

APPENDIX 4

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

First Consultation Responses for Consultation Period Ending 16/03/2015

<u>Clitterhouse Playing Fields:</u>	Officer Comments
<u>Justifying the loss of open space:</u>	
1. Improvements to Clitterhouse Playing fields should not be used as a justification for any loss of green space in the area. Particularly given the vast increase in the local population expected by the end of the regeneration development.	Principles established initially with the approval of Outline permission ("2010 Permission) Ref No C/17559/08 and subsequently within the S73 Planning Permission Ref No F/04687/13 allow the development of some areas of open space in recognition of the uplift in open space that would result with the complete delivery of the Development. .
2. There is a lack of green spaces given that the proposed regeneration would increase the population growth in the area. We lost the Hendon FC playing fields to the Fairview development, we will lose the green triangles to build replacement housing for the Whitefield Estate; additionally lose green space to develop the proposed car park, MUGA's and other sport pitches facilities.	<p>The amount of green space proposed has been established in principle with the approval 2010 Permission and 2014 Permission</p> <p>The current proposal represents an improvement to both Clitterhouse Playing Fields and Claremont Open Space which aims to make both of these sites more accessible to a range of local residents.</p> <p>The loss of the private playing fields at The Hendon Football Club has been established in the permission granted under application H/02747/14. It is not considered that this development which falls outside of the Brent Cross Cricklewood Regeneration area has a significant effect upon the acceptability of the Current RMA application or upon the wider Brent Cross regeneration Scheme.</p>

<p>3. A section of the open space will be lost to Whitefield School; this loss of open space is not made clear anywhere in the documentation.</p>	<p>This principle was established in the approval of the 2010 Permission and 2014 Permission. The proposals do not form a part of this reserved matters application being within the Clitterhouse Playing Fields Part 2 Works falling within Phase 2. .</p> <p>The current reserved matters application includes a degree of level changing in this area but in no way restricts access to or use of this space.</p> <p>There is no reduction in area proposed, although part of the grassed area of the park will be replaced by synthetic turf pitches to be used in conjunction with Whitefield School. The all weather pitches will be terraced into the park to minimise their visual impact and a landscape buffer will be provided to limit noise and light pollution to adjoining residential properties. Drainage will be improved to the remaining grassed sports pitches and this should ensure the number of playing hours will increase.</p> <p>It is intended that the 'all weather' sports pitches are managed to ensure that they are publicly available outside of school hours.</p>
<p>4. What is the Justification for Whitefield School being transferred to Clitterhouse Playing Fields and why does the school have to be moved?</p>	<p>Whitefield School is not to be moved to Clitterhouse Playing Fields. See the above answer in relation to the all weather pitches.</p>
<p>5. Schedule 8 Plan 015 illustrates the Section 106 Agreement plan and indicates that the trees on the boundary of Clitterhouse Playing Fields next to the re-sited school will be still be part of the Playing Fields. This is inaccessible space which could potentially encourage rough sleepers and other anti-social behaviour.</p>	<p>Details of the final landscaping in this location will be submitted with the submission of reserved matters relating to the Clitterhouse Improvement works Part 2 in Phase 2.</p> <p>The landscaping proposals within the Part 1 improvements are intended to deter rough sleeping and other anti-social behaviour. In particular to the southern boundary proposals result in a reduction of shrubbery providing clear view lines and also reduce the area in which rough sleeping can occur. The provision of swales to the north of the sport pitches also help reduce rough sleeping as the flat surfaces on which to camp are reduced. To an extent the increased activity in the park alone will assist in controlling such activities.</p>

