism is that key evidence base documents are not clearly referenced in the Plan. However, in response, the Council proposes adding a list of evidence reports, which I endorse as part of the suggested minor changes to improve the clarity of the document.
- 3.2 The evidence base incorporates comprehensive transport modelling developed through the use of widely recognised modelling packages and designed to test the level of growth proposed in the AAP. This modelling is based upon the premise there will be some degree of modal shift away from the car. Such an approach is wholly reflective of the Government's aim and the aim of the London Plan to reduce the need to travel by car. Of key importance is whether the degree of modal shift anticipated in the Plan is realistic. Transport for London (TfL) indicates it would have liked to have seen the Council go even further in the expected reduction in car use. However, the evidence given to the Examination confirms that the Council has considered in detail what level of modal shift and what car parking standards are appropriate, given the low public transport accessibility levels in some parts of Colindale. In contrast, there is no detailed evidence to cause me to question the integrity of the Council's approach. I therefore conclude that the AAP is sound in this respect.
- 3.3 One minor issue concerning the modelling is that it did not take account of the Imperial House and Kwik Fit sites that were identified following the Preferred Options consultation. Nevertheless, I am satisfied these are relatively small sites and they do not have a significant impact on the robustness of the modelling undertaken. Accordingly the AAP is sound in this matter, and no changes are needed.

## **Matter 2 - Is the AAP founded on a consideration of realistic alternatives?**

- 3.4 The Issues and Options stage and the Preferred Options stage have provided the opportunity for reasonable alternatives to the proposals in the AAP to be put forward, tested and evaluated. The Baseline studies included viability assessments of the development of key sites, and the close working with key landowners, developers and other stakeholders has informed the production of a realistic AAP. Overall, given the strategic imperative to accommodate 10,000 new homes, I am satisfied that the most appropriate options are being pursued. It follows that the AAP is sound in this respect.

## **Matter 3 - The justification for Policies 6.2 and 6.3?**

- 3.5 Policy 6.2 sets out that development should link in to, and support, a Colindale-wide Combined Heat and Power scheme and district heating system (CHP). Policy 6.3 sets out that residential development should

- 3.6 As the BREEAM target and the achievement of Code Level 4 is in advance of targets to be brought forward nationally, the advice in paragraphs 30 to 33 of the Climate Change Supplement to PPS1 is applicable. Paragraph 30 specifies that when proposing any local requirements for sustainable buildings, planning authorities must be able to demonstrate clearly the local circumstances that warrant and allow for this. Paragraph 33 goes on to specify that in bringing forward any policies relating to local requirements for decentralised energy supply, (Policy 6.2 for example) or for sustainable buildings, (such as Policy 6.3) planning authorities should ensure that what is proposed is evidence-based and viable. Furthermore, it should be consistent with securing the expected supply and pace of housing development and should not inhibit the provision of affordable housing.
- 3.7 In terms of whether local circumstances warrant Policies 6.2 and 6.3, I have no doubt that Colindale, being one of the largest growth areas in London, provides a clear opportunity for the implementation of a decentralised energy supply and the delivery of buildings to exemplary levels of sustainability. The former Policy also reflects the priority given to decentralised energy in Policies 4A.5 and 4A.6 of the London Plan.
- 3.8 With regard to the proposals being evidence based and viable, they have been subject to high level viability testing and found to be achievable. The Council is able to point to case studies in other parts of London to demonstrate viability. In the light of this, I do not foresee that they would hamper the anticipated delivery of market and affordable housing. In terms of the Code Level, Policy 6.3 contains flexibility to step down from the achievement of Code Level 4 through the assessment of viability again at the site application stage. In contrast, I do not consider it would be appropriate to specify the achievement of an even higher Code Level ahead of the Government's timetable as this has not been proven to be viable through relevant testing at this stage.
- 3.9 Confidence over the realism of these Policies can also be drawn from the recent application for the redevelopment of the Colindale Hospital Site which incorporates proposals for dwellings above minimum Code Level 3 standards, and with its own energy centre that could connect into a district-wide heating system network. As these proposals have come forward during a downturn in economic conditions, it can reasonably be expected that more challenging targets will be deliverable as the economic situation improves. Therefore I am satisfied that the AAP is sound in this matter, and accordingly no changes are needed.

**Matter 4 - Are the objectives the AAP seeks to meet sufficiently clear?**

- 3.10 The AAP's proposals for housing and employment growth clearly accord with Policy 5B.1 of the London Plan, which requires provision for a minimum of 10,000 additional homes and 500 additional jobs in the Colindale

- 3.11 The AAP has a clearly expressed vision on page 16 that aims to deliver the requirement in the London Plan within the context of the Council's Three Strands Approach to change in the Borough. The Vision is supported by ten key objectives that respond to the issues raised in the Baseline Report, in the Issues and Options document, and in the Preferred Options document. The AAP continues with this unambiguous approach with Figure 2.1 – The Spatial Plan for Colindale, by setting down which of the key objectives are pursued in various parts of the Plan, and by identifying four discrete Corridors of Change. Each Corridor has its own Vision, phasing plan and infrastructure requirements, which are well elaborated. Progress in implementing the AAP will be measurable by the monitoring indicators included throughout the plan.
- 3.12 I am therefore satisfied that the AAP's objectives, and indeed the entire document, are very clear. The AAP is entirely consistent with Government guidance on the nature of spatial planning, as set down in PPS12. Accordingly, I find the AAP sound on this matter, and no changes are needed.

**Matter 5 - Does the AAP have sufficient design guidance to achieve high quality buildings and spaces, and sustainable, mixed communities?**

- 3.13 PPS3 makes it clear that the creation of sustainable, mixed communities comprised of buildings and spaces of high quality design is one of the Government's strategic housing policy objectives. PPS1, paragraph 34, urges local planning authorities to plan positively for the achievement of high quality and inclusive design for all development, including individual buildings, public and private spaces and wider development schemes. However, paragraph 38 of PPS1 warns that design policies should avoid unnecessary prescription or detail but should concentrate on guiding the overall scale, density, massing, height, landscape, layout and access of new development in relation to neighbouring buildings and the local area more generally. This policy framework is reflected in Objective 10 of the AAP.
- 3.14 I saw that Colindale has no defining urban design characteristics that might constrain the density and design of new development. The area in fact comprises a variety of largely discrete and previously developed sites. These offer the opportunity to create a new urban character, led by housing built at densities that should and do accord with the London Plan and its Density Matrix. Therefore it is appropriate that the Policies and guidance in Chapter 5 of the AAP do not contain design codes but do require development proposals to adhere to a set of design principles, elaborated as part of Policy 5.1. Furthermore, guidance is provided later in the Chapter on appropriate building heights, internal building design, Lifetime Homes, and open space function and design. This is complemented by design guidance for each Corridor of Change and an indicative Master Plan that

- 3.15 With regard to dwelling mix, the AAP contains guidance for each of the Corridors of Change. The Plan aims to achieve a mix of dwelling sizes and types across the range of sites, with appropriate densities being based on the London Plan Density Matrix. The expected densities for each major site are clearly set down in Figure 7.1. This approach has been endorsed by the GLA. The target for 50% affordable housing (Policy 7.2) will also be an important element in the creation of sustainable, mixed communities. The AAP's affordable housing requirement is consistent with the adopted UDP requirement, with the London Plan, and it follows the Council's Supplementary Planning Document on Affordable housing. The Baseline Report containing site viability appraisals does not suggest any difficulty in pursuing a 50% level of provision but the AAP contains the flexibility to allow for further viability assessments when proposals are made.
- 3.16 I therefore find that the AAP contains the right balance of guidance and flexibility, not being too prescriptive but yet having a clear vision of what Colindale will look like when the AAP is implemented. I am confident that the AAP contains sufficient and appropriate design guidance to achieve high quality buildings and spaces, and sustainable, mixed communities. It will continue the progress already achieved with the substantial amount of high quality development in Colindale, at Beaufort Park for example. No changes to the AAP to ensure soundness are therefore required.

**Matter 6 - Have the impacts on green infrastructure been adequately assessed and addressed?**

- 3.17 There are two aspects to this matter. The first is whether the AAP provides sufficient recreational open space, and the second is whether the AAP will improve biodiversity in Colindale.
- 3.18 In terms of recreational open space, I note that the average level of provision across the Borough is 1.55 hectares per thousand of the population, with Colindale at the moment providing near this figure. The planned increase in population will reduce the level of provision in Colindale to 0.64 hectares per thousand. However, as PPG17 – "*Planning for Open Space, Sport and Recreation*" points out, it is important to consider not just the areas of land available but their quality, accessibility and utility. Much of the existing open space in Colindale is of poor quality and under used. The AAP's proposals, particularly Policy 5.5, for upgrading existing open spaces, together with the provision of a new 5 hectare park and improvements to connectivity and accessibility, persuade me that there is a real opportunity to significantly improve the quality of, and accessibility to, existing and proposed open spaces in Colindale.
- 3.19 In reaching the conclusion that the AAP is sound on this aspect, I have borne in mind the extent of the loss of the existing open space at the Metropolitan Police College. However, if more of that open space were to be retained, the strategic housing target for Colindale would not be achieved



- 3.20 As for biodiversity, Policy 5.5 contains a clear commitment to biodiversity enhancement by improvements to existing locally important corridors such as the Silk Stream, by the creation of green routes, and across Colindale generally. The wording of Policy 5.5, the recognition given to biodiversity in the supporting text, and the indicative Figures 5.4 and 5.5, all satisfy me that the AAP deals with this aspect at an appropriate level of detail and in a way that complies with Government guidance in PPS9. The success of the Policy in achieving biodiversity relies, of course, not just on its wording but on the commitment the Council makes to work with relevant stakeholders to improve the much needed environmental enhancement of Colindale. Although doubts were expressed at the Hearing, I have no evidence to cause me to question the Council's commitment in this respect, and no evidence to suggest that the AAP is anything other than sound in this aspect. Therefore no changes are called for.

