

<b><u>MEETING</u></b>
<b>ASSETS, REGENERATION AND GROWTH COMMITTEE</b>
<b><u>DATE AND TIME</u></b>
<b>THURSDAY 13TH JUNE, 2019</b>
<b>AT 7.00 PM</b>
<b><u>VENUE</u></b>
<b>HENDON TOWN HALL, THE BURROUGHS, LONDON NW4 4BG</b>

Dear Councillors,

Please find enclosed additional papers relating to the following items for the above mentioned meeting which were not available at the time of collation of the agenda.

Item No	Title of Report	Pages
1.	PUBLIC QUESTIONS AND COMMENTS (IF ANY)	3 - 18

Abigail Lewis [abigail.lewis@barnet.gov.uk](mailto:abigail.lewis@barnet.gov.uk) 020 8359 4369

This page is intentionally left blank

Public Questions – Assets Regeneration and Growth Committee – 13 June 2019

	Item	Raised by	Question Raised	Answer
1	13	Ms Emmanuel	<p>In relation to 5.1.1 of the report: Brent Terrace and the surrounding area has been subjected to the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A lack of enforcement regarding planning breaches, e.g. beds in sheds and HMOs.</li> <li>• A lack of enforcement regarding parking violations, e.g. parking on double yellow lines and on the verge.</li> <li>• A lack of enforcement regarding bins in the road and on the footpath.</li> <li>• Increased fly tipping.</li> <li>• Unlicensed and licensed businesses operating in the road.</li> <li>• Residents feeling unsafe due to increased groups of strangers hanging around, since businesses have vacated the development area.</li> <li>• Stashes of weapons were found for the first time recently around the development area that has been recently vacated by businesses.</li> <li>• Reduced air quality due to dust from the railway sidings (since much vegetation has been removed) and due to Donoghues). Brent Terrace north has deteriorated over the last decade with exponential deterioration occurring in the last 2 years. The air quality is extremely poor, due to the</li> </ul>	<p>The regeneration of Brent Cross area will take over a decade to deliver and physical works have only recently started.</p> <p>During the time of the council and its development partners will be developing the area into a safer, more pleasant and better maintained area.</p> <p>The council undertook a joint department site visit of the development earlier this year and a number of improvements were initiated. This includes the following</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Agreement to increase enforcement action on Brent Terrace North. Initially through enforcement focus in the mornings between 8am to 9am to deter parking whilst commuters and children are walking to school and the bus stop.</li> <li>- A number of on the spot fines have been issued for illegal parking of skips along the road.</li> <li>- Illegal operation of a crane was observed by one of the businesses which was reported to the relevant enforcement team within the council.</li> <li>- A broken drain was raised with the utility company and has subsequently been fixed</li> <li>- More regular cleaning and damping of the road to be initiated.</li> <li>- Highways team agreed to review the road condition and fix potholes where identified.</li> <li>- Correction of substandard works carried out by developer contractors on Brent Terrace and re-establishment of hedgerow.</li> <li>- Working with the local police and development partners to ensure anti-social and illegal activities in the area are reported and acted upon as quickly as possible.</li> </ul> <p>All contractors on the Thameslink scheme, which is under the councils direct control, are enrolled on the considerate constructors scheme and will be reviewed throughout the development with reports on</p>