<p>6. The development partners claim that the Playing Fields will be increased from 17.8 hectares to 18.2 hectares. Since there are no overlays or clear comparisons between the amounts of green space that is being proposed, it is unclear where the extra 0.6 hectares is proposed. Please Clarify how this uplift in open space arises.</p>	<p>Within part 1.5 of the Clitterhouse Playing Fields Design Development Report a plan is included indicating the existing area of 17.63 Ha and the proposed area of 18.2. This plan clearly indicates the increased areas of the playing fields including an extended area to the northern reach of the park as well as the addition of Open space and the Farm buildings to the south of the Hendon Football Club site.</p>
<p>Facilities proposed and open space for the public</p>	
<p>1. Concerns are raised over the proposed play facilities has the mix of these been discussed with the Local Authority?</p>	<p>The play facilities proposed are in accordance with the minimum requirements as detailed within the approved S106 Agreement schedule 28 Part F. This mix of equipment was established following discussions with the Council. Further to this the submitted layout and make up of the Play area has been subject to discussions with the Council's Green Spaces officer.</p> <p>In addition a condition is attached to this recommendation which allows a variation to the layout following public consultation.</p>
<p>2. Proposals at the Clitterhouse Playing Fields are too focused on sport facilities thereby excluding large parts of the population who do not engage in these activities.</p>	<p>The range and extent of uses proposed on the Clitterhouse Playing Fields has been subject to extended consideration. Principles have been established within the S73 Approval including a minimum area of playing fields (S106 Schedule 28 part 1, e) of 6.23ha.</p> <p>The Proposal includes a range of play facilities and landscaped areas of informal park space.</p>
<p>3. It is unclear how the existing levels of the park have been taken into consideration when planning the sport pitches, considerable work will have to be done to level them.</p>	<p>Please see the main report for a discussion of this issue. The sport drainage proposals have been checked by a specialist in sports drainage (an agronomist).</p>

<p>4. Object to the proposal to convert additional space to the north of Clitterhouse Playing Fields into sport pitches in later phases. This will limit open space usage to the general public. Such changes could also impact on the land's designation as Metropolitan Open Land.</p>	<p>Officers consider that the proposals for Clitterhouse Playing Fields strike an appropriate balance between sports use and more informal open space uses.</p>
<p>5. Concerned that little thought has been given to 'free-to use' space for everyone to use eg. for those who wish to walk their dogs, those who wish to walk and just enjoy the open space. Most of the area is for sports pitches which will only provide occasional benefit to a select few. The amount of space which is to be made 'use-specific' is disproportionate resulting in a clinical and artificial space.</p>	<p>Please see the main report for details of the proposal. Facilities for dog walkers and for informal park use are provided.</p>
<p>6. There is a lack of clarity on how 'open' the Clitterhouse Playing Fields will be. Concerns are raised that the new development will limit public access.</p>	<p>There is no intention to limit public access. Ownership of the playing fields will remain with the London Borough of Barnet and opening hours will be agreed at a later date.</p>
<p>7. What does the metropolitan open land currently cover and do officers agree with the changes to the size of the area made in this application?</p>	<p>This aspect of the planning application was considered at the outline stage. There are no proposals in this reserved matter planning application that would significantly impact upon the MOL designation.</p>
<p>8. Insufficient effort has been made to integrate the stream at the east edge of the park. It appears disconnected from the main area of the park and the Playing Fields. The stream should be promoted as a resource for wildlife, study and enjoyment for the public.</p>	<p>Please see the main body of the report for discussion of this issue.</p>

<p>9. Is it necessary to remove the existing mature grove of native trees? We are concerned about the loss of trees and feel that effort should be made to maintain and enhance the positive qualities that currently exist.</p>	<p>A tree survey of the trees has been undertaken and as many of the mature trees as possible have been retained. In addition, a tree planting strategy is proposed and this will enhance the tree cover in the park.</p>
<p>10. Concerned that there will be a cost to access these spaces and that these costs may be high.</p>	<p>The park will remain in the ownership of LBB. There are no plans to charge for access to the park although it is likely that there will be a charge for use of sports facilities. No details of likely charges are available at this time.</p>
<p>Access to the playing fields:</p>	
<p><i>Pedestrian access:</i></p> <p>1. Access at the south-western corner of the playing fields is of concern in respect of the interaction between cars and the flow of pedestrians within the park. The proximity of the access point to a roundabout on Claremont Road and the adjoining Primary school means that careful consideration is necessary to minimise potential incidents.</p>	<p>Please see the main report for a discussion of this issue. The vehicular access to the proposed car park is segregated from the pedestrian and cycle access.</p>
<p>2. The proposed barriers at the park entrances to restrict anti-social motorcycling are unsuitable and would hinder access for many users. A solution needs to be user friendly for all. The current design is not mobility friendly and will restrict access for cyclists, wheelchairs users, mobility scooters and parents with pushchairs. The 2014 London Cycle Design Standards (LCDS) suggests that barriers are not encouraged as they can have a major impact on access. Such barriers are not in use in nearby parks or open spaces</p>	<p>A condition is proposed to agree the detail of entrance gates before development commences.</p>
<p>3. Concern that a 4m wide footpath is not wide enough to accommodate a shared surface for cyclists and</p>	<p>The shared cycle and pedestrian routes will be designed in accordance with TfLs London Cycling Design Standards. Details are given in Section 4.5 of the Clitterhouse Playing Fields Design Development</p>