**Matter 7 - Is the AAP consistent with the strategies and policies of neighbouring authorities?**

- 3.21 The consultation draft replacement London Plan includes Colindale in a wider Opportunity Area known as "Colindale/Burnt Oak", where 12,500 homes and 2,000 jobs are to be provided for. The Brent Core Strategy proposes 2,500 homes for its part of this Opportunity Area along the Edgware Road corridor.
- 3.22 This additional level of growth has been assessed in the evidence base for the Colindale AAP. It refers in numerous places to the growth planned by Brent along the Edgware Road. The letter at Annex 2 of the Council's statement on this matter, and the evidence given at the Hearing, leave me in no doubt that close collaborative working between Barnet and Brent, as well as with other stakeholders, is taking place to ensure successful delivery across the newly defined Opportunity Area. The AAP is demonstrably consistent with the strategies and plans of Brent, and is therefore sound in this respect.

**Matter 8 - Is the delivery plan and mechanism realistic, clearly elaborated, and funded?**

- 3.23 Government guidance stresses the importance of deliverability in preparing local development documents. It is important to recognise from the outset that much has been and is being achieved in Colindale. Of the 10,000 new homes target in the AAP, some 5,700 of these are either built or under construction, and of those, some 30% are in the affordable category. Some important infrastructure projects, such as the Aerodrome Road bridges have been completed.
- 3.24 The AAP has been prepared with commendably wide stakeholder involvement. A phasing strategy has been derived from the programmes and intentions of the key landowners and stakeholders, with whom the Council has worked closely in the AAP's preparation. Figure 8.1 illustrates

- 3.25 I am therefore satisfied that the AAP's delivery plan and mechanism is realistic, clearly elaborated, and funded. It is sound in this respect, and accordingly no changes are needed.

**Matter 9 - Are there any infrastructure constraints to delivery?**

- 3.26 As recognised in paragraph 8.1.8 of the AAP, development of the key sites alone would not deliver the infrastructure required to ensure successful implementation. I attach weight to the fact that the majority of major infrastructure has either been delivered, will be delivered by development to be permitted or has funding allocated to enable the Council to deliver it.
- 3.27 Improvements to transport infrastructure are critical. The completion of the Aerodrome Road bridges, which otherwise could have been the most significant constraint to implementation of the AAP, will allow much better vehicular access to Colindale and the provision of new and better bus services. The new transport interchange, to be provided as part of the permitted redevelopment scheme for Colindale Hospital and Station House, will substantially improve public transport services for the area. Funding has been secured for the Colindale Avenue/A5 junction improvement. The increase in the capacity of the Northern Line of London Underground is provided for in TfL's Business Plan 2009/10 – 2017/18.
- 3.28 As for the more general point whether Colindale's highway network will be able to cope with the additional traffic likely to be generated by the AAP's proposals, I have taken account of the fears of local residents. However, there is no evidence to cause me to question the results of the very detailed and comprehensive traffic modelling underpinning the AAP. This modelling supports the overall level of housing growth required by the strategic planning framework. The Transport Analysis does recognise that, given the constraints in the wider North London highway network, the AAP's proposals will add to congestion and probably result in a spreading of peak flows. However, it is plainly not realistic to constrain the more intensive development of areas like Colindale, which will provide much needed housing, on the basis of a continuation of a current predilection to use the private car. The AAP encourages modal shift and rightly provides for significant public transport enhancements to encourage such a shift with a view to making car travel less attractive and public transport more attractive.
- 3.29 Under this matter I have also considered the soundness of the AAP's provision for better walking and cycling routes. I am satisfied that Policy 3.2, as the Council proposes to change it, provides for a practical approach

- 3.30 I have also considered whether the AAP should encourage the provision of a North London orbital light railway by including a safeguarded route, as put forward by one party at the Hearing. However, there is simply insufficient evidence for me to take this suggestion further, irrespective of the merits of such a proposal. TfL, which is the strategic transport authority, does not consider that there is a viable business case for such a project. In addition it suggests that existing freight services could be adversely affected. I have to be guided by this strategic advice, and it would not be appropriate for me to require the AAP to be changed when the evidence supporting such an option is so limited.
- 3.31 Another element of key infrastructure is the provision of additional primary school capacity. The AAP proposes, in Policy 7.6, two sites. However, the Council's evidence to the Hearing points out that one of these, the Peel Centre site, is unlikely to be available until Phase III of the AAP's implementation. There is also now some doubt over the timing of the release of the Barnet College site in view of recent adverse funding decisions by the Learning and Skills Council. The Council is seeking additional sites. Given the Council's and other stakeholders' strong and demonstrable commitment to Colindale, I am confident that every effort will be made to secure additional primary school places as soon as they are required. I do not consider that this is a matter that requires a change to the AAP to ensure soundness.

**Matter 10 - Is the AAP sufficiently flexible to respond to unexpected changes in circumstances?**

- 3.32 The need for the AAP to be flexible is explicitly recognised in paragraph 8.1.4, as is the need to avoid a strategy that is too prescriptive on the type and density of development. To the extent that the AAP proposes development that is required by the London Plan, and does so for a variety of sites that do not, for the most part, depend on other sites to be developed, I consider it is inherently flexible. I note that the Council has carried out extensive viability appraisals of the key sites in the AAP. The close collaborative working with stakeholders has allowed the Council to have a high degree of confidence that the proposals are robust. Nevertheless, AAP Policies 6.3, 7.2 and 8.3 provide flexibility should market conditions and development values be less favourable and the rate of development temporarily slowed.
- 3.33 The AAP recognises at paragraph 8.1.8 the partial dependency on external funding to achieve complete implementation. This will come from the Government's Growth Area Funding programme, from the London Development Agency, and potentially from the Council's innovative Tax Increment Financing proposals. With the expected restraint on public

#### **4 Minor Changes**

- 4.1 The Council wishes to make minor changes to the submitted AAP in order to clarify, correct and update various parts of the text. They are shown in Annex 1. Although they do not address key aspects of soundness, I endorse them in the interests of the AAP's clarity and accuracy.

#### **5 Overall Conclusion**

- 5.1 I conclude that the Colindale AAP satisfies the requirements of S20(5) of the 2004 Act, and is sound.

*Douglas Machin*

INSPECTOR

## ANNEX 1 - SCHEDULE OF MINOR CHANGES

No.	Location in Document	Suggested Change	Reason for change
<b>1</b>			
1-1	Page 8 Para. 1.2.3	Amend first sentence: The London Plan <i>identifies</i> <del>has recently formally identified</del> the Colindale area as an Opportunity Area and in doing so sets a minimum delivery target of 10,000 homes and 500 jobs for the area.	The London Plan (consolidated with Alterations since 2004) was published in February 2008 and the Opportunity Area Designation is therefore well established in policy.
1-2	Page 9 Para 1.2.4	Amend: The GLA have also been a key stakeholder and steering group member during the preparation of the AAP and close attention has been paid to the emerging direction of travel being set out for the <i>Mayor's</i> review of the London Plan. The Council will continue to work closely with the Government Office for London, Mayor of London, his Outer London Commission and other key partners to ensure that the Colindale AAP is kept up to date and in accordance with the emerging Core Strategy and the <del>future</del> review of the London Plan.	To update the document.
1-3	Page 9 Para 1.4.4	Amend: The Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 provides that existing UDPs remain in effect for three years after the date of the Act, or for more recently adopted plans, for three years after their adoption. <del>In the Council's case, this is 18 May 2009. The Secretary of State is the final arbiter of which UDP Policies are saved or deleted after 18 May 2009. In May 2009, the Government Office for London, under the direction of the Secretary of State directed the</del>	To update the document in light of recent decisions.

