

APPENDIX B – Schedule of Consultation Responses

Schedule of Consultation Response to Barnet's Sustainable Design and Construction SPD

Ref	Respondent	SPD Section / paragraph	Comments	Councils Response
1	Mani Hussein, Bestsafe Limited	General	<p>Barnet Planning is considered to be very difficult, much more over-zealous than other Local Authorities and tend to be over-bearing. Barnet Planning policies should be more relaxed, less draconian and aimed at accommodating the needs of growing population who require smaller / flexible dwellings than in the past.</p> <p>The sizes / dimensions should be much more flexible and smaller size rooms should be allowed.</p> <p>In Japan, people are sleeping effectively in "sliding horizontal draws", Planning must be much less restrictive and more freedom should be given to homeowners.</p>	The policy is in line with the minimum space standards that are set out in the adopted London Plan policy 3.3 and table 3.2. To ensure that development is fit for purpose and flexible which enables people to occupy homes over a long period of time the Mayor has introduced minimum space standards for development which Barnet will apply to all development.
2	Highways Agency, Stephen Nelson	General	We have reviewed the consultations and do not have any comment at this time.	n/a
3	Hertsmere borough council, Cheryl Maughan	General	With regards to the Draft Sustainable Design and Construction SPD – officers again consider that the document provides relevant and up to date guidance on best practice guidance regarding sustainable design and Construction. However, as there is a lot of information to digest, it may be worth including a sustainability checklist in the appendices that highlights the type of information/considerations that Barnet would like to see accompany and householder, minor and major applications. It is considered that a checklist approach would provide Barnet's requirements in a straightforward and digestible manner that could see the quality of information provide alongside future applications.	We consider that the more fluid presentation of the Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) gets Barnet's Sustainable Design & Construction priorities clearly across to developers. The more concise and clear SPD has removed the need and use for a checklist of all the potential requirements which may or may not be relevant to every development.
4	Finchley Society and HADAS, Peter Pickering	1.1.3	'Barnet's' for 'our'. This is a formal document, and should not be chatty.	The supporting text has been amended.
5	-	1.1.5	'complement(s)' on each occasion, not 'compliment(s)'	The supporting text has been amended.

Schedule of Consultation Response to Barnet's Sustainable Design and Construction SPD

Ref	Respondent	SPD Section / paragraph	Comments	Councils Response
6	-	1.2.1	'param' is not a word. 'factors', perhaps. In 6, 'people's', not 'peoples' In 18 and 19, 'it applies', not 'is applies'	The supporting text has been amended.
7	-	1.3.1	'issue' is not the right word here. 'section', perhaps. 'the opportunity to respond to the delivery of' is neither clear nor user-friendly language. 'a way of delivering', perhaps.	The supporting text has been amended.
8	-	1.3.2	Delete the otiose 'proposed'.	The supporting text has been amended.
9	-	1.4.2	'complemented', not 'complimented'. 'necessary' is a better word at the end than 'appropriate'.	The supporting text has been amended.
10	-	1.4.3	'March, not 'Mar' in the heading. Why both 'sustainable development' and 'the presumption in favour of sustainable development'? 'The heart of the NPPF is the presumption in favour of sustainable development' is clearer, shorter, and more user-friendly.	The supporting text has been amended.
11	-	1.4.5	The first two 'set out' phrases are totally unnecessary. I do not think 'opportunities' is the right word. Do we need 'Outer London' four times in two sentences?	The supporting text has been amended.
12	-	1.4.10	Do we need 'sets out' four times in this paragraph? The second sentence could read 'It is underpinned by the Three Strands Approach which provides the spatial vision.' If 'vision, objectives' in the first sentence were replaced by 'place-shaping objectives', the sentence beginning 'The DMP' could be dropped, producing a much tauter paragraph.	The supporting text has been amended.
13	-	1.4.14	'to' in the first sentence for 'we'. 'it', or 'that SPD' on each occasion for 'the SPD' or 'this SPD'. It is important to distinguish the two documents which are being consulted on simultaneously.	The supporting text has been amended.
14	-	1.4.15	Delete 'We consider that'; 'should' is enough of a hedge.	The supporting text has been amended.
15	-	2.1.3	'exemplary' for 'exemplar'	The supporting text has been amended.
16	-	2.4B	Is not the general glow which prevents Londoners from seeing the stars also light pollution?	Yes the general glow is a form of light pollution albeit the cumulative impact of human activity across the wider region. The intention of this guidance is to deal with any potential impact on residential

Schedule of Consultation Response to Barnet's Sustainable Design and Construction SPD

Ref	Respondent	SPD Section / paragraph	Comments	Councils Response
				amenity. A by product of this may help reduce unnecessary light spillage from a light fitting which could help reduce any contribution to the wider glow.
17	-	2.6.1	Is it not better public policy to encourage downsizing of dwellings as households shrink in size, and so reduce the need to build?	The Lifetime homes standard applies to all sizes of dwelling to help all household sizes to remain in their dwelling as their needs change. The standard improves the overall quality of development through making it more flexible.
18	-	2.7.2	'aspirations of', not 'on'	The supporting text has been amended.
19	-	2.8.2	second bullet point It is not clear from this sentence whether thermal bridging is a good thing or not.	The supporting text has been amended.
20	-	2.10.3	This paragraph could point the user to relevant sources of information like English Heritage's http://www.climatechangeandyourhome.org.uk/live/	The supporting text has been amended.
21	-	2.10.3	bis 'borough's', not 'boroughs'	The supporting text has been amended.
22	-	2.10.4	There is a garble in "Assessors then advise on other energy saving measures such as cavity wall insulation and heating measures and if the home cannot provide up-front funding then it will log the home details should funding become available in future." The first 'the home' is senseless, and what is 'it'?	The supporting text has been amended.
23	-	Table 2.10	Voltaic panels - it would help the user to be told where Article 4 conservation areas currently are.	The supporting text has been amended.
24	-	2.12B	2.12B is strongly supported, should be highlighted, and should be promulgated by the Council's planners.	Further detail on minimising construction waste will be contained in the North London Waste Plan.
25	-	2.13	Air Quality is very important. The Council needs to act on many fronts, not just in planning.	In line with the requirements the Council monitors air quality in the

Schedule of Consultation Response to Barnet's Sustainable Design and Construction SPD