**Public Questions – Assets Regeneration and Growth Committee – 13 June 2019**

			<p>piles of dirt along the road side, dust and debris being blown (and swept) off various waste sites. In addition, cement dust from the 2 cement works is adding to the poor air quality, despite these 2 sites apparently passing their inspections in October 2018.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The impending loss of the Brent Terrace green space triangles and other green spaces.</li> <li>• The recent incident in which 1 neighbour stabbed another due to ongoing animosity regarding parking, bins on the footpath and garden boundaries.</li> </ul> <p>Most of these aspects have worsened since the BXC development commenced. Please explain how this could be described as an example of ‘the responsible delivery of LB Barnet’s major regeneration schemes’ and how this contributes to the ‘safety’ of our community, helps to provide ‘a pleasant, well maintained borough’ and helps residents to ‘live happy, healthy lives’.</p>	<p>performance received by the council. Action plans will be put in place where improvements are required.</p>
2	11	MsThomas	<p>Growth Strategy, in the foreword, the Leader manages to highlight ‘extensive green spaces’ as a reason for people wishing to live in the Borough. This being distinct from open spaces. That there is a difference was also identified at recent Environment Committee.</p> <p>- Can there be consistency across regeneration and growth documentation to distinguish green space and open space?</p>	<p>The ‘greenspace’ definition, as set out in the council’s ‘Parks and Open Spaces Strategy’ includes parks, playgrounds, sports sites, natural and semi natural greenspaces and other miscellaneous. Open space is a wider term which encompasses land and water. . We will review the Growth Strategy documents and ensure that the final version will include a glossary of terms. We will ensure more consistency in terminology across regeneration and growth documents moving forward.</p> <p>The Outline planning permission for the regeneration of Brent Cross</p>

## Public Questions – Assets Regeneration and Growth Committee – 13 June 2019

			<p>This is particularly an issue for Brent Cross Cricklewood where there is a quantum loss of green space.</p>	<p>Cricklewood was first approved in 2010 (planning reference C/17559/08) and amended in 2014 through a Section 73 application (planning reference F04687/14). Alongside all of the other benefits the development will bring, the approved scheme will result in an overall increase in public open space of 8.76ha. The planning permission sets out a series of parameters and controls for the approved development. Parameter Plan 003 identifies the approximate location of new and retained open spaces, which achieves an area of 34.22ha. This exceeds the existing provision of open space within the regeneration area which equates to 25.46ha.</p> <p>The 2010 and 2014 applications were both accompanied by Environmental Statements which assessed the total quantum of open space lost and proposed. A further detailed site measurement survey of the existing open spaces within the planning application boundary was carried out pursuant to condition 2.3 of the 2014 Section 73 Permission (planning reference 14/07888/CON).</p> <p>Table 5 within the Revised Development and Specification Framework, which is one of the control documents for the permission, sets out a schedule of existing spaces and new spaces to be delivered as part of the development. The new development will include a range of different parks and spaces to suit different needs and requirements. Some of these will be public squares at key places within the new town centre, some are large green spaces such as Clitterhouse Playing Fields and new neighbourhood parks, and some will be smaller pocket parks. There is further guidance within the Revised Public Realm and Open Space Strategy which was submitted as supporting information with the original application.</p> <p>The approved BXC development will result in the loss of existing Clarefield Park and small open spaces off Brent Terrace, but this is mitigated by the provision of new spaces and improvements to existing, under-utilised parks and spaces in the area. An area of temporary open space (circa 0.8 ha) off Claremont Way will be provided before any existing spaces are closed. Claremont Open Space will be enlarged and</p>
--	--	--	--	---

**Public Questions – Assets Regeneration and Growth Committee – 13 June 2019**

				enhanced to create a new Neighbourhood Park in the first phase of the Brent Cross South part of the development. Clitterhouse Playing Fields will be transformed with new and improved sports facilities and children’s play facilities. Millennium Green in the south of the development will be reconfigured and slightly increased in size from 0.43 ha to 0.48 ha. It should be noted that as this is an outline planning permission, the detailed design and size of each open space will be subject to reserved matters and other matters applications.
3	10	Mr Mr Levy	<p>You claim “The development of Brent Cross Cricklewood will deliver at least 7,500 new homes and employment space for up to 27,000 new jobs. At least 15% of new homes provided will be affordable in addition to the replacement homes for Whitefield Estate.” (full report)</p> <p>Part 1: What is the audit trail that allows you to claim “27,000” jobs? Also, since some would have been retail, what is the audit trail showing how many are full-time?</p> <p>Are you saying the “15%” affordable target will indefinitely remain (until 2031 anyway) unmodified by more recent planning policies, for instance, those within the draft new London Plan?</p>	<p>This information is referenced through the planning documentation submitted in support of the BXC scheme. An update note will be prepared and reported to the next committee. The affordable housing targets are established within the S73 planning permission granted in 2014. This is the minimum requirement the development will deliver with a site-wide target of 30%. The permission requires the Developers to carry out a viability review before reserved matters for each Phase of the development can be submitted. This review is checked by the LPA in consultation with the GLA.</p>
4	12	Mr Roots	<p>Post Decision Implementation'. Next to last on the list of actions is 'public consultation as soon as possible'. Considering the scale and impact of this scheme on the residents of Hendon, why has no opportunity been given for a public consultation 'pre-decision'?</p>	<p>First stage Options appraisals only have been carried out to date. At this very early stage there are several options and the decision required at this stage is merely to establish the principle of investigating the business case further. Once we have a more concrete business case that passes viability tests we will consult at the appropriate time.</p>