		<p><u>council to save certain policies within its adopted May 2006 UDP and delete others. The saved policies will eventually be replaced by Barnet's <a href="#">Local Development Framework</a>.</u> Several <u>saved</u> UDP policies are particularly relevant to the preparation of the AAP and will effectively be updated when the plan is adopted. Under Policy H21 Residential Density the Council promote higher density residential development in Colindale and Mill Hill East. There are also relevant site allocations which are therefore replaced and updated. New sites are identified for development and their capacities assessed.</p>	
1-4	Page 10 Para 1.5.2.	<p>Amend second sentence: Development has been identified on the western side of the borough at Brent Cross <u>Cricklewood</u> as well as Colindale and Mill Hill East as Barnet's strategic contribution to the corridor.</p> <p>Amend fourth sentence: A Prospectus setting out the scale of opportunity within the corridor and how the boroughs are working together with regional and national government to ensure coordination of investment in delivering future housing and economic growth was launched <u>by the Mayor of London and Minister</u> in Jan 2009 and provides the basis for future funding bids and prioritising of investment cross the corridor.</p>	To update the document.
1-5	Page 11 Para 1.7.1	<p>Amend last sentence: The borough boundary between Barnet and the London Borough of Brent runs along the A5 <u>while the M1 forms the eastern boundary to the AAP area.</u></p>	To update the document.

1-6	Page 11 Para 1.8.2	Amend first bullet point: London Borough of Barnet – <u>in recognition of its strategic importance</u> the Steering Group is chaired by the <u>Council's Executive Cabinet Member for Planning and Environmental Protection</u> . Senior officers from, regeneration, planning, and transport services are represented;	To update the document.
1-7	Page 13 Para 1.10.1	<p>Amend Point 9: Land in between the railway lines (0.7ha) <u>Identified in the North London Waste Plan (NLWP) Preferred Options report as a potential site for Household Waste and Recycling Centre.</u></p> <p>Amend Point 14: Station House (0.15ha) <u>Council resolution to grant planning permission for: Demolition of Station House and construction of a 293 bed, part 6, part 13 storey Aparthotel (8965sqm) together with a 369sqm restaurant (Use Class A3) and three ground floor commercial units (Use Class A1/A2/A3) totalling 780sqm. Retention of and alterations to the Colindale underground station building and the provision of a new public square and a transport interchange incorporating bus stops, taxi rank and associated landscaping.</u></p> <p>Amend Point 15: Colindale Hospital Site (including nurses accommodation site and Colindale Avenue frontage) (6.6ha) <u>Council resolution to grant planning permission for: Redevelopment of the former Colindale Hospital to include the erection of 714 residential units including the change of use and conversion of the listed former Administration building to</u></p>	To update the document in light of the published NLWA Preferred Options Report and recent planning committee decisions.

		<u>residential, new primary care trust facility (Use Class D1) of 1,132sqm, commercial units (Use Class A1/A2/A3/B1) and site management office (Use Class D1/B1).</u>	
<b>2</b>			
2-1	Page 16 Para 2.1.3	Amend: The vision for Colindale responds to local challenges and opportunities and is based on evidence, a sense of local distinctiveness and stakeholder and community derived objectives, within the context of the London Plan's Opportunity Area designation, <u>the North West London to Luton Co-ordination corridor Prospectus</u> , Barnet's Sustainable Community Strategy and Corporate Plan, the Council's Three Strands Approach of Protect, Enhance and Grow and the emerging Barnet LDF Core Strategy.	To update the document.
2-2	Page 17 Point 4)	Amend: 4) Ensure the coordination of other infrastructure requirements: social, economic, physical, <del>and</del> environmental and educational.	To update the document.
2-3	Page 18 Point 7)	Amend: 7) Co-ordinate the development of a framework and mechanism for pooling of planning obligations through Section 106 planning legal agreements to deliver the necessary infrastructure requirements of the area, building upon existing secured Section 106 funding from approved developments and Government grants/TfL spending programmes and the emerging Community Infrastructure Levy and potential Barnet Finance Plan ('Barnet Bond') <u>or a pilot Tax Increment</u>	To update the document in light of the recent bid to the CLG.



		<p><u>Financing/Accelerated Development Zone (TIF/ADZ) funding structure.</u></p> <p>The AAP seeks to ensure that the relevant planning obligation priorities are clear and understood by those considering and pursuing development opportunities in Colindale. Discussions have taken place with the local authority children's service, the local health authority, the local highway authority and other relevant stakeholders to better understand the scope of the community and transport infrastructure and other improvements necessary for development on the scale envisaged in Colindale to proceed. All sites will be required to contribute to these priorities on a fair and equitable basis and an open book approach to discussions relating to the financial viability of particular development proposals will be required. <u>Barnet Council submitted a bid for CLG's Tax Increment Financing/Accelerated Development Zone (TIF/ADZ) Pilot proposals on the 30<sup>th</sup> June 2009 with Colindale as its pilot scheme area.</u></p>	
2-4	Page 18 Point 8)	Amend: 8) Plan for carbon free development <u>and significant reduction in the use of natural resources</u> by 2016 and beyond.	To update the document.
<b>3</b>			
3-1	Page 25 Para 3.5.9	Amend: The first package of measures would improve various junctions in the area and cover the first two phases of the AAP ( <del>from</del> <u>to</u> 2011and <del>from</del> <u>to</u> 2016). This would include:	To correct the document.

3-2	Page 25 Policy 3.2 Walking and Cycling	Amend Policy 3.2: Cycle parking will be provided at key destinations, including local centres, sports facilities, public transport nodes and education establishments <u>and be in accordance with TfL cycle parking standards</u> . Cycle storage facilities will be provided in all new developments.	Requested by TfL in their representation.
3-3	Page 25 Para 3.5.12	Amend: Figure 3.5 shows a proposed core walking network where high quality pedestrian facilities will be developed and associated key junctions where good pedestrian crossing facilities will be important. Colindale Avenue is seen as the key pedestrian route as it provides access to Colindale underground station and the facilities on the A5/ Edgware Road. A new pedestrian route will be provided from Colindale Hospital site to Montrose Park, improving access to the Park from Colindale Avenue. Aerodrome Road is an important link under the M1 to provide connections to Hendon and the East of the borough, particularly Middlesex University. The Peel Access Link will help to reduce the severance created by the Northern Line and improve north-south pedestrian connectivity within Colindale. Links between the neighbourhood centres at Grahame Park Estate and Beaufort Park and the proposed new centre around Colindale interchange will be crucial to ensure that walking is a viable, attractive alternative to other modes of transport for local trips and for accessing public transport for longer distance trips. <u>In addition, improved walking and cycling links to Mill Hill Broadway station to the north will be important to promote good access</u>	Requested by TfL in their representation on the Submission Document.

		<i>to overland rail services.</i>	
3-4	Page 26 Para 3.5.13	Amend: Development will provide a network of green pedestrian and cycle routes to connect public open spaces and enhance the biodiversity in Colindale, in accordance with Policy 5.4 <u>5.5 (Open Space and Biodiversity in Colindale).</u>	To correct the document.
3-5	Page 26 Para 3.5.14	Amend: Figure 3.6 shows a proposed network of cycle routes linking areas and key destinations. As with walking, Colindale Avenue and Aerodrome Road are seen as key links, and the proposed new Aerodrome Road/Colindeep Lane link will improve permeability. <u>Consideration should be given to possible connections to wider cycle routes outside the AAP area, including the Mayor of London's proposed Cycle Super Highways.</u> Cycle parking for new developments should be implemented broadly in accordance with TfL guidance on levels of cycle parking and storage. Additional cycle parking provision in public spaces, near public transport hubs and at key destinations should also be provided. <u>Where appropriate, the AAP will consider the Mayor of London's Cycle Hire Scheme.</u>	Requested by TfL in their representation on the Submission Document.
3-6	Page 26 Policy 3.3 Buses	Amend: Bus connections will be significantly improved, both within Colindale and to destinations outside Colindale, in accordance with Figure 3.7 <u>and in consultation with TfL.</u> The improvements to the Aerodrome Road bridges and potential new connections in the area provide opportunities for new and enhanced bus routes. Key routes will be designed to a	Requested by TfL in their representation on the Submission Document.

		standard suitable for bus operations and with appropriate accessible bus stopping facilities, particularly at interchanges such as Colindale Station. Developers will provide an appropriate level of financial contributions to local bus services, in accordance with Policy 8.3.	
3-7	Page 27 Policy 3.5.17	Amend: Colindale Underground Station is central to the AAP study area, and will become increasingly important with the level of future development that will be within walking distance. <del>It is crucial to</del> <u>To</u> ensure that the station can cope with future demand requirements, <u>it is crucial</u> that facilities are accessible to all and that interchange between modes is improved. The scale of growth envisaged in the Colindale area is dependent on developers/landowners and TfL making significant improvements to, and investments in, public transport infrastructure and services. <u>In considering improvements to Colindale Underground Station, reference should be made to TfL's Interchange Guidelines.</u>	Requested by TfL in their representation on the Submission Document.
3-8	Page 28 Para 3.5.25	Amend: The AAP proposes improvements for each travel mode which will need to be supported by development travel plans as required by the London Borough of Barnet and TfL, which can be co-ordinated with and support physical measures. The travel plans should consider measures to encourage travel choice including car clubs, cycle clubs, home delivery and servicing consolidation measures <u>and should also include targets that can be monitored.</u> The amount of	Requested by TfL in their representation on the Submission Document.