pedestrians?	Report and the footpaths measure 5m in width.
<p>Access for cyclists:</p> <p>1. The RMA submission illustrates that the cycling and pedestrian route through Clitterhouse Playing Fields would be segregated; however, there is no indication as to how this will be achieved.</p>	See answer above.
<p>2. Is the proposed cycling strategy illustrated for Clitterhouse Playing Fields in line with the planning guidance provided by the Mayor of London? Cycling provision must be in line with planning guidance from the Mayor of London, which would physically segregate cyclists and pedestrians, except at crossover points and junctions.</p>	See answer above.
<p>3. There is a lack of cycling routes through the playing fields to the North east and nothing alongside the stream</p>	The overall cycling provision for the development is the subject of a number of pre-preserved matter conditions currently under consideration including the Area Wide Cycling and Study and the Pedestrian and Cycle Strategy for Phase 1AN. The cycle network through Clitterhouse Playing Fields conforms with these strategies.
<p>4. Drawing 1065-04-5076 illustrates a cycle plan; however, many of the routes just stop in the middle of nowhere; there needs to be more thought to ensure cycle routes are joined up.</p>	See answer above

<p><i>Vehicular access and proposed car park:</i></p> <p>1. Will internal paths and roads within the open spaces be covered by the Highways Act 1980? Will there be sufficient light and who will maintain and own them?</p>	<p>Internal paths and roads will be owned and managed by the LBB and a condition is proposed to agree details of lighting before development commences.</p>
<p>2. The numbers of car parking spaces that have been proposed for the playing fields are limited. Prayle Grove and Wallcote Avenue are both very busy roads during the weekends and have restrictive covenants. Overflow parking from the park will make it difficult for residents to park vehicles on nearby congested roads.</p>	<p>The number of car parking spaces has been agreed by the Council's Green Spaces and Highways officers. The number of spaces represents a compromise between the need for car parking and the need to keep as much of the open space useable for the local community as park and playing fields.</p>
<p>3. Why is the car park situated in the middle of the playing fields? Would it not be convenient if it was situated near Claremont Road?</p>	<p>Green Spaces officers have supported the proposed location of the car park as the most convenient for users of the pavilion.</p>
<p>4. As a secondary school which caters for physically disabled students as well as able bodied students our concerns with regard to the development of Clitterhouse Playing Fields is what effect it will have on the traffic in the area. Our physically disabled students are dropped off and collected by Brent and Barnet vans each day, not to mention parents dropping their children of and our concerns are that the development works will cause additionally traffic problems which will impact on the students getting to school on time.</p>	<p>The traffic impact of the proposals for Clitterhouse Playing Fields was considered at the S73 Application stage. This Reserved Matter application is in accordance with the outline application.</p>
<p><u>Proposed Buildings:</u></p>	