**Public Questions – Assets Regeneration and Growth Committee – 13 June 2019**

5	13	Ms Emmanuel	<p>5.7.3 The BXC regeneration team met with residents from Brent Terrace to discuss plans and will continue to meet monthly. The IPMO is coordinating the action plan for concerns and issues raised by residents that fall within the BXC area that require a council service response.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Brent Terrace residents met with the BXC regeneration team on 16.04.19, as we have done in the past. As in the past, we were promised various documents (e.g. the integrated schedule of works and answers to a series of questions) which we requesting more than 6 months ago. We were promised these again, but we have yet to receive a single document. When will we receive these documents?</li> </ul>	<p>The BXC level 0 programme has been shared on the 11 June with the Brent Terrace Residents Association (BTRA) ahead of the next meeting on Tuesday 18.</p> <p>A number of responses to queries were also provided with the invitation to the BTRA to review and respond with further questions where they require more clarity.</p> <p>The project team are working with development partners to ensure a better level of consistent communication is established with the BTRA.</p> <p>As well as the BXC programme update meeting on the 18 June, the BXT Thameslink team are meeting with the BTRA on Friday 14 to review progress on site and welcome questions relating to the sidings and station development.</p>
6	11	Ms Thomas	<p>Given the disclosure at recent Environment Committee that there are no penalty clauses within the current London Highways Alliance Contract used by LB Barnet. Before agreeing to extend those arrangements to vital Brent Cross Cricklewood infrastructure, what safeguards, or local variations to contract will LB Barnet/BXS JVLP ensure are put in place to ensure Conway Aecom deliver the Brent Cross Cricklewood area roads infrastructure to time, quality and cost? (paras 1.17-1.20)</p>	<p>Under the current LoHAC agreement, variations will be required through the process of issuing task orders to the contractor to deliver the infrastructure. This will provide LBB the opportunity to safeguard against the contractor underperforming, such variations will include delay damages and are negotiated through agreeing the task orders before commencement of work.</p>

**Public Questions – Assets Regeneration and Growth Committee – 13 June 2019**

7	13	Mr Levy	Since the last report on 25 March 2019, you have signed off the SPIR for studying the integration of the Dudding Hill line in and through Brent Cross West station (paragraph 1.31 onwards). Does the BCS study give equal esteem to 4-car and 8-car Dudding Hill line trains being able to use Brent Cross West station, since Network Rail has now conceded that the very same equal esteem applies in its own forward planning?	The design integration study is looking options to enable passive provision to be made in the new Brent Cross West Station. It is a technical report and will be made available to interested parties once complete. This includes TfL as project sponsor to inform the project going forward. An update will be provided to the Committee in September.
8	12	Mr Roots	At the end of the list is 'consultation with Ward Members'. Does this mean that, after all the decisions have been made, Hendon residents will then - post facto- be allowed to discuss publicly the scheme with their councillors, or does it mean that Hendon councillors, who have not been involved in this process will then, at last, be informed of its decision by the ARG? (I note that there are no Hendon councillors on the ARG Committee.)	First stage Options appraisals only have been carried out to date. At this very early stage there are several options and the decision required at this stage is merely to establish the principle of investigating the business case further. We are still therefore at an early stage, and will consult with Ward Members post ARG.
9	13	Ms Emmanuel	When is there likely to be progress to report to the Committee and interested parties regarding the relocation of Donoghues? Until Donoghues is relocated, what further measures will be put in place to further reduce the unacceptable level of dust on Claremont Road and in the air, as well as reduce the dirt and dust flying off the dirt heap under the plastic canopy on the Donoghues site?	The council has been meeting with Donoghue and the Golders Green Residents Association. Council officers are meeting with the GLA on 20 June 2019. An update will be provided to the next committee.