		developments proposed in the area offer opportunities to achieve 'critical mass' to make such measures viable. The preliminary recommendation is that the travel plans associated with the developments should aim at a reduction of some 5%-10% of the peak car travel mode share. <u>In preparing Travel Plans Developers should refer to TfL 'Guidance for residential travel planning' and 'Guidance for workplace travel plans for development'.</u>	
3-9	Page 28 Figure 3.8	Amend Targets column in Figure 3.8 in relation to Indicator 3A:  Package 1 in Phases 1 <u>and 2</u> (2007- <del>2011</del> 2016) Package 2 in Phase 2 (2012-2016) Package 3 in Phase 3 (2017-2021)	To correct the document.
3-10	Page 28 Figure 3.8	Amend Targets column in Figure 3.8 in relation to Indicator 3B:  Joined up network of attractive, direct and safe pedestrian routes broadly in accordance with Figure 3.5.  Joined up network of attractive, direct and safe cycle routes broadly in accordance with Figure 3.6.  Cycle parking at key destinations.  Cycle storage in all new developments.  <u>Progressive mode shift for cycling and walking.</u>	Requested by TfL in their representation on the Submission Document.
3-11	Page 27 Para 3.5.18	Amend: Analysis of future demand and station facilities undertaken for the AAP indicates that that morning peak period ( <del>7am to 10am</del> ) <u>hour</u> two-way passenger flows <del>through the station</del> are likely to increase <u>by 2,600</u> from the current 1,400 to <del>2,600</del> 4,100 in 2021 once all	To correct the document.

		development is built out and occupied. There is sufficient capacity to cater for increased passenger demand up to <del>2011</del> 2016, but with full development there is a need for an additional two bi-directional ticket gates and <del>an additional 2 ticket issuing windows are also required</del> . The introduction of appropriate accessibility improvements is also required. Cycle parking facilities should be improved, but there is no proposed increase in car parking at Colindale station (currently 23 spaces) given the AAP <u>focuses</u> on sustainable modes. Developers will be required to contribute towards these improvements through pooled S106 contributions.	
<b>4</b>			
4-1	Page 32 Policy 4.1 Point a)	Amend: a) Develop a dynamic new public transport interchange/ <u>gateway</u> and associated pedestrian piazzas on Colindale Hospital/Station House site, British Library site and Peel Centre West site;	To clarify the policy.
4-2	Page 32 Policy 4.1 Point c)	Amend: c) Provide a sustainable and walkable neighbourhood centre including a convenience food store <u>provision</u> of up to 2,500sqm supported by a range of associated shops and services to meet local needs;	To make the policy clearer to allow the 2,500sqm of convenience retail to be provided across more than one store.
4-3	Page 32 Policy 4.1 Point e)	Amend: e) Provide a new focus of sustainable <u>higher</u> density living with a range of unit sizes, types and tenures, with a typical residential density of approximately 150 dwg/ha;	To clarify the policy.

4-4	Page 33 Para 4.2.1 Point a)	Amend: a) Develop a dynamic new public transport interchange/ <u>gateway</u> and associated pedestrian piazzas on Colindale Hospital/Station House site, British Library site and Peel Centre West site;	To reflect the proposed change to Policy 4.1a).
4-5	Page 33 Para 4.1 Point c)	Amend: c) Provide a sustainable and walkable neighbourhood centre including a convenience food store <u>provision</u> of up to 2,500sqm supported by a range of associated shops and services to meet local needs.  To complement the retail uses planned at the southern end of Grahame Park Estate, those in Beaufort Park and existing provision in the wider area, a new convenience store of up to 2,500sqm ( <u>or multiple stores where the combined floor area does not exceed 2,500sqm</u> ) and additional associated retail and other commercial floorspace will ensure that the retail needs of the new population in the area will be appropriately and proportionately met without harming the health of existing nearby centres already serving the area. This new neighbourhood centre will benefit existing and new residents by providing a walkable, accessible and appropriately sized neighbourhood centre.	To make the explanatory text clearer to allow the 2,500sqm of convenience retail to be provided across more than one store.
4-6	Page 34 Point h)	Amend body text: The AAP aims to transform Colindale Avenue into a high quality, tree-lined street <u>or 'boulevard'</u> which caters for both vehicular traffic movement and pedestrians and cyclists and is well overlooked and enclosed by new and existing buildings. The street will be widened to provide wider pavements, improved bus stopping	To clarify the explanatory text.

		<p>facilities and improved vehicular carriageways and integrated cycle facilities. All development sites on the south side of Colindale Avenue will be required to safeguard 3-4m on their frontages to achieve this.</p>	
4-7	Page 35 Para 4.4.2	<p>Delete first bullet point:  <del>Fairview New Homes submitted a planning application in January 2009 for development of the Colindale Hospital Site for over 700 homes; and an application for an apart-hotel and new public piazza on the Station House site;</del></p> <p>Replace with:  <u>On the 29<sup>th</sup> July 2009 Barnet Council resolved to grant planning permission to Fairview New Homes for the redevelopment of the former Colindale Hospital site to erect 714 residential units including the change of use and conversion of the listed former Administration building to residential, a new primary care trust facility (Use Class D1) of 1,132sqm, commercial units (Use Class A1/A2/A3/B1) and site management office (Use Class D1/B1).</u></p> <p><u>The Council also resolved to grant planning permission for the demolition of Station House and construction of a 293 bed, part 6, part 13 storey Aparthotel (8965sqm) together with a 369sqm restaurant (Use Class A3) and three ground floor commercial units (Use Class A1/A2/A3) totalling 780sqm. The application includes the retention of and alterations to the Colindale underground station building and the provision of a new public square and a transport interchange incorporating bus stops, taxi rank and associated landscaping.</u></p>	To update the document following recent decisions.



4-8	Page 35 Para 4.4.2	Amend third bullet: Fairview New Homes have submitted <del>are preparing</del> a planning application for <u>the</u> Brent Works site <u>for 104 residential units and 3 commercial units (Class A2/B1/D1) including the safeguarding of a 2m strip of land along Colindale Avenue.</u>	To update the document.
4-9	Page 35 Para 4.4.2	Delete fourth bullet point. <del>Barnet College and Fairview New Homes have agreed on the relocation of Barnet College to the Colindale Hospital site. Barnet College expect the Learning and Skills Council (LSC) to announce the criteria for prioritising capital applications soon and then formally to consider Barnet College's Colindale Application in Principle (AiP) in late spring/early summer, 2009. Barnet College remains confident in the strength of its case for substantial LSC funding for the planned relocation of its western provision to the site of the former Colindale Hospital.</del>  Replace with: <u>Having agreed on the relocation of Barnet College to the Colindale Hospital site, Barnet College and Fairview New Homes have now worked in close partnership for several years. At the time of the submission of the AAP (August, 2009), a conditional contract between the parties was close to Exchange. The College submitted its application for a substantial Learning and Skills Council (LSC) grant towards the cost of its relocation in July, 2008. Due to the LSC's much-publicised capital overspend, which first emerged in late December 2008, and whose effects are still being felt throughout the Further Education (FE) sector, the College's application is among many which</u>	To update the document to reflect the current position of the Learning and Skills Council.

		<u>have not been funded in the current spending round. Despite this setback, the College welcomes the LSC's commitment to help colleges explore private finance and other funding options such as local authority collaboration. The College has also given its strong support to the establishment of an Association of Colleges working group which has been tasked with investigating alternative sources of finance and which is due to report in autumn 2009. Barnet College remains both convinced about the case for relocation and committed to its long-standing plan to move its western provision from Grahame Park Way to the site of the former Colindale Hospital.</u>	
4-10	Page 36 Para 4.5.1	Amend third sentence: To the south of Aerodrome Road is the Metropolitan Police Peel Centre training campus which comprises a wide range of accommodation of mixed age and condition including three <del>18-storey</del> redundant tower blocks <u>of up to 18 storeys</u> previously used to house staff but no longer of a sufficient standard, a number of important Metropolitan Police technical buildings and some more traditional housing.	To correct the document.
4-11	Page 36	Update top photo to show completed Aerodrome Road bridges.	To update the document to Reflect completed development.
4-12	Page 37 Fig 4.3	Replace Figure 4.3 with high resolution version of the plan.	To update the document and ensure that the plan is legible.
4-13	Page 40	Replace top photo with new photo to show completed Former Kidstop site development.	To update the document to reflect completed development.
4-14	Page 41 Fig 4.4	Amend Figure 4.4 to show a 'new shops' and 'new jobs' symbols to Site 5 (McDonalds).	Requested by Arundel Corp in their representation on the Submission

			Document.
4-15	Page 41 Fig 4.4	Amend Figure 4.4 to show a 'new shops' symbol to Site 4 (Zenith House).	Requested by Genesis Housing Group in their representation on the Submission Document and to reflect the uses within the approved planning consent for the site.
4-16	Page 41 Fig 4.4	Amend Figure 4.4 as follows: Amend the boundary of Site 3 to include Kwik Fit and amend the description for Site 3 to read: 'Kidstop/Kwik Fit site'  Amend the description for Site 1 to read: 'Greenpoint/Imperial House site'	To correct the document to reflect para. 4.9.6.
4-17	Page 43 Para 4.12.1	Amend: 4.12.1 Key stakeholders in the Edgware Road Corridor of Change include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• TfL – Edgware Road is a red route;</li> <li>• Arundel Corp – owners of the McDonalds site;</li> <li>• London Borough of Brent – responsible for development along Brent side of Edgware Road;</li> <li>• Owners of Merit House, Burger King/D&amp;A site, <u>Kwik Fit</u>, <u>Imperial House</u> and Green Point; and</li> <li>• Owners of Zenith House</li> </ul>	To correct the document to reflect para 4.9.6 of the document.
4-18	Page 45 Policy 4.4 Points d), e), and f)	Amend: Policy 4.4: Grahame Park Way Corridor of Change  To achieve the vision for Grahame Park Way Corridor of Change, development will be expected to:  a) Promote the relocation of Barnet College to a more sustainable site closer to Colindale Underground station and release	To ensure consistency with the other Corridors of Change policies with regards density. To clarify and strengthen the policy.

