

Appendix 3
Consultation Responses

Report Section	Page No / Reference
<u>A: Report on Consultation</u>	4
<u>B: Report on Exhibitions</u>	4
<u>C. Petitions</u>	7
<u>D. Schedule of Consultation Responses</u>	9
<u>Statutory Consultees</u>	<u>Ref</u>
Natural England	1
Environment Agency	2
Highways Agency	3
English Heritage	4

Canal & River Trust London	5
Metropolitan Police	6
Brent Council	7
Camden Council	8
Barnet Clinical Commissioning Group	9
Haringey Borough Council	10
Holiday Inn	11
<u>Property developers and private enterprises</u>	
Intu Properties	12
<u>Residents Associations and Local Groups</u>	
Cricklewood Community Forum	13
Based on Friern Village Residents Association air pollution monitoring	14
Fordwych Residents Association	15
Cricklewood, Hendon and West Hampstead APTU station representative	16
Brent Terrace Residents	17
London Cycling Campaign	18
Federation of Residents Associations in Barnet (FORAB)	19

Mapesbury Residents Association.	20
Residents' Community Association Railway Terraces	21
Clitterhouse Farm Project	22
Dollis Hill Association	23
Green Party	24
Barnet Friends of the Earth	25
<u>Local Politicians</u>	
Darren Johnson AM Green Party Member of the London Assembly	26
Alison Hopkins Liberal Democrat Councillor for Dollis Hill	27
Cllr Javaid Ashraf	28
Cllr Shafique Choudhary	29
<u>Local Residents</u>	30-56

A: Report on Consultations

The Council has carried out extensive consultation on the planning application. This has included sending out consultation letters to more than 20,000 local residents and businesses, including the parts of Brent and Camden adjacent to the planning application boundary. In addition, 27 site notices were placed in various locations in and around the application boundary and a notice was placed in the local press. The Council has also consulted all the usual public bodies and interest groups on the application.

The Council held a public exhibition on the proposals at the Hendon Leisure Centre in the regeneration area on the 12 and 13 November 2013. This exhibition were attended by approximately 120 local residents and business and provided an opportunity to explain the proposals in more detail to local people.

In addition, the Council carried out a further round of consultation on 18 December for four weeks following the receipt of amended and additional information. The Council notified all the statutory and other consultees and those who had already submitted comments on the Section 73 application and in addition placed site and press notices in accordance with the Regulations.

All consultation responses have been carefully considered and where appropriate concerns have been addressed including through the planning conditions and obligations. Summary details of the consultation responses are included in Appendix 3 attached to this report.

B: Report on Exhibitions

A public exhibition was held on 12 and 13 November 2013 at the Hendon Leisure Centre between 11.00 am and 8.00pm. This exhibition was attended by approximately 120 people.

In addition to explanation of various aspects of the proposal the following specific issues were raised:

Open Space

- Opposition to the development of the open area next to the B & Q store on Cricklewood Lane. Local people value this area as one of the few areas of open space in Cricklewood Town centre and in addition a number of events have been held on this space since 2010 that have added to its value to local people.

- Opposition to the development of the Brent Terrace Triangles for housing.
- There appears to be a potential danger to wildlife in the proposals for the area north of Millennium Green and the green itself

Community Uses

- Requests to retain the Clitterhouse Depot buildings and to restore them to local community arts use.
- Need for space for the local community.

Whitefield Residents

- Request for more information on the timetable for re-development of the Whitefield Estate.
- A number of residents requested more information about their rehousing options and expressed concern about the uncertainty surrounding the Whitefield Estate.
- Existing owner occupiers expressed a desire to stay in the area or else receive an acceptable offer for their homes.
- Concern about potentially having to move twice.

Traffic and Transportation

- Concern was expressed as to the future loading and unloading arrangements for Carey Hall (58A Claremont Road) when the new Spine Road is in place.
- Concern about increased traffic.
- Concern about the future of Cricklewood Station. It must be retained.
- The need for more public transport provisions and the application of green measures to the impact of construction traffic.
- Missed opportunity to provide excellent cycling and pedestrian links.
- New Road bridges should provide a separate cycle lane.
- Brent Cross shopping centre requires a better rapid transport facility.

- Ensure that there is excellent signage for the station.
- Need for the provision of two BX platforms on the MML freight lines at the possible new station and need to clarify if Dudding Hill lines have joined the MML freight lines at that point.
- Transport proposals are dated and underestimate the use of the car, there seems to be an over emphasis on the bicycle and an absence of mass transit links.

Light Rail

- Support for a light rail link
- The proposed enlarged bridge for traffic at A41/A406 should not sever the possible route to Brent Cross Tube for light rail.
- Bridge supports for the new NCR Bridge should leave enough space for a future light rail on the south side.
- The current Templehof Bridge should become a pedestrian bridge to allow for a segregated light rail.

Waste

- Concern about possible pollution and traffic from waste handling facility and combined heat and power plant.

Materials

- Avoid white render and wood

Drainage

- Concern about water run off leading to the flooding of the sewer system.

All these issues are discussed either in the main body of the committee report or in the attached Schedule of Consultation Responses contained in the Appendix where key themes from the consultation responses are discussed.

C. Petitions

Two petitions have been received.

Petition in respect of site adjacent to B & Q in Cricklewood Lane (approximately 383 paper signatures and 265 on line signatures)

Objecting to the inclusion of the green space on Cricklewood Lane (adjacent to B & Q) as part of the Brent Cross Development. It should be preserved as green space because:

- It was provided as planning gain when Food Giant was built:
- It should never have been included in the in the wider application and is an attempt to get planning permission for this site by stealth.
- It has not been counted as green space in the planning documents so that its loss would be less significant.
- This is the only green space in the town centre of Cricklewood.
- There is no other space in the town centre which could be developed as an urban park or plaza.

Comment: The development of this site was approved in the 2010 permission and the Section 73 application does not propose any changes to the uses or quantum but does propose to bring the development of this site forward from Phase 2 to Phase 1 as it is a site on which it is considered that the early development of housing could be achieved. See the Open Space section of the report for detailed comment

Petition submitted by Brent Terrace Residents (approximately 150 signatures)

Objecting to the building of housing on the two green space 'triangles' on Brent Terrace for the following reasons:

- Local residents have never supported the development of these plots for housing.

- Green space is lost early in the Phase 1 but is not replaced until much later. If later phases to do come forward the quantum of green space will never be replaced.
- The spaces provide safe, local play areas.
- The Brent Terrace linear replacement space adjacent to the Spine Road is inappropriate as it is not safe for unsupervised children and is adjacent to what will be a busy road.
- The north triangle is the only area suitable for an air ambulance (as used on 3 November).
- The existing hedgerow is will be disturbed if housing is built here and this hedgerow is important for wildlife.
- Brent Terrace has a unique character, much of which will be lost through the development of these sites for housing.
- The scale and appearance of the proposed housing units will have an adverse effect on the existing railway terrace cottages
- The proposed number of units for this site will result in an over dense development.
- The additional housing units will create additional parking problems.

Comment: The development of these sites for housing was approved as part of the 2010 permission. The Section 73 application does not propose any changes in respect of the Brent Terrace triangles. The loss of the Brent Terrace triangles, the space alongside B & Q and Clarefield Park will be compensated for by the qualitative improvements to Clitterhouse Playing Fields and Claremont Park in Phase 1 and will be replaced in terms of quantity in later phases of the development when Brent Terrace Park and Eastern Park are provided. See the open space section of the report and Appendix 3 for detailed comment.

D. Schedule of Consultation Responses

Statutory Consultees.

Ref	Consultee	Comments	Officer Response
1	Natural England – NO OBJECTION	<p>Letter Received 25th October 2013</p> <p><i>Statutory nature conservation sites – no objection</i></p> <p>The proposal is unlikely to affect any statutorily protected sites or landscapes.</p> <p><i>Protected species</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This application has not been assessed by Natural England for impacts on protected species. • Natural England has published Standing Advice on protected species. The Standing Advice includes a habitat decision tree which provides advice to planners on deciding if there is a 'reasonable likelihood' of protected species being present. It also provides detailed advice on the protected species most often affected by development, including flow charts for individual species to enable an assessment to be made of a protected species survey and mitigation strategy. • You should apply our Standing Advice to this application as it is a material consideration in the determination of applications in the same way as any individual response received from Natural England following consultation. • The Standing Advice should not be treated as giving any indication or providing any assurance in respect of European Protected Species (EPS) that the proposed development is unlikely to affect the EPS present on the site; nor should it be interpreted as meaning that Natural England has reached any views as to whether a license may be granted. 	<p>The assessment of ecology and nature conservation presented in the RES 2008 (as amended in 2009) has been reviewed in light of the proposed amendments to the Consented Scheme, particularly the altered River Brent realignment and associated Riverside Park, phasing of the works and updates in respect of planning policy context. The baseline conditions have also been reviewed following a Phase 1 Habitat update and bat surveys of the Site. None of the aforementioned changes materially affect the conclusions of the assessment of ecology and nature conservation that were presented in the RES 2008 (as amended in 2009) that was accepted at the time of granting planning permission in 2010. Potential impacts on protected species were considered in both the initial surveys and also the survey update. The only protected species confirmed across the site were bats and the relevant mitigation measures have been developed and put forward in the application.</p> <p>The ecological assessment was based on a robust set of surveys, although some surveys were, for access reasons, undertaken during sub-optimal periods of the year. Most surveys were undertaken in 2006. However, repeat surveys, including a bat survey were undertaken in 2011. Bats were the only protected species confirmed on the Site as part of the previous surveys and the Site was revisited in 2013 to update the Phase 1</p>

		<p><i>Local Wildlife Sites</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> If the proposal site is on or adjacent to a local wildlife site, e.g. Site of Nature Conservation Importance (SNCI) or Local Nature Reserve (LNR) the authority should ensure it has sufficient information to fully understand the impact of the proposal on the local wildlife site, and the importance of this in relation to development plan policies, before it determines the application. <p><i>Biodiversity enhancements</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> This application may provide opportunities to incorporate features into the design which are beneficial to wildlife, such as the incorporation of roosting opportunities for bats or the installation of bird nest boxes. The authority should consider securing measures to enhance the biodiversity of the site from the applicant, if it is minded to grant permission for this application. This is in accordance with Paragraph 118 of the National Planning Policy Framework. Additionally, we would draw your attention to Section 40 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act (2006) which states that <i>'Every public authority must, in exercising its functions, have regard, so far as is consistent with the proper exercise of those functions, to the purpose of conserving biodiversity'</i>. Section 40(3) of the same Act also states that <i>'conserving biodiversity includes, in</i> 	<p>Habitat Survey.</p> <p>The updated Phase 1 Habitat survey did not identify any significant differences between the current 2013 baseline and the Phase 1 Habitat Map presented in the RES 2008 (as amended in 2009) for the Consented Scheme. The Phase 1 Habitat update found no significant habitat changes or other evidence indicating additional or repeat surveys were required in support of the s. 73 application. It is therefore considered that the findings of the 2006 ecological surveys, with repeat bat survey in 2011 and Phase 1 Habitat update in 2013, remain valid for the purposes of this s.73 ES.</p> <p>There are two sites with a non-statutory designation within the Site, including Clitterhouse Recreation Ground SLINC and Clarefield Park SLINC. The impacts on these sites have been assessed and measures proposed in order to mitigate for the loss of Clarefield Park SLINC and the intensification of recreational use in Clitterhouse Playing Fields SLINC. These measures have been developed to provide greater ecological value to both the SLINC on completion of the scheme.</p> <p>Measures have been proposed in order to mitigate against any significant impacts. Additional biodiversity enhancements have been incorporated, in particular the naturalisation of the River Brent and the biodiversity opportunities that brings.</p>
--	--	---	--

		<p><i>relation to a living organism or type of habitat, restoring or enhancing a population or habitat'.</i></p> <p><i>Landscape enhancements</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> This application may provide opportunities to enhance the character and local distinctiveness of the surrounding natural and built environment; use natural resources more sustainably; and bring benefits for the local community, for example through green space provision and access to and contact with nature. Landscape characterisation and townscape assessments, and associated sensitivity and capacity assessments provide tools for planners and developers to consider new development and ensure that it makes a positive contribution in terms of design, form and location, to the character and functions of the landscape and avoids any unacceptable impacts. 	<p>A Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment has been conducted as part of the assessment. The proposals respect the landscape policy framework and help advance the regeneration objectives, and as a consequence will deliver a wide range of positive impacts. The likely significant negative effects on the physical landscape as a resource are limited to the construction phase. Post-completion, the provision of an improved built environment and new landscape ensures that the limited negative impacts are reversed to give a positive effect.</p>
2	<p>Environment Agency</p> <p>No Objection subject to conditions.</p>	<p>Letter Received 20th December 2013</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> This letter intends to clarify our position with regards to the likely ecological impacts of this development, and our subsequent Section 106 contribution request. We acknowledge that this matter was not raised during our pre-application discussions. Due to the scale and complexity of this application, not all of these impacts were recognised at that time whilst we were working through other issues. If raised earlier however we would still have reached the same position and sought an offsite resolution. We agree that the proposed scheme is a great improvement upon the baseline situation, and we acknowledge that all development proposals are limited by their individual site constraints. The scale and vision for this site however offers a number of development options. The loss of approximately 40 metres of the Clitterhouse Stream and the increased number of bridges across the River Brent will have a negative ecological impact on the site in comparison to the baseline. The minimal buffer zone proposed between the River Brent and Prince Charles Drive and the A406 North Circular does not maximise the ecological opportunity available. It is for this combined ecological impact which will last the lifetime of the development and beyond that we are seeking this Section 106 contribution. Further explanation of these points in relation to your email is set out in the sections below. Paragraph 109 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), recognises that the planning system should aim to conserve and enhance the natural and local environment. Impacts on biodiversity should be minimised and net gains in biodiversity provided where possible. Paragraph 118 of the NPPF states that if significant harm resulting from a 	<p>Measures have been proposed in order to mitigate against any significant impacts. Additional biodiversity enhancements have been incorporated, in particular the naturalisation of the River Brent and the biodiversity opportunities that brings. The restoration of the River Brent presents a valuable opportunity of the s. 73 Scheme for nature conservation and biodiversity, and it is considered that the restoration will provide a benefit of up to Borough significance for nature conservation. It is considered that there will be a much improved river and ecological corridor arising from the development than exists now. Further to this, the Applicants have agreed to pay a contribution of £50k towards the costs of the Environment Agency in de-culverting of 160 metres of Clitterhouse Stream through nearby Basing Hill Park as a mitigation for the impacts of the scheme by improving resilience of the river corridor and providing refuge for wildlife and helping to reduce overall ecological impact of the development.</p>

	<p>development cannot be avoided, adequately mitigated, or, as a last resort, compensated for, then planning permission should be refused.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The suggested project for this Section 106 contribution is to deculvert and restore 160 metres of the Clitterhouse Stream through nearby Basing Hill Park. We believe this would cost in the region of £50,000. The project would improve the long term resilience of the river corridor providing refuge for wildlife, and helping to reduce the overall ecological impact of the development. • Environmental Statement (ES) did not determine the same negative impacts as set out above. The ES should assess the likely significant environmental impacts of a development. It is possible that these impacts were found to be too localised to have been considered. <p><i>Loss of approximately 40 metres of the Clitterhouse Stream at the confluence with the River Brent</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Water Framework Directive assessment (WFDa) considers the physical functioning as well as biological and chemical composition of waterbodies. It is unlikely that this loss of the Clitterhouse Stream would affect the status of the Dollis Brook waterbody or its reasons for failure. This loss of green infrastructure should instead be seen as an ecological impact of the development with long lasting consequences. • The stretch of the Clitterhouse Stream to be lost is described as “largely in culvert and of limited environmental / ecological value at present”. Perhaps for this reason the ES does not appear to make reference to the loss. Policy 7.28 of the London Plan states that development proposals should restore and enhance London’s Blue Ribbon Network by taking opportunities to open culverts and naturalise river channels, and by increasing habitat value. Development which reduces biodiversity should be refused. This is supported by Barnet’s core strategy policy CS 7 to protect existing site ecology, enable green corridors and enhance biodiversity. • Watercourses are vital in providing a variety of habitats for different species and helping wildlife adapt to climate change. River restoration is a key way to redress past ecological damage. We consequently would expect this watercourse to be deculverted and restored to a high ecological value through this development opportunity. Restoring this section of the Clitterhouse Stream would provide valuable new habitat and a refuge for wildlife. • Section 11.4 of the Environmental Statement Volume 1a states that the surveyed section of the Clitterhouse Stream is considered to be of local value for nature conservation. It goes on to say that the riparian habitat supports bird species that are relatively scarce within the development area and are of Borough importance for nature conservation. These statements illustrate the added value that could be achieved if this part of the Clitterhouse Stream were to be restored 	<p>The assessment of the loss of approximately 40 metres of the Clitterhouse Stream has been made on the assumption of the replacement of a section of a culverted watercourse with a naturalised river channel. This section is largely in culvert and of limited environmental/ ecological value at present. The proposed River Brent alignment will add a number of WFD mitigation features to the Dollis Brook catchment, which currently do not exist within the River Brent which is currently a concrete channel. We suggest there is a net benefit of WFD mitigation measures provided by the Section 73 scheme, and this will be demonstrated through the provision of the technical information that will be submitted to the LPA to satisfy proposed Condition 44.2. Measures have been proposed in order to mitigate against any significant impacts. Additional biodiversity enhancements have been incorporated, in particular the naturalisation of the River Brent and the biodiversity opportunities that brings. The restoration of the River Brent presents a valuable opportunity t of the Section 73 Scheme for nature conservation and biodiversity, and it is near certain that the restoration will provide a benefit of up to Borough significance for nature</p>
--	---	--

with new aquatic and riparian habitats.

- Ecological mitigation is required for this loss of the Clitterhouse Stream. As mentioned in our application response letter of 11 December 2013, it would be appropriate if other sections of the Clitterhouse Stream on site could be deculverted and restored. We assume that this is not feasible as it is not mentioned in your proposals, however we would welcome further discussion on this if you feel it could be achieved. We do not believe there are any other suitable opportunities to mitigate this impact on site within the current proposals. As such, we are seeking this Section 106 contribution.

Lack of adequate buffer zone between the realigned River Brent and Prince Charles Drive and the A406 North Circular

- We expect all new development to provide an eight metre naturalised buffer zone from top of bank in line with the Thames Region Land Drainage Byelaws (1981). We mentioned this several times during our pre-application discussions including at our meeting of 23 August 2013. Such a buffer zone at this location would provide the following benefits:
 - Biodiversity – space provided for riparian habitats to colonise and support a variety of flora and fauna. Such areas allow for the movement of wildlife and enhance their resilience to climate change.
 - Water Quality – a natural vegetated area will slow down and filter polluting run off from the nearby roads entering the river which suffers from poor water quality.
 - Flood Risk – increased flood storage capacity created, reducing volume and speed of flowing waters.
- Barnet's development management policy DM04 seeks to ensure adequate buffer zones are created, and that where appropriate, contributions towards river restoration and de-culverting will be expected. Barnet's Unitary Development Plan also specifies that the Brent Cross Cricklewood development must ensure adequate buffer zones are provided, and that opportunities must be taken to enhance the biodiversity of the area.
- We agree that the current baseline buffer zone to the River Brent is of variable width. Section 11.5.17 and Table 22.1 of the ES Volume 1a state that extensive natural riparian habitats are proposed upon the banks and adjacent areas of the realigned channel, which we fully support. To correct the terminology used in my letter of 11 December, rather than this proposal having a detrimental impact compared to the baseline, the proposals are preventing the river from achieving the better ecological outcome of an eight metre buffer zone as required by local byelaw. We would not expect this to have been included in the Environmental Statement. This will remain the case for the lifetime of the development. This combined with the other impacts

conservation. It is considered that there will be a much improved river and ecological corridor arising from the development than exists now.

The current baseline (the River Brent as it is today) has a variable and often limited buffer. It is against this baseline that the effects of the Section 73 scheme are assessed. However extensive riparian habitats are proposed upon the banks of the realigned channel. Further to this the Applicants have agreed to pay a contribution of £50k towards the costs of the Environment Agency in de-culverting of 160 metres of Clitterhouse Stream through nearby Basing Hill Park as a mitigation for the impacts of the scheme by improving resilience of the river corridor and providing refuge for wildlife and helping to reduce overall ecological impact of the development.

The measures that have been proposed and incorporated into the fundamental design of the River Brent diversion will, compared to the existing baseline, enhance biodiversity; improve water quality; and improve flood risk management. Additionally, the A406 will be resurfaced and there will be a noise barrier between Prince Charles Drive and the river. The air quality environment is not predicted to change as a result of the development proposals.