**Public Questions – Assets Regeneration and Growth Committee – 13 June 2019**

1 0	11	Ms Thomas	What proportion of BXS JVLP is owned by LB Barnet?	LB Barnet owns 50% of BXS JVGP. The report to the Committee on 17 March 2016 details the corporate structure (paragraph 2.21)  <a href="https://barnet.moderngov.co.uk/documents/s30516/Brent%20Cross%20Cricklewood.pdf">https://barnet.moderngov.co.uk/documents/s30516/Brent%20Cross%20Cricklewood.pdf</a>
1 1	13	Mr Levy	In paragraph 1.33 you say “The location being considered...”. Since the word “The” only means ‘one’, how is this a credible study between ‘alternatives’? Why isn’t the SPIR BCS money going to consideration of connectivity and integration requirements, developing options for linkage, and documenting outline cost implications? Also, what audit trail is there of any policy that justifies, including after the event, the rejection in the study of ‘unrealistic’ options?	More than one option is being explored currently as set out in the initial ARG update. Three options are identified and whilst the work has not concluded it is fully anticipated that any final report will set out reasoning for rejection of any options.
1 2	12	Mr Roots	When the agenda for this meeting was first posted , it had two enclosures, 13 and 14. Enclosure 13 was marked as 'restricted', but enclosure 14 was available for public view. Overnight, enclosure 14 became 'restricted', too, and disappeared. What possible justification do you have for that?”	Item 14 is a restricted item due to the commercially sensitive information contained within the report. Unfortunately, due to human error this report was published into the public domain for a short amount of time. Once the error was identified the access to the report was restricted. The impact and risk to the Council have been considered and appropriate action taken to resolve the issue.
1 3	13	Ms Emmanuel	West London Orbital Study (Report Item 1.3) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Will this study consider the cost to tax payers if the West London Orbital platforms are built as an add on AFTER the Brent Cross West station is built compared to the cost if the West London Orbital platforms are built at the same time as the Brent Cross West station?</li> </ul>	It would be premature to look at building the West London orbital platforms at this stage given that they are not at a detailed level of design and that there is no current certainty that the entire West London Orbital Project will proceed at this stage. The aim of the study is to look at potential linkage or connections between the potential platforms and try and reduce future costs however.