Ref	Respondent	SPD Section / paragraph	Comments	Councils Response
				borough and the whole borough is designated an Air Quality Management Zone.
26	-	2.14	Recognise that natural habitats are not only affected by noise, but cause it (foxes barking and owls hooting in the night)! And also recognise that complaints about noise can hit business and jobs, as well as culture (church bells!)	The supporting text has been amended.
27	-	2.16 4C	Despite the heading, the text here says nothing about indigenous plants. It should.	The supporting text has been amended.
28	-	2.18.1	I thought the government may be abandoning the zero carbon commitment.	The definition of Zero Carbon was revised and announced in the 2011 budget in the HM Treasury: Plan for Growth. The revised definition is not a true zero carbon as housebuilders will only be made accountable for emissions covered by Building regulations and not unregulated emissions ie those emissions arising from homeowners use of electrical appliances.
29	-	2.18.2	'complements' for 'compliments'	The supporting text has been amended.
30	-	2.19.4	This paragraph could point the user to relevant sources of information like English Heritage's http://www.climatechangeandyourhome.org.uk/live/	The supporting text has been amended.
31	-	3.1.1	(and elsewhere) 'the council' for 'we'	The supporting text has been amended.
32	-	Glossary	The paragraph on listed buildings should perhaps use the more modern term 'heritage asset', as in the glossary to the NPPF	The supporting text has been amended.
33	HADAS, Peter Pickering	Section 2.16	There is an important omission from the draft Sustainable Design and Construction SPD P E Pickering (Vice-Chairman HADAS) Section 2.16 about the natural environment must be complemented by a similar	A new section 2.17 has been added.

Schedule of Consultation Response to Barnet's Sustainable Design and Construction SPD

Ref	Respondent	SPD Section / paragraph	Comments	Councils Response
			section about the historic environment, explaining how new development should respect heritage assets and archaeological priority areas, and provide opportunity for archaeological excavation. Paragraphs 126 to 141, and especially 141 of the NPPF and section 7.4 with Policy DM06 of the DMPD should be the basis for this section; it need not be long, but developers must be made aware of their responsibilities, and how best and most economically and sustainably to fulfil them. The SPD must not be silent on the historic environment.	
34	Middlesex University, Andy Karski, Tibbalds Consulting	1.1	Unlike the Residential Design Guidance SPD this applies to all forms of development, although the content focusses mostly on residential. Perhaps this could be more clearly stated up-front in the introductory section, 1.1.	The supporting text has been amended.
35	-	1.2.1	There is a typo in line 2 of para 1.2.1 – what does "param"refer to?	The supporting text has been amended.
36	-	2.7	We note that in Section 2.7 the London Plan standard of 10% of new housing to be wheelchair accessible is relied on in Table 2.7 for major and large scale residential development. It would be helpful for the document to acknowledge that specialist forms of housing will require different levels of provision and that the proportion of wheelchair accessible housing should reflect the specific nature of the development and its prospective occupants. Some housing for special needs may require more, while student accommodation requires less. Only a very small proportion of students at Middlesex University (or nationally for that matter) suffer from some form of disability (4% - 6%) and only a small proportion of these will suffer a mobility impairment (2% - 3%), and not all of these will require wheelchair access. The precise number for any development should reflect the characteristics of the target population, together with an aspiration to maximise opportunities for the disabled by generous, perhaps statistically excessive, levels of provision.	The supporting text has been amended.
37	-	2.8	The University supports the principles on energy use in new buildings set out in Section 2.8, but there are a number of points that are of concern. The requirement for 1 car parking space in 5 to have or be suitable for a suitable electrical charging point,	The supporting text has been amended to reflect paragraph 18.8.6 in the Development

Schedule of Consultation Response to Barnet's Sustainable Design and Construction SPD

Ref	Respondent	SPD Section / paragraph	Comments	Councils Response
			is too onerous as worded as this simply may not be feasible. This is already acknowledged in the Development Management Policies DPD where para 18.8.6 states that electrical charging points (and parking for bicycles) will generally be provided in accordance with the London Plan or as agreed in a travel plan. This should be reflected also in the second part of Table 2.8 in this SPD, where the qualification "where feasible" should be inserted.	Management Policies DPD.
38	-	2.9	The desired connection of new development to an existing or future decentralised energy network in Section 2.9 may be a laudable aspiration but, as the SPD acknowledges, it may not be feasible. The University welcomes the qualification in para 2.9.4 that "Where connection is not possible justification will be required in the Energy Statement." While the University does not object to the concept of future-proofing in design to enable future connections to be made to a decentralised network that will considerably post-date it, it objects strongly to any requirement to enter into a legal agreement to make such a connection. No prospective developer or owner would readily agree to enter into a binding legal agreement to make a connection to an unknown future network or energy centre where the costs and practicalities of doing so are unknown. The University would probably be prevented from doing so by its Audit and Risk Management Committee, and the National Audit Office would not sanction such risks by a public body. The reference to commitments to connect via legal agreements should be deleted from both parts of Table 2.9.	The supporting text has been amended to remove reference to commitments to connect being made as part of a legal agreement. A reference is still made to making a commitment to undertake future connections.
39	-	2.19	The University is committed to sustainable development and strongly supports the principles set out in Section 2.19. It has successfully achieved BREEAM ratings in excess of the Very Good minimum with its phases of academic development on the Hendon Campus, and would continue to strive for high environmental performance. It welcomes the recognition in this SPD that the achievement of Code Levels 3 or 4 for residential development may not always be feasible. It supports the use of BREEAM Very Good as the minimum standard to be achieved for major and large scale non-residential developments, and the encouragement to achieve an Excellent rating where practical. It welcomes the pragmatic recognitions that there may be exceptions	We welcome this support. The supporting text has been amended.