		<p>of this development have led to us requesting this Section 106 contribution.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There will be a noise barrier between Prince Charles Drive and the River Brent, and that the air quality is not predicted to change. We do not comment on noise and air pollution in relation to development proposals unless a permit will be required for the activity. <p><i>Increased number of bridges restricting movement through the river corridor</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There are 3 additional bridges in the proposed scheme compared to the baseline. We are pleased that clear span bridges are proposed to prevent obstruction to the River Brent, and agree that these should be screened out of the WFDa. Section 2.4.46 of the ES Volume 1a states that bridge abutments will be set back from bank top. The abutments are however still likely to fall within the buffer zone, and are physical structures which will take up habitat space and impede the movement of wildlife within these areas. Article 10 of the European Habitats Directive stresses the importance of natural networks of linked habitat corridors to allow the movement of species between suitable habitats, and to promote the expansion of biodiversity. Buffer zones should therefore be naturalised and kept free from development in order to facilitate this. This is a very localised impact of the development, however when combined with the loss of the Clitterhouse Stream and lack of adequate buffer zone, contributes to the overall ecological impact for which we are seeking this Section 106 contribution. Shading impacts from the bridges. We are satisfied that these will be addressed through the shading study specified in condition 34.4 of the 2010 planning permission. 	<p>The proposed bridges are clear span so there is no restriction of water flow up to and beyond the 1 in 100 year flood + climate change. Impact on bat movement has been dealt with through the biodiversity consideration in the landscaping of this corridor, along with the night time lighting requirements to make the new alignment attractive to bats. Movement of terrestrial fauna in general should be unimpeded by the clear span bridges and the abutments being set back from the bank top. Any shading effects on the river and the potential for fish movement impacts have been assessed and found to be negligible. In the urban context of the wider watercourse, some shading could be a positive attribute.</p>
3	Highways Agency – NO OBJECTION	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No objection to the proposals. 	
4	English Heritage - OBJECT (subject to amended assessment condition)	<p>Recommend Review of Archaeological Condition 43</p> <p>The Greater London Archaeological Advisory Service (GLAAS) has previously noted that the area under consideration includes the whole of the Archaeological Priority Area for Childs Hill where there is likelihood that currently unidentified heritage assets of archaeological interest will be discovered and some other area of possible interest.</p> <p>The National Planning Policy Framework (Section 12) and the London Plan (2011 Policy 7.8) emphasise that the conservation of archaeological interest is a material consideration in the planning process.</p>	<p>Chapter 13 of the s. 73 ES presents an updated assessment of likely significant effects of the s. 73 scheme on cultural heritage and archaeology.</p> <p>The RES (2010) included an assessment of the likely significant effects on archaeology and</p>

	<p>Paragraph 128 of the NPPF says that applicants should be required to submit appropriate desk-based assessments, and where appropriate undertake field evaluation, to describe the significance of heritage assets and how they would be affected by the proposed development. This information should be supplied to inform the planning decision. Planning consent was granted in 2010 subject to the following condition covering archaeological interest:</p> <p>43.Archaeology</p> <p><i>43.1. No part of the Development shall commence within any Phase or Sub Phase unless and until proposals have been submitted to and approved by the LPA for a Scheme of Archaeological Investigation to monitor development groundworks and to preserve or record any archaeological evidence revealed. The Development shall take place in accordance with the approved Scheme of Archaeological Investigation.</i></p> <p>Reason: To secure the provision of an archaeological watching brief to avoid damage to any archaeological remains.</p> <p>It is now proposed to amend this condition as follows:</p> <p>No part of the Development shall commence within any Phase or Sub Phase unless and until proposals have been submitted to and approved by the LPA for a Scheme of Archaeological Investigation to monitor development groundworks and to preserve or record any archaeological evidence revealed within the Phase or Sub Phase.</p> <p>In my previous correspondence related to the EIA Scoping Report I raised concern over the approach to archaeological assessment and mitigation. Those concerns are not allayed by the condition applied in 2010 which simply refer to a 'watching brief'. Whilst recommending that a condition was applied, my predecessor Kim Stabler did not suggest the wording used in condition 43, and specifically she advised you in a letter dated 7th May 2008:</p> <p><i>"However, at present there is not enough detail on the development phases to be able to design appropriate investigation and mitigation strategies..."</i></p> <p><i>In this instance, as the regeneration area is very large and will be developed in set phases, I would recommend that as detailed planning applications are submitted for each phase that these be accompanied by Archaeological Impact Assessments. These reports will provide detailed and specific information comparing the predicted archaeological resource, the levels of modern truncation and the impact of the proposals in those areas. I would not recommend to the Council that fieldwork be undertaken without further baseline data being made available."</i></p> <p>I must therefore advise you that I cannot support a presumption that a 'watching brief' would necessarily constitute either adequate or appropriate mitigation for each phase or sub-phase and moreover that a watching brief will not achieve the stated aim 'to avoid damage to any archaeological remains.' Rather I</p>	<p>cultural heritage, which found that there would be limited potential for discovering undisturbed archaeological deposits in the majority of the Site, which had been previously developed. It identified that the main exception to this would be the area of the Clitterhouse playing fields and Clitterhouse Farm, which had escaped major development. Although, it should be noted that Clitterhouse playing fields were converted to allotments during the 1940s, and as such were subject to significant ground disturbance. This intense cultivation, in conjunction with likely earlier ploughing, will have had some impact on potential archaeological remains. The playing fields have historically been subjected to impacts from re-grading and drainage with inevitable consequences for buried archaeological remains.</p> <p>The S.73 ES does assess the significance of the known and possible buried heritage assets on the site in some detail, as well as potential impacts on these assets (section 13.4). In acknowledging the lack of clear information about the presence of buried remains across the site owing to its current use, the proposed mitigation strategy clearly states the need for evaluation at each phase of project development (sections 13.5.3-13.5.5). The assessment and mitigation proposals as set out in the s.73 ES are therefore in keeping with the requirements of NPPF as has been recognised and accepted by Sandy Kidd at GLAAS.</p> <p>References to the relevant archaeological planning conditions were added into the s.73 ES chapter. Subsequently, GLAAS proposes the preparation of an Over-arching Scheme of Archaeological Investigation (OSAI) to provide the framework for a series of phase-specific archaeological impact assessments and targeted mitigation strategy. The OSAI should therefore</p>
--	--	--

		<p>would anticipate that for some phases it may be necessary to undertake evaluation fieldwork to inform the detailed design of development or identify the need for full excavation whilst in other phases some form of a watching brief may be appropriate or indeed no investigation warranted. As I have observed previously it is unfortunate that the ES did not clarify these points in order for all parties to agree on an appropriate zoned mitigation strategy rather than the piecemeal approach implied by the condition. I would strongly advise that the overall strategy is reviewed and refined before development starts - it is perhaps worth noting that an archaeological watching brief across such a complex project is simply not likely to be the most cost effective strategy for any of the parties involved and that my recommendations are aimed at providing clarity, focus of investigations and reducing uncertainty to the development process.</p> <p>My recommendation is therefore that the archaeological condition be amended as follows:</p> <p><i>Prior to the commencement of development an over-arching Scheme of Archaeological Investigation will be submitted to the LPA setting out the process for assessing and mitigating the impact of development on archaeological interest, including appropriate post-excavation analysis, archiving and publication.</i></p> <p><i>No part of the Development shall commence within any Phase or Sub Phase unless and until proposals have been submitted to and approved by the LPA for a site-specific Scheme of Archaeological Investigation to preserve or record any archaeological evidence within the Phase or Sub Phase.</i></p> <p><i>Each Phase or Sub-Phase of the Development shall take place in accordance with the approved over-arching Scheme of Archaeological Investigation and the site-specific Scheme of Archaeological Investigation approved for that Phase or Sub-Phase.</i></p> <p><i>Reason: To secure the provision of archaeological assessment and to minimise or mitigate harm to remains of archaeological interest.</i></p>	<p>result in more targeted watching briefs than the current planning condition tends to suggest, although as the letter from GLAAS highlights, it is also possible that in some areas it may be necessary to undertake evaluation fieldwork.</p> <p>The preparation of the OASI is likely to be of value to the Development Partners as well as to GLAAS. It should provide clear guidance to all stakeholders with regards to extent, nature and programming of archaeological involvement at each phase of the project as it goes forward. An amended planning condition is proposed.</p>
5	Canal & River Trust London – NO OBJECTION	<p><i>Welsh Harp improvements</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Suggests a £20k developer contribution towards a feasibility study for the implementation of a green walking and cycling link around the Welsh Harp and possibly link to green corridors across the development. • The Welsh Harp is a very important natural asset and destination for local residents and visitors to the area. These improvements would therefore provide a significant benefit to the local area and contribute to the network of green corridors across the development. This is likely to be necessary as a result of the 7,500 new homes and 27,000 new jobs in the area. 	<p>The walking and cycling implications of the development will be covered in the Area Wide Walking and Cycling study which is a pre Reserved Matters Obligation, and local groups will be consulted at the appropriate time. This will be followed by the Pedestrian and Cycling Strategy on a Phase by Phase basis. Consideration of links to the Welsh Harp will be included. A contribution is therefore not considered to be appropriate.</p>
6	Metropolitan Police	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As discussed with regard to the regeneration of this area and the outline planning application, there are no major concerns with the current development proposals in respect of Designing Out 	<p>Further discussions will be held with the specialist units of the Metropolitan Police as the detail of the reserved matters applications come forward.</p>

	Secured by Design – No OBJECTION	<p>Crime.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> To confirm there is a meeting taking place between the applicants/agents and specialist Policing Units on 13th December. Areas for discussion on the development proposals will be discussed at this meeting and I am grateful to yourself & the agents in accommodating this. I am heartened that any areas for further discussion following this update meeting will be acknowledged where appropriate. With further regard to Designing Out Crime measures, and as the development proposals move toward detailed plans I would welcome compliance with the ACPO Secured By Design (SBD) Scheme. SBD supports the Barnet Local Plan: Development Plan Document 2.6 Security in Design and 3.9 Secured by Design (adopted September 2012). Further, credits are available within the Code for Sustainable Homes for compliance with SBD New Homes 2010 Section 2 - Physical Security. 	
7	Brent Council - OBJECT	<p>Objections are raised on the following grounds:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Recent traffic surveys undertaken between July and September this year have not been included in the transport assessment which is considered vital. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Road traffic growth rates over the intervening five years (2008 to 2013) have been examined within the Transport Assessment submitted as part of the Section 73 application. Traffic volume data has been provided from Department for Transport and includes traffic volumes on individual roads including North Circular Road and A5. The data shows the North Circular Road and A5 to have risen by 11.1% and 7.1% respectively, whilst flows on other main roads in the area (M1, A41 and A407) have fallen. Additional detailed junction surveys were also undertaken in the area by the transport consultants during July and September, but the results of these surveys have not been included in the revised Transport Assessment. This is a significant omission given that the agreed EA scoping report stated that data would be gathered for the revised Transport Assessment. It is requested that these up to date results be made available now to give a firmer basis from which to draw conclusions regarding the growth or decline in traffic flows in the area since 2005 (particularly along the A5 corridor). Without this information it cannot be verified that traffic conditions have not altered significantly, particularly along the A5 traffic corridor. The shift in the construction is such that the third quarter of 2020 will now see the biggest impact – mitigation measures required to ensure not significant. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The impact during the construction period has been examined in more detail within the Transport Assessment. With regard to traffic flows, the peak period for construction traffic is now forecast to be during the third quarter of 2020. With the greater concentration of construction activity within 	<p>The road traffic flow changes and growth rates are discussed in the S.73 Transport Report contains up to date and appropriate survey data that has been used to assess the changes in traffic flows and this has been agreed with LBB and TfL. The detailed survey work referred to by LB Brent has been prepared to support the A5 Corridor Study and the development of the Detailed Design Model which will be used for highway approvals of key junctions, including along the A5. The LB Brent is a party to the Study and has been provided with the survey data referred to. The use of the survey data has been and will be as set out in the 11th September 2013 Planning and Environment committee report, and will also be used to inform monitoring of the scheme and will feed into the Transport Matrix.</p> <p>The Construction traffic will be generally confined to periods that are outside of the network peak hours and this together with the use of off-site consolidation areas and Travel Plans for construction workers will result in minimal</p>

		<p>the first phase of the development, peak construction traffic flows are now forecast to be higher than predicted for the original planning application and also higher than the limits set in the S106 Agreement (although they will then be correspondingly lower during later phases of the development).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In terms of impact on Brent's roads, traffic is now forecast to make greater use of the M1 and A41 at the expense of the A5, which would be welcomed although no reasons have been given for this change. Nevertheless, additional traffic flows through any particular junction in the area would remain below about 2.5% in the worst case, which is not considered significant. • To further mitigate impact, it is proposed to pre-programme deliveries to take place outside of peak hours and to use a Construction Works Travel Plan to minimise car use amongst construction staff. The scope for a Consolidation Centre and a Railhead Facility are also to be examined to further reduce construction traffic flows. • In summary, the additional construction traffic during Phase 1 of the development is considered to be an identified negative impact, but impacts are not considered likely to be great enough to give rise to significant concern, providing mitigation measures are implemented. <p>3. Reserving approximately £5m of the £46m of the transport fund to look at impacts to the west of the A5 to ensure impacts on Brent are looked at proportionately</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Results generally showed junctions in the area working within capacity following development, with the alterations to the development scheme having a negligible effect on results. However, as before, some capacity issues have been identified along the A5 corridor in the weekday evening peak hour and this will again need to be addressed in greater detail through the previously agreed A5 Corridor Study. To this end, work has begun to progress the study with LB Brent's involvement. • LB Brent requests the retention of S106 commitments to undertake further study of the impact of the overall development on the A5 corridor and to again provide a Transport Fund to undertake mitigation measures. Brent's requests that approximately £5m of the £46m of the transport fund to look at impacts to the west of the A5 to make sure impacts on Brent are looked at proportionately. <p>In addition Brent have asked that their objections to the 2010 application should also be restated</p>	<p>additional impacts on the road network when compared with the 2010 Consent. Developer funded on-street parking controls to deter commuter parking by construction workers can be introduced if necessary. The increases in forecast construction traffic in the S.73 are not significant in volume with a maximum weekday increase of only 29 vehicles.</p> <p>Changes to the CTF are discussed in the transport section of the report, but the £1.25m Adjoining Boroughs fund is unchanged. Moreover, and in addition to this, the A5 Corridor Study will inform whether there are any forecast traffic impacts that are significant on the local roads within LBB, LB Brent and LB Camden. These issues will also be addressed in the Matrix and Transport Reports (including Phase Transport Reports and Reserved Matters Transport Reports) as the development proceeds. The Developer has committed to fund any necessary supplementary measures to mitigate any such significant local traffic impacts so a separate fund is not necessary for this purpose as they will be covered if necessary in the context of approvals of the A5 Corridor Study and Transport Reports (and supporting planning obligations considered necessary at that time).</p> <p>Brent will be a member of the TAG under the proposed Revised S106 in the same way as under the S106 Agreement.</p>
--	--	--	---

BRENT COUNCIL OBJECTION TO THE 2010 PERMISSION

Letter to Barnet Council dated 07.10.2009 following receipt of full planning report

Following the receipt of the full planning report by LB Barnet's officers, Brent officers advised that whilst the response provides some comfort that the relevant information and mitigation could be forthcoming it is not considered to be sufficient to remove all the objections raised.

In particular in response to the main report Brent would like to confirm that while Barnet have stated that the proposed A5/Geron Way/Humber Road and A5/Oxgate Gardens/Link Bridge/Dollis Hill Lane junctions are acceptable, Brent Council does not hold this view and believe that the junctions should still be redesigned to ensure that there is no detrimental impact on traffic movements on the A5 and surrounding roads nor on pedestrian safety.

In relation to the proposed conditions and section106 heads of terms, Brent would welcome confirmation or clarification on the following comments.

1. Brent would seek clarification on its involvement in agreeing the geographical extent of a future CPZ as stated in the paragraph *Controlled On-Street Parking Zones* on page 250 of the main report where Brent is specifically identified but less so in the relevant condition and Heads of Terms.

2. As the impact of the proposed development on parking will not be confined solely to the development area it is important to ensure that mitigation of impact within Brent is recognised. To this extent Brent would need to be party to consideration of further CPZ development and implementation outside the development area through the Consolidated Transport Fund.
3. Confirmation is needed that Brent will be consulted on all Reserved Matters applications which have a significant transport impact on Brent and in particular on the Waste Handling Facility, Railway Freight Facility and Brent Cross Shopping Centre Applications and PTRs, and also all those when a trigger is reached. In relation to condition 4.2 we would also require further consultation on any amendments to the Indicative Phasing Parameter Plan.
4. Confirmation that Brent will be a full member of the Transport Advisory Group from when it is first formulated, and not simply an invited representative from time to time.
5. It is noted that Barnet and the Development Partners have given some recognition to the impact the proposed development may have on Brent and in particular the effective operation of its local road network. However it is recognised Brent Council has no control over the allocation of the Consolidated Transport Fund or approval of monies for scheme projects arising from the A5 Corridor Study. Therefore further details of the mechanism(s) by which Brent will be able to draw on and utilise such funds from either the Consolidated Transport

		<p>Fund or via the A5 Corridor Study, reflecting possible and justifiable mitigation measures that will be necessary throughout the development process, is required.</p> <p>6. Following from point 5, details of the projected time-scales for the Corridor Study and the level of funding to be allocated should be provided to ensure that Brent are satisfied that a sufficiently comprehensive assessment of the impact of the proposed development on Brent's local road network will be made and that adequate mitigation will be undertaken if required.</p> <p>7. Brent request that the wording of the following conditions be amended as set out below</p> <p>20.12 The construction of Cricklewood Lane (A407)/Claremont Avenue and Cricklewood Lane (A407)/A5 Junction Works shall not be commenced until any traffic management measures or other mitigation measures to Chichele Road <i>and/or</i> adjacent local roads required by the London Borough of Brent have been authorised by a section 278 highways agreement.</p> <p>20.13 The Waste Handling Facility shall not be occupied prior to the practical completion of the A5 Junction to Waste Handling Facility, unless otherwise agreed in writing with the LPA. The development of the A5 junction to Waste Handling facility shall not be commenced until any traffic management/<i>highways/parking measures</i> on Humber Road <i>and/or other adjacent local roads</i> (as identified as necessary in the A5 Corridor Study) <i>and/or</i> required by the London Borough of Brent have been authorised by a section 278 highways agreement.</p> <p>24.4 The development of the A5 junction (with the Road bridge over the MML) shall not be commenced until any traffic management/ <i>highways/parking</i> measures to Oxgate Gardens and Dollis Hill Lane <i>and/or other adjacent local roads</i> (as identified in the A5 corridor Study) <i>and/or</i> required by the London Borough of Brent are covered by a section 278 highways agreement.</p> <p>It is recognised that Barnet Council and the Development Partners have moved significantly to address Brent's concerns through the proposed conditions and draft Heads of Terms; however the response does not fully address the concerns identified in previous correspondence and accordingly the objection to the proposal remains. We would also welcome the opportunity for further discussion of the proposed conditions and draft Heads of Terms as and where they affect Brent, particularly as the mechanism by which funds for mitigation works are agreed and spent, does not provide any guarantee that funding will be made available for works Brent consider necessary to mitigate against the effects of the proposed development. In short, Brent are wholly reliant on a reasonable and fair approach being taken by Barnet Council and the Development Partners.</p> <p><u>Letter to Barnet dated 27.11.2009 following Planning Committee meeting at Barnet Council</u></p> <p>Following Barnet's committee meeting on 18th and 19th of November where it was reported by Barnet officers that Brent had withdrawn its objection to the proposal, I would like to clarify that while significant</p>	
--	--	--	--

		<p>moves had been made to address Brent's concerns in the draft heads of terms and conditions, Brent had not withdrawn their objection to the proposed development. We do note that Brent's objection was clearly expressed in the main report. I would be grateful if this could be clarified in any further reports on the proposals.</p>	
8	Camden Council – OBJECT	<p>The Council is supportive of the new living bridge and the inclusion of the bus station in phase 1. However the Council maintains a strong objection to the proposals in respect of transport impacts upon this borough.</p> <p><i>Transport:</i></p> <p>The proposal remains fundamentally flawed in that it relies far too heavily on travel by private car, which would lead to an avoidable and unnecessary increase of traffic on Camden's roads.</p> <p>It is a major concern that the modal share attributable to usage of public transport does not seem to have changed, despite the inclusion of the bus station in phase 1. Insufficient information has been provided to allow assessment of the extent to which the inclusion of the bus station in phase 1 would mitigate the impact of the increased quantum of phase 1 development.</p> <p>It remains a concern that the impact of interim phases within the development would only be submitted for consideration as further supplementary TAs as each phase of development comes forward. Insufficient information has been provided to allow assessment whether the trigger points for future mitigation should be changed as a result of the re-phasing proposed within the current application.</p>	<p>The impacts of the development on Camden's roads forms part of the A5 corridor study that is a pre RMA condition. The applicants have undertaken to mitigate any identified impacts on the roads of the surrounding boroughs.</p> <p>The 2010 Consent assessment showed that the predicted PTAL of the BXC regeneration area would range between PTAL ratings of 5-6b ensuring that the whole of the regeneration area will be well served by public transport. This remains the case under the amended masterplan proposals with the predicted PTALs of the area remaining the same and ensuring that the site capitalises on the strategic transport benefits of the area by being classified as highly accessible. This suggests that the mode share predictions in the 2010 consent are appropriate for the assessment of the impacts of the S73 application.</p> <p>The Section 73 application seeks to bring forward the delivery of a large amount of the mitigation measures included in the 2010 consent including the M1 junction and the new bus station. The application of the Transport Matrix and the phase transport reports provides a robust mechanism to ensure the development is carried out in a manner that is consistent with the forecasts within and</p>

		<p>Insufficient information has been provided to enable Camden to assess the likely impact of the increased construction-related vehicles resulting from the enlarged phase 1.</p> <p>It remains unclear what the impact of the newly phased development would be on the previously identified junctions within Camden.</p> <p><i>Affordable Housing:</i></p> <p>The proposals include an unacceptably low proportion of affordable housing and it is urged that the proposed changes to the quantum of development in phase 1 should trigger a re-appraisal of whether the development contributes the maximum reasonable amount of affordable housing, consistent with London Plan policy.</p>	<p>meets the criteria defined in the BXC transport assessment and the matrix will be updated as part of the revised Section 106.</p> <p>Construction traffic is discussed in broad terms within the S73 TR. The level of detail provided is consistent with the information available at this stage in the design. The phase transport report submitted with the RMAs will provide more detailed information.</p> <p>The impacts of the development on Camden's roads forms part of the A5 corridor study that is a pre RMA condition.</p> <p>The affordable housing position was fully tested as part of the 2010 Permission, and includes the provision of a review mechanism to ensure maximum possible levels of affordable housing are provided</p>
9	Barnet Clinical Commissioning Group – NO OBJECTION	<p>Overall, there will be no impact on the health provision due to these changes in the application. However, I wish to feedback the following comments:</p> <p>Please also include the current Primary Care Commissioners - NHS England – in consultations around primary care provision and where commissioning of services is required.</p> <p>Please continue to consult with the CCG as we would be keen to influence the decision making and provision in this area.</p> <p>We would recommend consideration of community pharmacy provision in the area; this could be in the healthcare centre and/or in the parade of 'shops'.</p>	<p>The Clinical Commissioning Group and the NHS England will continue to be consulted at the appropriate time.</p>
10	Haringey Borough Council – NO	<p>Letter Received 6th December 2013</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Given the quantum of floorspace and uses proposed remain the same as what was previously approved, the London Borough of Haringey (LBH) raises no objection to the scheme. However, this is subject to the increase in capacity of the 232 bus route and measures to increase 	<p>The 232 bus is one of the services identified to be improved in partnership with TfL. Schemes to provide suitable capacity on the A406 are proposed as part of Phase 1A (North).</p>

	OBJECTION	capacity of the A406 Northern Circular. Therefore, those comments submitted by LHB under approved planning application C/17559/08 are still considered to be relevant with regards to the current s73 application.	
11	Holiday Inn – OBJECTION	<p>Letter Received 12th December 2013</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In relation to the Holiday Inn site, the Transport Assessment provides some further detail of the proposal for the replacement Templehof Bridge. Our comments are based on a review of the specific documents and parameter plans that are considered relevant to the Holiday Inn site and the general location of the bridge. The retention of the Holiday Inn site is of paramount concern. It is still shows as being retained on the parameter plans, however, we note reference in the Revised DAS (BXC03) that the Market Quarter 'could' also accommodate the existing Holiday Inn hotel while providing space for it to be extended and integrated into the fabric of the area. Whilst the reference to allowing space for extension is welcomed, we are concerned over the change in reference from the original DAS, whereby it was noted that 'the Market Quarter <u>will</u> accommodate the existing hotel'. In those terms, Holiday Inn would welcome further confirmation and assurance from the applicant that the Holiday Inn site is to be retained as part of the wider regeneration proposals. In those terms, confirmation of the proposed new access to the site is required at the earliest opportunity, to provide assurance that the hotel site, and its operations, is unfettered by the proposals. As it currently stands, that information has not been provided. Accordingly, we also note a minor revision on plan ref: P/D111870/H/100/1026 rev C. which now provides annotation to confirm that access to the hotel site will be provided, under the supporting arches to the Templehof Bridge. However, it would appear that, as previously, no additional information has been provided relative to the exact detail of the new access point. In these terms, and on that no amendments have been made that would suggest otherwise or alleviate out clients concerns, we confirm that objections made previously still stand on the basis that the proposed development would be prejudicial to the ongoing use of the site and would effectively blight the site in planning terms. <p>Accordingly, refer to letters dated 20th May 2008 and 23rd December 2008 (below).</p> <p>Letter Received 20th May 2008</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>In terms of the planning application submission, and further to our visit to the Council offices on 19th May, we note that the planning application is currently incomplete and as confirmed with yourself (as the Case Officer for the application), understand that the Council await the submission of, inter alia, the Transport Assessment and several detailed layout plans (to include those referenced 8, 14 and 26 on the "Key Plan"- ref: P/O111870/H/100/1000 Rev C).</i> 	<p>The impacts on the Holiday Inn remain unchanged from the 2010 Consent and the detailed designs will take full account of the need for the Holiday Inn to continue trading successfully.</p> <p>The applicant continues to demonstrate that an acceptable new access point can be created to the west of the Holiday Inn under the new Templehof bridge in a similar location to the existing access</p>

		<p>Therefore, our comments at this stage are made on the basis of submissions made to date, and we formally request (as per advice given to us by yourself during our visit to the Council on 19th May) that the Council notify both ourselves and our client, in order to reconsult on the application, once any additional and remaining submissions are made to the Council. In this respect, whilst we understand that the deadline for the submission of representations is 30th May, we note your confirmation that representations made after the said date will also be taken into account.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Whilst the plans are not at a scale whereby the exact implications for the Holiday Inn site can be ascertained, the parameter plans (as submitted in BXC01 - "Development Specification and Framework") appear to show that a portion of the western part of the Holiday Inn site is required for the new road layout, and in conjunction with the replacement Templehof bridge, which will form the main vehicular link between the existing Brent Cross Shopping Centre and the new Brent Cross town centre as proposed. However, to date, the detailed layout plans for this area of the application site are yet to be submitted (as above, and confirmed in discussions with you on 19th May). As stated previously, we formally request that the Council notify ourselves and our client once these, and any other, outstanding submissions have been made - and indeed allow further appropriate and sufficient time for the submission of additional comments. • On the basis of the above deficiencies, in so far as the submission of the application to which we have had access to date, and against the background of our client reserving the right to comment further when additional plans are submitted, or indeed are made available to us at a later date, we wish to object to the application (at this stage) on the following grounds: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Whilst details of the proposed access (ref: proposed highway layouts - plan 8, 14 and 26 relating to the "Key Plan"- ref: P/0111870/H/100/ 1000 Rev C) are not available as yet, it is apparent from the parameter plans submitted that there will be a requirement to make use of our client's land (on the western part of their Holiday Inn site) for the construction of the bridge across the North Circular and indeed the possible permanent structure of the replacement Templehof bridge and related road layout. This is potentially prejudicial to the ongoing authorized use of the site as a hotel, with ancillary uses. The availability of car parking spaces is critical to the operation of the hotel. 2. It is noted that the construction of the Brent Cross Cricklewood new town centre is programmed over a 20 year period, with the Templehof bridge to be completed in the early stages of construction, as the first phase, to allow required access between the existing Brent Cross Shopping Centre and the proposed new town centre uses to the south. Indeed, the documentation submitted with the application implies that the proposed retail elements of the new town centre cannot open until the bridge structure has been completed. This extended construction period is likely to have significant highway impacts 	
--	--	---	--

on the North Circular road, as well as localised impacts on the use of our client's Holiday Inn site, in terms of the ease and quality of access, as well as general disruption to the hotel's function during the construction phase.