**Public Questions – Assets Regeneration and Growth Committee – 13 June 2019**

1 4	11	Ms Thomas	<p>How are Members taking account of, and providing residents with the assurance the increased financial risk to the Borough is being appropriately managed, given the increased reliance on grants and loans to deliver Brent Cross Cricklewood?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- What changes to governance are being put in place to oversee the increased financial risk to LB Barnet via BXS JVLP?</li> <li>- What formal arrangements are in place beyond the Shareholder Working Group? (paras 1.12-1.14)</li> </ul>	<p>The risks are set out in the Policy and Resources Committee in February 2019.</p> <p>The governance arrangements in place are robust to manage these risks, and will be regularly reported to the Policy and Resources, Assets and Regeneration and Growth and the Financial Performance and Contracts Committees. Beyond that there is an internal monthly BXC Governance Board chaired by the Chief Executive and the monthly Government Assurance Board with the GLA and HM Government chaired by the Deputy Chief Executive alongside the monthly project review meetings and Change and Decision Board.</p>
1 5	13	Mr Levy	<p>Regarding paragraphs 1.31 to 1.34 outside the borough, the LB of Brent is submitting a Local Plan for examination where it mandates only 8-car stations on the Dudding Hill line within Brent (perhaps with passive provision but still meaning that '4-car-only' station locations would not receive planning permission). The same planning policy of 8-car platforms is likely in the LB of Ealing at Old Oak Common Lane station, the interchange for HS2, and where Transport for London is already intending 8-car platforms on the adjacent North London Line. What is the policy of the LB of Barnet?</p>	<p>The initial view from the TFL's draft GRIP review is that no more than 4 car trains would be required on the West London Orbital Railway at this stage. We await the final TFL GRIP review report.</p>
1 6	13	Ms Emmanuel	<p>West London Orbital Study (Report Item 1.3) - Consultation (Report Item 5.7.10) - A series of public exhibitions were held re the final station RMA application, compliant with the Planning Act, at Claremont School and Clayton Crown Hotel. Brent Terrace is the closest neighbour of the new station and residents did not receive notification</p>	<p>As part of these events a direct invitation letter was issued to 42,000 homes and businesses across Barnet, Brent and Camden, as well as the events being widely promoted through Barnet Council's website and social media channels. As a result, these events were well attended.</p> <p>Brent Terrace was included in the mailing list and the council have received GPS tracking information shown the hand delivery agent did</p>

**Public Questions – Assets Regeneration and Growth Committee – 13 June 2019**

			<p>of these consultations. Why not? What will be done to ensure that Brent Terrace residents will be notified of the Station RMA to be submitted in summer 2019?</p>	<p>travel the length of Brent Terrace. Some residents of Brent Terrace attended the events and brought letters.</p> <p>Without signed for delivery there is no way to prove all letters were delivered through the door and this would be prohibitively expensive for mailing of this size.</p> <p>The council and project team are exploring better ways of communicating with key stakeholder groups including the Brent Terrace residents to avoid the possibility of missing key events and communications in the future.</p>
1 7	11	Ms Thomas	<p>How are Members seeking assurance as to the risk exposure of the Borough due to extensive seeking of Government loans and grants by Argent Related via BXS JVLP, rather than the intention to rely on developer investment? What arrangements have been, or are being, put in place to manage the risk in the event BXS JVLP is unable to repay the Homes Building Fund loan? (paras 1.11-1.13 and 5.4.9)</p>	<p>Please see response to Item 13.</p> <p>As set out in the report, the council is negotiating a Direct Agreement with Homes England to manage this risk. This will be finalised by the Chief Executive and Chairman of the Committee and subject to a delegated powers report in due course that will explain the arrangements.</p>
1 8	13	Mr Levy	<p>Regarding paragraph 1.33, will the BCS Dudding Hill line integration study be freely published “in July”, or what specific statutory powers does the Authority believe it has to lawfully keep it secret and only circulate it to Members (presumably embargoed to avoid it from being seen by the public)?</p>	<p>There is no current expectation that the report would be kept secret or embargoed. Indeed, officers are already considering how to disseminate the final report to relevant or interested stakeholders.</p>


## Public Questions – Assets Regeneration and Growth Committee – 13 June 2019

19	13	Ms Emmanuel	<p>Railway Sidings work (Report Item 1.21)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Please supply the measurements between the sidings boundary and the Brent Terrace garden/allotment boundary palisade fence.</li> </ul>	<p>The requested drawing will be provided at the scheduled meeting between the Brent Cross Thameslink project team and Brent Terrace Residents on Friday 14<sup>th</sup> June.</p>
20	11	Ms Thomas	<p>How is risk apportioned between BXS JVLP members? What proportion of the risk is borne by LB Barnet? And how will the risk be reported/reflected within the LB Barnet Report and Accounts?</p>	<p>The report to the Committee on 17 March 2016 details the corporate structure (paragraph 2.21)</p> <p><a href="https://barnet.moderngov.co.uk/documents/s30516/Brent%20Cross%20Cricklewood.pdf">https://barnet.moderngov.co.uk/documents/s30516/Brent%20Cross%20Cricklewood.pdf</a></p>
21	13	Mr Levy	<p>Does the Authority accept that the BCS Dudding Hill line report of paragraph 1.31 onwards is within the scope of the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe Convention on Access to Information, Public Participation in Decision-Making and Access to Justice in Environmental Matters of 1998, ratified by the UK, and ultimately policed by the Supreme Court? If so, how will you implement that, in terms of public consultation?</p>	<p>As reported this study is to establish if a future WLO station could be incorporated with the BXW station design. There will be no public consultation at this time however the report will be shared as referenced in answer to question 17.</p> <p>If the WLO programme does go ahead, then it will be for that programme to consult on options at the relevant point in time in line with the relevant regulations.</p>
22	13	Ms Emmanuel	<p>Railway Sidings work (Report Item 1.21)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Please supply a revised masterplan (or graphic) which takes into account the above measurements.</li> </ul>	<p>This plan is being prepared and will be shared once sufficiently developed.</p>