		<p>the vacated site for housing and a primary school;</p> <p>b) Support the ongoing regeneration of Grahame Park Estate, its integration with surrounding new development and the existing area and the replacement of its neighbourhood centre;</p> <p>c) Provide for a 2 Form Entry primary school on the Barnet College site, possibly for the relocation of an existing school, in liaison with key education stakeholders;</p> <p>d) Promote a range of sustainable house types and sizes, including family housing, on the remaining part of the Barnet College site to a density <del>similar to that of the adjacent Grahame Park redevelopment</del> <u>level of up to 100dph</u>;</p> <p>e) Provide direct, legible, attractive and safe connections to the redeveloped Grahame Park Estate <u>including the remodelled Grahame Park Open Space</u>, RAF Museum and other surrounding areas, including improving the existing pedestrian route (via subway and footbridge) to Pentavia Retail Park and the area beyond;</p> <p>f) Support the continued use and expansion of the RAF Museum as both an educational, cultural and tourist facility of international repute <u>with scope for a new iconic building/attraction to reflect the historic aeronautical links with the area</u>; and</p> <p>g) Enhance employment and local business development on sites between Grahame Park Way and the over ground railway to support</p>	
--	--	---	--

		local jobs and economic opportunities.	
4-19	Page 45 Fig 4.5	Replace Figure 4.5 with high resolution version of the plan.	To update the document and ensure that the plan is legible.
4-20	Page 46 Para 4.14.1	Amend point a) second para: The AAP supports and promotes the relocation of Barnet College to the Colindale Avenue Corridor of Change area and specifically the Colindale Hospital site (see objective in Colindale Avenue Corridor of Change) and the redevelopment of the College site for a primary school and housing. The youth centre currently located on the Barnet College site <del>should</del> <u>must</u> be reprovided either on the site, close to the new primary school in order to share facilities if desired, or in an alternative appropriate location close to Grahame Park Estate.	Requested by Choices for Grahame Park in their representation on the submission document.
4-21	Page 47 Para 4.16.2	Amend 1 <sup>st</sup> bullet point: The redevelopment of Grahame Park Estate has outline planning permission. Phase 1a around Grahame Park <i>Open Space</i> has full planning permission <u>and work commenced on site in July 2009.</u> The reserved matters application is currently being prepared for phase 1b around the south of the site adjacent to Grahame Park Way;	To update the document.
<b>5</b>			
5-1	Page 51 Para 5.2.3	Amend point a) third paragraph: Development will respond positively to the character and opportunities of the site and provide high quality contemporary urban design and architecture in Colindale. Taller buildings will <u>only</u> be supported closer to the public transport interchange and on important sites and corners which	To clarify the guidance.

		aid legibility and will be required to meet stricter tests on environmental impact and design. Buildings on the Colindale Hospital site, British Library and Peel Centre West sites fronting Colindale Avenue should be around six storeys high to reflect the importance of the route but must respect and be sensitive to existing buildings, <u>particularly historic listed buildings.</u>	
5-2	Page 51 Para 5.2.3	Amend point a) fourth paragraph: Innovative approaches to the provision of private amenity space should be considered, particularly in Colindale Avenue Corridor of Change and Edgware Road Corridor of Change, including shared roof gardens, winter gardens, <del>oversized</del> <u>larger than average</u> balconies and terraces.	To clarify the guidance.
5-3	Page 51 Para 5.2.3	Amend point c) fourth paragraph: Considering the proposed densities <u>and in order to minimise the visual impact of surface car parking on the street scene</u> , the majority of car parking is likely to be basement or undercroft, particularly in Colindale Avenue Corridor of Change and Edgware Road Corridor of Change. It is envisaged that courtyard parking is more likely in Aerodrome Road Corridor of Change and Grahame Park Way Corridor of Change, depending on the location within each Corridor.	To clarify the guidance.
5-4	Page 51 Para 5.2.3	Amend point e) first paragraph: Colindale will deliver new development to exemplary levels of sustainability <u>that reduces reliance on natural resources</u> incorporating transport and movement, energy, green infrastructure and public space, and social and economic sustainability within a sustainable	

		<p>built form. Opportunities for passive solar design should always be considered at the early stage when designing schemes. Development will link in to a district-wide CHP network and adhere to policies contained in Chapter 6.</p>	
5-5	Page 51 Para 5.2.3	<p>Amend point f) first paragraph: New development in Colindale will incorporate adaptable and flexible building forms to respond to future changes in use, technology, lifestyle and demography and must be build in accordance with Policy 5.3 Building for Life and Lifetime Homes.</p>	
5-6	Page 53 Policy 5.3	<p>Amend: Policy 5.3 Building Heights</p> <p>The height of new buildings in Colindale will take account of accessibility to public transport, shops and services and the height of existing buildings in the vicinity of the proposal site. Guidance on the appropriate height of new buildings is set out in Figure 5.2 and this should be the starting point for development proposals.</p> <p>Taller buildings (in excess of 6 storeys) will <u>only</u> be located in the most sustainable locations which benefit from good access to public transport facilities and shops and services. The area immediately around Colindale Underground station will become the most sustainable location within the AAP.</p> <p>Tall buildings will be of excellent design quality in their own right and should enhance the qualities of its immediate location and wider setting. Proposals should demonstrate that the building is attractive and elegant from all</p>	To strengthen and clarify the policy.

		significant views and will act as a positive landmark and help aid legibility and orientation. Developers should have regard to 'Guidance on Tall Buildings' by CABI and English Heritage.	
5-7	Page 53 Para 5.4.2.	Amend first sentence: Taller buildings will <i>only</i> be located in the most sustainable locations with good access to the public transport interchange, shops and services and on important sites and corners which aid legibility and will be required to meet stricter tests on environmental impact and design.	To clarify the statement.
5-8	Page 55 Para 5.6.4	Amend: Colindale Park is centrally located in the heart of the Colindale area with direct access from Colindale Avenue opposite the Underground Station. This small open area contains a number of mature trees and serves as a pedestrian and cycle link between the station and the communities around Colindeep Lane. The space contains children's play equipment but is limited in terms of landscape quality. <i>It is currently being considered for a Playbuilders project by Barnet Council's Children's Service to improve investment in children's facilities.</i>	To update the document.
5-9	Page 56 Para 5.6.6	Amend second paragraph: Policies in the Barnet UDP <i>and Three Strands Approach strategy</i> seek to protect open spaces from built development.	To update the document.
5-10	Page 56 Policy 5.5	Add the following additional point to Policy 5.5: <i>J) Retain existing mature trees wherever possible and practical, particularly those included in Tree Preservation Orders, and offset losses where tree retention is not possible.</i>	To strengthen the policy.



5-11	Page 57 Para 5.6.9 Point a)	Amend last sentence: Aerodrome Park may provide the school with an educational and young people resource with the opportunity for learning connected to sport, nature conservation and biodiversity <u>as well as shared sports field facilities for the wider community.</u>	To update the document.
5-12	Page 57 Para 5.6.9 Point b)	Amend: Montrose Park is an important <del>and attractive</del> public open space within Colindale and Burnt Oak and in close proximity to the development sites within the Colindale Avenue Corridor of Change. Improvements to access and quality of <u>the space</u> , services and facilities provided in the park, particularly youth facilities, will be important in order to ensure existing and new residents in the area have access to good quality public open space. See Chapter 4 'Colindale Avenue Corridor of Change' for further information.	To correct the document.
5-13	Page 58 Para 5.6.9	Add new paragraph to 5.6.9: <u>J) Retain existing mature trees wherever possible and practical, particularly those included in Tree Preservation Orders, and offset losses where tree retention is not possible.</u>  <u>Existing mature trees are important in Colindale and provide a range of multifunctional contributions to environmental, social and economic sustainability. Trees can improve public health and moderate the local impact of climate change, whilst boosting biodiversity and reinforcing the distinctive character of Colindale. As such, there should be a presumption of retaining mature trees, particularly those included in Tree Preservation Orders (TPOs). Where trees can not be retained,</u>	To strengthen the document.