- *Accordingly, we request that these points are made as objections to the aforementioned planning application on behalf of our client, albeit noting that the application is currently incomplete, and our client therefore reserves the right to make further comments once the applicant has submitted the outstanding, or indeed additional, information.*

Letter Received 23th December 2008

- *Whilst the application documents appear to identify the retention of the existing Holiday Inn hotel, the proposed alterations to the highway network should be presented in significant detail that allows full consideration of the outline application proposals. It is acknowledged that the new bridge represents a key element to securing the improved accessibility and links between the regeneration areas, and therefore the hotel is sited in a location critical to the implementation of the proposals.*
- *It appears likely - from the proposed plans and supporting text - that the proposed replacement bridge will extend into the northern area of the hotel site, resulting in the removal of the existing electricity substation and potentially resulting in the loss of existing parking spaces. The encroachment into the existing hotel site would be prejudicial to the ongoing use of the site as a hotel, with ancillary uses, and have an adverse impact upon the operation and circulation space around it. As you will appreciate, the availability of car parking spaces is critical to the operation of the hotel.*
- *We therefore object to the planning application - in its current form - on the basis that the proposed development would be prejudicial to the ongoing use of the site and would effectively blight the site in planning terms.*
- *The Transport Assessment further identifies that the existing Holiday Inn access is to be 'stopped up'. However, no evidence has been provided to justify the location and position of a new access, and indeed an indication of timings with regards to closing the existing access.*
- *Suggestions have been made that the access to the hotel will be under the new road bridge, albeit, this has not been clearly illustrated on any of the submitted plans. Annotations pertaining to such a location are identified on plan (ref: P/D111870/H/100/ 1026) although the exact details are proposed to be dealt with at a later stage.*
- *On the basis that the Stage 1 Safety Audit identifies that the access arrangements are unclear (and that if access is to be provided under the new Templehof Bridge, there may be concerns*

		<p><i>over visibility and safety due to the position of the support pillars (BXEOS Volume 4 - Appendix D, Page 3 and 12), it is considered vital that as the Local Planning Authority, you request additional information in order to be satisfied of the exact location of the proposed access, and indeed that it can be achieved without causing harm to highway safety.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>In all respects, clarification and further details of the access and circulation routes are required to ensure that, in principle, the proposal can be accommodated within the highway infrastructure. Scott Wilson (transport consultants for the application) even suggest that further detail is needed - specifically in relation to the temporary bridge and the new access to the hotel. Specifically, this access should be workable in technical highway terms, as well as providing a safe and suitable access and egress to the hotel.</i> • <i>On the basis that access is being considered, this level of detail is considered to be a minimum requirement of the outline application and therefore the current submission - as it stands - is inadequate and should be refused accordingly (following the view that unless sufficient information is provided to achieve an 'in principle/ agreement to the new access point then the Local Authority cannot be satisfied that the access will be suitable). Further,</i> • <i>Such lack of clarity is not in accordance with the Government's aim for a fair and transparent planning system as set out in PPS1.</i> • <i>Accordingly, we request that the above points are made as objections to the aforementioned planning application on behalf of our client.</i> 	
--	--	--	--

Property developers and private enterprises

Ref	Consultee	Comments	Officer Response
12	Intu Properties - OBJECT	<p>Letter Received 5th December 2013</p> <p>Sent by Bond Dickson LLP on behalf of Intu Properties.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Intu Properties are concerned that the Section 73 Application strays outside the ambit of what may lawfully be included in an application under Section 73 of the Town and County Planning Act 1990 and we are therefore instructed to firmly object to the Council proceeding any further with this application. <p><i>Objection:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Section 73 Application is not as a matter of law a proper application under Section 73 of the 1990 Act because the changes to the development envisaged by the Section 73 Application extend beyond what the local planning authority may lawfully grant planning permission for under that section. It is entirely inappropriate and unacceptable for Section 73 to be misused in this way to facilitate an unlawful ex post facto expansion of the infrastructure permitted by an existing planning permission. Any planning permission granted pursuant to the Section 73 Application would be ultra vires and would be liable to be quashed on application for judicial review. In these circumstances the Council should not proceed any further with the Section 73 Application save to decline to determine it on the basis that it does not have the power to make a determination. 	<p>The statutory power and relevant case law were carefully considered by the LPA before the above application was submitted and it was concluded that an application under Section 73 was appropriate in the circumstances of this case. Nothing contained in your letter casts any doubt on that conclusion.</p> <p>The above application is confined to seeking modification to some of the conditions imposed by the 2010 permission. It does not seek in any way to change the description of the development contained in the amended 2008 application and specified in the 2010 Permission. As they rightly state, the description of development is "widely drawn": for example, in respect of bridge structures it simply permits "vehicular and pedestrian bridges" and in relation to the realignment of the River Brent it permits "works to the River Brent". The identical description of development is proposed in the above application under Section 73. The Brent Cross Cricklewood regeneration project is a very large and complex strategic project with policy support at all levels.</p> <p>Unlike the Arrowcroft case referred to in their letter, if planning permission is granted pursuant to this Section 73 Application it will not in any way lead to a conflict between the "operative part of the new planning permission" (i.e. the description of development) and the conditions, which, in paragraphs 32 - 35 of his judgement, Sullivan J</p>

Ref	Consultee	Comments	Officer Response
			<p>clearly indicates was the key reason for his decision. This is an important difference.</p> <p>Whilst they assert that the description was “circumscribed by incorporation of the plans submitted with the Outline Application”, it is important to emphasise that the plans showing the bridge structures and the other works referred to in your letter were “parameter plans” which were tied into the permission by various conditions, all of which are within the scope of Section 73. They did not qualify or curtail the scope of the description of development.</p> <p>The 2010 permission (and the application to which it related) were deliberately designed to be flexible in order to enable the development to respond to the opportunities and challenges that are likely to face all such projects: it created an overall framework to guide and govern the evolution of the scheme as work on the design and delivery of the project progressed. The principles of the 2010 permission reflected the principles identified in Sullivan J’s judgements in the Rochdale cases (Tew and Milne) in the context of EIA and this model has been followed in permissions for several large-scale strategic projects. In this context, it is important to note that the Section 73 application has been subject to an EIA process which also fulfils the requirements of these judgements, including extensive consultation. It has also been assessed in the application documents by reference to a fully updated review of relevant development plan policies and other guidance.</p> <p>There are frequent references, to section 73</p>

Ref	Consultee	Comments	Officer Response
			<p>permissions within the 2010 permission, which demonstrates that it was anticipated at the time that the parameters and principles referred to in the conditions might be varied by Section 73 modifications to the planning conditions.</p> <p>Against that background, it is important to note that the above Section 73 application is entirely consistent with the requirement under Section 73(2) that "the local planning authority shall consider only the question of the conditions subject to which the planning permission should be granted". It is not seeking any modifications other than those arising under the express terms of the 2010 conditions. The decision of the LPA in determining this application will be entirely consistent with the scope of Section 73(2), whichever way it is determined.</p> <p>In the light of the above, the LPA does not consider that this application falls outside the scope of Section 73, or that any planning permission granted pursuant to it would be ultra vires and liable to be quashed on judicial review. Any proceedings which your client brought for this purpose would be rigorously defended.</p>

Residents Associations and Local Groups

Ref	Consultee	Comments	Officer Response
13	Cricklewood Community Forum – OBJECT	<p><i>Objection: Whitefield Estate Residents</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cricklewood Community Forum wish to express concern and support for the Whitefield community who will have their homes compulsorily purchased and demolished. People were previously told that they will be relocated to various sites in the regeneration area and that this would take place in two phases. • At the recent exhibition at Hendon Leisure Centre, people were told that it had not been decided where Whitefield residents would be relocated to. This is a backward step and is unhelpful to say the least. • Of the various sites previously suggested, several are considered by the resident Cricklewood community to be unsuitable (particularly the Cricklewood Lane-B&Q site). • Cricklewood Community Forum suggest that the LPA relocate people to the derelict land next to the Millennium Green Park, Claremont road. This area of land suffers from squatting and dumping, hence new housing in this location would solve several community problems in one go. • Those who own their own property, often mortgage free, have been told they will be offered new accommodation and that this would be on a shared equity basis. This is not treating residents equitably and is further damaging community-developer relations. <p><i>Letter 2: REQUEST TO SPEAK AT THE PLANNING COMMITTEE</i></p>	<p>A Whitefield Steering Group has been established and these issues are under discussion. Please see the main body of the Committee Report for further information.</p> <p>It is too early in the process to agree relocation sites for the Whitefield or Rosa Freedman residents. Proposals for the design and location of replacement dwellings for the residents of the Whitefield Estate will be confirmed within detailed design proposals to be brought forward within Reserved Matters Applications (RMAs).</p> <p>Compensation arrangements have not been finalised at this outline stage.</p>
14	OBJECTION Based on Friern Village Residents Association air pollution monitoring	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Refer to the 'Air Pollution Report' which resulted from the pollution monitoring tubes bought by the Friern Village residents' Association (<i>see attachment on the email for the report</i>). • The tubes were placed in 3 locations - Alan Day garage on the North circular, Ribbesdale Avenue in Friern Village (less than half a mile from the North Circular), and Tesco (on Colney Hatch Lane, and also adjoining the North Circular). • Most of the readings were above 40 microgrammes/m3, some being over twice this level, which is the EU limit for No2. • Very concerned that BXC proposals, with £200 million being spent on the roads surrounding the Brent Cross Area, will become a pollution hot-spot. 	<p>With regards to the results of the monitoring, this is nothing unusual for London, where there are typically exceedances of the air quality standards close to major roads and the results from the site adjacent to the A406, indicate that this location is typical. However, in terms of the assessment that was undertaken, the monitoring has little material effect on the core assessment method and assumptions and the findings. The assessment remains valid, as it is based upon the assessment of traffic related emissions and baseline conditions a</p>

Ref	Consultee	Comments	Officer Response
			<p>considerable time into the future where emissions will be distinctly different from those produced by the current vehicle fleet.</p> <p>Additional conditions 30.5,20.6 and 30.7 require the establishment of air quality monitoring stations and monitoring tubes in all development plots.</p>
15	<p>Fordwych Residents Association – OBJECT</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Fordwych Residents Association is in the London Borough of Camden, which includes the part of Cricklewood in Camden. • The Association is particularly concerned about the part of this application that relates to the green space outside B&Q on Cricklewood Lane. This is a vitally important green/open space for Cricklewood and that development on this site should not be permitted. • The part of Cricklewood covered by LB Camden is classified as an area deficient in open space in the Camden Core Strategy. As such, any development of this site would be in breach of planning policies in at least one (and probably three) Local Plans. • I appreciate this proposal is part of a lengthy, complex and ongoing planning application, which largely relates to Brent Cross (several miles away). However, due to the strength of opposition this part of the proposal has aroused, we would suggest this particular issue is removed from consideration in this application. 	<p>See the open space section of the committee report in relation to this issue.</p>
16	<p>Cricklewood, Hendon and West Hampstead APTU station representative - OBJECT</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Further to our meeting on Wednesday 13th November at the BXC public exhibition, I wish to express my concerns as to its impact on the future of Cricklewood Station and the disruption to all passengers on the Midland Main Line. • This is because the redevelopment includes plans for a new 6 platform, 12 coach length, railway station approximately midway between Cricklewood and Hendon. However, First Capital Connect, the train operator of the Thameslink franchise which provides services to Cricklewood and Hendon stations have advised me that under no circumstances would they stop trains at both Cricklewood and the new station. • Hence, I would like to have reassurances on a secure future for Cricklewood (and Hendon) stations, which provides a vital link to central London. If Cricklewood station was to be closed many existing travelers would be greatly disadvantaged long term, including the existing residents on the site. I am copying to the 4 local Members of Parliament (I am one of Ms 	<p>The new Railway Station will have five 12 car platforms. It has been agreed with Network Rail and the Department of Transport that the existing four 8 car per hour services at the Cricklewood and Hendon Railway Stations will continue as at present when the new Railway Station is brought into use. The new 12 car Thameslink services will stop at the new Railway Station and this level of service forms the basis of the Transport Assessment. The existing Railway Stations cannot accommodate these longer trains.</p>

Ref	Consultee	Comments	Officer Response
		<p>Teather's constituents) and the Cricklewood Community Forum for their information.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> I would also anticipate some disruption to services on the Midland Main Line over an extended period if the building of the new station was to go ahead. For this reason I'm copying the chair of my rail passengers association and the chair of the Bedford Commuters Association (which represents Bedford and Flitwick stations). We would appreciate some reassurance that there would not be prolonged weekend closures. 	<p>The design and implementation of the necessary railway track alterations to accommodate the new station platforms are being progressed in close liaison with Network Rail and in conformity with their formal processes. Inevitably there are expected to be certain weekend closures.</p>
17	Brent Terrace Residents OBJECT	<p><i>Introduction – Letter 6/12/13</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Whilst there may be a good case for improving the Brent Cross Shopping Centre, this should not be at the expense of local residents, especially since we are not even on the same side of the road as the shopping centre. If the developers can make radical changes to the first phase, the residents want built in assurances that we can make changes later. The developers should not be able to leave a legacy plan with many aspects that residents don't like and that seem to be poor town planning practice, wash their hands of it, and walk away once they have built their shopping centre. Although there is a huge amount of documentation, the residents still have many questions concerning the detail, which currently is unavailable. A 2 page list of questions was sent to Barnet Council during the Consultation period asking for clarification and detail regarding items for phase 1, scheduled to start in 2015, e.g. how many units will be built on the Brent Terrace green space 'triangles', how high will these units be, where will the parking be since there is no room on the road, what will happen to the spring on Clitterhouse Playing Fields when the fields are landscaped, etc. We are in one of the areas where huge changes will occur during the first phase, scheduled to commence in a year's time, and yet the answers to these questions are not currently forthcoming. Hence, without the prerequisite detail, it is not possible to support these huge changes to our neighbourhood. The developers promoted the plan as a project to regenerate the area that would benefit local residents by improving the urban environment, etc., but from the detail that is available, this development plan will demolish one neighbourhood entirely and will erase the character, history, and green spaces of Brent Terrace and Clitterhouse residents, as well as damaging 	<p>The proposals are for a comprehensive mixed use development on both sides of the A406 in accordance with planning policy. The proposals include significant community facilities, including new schools; medical facilities and significant upgrade to open spaces.</p> <p>Although further consultation will take place at the reserved matters stage, the outline consent will establish the parameters and principles within which future reserved matter applications will be made.</p> <p>Answers to resident's questions are provided later in this consultation response. This is an outline application and the detailed design and final unit numbers for individual plots are not for approval at this stage. Detail regarding phase 1 and subsequent phases will be set out in a series of Reserved Matters applications which will be subject to full public consultation. Parking will need to be provided on site.</p> <p>The application proposes alterations to the conditions of the 2010 permission already permitted. It is expected that the comprehensive approach to development will benefit the local</p>

Ref	Consultee	Comments	Officer Response
		<p>their health and is therefore, inappropriate for this area.</p> <p><i>Consultation problems</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The developers took several years to revise their complex and numerous planning application documents. The 6-7 week consultation period for residents to voice objections is far too short compared to the huge number of documents that must be trawled through to check for changes. We were led to believe that the changes requested by the developers mostly related to the phasing and shopping centre but close inspection of the documents indicates that there are substantive changes to other areas of the development, e.g. building heights have changed in some areas. Not everyone understands the implications or such an enormous development and the impact it will have on them. This may only occur when the build begins and people see the actual scale of it. The documentation was only written in English, however, the first language of many of the residents in the area is not English and some residents may not be literate in any language. The BXCO4 Planning Statement Addendum document preface does not accurately depict the changes that will happen in Phase 1; the items relate to the shopping centre and some roads but do not refer to loss of our green spaces and the demolition of the Whitefield neighbourhood. These latter changes may not matter to the developers or Council but they do matter to local residents. Hence, the document is extremely misleading and reflects the bias of the interests of the developers. See http://www.brentcrosscricklewood.com/planningapps/2013/BXC4/BXC04_PS_Addendum.pdf (p3-4). The feedback questions relating to the Developers consultation were extremely biased in wording and also in content. These were leading questions, at least 2 of which lead the respondent to answer in the affirmative. This questionnaire was not representative of the plans, asking only about the new bridge and shopping centre but not about the loss of green space or the demolition of Whitefield. During the developers consultation and the Council evenings in Hendon Leisure centre, we were shown many diagrams and illustrations which were often divorced from their keys or so lacking in detail as to be totally meaningless. For example, we were shown a road diagram of the A406 around Brent Cross which consisted of a few brightly coloured circles and lines 	<p>community overall through improvements to the transport system and open spaces and social infrastructure (for example).</p> <p>The consultation period has exceeded the statutory requirements. Further consultation will take place on the detailed development of individual plots at the appropriate time</p> <p>Normal Council procedures were followed in this respect. No requests to translate information have been received.</p> <p>The development of the Brent Terrace Triangles and Cricklewood Lane, and the demolition and re-provision of the Whitefield Estate were part of the 2010 permission, and thus have not been identified as changes in this Section 73 application.</p> <p>The applicants' pre-application exhibition was produced without input from planning officers. This is the frequently the case for pre-application consultation on major applications.</p> <p>The Council exhibition was fully staffed at all times and there was always a representative of the applicant as well as the technical team present to answer questions. Detailed engineering plans have</p>

Ref	Consultee	Comments	Officer Response
		<p>drawn to represent the roads and roundabouts: These do not give enough detail, so cyclists, pedestrians and drivers will have difficulty understanding what the improvements to the road system will be, e.g. will there be separation of cyclists and cars and where will the pedestrian and cyclist routes across Brent Cross Shopping Centre be? Staples Corner roundabout is depicted as just a circle – currently there is an extremely narrow pedestrian and cycle path around part of it – there is NO detail on the new plan to show any changes to the current situation. These circles and lines were in different colours but there was no key provided, although we assume that there is a reason for the different colours used.</p> <p><i>Green space – Clitterhouse Playing Fields</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Under the Regeneration project, Whitefield School will be re-sited and its playing fields will be requisitioned and built on. Replacement school playing fields will be created on Clitterhouse Playing Fields. This area will not be accessible to the public during the day and evenings when the school is using it, so the residents will lose just under 1/5 of the area of this park to Whitefield School. The developers may feel that ‘nobody uses Clitterhouse Playing Fields’. However, it has the only children’s playground in the area, groups play football on the weekends and people use it for walking, despite the fact that it is often full of rubbish, there are no trees for shade during the summer, there are no attractive features and it is not kept in the same pristine condition as other parks in the Borough, e.g. Golders Hill Park. The fact that Barnet has neglected this Green Space does not justify its partial loss to the community. This loss of a section of Clitterhouse Playing Fields follows closely on the breaking of several covenants and subsequent selling of Hendon Football Club (a public amenity space on the Clitterhouse Playing Fields) for residential development; so the playing fields will sustain a double curtailment of its land. With a large increase in population (the Brent Cross Cricklewood development is supposed to deliver nearly 4 x the current number of residential units), there should be MORE green space NOT less. <p><i>Green Space - Cricklewood Lane (next to B&Q)</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> This is the only green space in the Cricklewood Town Centre area and would serve well as the Town Square. Cricklewood Town Team have secured funding to make big improvements to the streetscape of Cricklewood, including repaving this part of Cricklewood Lane and taking a strip of the green to create a paved tree-lined area wide enough for market stalls, which will be completed by spring 2014. The rest should be redesigned as a 	<p>been included in BXC05 Volume 6 and were available at the exhibition. Section 15 of BXC05 Volume 5 discusses pedestrian and cycle networks, including routes in the vicinity of the shopping centre.</p> <p>The sports facilities at Clitterhouse Playing Fields will be significantly improved to allow for greater use throughout the year by both the schools and the community. The schools will be able to make use of the facilities during school hours, while the community will be able to make full use of the facilities out of school hours and in the school holidays. This is consistent with the 2010 permission.</p> <p>Through public consultation at the Reserved Matters Application stage there will be consultation to establish the detail of the preferred uses for the Clitterhouse Playing Fields, to ensure that all relevant user groups are catered for in the redevelopment of this key open space. The indicative proposals for this space include not only sports pitches, but extensive new play and activity areas, and spaces set aside for relaxing and walking, with the intention that the whole community can enjoy an improved open space.</p> <p>The issues relating to this site are discussed further in the open space section of the committee report. It should be noted that residential development is permitted on this plot within the 2010 Planning Permission and that the OLF proposals are potentially compatible with the Section 73 proposals</p>