Schedule of Consultation Response to Barnet's Sustainable Design and Construction SPD

Ref	Respondent	SPD Section / paragraph	Comments	Councils Response
			to the requirement to meet the minimum standards, and supports the provision for justifying such exceptions in Energy Statements.	
40	Thames Water, Carmelle Bell	Section 2.11	<p>Thames Water supports the paragraph which acknowledges that water is a precious resource, putting an emphasis on the need for new developments to use water efficiently.</p> <p>Water conservation and climate change is a vitally important issue to the water industry. Not only is it expected to have an impact on the availability of raw water for treatment but also the demand from customers for potable (drinking) water. Therefore, Thames Water supports water conservation and the efficient use of water.</p>	We welcome this support.
41	-	2.15	<p>Thames also supports the above section on Flood Risk and Water Quality. We welcome the paragraph which highlights the need to improve the Borough's water quality and acknowledges that water is a precious resource.</p> <p>We support the references to SUDs in new development in appropriate circumstances. However, it should also be stated that certain types of sustainable drainage systems are not appropriate for use in all areas, for example soakaways may not be suitable in areas with high ground water levels or clay soils which do not allow free drainage.</p> <p>A well maintained and managed sustainable drainage system is also required to prevent it becoming ineffective, potentially increasing overland flows, and consequently having an impact on the sewerage network.</p> <p>We particularly welcome paragraph 2.15.2 and table 2.15.2 which makes reference to sewer flooding also known as pluvial flooding. In relation to flooding, water and sewerage undertakers have limited powers under the Water Industry Act to prevent connection ahead of infrastructure upgrades and sewer flooding can be caused when developers make connections to the existing sewerage network without proper</p>	The supporting text has been amended.

Schedule of Consultation Response to Barnet's Sustainable Design and Construction SPD

Ref	Respondent	SPD Section / paragraph	Comments	Councils Response
			consultation and authorisation from the relevant water company.	
42	-	2.18	Finally we also support table 2.18 and its target of meeting the code for sustainable homes code 3 rating as a minimum.	We welcome this support.
43	Canal and River Trust		I can confirm that the Trust has no specific comments to make on the documents.	n/a
44	Natural England	2.16	<p>With regards to the Design Principles in 2.16 we recommend that the following (underlined) is incorporated:</p> <p>□ A. Replacement and enhancement of natural environmental features <i>“Proposals should include an assessment of existing wildlife habitats and seek to preserve <u>and enhance existing habitats and features</u> or, if not possible, <u>measures are taken to mitigate or compensate for the adverse effects, such that the development will result in at least no net loss to biodiversity.</u> Existing mature healthy trees, <u>mature dying trees and standing deadwood, where feasible, should be incorporated into layouts rather than be felled due to the benefits that they provide to a variety of species.</u>”</i></p> <p>□ B. Green roofs, green façades and rainwater gardens – ensure that the built form of the development can contribute to the ecological environment. <i>The <u>built environment should aim to be permeable to wildlife, incorporating design features aimed at sustaining and increasing the population of particular species and facilitating climate change adaptation.</u> Any building or built structure has the potential to be designed or adapted to support biodiversity; in turn buildings can benefit through better environmental performance. <u>Green roofs, façades and rainwater gardens can help to attenuate water runoff, reduce the urban heat island effect, reduce solar heating of a building and provide habitat for wildlife.</u> The design of a flat roof in a development should use a green roof, which should be planted with sedums and native wildflowers, in order to provide sufficient foraging resources and structural variation for a range of species to colonise the roof.”</i></p> <p>C. Low maintenance, indigenous landscaping– <i>“landscaping should aim to choose</i></p>	<p>The supporting text has been amended and reference to enhance is included. Including a reference to ‘at least no net loss of biodiversity’ is considered unnecessary now that enhance has been added. For example if the land being developed had little value to start with then its replacement would also have little value whereas adding the enhancement clause gives traction to delivering a richer biodiversity, albeit possibly on less land.</p> <p>Explicit reference to dead and dying trees has not been included because it is not considered realistic for application in Barnet.</p> <p>The Design Principles text for B and C has been amended.</p>

Schedule of Consultation Response to Barnet's Sustainable Design and Construction SPD

Ref	Respondent	SPD Section / paragraph	Comments	Councils Response
			<i>plants which are beneficial to wildlife, require low levels of water and are low maintenance to enable the appearance, quality and amenity of the environment to remain high in low rainfall years. Consideration should also be given to the long term management of existing habitats, new landscaping and other biodiversity design features."</i>	
45	-	2.16 refs	<p>We would also recommend that you include the following references under 2.16:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. http://www.tcpa.org.uk/data/files/bd_biodiversity.pdf Biodiversity by Design: A guide for sustainable communities 2. http://livingroofs.org/ Living Roofs: advice, research and promotion of green roof systems for environmental urban regeneration 3. http://www.tcpa.org.uk/pages/planning-for-a-healthy-environment-good-practice-for-green-infrastructure-and-biodiversity.html Planning for a healthy environment: good practice guidance for green infrastructure and biodiversity 4. http://www.tdag.org.uk/trees-in-the-townscape.html Trees in the townscape 5. Sustainable Drainage Design and Adoption Guide 6. UK Rain Garden Guide 7. http://www.landscapeinstitute.org/PDF/Contribute/LocalGreenInfrastructurewebversion_000.pdf Local Green Infrastructure: Helping communities make the most of their landscape 	<p>The supporting text has been amended to include the majority of these references except for; Local Green Infrastructure: Helping communities make the most of their landscape as we consider that this will be better placed in the proposed Green Infrastructure SPD.</p> <p>Reference to Sustainable Drainage Design and Adoption Guide will be included in the relevant section.</p>
46	-	Appendix 3	<p>We would also like you to consider incorporating additional monitoring indicators for biodiversity in Appendix 3 that are more conducive to enhancing, as well as protecting, the natural environment, such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> "Number of developments delivering/providing Green Infrastructure, i.e. Green/Brown Roofs, SUD's, Living Walls". 	<p>The supporting text has been amended to include monitoring of green roofs with a target of all high density development to include some aspect of green roof.</p> <p>Once full implementation of the Flood and Water Management Act has occurred it is assumed that</p>

Schedule of Consultation Response to Barnet's Sustainable Design and Construction SPD