<p>1. Centralising the buildings in Clitterhouse Playing Fields seems unnecessary and will create clutter in the centre. The Clitterhouse Farm buildings site would have been an ideal site and there are concerns on why this site was not considered?</p>	<p>Please see the main report for discussion of this issue. The proposed location for the pavilion was considered the most appropriate in relation to the playing pitches and play area. In addition there is a community proposal in development for the Clitterhouse Farm Buildings.</p>
<p>2. There are a number of buildings proposed on Clitterhouse Playing Fields these could potentially become brownfield sites if the park is not maintained properly.</p>	<p>The Pavilion is the only new building. The Clitterhouse Farm buildings are retained buildings. Management and maintenance arrangements are to be agreed but all park facilities – including the buildings – are likely to remain the responsibility of the applicant for the first two years.</p>
<p>3. The proposal for a centrally located kiosk as well a café within the Clitterhouse farm buildings could lead to competing business. The services should support each other. Is the Kiosk necessary?</p>	<p>It is considered that they are complementary rather than competing. The kiosk is situated close to the play area and is intended to provide a facility for users of the play area and sports pitches. The proposals for the café use in the Farm Buildings is not a fully developed proposal - no details of what is proposed are currently available. (It should be noted that the proposals for the Farm Buildings will be subject to a further planning application)</p>
<p>4. The proposed Pavilion has increased from being 251sqm to 325sqm, why is this increase proposed?</p>	<p>Detailed design of the pavilion – particularly the changing rooms – has resulted in this need to increase the size to provide adequate facilities.</p>
<p>5. The increase in building sizes in Clitterhouse Playing Fields are disproportionate and could be an attempt to provide the authority with depot and office spaces that could be moved out of other borough parks, has this been discussed within the Local Authority?</p>	<p>The full detail of the proposals for the Park Maintenance Facility has not been finalised at this stage. It is anticipated that the depot will provide a base from which maintenance of nearby parks could be carried out – for instance Claremont Park. The detail of the Park Maintenance Facility will be controlled by planning conditions.</p>
<p>Maintenance Depot:</p> <p>1. It is not clear from the relevant documentation or drawings where the maintenance depot will be sited.</p>	<p>The revised submission identifies the location of the maintenance facility in part of the Clitterhouse Farm Buildings.</p>
<p>2. Why is 1000sqm required for a maintenance store?</p>	<p>This area proposed for the maintenance depot has been reduced in the revised submission.</p>

And do other parks in Barnet meet this requirement?	
3. We understand that there may be a proposal for a maintenance depot which is proposed to be located within the farm buildings where the Clitterhouse Farm Project is based. The inclusion of the Maintenance depot and store will impact upon the community use and value this heritage site.	Please see the main report for discussion of this issue.
4. The maintenance depot should be placed elsewhere in the wider regeneration area; however, if both are located on the same site the old buildings and courtyard should be given to the community to use and a new development should be integrated and considered on the southern part of the site for recreational team to use.	Green Spaces have identified the area of the Farm Buildings as the most appropriate location for a maintenance depot. This is principally because of its location close to Claremont Road.
5. The Playing Fields should have a dedicated team of park wardens to maintain the facilities and enforce stern discipline.	Management and maintenance details will be agreed at a later date. There are no proposals from the applicant to fund park wardens.
<u>Farm Buildings</u>	
1. The playing fields stands in an area of Archaeological significance, the plans presented do not adequately integrate this aspect and future uses of the Farm buildings into the surrounding public space.	Please see the main report for a discussion on archaeological aspects of the proposal.
2. We object to the removal of all the hard standing in front of Clitterhouse Farm buildings, this space is currently used to facilitate community events. It should be kept in some form and landscaped to cater for a multitude of uses.	Officers consider that the Community Lawn proposed is an appropriate replacement for the area currently occupied by the hard standing to the rear of the Farm Building.

<p>3. The aim of the Clitterhouse Farm Project is to make use of <i>all</i> existing original Victorian farm buildings and outbuildings, there are currently plans to apply for restoration grants and this could clash with the needs of indoor and outdoor space. It is proposed that this space could be accommodated by a new building running along the southern edge of Clitterhouse Farm.</p>	<p>Green Spaces have identified part of the area of the Farm Buildings as the most appropriate location for the park maintenance facility. The Farm Project proposals are still under development and in this situation it is considered appropriate to propose part of the existing Farm Buildings for the maintenance depot.</p>
<p>4. The Clitterhouse farm project should be incorporated into this proposed development.</p>	<p>Please see the above answer.</p>
<p><u>Claremont Open Space</u></p>	<p>Officers Comments</p>
<p>1. Claremont Open space open space should provide local play facilities and activities. It will become impossible to access the space with the highly structured layout and multiple levels.</p>	<p>Claremont Park will provide local play facilities – please see the main report for details.</p>
<p>2. The RMA submission states that Claremont Open Space currently measures 2.3 hectares, does this measurement include Brent Terrace green triangles?</p>	<p>The measurement of 2.3 hectares includes the Brent Terrace Triangles</p>
<p>3. In accordance with the Section 106 Agreement Claremont open space is required to have a minimum area of 1.95ha; however no detailed explanation has been supplied to explain how this has been achieved.</p>	<p>Please see the map in the Claremont Park Design Development Report</p>