		<i>the loss should be offset through new tree planting.</i>	
<b>6</b>			
6-1	Page 62 Policy 6.1	Amend: Policy 6.1 Energy Hierarchy  Development in Colindale will make the fullest contribution to the mitigation of, and adaptation to, climate change and to minimise emissions of carbon dioxide <u>and reduce consumption of natural resources</u> . The following hierarchy will be used to assess applications:  <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Using less energy, in particular by adopting sustainable design and construction measures, in accordance with London Plan Policy 4A.3 and the London Borough of Barnet's SPD on Sustainable Design and Construction (June 2007);</li> <li>• Supplying energy efficiently, in particular by prioritising decentralised energy generation, in accordance with London Plan Policy 4A.6 and Policy 6.2 of the AAP to provide a CHP and district heating system; and</li> <li>• Using renewable energy, in accordance with London Plan Policy 4A.7 and the Council's SPD on Sustainable Design and Construction.</li> </ul>	To update the document.
6-2	Page 62 Para 6.2.2	Amend last sentence: The Council will, however, consider the costs of sustainability measures when determining development viability and deliverability and prioritisation of planning obligations to ensure Colindale becomes one of London's most sustainable <u>city</u> suburbs.	To update the document.
6-3	Page 62 Para 6.2.6	Amend second sentence: The potential to incorporate high	To make the statement clearer.

		energy-requiring existing <i>housing</i> stock will support the viability of the CHP network and therefore represents an important factor.	
6-4	Page 62 Para 6.2.7	Amend: The assessment found that the Corridors of Change form a useful framework for building an energy network to serve the entire Colindale AAP area and beyond. Running energy infrastructure along existing routes and underneath green corridors provides spinal routes from which all buildings can be connected. <u>Where energy infrastructure is routed through green corridors and open spaces care should be taken to avoid existing trees and any trees which cannot be retained should be offset with new tree planting.</u>	To clarify the document.
6-5	Page 62 Para 6.2.8	Add new paragraph: <u>The Council recently resolved to grant planning permission to Fairview New Homes for the redevelopment of the Colindale Hospital site. The approved scheme includes an energy centre with a CHP plant which provides heating and hot water for all of the units within the development as well as generating electricity which is fed back to the grid. The energy centre is large enough to serve the approved Aparthotel and future Barnet College facility and could be able to serve future developments on the British Newspaper Library site and Brent Works on Colindale Avenue.</u>	To update the document to reflect the recent resolution to grant planning permission at the Colindale Hospital site.
6-6	Page 63 Para 6.3.2	Amend first sentence: These targets will present challenges for developers, particularly in the context of a slowing housing market, but there is clearly a benefit to Colindale and to London from implementing Code	To clarify the document.

		Levels ahead of the Government <i>timetable if viable</i> , in terms of emissions targets and future mandatory Code Levels and helping to deliver exemplary levels of sustainability in the area.	
6-7	Page 64 Policy 6.4	<p>Amend Policy 6.4: <u>Sites within Flood Zone 1 over 1ha, all sites within Flood Zone 2 and 3 and sites with critical drainage issues</u> All development sites within the Colindale AAP require site specific Flood Risk Assessments (FRAs), <u>in accordance with PPS25</u>. The FRA will <del>focus on surface water flooding</del> and have regard to the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment and the Outline Surface Water Strategy carried out for the AAP. Water efficiency initiatives will be included in all new development.</p> <p>Planning permission for residential development on sites wholly or partly within the existing flood zone of the Silk Stream (Flood Zone 2, 3 and <u>3b</u>) will not be granted. For development of non-residential uses on sites that might lie partly in Flood Zone 2 or 3, the sequential approach should be carried out on site to design the development so that buildings and vulnerable uses are kept outside of the flood zones and that the area affected by Flood Zone 2 or 3 can be used as green space or parking.</p> <p><u>A green corridor should be created along the Silk Stream River. A vegetated buffer zone between the river and proposed developments will help manage flood risk and enhance biodiversity.</u></p>	Requested by the Environment Agency in their representations on the Submission Document.
6-8	Page 64 Para 6.4.3	<p>Amend first sentence: <del>The time frame requirements of the AAP are such that t</del>The</p>	To update the document.

		Colindale SFRA <del>has been</del> was prepared in <del>advance</del> <i>the context</i> of the <del>final</del> North London SFRA <i>which was completed in April 2008.</i>	
6-9	Page 65	Add new paragraph 6.4.9 after existing 6.4.8 and re-number rest of the paragraphs: <u><i>A green corridor should be created along the Silk River Stream. This would provide a green pedestrian route through the Colindale AAP area improving east-west connections and support biodiversity around the river, whilst providing a buffer zone between the river and development as a means of managing flood risk.</i></u>	Requested by the Environment Agency in their representations on the Submission Document.
6-10	Page 65 Policy 6.5	Amend Policy 6.5: All development will have regard to the drainage hierarchy of the London Plan. Developments will incorporate Sustainable Drainage Systems (SUDS) to manage surface water run-off. As part of the FRA (Policy 6.4), developers will carry out ground investigations to check the suitability of SUDS for infiltration and storage. SUDS schemes focussing entirely upon infiltration will not be acceptable due to the presence of London Clay in Colindale. <del>The following SUDS are acceptable in Colindale</del> <u><i>The following are some good examples of the types of SUDS that can be used in the Colindale area:</i></u> a) Flood storage (retention ponds) b) Permeable paving c) Green roofs d) Rainwater harvesting schemes - water butts installed on new development)  The Council will either enter into S106 discussions with the developer relating to the future maintenance of the SUDS or	Requested by the Environment Agency in their representations on the Submission Document.

		attach relevant planning conditions.	
6-11	Page 66 Para 6.5.4	Amend: <del>The emerging NLWP Preferred Options report does not identify potential new waste management sites within Colindale, however it does reference the Colindale AAP as an opportunity 'for the development of more integrated waste and resource parks (sometimes referred to as eco-parks) or the integration of waste based renewable energy systems into mixed use developments.</del> <u>identifies the land between the railway lines as a potential future site for a household waste and recycling facility.</u>	To update the document.
6-12	Page 66 Para 6.5.6	Amend first sentence: The proposed Waste Management Facility at Edgware Road / Geron Way <del>(Hendon – Cricklewood)</del> forms part of the outline planning application submitted to Barnet Council in March 2008 for the comprehensive regeneration of the Brent Cross Cricklewood Area and comprises a rail linked waste handling facility.	To update the document.
6-13	Page 66 Para 6.5.7	Amend: <del>The small area of land in-between the railway lines off Aerodrome Road and owned by Network Rail may have potential as a waste management facility</del> The identification of suitable sites for waste management <del>will be</del> <u>is</u> the responsibility of the North London Waste Plan. <u>The small area of land in-between the railway lines off Aerodrome Road owned by Network Rail is identified in the NLWP Preferred Options Report as a potential future site for a household waste and recycling facility.</u>	To update the document.

6-14	Page 67 Fig 6.3	Amend target for indicator 6B: Energy Centres on Peel Centre West site <u>and Colindale Hospital site</u> within Phase 2 (2012-2016)  Amend target for indicator 6F: <u>Household waste and recycling facility on the land between the railway lines.</u> Waste and recycling storage facilities in all developments in accordance with the Council's guidance (Michael Lai – 'Information for Developers and Architects – provision of domestic and organic waste collection services, and recycling facilities')	To update the document to reflect the recent planning decision.
<b>7</b>			
7-1	Page 70 Introduction - 2 <sup>nd</sup> bullet	Amend: Objective 4 of the AAP: to ensure the coordination of social, economic, physical, <del>and</del> environmental and educational infrastructure requirements; and	To update the document.
7-2	Page 70 Para 7.1.5	Amend: The minimum target of 10,000 new homes in the Colindale Opportunity Area naturally accounts for a significant proportion of the Borough's housing target under London Plan Policy 3A.2, <u>although the AAP delivery timescales go beyond 2016.</u>	To update the document.
7-3	Page 71 Policy 7.2	Amend: Policy 7.2 Affordable Housing  The Council has a <u>borough-wide</u> target of 50% affordable housing, in line with the London Plan. The maximum amount of affordable housing will be sought having regard to this target and to a viability assessment. Affordable units should be distributed throughout the site and be well integrated into all new development.	To update the document and in response to the Environment Agency's Representation on the Submission Document.