Ref	Consultee	Comments	Officer Response
		<p>new (and well-lit) small park.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • However, under the Brent Cross development plan, this site will be used for sheltered accommodation to re-house residents from the Rosa Freemont Centre which will be demolished under the scheme. This is an inappropriate use of the site since these residences will be built on a very busy, polluted main road, with little outside green space. In addition, the Brent Cross development and shopping centre are over a mile from this site. • Finally, there are more appropriate sites that could be used to re-house residents. The developers talk about the government target of building 60% of homes on brownfield sites, but they will commence residential building on green areas, i.e. the Brent Terrace triangles and the Cricklewood green space next to B&Q. This is even more inexcusable when you consider that there is other space that could be used and which is currently wasteland and an eyesore, due to rubbish dumping, e.g. the wasteland next to the Millennium Green or the area next to the gas pipe at the beginning of Brent Terrace, both of which are in dire need of development and which would easily accommodate Whitefield and Rosa Freemont residents. The purchase cost of either area is likely to be a small drop in the development ocean. If the developers are really trying to regenerate the area, surely they should start by building on wasteland and not on our desperately needed green spaces. <p><i>Green space - Brent Terrace green space 'triangles'</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Brent Terrace green space 'triangles' will be built on early in phase 1 as part of the replacement housing for Whitefield residents. One is a designated playground (see graphic at the end of this document) and the other has been used for years as public amenity space, now called Claremont Open Space. We strongly object to building these new residential properties on these green spaces for the following reasons: • These green spaces would be lost early in the first phase of the Brent Cross Cricklewood Development but not replaced until a much later phase of the development, possibly several decades later. If the later phases of the development do not eventuate, we will never regain this green space. • The developers should be building on brownfield sites, but they will commence residential building on our green areas, i.e. the Brent Terrace triangles and the Cricklewood green space next to B&Q, which is inexcusable since there is other space that could be used which is currently wasteland and subject to rubbish dumping, e.g. the wasteland next to the Millennium Green or the area next to the gas pipe at the beginning of Brent Terrace. The developers should start by building on wasteland and not on our desperately needed green 	<p>Detailed design proposals will be brought forward within Reserved Matters Applications (RMAs). Proposals submitted within RMAs will be subject to the maximum development quantum and other parameters set out in the Revised Development Specification Framework (BXC01). Appropriate levels of outdoor amenity space will be provided within the scheme, with an overall increase in open space provided.</p> <p>The development of illustrative plots 53, 54 and 58 is permitted within the 2010 Planning Permission.</p> <p>Additional green space will be provided within the new development. It is proposed that Claremont Park will be constructed in Phase 1A, and that this will provide new play facilities for a number of age groups to serve the existing residents of the area, including Brent Terrace.</p> <p>Clitterhouse Playing Fields (Part 1) will also benefit from major investment in Phase 1A including extensive landscaping, planting and new sports and play facilities.</p>

Ref	Consultee	Comments	Officer Response
		<p>spaces.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • These green spaces provide very safe, local play areas for our children when unsupervised; they are surrounded by houses on most sides and back on to Brent Terrace, which is a cul-de-sac with little traffic. • The spine road linear 'replacement' green space is inappropriate since it will have a very busy 4 lane highway down the full length of one side and the children will have no direct access to it from their houses. It will not be a safe area for unsupervised children due to danger from traffic and unknown adults. The poorer air quality and increased noise pollution in this park, will be detrimental to the health of our children. • The north triangle is the only space large enough, flat enough and open enough in the area, for the air ambulance to land. The air ambulance used this space recently (November 3rd) in a life threatening medical emergency. The preservation of this space will be even more important when the area is surrounded by 14 storey blocks of flats and there are nearly 4 times the number of current residents who could be in need of such care. • At a time when England is trying to preserve its hedgerows, the hedgerow running most of the length of Brent Terrace will be severely disturbed or destroyed if the 'triangles' are built on. It is probably one of the last remaining hedgerows in London and possibly the only one remaining in zone 2. The destruction of the hedgerow will result in a loss of trees and will have a detrimental effect on nature conservation since this hedgerow currently creates a wildlife corridor and haven in an area that suffers from barriers such as the railway line, and the A406 and Hendon Way roads. 	<p>As with the 2010 Planning Permission the Section 73 proposes the development of the existing two triangles of open space in Brent Terrace. Please see the open space section of the main report. The approach to the temporary provision of open space is outlined in the open space section of the committee report.</p> <p>The access to the new Claremont Park will be easy and safe, utilising the pavement that runs along Brent Terrace currently a road which has very light traffic and will continue to in the future</p> <p>The redevelopment of this part of the site is consistent with the 2010 Permission. Adjacent open space, such as Clitterhouse Playing Fields can be used for an air ambulance should an emergency occur.</p> <p>A comprehensive tree survey is to be undertaken. The results of the tree survey will be taken into account in developing more detailed proposals for the triangles and Brent Terrace housing. Where there are found to be trees and /or hedgerows of high value, every effort will be made to retain these and incorporate these into the development proposals.</p> <p>As shown on Parameter Plan 003 the street is to be framed by green spaces/corridors in order to compensate for any removal of hedgerow that is necessary. Further details will be confirmed within detailed design proposals to be brought forward within Reserved Matters Applications (RMAs).</p>

Ref	Consultee	Comments	Officer Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="464 355 1430 483">• Although Brent Terrace is not a conservation area and the railway cottages are not listed buildings, Brent Terrace has a unique character and history. With the destruction of our hedgerow and the building of residential units which are not in keeping with the street, much of the character and townscape of our street, with its Victorian railway cottages, would be destroyed. <li data-bbox="464 716 1430 844">• The scale and appearance of the 36 proposed units will have an adverse effect on adjoining existing neighbours. The proposed units are at least 3 storeys high, and since the 'triangles' are on a higher elevation than Brent Terrace, they would directly overlook the railway cottages causing a loss of privacy. The Clitterhouse houses that back directly onto the 'triangles' would also be overlooked and suffer a loss of privacy. <li data-bbox="464 898 1276 922">• The proposed number of units is too dense for the small size of the triangles. <li data-bbox="464 1154 1430 1206">• Brent Terrace already has problems with parking due to the narrowness of the road. The additional 36 units will create more traffic and even greater pressure on the parking situation. 	<p data-bbox="1461 355 1986 686">There is a requirement to provide a green corridor along both the east and western sides of Brent Terrace. The creation of Brent Terrace Park to the west of the terraces will provide new green space, where there are currently redundant railway sidings. It is intended that there will be an increase in tree planting and green corridors within the development area, which enhances existing natural features. There will be enhanced opportunities for recreation with the provision of Claremont Park, and new facilities at Clitterhouse Playing Fields. Green spaces will be more interconnected than at present improving opportunities for recreation, walking etc.</p> <p data-bbox="1461 716 1986 867">There will be an opportunity to consider the detailed design of the properties when the relevant reserved matters application has been submitted to the Council. Issues of scale, privacy and overlooking will be carefully considered, the design will accord with the relevant planning policies.</p> <p data-bbox="1461 898 1986 1024">The outline planning application does not specify the number of properties on the 'triangles' (plots 53 and 54). The detailed design including the number of properties will be subject to a reserved matters planning application and public consultation.</p> <p data-bbox="1461 1053 1986 1125">Parameter Plan 007 (within Appendix 2 of the DSF (BXC01)) shows a maximum height of between 10m and 12m.</p> <p data-bbox="1461 1154 1986 1305">The car parking associated with the proposed residential units on the triangles will be in line with the car parking standards identified in the 2010 Planning Permission (Condition 38.2). The detailed design of this car parking will be subject of the reserved matters application and associated public</p>

Ref	Consultee	Comments	Officer Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Removal of many of the trees and much of the green outlook of Brent Terrace and Clitterhouse will remove the 'lungs' of our area, an area which is extremely close to a red pollution route. This is likely to result in poorer health outcomes for local residents. • In summary, this plan will erase the character, history and green spaces of Brent Terrace and Clitterhouse residents, as well as damaging their health and is therefore, inappropriate for this area. <p><i>Green Space – Brent Terrace Gardens/allotments</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The plans suggest that the developers will take the gardens/allotments of Brent Terrace residents in order to build the new Spine Road Park. These allotments have been used by the residents for over 100 years. We would like clarification as to the intentions for our gardens/allotments. We strongly object to the loss of our gardens/allotments. <p><i>Clitterhouse Farm Buildings</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The current proposal for the historic Clitterhouse Farm Buildings is demolition, to make way for a park depot and car parking. We do not support the demolition of these buildings as outlined in the Brent Cross Cricklewood Development plans. We want the buildings to be conserved, renovated and transformed into a multi-use community hub. The Farm buildings can provide a flexible space relevant to community needs, creating a focal point for local residents and a tangible improvement to the area. We support the work of the Clitterhouse Farm Project and we urge Barnet Council to change the plans and protect this historic site from demolition. 	<p>consultation.</p> <p>As shown on Parameter Plan 003 Brent Terrace is to be framed by green spaces/corridors. Additional green space will be provided within the development. It is proposed that Claremont Park and Clitterhouse Playing Fields (Part 1), excluding the nature park, will be constructed in Phase 1A, and that this will provide new play facilities for a number of age groups to serve the existing residents of the area, including Brent Terrace.</p> <p>There will be the opportunity to use part of the new Brent Terrace Linear Park for allotments but this will be subject to detailed design at the appropriate stage.</p> <p>Parameter Plan 016 shows the farm buildings to be demolished as part of the plans to enhance Clitterhouse Playing Fields. The improvements to Clitterhouse Playing Fields Part 1 (excluding the Nature Park) are proposed to be a direct Phase 1A (North) delivery obligation on the applicant, as part of the Revised S106 agreement. A specification will be agreed in accordance with the Revised S106 Agreement and the details will be approved under Condition 13.1 before the BXC Development commences. Initial discussions have been held between the promoters of the community use for the building and the applicant. The applicant has stated that they will consider this proposal as part of the detailed planning stage for Clitterhouse Playing Fields and is open to the retention of these buildings by means of either an amendment application under the proposed S73 Conditions or (if necessary) a new Section 73 application. It should</p>

Ref	Consultee	Comments	Officer Response
		<p><i>Car based scheme</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> This is a car-based plan with little or no attempt to bring people to Brent Cross other than by car. There will be an increase in the number of cars (29,000 from original transport report or 8,000 from later Developers report). There are already regular traffic jams so any increase in traffic will compound this problem. In addition, the North Circular Road is already the most polluted road in London and arguably one of the most polluted in the UK, so Brent Cross shoppers need to be persuaded onto public transport. The current public transport option is buses, involving waiting around in the heat and cold or being stuck in traffic jams. We welcome the rebuilding of the existing bus station, but we understand that the rapid bus transport system has been shelved, so the status quo will remain the same as now: cars and buses, which is clearly inadequate. The public will only be persuaded onto public transport if the public transport option is quick and efficient, with little exposure to the weather, and benefits from no traffic jams. So, it will require a much more innovative solution to the problem, i.e. a light railway system between the Jubilee and Northern tube lines, with a station inside Brent Cross Shopping Centre. The other large shopping developments (Westfield, Stratford, etc.) all have extremely good public transport links – not just cars and buses. Brent Cross could be a beacon of innovation but instead we are getting more of the same. £200 million will be spent on the road system around the Brent Cross Shopping Centre, but there is no money for a light railway system, where at least some of the infrastructure (disused and little used rail lines, used rail lines, etc.) already exist. Even if the light railway system is currently unaffordable, the opportunity should be taken now to plan for its future and leave space for it. The current plans do not leave room for a light railway in the future. In addition, the 4 lane spine road between Brent Terrace and railway line will also encourage more car traffic with the resultant extra air pollution, noise pollution and traffic jams in the area. The new spine road will be a main access road to the new town centre and Brent Cross 	<p>also be noted that renovation of these buildings is likely to be considerably more expensive than their demolition and replacement with the uses approved in the 2010 permission. Therefore it is likely that the community proposals will need to be further developed, including developing a viable business case. The detailed consideration of the area containing the farm buildings will be dealt with at the Reserved Matter Stage – probably in 2014</p> <p>The overall Regeneration scheme is based on providing sufficient capacity across all modes of transport and in accordance with the mode split targets contained in the Framework Travel Plan. The new bus station will provide a good level of passenger comfort, including being partially covered. Bus priority measures including bus-only streets and bus lanes are planned to ensure buses can move around the site easily, and good bus connections will be provided between the new train station and the southern and northern parts of the town centre.</p> <p>The source of the 29,000 cars figure is from the Regeneration Area Development Framework, which was prepared in 2003 and 2004 and was based on a simple spreadsheet form of assessments and there had been no comprehensive modelling of new journeys which has now been undertaken to support the current planning application. For example, the 29,000 figure includes traffic generated by the West Hendon regeneration scheme which is not part of BXC and that the figure does not account for road trips that will be removed as a result of the change of uses of the site through</p>

Ref	Consultee	Comments	Officer Response
		<p>Shopping Centre, which will be a through route between Edgware Rd and the new development and Claremont Rd, and therefore, has all the makings of a 'rat run', since it will avoid the very busy Claremont Rd/Cricklewood Lane junction. Good town planning practice dictates that this 4 lane spine road should be re-sited next to the railway line. This will keep the noise of the railway and road in the same space, with less residents affected, overall, by the noise. Currently, noise would affect the high rise blocks of flats on both sides, as well as the Brent Terrace residents, trebling the number of affected people. To reduce the noise from the spine road, the road could be placed in a cutting or even a tunnel. This is the ONLY effective way to reduce the noise that this road will create.</p>	<p>the regeneration – for example the removal of a number of existing industrial premises. Nor does it properly account for the future choice of travel mode when all the proposed public transport improvements come forward when it is predicted that there will be less use of the private car and a shift to use of public transport, walking and cycling.</p> <p>The Development Framework figure was generated using basic assessment methods that were inappropriate for a mixed use scheme on the scale of BXC where the existing traffic patterns will change significantly and that since then, much more precise modelling has been done and these latest more accurate assessments and predictions have been accepted by both Barnet and TfL.</p> <p>The 29,000 figure quoted in the Development Framework is over a whole 12 hour day and the equivalent 12 hour period traffic flow for the BXC development is 8000, but it is the peak hour traffic flow that is the concern when considering traffic congestion.</p> <p>TfL had approved all the modelling and modal share predictions which are based on the current transport strategy as per the 2010 permission, and includes schemes to mitigate the impact of the development and help address congestion and pollution.</p> <p>The Spine Road is proposed to be single carriageway throughout, but cycle lanes provided on both sides of the road to the south of the MML bridge and bus lanes on both sides to the north. These facilities will help encourage non-car modes. The new Spine Road will help provide relief and offer a choice of routes to key destinations, including in combination with the MML bridge link providing a new route for development related traffic avoiding the A407 and Claremont Road for north-</p>

Ref	Consultee	Comments	Officer Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The lack of a light railway plan and the emphasis on car based travel, ensure that this development plan is still part of the pollution problem and not part of the solution. In addition, the extra air pollution will contribute to poorer health outcomes for local residents. <p><i>Incinerator</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The incinerator is still being built in phase 1 despite assurances by the developers that it will not happen and the North London Waste Authority having changed their business plan so that it is no longer needed in any comparable scale. Please could you clarify why this is still being built? We strongly object to an incinerator in the middle of a residential area, since air pollutants that would be released are likely to have a detrimental effect on the health of local residents. <p><i>Whitefield</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> We want to express the hope that if you are determined to demolish the homes of Whitefield residents, that you recompense them in a fair manner, which takes into account the psychological and emotional upheaval of the loss of their neighbourhood and community, as 	<p>south traffic.</p> <p>The location of the Spine Road does follow good town planning practice in that it provides local traffic flows adjacent to the park area and this is considered to be advantageous in respect of public safety. It also passes along the frontage of new housing which again presents enhanced safety for pedestrians.</p> <p>The suggestion of a new orbital railway of some form would no doubt benefit North London as a whole, and may be promoted by TfL, but there is no need for such a facility identified in regard to the Brent Cross Cricklewood Development alone</p> <p>This Development will have a new Railway Station on the Midland Main Line and improved access to the Brent Cross underground station.</p> <p>This proposal is consistent with the 2010 Permission and the Development Framework.</p> <p>The Energy from Waste facility, of whatever kind, will be obliged to comply with the relevant EU Directive and will require an environmental permit from the Environment Agency before it is allowed to operate. The emissions will therefore be strictly regulated and monitored. The pollution control regime operated by the Environment Agency requires that all monitoring data are made available to the public.</p> <p>A Steering Group has been established and these issues are under discussion. Please see the main body of the Committee Report for further information.</p>

Ref	Consultee	Comments	Officer Response
		<p>well as the loss of their physical homes and gardens.</p> <p><i>Buildings</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some residential buildings will be built facing the North Circular Road, so residents will be breathing very poor quality air. Furthermore, the intention is to build densely packed, 14 storey residential buildings and 24 storey commercial buildings. There is no precedence for this type of building in this area. 5-6 storey residential buildings would be more reasonable and in keeping with the mansion blocks in West Hampstead, just up the road. Existing housing stock in the immediate vicinity is only 2 stories high, rising to 3 stories in the Clitterhouse Estate. These enormous 6-20 storey buildings will dominate the landscape and overlook much of the existing housing in the area. The buildings will be very high and the green space for each building will not be visible to the public due to these private gardens being surrounded by flats on ALL 4 sides. Hence, the public will see a mass of walls which will create an overall concrete jungle look and feel of the new town. 	<p>It is recognised that air quality is an issue to be addressed in some locations such as close to the north circular. For this reason, dual aspect flats have been assumed in these locations close to the north circular and the issue will continue to be addressed as detailed design progresses. Condition 30.3 requires that a scheme of proposed air pollution measures be submitted to the LP before the commencement of any phase or sub phase.</p> <p>With regard to building height and density, the principle of tall building location and density is unchanged in the s73 scheme from the scheme approved in 2010, and is consistent with the Development Framework.</p> <p>Density is built up in a series of height contours averaging between 4 and 9 storeys. The tallest buildings are generally closer to public transport nodes such as the new Thameslink station. The taller buildings also provide some screening for the lower blocks from the larger pieces of infrastructure such as the North Circular and M1.</p> <p>The illustrative masterplan clearly defines public and private space through the use of consistent building frontages. There is a clear intention in some public areas within the masterplan to create streets with an urban character. Many of these frontages are softened through the use of street planting. In addition there are public squares and new public green spaces within the development.</p>

Ref	Consultee	Comments	Officer Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="464 358 1440 456">• High rise buildings can create problems concerning lack of sunlight and daylight. In the Health document the developer's state that lack of sunlight can affect mood and that some of the buildings failed to meet sunlight and daylight guidelines. These buildings need to be identified to ensure that the remedies suggested are followed through. <li data-bbox="464 1024 1440 1300">• The developers state that the 'character of Brent Terrace will be retained and enhanced...' Brent Terrace is a very quiet backwater (despite the proximity of the railway) with no other housing overlooking it. The terrace backs onto scrubland which is a wildlife haven. The Terrace is Victorian in character. That the unique character of the Terrace will be retained and enhanced is a fictitious claim since the developers will surround Brent Terrace on both sides and at the ends of the terrace with buildings that are in most cases vastly taller than the existing buildings, so Brent Terrace will be dwarfed and overlooked from all directions and will suffer a total loss of privacy. The developers will tear up the scrubland behind the terraces to turn it into a narrow park, a noisy 2-4 lane road and huge blocks of flats (6-20 stories high). The green triangles (one is an old playground) will have housing built on them, which although only 3 stories high, will dwarf the existing terrace buildings (which are only 2 	<p data-bbox="1461 350 1988 992">The sunlight and daylight assessment reported in the Microclimate chapter of the ES was based on block parameters, which were derived from the indicative layout plan. Best practice guide values were met at all amenity spaces within the area surrounding the Site in respect of the sunlight assessment and this will be maintained during detailed design. The majority of façade assessment locations within the area surrounding the proposed development meet the recommendations of best practice guidelines for daylight availability. However three façade assessment locations failed to meet the recommended guidelines. At the detailed design stage, further analysis of micro-climates will be necessary to refine the design of individual buildings and groups of buildings within the public realm in order to deliver the necessary environmental standards. The predicted daylight impacts will need to be retested to ensure that the relevant buildings are designed to deliver acceptable standards of daylight to neighbouring properties. These minor refinements during detailed design will mitigate these impacts and would result in all façades meeting or exceeding the guide value.</p> <p data-bbox="1461 1024 1988 1097">The approach to development in this area is consistent with the 2010 Permission and the Development Framework.</p> <p data-bbox="1461 1130 1988 1300">The outline planning application does not specify the number of properties on the 'triangles' (plots 53 and 54). The detailed design including the number of properties will be subject to a reserved matters planning application and public consultation. Developments on these sites will conform with London Plan policy and the planning parameters</p>

Ref	Consultee	Comments	Officer Response
		<p>stories high) because the ground of the triangles is at a higher level. Our hedgerow, running the length of our street will be ripped out to build the extra houses. All of this will occur so that the developers can increase the size of their shopping centre!</p>	<p>with regard to height, privacy and overlooking.</p> <p>The proposal will result in an urban form very different from surrounding areas of Barnet although suitable for its strategic location and urban setting. It is considered that the high density urban nature of the proposal – which does include tall buildings at the heart of the new town centre – responds to national, London and local planning policy as being the most sustainable way to make use of urban land. The residential blocks between Brent Terrace and the railway line will be higher than the terrace and will be flats. Heights will be up to 65 metres facing the railway.</p>
		<p>Letter/Questions submitted 24/11/13</p> <p>How many houses on each triangle? Houses or flats?</p> <p>How high – how many storeys?</p> <p>Underground parking?</p> <p>If we are supposed to agree to this and this will happen early in the first phase of the development, where are the plans for these new residences?</p>	<p>The outline planning application does not specify the number of properties on the 'triangles'. The detailed design including the number of properties will be subject to a new reserved matters planning application and public consultation. However, the illustrative masterplan which shows one possible way in which the scheme could be built shows 36 units across both sites.</p> <p>Parameter Plan 007 (within Appendix 2 of the DSF (BXC01)) shows a maximum height of between 10m and 12m. The detailed design of the properties on the triangles is a reserved matter.</p> <p>Parameter Plan 009 Basement and Service Access identifies that the triangles are areas with no basements. Therefore, no underground parking will be provided.</p> <p>As identified above, the detailed design of the properties on the triangles is a reserved matter.</p>

Ref	Consultee	Comments	Officer Response
		<p>How are you proposing to deal with the parking problem in the street that these new houses will cause?</p> <p>What will happen to our hedgerow?</p> <p>How are you proposing to get the big trucks up our very narrow street?</p> <p>How will you deal with the problem of these houses overlooking all the houses around them in Brent Terrace & Clitterhouse?</p> <p>Will the new residences be in keeping with the character of Brent Terrace?</p> <p>Children play on these triangles. Why will these green spaces not be replaced until the 5th phase?</p>	<p>The car parking associated with the proposed residential units on the triangles will be in line with the car parking standards identified in the 2010 Planning Permission (Condition 38.2) which is 1 car parking space per residential unit. The detailed design of this car parking will be subject of the reserved matters application and associated public consultation.</p> <p>As shown on Parameter Plan 003 the street is to be framed by green spaces/corridors.</p> <p>A condition of consent (Condition 12.1) requires a site wide Construction Traffic Management Plan to be approved prior to the start of any work. This will set out traffic management procedures and processes to mitigate any impacts arising from construction traffic including the appointment of a Traffic Management Officer. A Construction Workers Travel Plan will also be agreed with the Council. The permitted lorry/construction traffic routes will be agreed with TfL and LBB.</p> <p>There will be an opportunity to consider the detailed design of the properties when the relevant reserved matters application has been submitted to the Council. The design will be expected to accord with the relevant planning policies in this respect</p> <p>This design will be subject to further public consultation as part of the reserved matters application.</p> <p>It is proposed that Claremont Park will be constructed in Phase 1A, and that this will provide new play facilities for a number of age groups to</p>