Ref	Respondent	SPD Section / paragraph	Comments	Councils Response
				SUDS will be monitored by the SUDs Approval Board.
47	Herts and Middlesex Wildlife Trust	2.11	Over abstraction of water is a major threat to the health of our rivers, in particular rare and vulnerable chalk river ecosystems. Urgent action is required to reduce the quantity of water we use in homes, businesses and industry.	Noted
48	-	Table 2.11	<p>Water efficiency targets are strongly welcomed by the Trust. However, Barnet is encouraged to consider whether more stringent, ambitious requirements could be put in place. The stated target of an average consumption of 105 litres per person per day (l/p/d) relates only to Code for Sustainable Homes (CSH) Level 3. Furthermore it is noted that CSH level 3 requires a maximum consumption of 105 l/p/d, not an average. It is recommended that 105 l/p/d is given as the maximum permissible consumption. It is also recommended that this requirement is reduced on a sliding scale over time, to drive efficiency improvements over the life of the local plan. For instance, London Borough of Enfield has placed a requirement of maximum water consumption of 80 l/p/d by 2016, in line with CSH level 5.</p> <p>The council should also consider what requirements can be established for commercial development, perhaps in line with BREEAM ratings (x% improvement against a suitable baseline).</p>	<p>The requirement has been amended to reflect the maximum target in the Code for Sustainable Homes.</p> <p>Introducing a sliding scale would go beyond the energy requirements set out in the London Plan. Doing this would require further justification to demonstrate that this would not impact on the economic viability of development in Barnet.</p> <p>Major commercial development is required to achieve a minimum BREEAM very good which includes a minimum water credit target.</p>
49	-	2.15	HMWT welcomes the content within this section, including the Water Quality Design and Construction Principles. Design Principle B in particular is welcomed, to encourage at/near source attenuation and use of SUDS. As well as their principle advantages for flood risk management and water quality, SUDS can also help improve habitat diversity and opportunities for wildlife in new development. HMWT would encourage the council to use policy to maximise delivery of co-benefits of SUDS.	We welcome this support. We expect that full implementation of the Flood and Water Management Act will help ensure the maximum the delivery of co-benefits of SUDS.
50	-	Table 2.15.2	HMWT strongly welcomes the requirement for major and large scale development to demonstrate how they have considered the drainage hierarchy, and the setting of the	We welcome this support. Replacing natural habitat with

Schedule of Consultation Response to Barnet's Sustainable Design and Construction SPD

Ref	Respondent	SPD Section / paragraph	Comments	Councils Response
			<p>maximum run-off rate equivalent to Greenfield rates. This should help ensure uptake of SUDS.</p> <p>It is welcome that all developments are expected to use porous materials for hard surfacing. However, HMWT would stress that replacing semi-natural habitat/soft landscaping with hardsurfacing has adverse impacts on wildlife, and should be kept to a minimum where required.</p>	<p>hardsurfacing/buildings can potentially impact wildlife and all major schemes are required to provide an ecological statement to demonstrate how protection of biodiversity and habitat quality will be achieved and where enhancement can be made.</p>
51	-	2.16	The Trust supports the content provided in this section, including the Design and Construction Principles.	We welcome this support.
52	-	2.16.1	HMWT welcomes Barnet's positive approach to ensuring biodiversity and habitat quality are protected and enhanced within development. In particular, it is good to see acknowledgement made of the other benefits biodiversity and the natural environment can bring, such as for health and wellbeing and ecosystem services.	We welcome this support.
53	-	2.16.2	HMWT agrees that wildlife can co-exist and flourish within the built environment, bringing many advantages to communities, providing that development is well planned and space is used to deliver a range of public benefits.	Noted
54	-	2.16.3	HMWT is pleased to attention has been drawn to the biodiversity value of residential gardens. It is welcome that impacts on residential gardens will be taken into account in decisions.	Noted
55	-	2.16 design principle A	<p>HMWT is pleased that the council recognises that most development sites have some existing and/or potential value for wildlife. Design Principle A is welcomed and supported fully by the Trust.</p> <p>It should, however, be noted that ecology assessments must be carried out by competent professionally ecologists, with appropriate qualifications, experience and licences (where needed).</p> <p>It is recommended that the document makes clear that all developments, even householder and minor schemes, may require ecology surveys and suitable mitigation, in order to comply with legislation and duties on local authorities in respect of protected species.</p>	The design principles have been amended and detail has been included under Construction Principles with regards to Protected Species.

Schedule of Consultation Response to Barnet's Sustainable Design and Construction SPD

Ref	Respondent	SPD Section / paragraph	Comments	Councils Response
56	-	2.16 design principle C	This principle is welcome in that it should contribute to improving resilience of landscaping in the face of changing rainfall patterns, and also help to reduce the need/temptation for additional watering from mains water supplies. We would welcome an expansion of the text, however, to emphasise the benefit of locally native species planting from an ecology perspective.	The design principles have been amended to include reference to indigenous species.
57	-	2.16 construction principle b	We strongly welcome this principle. In particular, it is positive that the council recognises that other features besides trees are important for biodiversity, including log piles. Ponds could also be emphasised, based on their value for wildlife, habitat diversity, amenity, and ecosystem service role (water storage and purification, environment cooling, etc).	The design principles have been amended to include reference to the importance of dead or dying trees as well as reference to ponds.
58	-	Table 2.16	Whilst recognise that details and requirements should be commensurate with the scale of development, all development should seek to provide a biodiversity gain. For example, householder and minor development could aim for biodiversity gains through small, low cost enhancements like bat boxes and biodiversity friendly landscaping.	The scale of requirements should be commensurate to the scale of development and it is considered reasonable to just encourage smaller developments.
59	Theatres Trust	2.8	<p>For your information and not a comment on the document, due to the specific nature of the Trust's remit, we are concerned with the protection and promotion of sustainable theatres and in delivering its commitment to sustainability The Theatres Trust has raised awareness of the environmental actions that theatres can undertake to organisations running all types of theatres, from small-scale modern studio theatres to larger-scale listed Victorian and Edwardian historic theatres. It is able to provide advice and comment on proposals for complete capital projects, adaptations to stages, foyer layouts, backstage facilities, management offices and building services, and relate this directly to the different types of performance on stage.</p> <p>Through its environmental sustainability work the Trust has showcased actions that commercial and subsidised theatres have taken to improve the environmental performance of building services and their resource management, undertake retrofitting and adaptations, introduce renewable energy sources, and plan for sustainability within capital projects. The Trust has just ended (December 2012) a</p>	Noted

Schedule of Consultation Response to Barnet's Sustainable Design and Construction SPD