**Public Questions – Assets Regeneration and Growth Committee – 13 June 2019**

2 3	11	Ms Thomas	<p>How are Members assuring themselves that appropriate consultation and engagement of residents is taking place? (paras 1.16 and 5.4.11, 5.7.15, 5.7.3, 5.7.7).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Brent Terrace sits in the middle of the BXC development area and yet engagement is consistently poor, invitations selective and inaccessible, meetings inappropriately scheduled and questions remain unanswered.</li> <li>- The proposed BXN developments on plots 53 and 54 represent an increase of nearly 50% to the properties on Brent Terrace and will significantly impact the tenure mix. To date there has been no specific engagement of existing Brent Terrace residents. And work commissioned by L&amp;Q has already proven problematic, of poor quality, poorly scheduled and often unsafe. To date, there remains construction fencing abandoned on site attracting flytipping, with denials from L&amp;Q they are responsible for the site(s). See photo below.</li> </ul>	<p>The project team have arranged two meetings with Brent Terrace Residents. One with the Thameslink project team on the 14<sup>th</sup> June followed by a BXC wide update with the Regen PMO team on the 18<sup>th</sup> on June.</p> <p>One of the agenda items on the 18<sup>th</sup> of June will be to agree a regular series of update meetings with the Brent Terrace Residents. This will include more regular updates and liaison with L&amp;Q as the plots 53/54 developments come forward.</p>
--------	----	--------------	---	--

Public Questions – Assets Regeneration and Growth Committee – 13 June 2019

				
2 4	13	Mr Levy	The Dudding Hill line study ‘findings’ mentioned in paragraph 1.34 are “expected” to be incorporated. Does that mean they might not be? Does the Authority care either way? What is the audit trail of the preparation of the wording of paragraph 1.34?	At this stage the study is still underway and the conclusions are not set out therefore we cannot speculate as to what will be proposed and whether it will be taken into account in the Brent Cross West station design.
2 5	13	Ms Emmanuel	Railway Sidings work (Report Item 1.21) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Please specifically state/show what will occur now that there is no building space on the sidings land at the end of the Millennium Green; the original masterplan showed a residential building in this space, but there is no room for it now.</li> </ul>	The planning application for the sidings compound (18/5244/EIA) included a study titled ‘ <i>Brent Cross Thameslink Works Package B: Sidings, Brent Terrace Reconciliation Feasibility Study, August 2018</i> ’ which assessed of the effect of locating the sidings compound and the New Train Stabling Facility approved under planning application 18/5647/EIA, partly within the Brent Terrace Development Zone and whether they would undermine or prejudice delivery of the BXC Development. Specifically, the Study assessed the relationship of the entire sidings related developments with the wider BXC masterplan relative to the Brent Terrace and Railway Lands Development Zones, including the Spine Road South, Development Plots 38, 39, 40, 47, 48 and 55, and Nature Park 2 (Railways Lands Nature Park) and illustrated a number of permutations to demonstrate how the permitted floorspace,