Ref	Consultee	Comments	Officer Response
		<p>One is a designated playground and one has a sign saying Claremont Open Space. How is it possible that the Council can build on such green spaces?</p> <p>Can we have the measurements for the triangles, each housing unit, each housing unit garden & parking space?</p> <p>The triangles are being built on to replace Whitefield housing stock. Where are the other 2 areas that will be used for this purpose</p> <p>What assurances can you give us that the developers will not take our garden allotments? Why are they coloured green in all plans? Will our Brent Terrace garden allotments become part of the new spine road park?</p> <p>How high will the blocks of flats be along the spine road?</p>	<p>serve the existing residents of the area, including Brent Terrace. The new Claremont Park is intended to provide a significantly enhanced recreation and play facility within a very short distance of the existing triangles which it will replace in terms of open space. Furthermore, Clitterhouse Playing Fields (Part 1) will also benefit from major investment in Phase 1A including extensive landscaping, planting and new sports and play facilities.</p> <p>As with the 2010 Planning Permission the Section 73 proposes the removal of the existing two triangles of open space in Brent Terrace. Please see the open space section of the committee report (and the answers to similar questions above)</p> <p>The detailed design of the properties and associated car parking and gardens on the triangles is a reserved matters and has not been finalised but will be subject to a new application and public consultation in the future. However, Appendix 10 of the Development Specification Framework sets out the maximum and minimum scale thresholds for the area.</p> <p>It is too early in the process for the sites to be identified to house Whitefield Residents</p> <p>There will be the opportunity to use part of the new Brent Terrace Park for allotments but this will be subject to detailed design at the appropriate stage.</p> <p>The detailed design of the properties is a reserved</p>

Ref	Consultee	Comments	Officer Response
		<p>Can we have the measurements for all aspects between the railway line and the Brent Terrace houses, i.e. width of blocks of flats, spine road, spine road park, Brent Terrace garden allotments?</p> <p>Brent Terrace children will have no access from their houses to this park. They do on the 'triangles'. What will you do about this?</p> <p>This park is unsafe for children (compared to the triangles), being next to a 4 lane very busy road. What will you do about this?</p> <p>The park is unsafe for children (compared to the triangles), since they will be more exposed to unknown adults. What will you do about this?</p>	<p>matter. However, Parameter Plan 007 identifies that the maximum frontage heights along the Spine Road are 27m stepping up to a maximum height of 65m in certain locations as in the 2010 Planning Permission. Please see earlier comments to a similar question.</p> <p>The dimensions for these elements will be determined at detailed design stage. However, Appendix 10 of the DSF does provide building scale thresholds and Parameter Plan 003 confirms the minimum sizes of open space, including Brent Terrace Park at 2.1ha.</p> <p>There will be access to the new Brent Terrace Park from the southern and northern ends of Brent Terrace, as well as to Claremont Park at the northern end of Brent Terrace. There is also potential for an access point to be created midway along Brent Terrace, and the illustrative park design shown in the Public Realm and Open Space Strategy (BXC07) on p.117 has been developed to be flexible enough to allow for this to happen. There will be further consultation with residents at the next design stage.</p> <p>The proximity of the park to the road will ensure that there is good oversight and informal surveillance of the park. In addition, all play areas will be enclosed by fencing in accordance with appropriate current good practice guidelines.</p> <p>The park will provide new recreation facilities for both existing and new residential communities. It is hoped that this will be a well-used facility which will be 'self-policing', and which is overlooked from the properties of Brent Terrace and new development.</p>

Ref	Consultee	Comments	Officer Response
		<p>How wide will the park be?</p> <p>How high will the new school be where it backs onto Brent Terrace?</p> <p>Is it necessary to back the school directly onto Brent Terrace? The current school is oriented differently and is lower. The new school is likely to block light and cause loss of privacy due to overlooking of the 2-storey houses on Brent Terrace. A new 3 storey building following the current foot print and being the same distance from the road (Brent Terrace) as currently, will be less intrusive than what seems to be described in the developers' diagrams and documents.</p> <p>Is it necessary to have a primary school of over 600 children (factory education)? Couldn't we have 2 schools in the area?</p>	<p>It will be no different to any other park, where there will be a mix of people using it. It should be noted that the triangles are currently separated from the properties within Brent Terrace by car parking and roadway</p> <p>The dimensions of the park are not set at this stage. It will be a minimum of 2.1ha and the illustrative masterplan shows it as a width of 24m. This detail will be included in the reserved matters application.</p> <p>The detailed design of the school is a reserved matter. However, as detailed in Appendix 10 of the DSF and Parameter Plan 007 the maximum height identified for buildings on this plot is 16m.</p> <p>The detailed design of the school is a reserved matter. However, as detailed in Appendix 10 of the DSF and Parameter Plan 007 the maximum height identified for buildings on this plot is 16m and the design of the building will seek to ensure that there are no significant impacts on residential amenity in accordance with planning policy. Parameter Plan 003 also shows that the northern boundary will be separated from Brent Terrace by a green corridor.</p> <p>As with the 2010 Planning Permission, the Section 73 application proposes the expansion of the existing Claremont Primary School from 1 form of entry (210 pupils) to 3 forms of entry (630 pupils) in order to meet the increase in demand for primary school places expected to arise from the development. This approach has been agreed with Barnet Council throughout the evolution of proposals and is in line with existing provision elsewhere in the Borough.</p>

Ref	Consultee	Comments	Officer Response
		<p>What is the bridge-type structure shown on some development diagrams between the new Claremont school and Clitterhouse playing fields where the current farm buildings stand?</p> <p>What will happen to the farm buildings in the development</p> <p>Why will 1/5 of Clitterhouse playing fields be effectively given to Whitefield school? Isn't this merely so that more large residential blocks of flats can be built on the current school grounds?</p> <p>What will happen to the Spring in the middle of the playing fields?</p> <p>Will the playing fields be levelled under the development plans?</p>	<p>The 'bridge-type' structure shown on some development diagrams is not a bridge, but a graphic representation of a 'shared surface' like a pedestrian crossing to allow easy and safe crossing of the road at this point and to slow vehicles down.</p> <p>Please see earlier comments on the Clitterhouse Farm issue</p> <p>There are no plans to give 1/5 of the playing fields to Whitefield School for their sole use. The sports facilities at Clitterhouse Playing Fields will be significantly improved to allow for greater use throughout the year by both the schools and the community. The schools will be able to make use of the facilities during school hours, while the community will be able to make full use of the facilities out of school hours and in the school holidays. There will be flexibility in the timetabling to ensure that community use of the facilities will be possible during school hours if required.</p> <p>There will be detailed investigation of the spring in the middle of the playing fields during the detailed design stage and it is likely that it will be integrated into a comprehensive sustainable urban drainage system. The spring may be developed as part of a swale or other similar drainage feature as part of the proposals for the pavilion in the playing-fields.</p> <p>The playing fields will be levelled under the development plans where these areas have been allocated for formal playing pitches. The area of the playing fields to the north west corner of the site, not shown as formal pitches on the plans, are not likely to be levelled and are likely to be retained as</p>

Ref	Consultee	Comments	Officer Response
		<p data-bbox="422 435 1377 459">What are all the coloured patches shown in various parts of the masterplan of the playing fields?</p> <p data-bbox="422 618 1440 695">The Council has removed the Hendon football club and 1/5 of the playing fields, so this will result in LESS green space in an area that will have nearly 4 x the number of current residents when the plan is completed</p> <p data-bbox="422 1062 1440 1114">This seems to peter out at its northern end where it meets the new buildings. Where is traffic thought to continue at this point (near 'U' on summer 2013 development plan or diagram E)</p> <p data-bbox="422 1170 1440 1247">Why can't the new 4 lane spine road be run next to the railway line? This will keep all the noise, traffic and pollution next to the railway line. It will also be safer for children playing in the park and for children from the flats – if they don't have to cross a 4 lane very busy road to play in a park</p>	<p data-bbox="1465 354 1988 402">a gentle rolling area of grassland for informal recreation and for community events.</p> <p data-bbox="1465 435 1988 586">The illustrative masterplan for the playing fields shows different pitches for different sports, as well as provision for a play area, a skate park, parking and a space for informal recreation. A sports pavilion/café and new changing rooms are also shown.</p> <p data-bbox="1465 618 1988 1032">As noted above the sports facilities proposed are to be for both school use and for community use. The proposals for the playing fields will see significant improvements to the quality of the pitches (which are currently unusable for periods of time over the winter months due to poor drainage) enabling the pitches to be used for a greater number of matches and for a longer period of time over the winter and summer months. While there may be an increase in the number of people wishing to use the pitches, this will be compensated for by the improvements to the pitches, and the increase in the number of pitches and provision of all-weather surfaces in some instances, allowing for increased overall use. The future use of Hendon football club does not form part of the Section 73 application.</p> <p data-bbox="1465 1062 1988 1138">Claremont Road links to Claremont Avenue at its northern end which then provides access to Tilling Road.</p> <p data-bbox="1465 1170 1988 1320">The proposed location of Spine Road is supported in the adopted Development Framework and is permitted in the 2010 Planning Permission. The design intent for the location of the Spine Road is to be a 'Park Road' so that the park is highly visible and accessible to local residents. If the road were</p>

Ref	Consultee	Comments	Officer Response
		<p>Will the spine road take over in prominence from Claremont road?</p> <p>Will we lose the pedestrian crossing over the A406 under the Hendon Way?</p> <p>Why are 2 pedestrian bridges necessary over the A406? They are very close together</p> <p>Why can't we have the new pedestrian/cycle bridge over the railway line instead of one of the 2 pedestrian bridges during the 1st phase? It would work well for bringing people into Brent Cross and help residents.</p>	<p>on the railway side, then only the residents of the new homes would be able to see and have immediate access to the Park. With the proposed configuration, everyone can enjoy views and access to the park; it will also make the park safer as it is always overlooked by pedestrian and vehicular traffic. It is likely that there will be a number of controlled crossing points so it will be safe to cross the road at several points.</p> <p>As identified on Parameter Plan 002, Claremont Road is being directly connected to Tilling Road, via the new Claremont Avenue. The Spine Road will mainly attract persons wishing to enter the development area.</p> <p>The pedestrian crossing of the Hendon Way adjacent to the Shopping Centre is being improved to ensure it is a safe and pleasant environment.</p> <p>The Living Bridge (identified as B7 on Parameter Plan 002) is being proposed so as to provide a stronger connection between the northern and southern elements of the development area. It is also intended to provide an important element of public realm. The pedestrian bridge (B4) is intended to provide improved access between the town centre and Brent Cross Underground Station. Improved connectivity with the site is a key aspiration of planning policy and the Section 73 application.</p> <p>The bridge over the Railway from Geron Way is for pedestrians only and will be provided when the Station quarter is delivered in later phases.</p>

Ref	Consultee	Comments	Officer Response
		<p data-bbox="422 367 1436 415">It is stated that 'the step free access to areas will be removed' for pedestrians and cycles. What does this mean?</p> <p data-bbox="422 1016 953 1040">How will the pedestrian and cycle ways be improved?</p>	<p data-bbox="1465 367 1984 984">The Section 73 application continues to include proposals for step free access at Brent Cross London Underground and Cricklewood Stations. Funding remains in the Consolidated Transport Fund in the Section 106 Agreement for step free access feasibility studies, along with funding to contribute to the improvements at Brent Cross London Underground. The Consolidated Transport Fund does not include funding for the step free access at Cricklewood Station. The Transport Assessment modelling forecasts that Phase 1 will generate limited numbers of additional passengers at Cricklewood station, Consequently, the step free access works at the existing Cricklewood Station are not considered a mitigation necessity of the Phase 1. It should also be considered in the context of improvements that are being made in Phase 1 including step free access at new Brent Cross Bus Station, the Living Bridge, and the contribution to step free at Brent Cross London Underground, as well as future step free access at the BXC railway station. This approach is considered consistent with Development Plan policy.</p> <p data-bbox="1465 1016 1984 1299">The Living Bridge provides a completely new and attractive pedestrian and cycle route between the Brent Cross Town Centre and the Clitterhouse Park to the south of the A406 which was not part of the 2010 Planning Permission. The other pedestrian and cyclist improvements are identical to the 2010 Planning Permission. This is described in more detail in the Design and Access Statement. Also, more detail of the improvements will be identified in the Walking and Cycling Study which is to be submitted to the Council in accordance with</p>

Ref	Consultee	Comments	Officer Response
		<p>area of NW London towards Central London, and principal connection for cyclists between the suburbs of Edgware, Colindale, West Hendon, Cricklewood and Kilburn. We require, first and foremost, a safe, direct, protected route on the A5. This is not provided for in the current plan, and the cycling alternatives to the A5 envisaged in the plan are not viable or practical. The A5 is not part of the development area itself, yet major changes to the A5 junction with the A406 are proposed in Phase 1A of the development. It is the responsibility of the developers therefore to provide the cycle route we are demanding on the A5, including particularly a safe and efficient route through the Staples Corner West junction. This needs to take the form either of new cycle bridges or tunnels across or under the junction, on the line of the A5, or cycle tracks with dedicated signalling to provide a safe surface-level route on the line of the A5. The A5 is marked with a brown line on the "Detailed Cycle Network" plan, indicating "No specific cycle provision". This is unacceptable. This is the crucial route for cyclists and is the primary location where specific cycle provision is required. (We have discussed this separately with the developers and suggested solutions to them. We suggest that they should agree to jointly plan and fund such a cycling solution for the A5 at Staples Corner West with Transport for London.)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Other key routes within and leading to the development area are Claremont Road, the proposed Spine Road North (on the site of Brent Terrace), Tilling road, Prince Charles Drive, Brent Park Road, Shirehall Lane, Brentfield Gardens, the A406 east of Brent Cross, and the A406 west of Staples Corner, and through Staples Corner, all marked as part of the cycle network, yet all with "No specific cycle provision". This is unacceptable, as these roads either now carry, or will carry when the development is completed, large volumes of motor traffic: that is, above the 2,000 passenger car units (PCUs) per day the LCC regards as the acceptable limit for cycle routes on space shared with motor vehicles. • A number of the cycle routes in the plan on entirely new road infrastructure are projected to consist of advisory cycle lanes. This is unacceptable, as advisory cycle lanes provide no protection to cyclists. As these roads are being built from scratch, fully separated and protected cycle tracks or paths should be built, if the roads are projected to carry more than 2000 PCUs a day. • The key cycle links between the development area and the A5, at Staples Corner West and the new road bridge across the railway line, plus the links to the development area from the east side of the A41, are shown on the plan as "Shared Footways". This is unacceptable for new build in a densely populated urban area. Pedestrian and cycle infrastructure should be separate in places where there are likely to be significant numbers of both user group, as the 	<p>The Mayor does not support the provision of cycle routes on strategic roads such as the A5 where there is insufficient space for safe cycling facilities. Therefore, a parallel and safer north – south route through the Development has been provided.</p> <p>There is an entirely coherent parallel cycle route to the A5 which will be clearly signed and apparent to the cyclist on site. These roads are indicated as available to cyclists but less proficient cyclists have alternative safer routes that they can use.</p> <p>There is no requirement to provide fully segregated cycle facilities on the new roads and there are alternative routes provided for cyclists.</p> <p>Shared footways are proposed in a number of locations and are considered acceptable and meet the requisite design standards.</p>

Ref	Consultee	Comments	Officer Response
		<p>two groups have entirely different needs, and shared infrastructure will create danger for both types of user, will cause conflict and resentment, and will fail to effectively facilitate cycling.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Apart from the failure to provide safe cycling facilities on the A5, the plan fails to provide a coherent route for cycling parallel to the A5. The shared footways shown around Staples Corner, apart from the problem of them being shared, do not work, as they provide no connection with the northbound side of the A5. • There should be specific cycle provision on all the new bridges planned across the A406, the A41 and across the railway. The only one where cycle provision is shown is the new road bridge across the railway south of the proposed station. This is inadequate to address the current severance to cycle routes due to the barriers of the railway, the A406, and the A41. 	<p>A number of routes are provided through the development that provide an alternative to cycling along the A5.</p> <p>There are new dedicated cycle crossings being provided across the A 406 (3 in all), the Mainline Railway and the A 41.</p>
19	Federation of Residents Associations in Barnet (FORAB) – OBJECT	<p>FORAB supports the regeneration of this area as much of it is underused and other parts are long past their useful life and would benefit from major capital investment. This is an opportunity to regenerate the area with sustainable (social, environment and economic) buildings meeting a variety of needs fit for the 21st century.</p> <p><i>Main Objections:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This scheme is dependent on increased private cars to make it viable. There is no provision of any form of light railway, trams or other mass public transit system linking the site to the two main line railways and eight TfL tube lines that all run North to south within the Borough or its immediate neighbours. This scheme is predicated on 29,000 extra cars per day. This is in addition to all the extra car journeys generated by the 10,000 new homes in the Colindale area and total of 22,250 new homes across the Borough over the next seven years (possibly up to 45,000 by the time the BXC scheme is finished). • It has been argued that many present and future journeys to Brent Cross are made by bus and this will increase as more bus routes come to the new bus station. This is some disingenuous as it has been noted that many of the people travelling by bus to the bus station do not enter the shopping mall but cross over to another bus to continue their journey. This is an interchange station as well as a destination point. Provision must be made for land to be ring fenced for a mass transit light rail or similar system as part of the application for the route. 	<p>A high quality bus service will be provided between the new town centres north and south of the A406 and the new railway station on the MML. Good bus links are already provided between Brent Cross Underground station and the Shopping Centre and the connections between these two locations will be improved as part of the scheme, including through the provision of a better walking route via the Living Bridge.</p> <p>The new bus station is planned to provide good quality interchange facilities for passengers. TfL have approved all the modelling and modal share predictions which are based on the current transport strategy for the whole development, and not just the retail element.</p>

Ref	Consultee	Comments	Officer Response
			<p>The suggestion of a new orbital railway of some form would no doubt benefit North London as a whole, and may be promoted by TfL, but there is no need for such a facility identified in regard to the Brent Cross Cricklewood Development alone</p> <p>The provenance of the 29,000 cars figure is from the Regeneration Area Development Framework, which was prepared in 2003 and 2004 and was based on a simple spreadsheet form of assessments and there had been no comprehensive modelling of new journeys which has now been undertaken to support the current planning application. For example, the 29,000 figure includes traffic generated by the West Hendon regeneration scheme which is not part of BXC and that the figure does not account for road trips that will be removed as a result of the change of uses of the site through the regeneration – for example the removal of a number of existing industrial premises. Nor does it properly account for the future choice of travel mode when all the proposed public transport improvements come forward when it is predicted that there will be less use of the private car and a shift to use of public transport, walking and cycling.</p> <p>The Development Framework figure was generated using basic assessment methods that were inappropriate for a mixed use scheme on the scale of BXC where the existing traffic patterns will change significantly and that since then, much more precise modelling has been done and these latest more accurate assessments and predictions have been accepted by both Barnet and TfL.</p> <p>The 29,000 figure quoted in the Development Framework is over a whole 12 hour day and the</p>

Ref	Consultee	Comments	Officer Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="464 602 1430 703">• The incinerator with a 140m high chimney is still included in the scheme. The need for it has never been made and is even more doubtful now the NLWP has been rejected by the planning inspector and the whole basis for it questioned in light of new information and a changing environment. <li data-bbox="464 1016 1423 1089">• The proposed road improvements in phase one have not been properly thought through. They will lead to rat running through many of the existing side roads in Barnet, Camden and Brent and new roads on the West Hendon estate. <li data-bbox="464 1198 1430 1320">• The revised phasing allows for the extension of the shopping mall and is in effect the original 1996 scheme which was rejected by the Secretary of State in 1999 and confirmed as unsuitable through the Courts in 2000 and 2002. The remaining parts of the original outline permission are subject to finding a developer to take them on and they may, or may not proceed, but if they do they are unlikely to follow the current master plan. If the scheme 	<p data-bbox="1461 354 1990 529">equivalent 12 hour period traffic flow for the BXC development is 8000, but it is the peak hour traffic flow that is the concern when considering traffic congestion Development in Colindale is included as a set of committed schemes within the BXC Transport Model</p> <p data-bbox="1461 613 1990 764">Fuel for the waste to energy plant, will be a refuse derived fuel and can be sourced from a number of suppliers. As such the plant is not reliant on waste from the NLWA but could take this as a feedstock, subject to the necessary treatment to convert it into a refuse derived fuel. The Environmental Statement has considered the appropriate stack height of the CHP stack based on optimal dispersion and acceptable visual impact. The maximum height of the stack will be 140m, however, the actual height will be refined within that maximum limit at the detailed design stage and take due account of the proposed height depending on the height of the adjacent buildings.</p> <p data-bbox="1461 1000 1990 1151">The need to prevent rat running has been addressed in the proposals to date and is also the subject of the ongoing A5 Corridor Study which will address any issues along the corridor in Barnet, Brent and Camden. West Hendon is the subject of a separate application.</p> <p data-bbox="1461 1206 1990 1308">This 2010 application (and this Section 73 application) differs from the scheme rejected by the Secretary of State as it is for comprehensive development to create a new town centre on both</p>

Ref	Consultee	Comments	Officer Response
		<p>was reduced in scale and scope this could be a blessing, but if the profitable parts are cherry picked for progression and the socially desirable, but less profitable, bits are omitted then that will be a curse on the community. This variation should not be granted until the longer term regeneration of the area is addressed and is legally binding.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • On a number of occasions we were assured by the developers that the housing proposals were in full compliance with the adopted version of the Barnet Local Plan and the adopted version of the Mayor for London's adopted Plan. It now appears that this is not the case. Some flats have no identified amenity space. Others have balconies which are not compliant with the adopted plans. It appears that some green spaces are identified as amenity space for the flats but are also included in the calculations of replacement open spaces. This is double counting which reduces the amount of green space provided to maximise profits by covering what should be green space with buildings. There is insufficient information to check other details in the time available. • The quality of much of the open space is highly questionable having regard to its proximity to the North Circular Road and its impact on noise and pollution. This road frequently breaches the European standards for air quality. These will become more frequent with the increase in traffic on this arterial ring road from the growth in number of new homes generally in Barnet plus the extra 29,000 cars a day and particulates from the increased bus trips. It is a noticeable omission that information from traffic and other surveys carried out in the vicinity this summer has not been included in the documentation. This suggests that it is not favourable to the developers cause. • There is still no recognition of the negative impact these proposals will have on the surrounding communities in Barnet, Brent and Camden and especially the various shopping centres. There is no evidence of discussions with the other Boroughs. No impact assessments. No proposals to mitigate the harm. No proposals for support either in cash or 	<p>sides of the A406. Please see discussion of the 'cherry picking' issue in the main report.</p> <p>Please see the appraisal section of the report for discussion on this issue. All reserved matter applications will be expected to comply with the current London Plan standards in this respect.</p> <p>With regards to the results of the monitoring, this is nothing unusual for London, where there are typically exceedances of the air quality standards close to major roads and the results from the site adjacent to the A406, give some comfort that this location is typical. However, in terms of the assessment that was undertaken, the monitoring has little material effect on the core assessment method and assumptions, and the findings. The assessment remains valid, as it is based upon the assessment of traffic related emissions and baseline conditions a considerable time into the future where emissions will be distinctly different from the current vehicle fleet.</p> <p>Planning conditions require the establishment of air quality monitoring stations.</p> <p>The proposals are consistent with the London Plan, Core Strategy and Development Framework which seek to see Brent Cross, Cricklewood evolve into a Metropolitan Town Centre. Further discussion of this issue can be found in the retail section of the committee report.</p>