		<p>The Council will, <u>with reference to the London Plan's 70:30 social rented/intermediate ratio and recognition of a move to a 60:40 split</u>, negotiate the ratio of social rented/intermediate housing on a site by site basis having regard to the Council's SPD, <u>Housing Strategy</u>, and the London Plan.</p>	
7-4	<p>Page 71 Para 7.1.12</p>	<p>Amend: Whilst a target of 50% affordable housing will be sought across the area to include a mix of social rented and intermediate tenures, the final level of provision will be dependent on a viability assessment on a site by site basis to ensure the delivery of the AAP objectives. <u>Given a large social rented dominance at Grahame Park Estate there is a concern not to repeat over-concentrations of this or other tenures in single locations or in totality, but to achieve a good mix across the AAP.</u> Whilst it is <del>it</del> is recognised that the Mayor intends to move towards a 60:40 split in his review of the London Plan, the Council's adopted SPD on Affordable Housing (February 2007) sets out that the Council will, with reference to the London Plan's 70:30 social rented/intermediate ratio, negotiate, on a site by site basis, a more appropriate split for Barnet in order to enable the delivery of wider sustainable development and regeneration objectives.</p>	To update the document.
7-5	<p>Page 71 Para 7.1.13</p>	<p>Amend: The London Borough of Barnet will monitor affordable housing provision within Colindale and work closely with the GLA on monitoring delivery in the light of the availability of public subsidy, prevailing economic conditions,</p>	To update the document.



		updated housing viability <i>and needs</i> assessments and planning policy.	
7-6	Page 72 Policy 7.3	Amend: Policy 7.3 Health in Colindale  New health facilities will be provided in the Colindale Avenue Corridor of Change, complemented by reprovided facilities at Grahame Park Estate. The exact requirements will be subject to discussions between the developer, the London Borough of Barnet and Barnet PCT and have regard to the phasing and delivery of proposals within Colindale. Such facilities will provide for primary health care which will comprise general practitioners (GPs), dentistry, pharmacy and a range of community services. Developers should have regard to the Council's <i>adopted</i> SPD on financial contributions for health care services.	To update the document.
7-7	Page 72	Replace all references to the 'Barnet PCT' with <i>NHS Barnet</i> .	To update the document to reflect the recent change in title from Barnet PCT to NHS Barnet.
7-8	Page 72 7.2.12	Amend: A facility of approximately 2,000sqm would be particularly suitable if the replacement facility on Grahame Park for like-for-like facilities (around 1000 sq m) proceeded as currently consented.	To update the document.
7-9	Page 72 Para 7.2.13	Delete: <del>The Council and Barnet PCT are working together on the preparation of a Supplementary Planning Document which will provide clear advice and guidance on the appropriate level of financial contribution from developers for the provision of health care services that will be</del>	To update the document in light of the adoption of the SPD in July 2009.

		<p><del>required for the population growth as a result of any new development. The guidance contained in this forthcoming SPD will be relevant and applicable to new housing and mixed use development across the borough including Colindale.</del></p> <p>Replace with:  <u><i>In partnership with NHS Barnet, the Council has prepared and adopted a Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) on Contributions to Health Facilities from Development. The guidance contained in the SPD is relevant and applicable to new housing and mixed use development across the borough including Colindale.</i></u></p> <p><u><i>The Council uses the HUDU Planning Contributions Model to calculate the potential planning contributions from residential developments in Barnet for the provision of health care facilities. It is proposed that the HUDU Model will be extended to incorporate a method to calculate the impact of new residential development on the provision of social care facilities. Following the successful extension of the HUDU Model the Council will seek s106 contributions for social care facilities.</i></u></p> <p><u><i>For major development schemes the council will assess the complex factors that must be taken into account in putting together a 'package' of Section 106 financial contributions, and the standard values used in the HUDU Model will be used, but may be subject to variation in some cases.</i></u></p>	
7-10	Page 73 Para 7.3.5	Amend: New facilities at Beaufort Park	To correct the document.

		include a Tesco <del>Extra</del> <i>Metro</i> and a number of other shops, restaurants and a pub.	
7-11	Page 74 Para 7.3.11	Amend: ... In addition to retail provision, supporting community and leisure uses such as <u>cafes, restaurants, and bars (Use Class A3/A4/A5)</u> <del>uses</del> and health and leisure uses <u>(Use Class D1)</u> will be provided which complement existing facilities. There should be a degree of flexibility within any development proposals to reflect current market conditions in terms of the size and configuration of retail floor space when such development is brought forward.	To clarify the document.
7-12	Page 75 Para 7.4.2	Amend: In seeking to ensure the growth planned for the Colindale area creates sustainable, mixed and balanced communities, it is important to consider what contribution the identified sites could have in terms of providing high quality, mixed use development <u>and creating locally based employment.</u>	To update the document.
7-13	Page 75	Renumber existing paragraph 7.4.7 as para 7.4.9 and add new paragraphs 7.4.7 and 7.4.8 within Section 7.2 as follows:  <u>7.4.7 As the majority of jobs are created within proposed mixed use development, the timing of job creation is, to a degree, dependant on the timing and phasing for the residential development (as discussed in paragraphs 7.1.7-7.1.10 and Section 8.2). Three development phases have been used in the background work and within the AAP which relate well to the aspirations of the key landowners and are considered to sit well against the phases used in</u>	In response to GOL representation on the Submission Document.

		<p><u>the London Plan relating to the delivery of homes and jobs across the Opportunity Areas.</u></p> <p><u>7.4.8 It is assumed that the majority of jobs proposed within Beaufort Park (335 new jobs) will be created within Phase 1 (2007-2011). The majority of the remaining new jobs will be created in Phase 2 (2012-2016) consisting of those in Colindale Avenue Corridor of Change around the new neighbourhood centre and Barnet College (239 new jobs) and Farrow House (294 new jobs) and the land in-between the railway lines (80 new jobs) in Aerodrome Road Corridor of Change. Phase 3 will consist of new jobs on the Peel Centre East site and in Grahame Park Estate.</u></p>	
7-14	Page 77 Policy 7.6	<p>Amend third paragraph:</p> <p>New buildings for education uses in Colindale will be of the highest quality of design befitting their important community function. They will be prominent buildings and fully integrated into the local environment <u>and where potential exists they will be "exemplars" in sustainability and green education building design.</u></p>	To update the document.
7-15	Page 77 Para 7.5.1	<p>Add new paragraph between 7.5.1 and 7.5.2:</p> <p><u>Barnet Council's Cabinet recently gave Executive Approval for the rebuilding of Colindale School which is a primary school just outside the AAP area but directly affected by it. This primary school will be rebuilt and expanded from a two form entry to a three form entry school. The extra capacity created by the expansion is needed to meet growth in primary school aged children from the existing area and therefore will not</u></p>	To update the document.

		<u>meet the needs of the planned growth in the area.</u>	
7-16	Page 77 Developer Contributions	Add paragraph number.  Amend: For example, particularly large housing developments may be required to provide a new school in order to meet the demand that will arise from the development, <u>particularly if generating over 1,000 new homes.</u>	To update the document.
7-17	Page 79 Fig 7.8	Amend Indicator Number 7a in the 'Targets' column of Fig 7.8:  <del>3739</del> <u>3185</u> units by 2011 <del>7384</del> <u>7601</u> units by 2016 <del>9526</del> <u>9806</u> units by 2021	To correct the document to reflect the figures in Figure 7.1.
7-18	Page 79 Fig 7.8	Amend Indicator Number 7d in the 'Targets' column of Fig 7.8: Around 5,000 sq m <del>including</del> <u>excluding</u> community facilities provided within Colindale Avenue Corridor of Change in Phase 2 (2012-2016).	To correct the document to reflect Policy 7.4.
<b>8</b>			
8-1	Page 82 Para 8.1.1	Amend: This chapter outlines how the Council will translate the vision for Colindale into reality. Achieving the vision will be challenging and the Council cannot implement the Colindale AAP alone <u>and it will rely on a genuine partnership delivery approach.</u> The Council will work with a range of stakeholders <u>and partners</u> including the GLA and TfL, neighbouring boroughs, landowners, utility providers, the voluntary and community sectors and others to ensure that the objectives and policies in this AAP are implemented throughout the lifetime of the document.	To update the document.
8-2	Page 82	Amend:	To update the document.

	Para 8.1.4	In order to be effective, the AAP must be flexible. A long term strategy which is too prescriptive in the type and extent of development may date quickly and may not reflect market demand at the point of delivery, <u>particularly pertinent in a recession.</u>	
8-3	Page 82 Para 8.1.6	Amend first sentence: <u>Recognising current market conditions and the recession,</u> the results from the high level appraisals indicate that, assuming benign market conditions, private residential uses provide the principal source of value in redevelopment proposals as they have the largest margins between build cost and revenue.	To update the document.
8-4	Page 82	Update photos with photos of the completed bridges and Kidstop development.	To update the document.
8-5	Page 83 Para 8.1.10	Amend: <del>In view of this, the Council has identified over £120 million of necessary infrastructure to support the proposed growth in Colindale.</del> The Council has developed <u>an innovative infrastructure funding model known as</u> the Barnet Finance Plan based on tax investment <del>and.</del> <u>It</u> has piloted Colindale as its front runner scheme awaiting HM Treasury and CLG announcements. <u>The Council has also bid for the recent Government pilot scheme for Tax Increment Financing and Accelerated Development Zone (TIF-ADZ) status and is formally a member of the National Government (CLG/HMT) led TIF-ADZ working Group, to develop such infrastructure financing models.</u>	Requested by the Inspector at the Hearing and to update the document.
8-6	Page 83	Amend:	To update the document.