<p>4. The current shape of Claremont Open space looks completely different to the proposed design. We are unable to determine whether land has been added or removed. Please explain.</p>	<p>Land is added to the proposed new Claremont Park from the surrounding buildings to the north. Please see the main report for a discussion of this issue.</p>
<p>5. What do the developers mean by stating that Claremont open space 'could have 2 distinct levels'? How is this applied to the distinct woodland character sought.</p>	<p>Please see the main report for a description of the proposal for Claremont Park.</p>
<p>6. How will level changes and retaining walls be incorporated to prevent them from being a hazard for cyclists or pedestrians?</p>	<p>Officers consider that the design proposed will be safe for pedestrians and cyclists.</p>
<p>7. Who will maintain Claremont open space?</p>	<p>Claremont Park will be owned by LBB and the detail of the management and maintenance is still to be agreed. The applicant has suggested that they should be responsible for a period of two years.</p>
<p>8. There are too many proposed footpaths for a small open space. There needs to be less pathways and more open space. Furthermore, there is no direct route through the open space. It is important to know that this space is currently used by residents to cut across to access Claremont Road, if there is no direct route it would be difficult for elderly pedestrians.</p>	<p>The design of routes through Claremont Park should be considered in relation to future phases of the BXC development – including access to the new Thameslink Station.</p> <p>The network of footpaths is currently under consideration as part of the Area Wide Walking and Cycling Study and the Phase 1 AN Pedestrian and Cycle Strategy. The paths proposed through Claremont Park are in accordance with these strategies.</p>
<p>9. Are all the foot paths and areas with hard standing permeable? There are many problems with flooding and drainage in this particular area.</p>	<p>Please see the main report for a discussion of the drainage issues.</p>

<p>10. The main entrances at either end of the open space have a lot of hard surfacing. What is the reason for this?</p>	<p>These proposed gateways to the park are considered appropriate. Particularly in relation to future phases of the BXC development.</p>
<p>11. Can it be justified why there are so many entrances to the open space on the north side? There is less play area and more hard surfaces.</p>	<p>Please see the answer to question 8 above.</p>
<p>12. Why is there a temporary embankment on the north side of the park? How long will this embankment be there for and will it be replaced by?</p>	<p>Please see discussion of this issue in the main report.</p>
<p>13. The proposed planting along the boundary of the south side of Claremont Park will allow usage by rough sleepers. What measures are proposed to prevent this?</p>	<p>The current proposals have considered this aspect and the shrubbery will be reduced in this area.</p> <p>Increased activity in the area should also help to reduce a range of anti-social behaviours.</p>
<p>14. It is proposed that the remainder of Claremont Park will be developed during phase 5. Will Argent be able to make changes to the master plan? And what will be proposed to safeguard the future additions of the park?</p>	<p>It is assumed that this is a reference to the industrial building to the north of Brent Terrace that will be retained in Phase 1AN but will eventually form the link between Claremont Park and Brent Terrace Park.</p> <p>Detailed proposal will be brought forward as part of future Reserved Matter proposals for that particular phase and should be in overall conformity with the outline Master Plan.</p>
<p>15. There is hardly any recreational space or picnic areas. This space is not community friendly or multi-functional. Proposed design works against the encouragement of community activity dissecting the space into a series of hard standing zones.</p>	<p>The area is intended to be both multi-functional and community friendly. Please see the main report for details.</p>

<p>16. The level of planting and hardstanding should be reduced to widen the scope for community activity; this would help to improve safety for local residents and allow sufficient space for recreational walkers and runners.</p>	<p>Officers consider that an appropriate balance has been struck between planting and hard standing.</p>
<p><i>Question in relation to both Clitterhouse Playing Fields and Claremont Open Space:</i></p> <p>1. Clitterhouse Playing Fields are identified as being a community parks on Parameter Plan 002 and Claremont Park is identified as a Neighbourhood Park. Why are they designated differently and what is the difference?</p>	<p>These designations relate to the functions of various open spaces across the BX area developed as part of the original Master Plan.</p>
<p>2. It is significant to understand that these open spaces are recognised as an important gateway to the southern development and integrated into the wider scheme; can assurance be provided that these considerations have been thought through?</p>	<p>These proposals are consistent with the original Master Plan. Please see the main report for discussion in relation to this issue.</p>
<p><u>RMA Submission Consultation:</u></p>	
<p>1. The planning authority has unreasonably validated this RMA application. The short consultation period between has not allowed local residents to fully consider and comment on the impacts of the proposed development. The timescale provided is unreasonable making this consultation period an unfair process.</p>	<p>The consultation periods exceeded the statutory minimum. Please see the main report for details.</p>