Ref	Consultee	Comments	Officer Response
		<p>kind for the affected communities and retailers.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The case has not been made for the office accommodation. All over London, and that includes all corners of Barnet Borough, there are empty or near empty office blocks. Applications are being made, again all over the Borough, for them to be converted to housing under the new permitted development rights legislation. As this a S73 application and in the absence of any justification for the need for the high rise office tower blocks why have they not been omitted or a more suitable use found for them? • This argument also applies to the proposal to build on the only remaining bit of green space in the Barnet corner of Cricklewood in front of B & Q. This was provided as part of the planning deal for the B & Q store (S52, precursor of the S106). If there is a need to relocate an existing facility there are many other possible locations within the scheme. It has been argued that bits of the original application cannot be changed as it is “all or nothing”. If one follows this argument to its logical conclusion therefore this whole S73 application should be rejected as it is seeking to vary various elements of the original application. If one part can be changed to suit the business objectives of the developer why cannot another part, which I think we all would agree, was a mistake also be changed. The only bit of green open space visible from the street in the area should be kept as originally promised by your predecessors. • The Brent Cross Cricklewood area needs improvements which will cost a lot of money most of which will come from the private sector. The Council must take the lead in ensuring that any works are, to quote the government’s National Planning Policy Framework “Socially, Environmentally and Economically Sustainable”. • The present proposals provide economic advantage to the developers. They do not provide the Barnet residents, plus also those of Brent and Camden with a socially, environmentally and economically viable sustainable future. 	<p>The approach is consistent with the Local Plan, Core Strategy and Development Framework, and is no different to the 2010 Permission. Details are set out in the Retail Report Addendum (BXC06).</p> <p>Please see discussion on this issue in the main committee report and above. The London Plan supports office development in this location.</p> <p>Please see the open space section of the committee report.</p>
20	Mapesbury Residents	<p>Consider that some aspects of the proposal have been improved. Object to the development of the open space adjacent to B & Q in Cricklewood Lane. There is no logic in it being associated with B & Q. The Brent Cross Development should contribute more than the improvement of road junctions to Cricklewood Town Centre. Building on this open space would be a retrograde step.</p>	<p>Please see comments elsewhere on the B & Q space.</p>

Ref	Consultee	Comments	Officer Response
	Association.		
21	Residents' Community Association Railway Terraces OBJECT	<p><i>Increase in noise</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some noise survey information is now included in the document. It demonstrates a major deterioration to our current situation. The noise from the freight transfer station will be, as we understand it, 15DB (including 5DB tonal/intermittent penalty) above background noise instead of 10DB below which is a more normal criteria. (The acoustic screen is inadequate and will not preserve the 'tranquility' of our conservation area). 	<p>Baseline noise levels in the railway cottages Conservation Area are low, and have been quantified in the ES. The proposed freight yard will introduce an additional noise source and a buffer has been provided within which a substantial landscaped noise bund will be constructed. Whilst noise levels in the Conservation Area will be increased at night, the future design of the bund will be developed to minimise this and to avoid significant noise disturbance to residents. Noise modelling indicates that it would not be possible to prevent any increase in noise levels at the closest properties, although it should be possible to control noise levels from the facility to within LAeq, 5 minutes 45 dB at the nearest property. Over a full 8 hour night LAeq, (2300-0700 hours) levels would be lower than the 45 dB LAeq level predicted over 5 minutes. As such the operation of the freight facility is not expected to cause sleep disturbance, although the increase in noise will be noticeable during periods of lorry activity.</p> <p>The noise modelling should be updated as the design progresses to inform the design of the rail freight facility and the bund. It may be that better noise levels can be achieved, but the ES is based on an outline design at this stage.</p> <p>An additional planning condition is proposed (29.9) which require the applicant to submit information regarding the detailed layout of the rail freight facility and associated acoustic barriers which will be supported by detailed noise modelling.</p>

Ref	Consultee	Comments	Officer Response
		<p><i>Loss of green spaces</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The B&Q green space in Cricklewood Lane was omitted from the calculation of open space and this should be rectified and the plans readjusted so that no loss occurs in Cricklewood town centre. We are also concerned about the loss of two green triangles of children's play areas adjacent to Brent Terrace. We feel in other parts of the borough these areas, in all likelihood, would be preserved. This proposed sale of public land is in the same planning application as the Brent Cross Shopping Centre expansion, even though that is a mile away. 	<p>The land adjacent to B&Q has not been identified in any recent planning policy document, including the UDP, Development Framework of Core Strategy. As such, the space was not included in any public open space calculations. This site was included in the 2010 application as the site has historically been subject to anti-social behaviour and it was considered that there were sound urban design reasons for continuing the active built frontage to this side of Cricklewood Lane. For further discussion in relation to this site please see the summary and the open space section of this report. The scheme provides a comprehensive public realm and open space strategy, as set out in the Public Realm and Open Space Strategy (BXC07). Claremont Way Open Space is at present an open space which offers no play facilities. This space has poor access and offers no passive surveillance. The proposals for the new Claremont Park will see the creation of a new open space, with seating, seasonal planting and numerous access points, as well as two play areas for different age groups. There will be passive surveillance of the new park from the new road which will run along its northern edge and in due course from the residential development to the north. It is considered that the new park will provide a significantly improved open space than that provided by the existing Claremont Way Open Space and triangles. As with the 2010 Planning Permission the Section 73 proposes the removal of the existing two triangles of open space in Brent Terrace. It is recognised that these areas are used by local people. The development of these areas is supported in the adopted Development Framework and is permitted in the 2010 Planning Permission.</p>

Ref	Consultee	Comments	Officer Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Throughout the development plan the open spaces do not meet the criteria (the living bridge cannot be considered amenity space on this basis) – only 20% are quiet enough to meet the noise criteria. Quieter open space should be provided particularly as this is being relied upon to service the new housing. <p><i>Housing - Changes to previous plans and inadequacies</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Cricklewood Lane development now has 26 units not 25 as consented. All units are serviced from the street with no parking. Servicing is inadequate and retail development is 	<p>It is proposed that Claremont Park will be constructed in Phase 1A, and that this will provide new play facilities for a number of age groups to serve the existing residents of the area, including Brent Terrace.</p> <p>Clitterhouse Playing Fields (Part 1) will also benefit from major investment in Phase 1A including extensive landscaping, planting and new sports and play facilities. There is and will be easy access to these areas from all parts of the Regeneration Area.</p> <p>The preferred ambient noise level for parks and recreational areas is no higher than LAeq, daytime 50-55 dB. None of the open spaces (with the minimum noise contours) within the site currently achieve a noise level of 55dB or less. However around 24% of overall open/amenity spaces within the proposed Scheme (as amended by the s. 73 application) achieve a noise level of below 55dB or less, and noise levels in some of the existing open space are predicted to improve with the Scheme in place - in Clitterhouse Playing Fields the addition of new buildings and low noise surface on the A406 will reduce noise levels in the central part of the park such that approximately half of the recreational area would experience noise levels below LAeq, daytime 55dB</p> <p>The unit nos. for illustrative plots 30 and 58 are indicative and will be further developed by detailed</p>

Ref	Consultee	Comments	Officer Response
		<p>not appropriate.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Substandard housing is proposed with insufficient private amenity space. The bespoke criteria for 1 and 2 bedroom flats are insufficient to meet GLA guidelines something the developers assert they meet. <p><i>Station</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cricklewood station is described as having step free access, amended road junction and a 'drop off' for the RTS. Elsewhere it is a green space, no step free access & a building plot with no vehicular access or parking. It can't be both. The documentation is full of discrepancies and the offer is unclear. 	<p>design proposals to be brought forward within Reserved Matters Applications (RMAs). The total development quantum permissible in Cricklewood Lane Development Zone has not changed from that set out in the 2010 permission which the Revised Development Specification Framework (BXC01) confirms to be 2,380m² of residential floorspace.</p> <p>Proposals submitted within RMAs will be subject to the maximum development quantum and other parameters set out in the Revised Development Specification Framework. The servicing strategy will be confirmed at the same time. Some retail development is permitted within both of these plots within the 2010 Planning Permission, reflecting its proximity to Cricklewood Town Centre.</p> <p>Please see the open space section of the committee report for analysis of the amenity space proposed.</p> <p>The Parameter Plans and the Revised Development Specification Framework (BXC01) provide the relevant controls for this area. This shows that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the Cricklewood station forecourt may be upgraded, which will include public realm enhancements although this is not currently funded in the CTF; The station may be provided with step free access enhancements, although this is not currently funded in the CTF; The A407/Claremont Road junction will be enhanced;

Ref	Consultee	Comments	Officer Response
		<p data-bbox="422 354 1010 378"><i>Increase in Traffic and in present unacceptable air pollution</i></p> <ul data-bbox="464 396 1434 548" style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="464 396 1434 548">• The proposal is unsustainable, particularly because of the extra car traffic that will be generated. Barnet produced "Supplementary Planning Guidance" for Brent Cross, estimating over 29,000 extra cars a day in the area. For that reason, the Brent Cross developers propose spending £200-million on the surrounding roads - but the congestion will spill over a larger area, and also fails to reduce carbon emissions and improve air quality which greatly exceeds guidelines at the North Circular 	<p data-bbox="1463 370 1990 857">The provenance of the 29,000 cars figure is from the Regeneration Area Development Framework, which was prepared in 2003 and 2004 and was based on a simple spreadsheet form of assessments and there had been no comprehensive modelling of new journeys which has now been undertaken to support the current planning application. For example, the 29,000 figure includes traffic generated by the West Hendon regeneration scheme which is not part of BXC and that the figure does not account for road trips that will be removed as a result of the change of uses of the site through the regeneration – for example the removal of a number of existing industrial premises. Nor does it properly account for the future choice of travel mode when all the proposed public transport improvements come forward when it is predicted that there will be less use of the private car and a shift to use of public transport, walking and cycling.</p> <p data-bbox="1463 875 1990 1078">The Development Framework figure was generated using basic assessment methods that were inappropriate for a mixed use scheme on the scale of BXC where the existing traffic patterns will change significantly and that since then, much more precise modelling has been done and these latest more accurate assessments and predictions have been accepted by both Barnet and TfL.</p> <p data-bbox="1463 1105 1990 1282">The 29,000 figure quoted in the Development Framework is over a whole 12 hour day and the equivalent 12 hour period traffic flow for the BXC development is 8000, but it is the peak hour traffic flow that is the concern when considering traffic congestion. This more accurate level of analysis was not undertaken at that time.</p>

Ref	Consultee	Comments	Officer Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="464 621 1402 699">• Barnet refuses to even consider light-rail/tram alternatives. A new branch of the London Overground would do much to alleviate the congestion on the roads. We accept this is an expensive option but one, as residents, we feel would be well supported and sustainable. <li data-bbox="464 821 1409 924">• The proposed depths of basements below the shopping centre have increased from 7m to 9m. The increased soil disposal and risk of flooding has not been addressed. Additional storage would be intensification of use with consequent increase in traffic. It may also be used as parking in due course. 	<p data-bbox="1461 407 1990 561">It is accepted that the air quality currently exceeds guidelines at the Staples Corner junction on the A406. This situation will be improved following the implementation of the proposed highway improvements. Traffic is predicted to flow better and so emissions will be reduced.</p> <p data-bbox="1461 634 1990 760">The suggestion of a new orbital railway of some form would no doubt benefit North London as a whole, and may be promoted by TfL, but there is no need for such a facility identified in regard to the Brent Cross Cricklewood Development alone.</p> <p data-bbox="1461 833 1990 1295">The depth of the Basements will have no impact on the number of car parking spaces which are controlled by the S.106 and the planning conditions as is the quantum of retail floorspace. Basements are regularly below the water table and the issues are addressed by Engineers in the detailed designs. The proposed basements have been assessed in the Environmental Statement, as the numbers of construction vehicle movements used in the assessment have been based on these basements. It is noted, however, that further investigation should be made to confirm the risks of groundwater levels to basements proposed in the S.73 Scheme's designs. Such investigations will take account of the future effects of climate change, comparing the final development layout and excavation parameters against maximum groundwater levels to assess the potential impacts from, and to, groundwater.</p>

Ref	Consultee	Comments	Officer Response
		<p><i>Waste disposal unit</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> We also continue to be concerned about the proposed waste handling facility in the vicinity of a Brent primary school and local housing. <p>We are also concerned about the CHP incinerator at Brent Cross which would process and burn waste from dustcarts, in a furnace with a 140-metre chimney. This eyesore would be the first landmark to be seen as we and visitors to London, leave the M1 motorway.</p>	<p>This objection appears to be based on a misunderstanding of the processes insofar as it refers to 'incineration', which is not permitted under the 2010 permission or the Section 73 application now submitted. The environmental assessment of both the Waste Handling Facility and the Combined Heat and Power facility have both been based on a realistic overall set of parameters and assumptions, derived from other similar facilities. The assessment is considered to be both adequate for the land use stage of the consenting process and robust and sets out the 'likely significant effects' of this and other components of the development bearing in mind that there is likely to be a further EIA in relation to the separate statutory consenting procedures relating to the detailed processes and operation of the facility.</p> <p>The height of 140metres has been specified as a maximum height in the 2010 permission. Actual height will depend on a range of factors and will be informed by a site and technology specific air dispersion modelling exercise. One of the technologies being considered would produce a synthetic gas, which after cleaning could be used as a replacement for natural gas in a large gas fired boiler. In this instance the height of the flue stack would be much lower.</p> <p>The applicants are committed to delivering a CHP and this commitment is independent of issues with the NLWA waste strategy. If the applicants were unable to obtain RDF from the WHF, the CHP would either be fuelled by RDF obtained off-site and transported in by rail, or via another source. The</p>

Ref	Consultee	Comments	Officer Response
			<p>CHP waste to energy plant will provide the heat for the district heating scheme as part of the plans to reduce carbon emissions for the scheme. It is therefore required in the early phases of the scheme.</p>
22	<p>Clitterhouse Farm Project – OBJECT</p>	<p>The Clitterhouse Farm Project are a grass roots community group of local residents and organisations within the regeneration area. We strongly object to any future plans to demolish the Clitterhouse Farm buildings and replace them with park sheds/depot and car parking, as proposed in the BXC planning application.</p> <p>We are of the view that the proposed demolition of the Clitterhouse Farm buildings will have a detrimental impact on the identity of the area, its community and its future character.</p> <p>Specific objections:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Loss of community facilities <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Farm buildings are identified in the planning application's BXCC03 - Revised DAS (page 35) as having 'Community' land use. In the past the Farm buildings housed changing rooms, public toilets and the park keeper's house. The fact that the buildings have been derelict for some time is in no way a sign that they are not a much needed community resource. • The area has been neglected for more than two decades as a result of the uncertainty over the BXC regeneration. Additionally, the recent loss of the Hendon Football Club site to private developers, make evident the urgent need to encourage a stronger sense of community spirit and pride through the provision of community spaces and improvements to the public realm. • The refurbishment of the farm buildings can serve as a positive focal point and a catalyst for change before, during and after the BX Cricklewood Regeneration. The farm buildings have the potential of becoming a multi-use community hub with a multi-purpose hall, working spaces for local creatives, a café, education centre or growing spaces, and many other valuable community uses. 2. Loss of an asset with historical value <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Barnet Unitary Development Plan identifies the Farm Buildings are within an area of special archaeological significance. The area has a very rich history that goes back to medieval times, when Clitterhouse Farm was a sub-manor of Hendon. The area was also very 	<p>Parameter Plan 016 shows the farm buildings to be demolished as part of the plans to enhance Clitterhouse Playing Fields. The improvements to Clitterhouse Playing Fields Part 1 (excluding the Nature Park) are proposed to be a direct Phase 1A (North) delivery obligation on the applicant, as part of the Revised S106 agreement. A specification will be agreed in accordance with the Revised S106 Agreement and the details will be approved under Condition 13.1 before the BXC Development commences. Initial discussions have been held between the promoters of the community use for the building and the applicant. The applicant has stated that they will consider this proposal as part of the detailed planning stage for Clitterhouse Playing Fields and is open to the retention of these buildings by means of either an amendment application under the proposed S73 Conditions or (if necessary) a new Section 73 application. It should also be noted that renovation of these buildings is likely to be considerably more expensive than their demolition and replacement with the uses approved in the 2010 permission. Therefore it is likely that the community proposals will need to be further developed, including developing a viable business case. The detailed consideration of the area containing the farm buildings will be dealt with at the Reserved Matter Stage – probably in 2014.</p>

Ref	Consultee	Comments	Officer Response
		<p>important in aeronautical history with the former presence of Handley Page factory.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The existing farm buildings are one of the few remaining structures left standing that provides a physical architectural link to the rich agricultural and industrial history of the area. As there are few buildings of architectural significance proposed in the BXC scheme, a refurbished Clitterhouse Farm Victorian buildings could serve as a valuable contrast to the modern buildings that are set to dominate the regeneration area. <p>3. Incompatibility of uses</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Clitterhouse Farm buildings are opposite Claremont Primary School. The proposed depot and car parking uses would be incompatible with the provision of safe access for children and their families to the Playing Fields, especially where there is the potential to create a public space that welcomes everyone from Claremont Road into the Playing Fields. The Clitterhouse Farm could provide the space and infrastructure needed and become an epicenter for after-school and holiday activities for children based at Claremont School, Whitefield School and Wessex School, on the other side of Hendon Way. <p>4. Loss of Trees</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Many of the trees on the northern side of Clitterhouse farm would have to be removed to make way for the proposed depot and car park. This small but beautiful grove of trees that sits just inside the entrance to the playing fields on Claremont road is one of the finest features of the park. We would strongly object to their loss. 	
23	Dollis Hill Association – OBJECT	<p>1) <i>The junction between the M1 and A406</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Vehicles driving south on the M1 then turning west along the A406 will often find slow or blocked traffic on the A406, so will themselves be kept in long queues at each of the traffic lights in the junction. These queues will block traffic driving north up the A5 wishing to turn right onto the eastbound A406, or to get into Brent Cross shopping centre as well as other traffic trying to move eastwards. It is said that the modelling of traffic flows shows southbound M1 traffic clearing onto the westbound A406 at each traffic light change. This is blatantly incorrect, as their exit onto the westbound A406 will be restricted by the crawling A406 traffic during peak 	The solution to the traffic congestion at this junction has been modelled and developed in close liaison with both TfL and the Highways Agency. The surface road solution which is now proposed has been shown to operate satisfactorily in the peak traffic flow periods. By the use of two additional Railway Arches for the A406 and combining both the A406/A5 and the A406/M1 traffic movements

Ref	Consultee	Comments	Officer Response
		<p>hours. Traffic needs to be held on the M1 itself. Modelling needs to consider these worst cases that arise every day.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The original 2003 plan for a bridge enabling direct flow of traffic from the A406 on the west side of Staples Corner onto and off the M1 should be reinstated. The reasons for changing to surface road measures after 2003 must be revisited and the bridge solution reconsidered. The traffic scheme currently proposed will lead to jams and put off people from visiting Brent Cross. It will create unnecessary pollution by increasing the amount of stopping and starting, and causing too much of a jam. The junction is in a dip so pollution hovers there without clearing. <p><i>2) The A406 / A5 junction and traffic modelling</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is essential that the traffic modelling for the approaches to the A406 / A5 junction stretches back far away enough from it and uses data from the most congested times - in the past it has under-reported the traffic. The A5 on the south of the A406, particularly its northbound carriageway, often has very long tailbacks stretching as far as Dollis Hill Lane. The side roads on the west of the A5 are NOT cut through for traffic - in particular Dollis Hill Lane is a residential road. All roads leading west off the A5, from Gladstone Park Gardens to the A406, will soon have a 20mph limit on them, and the 7.5T lorry limit will be more clearly signposted. Traffic modelling MUST NOT assume any through traffic to be using the Brent side roads. There are many proposed traffic lights on the stretch of the A5 from Gladstone Park Gardens to the A406. It is essential that traffic is not wedged between each of them in a blockage - particularly southbound in the morning rush and northbound in the evening peak, when exit from this stretch of road is also blocked or very slow moving. When each stretch between traffic lights on the A5 is solidly blocked, Brent residents cannot turn out onto the A5. <p><i>3) Bus lane on northbound A5 south of the A406</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There should be no bus lane northbound on the A5 between Dollis Hill Lane and Staples Corner, the A406. We welcome the removal of a bus lane near to the A5/A406 intersection, but there must be no bus lane on the A5 northbound between Dollis Hill Lane and Staples Corner as this will cause cars to squeeze into one lane before spreading out again into three lanes at the junction - it will cause congestion and dissuade lorries from sticking to the A5/A406. We do not want lorries encouraged to cut through the side roads on the west of the A5. 	<p>into an integrated layout the proposals will avoid any significant queuing of traffic in this location. The timing of the traffic signals at this location following the construction of the improvements will be closely monitored by TfL and optimised by use of electronic traffic controllers to ensure the best possible movement through the new road layout.</p> <p>There is no suggestion that traffic resulting from the Development would wish to use any of the local roads to the west of the A5 as shortcuts in preference to the strategic roads in the area. However, this concern has been expressed previously by both residents and officers of the LB Brent and as a result a specific Study of the A5 Corridor and the area to the west of the A5 is a Condition of the 2010 Planning Consent. A similar condition will be imposed on any Section 73 Permission.</p> <p>This issue is also being considered further as part of the A5 Corridor study referred to above. There will be a micro-simulation model (an accurate computer model showing the real time movement of vehicles) prepared for the A5 which will enable an optimum traffic movement solution to be agreed with TfL, LB Barnet and LB Brent , which will provide a balance between the needs of buses and those of other forms of transport.</p>

Ref	Consultee	Comments	Officer Response
		<p data-bbox="422 407 642 431"><i>4) Waste disposal site</i></p> <ul data-bbox="443 451 1430 630" style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="443 451 1430 630">• We are concerned that the waste disposal site is still proposed off the A5. Even though an incinerator is no longer proposed, we consider that the proposed waste disposal site will still create too much traffic. Lorries will cause traffic jams turning right into it and out of it. This will then block up the small gaps between sets of traffic lights on the A5. The waste disposal site needs to be accessible directly from the A406, as it is now. Large lorries can much more easily enter and leave it from the A406. Why is it not situated at point F on the plan, near Staples Corner. <p data-bbox="422 703 632 727"><i>5) Energy production</i></p> <ul data-bbox="443 747 1430 873" style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="443 747 1430 873">• With the removal of the incinerator from the waste disposal site, the development now plans three power sites for producing energy. Why is it proposed to use burning to produce electricity on site? We do not want a power station at point F, just near Staples Corner. We do not want this pollution added to our air, in addition to all of the traffic pollution. We want the development to be clean and to use electricity from the grid. 	<p data-bbox="1465 394 1990 597">The site for the Waste Handling Facility was approved under the 2010 Permission and is unchanged as part of this section 73 proposal. The existing waste handling site is accessed via Tilling Road and Brent Terrace, whereas the new facility is to be accessed directly off the A5 which is classed as part of the Strategic Road Network (SRN).</p> <p data-bbox="1465 691 1990 995">The waste to energy plant will provide the heat for the district heating scheme in place of gas boilers for each individual building or dwelling which would also contribute to air pollution if installed. However, by using the waste heat from the generation of electricity an overall efficiency of 80% can be achieved, versus 35-50% for a separate power station. This results in energy savings of around 30% when the production of electricity and heating is considered. The scheme will also have a connection to the national grid which will provide energy.</p> <p data-bbox="1465 1024 1990 1279">The Energy from Waste facility, of whatever kind, will be obliged to comply with the relevant EU Directive and will require an environmental permit from the Environment Agency before it is allowed to operate. The emissions will therefore be strictly regulated and monitored, such that the <i>maximum</i> emission concentrations are well understood. The pollution control regime operated by the Environment Agency requires that all monitoring data are made available to the public.</p>