**Public Questions – Assets Regeneration and Growth Committee – 13 June 2019**

				<p>infrastructure and open space provisions could be redistributed elsewhere within the Brent Terrace Development Zone in accordance with the approved parameters. Section 9 of the committee report for planning application 18/5244/EIA contains the assessment of the proposal.</p> <p>It is not clear what space is referred to, however for clarity, the approved sidings and compound do not impact Plots 31, 32 or 33 within the S73 Permission which are located to the north and south of Millenium Green. Nor do they alter the proposals to retain and enhance Millenium Green.</p>
2 6	13	Mr Levy	<p>Does the Aerodrome Road terminus in the Barnet LIP affect the BCS Dudding Hill line study of paragraph 1.31 onwards? Would a western-side station there instead of Propeller Way make any difference, since it would allow passive extension on new track to Mill Hill Broadway?</p>	<p>The idea of a study to look at a Colindale station on the West London Orbital has no relationship or bearing at this stage on the current Interchange feasibility study.</p>
2 7	13	Ms Emmanuel	<p>Railway Sidings work (Report Item 1.21)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If there is a loss of space for housing at the south end of the railway sidings, please state how many units were intended for this space and where these units will be built in the future.</li> </ul>	<p>The planning application for the sidings compound (18/5244/EIA) included a study titled '<i>Brent Cross Thameslink Works Package B: Sidings, Brent Terrace Reconciliation Feasibility Study, August 2018</i>' which assessed of the effect of locating the sidings compound and the New Train Stabling Facility approved under planning application 18/5647/EIA, partly within the Brent Terrace Development Zone and whether they would undermine or prejudice delivery of the BXC Development. Specifically, the Study assessed the relationship of the entire sidings related developments with the wider BXC masterplan relative to the Brent Terrace and Railway Lands Development Zones, including the Spine Road South, Development Plots 38, 39, 40, 47, 48 and 55, and Nature Park 2 (Railways Lands Nature Park) and illustrated a number of permutations to demonstrate how the permitted floorspace, infrastructure and open space provisions could be redistributed elsewhere within the Brent Terrace Development Zone in accordance with the approved parameters. Section 9 of the committee report for planning application 18/5244/EIA contains the assessment of the</p>

**Public Questions – Assets Regeneration and Growth Committee – 13 June 2019**

				<p>proposal.</p> <p>The S73 Permission does not specify a number of units for specific plots. Instead it distributes floorspace across the BXC masterplan on the basis of a series of Development Zones which reflect differing character areas of the BXC Development. This is then further sub-divided into Building Zones. Proposals must then accord with the controls in the Revised Development and Specification Framework, Revised Design Guidelines and the Revised Design and Access Statement.</p>
28	13	Ms Emmanuel	<p>Relocation of Whitefield Estate to Brent Terrace green space triangles (Report Item 1.16)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>When will L&amp; Q be meeting with their neighbours on Brent Terrace?</li> </ul>	<p>L&amp;Q are currently developing a communication strategy for residents and this will include engagement with Brent Terrace. L&amp;Q are most likely to meet with the Brent Terrace residents in the late summer/early Autumn this year.</p>
29	13	Ms Emmanuel	<p>Relocation of Whitefield Estate to Brent Terrace green space triangles (Report Item 1.16)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>When will Brent Terrace residents receive a schedule of work from L&amp;Q, since they have already started survey work without supplying this?</li> </ul>	<p>The soil investigate survey was used to inform the detail plans for L&amp;Q to start construction and this was a separate piece of work.</p> <p>As part of L&amp;Q's engagement with Brent Terrace residents, they will discuss their construction activities and provide information on the planned schedule of works. This is likely to happen later in the year and before the start of any construction works.</p>
30	13	Ms Emmanuel	<p>Relocation of Whitefield Estate to Brent Terrace green space triangles (Report Item 1.16)</p> <p>How many Whitefield residents will be relocating to the Brent Terrace green space triangles?</p>	<p>Whitefield Estate Residents living in Anderson, Rawlinson and Dyson Courts will be moving to their new homes in Plots 53 and 54. The total number of households is 46.</p> <p>This equates to 30 households on Plot 53 and 17 households on Plot 54.</p> <p>The total number of properties to be built across the two plots is 47 as this includes 1 investment property.</p>