Ref	Respondent	SPD Section / paragraph	Comments	Councils Response
			three year project delivering specific environmental sustainability advice to 48 London venues as part of an ERDF/LDA funded project, called 'Ecovenue'.	
60	Health and Safety Executive		We have concluded that we have no specific representation to make at this stage of your plan-making process. This is because there is insufficient information in the consultation documents on the location and use class of sites that could be developed. In the absence of this information, the HSE is unable to give specific advice on the compatibility of future developments within the consultation zones of major hazard installations and MAHPs located in the area of your plan.	n/a
61	London Wildlife Trust – Barnet Group	2.15	SUDS do not work well on Clay soils as permeability of local boulder clay to water is low. Hence over-dependence on SUDS is not a preferred sustainable route.	SUDS based on infiltration such as soakaways may not be suitable for clay soils and the text has been amended to note this.
62	-	2.16	Streams and their tributaries and adjacent valleys 1.1 The main rivers in Barnet are: Silk Stream/Edgware Brook, Dollis Brook, Pymmes Brook and Colne river, their tributaries and the damp valleys through which these flow. 1.2 Flooding is a serious threat with over 41,000 properties at risk of flooding to depths of over 0.1 m furthermore, some 16,000 properties are at risk of flooding to a depth of over 0.3 m (one foot depth). Source: Google "Barnet Rivers Environment Agency" or via this link: http://www.environment-agency.gov.uk/static/documents/Research/Barnet_2011.pdf 1.3 More details is given in Appendix item (1) 1.4 Our recommendations The lower regions of valleys should not be developed using non-porous surfaces such as roads, buildings or artificial turf unless adequate water-storage with slow release facilities are simultaneously employed. 1.5 Such water-storage facilities can take the form of open ponds which can increase biodiversity enormously – but these ponds must be maintained to remove accumulated debris. 1.6 The Dollis Brook valley along Barnet Lane should not be developed into an all-	Development proposals in areas at risk of flooding will have to comply with the established principles set out in the National Planning Policy Framework and previously PPS25: Development and Flood Risk which are replicated in table 2.15.2. Development will have to demonstrate a sequential approach to ensure that inappropriate development is not located in areas with the greatest flood risk. Surface water flooding is addressed through the requirement for major and large scale developments to achieve a maximum run off rate which is equivalent to green field rates.

Schedule of Consultation Response to Barnet's Sustainable Design and Construction SPD

Ref	Respondent	SPD Section / paragraph	Comments	Councils Response
			<p>weather sports pitch with artificial turf (Old Stationers Fields). The river has recently (January 2013) flooded over Barnet Lane, adversely-affecting the flow of traffic.</p> <p>1.7 The Ravenscroft school (now Totteridge Academy) should not be permitted to destroy an ancient hedge, nor develop a sports pitch in a field with a highly diverse flora. The methods proposed for draining this field will elevate flood-risk here and also downstream.</p> <p>1.8 The above two schemes should not proceed. Such developments so close to the Dollis Brook are unsustainable as they will not only encourage proliferation of similar sites in the Dollis and other river valleys.</p> <p>1.9 Furthermore, permitting the above two developments to proceed will render remaining undeveloped sites indefensible against further developments.</p>	
63	-	2.16	<p>Trees need to be retained and strengthened by new plantings</p> <p>2.1 These damp valleys with their trees and hedges not only confer higher biodiversity, but their vegetation also reduces flood risk.</p> <p>2.2 It is considered that soils with trees growing can absorb and retain more water than when trees are absent. Hence trees are important in terms of both biodiversity and flood-reduction.</p> <p>2.3 In addition the processes of evapotranspiration by trees and hedges remove vast volumes of ground water into the atmosphere.</p> <p>2.4 These damp soils allow an enormous biodiversity of plants, insects and bird life to occur. A glance at the damp sports fields even in winter time show an abundance of migratory birds from Scandinavia feeding on soil invertebrates on sports pitches.</p> <p>2.5 To retain high levels of biodiversity as well as reduce risks and severity of flooding, the following measures need to be introduced: To maintain as much natural ground as possible To retain trees and hedges within valleys even when streams are culverted To plant new stands of trees and hedges on valley slopes and to organise community planting schemes where individuals can choose trees and look after them – weeding around the roots and watering in drought periods.</p> <p>2.6 Planting of trees and hedges should be encouraged in streets as well as in public</p>	<p>Policy to protect trees and hedges is contained in the Development Management Policies Document Policy DM01: Protecting Barnet's character and amenity in parts j and k. The Supplementary Planning Documents aim is to expand on this policy approach. Further detail, particularly on trees has been added to section 2.16 including reference to hedges. A further Supplementary Planning Document on Green Infrastructure will be produced which will provide further detail on landscape including trees and hedges.</p>

Schedule of Consultation Response to Barnet's Sustainable Design and Construction SPD

Ref	Respondent	SPD Section / paragraph	Comments	Councils Response
			and private gardens, but also to minimise potential root damage to buildings and services. 2.7 There are few parks and open spaces have boundary hedges. This deficiency can be rectified. The notion that hedges pose Safety hazards may be an urban myth that needs to be explored and if untrue will allow (gapped) hedges to be re-instated or planted anew.	
64		2.16	Tree Preservation Orders need to be enforced to deter felling. 3.1 This may deter tree-felling as a preliminary step to secure planning permission by uncaring individuals. L B Barnet needs to start prosecutions against those who defy the orders and LBB needs to press for maximum penalties against offending individuals.	The Council prosecutes where it is appropriate and in the public interest.
65	-	2.16	4.1 Entire areas – woods, parks and other open spaces all need to be surveyed and up-to-date lists compiled.	A further Supplementary Planning Document on Green Infrastructure will be produced which will provide further detail on landscape including trees and hedges. Monitoring indicators will be included in this document.
66	-	2.16	Education - Wildlife and Countryside Act (1981) 5.1 LB Barnet needs to inform the public of their duties to protect wildlife – eg European Protected Species (eg Bats). This would enable L B Barnet to comply with Section 25 of the Wildlife and Countryside Act (as amended) 1981 – see the Appendix item (2)	The Development Management Policies Document references the need to protect individual wildlife species of national importance in paragraph 17.1.3. The SPD has also been amended in section 2.16 under Construction Principles.
67	Robert Newton	General	Mayor of London's Housing SPG. Amend all references to the draft Housing SPG in the main text and in Appendix 1 to those in the adopted Housing SPG (November 2012).	The references have been amended