Ref	Consultee	Comments	Officer Response
		<p data-bbox="422 367 758 391">6) <i>Cricklewood Lane green space</i></p> <ul data-bbox="443 410 1430 565" style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="443 410 1430 565">• We object strongly to the plans to develop the land which is currently green space alongside B&Q in Cricklewood Lane. There are Barnet Council plans at present to use the London mayor's funding to make this area a more effective communal town square. We need this heart for Cricklewood to ensure that the local area continues to flourish, rather than being suffocated by the extended Brent Cross. It is essential that the developers are not granted planning permission for this development as part of the Brent Cross proposals. <p data-bbox="422 638 1188 662">7) <i>Junction of A407 Cricklewood Lane with B&Q car park exit and Oak Grove</i></p> <ul data-bbox="443 680 1430 883" style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="443 680 1430 883">• The Brent Cross development plans show improvements for the junction of Cricklewood Lane and Claremont Road. It is important also that the vehicular exit from B&Q onto Cricklewood Lane, which is used by shoppers but also as a cut through when the A5 is blocked, is able to run more freely. At present, this B&Q exit forms a cross road with Oak Grove where they both join Cricklewood Lane (A407). This junction needs improving, otherwise vehicles turning right cause traffic jams. This junction needs some widening to improve it - which can be achieved by using a small piece of the green space alongside B&Q (not by building flats on it). Plans for it should be added to those for the Claremont Road junction with Cricklewood Lane. <p data-bbox="422 956 1247 980">8) <i>Late access from Brent and the A5 to the extended Brent Cross shopping centre</i></p> <ul data-bbox="443 998 1409 1127" style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="443 998 1409 1127">• The access roads from the A5 and Brent are too late within the phases. They do not allow access from the west to the new part of the Brent Cross shopping centre or the shops on the south side of the A406 when they are built. Can the pedestrian bridge over the railway line be brought as early as possible so that the development does not exist without access from the west for too long? <p data-bbox="422 1216 569 1240">9) <i>New station</i></p> <ul data-bbox="443 1258 1419 1305" style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="443 1258 1419 1305">• Can Barnet Council strengthen the lobby to bring the building of the new station earlier in the development. Without it, there will be an increase in vehicular traffic as soon as Brent Cross is 	<p data-bbox="1463 355 1988 456">The approach to development in this location is as in the 2010 Permission. The detailed design will be subject to a reserved matters planning application and public consultation.</p> <p data-bbox="1463 623 1988 670">Any traffic issues related to the existing B&Q car park do not form any part of the BXC scheme.</p> <p data-bbox="1463 943 1988 1174">The vehicular access from the A5 to the Shopping Centre will be improved with the more efficient movement of traffic at the A406/A5/M1 Junction as part of Phase 1A North. The provision of the pedestrian bridge over the Railway is linked to timing of the delivery of the Development on the east side of the Railway (currently envisaged to be in phase 5) and it will be for the Southern developer to bring this forward in due course.</p> <p data-bbox="1463 1203 1988 1323">The provision of the new Railway Station is linked to timing of the delivery of the Development on the east side of the Railway. When the Station is brought forward (currently envisaged to be in phase 5) then the Pedestrian Bridge from the A5 over the</p>

Ref	Consultee	Comments	Officer Response
		<p>extended. The area needs the new station as soon as possible in order to keep down the increase in vehicular traffic. It is important that access to the station from the west is straightforward, even if the main ticket office is on the east side.</p> <p>10) <i>Disruption caused during work on the roads</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> We want the traffic disruption minimised while the A5/A406 junction is being rebuilt. Consultation with Brent Council is essential when planning how to keep as many roads as possible open during the building of the junction. The absolute minimum of time must be spent on this building as the impact on local businesses and residents will be very high. 	<p>Railway will also be provided so that Brent residents will have direct access to the ticket office. The need for the train station is related to and driven by the office development.</p> <p>Officers are seeking to ensure, through the controls in the S.106 and the Conditions that the road improvements will be constructed in a manner that minimises disruption to the existing traffic, and the Developers are working closely with all of the Highway Authorities to agree the most effective traffic management measures to achieve this result. The Contractors for this work will be working to a strict timetable and be incentivised to complete in the minimum time possible.</p>
24	Green Party – OBJECT	<p>The plans for the BXC development are, seeking to create a false impression about the environmental sustainability of this project.</p> <p><i>Comment 1:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Plans must be suspended until the development partners pledge to make the whole site carbon neutral and set out measures they will take to achieve that target. Sainsbury's has already opened its first carbon neutral store and plans to open more, showing that the technologies are available to make the Brent Cross shopping centre and the housing developments completely carbon neutral or carbon positive. The proposed buildings are likely to exist for several decades at least and there is no way whatsoever that the British government will achieve its aim of a 60% cut in greenhouse gas emissions by 2050 if concrete giants like the Brent Cross shopping centre are still belching out carbon dioxide from heating, lighting and air conditioning. This scheme is an ideal opportunity to install energy conservation measures and sustainable power facilities right from the beginning. There is plenty of scope on the site for enough wind turbines, solar arrays and ground source heat pumps to make the whole area carbon positive, never mind carbon neutral. 	<p>The preferred option of creating heat and power for the site via refuse derived fuel is in accordance with Government objectives. An alternative approach is also included in the BXC09 document which outlines how the scheme will comply with policy requirements in the event that the use of RDF fuel is not possible.</p> <p>The applicants' commitment to this approach is evidenced by their acceptance to the completion of various pre commencement feasibility reports and delivery commitments within the proposed S.106 agreement.</p> <p>There are provisions to cover the need to obtain LPA approval to a Revised Energy Strategy and alternative energy permission to achieve the carbon reduction targets, if appropriate in the light of the conclusions of the feasibility studies, and to implement any such alternative energy solutions under the proposed section 106 agreement.</p>

Ref	Consultee	Comments	Officer Response
		<p><i>Comment 2:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> At a time when neighbourhood shopping areas are under threat all over London from post office closure, cut backs to libraries and the marginal viability of many small shops and pubs, Barnet Council should be making a broader study, paid for by the developers, of the likely impact of Brent Cross Cricklewood on other shopping areas in the borough. The scheme is not just about new housing and a so-called town centre, the whole thing is based on "an expanded and improved shopping centre", with an "enhanced retail offer including new stores at Brent Cross Shopping Centre", to cite the developers' own documents. <p><i>Comment 3:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> When the council has assessed the likely impact, it should order the developers to pay whatever it costs to ensure the sustainability of Hendon, Golders Green and the other nearby centres: better street layouts, improved public transport, more greenery, more public toilets, more benches to rest on or whatever it takes to ensure that these neighbourhood areas remain available and attractive for local residents to use. 	<p>Please see the retail section of this report. The London Plan, Core Strategy and Development Framework seek to create a metropolitan town centre at Brent Cross, Cricklewood. Further details are set out in the Retail Report Addendum (BXC06)</p>
		<p><i>Comment 4:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> As for the transport issues surrounding the new plans, of course there should be a direct rail link to the expanded shopping centre rather than more car parking. The developers say they expect cars still to be the main way that people get there but why is that? People will no doubt continue to want to shop at Brent Cross but why should they necessarily go by car? Do people mostly go to Oxford Street or Westfield shopping centres by car? Of course not, because they are properly served by London Underground lines and by buses. The BXC developers should be instructed to provide attractive and adequate Tube/train/tram, bus, cycle and pedestrian links for there to be a likelihood of far fewer than the projected extra 29,000 car journeys per day in the area. 	<p>The suggestion of a new orbital railway of some form would no doubt benefit North London as a whole, and may be promoted by TfL, but there is no need for such a facility identified in regard to the Brent Cross Cricklewood Development alone. The Development will be well served by the significant improvements to the bus services and facilities, the new Railway Station on the MML and the enhanced access to the Underground at Brent Cross station. Hence there will be every incentive for visitors to use public transport. Car parking charges will be introduced at the shopping centre which will assist mode shift to public transport and there will also be a step wise improvement in pedestrian and cycle provision throughout the development and connecting into the surrounding areas.</p>

Ref	Consultee	Comments	Officer Response
			<p>The source of the 29,000 cars figure is from the Regeneration Area Development Framework, which was prepared in 2003 and 2004 and was based on a simple spreadsheet form of assessments and there had been no comprehensive modelling of new journeys which has now been undertaken to support the current planning application. For example, the 29,000 figure includes traffic generated by the West Hendon regeneration scheme which is not part of BXC and that the figure does not account for road trips that will be removed as a result of the change of uses of the site through the regeneration – for example the removal of a number of existing industrial premises. Nor does it properly account for the future choice of travel mode when all the proposed public transport improvements come forward when it is predicted that there will be less use of the private car and a shift to use of public transport, walking and cycling.</p> <p>The Development Framework figure was generated using basic assessment methods that were inappropriate for a mixed use scheme on the scale of BXC where the existing traffic patterns will change significantly and that since then, much more precise modelling has been done and these latest more accurate assessments and predictions have been accepted by both Barnet and TfL.</p> <p>The 29,000 figure quoted in the Development Framework is over a whole 12 hour day and the equivalent 12 hour period traffic flow for the BXC development is 8000, but it is the peak hour traffic flow that is the concern when considering traffic congestion.</p>

Ref	Consultee	Comments	Officer Response
		<p><i>Comment 5:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Clitterhouse Farm buildings should be saved. Preserving them would only require minor alterations to the overall plan. 	<p>Parameter Plan 016 shows the farm buildings to be demolished as part of the plans to enhance Clitterhouse Playing Fields. The improvements to Clitterhouse Playing Fields Part 1 (excluding the Nature Park) are proposed to be a direct Phase 1A (North) delivery obligation on the applicant, as part of the Revised S106 agreement. A specification will be agreed in accordance with the Revised S106 Agreement and the details will be approved under Condition 13.1 before the BXC Development commences. Initial discussions have been held between the promoters of the community use for the building and the applicant. The applicant has stated that they will consider this proposal as part of the detailed planning stage for Clitterhouse Playing Fields and is open to the retention of these buildings by means of either an amendment application under the proposed S73 Conditions or (if necessary) a new Section 73 application. It should also be noted that renovation of these buildings is likely to be considerably more expensive than their demolition and replacement with the uses approved in the 2010 permission. Therefore it is likely that the community proposals will need to be further developed, including developing a viable business case. The detailed consideration of the area containing the farm buildings will be dealt with at the Reserved Matter Stage – probably in 2014</p>
		<p><i>Comment 6:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> If waste treatment facilities are to remain part of the plan, it should be specified that the priority should be sustainable systems such as anaerobic digestion and/or other systems from the growing range of alternative technologies. <p><i>Comment 7:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> It should be specified that no waste incineration should take place at the Geron Way cite. A 	<p>The scheme is designed to reduce carbon emissions compared to Building Regulations 2010 by 40% for housing and 25% for non-domestic buildings. This is in-line with the London Plan policies on energy. It is also a significant increase to the performance proposed in the consented scheme. These savings are being achieved through a combination of energy saving and energy</p>

Ref	Consultee	Comments	Officer Response
		<p>new waste plan is under consideration for North London and it would be simple and cost-free for the designers of that plan to omit any proposal for incineration at Geron Way. This would in any case match the practicalities of the site, given the current objections by Bestway and others.</p>	<p>efficiency, use of combined heat and power and use of renewable energy.</p>
25	Barnet Friends of the Earth – OBJECT	<p><u>EMAIL 1</u></p> <p>Barnet Friends of the Earth oppose the current application to vary the conditions of the BXC Planning Application for the following reasons.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>The original application granted permission in 2009 and 2010 was deeply flawed to begin with, in particular:</i> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. The scheme is likely to result in 29,000 additional car movements according to Barnet's own SPG, a figure that the applicant revised downward dramatically and unrealistically, as Brent and Camden Councils have complained about. This downward revision was apparently made so as to reduce predicted breaches of air pollution regulations in the Environmental Assessment. We believe that both the Transport and Environmental assessments were therefore invalid. ii. Permitting a gasifying incinerator. Such technology emits many kinds of toxic pollution not dissimilar to those of conventional incineration. The London Assembly has previously heard that Environment Agency monitoring of incineration facilities is inadequate for pollution control. Additionally, residual waste arisings are falling considerably due to new recycling practices and an EU Directive applying in 2016 will forbid the landfilling or burning of recyclable waste; i. Building in the path of a proposed light rail route, beside and crossing the A406, could be financed as planning gain. Indeed the Hammerson-Westfield shopping development in Croydon just granted permission by the Mayor of London on 25/11/2013 includes some £26.6 million in planning gain finance for local public and sustainable transport. 	<p>The estimate of over 29,000 extra cars per 12 hour day was accepted by LB Barnet as an inaccurate estimate due to the lack of any suitable transport model at that time. The forecasts of car trips in the Transport Assessment which supports the Section 73 planning application is significantly lower and takes full account of the trips which will be attracted to other modes.</p> <p>The Energy from Waste facility, of whatever kind, will be obliged to comply with the relevant EU Directive and will require an environmental permit from the Environment Agency before it is allowed to operate. The emissions will therefore be strictly regulated and monitored, such that the maximum emission concentrations are well understood. The pollution control regime operated by the Environment Agency requires that all monitoring data are made available to the public. The scheme does not include an incinerator.</p> <p>A new train station and bus station is proposed and significant contributions to be made to TfL to enable enhancement local bus services totalling £11.5m are contained in the CTF. The suggestion of a new orbital railway of some form would no doubt benefit North London as a</p>

Ref	Consultee	Comments	Officer Response
		<p>ii. Housing is only required to follow the minimum permitted Code for Sustainable Homes level</p> <p>iii. Permitting building/concreting completely over the green space in Cricklewood Lane (secured by Barnet as a public Open Space in the 70's), and replacing the green spaces on Brent Terrace that children play on with a rectangular recreational strip beside the A5 (a 'Brooklynising' of children's recreational space).</p> <p>2. <i>The average price of residential flats has risen by 35%, and all residential properties by 34%, from Sep 2009 to Sep 2013 (most recent 3-month moving average figures).</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This could dramatically increase the profitability of the colossal expansion in non-retail accommodation within the scheme, compared with expected returns at the time of the 2009 application. We therefore believe Barnet Council has a responsibility to re-examine the gains in the matters described in (1) that can now be obtained as conditions. These options should be presented before the Planning Committee but no such, befitting exercise appears to have been undertaken. <p>3. <i>Ms Capelli stated previously that comments can be made on any aspect of the environmental case now, even if they missed the committee hearing on the Environmental Scoping Report.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Therefore, we would like to comment now that it was deeply flawed of this application to be using the same traffic modal shift and growth forecasts as before, not taking into account the latest DfT or TfL projections on the subject; and further that it was deeply improper and invalid for council officers to present an accompanying comment on the Environmental Scoping Report that recent traffic falls "indicate that the model is robust". • That is highly unscientific; recent traffic falls were to be expected because of the recession. Council officers should not be making unscientific claims in favour of applications. <p><u>EMAIL 2</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If permission for an energy from waste plant is embedded in the planning application 	<p>whole, and may be promoted by TfL, but there is no need for such a facility identified in regard to the Brent Cross Cricklewood Development alone</p> <p>All Reserved Matter planning applications will be expected to comply with current London Plan standards in this respect.</p> <p>Please see previous comments on this and the open space section of the committee report.</p> <p>The approach to affordable housing including the review mechanism will ensure that should the viability of the scheme improve, additional affordable housing will be provided.</p> <p>The road traffic flow changes and growth rates are discussed in the transport section of the report. The observed reduction in car use within the London area as a whole is partly due to the prevailing economic conditions, but there is a strong underlying movement from car to public transport which supports the view that car use in this area is certainly not increasing overall in recent years and the latest TfL forecasts of growth over the next 20 years have been used in preparing the forecasts of traffic at the completion of the Development.</p> <p>Fuel for the waste to energy plant, will be a refuse derived fuel and can be sourced from a number of suppliers. Therefore the plant is not reliant on</p>

Ref	Consultee	Comments	Officer Response
		<p>somewhere, then please consider the following information. These figures are from the NLWA's own statistics.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Population growth in the NLWA Boroughs, census to census, GREW by 15.9% in the decade to 2011. - Household growth in the NLWA Boroughs, census to census, GREW by 10.0% in the decade to 2011. - London waste levels over the same decade FELL by 14.3%; waste per person fell by c 9.5%, by household by 14+% - Final Household Spending rose strongly by 23.6% from 2000-2007; there was a sharp dip during 2008, followed by a recovery. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Furthermore, after 2016, according to an EU directive, any "waste" that can be recycled or composted will not allowed to be incinerated or sent to landfill. • Currently, in England, there is a recycling target of 50% by 2020. In 2012 over 70 English local authorities had already exceeded this target. If Labour win the next general election, they have already stated that they will set a recycling target of 70%. • So what is the need for an incinerator or other type of waste heat treatment plant at Brent Cross? Would waste need to be brought in from elsewhere? 	<p>waste from the NLWA but could take this as a feedstock, subject to the necessary treatment to convert it into a refuse derived fuel. The use of alternative renewable fuels will also be considered should the viability of using refuse derived fuel not be possible.</p>

Local Politicians

Ref	Consultee	Comments	Officer Response
26	Darren Johnson AM Green Party Member of the London Assembly – OBJECT	<p>Letter Received 3rd December 2013</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> I have been contacted by local residents concerned about the proposed demolition of the Victorian farm buildings at Clitterhouse Farm outlined in the above application. I would like to give my full support to the retention and restoration of these buildings for the local community as part of the regeneration project and therefore urge that demolition of these buildings be opposed. 	<p>The improvements to Clitterhouse Playing Fields Part 1 (excluding the Nature Park) are proposed to be a direct Phase 1A (North) delivery obligation on the applicant, as part of the Revised S106 agreement. A specification will be agreed in accordance with the Revised S106 Agreement and the details will be approved under Condition 13.1 before the BXC Development commences. Initial discussions have been held between the promoters of the community use for the building and the applicant. The applicant has stated that they will consider this proposal as part of the detailed planning stage for Clitterhouse Playing Fields and is open to the retention of these buildings by means of either an amendment application under the proposed S73 Conditions or (if necessary) a new Section 73 application. It should also be noted that renovation of these buildings is likely to be considerably more expensive than their demolition and replacement with the uses approved in the 2010 permission. Therefore it is likely that the community proposals will need to be further developed, including developing a viable business case. The detailed consideration of the area containing the farm buildings will be dealt with at the Reserved Matter Stage – probably in 2014</p>
27	Alison Hopkins Liberal Democrat Councillor for	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Please take this as a formal objection to the revised BXC plans. Please also be advised that I wish to speak at the Planning Committee Meeting which considers the application. The main grounds for objection are unchanged, given that plans will bring significant amounts 	<p>Proposals for the Waste Handling Facility and CCHP are unchanged in the current application.</p>

Ref	Consultee	Comments	Officer Response
	Dollis Hill - OBJECT	<p>of traffic onto Brent roads with "revised" layouts that are wholly unacceptable to my ward and the wider Brent area.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The WHF is still in the plans, despite the developer's assurances that it will not happen and the NLWA having changed their business plan so that it is no longer needed in any comparable scale. The incinerator is also still shown, again despite the developer's assurances that it will not happen. They have refused to remove both these unacceptable structures, "just in case plans change". I object in the strongest possible terms to the WHF and incinerator remaining in the plans. • Any increase in traffic on Dollis Hill Lane or, indeed, any other side road off the A5 is unacceptable. Dollis Hill Lane is already impacted with speeding cars and illegally accessing HGVs. It is primarily residential and this is not acceptable. Oxgate Gardens suffers similar problems and the proposed road layouts mean both these roads, and Humber Road would become rat runs, even more than at present. Any proposal to close Oxgate Gardens completely at the A5 end would divert traffic to Dollis Hill Lane and cause huge inconvenience to those who actually live in Dollis Hill. • The proposal to make Humber Road the first right turn off the Edgware Road is not acceptable. It is the narrowest road off the A5. The new road layout is also contingent on Geron Way being re-routed. This is part of the WHF development, which, as I say, is now supposedly unlikely. That re-routing can also only happen if Barnet are able to CPO the Bestway site. Bestway can and will resist this, and have the money and will to do so. The developers have said that the Humber Road junction layout is "dotted line", dependant n the Bestway site being obtained, but this places huge uncertainty on the area. • The traffic figures are inaccurate and inadequate. This has been pointed out on numerous occasions to the developers and to Barnet Council. For example they show no cars turning left into Humber Road in the peak hours, which is patently nonsense. Other flows are similarly wrong elsewhere in the area. 	<p>The TA predicts the transportation impacts of the scheme and proposes sufficient mitigation measures to ensure any scheme-related congestion will not be unacceptable. The need to prevent rat running has been addressed in the proposals to date and is also the subject of the ongoing A5 Corridor Study which will address any issues along the corridor in Barnet, Brent and Camden. West Hendon is the subject of a separate application.</p> <p>Dollis Hill lane is an important Bus route so It is not considered appropriate to place any restriction on access. However, as the Developers have discussed with the local resident groups they will consider jointly with the relevant highway authorities any appropriate traffic management measures to inhibit rat running in Oxgate Gardens and Humber Road at the detailed design stage. The junction layouts were approved in 2010 and are required in order to mitigate the impacts of the development. However, delivery will involve LB Brent as it will be through S.278 agreements jointly between LB Barnet and LB Brent.</p> <p>The traffic modelling in the TA has been audited and approved by the LB Barnet, TfL and the HA. In Brent this modelling is primarily concerned with strategic traffic flows both existing and forecast, and therefore more detailed local traffic surveys have been undertaken to help inform the future detailed designs for key schemes. The surveys are also informing the A5 Corridor Study which will inform whether there are any forecast traffic</p>

Ref	Consultee	Comments	Officer Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="464 602 1461 781">• I have suggested to the developers that one mitigation would be to implement a proper gyratory at the Oxgate Lane junction with the Edgware Road, whilst leaving in place the remainder of the barrier that protects other Brent roads. This would allow HGV traffic to leave and enter the small industrial portion of Dollis Hill without entering the residential part of the ward where an HGV ban already exists. It would also allow traffic wishing to travel west on the A406 from the southbound A5 to do so far more simply than the current proposals. I have raised this with Brent highways department as well and recommend we press for this. <li data-bbox="464 813 1461 919">• Lastly, I object strongly to the proposals to build on Cricklewood Green in Cricklewood Lane and to the nonsensical fact that these have been bundled into the Brent Cross plans, despite being a mile away! Cricklewood has no other green space and building on the space constitutes a major degradation of facilities. 	<p data-bbox="1478 354 1990 557">impacts that are significant on the local roads within LB Barnet, LB Brent and LB Camden. The Developer has committed to fund any necessary supplementary mitigation measures arising out of the study to mitigate any significant local traffic impacts. All of the detailed comments on specific roads within the LB Brent will be fully taken into account as part of the A5 Corridor Study.</p> <p data-bbox="1478 586 1990 740">The Oxgate Lane proposal is a matter for the Local Highway Authorities and has yet to be discussed at officer level. However, HGV routes and impacts are being considered as part of the A5 Corridor Study, which LB Brent officers are participating in.</p> <p data-bbox="1478 813 1990 862">See previous comments to similar question and please see the open space section of the report.</p>
28	Cllr Javaid Ashraf – OBJECT	<p data-bbox="422 946 1430 995">Completely agree with my ward colleague Cllr Hopkins and the points she raises. I would also like my objection to go on record for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="464 1019 1461 1141">• Issues arising from the BXC proposal are extra traffic and congestion, lack of community facilities and infrastructure to accommodate the growth of the area and additional health risks associated with additional pollution. Public transport around the area is already well serviced but is already stretched to accommodate current usage. Any additional population will cause this supply to be unable to meet the demand. <li data-bbox="464 1235 1461 1308">• I attended one of the consultation events at Brent Cross shopping centre and was disappointed that the developers were trying to show that they have listened to local people and made the necessary changes to make this work. I could hardly notice any changes and certainly they do 	<p data-bbox="1478 1011 1990 1190">The TA predicts the transportation impacts of the scheme and proposes sufficient mitigation measures to ensure any scheme-related congestion will not be unacceptable. The applicant will fund additional bus services to meet the increased demand; with £11.5m allocated to this is the CTF.</p> <p data-bbox="1478 1219 1990 1317">The consultation events at Brent Cross Shopping Centre were part of the pre-application consultation activities organized by the applicant and were staffed by the applicant and their team.</p>