<p>2. No reasonable adjustments have been made for those residents for whom English is not their first language.</p>	<p>It is not Council policy to provide translations of planning documents.</p>
<p>3. There has been a lack of public consultation and not enough effort has been made to engage with local people in the park's design. Now the southern development partner has been selected, plans should be developed through consultation</p>	<p>Consultation has been carried out by the applicant and by the Council in relation to the approved Master Plan. Specific consultation has been carried out in relation to this Reserved Matter Application.</p> <p>Any future applications will also be subject to public consultation.</p>
<p>4. We were initially informed that four RMA submissions will be submitted. Could you explain the delay and whether the Local Authority has misled the public? Has the Local Authority not been able to validate or examine the RMA submissions? If this is the case could you explain how the public is supposed to comment and review these applications?</p>	<p>Please see the main report – including the summary – for discussion of this issue.</p> <p>The Brent Terrace Triangles RMA has been determined, the Clitterhouse and Claremont Park RMA is before this Committee for consideration and the two remaining RMAs were re-submitted in June are under consideration at the moment.</p>
<p>5. What are the risks that Claremont Park or buildings on the Brent Terrace triangles are never carried out?</p>	<p>This is not a question for the planning committee.</p>
<p><u>Compliance of the Proposed Development with the Outline Application</u></p>	
<p>1. It was impossible to comment on the 2009 Planning Committee as no one was permitted to take any form of notes. This action by the Authority is in breach of the Humans Rights Act 1998.</p>	<p>Many comments were made by residents and community groups on the 2010 permission. Planning Application and these were reported to the planning committee.</p>

<p>2. Could you provided an analysis and the relationship between this RMA submission and other relevant RMA submission and explain the difference between the 2008 Outline Planning Application, the Planning Application consented in 2010 and the Section 73 2014 Application.</p>	<p>Please see the main report for an explanation of this process.</p>
<p>3. Residents feel they have not been consulted properly and feel since the Southern developer has been appointed a sufficient period of time should have been given to review plans. There has been a lack of effective consultation and collaboration with the local community and park users.</p>	<p>This application has been submitted by the existing BXC partner and should be considered by the planning committee as submitted and on its merits. The proposed southern development partner has not been involved in the production of this planning application.</p>

<u>Support</u>	Officer Comments
<p>1. Some residents support the proposals submitted alongside this RMA application and have highlighted that the open spaces need to be improved. Clitterhouse Playing Fields in particular is regularly vandalised and suffers from fly-tipping and rough sleepers. The open spaces need to be maintained and provide facilities for the community to use.</p>	<p>Noted</p>
<p>2. In support for a wide range of sport facilities and Multi use pitches.</p>	<p>Noted</p>
<p>3. The proposal to improve Claremont Park will be beneficial to the environment and local area.</p>	<p>Noted</p>
<p>4. In support of the addition of a baseball pitch in the plans for Clitterhouse Playing Fields as currently there no facilities for baseball.</p>	<p>No baseball is currently proposed but the playing fields could be adapted to accommodate baseball as shown in the Design Development Report.</p>

Second Consultation Responses for Consultation Period Ending 5/06/2015

<u>Clitterhouse Playing Fields:</u>	Officer Comments
<u>Farm buildings</u>	
1. The use of the Southern two storey buildings as Council Maintenance buildings would have a significant impact upon the Clitterhouse Farm Project business plan. This could have a negative impact on the project's financial sustainability. We have explored the use of this wing of the Farm Buildings as a versatile space for renting shared desk spaces and studios to stimulate revenue and income to the business.	Please see the main report for discussion on this issue.
2. The developers initially acknowledged the farm buildings as a community asset. It was confirmed that the community farm group would be allowed to retain these buildings. The outbuildings around the farm yard work as a unit with the remaining buildings. They should be maintained as such.	Officers are not aware that Clitterhouse Farm has been registered as a community asset. Please see the main report for discussion of this issue.
3. The council are legally and morally obliged to inform the community regarding the proposed plans. They are legally obligated under the Localism Act 2012 to offer the community the chance to obtain the community asset and put together a suitable business plan.	There is no specific provision in the Localism Act 2011 which relates to consultation on green spaces. Section 122 of the Act inserted a new section 61W into the TCPA 1990. That section places a duty on developers to carry out pre-application consultation with local communities before applying for planning permission for certain types of development. Article 3 of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) Order 2015 states that the duty to consult introduced by the Act only applies to developments for wind farms. Since the Brent Cross scheme is not such a development, the duty to consult under section 122 of the Act does not arise. Developer consultation as detailed in the submitted Public Consultation Strategy is