	Policy 8.1	<p>Policy 8.1 The Council's Powers and Resources in Colindale</p> <p>The Council, along with the GLA group, will ensure that their policies and resources promote the implementation of this Plan <u>prioritising Colindale as the Borough's key pilot area for new and innovative infrastructure funding mechanisms and delivery.</u> The AAP provides the development plan framework within which all future planning applications will be determined, and each application will need to demonstrate to the Council and GLA group how the proposed development will help realise the visions and objectives contained within the AAP.</p>	
8-7	Page 83 Para 8.2.5	<p>Amend:</p> <p>There is an opportunity in Colindale to transform the area and deliver new development to exemplary levels of sustainability, as reflected in the policies and guidance contained in Chapter 6, particularly with regard to providing decentralised energy in the form of an energy centre providing district wide heating and power <u>and eco friendly new schools and educational developments.</u> The Council will continue to work closely with the GLA and LDA to further promote the exemplary levels of sustainability in Colindale.</p>	To update the document.
8-8	Page 84 Policy 8.2	<p>Amend:</p> <p>Policy 8.2 Partnership Working in Colindale</p> <p>The Council will work with partners, landowners and other stakeholders to secure the implementation of the policies in the Colindale AAP. The Council will continue to coordinate regular</p>	To update the document.

		meetings of the Colindale AAP Stakeholder Group and consult with local residents and the wider growing community throughout the life of the AAP to help deliver the vision, objectives and policies <u>to transform the area into a vibrant and successful city suburb of Barnet.</u>	
8-9	Page 84 Para 8.2.6	Amend first sentence: Key landowners <u>and developers</u> will ultimately be responsible for delivering the change, improvements and growth put forward in the Colindale AAP.	To update the document.
8-10	Page 84	Add paragraph numbers to paragraphs under title 'Landowners'.	To update the document.
8-11	Page 85 Under heading 'London Borough of Brent'	Amend paragraph 8.2.6 (under heading of London Borough of Brent): Many of the community and transport infrastructure issues relevant to the Colindale AAP are also relevant to the forward planning of these adjacent major sites in Brent and <del>close working relations will continue to be maintained as progress on their LDFs is made by both Councils.</del> <u>The Council is committed to joint-working and will continue to work closely with the London Borough of Brent to ensure the coordinated management and implementation of development and infrastructure through regular officer meetings to discuss LDF progress and other relevant development issues within the area. In addition, partnerships are developing with North West London boroughs, including the London Borough of Brent, to plan sustainable growth within the North West London-Luton Corridor.</u>	Requested by GOL in their representations on the Submission Document.
8-	Page 84	Fairview New Homes owns the	To update the document in



12	'Fairview New Homes'	<p>Colindale Hospital and Brent Works sites. Fairview submitted two planning applications for the Colindale Hospital site and Station House site in January 2009. for a residential-led mixed-use development incorporating an Aparthotel and new public piazza. <u>On the 29<sup>th</sup> July 2009 Barnet Council resolved to grant planning permission to Fairview New Homes for the redevelopment of the former Colindale Hospital site to erect 714 residential units including the change of use and conversion of the listed former Administration building to residential, a new primary care trust facility (Use Class D1) of 1,132sqm, commercial units (Use Class A1/A2/A3/B1). The Council also resolved to grant planning permission for the demolition of Station House and construction of a 293 bed, part 6, part 13 storey Aparthotel (8965sqm) together with a 369sqm restaurant (Use Class A3) and three ground floor commercial units (Use Class A1/A2/A3) totalling 780sqm. The application includes the retention of and alterations to the Colindale underground station building and the provision of a new public square and a transport interchange incorporating bus stops, taxi rank and associated landscaping. Part of the Fairview's approved master plan for the Colindale Hospital site is identified safeguards a plot of land for the relocation of Barnet College. Once the College has received funding, Fairview will then purchase the current Barnet College site and redevelop for residential use and a primary school.</u></p>	light of recent planning decisions.
8-	Page 84	Amend second and third	To update the document.

13	'Metropolitan Police'	<p>paragraphs:  The Metropolitan Police would like to dispose of surplus land for residential-led mixed-use development <u>but have not yet reached the stage where they can provide certain timescales for the disposal of this land.</u> The Metropolitan Police are unable at this stage to provide certain timescales for the disposal of this land.</p>	
8-14	Page 84 'Barnet College'	<p>Amend second paragraph:  The current building is not fit for purpose and, if continued <u>to be occupied</u> occupancy in the long term would need to be upgraded.</p>	To update the document.
8-15	Page 85 'The Community'	<p>Amend heading:  The <u>Colindale and Wider</u> Community</p>	To update the document.
8-16	Page 86 Policy 8.3	<p>Amend:  Policy 8.3 <del>Planning Obligations in Colindale</del> <u>Funding Infrastructure in Colindale and Section 106 Contributions</u></p> <p>The Council will seek to ensure, through the use of conditions and/or planning obligations that new development provides for the planning benefits which are necessary to support and serve proposed new development in Colindale. The pooling of contributions for necessary transport and community infrastructure will be required having regard to the relative priorities for planning obligations for each Corridor of Change. Where necessary, the Council will require an open book approach from developers when discussing and negotiating planning obligations and <u>development viability</u> with the Council.</p>	To update the document.

8-17	Page 86 Para 8.2.10	<p>Amend point 6.: Health provision – working with the PCT <u>NHS Barnet</u> to ensure the health care needs of existing and future residents are met through the delivery of improved and expanded facilities;</p> <p>Amend point 9.: Cultural heritage <u>and tourist</u> facilities – the RAF Museum is a facility of international significance and represents a major strength of and opportunity for the Colindale area; and</p>	To update the document.
8-18	Page 86 Para 8.2.13	<p>Amend: A system to levy a tariff on development is currently being considered by the Council as a mechanism for delivering planning obligations in accordance with advice from Central Government. Such a system could form part of the emerging Barnet Finance Plan <u>or Tax Increment Financing pilot for a Colindale Accelerated Development Zone (TIF-ADZ)</u> which is designed to provide funding for physical and <del>social</del> <u>community</u> infrastructure upfront. The mechanism to deliver the necessary infrastructure in Colindale could, therefore, change over the lifetime of the AAP. <u>More strategic infrastructure funding will come forward from Growth Area Funding (GAF3) and mainstream public sector funding.</u></p>	To update the document.
8-19	Page 86 New Para	<p>Add new paragraphs 8.2.16, 8.2.17 and 8.2.18</p> <p><u>Schedule of Infrastructure Delivery</u></p> <p><u>The Colindale AAP identifies specific physical, environmental and community infrastructure that is needed to support the growth planned in Colindale and ensure the creation of a sustainable and</u></p>	Requested by the Inspector.

		<p><u>successful place. A Schedule of Infrastructure Delivery is included in Appendix 1 which indicatively sets out when each item of infrastructure will be delivered across the different phases of the AAP and the anticipated sources of funding that will be used to deliver them.</u></p> <p><u>The schedule sets out those projects that have already been completed and the figures associated with them, funding secured to deliver specific items of infrastructure, infrastructure being delivered 'in kind' through consented developments and potential sources of funding for remaining infrastructure.</u></p> <p><u>The schedule is intended to provide a simple guide for the AAP and will be subject to review and revision throughout the lifetime of the plan in accordance with Policy 8.5 (Monitoring Development in Colindale).</u></p>	
8-20	Page 87 Para 8.2.18	Amend: The London Borough of Brent are <u>is</u> currently developing a detailed infrastructure framework to assist in managing the implementation of development around Edgware Road.	To update the document.
8-21	Page 87 Para 8.3.1	Amend: The importance of monitoring is recognised in both the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 and the London Plan, which place a duty on every local planning authority to keep under review matters affecting the planning and development of its area, and to carry out surveys where necessary in order to test the effectiveness of the policies. An important aspect of the new planning system is the flexibility to	To update the document.

		update components of the Local Development Framework, including this AAP, to respond quickly to <u>a changing environment and priorities, for example the recession or market upturn.</u>	
8-22	New Page	<p>Add new page with following:</p> <p><u>Appendices</u></p> <p><u>Appendix 1: Schedule of Infrastructure Delivery</u></p> <p><u>Appendix 2: List of Reference Documents</u></p> <p><u>The following supporting documents are available at Barnet Online</u>  <a href="http://www.barnet.gov.uk/planning-consultations"> (www.barnet.gov.uk/planning-consultations)</a> :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Sustainability Appraisal</u></li> <li>• <u>Equalities Impact Assessment</u></li> <li>• <u>Appropriate Assessment</u></li> <li>• <u>Statement of Consultation and Conformity</u></li> </ul> <p><u>The following technical reports have informed the preparation of the Colindale AAP:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Transport Analysis Summary Report (June 2009)</u></li> <li>• <u>Saturn Modelling Report (June 2009)</u></li> <li>• <u>VISSIM Proposed Modelling report (April 2009)</u></li> <li>• <u>VISSIM Validation Report (April 2009)</u></li> <li>• <u>Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (September 2008)</u></li> <li>• <u>Outline Surface Water Management Strategy (June 2009)</u></li> <li>• <u>Retail Provision Report (February 2008)</u></li> <li>• <u>Employment Market Report (March 2009)</u></li> <li>• <u>Property Market Report</u></li> </ul>	To update the document.

		<i>(June 2009)</i>	
8-23	New page	<p>Add new page with Schedule of Infrastructure Delivery as submitted to Inspector.</p> <p><u><i>Appendix 1: Schedule of Infrastructure Delivery</i></u></p>	Requested by the Inspector.
8-24	New page	<p>Add new page:</p> <p><u><i>Appendix 2: List of Reference Documents</i></u></p> <p>Add table containing list of relevant reference documents (similar format to the table in Appendix 1 of the Mill Hill East AAP).</p>	To update the document.