Schedule of Consultation Response to Barnet's Sustainable Design and Construction SPD

Ref	Respondent	SPD Section / paragraph	Comments	Councils Response
68	-	2.1.1 and 2.1.12	<p>Between these paragraphs, add a new paragraph to read: "The Local Plan "Policy DM08 - Ensuring a variety of sizes of new homes to meet housing need" addresses the oversupply of small units since 2004. We will require developers to provide new homes that meet the housing needs of the Borough as is appropriate to the location of the proposed development and we will resist: a) Developments that include one person units except in exceptional circumstances, and b) Developments that provide second and third bedrooms with a floor area that is only marginally below the Table 2.2 standard overleaf for double/twin bedrooms but do not otherwise meet the London Plan Residential Space Standards for units with double/twin bedrooms." (Reason: To address inappropriate development proposals that seek to circumvent the London Plan Residential Space Standards).</p>	<p>Making the suggested changes would not be in line with the policy approach set out in the Core Strategy and Development Management Policies. The objective of DM08 is to provide housing choice to meet the aspirations of existing and future residents. The policy emphasises variety of sizes and mix of types to provide choice. Within that context Policy DM08 sets out our dwelling size priorities and is backed up by supporting text that states that the policy can be applied flexibly. Policy DM08 makes clear that family sized accommodation is the priority in Barnet.</p> <p>Development should meet the minimum space standards and room dimensions to deliver the Mayor's aspiration that homes are fit for purpose. Full justification will be required if these standards cannot be met.</p>
69	-	2.1.3	<p>Delete the first sentence of paragraph 2.1.3 and replace with the following two sentences: "Applications should demonstrate how these standards are to be met by identifying on the submitted drawings and/or the Design and Access Statement the size of each</p>	<p>The supporting text has been amended.</p>

Schedule of Consultation Response to Barnet's Sustainable Design and Construction SPD

Ref	Respondent	SPD Section / paragraph	Comments	Councils Response
			dwelling, the bedroom sizes and the number of persons to be accommodated. Where a development includes accommodation in the roof space, appropriate section drawings should be submitted."	
70	-	2.2.2	At the end of the second sentence in paragraph 2.2.2 add the words "and is applicable to all the habitable floorspace in new build development."	The ceiling height applies to a habitable room. Habitable floorspace and a habitable room are different.
71	-	Table 2.2	Under the section titled "Ceiling Heights" reword test to read: Habitable rooms in new build development are expected to have minimum ceiling heights of at least 2.5 metres and is applicable to all the habitable floorspace including in rooms in the roofspace. Habitable floorspace in rooms with sloping ceilings in development of existing buildings (as opposed to new build development) is defined as that with 1.5 metres or more of ceiling height	The existing text is considered appropriate.
72	-	2.3.3	Section 2 – Outdoor Amenity Space – Paragraph 2.3.3 – Page 14. At the end of the second sentence in paragraph 2.3.3 insert a new sentence to read: "Such a Planning Obligation is separate from and in addition to any Obligation that is required where a development is located in an area of open space deficiency".	The supporting text has been amended.
73	-	Appendix 2	Appendix 2 – Glossary – Habitable Room - Page 49. The first five words of the definition of Habitable Room should be amended to read: "A room within a dwelling"	The supporting text has been amended.
74	St George	2.3.1	St George would seek clarity in the wording and comfort that outdoor amenity space for flats can be provided through a combination of "communal space around buildings and/or on roofs and/or as balconies". The outdoor amenity space at Beaufort Park has been very succesful, in particular the semi-private podium gardens, it is important that	The supporting text has been amended to include a cross reference to the Residential Design Guidance which provides clarity on

Schedule of Consultation Response to Barnet's Sustainable Design and Construction SPD

Ref	Respondent	SPD Section / paragraph	Comments	Councils Response
			<p>a combination of external spaces is continued to be utilised in order to provide as much outdoor amenity space as possible.</p> <p>The wording that outdoor amenity space must be 'usable' contains a degree of ambiguity as the broad range of potential uses has varying space requirements depending on circumstance. We would suggest that the requirement for the space to be 'accessible' may be a more appropriate wording.</p>	the usability of outdoor amenity space.
75	-	2.4.3	We would suggest that further detail on the scope for the assessment of residential amenity is included to avoid ambiguity. We would suggest that the wording could read "proposals involving new lighting should demonstrate they will not significantly impact on the residential amenity of the proposed development."	The supporting text has been amended.
76	-	2.8.2	We would suggest that the provision to prevent solar gain in large south facing windows be extended to include "other suitable methods" beyond just shading mechanisms alone.	The supporting text has been amended.
77	Environment Agency	Table 2.4	We support the requirement for development to take neighbouring properties into account when considering light pollution. However, we would ask that this is expanded to also include a consideration of any sensitive natural areas adjacent to the development (e.g. woodlands, rivers etc.). The sentence could be re-worded as follows: "New development should take into account neighbouring properties, as well as sensitive habitats or species, to ensure that nuisance or detriment will not be caused from lighting during night time hours."	This issue has been addressed in the Residential Design Guidance and a reference has been added.
78	-	2.8.2	(part 3 (Be Green); third bullet): The second-to-last sentence states that an extraction licence would be required from the Environment Agency for an open-loop ground sourced heat pump. Whilst this is correct, an open-loop system would also require a discharge consent from us. Please amend this sentence to reflect this requirement.	The supporting text has been amended.
79	-	2.8 Useful references	We would appreciate a link to the 'Ground source heating and cooling (GSHC)' page of our website, which provides developers with information to determine whether a GSCH system is suitable for the location, best practice guidance and consent/permit requirements. The webpage is: http://www.environment-agency.gov.uk/business/topics/128133.aspx .	The reference has been added

Schedule of Consultation Response to Barnet's Sustainable Design and Construction SPD