	considered to meet their requirement to consult.
4. Why has it been proposed to use part of the farm buildings as a maintenance store and depot? Why not place the Maintenance depot on a more suitable site?	Please see the answers to questions in relation to the Maintenance Depot above.
5. How is adding a maintenance depot beneficial to the community?	The maintenance depot will provide a facility for machinery and operatives to allow the easy maintenance of the improved park facility.
6. The council's park team have stipulated a requirement of 269m2 of internal and external space; however, the red line boundary (General Arrangement Plan) represents a greater area, especially with regard to the external yard space. By taking a larger share of the yard space will ruin the historical space. There is no clear explanation and we are very concerned and require clarification.	Green Spaces officers have outlined to the applicant the areas they will require to operate an effective maintenance depot. This includes an outside area for the storage of materials.
7. Relationships have been developed with Middlesex University for a creative community on site. The revised changes to the RMA submission would limit the potential for community use and interaction.	It is understood that the community group are developing their proposal – including identifying sources of funding. The involvement of Middlesex University is noted and is welcomed.
8. We would like time for our architect to work in collaboration with the developers to draw up a design which caters for both needs and a design which does not jeopardise the future viability of the Farm project organisation but yet still provided the	The detailed proposals for the part of the Farm Buildings required for the maintenance depot is subject to a planning condition and will be coming forward at a later date.

necessary space for the parks team. The planning documentation produced fails to acknowledge the Clitterhouse Farm project or our concerns.	
9. The amended design should have been treated as a separate planning application	Please see answer to question 8 above.
10. The size and the scale of the proposed maintenance depot are unreasonable. The characteristics and court yard feature of the Victorian Farm buildings would be lost and it is a shame to lose a historical aspect of the buildings.	Please see answers to earlier question
11. The creation of a maintenance store and depot would create potential health and safety risks for anyone using the facilities in the farm project buildings; in particular if activities were offered to children. There needs to be assurance that machinery would not cause potential hazards or risks.	Noted. This issue will need to be considered further as detailed proposals for both the community use of the farm buildings and the detail of the maintenance depot are brought forward
12. .There has been a vast amount of consultation regarding Clitterhouse Playing Fields; however, there seems to be little evidence which demonstrates public engagement regarding Claremont Open Space.	Both parts of this application have been subject to the same amount of public consultation.
13. There has been a notable absence of site notices required under the Town and County Planning Act to alert local affected residents and other users of the facilities to this Reserved Matters Application.	Please see the main report for details of the number of site notices displayed
14. The re-consultation of this RMA submission does not clearly highlight the changes in the application. It appears time consuming to navigate the relevant	The covering letter outlines the changes made in the revised submission.

<p>changes.</p>	
<p>15. Concerns were raised that The Environmental Statement Further Information Report and supporting technical information saved under reference '15/00732/BXE' was not available to view on the councils website.</p>	<p>The case officer has not been contacted about this issue by any members of the public.</p>
<p>16. The revised RMA documentation illustrates that work on both parks will commence in September 2016. Presumably this means that both parks will be closed to the public whilst work is carried out. This will coincide with the construction work on the Brent Terrace green space triangles. According to the original conditions all these green spaces were not supposed to be unusable by the public. The Environmental Impact Assessment should have been updated to reflect this impact on the physical and psychological health impacts of the community due to the closure of all these green space.</p>	<p>This concern is noted. Works are likely to take place at the same time but consideration will be given as to how much of the park can be kept open.</p>
<p>17. Concerns have been raised by a sports development organisation. Consideration for minority sport should have been considered in more detail. It would have been beneficial if a full size court could be used for events, training and games for basketball.</p>	<p>Green Spaces officers have advised on the most appropriate configuration of sports pitches based on their local knowledge.</p> <p>It would be possible to use the pitches for other sports and the applicants Design Development Report demonstrate this.</p>