**Public Questions – Assets Regeneration and Growth Committee – 13 June 2019**

3 1	13	Ms Emmanuel	Paragraph 1.2: The BXC joint venture can borrow £23m on a 'rolling' basis. What do you mean by rolling? Is it in the interests of the JV to minimise the loan at all times, given the 7% interest rate, and in the interests of the council to maximise it at £23m at all times, given it is a nice little earner?	The £23m is a loan facility to deliver strategic infrastructure within a phase, and can be “rolled” into the next phase by agreement with the council. The council is receiving a market rate for making this facility available.
2 1	13	Ms Emmanuel	. Paragraph 1.2: You have set out the 'amount' of the Social Infrastructure Fund, now known as the Strategic Infrastructure Charge (SIC) but the 'principle' of it has been exempt information since 2016. After three secret years, are you now able to relax and say what that 'principle' is, as was stated in 2016?	The principles of the strategic infrastructure facility are outlined in previous reports. It is a loan facility totalling £23m being made available to BXS JVLP at a market rate of 7%.
3 3	13	Ms Emmanuel	. Paragraph 1.2: Have you essentially been granted £97m and £320m (some repayable) money from the MHCLG, and then said you are prepared to loan up to £23m of the same money to the JV at 7%? If so, what activity by the JV is generating the 'extra wealth' to pay the 7% interest? Did the MHCLG know this was going to happen?	The strategic infrastructure charge (SIC) was approved by the Policy and Resources Committee in May 2016 and documented in Project Agreement signed on 17 July 2016. The £23m is not being funded by the HM Government Grant. MHCLG were aware of the SIC facility.
3 4	13	Ms Emmanuel	. Paragraph 1.2: Regarding your 17 September 2018 reference, have you had to pay any compensation mentioned in paragraph 1.66 to extinguish third-party rights, under the Housing and Planning Act 2016 Section 204, and is that subject fully settled now?	There have been no compensation payments made.

## Public Questions – Assets Regeneration and Growth Committee – 13 June 2019

3 5	13	Ms Emmanuel	Paragraph 1.12/1.13: (a) If the potential £125m Homes England loan facility involved Argent, they would own the risk, wouldn't they? (b) Has Argent refused to own any risk? (c) Why is it being transferred to the JV - just to get a preferential rate, or for other reasons? (d) How do you apportion the risk between the JV members? (e) How would the council's share appear in the council's accounts? (f) Who has requested that the council's land is used as security?	The report to the Committee on 17 March 2016 details the project and corporate structure.  <a href="https://barnet.moderngov.co.uk/documents/s30516/Brent%20Cross%20Cricklewood.pdf">https://barnet.moderngov.co.uk/documents/s30516/Brent%20Cross%20Cricklewood.pdf</a>  This facility is currently being negotiated. As stated in the report to committee it is market norm for land to be used in this way. The council is mitigating this risk through the Direct Agreement, which will be finalised by the Chief Executive in consultation with the Chairman of the Committee.
3 6	13	Ms Emmanuel	Paragraph 1.14: (a) In the sentence beginning 'However' are the two halves of the sentence two different risks or the same one? (b) Does the 'Direct Agreement' mentioned following that sentence have any connection with the 'direct loan facility agreement' of the first sentence of paragraph 1.13 or is it something different?	The Loan facility agreement will be between BXS JVLP and Homes England. The council may be a party to that agreement. The Direct Agreement will be between Homes England and the council to ensure that the project is delivered in line with the agreed delivery strategy which forms the basis of BXS.
3 7	13	Ms Emmanuel	Paragraph 1.14: Would a loan default by the JV mean the JV would definitely need to be 'wound up'? What accounting process would correctly describe that winding up? Does the JV have any assets to be distributed to creditors? What order would creditors be paid?	The agreements currently being negotiated and will be subject to a delegated powers report in due course.

### Request to speak

None.