Ref	Respondent	SPD Section / paragraph	Comments	Councils Response
80	-	2.11	We support this section. We are pleased that you have targeted residential development to limit water consumption to 105 litres per person per day.	Noted
81	-	2.12.3	(part A (Design Principles); second bullet): This bullet mentions moving waste from shops and offices to a central location for recycling. This bullet should be expanded to include the following details: "...can be collected. <i>Waste from shops or offices would be considered trade waste, so any movement of this waste would need to be undertaken by an appropriate, licensed waste carrier and taken to a permitted waste management site. An exemption or permit may be required from the Environment Agency for storage of waste at a collection point.</i> "	The supporting text has been amended.
82	-	2.12.3	(part B (Construction Principles); first bullet): This bullet mentions the use of demolition materials, such as hardcore, being stored and put to use in construction. The sentence should be expanded to read: "...effect in the new development. Activities that involve any form of treatment to make the material suitable for re-use may require an exemption or permit from the Environment Agency."	The supporting text has been amended.
83	-	2.12 Useful references	We would appreciate a link to the 'Do I need to apply for a permit or register an exemption?' page on our website in this list. The webpage is at: http://www.environment-agency.gov.uk/business/topics/permitting/32330.aspx .	The reference has been added.
84	-	2.15	<p>This section largely provides an overview of surface water flooding and SuDS, but does not consider sustainable design and construction in flood risk areas (flood zones 2 & 3 and critical drainage areas). Table 2.15.2 refers to the need for a Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) for sites in flood zones, but gives no indication of what would need to be considered and presented in any FRA.</p> <p>We suggest that a new 'Flood Risk and Flood Resilient Design' section is created for more specific detail (see below). We also suggest that this section is renamed: 'Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) and Water Quality'.</p> <p>There should be further detail in this section about the requirements of the Water Framework Directive (WFD), provided by the Thames River Basin Management Plan (RBMP) in Barnet. The WFD sets a target that all main river waterbodies identified in the Thames RBMP should achieve a 'good' ecological potential by 2027.</p>	<p>Further detail on what a Flood Risk assessment should cover has been added.</p> <p>Further detail on the Water Framework Directive, the relevant watercourses in Barnet and Sustainable Urban Drainage has been added.</p> <p>With further additions to this section it is not considered necessary to create a new section on Flood Risk</p>

Schedule of Consultation Response to Barnet's Sustainable Design and Construction SPD

Ref	Respondent	SPD Section / paragraph	Comments	Councils Response
			<p>New development and redevelopment can help Barnet achieve the requirements of the WFD by ensuring that the quality of water discharging from sites is of sufficiently good quality so as not to have a detrimental impact on the main rivers in Barnet. This can be achieved by maximising the use of certain SuDS techniques on sites (e.g. swales and detention basins/ponds), and by ensuring that adequate pollution prevention measures are in place where required.</p> <p>There are three main rivers in Barnet identified in the Thames RBMP:</p> <p>Pymmes Brook – currently designated as moderate ecological potential. It needs to move up one descriptive class to good potential. The brook is failing for the following elements: macroinvertebrates, levels of ammonia, levels of phosphates and levels of dissolved oxygen. The main reasons for failure are linked to pollution – both point source (e.g. sewer misconnections) and diffuse (e.g. urban runoff), and physical modifications to the brook.</p> <p>Dollis Brook – currently designated as poor ecological potential. It needs to move up two descriptive classes to good potential. The brook is failing for the following elements: levels of phosphates and levels of dissolved oxygen. The main reasons for failure are linked to pollution – point source (e.g. sewer misconnections), diffuse (e.g. urban runoff), and intermittent pollution incidents.</p> <p>Silk Stream & Edgware Brook – currently designated as moderate ecological potential. It needs to move up one descriptive class to good potential. The stream/brooks are failing for the following elements: levels of phosphates and levels of dissolved oxygen. The main reasons for failure are linked to pollution – point source (e.g. sewer misconnections), diffuse (e.g. urban runoff), and intermittent pollution incidents.</p> <p>We would be happy to send you the technical reports for the three main rivers (Stage 2 WFD reports) for your information and evidence. Please contact me if you would like copies of these reports.</p>	and Flood Resilient Design.
85	-	2.15.3	(part B): The first sentence is misleading by suggesting that flood risk should either be reduced on-site or downstream. The sentence should be re-written as follows for clarity: "Ensure that development has been designed not to increase flood risk either on-site or off-site and ensure that flood events will not lead to overflowing of the	The supporting text has been amended.

Schedule of Consultation Response to Barnet's Sustainable Design and Construction SPD

Ref	Respondent	SPD Section / paragraph	Comments	Councils Response
			sewers”.	
86	-	2.15 Useful references	We would appreciate a link to the Thames RBMP section of our website in this list: http://www.environment-agency.gov.uk/research/planning/125035.aspx .	The reference has been added.
87	-	New section	<p>New ‘Flood Risk and Flood Resilient Design’ section: We recommend that a new section is created to cover flood risk and sustainable design of buildings to ensure flood resilience, including taking the effects of climate change into account. We would be happy to help you with this section if required. We would expect this section to cover the following points as a minimum:</p> <p>Flood risk vulnerability classification and flood zone compatibility (as identified in the Technical Guidance to the NPPF: http://www.environment-agency.gov.uk/static/documents/Business/NPPF_technical_guidance_published_27Mar2012.pdf).</p> <p>Outline and requirements of the sequential test and the exception test.</p> <p>FRA requirements (http://www.environment-agency.gov.uk/research/planning/93498.aspx).</p> <p>NOTE: the first two rows of Table 2.15.2 could be added to this new section as they are focused on the sequential test and the need for an FRA.</p> <p>Ensure that development does not result in the loss of flood storage or obstruct flood flows.</p> <p>Ensure that any dwelling remains safe in a flood event, and that occupants have safe, dry access to and from the site in a flood event, or that a suitable evacuation plan is agreed with the Barnet emergency planners.</p> <p>Ensure that flood risk is considered over the lifetime of the development (typically 100 years for residential development), including the effects of climate change.</p> <p>Flood resistant and/or resilient design. Examples of such designs include raised floor levels, solid floors, flood gates, air brick covers, raised electrical points and electrical appliances on plinths. Details can be found at: http://www.environment-agency.gov.uk/homeandleisure/floods/31644.aspx.</p> <p>The use of innovative flood resistant/resilient design in redevelopments or conversions in previously developed sites in areas of flood risk.</p> <p>The following references could be used in this section:</p>	<p>With further additions to this section it is not considered necessary to create a new section on Flood Risk and Flood Resilient Design.</p> <p>Further references have been added.</p>

Schedule of Consultation Response to Barnet's Sustainable Design and Construction SPD

Ref	Respondent	SPD Section / paragraph	Comments	Councils Response
			<p>Technical Guidance to the NPPF: http://www.environment-agency.gov.uk/static/documents/Business/NPPF technical guidance published 27Mar2012.pdf.</p> <p>Environment Agency – FRA requirements: http://www.environment-agency.gov.uk/research/planning/93498.aspx.</p> <p>Environment Agency – Flood: http://www.environment-agency.gov.uk/homeandleisure/floods/default.aspx.</p> <p>Environment Agency – Prepare your property for flooding: http://www.environment-agency.gov.uk/homeandleisure/floods/31644.aspx.</p> <p>Planning Portal/DCLG – Improving the Flood Performance of New Buildings: http://www.planningportal.gov.uk/uploads/br/flood_performance.pdf.</p>	
88	-	2.16.1	We strongly support this paragraph and are pleased that the creation of new biodiversity habitats is encouraged.	We welcome this support
89	-	2.16.4	(part B): We support this paragraph and are pleased that green roofs are encouraged for flat roofs at developments.	We welcome this support
90	-	2.16 Useful References	We would appreciate the link to the 'Biodiversity, flora and fauna' section of our website in this list: http://www.environment-agency.gov.uk/research/policy/40131.aspx .	The reference has been added.
91	-	2.17.2	(part B): The last sentence of this part is misleading as it suggests that land contamination will never prevent development. This is incorrect, as there may be circumstances where land contamination may prevent certain development. As such, we would request that the sentence is re-written as follows: "Contaminated land will not inhibit developments where site investigation and, if necessary, remediation has resulted in a site suitable for its intended use."	The supporting text has been amended.
92	-	2.17 Useful references	<p>We would appreciate links to the following documents in this list:</p> <p>Environment Agency – PPG6 – Working at construction and demolition sites: preventing pollution guidance: http://publications.environment-agency.gov.uk/PDF/PMHO0412BWFE-E-E.pdf.</p> <p>Environment Agency – Managing concrete wash waters on construction sites: http://www.environment-agency.gov.uk/static/documents/Business/MWRP_RPS_107_Concrete_washwaters_-</p>	The references have been added.

Schedule of Consultation Response to Barnet's Sustainable Design and Construction SPD

Ref	Respondent	SPD Section / paragraph	Comments	Councils Response
			_June_2011.pdf.	
93	John Rosen Susan Rosen	General	<p>We have considered the proposals particularly with regard to Basements and would to add the following representations:</p> <p>The new rule adopted by the London Borough of Camden should be adopted ie that basement developers should pay for 2 basement impact assessments – one to be carried out by their own engineers and a second to be performed independently on behalf of neighbours and after consultation with neighbours before submitting applications. (In many areas of Barnet there is a problem with subsidence and with the water table)</p>	<p>The Strategic Flood Risk Assessment carried out in the borough in 2008 identified that flooding from ground water was found to be a relatively low risk in the borough. There is no evidence to suggest that this has changed since the assessment was carried out.</p> <p>The policy approach taken by Camden involves a screening process whereby the impact of the development is considered in relation to the ground conditions and the proposed development. In this context the specific ground conditions found in the Hampstead Heath area can trigger the need for a hydrological report. Barnet's approach set out in the Sustainable Design and Construction SPD does not preclude the need for a hydrological report and this will be determined on a case by case basis.</p>
94	-	General	<p>Barnet should also adopt the new planning policy of Haringey Council as follows: -</p> <p>(a) "A basement should only be allowed if the applicant can prove it will not harm the natural environment and neighbouring properties."</p>	<p>It is not clear which adopted Haringey policy document this detail is taken from but the potential</p>

Schedule of Consultation Response to Barnet's Sustainable Design and Construction SPD

Ref	Respondent	SPD Section / paragraph	Comments	Councils Response
			<p>(b) Surface flooding, ground water flow and land stability are just some of the aspects which will be assessed before building work is allowed to be carried out.</p> <p>(c) Applicants will also have to carry out hydrological and hydrogeological tests costing £5,000 to £15,000 if they want to build a larger type four basement.</p>	<p>impact of development on hydrology will be considered on a case by case basis as set out in the Sustainable Design and Construction SPD, the design of a basement is considered in the Residential Design Guidance document and the structural integrity of a development is covered by Building Regulations.</p>
95	-	General	<p>A condition should be made before permission is granted that at least 20% of the conversion works, which would also include other major works on the property than the basement creation should be deposited with the Council (of if the property is for example within Hampstead Garden Suburb Trust) to pay for damage to the road, hedges, greens, trees, neighbours property and neighbours cars.</p>	<p>Damages caused to neighbouring property, cars or the road outside the development site because of development would be a matter for the insurance industry and courts, where necessary. The planning system can control, where material to a planning decision, matters on site. Where relevant to a planning decision, off site a section 106 agreement can be signed but it has to be fairly and reasonably related to the development. It would be unreasonable to expect a developer to sign an agreement which anticipates damages. The party wall act is the appropriate procedure for immediate neighbours. The planning system can reasonably consider the hours of working and other construction management</p>

Schedule of Consultation Response to Barnet's Sustainable Design and Construction SPD

Ref	Respondent	SPD Section / paragraph	Comments	Councils Response
				issues such as vehicle access where there is a constrained site.
96	-	General	In many cases where basements are built the owner immediately sells the property making a considerable profit. Would the Council consider a rule to the effect that any sale within, say 5 years of the development, would be subject to some form of taxation or penalty for the capital gain?	It would not be legal for the planning system to tax development in this manner.
97	-	General	Where a basement is proposed in a very narrow road or in a cul de sac where it is impossible for any large lorries with skips and plant and machinery etc to turn without damaging roads, lawns, kerbs, pavements, hedges, parked cars of neighbours etc, such development should be refused bearing in mind that the time taken is often in the region of 2 years or more.	The supporting text and requirements have been amended.
98	-	General	The situation of any external Air Conditioning units should not be facing any neighbouring property, but should be preferably at the rear of the house under which the basement is being built and in a position least likely to cause a continuous nuisance from noise, air pollution etc.	The adverse impact of noise from plant is considered in section 2.14.