Ref	Consultee	Comments	Officer Response
		<p>not feel substantial. I expressed my dissatisfaction of the consultation event to the Developers who failed to engage with me at the time. They later apologised for ignoring me, but it should not have to take me to complain to be part of a consultation event. I felt they were being selective as they talked to certain people and did not engage with the young or ethnic communities.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="464 516 1430 565">• I am also concerned on how the proximity of the scheme to the Welsh harp would impact the environmental nature of the SSSI. <li data-bbox="464 927 1444 976">• Also, how extra congestion could cause chaos during events days at Wembley Stadium which is in close proximity to the road network impacted by such a large scale development. <li data-bbox="464 1057 1444 1105">• The waste transfer station location issue is also ambiguous and needs to be confirmed prior to a decision on this matter. <li data-bbox="464 1211 1444 1310">• I have always been supportive of regeneration and making changes that fits in, improves and accommodates the near future of a local area, but this has to be done in a way which benefits local people. This planning application will have a detrimental impact on local people and existing communities and I think there needs to be a scale back of development, especially 	<p>No statutory designated sites will be directly affected by the proposals in the long-term and indirect effects are unlikely in the medium to long term. The realignment and naturalisation of the River Brent will have a beneficial effect on the Welsh Harp SSSI. The naturalisation of the existing river through the channel and bank designs to include features appropriate to the character of each reach, including three-stage channels, natural type beds, riffles, berms, natural revetment and native seeding and planting will improve water quality and extend ecological corridors much further upstream, with the resultant benefits to the Welsh Harp SSSI. Please see Environment Agency comments.</p> <p>The BXC scheme measures provide appropriate mitigation to address any increases in typical peak hour traffic levels, but are not required to address the transport effects of any special events.</p> <p>Any proposed waste to energy plant will have its design carefully considered and any appropriate visual impact considered. This will be the subject of a reserved matters application with associated public consultation.</p> <p>The application proposals result in significant overall improvements for the local community including new jobs, new homes, public transport, open space, community facilities etc.</p>

Ref	Consultee	Comments	Officer Response
		west of Brent Cross Shopping Centre.	
29	Cllr Shafique Choudhary – OBJECT	<p><i>Objection 1:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The BXC proposals are unsustainable, particularly because of extra car traffic. Barnet produced "Supplementary Planning Guidance" for Brent Cross, estimating over 29,000 extra cars a day in the area. For that reason, the Brent Cross developers propose spending £200-million on the surrounding roads - but the congestion will spill over a larger area, and also fails to reduce carbon emissions and improve air quality. This is the 1996 proposal for a car-based Brent Cross expansion: http://2.bp.blogspot.com/-NG45Q8A0kTc/T9i96hScDII/AAAAAAAAIDI/2lrRLTz1U5I/s800/Brent+Cross+plan+1996.jpg It was rejected in 2002 in the high court, because of traffic generation, and its effect on local high streets. The announced alternative, a "new Brent Cross town centre" has now been largely abandoned, with Barnet Cabinet accepting last April that the developers were selling up, except for still enlarging the shopping centre, rather like in 1997. Barnet refuses to consider light-rail/tram alternatives, and shows no interest in a new branch of the London Overground - everything must apparently go into roads. <p><i>Objection 2:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Barnet proposes a huge waste incinerator at BXC which would process waste from dustcarts, and send it to be burnt nearer the shopping centre, in a furnace with a 140-metre chimney. The 	<p>The estimate by LB Barnet of over 29,000 extra cars per 12 hour day was accepted by LB Barnet as an inaccurate estimate due to the lack of any suitable transport model at that time. The forecasts of car trips in the Transport Assessment which supports the S 73 planning application is significantly lower and takes full account of the trips which will be attracted to other modes.</p> <p>The suggestion of a new orbital railway or tram of some form would no doubt benefit North London as a whole, and may be promoted by TfL, but there is no need for such a facility identified in regard to the Brent Cross Cricklewood Development alone</p> <p>The idea of a train service on the Dudding Hill line has been around for a long time but Officers are not aware of the Mayor having said anything about definitely introducing an Overground service to BXC. A link to Brent Cross via the Overground is not part of TfL's current proposals, and there is no station on the Dudding Hill line within plans to serve this corridor. Whilst TfL is keeping this as one of the options for linking in other destinations to Old Oak Common, it would be subject to further assessment. Furthermore there has been no cost benefit analysis of a passenger service on the Dudding Hill Line. So at this stage it is far from being a committed scheme</p> <p>This aspect of the proposal is unchanged from the 2010 permission. The Energy from Waste facility, of whatever kind, will be obliged to comply with the</p>

Ref	Consultee	Comments	Officer Response
		<p>picture (below) shows the A5 Edgware Road, opposite a Brent primary school and housing. http://1.bp.blogspot.com/-nusoXQXF-4Q/T3Bf9DEOMml/AAAAAAAAAGJg/GpvZj_OEmIU/s800/Hammerson%252BWaste%252BIncinerator%252B-%252BStage%252B1%255B1%255D.jpg</p> <p><i>Objection 3:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Barnet wants to concrete over the only piece of green space in central Cricklewood, used by Barnet, Brent and Camden residents. http://1.bp.blogspot.com/-NIBacAKBzPA/UpezWqq5dDI/AAAAAAAhB0/0K2iArQ19rl/s1600/Cricklewood+green+space++copyright.jpg Furthermore, this proposed sale of public land is in the same planning application as the Brent Cross Shopping Centre expansion, even though that is a mile away. The single Barnet plan can only be accepted or rejected in its entirety, so there is absolutely no democracy regarding this site - it has no connection whatsoever with the shopping centre. The same applies to the Brent Terrace Triangles. http://3.bp.blogspot.com/_mHWLiJNwXI8/TJj6D23eFtl/AAAAAAAABNM/Y8I8VmXSy0U/s800/Brent+Terrace.jpg 	<p>relevant EU Directive and will require an environmental permit from the Environment Agency before it is allowed to operate. The emissions will therefore be strictly regulated and monitored, such that the maximum emission concentrations are well understood. The pollution control regime operated by the Environment Agency requires that all monitoring data are made available to the public. The scheme does not include an incinerator</p> <p>See previous replies to similar question and the open space section of the committee report</p>

Local Residents

Ref	Consultee	Comments	Officer Response
30	Resident 1 – OBJECT	<p>See below a number of questions that need satisfactory answers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is there a need for another new town and extended retail centre? • Why has the council relied on the developer's assessment of the need for more retail space? Why has the council not carried out its own assessment in light of the large new Westfields development at White City and Europe's largest shopping mall by Westfields at Stratford? • Why has the council not had regard to the change in shopping patterns e.g. the rapid growth of internet shopping? • Why has the council not considered the impact of a new town centre and extended retail mall at Brent Cross on the other 22 town centres in Barnet plus others further afield? • • What evidence do the officers have that leads them to believe that 70% of all current Brent Cross users plus 70% of all future users will leave their cars at home and travel to the centre by bus? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do you believe that the Edgware branch of the Northern line will be able to cope with tens of 000s of shoppers for Brent Cross, 20,000 occupiers of the new high rise flats at Brent Cross, 30,000 new residents at Colindale plus c 20,000 for other new residents up the rest of the Northern Line every day? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Why are the officers refusing to safeguard the route for a possible future light rail/rapid transit system? Particularly when at the planning meeting councillors asked officers to bear this in mind 	<p>The approach is consistent with the London Plan, Core Strategy and Development Framework which support the evolution of Brent Cross, Cricklewood into a metropolitan town centre. Further details are set out in the Retail Report Addendum (BXC06) and these issues are discussed in the retail section of the main report.</p> <p>The Transport Report does not suggest that 70% of all current Brent Cross users plus 70% of all future users will travel to the centre by bus. The 70% refers to the total trips to the whole mixed use Development at end state and the proposed offices are a significant contributor to the public transport share. The future mode share assumptions are approved by LBB and TfL.</p> <p>The increased passenger numbers on the Northern Line are agreed by TfL who are monitoring passenger flows with a view to bringing forward upgrades to this line where necessary, which is all included in the BXC public transport modelling.</p> <p>The suggestion of a new orbital railway of some form would no doubt benefit North London as a whole, and may be promoted by TfL, but there is no need for such a facility identified in regard to the Brent Cross Cricklewood Development alone</p>

Ref	Consultee	Comments	Officer Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Why has the Council ignored the opposition in writing to the proposals from the neighbouring Borough of Brent? There are new objections in 2013 • Why have the officers misled the Councillors in respect of recent changes in National and Regional Planning policies? • Are councillors aware that only phase one with the retail mall extension, the rubbish dump and a few flats are guaranteed to be built if permission is granted? • Are Councillors aware that the developer can build the most profitable first phase and then use the flexibility they persuaded the officers to build into the legal agreement to walk away from the remaining phases? • Are Councilors happy to proceed with a £4.5billion scheme on the basis of a deal with a shell company e.g. no assets or parent company guarantees? • Have the councillors seen the evidence that “the air leaving the 140 metre high chimney will be cleaner than the air entering the plant” as stated by Cllr Freer • Have the developers been given examples of successful pollution free heat from waste plants as promised by the developers last year? We have only been able to find examples of the new technology failing in the UK, Germany, Austria, Norway, America and Australia. Is that why the developers are keeping quiet? • The regeneration scheme does not conform to a number of national planning policy issues. For example, the Government’s Climate Change Law has agreed to reduce CO2 emissions by 80% by 2050. However, this scheme will generate thousands of extra car journeys per day, and this will only detract from the required reduction in CO2 emissions. In addition, residential buildings will only achieve a basic rating under the Code for Sustainable Homes, further contributing to CO2 emissions. 	<p>Brent Council objections and the Councils response is reported elsewhere in this report. Earlier in this consultation appendix and in the main body of the committee report.</p> <p>Please see Appendix 2 where planning policy relevant to this proposal is analysed.</p> <p>The delivery arrangements and the ‘cherry picking’ issues are discussed in the main body of the report and the summary.</p> <p>The revised phasing proposed includes a significant amount of mixed use development in phase 1, and substantial infrastructure delivery to assist the delivery of the wider regeneration.</p> <p>Planning consents are not personal, but run with the land. The Council is entering into a development agreement with respect to their land interests. That is not a planning matter</p> <p>The environmental assessment of both the Waste Handling Facility and the Combined Heat and power facility are based on a realistic set of parameters and principles derived from other similar facilities. This aspect of the Section 73 is unchanged from the 2010 consent.</p> <p>The Applicants are committed to delivering an energy strategy that minimises CO₂ emissions. The energy strategy will deliver at least a 40% CO₂ emissions reduction in residential and at least a 25% reduction in commercial compared to a 2010 Part L Building regulations compliant scheme.</p> <p>Whilst any increase in CO₂ emissions is undesirable in the short term, it is useful to put</p>

Ref	Consultee	Comments	Officer Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="464 711 1423 789">• the adverse impacts arising from this scheme (the large increase in noise, traffic congestion and air pollution) extend far beyond the London Borough of Barnet boundary, so decisions concerning the scheme should not be left to Barnet councillors alone <li data-bbox="464 922 1423 1000">• there is increasing confusion over what is being proposed. For example, the large waste handling facility is unspecified. Arguments about concerning incineration and gasification; both could have adverse effects on the health and safety of residents. <li data-bbox="464 1068 1423 1146">• Barnet Council are unable to take an impartial view of the scheme due to a conflict of interest, since they are supporters of the scheme, major landowners in the area, and acting as 'objective' Local Planning Authority decision-makers. <li data-bbox="464 1214 1423 1304">• the current scheme is simply a way of extending Brent Cross Shopping Centre, a proposal that was strongly opposed and thrown out by a public inquiry in 1999, and a Judicial Review and a High Court judgement in 2003. The recent reduction of other elements of Phase One, but still allowing the doubling of the shopping centre, seems to support this view. No other phases are 	<p data-bbox="1482 352 1976 683">these increases into the context of steady state emissions from the development as whole. The development will result in a 7 fold increase in floorspace yet the steady state CO₂ emissions do not increase to nearly the same extent. Although outside of the scope of the quantitative assessment carried out, it is expected that this small increase in CO₂ emissions is expected to be offset by a larger CO₂ emission reduction from elsewhere as it is extremely likely that the new residents will have moved from much less energy efficient residences than those within the Section 73 Scheme.</p> <p data-bbox="1482 711 1976 914">The consultation process has sought comments from all relevant parties, including neighbouring boroughs. The Mayor of London will also be commenting on this proposal. Generally, the TA predicts the transportation impacts of the scheme and proposes sufficient mitigation measures to ensure any scheme-related congestion will not be unacceptable</p> <p data-bbox="1482 919 1976 992">There are no changes to the proposals for the WHF or the CCHP from that permitted by the 2010 permission.</p> <p data-bbox="1482 997 1976 1045">This has been considered in the Environmental Statement submitted with the application.</p> <p data-bbox="1482 1073 1976 1175">The Section 73 application is being considered on its planning merits and the decision will be taken by the Planning and Environment Committee based on an appraisal of the planning issues.</p> <p data-bbox="1482 1203 1976 1304">The 2010 application (and this Section 73 application) differs from the scheme rejected by the Secretary of State as it is for comprehensive development to create a new town centre on both</p>

Ref	Consultee	Comments	Officer Response
		<p>guaranteed to be delivered by the developers.</p> <p><u>Specific Objections</u></p> <p><i>Traffic</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Barnet produced "Supplementary Planning Guidance" for Brent Cross, estimating over 29,000 extra cars a day in the area. For that reason, the Brent Cross developers propose spending £200-million on the surrounding roads - but the congestion will spill over a larger area, and also fails to reduce carbon emissions and improve air quality. 	<p>sides of the A406. Please see discussion of the 'cherry picking' issue in the main report. The revised phasing proposed includes a significant mixed use development in Phase 1. This is supported by a significant infrastructure package which will assist and facilitate the delivery of the remainder of the development.</p> <p>In addition to the below please see response to LB Brent comments (number 6 above)</p> <p>The source of the 29,000 cars figure is from the Regeneration Area Development Framework, which was prepared in 2003 and 2004 and was based on a simple spreadsheet form of assessments and there had been no comprehensive modelling of new journeys which has now been undertaken to support the current planning application. For example, the 29,000 figure includes traffic generated by the West Hendon regeneration scheme which is not part of BXC and that the figure does not account for road trips that will be removed as a result of the change of uses of the site through the regeneration – for example the removal of a number of existing industrial premises. Nor does it properly account for the future choice of travel mode when all the proposed public transport improvements come forward when it is predicted that there will be less use of the private car and a shift to use of public transport, walking and cycling.</p> <p>The Development Framework figure was generated using basic assessment methods that were inappropriate for a mixed use scheme on the scale of BXC where the existing traffic patterns will</p>

Ref	Consultee	Comments	Officer Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="464 711 1115 737">• Mode shifts in the TA are a fantasy and were rejected by TfL <li data-bbox="464 816 1451 867">• There is no sanction built in to penalise or fine the developer if their back-engineered forecasts are wrong <li data-bbox="464 1019 1430 1097">• Traffic surveys undertaken between July and September this year have not been included in the transport assessment. Without this information it cannot be verified that traffic conditions have not altered significantly, particularly along the A5 traffic corridor. 	<p data-bbox="1480 352 1990 451">change significantly and that since then, much more precise modelling has been done and these latest more accurate assessments and predictions have been accepted by both Barnet and TfL.</p> <p data-bbox="1480 480 1990 631">The 29,000 figure quoted in the Development Framework is over a whole 12 hour day and the equivalent 12 hour period traffic flow for the BXC development is 9000, but it is the peak hour traffic flow that is the concern when considering traffic congestion.</p> <p data-bbox="1480 711 1990 789">TfL had approved all the modelling and modal share predictions which are based on the current transport strategy.</p> <p data-bbox="1480 816 1990 992">The application includes a full framework of control set out in the S.106 and Conditions including careful monitoring and approval processes that must be followed for each phase of the development, plus CTF / mitigation fees to achieve mode shift through traffic management and promotion of public transport.</p> <p data-bbox="1480 1019 1990 1304">The road traffic flow changes and growth rates are discussed in the transport section of the report. The S.73 Transport Assessment contains up to date and appropriate survey data which has been used to assess the changes in traffic flows and this has been agreed with LBB and TfL. The detailed survey work has been prepared to support the A5 Corridor Study and the development of the Detailed Design Model which will be used for highway approvals of key junctions, including along the A5. The LB Brent is</p>

Ref	Consultee	Comments	Officer Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mitigation measures set out in the submitted documentation to take account of the changes to the construction phasing must be implemented. • Approximately £5m of the £46m of the transport fund to look at impacts to the west of the A5 to make sure impacts on LB Brent are looked at proportionately. Without this provision, the LB Brent would raise objection on the grounds of the inability to fully review the impacts on the A5 Corridor. • Many of these so-called road improvements will result in cars being forced to use rat runs in residential roads and will mean hundreds of extra cars an hour in narrow streets. Other developments haven't squandered money on Roadworks but built an extra tube or overground stations instead. • It has been stated previously that comments can be made on any aspect of the environmental case now, even if they missed the committee hearing on the Environmental Scoping Report. • It was deeply improper for council officers to present an accompanying comment on the Environmental Scoping Report that recent traffic falls "indicate that the model is robust". • That is highly unscientific; recent traffic falls were to be expected because of the recession. Council officers should not be making unscientific claims in favour of applications. 	<p>a party to the Study and has been provided with the survey data referred to.</p> <p>These will be secured through the planning conditions and the S.106 agreement.</p> <p>The framework of controls for the scheme continue to require the developers to undertake an A5 Corridor Study and the S.106 CTF will continue to make £1.25m available for adjoining boroughs.</p> <p>The transport proposals have been developed to cater for the numbers of trips forecast to be using the various modes of travel that are forecast in the Transport Report This matter has been fully addressed by the highways authorities, and will continue to be reviewed during implementation, in particular through the A5 Corridor Study, which is a Pre RMA Obligation and other key control mechanisms.</p> <p>Please see the section of the Summary which outlines that the terms of the 2010 consent are material considerations.</p> <p>The road traffic flow changes and growth rates are discussed in the transport section of the report.</p> <p>The observed reduction in car use within the London area as a whole is partly due to the prevailing economic conditions, but there is a strong underlying movement from car to public transport which supports the view that car use in this area is certainly not increasing overall in</p>

Ref	Consultee	Comments	Officer Response
		<p data-bbox="422 581 583 605"><i>Public transport</i></p> <ul data-bbox="464 626 1434 959" style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="464 626 1373 675">• Every other new development in London over the last 10 years has involved significant transport improvement – Westfields, Imperial Wharf, Battersea etc. etc. <li data-bbox="464 695 1226 719">• BXC is unprecedented in the 21st century in being a car-based scheme. <li data-bbox="464 738 1434 787">• A few more buses will not be used by the demographic BXC is attempting to attract to live, to work and to shop <li data-bbox="464 807 1409 855">• Barnet refuses to even consider light-rail/tram alternatives, and shows no interest in a new branch of the London Overground - everything must apparently go into roads. <li data-bbox="464 911 1419 959">• The new Thameslink will lead to the eventual closure of Cricklewood station despite denials and reassurances <p data-bbox="422 1073 533 1097"><i>Incinerator</i></p> <ul data-bbox="464 1118 1423 1167" style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="464 1118 1423 1167">• The presence of an incinerator (defined as any process which produces ash, thus indicating incineration has taken place) 	<p data-bbox="1480 354 1990 451">recent years and the latest TfL forecasts of growth over the next 20 years have been used in preparing the forecasts of traffic at the completion of the Development.</p> <p data-bbox="1480 483 1990 557">One reason that traffic levels on the road network in London generally have fallen is due to the recorded increased use of public transport.</p> <p data-bbox="1480 589 1990 760">This Development is public transport led as evidenced by the mode share of 70% of person trips being forecast to be by public transport at end state, including a significant increase in the use of buses. A light rail scheme is not considered necessary for the development, consistent with the 2010 Permission.</p> <p data-bbox="1480 816 1990 995">Network Rail have confirmed that the existing services at Cricklewood Railway Station will continue as at present when the new Railway station is brought into use and the transport assessment work is based on both the new Brent Cross station and the existing station at Cricklewood being open at the end-state.</p> <p data-bbox="1480 1076 1990 1230">There is no regulatory definition that defines thermal processes that produce ash as incineration. Coal and biomass power stations are examples of plants that produce ash but are not incinerators. The Scheme will not be delivering an incinerator.</p> <p data-bbox="1480 1255 1990 1304">The provision of a replacement waste facility is consistent with the Development Framework and</p>

Ref	Consultee	Comments	Officer Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Compulsory purchase of the Bestway site • As the country is due to be over-provided with waste processing plants by 2015 and given that an area near schools and houses is highly inappropriate for such an installation • The 140m high chimney will be stick out like a sore thumb with no tall buildings around it till later phases. The Developers say they have alternatives to burning refuse derived fuels and don't need the chimney. It should be rejected now. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The 140m chimney will be a blot on the landscape <p><i>Pollution</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The A406 at Neasden is already one of the most polluted stretches in London 	<p>the 2010 Permission.</p> <p>The height of 140metres has been specified as a maximum height. Actual height will depend on a range of factors and will be informed by a site and technology specific air dispersion modelling exercise. One of the technologies being considered would produce a synthetic gas, which after cleaning could be used as a replacement for natural gas in a large gas fired boiler. In this instance the height of the flue stack would be much lower. This will be finalised at the detailed design stage.</p> <p>The chimney will be located away from residential development – its immediate context is mainly large pieces of road and rail infrastructure</p> <p>Any chimney required to support any proposed waste to energy plant will have its design carefully considered and any appropriate visual impact considered. This will be subject to full public consultation.</p> <p>The most recent iteration of the LB Brent AQMA (December 2006) designates the entire borough south of the North Circular Road as an area for nitrogen oxide and particulates associated with road traffic emissions.</p> <p>The impact to air quality as a result of emissions from the exhausts of vehicles associated with the base case and operational phases of the Scheme has been modelled and assessed. The operation of the proposed development is not predicted to result in a substantial impact to air quality in terms of nitrogen dioxide or particulate emissions, either</p>

Ref	Consultee	Comments	Officer Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Incinerators pump out particulates too small to measure - nanoparticles <p><i>Housing</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • housing only required to follow the minimum permitted Code for Sustainable Homes level; The scheme is now indeed greener but only because legislation is much tighter • Insufficient affordable housing • Too many flats, not enough houses • Very few family homes • Even fewer with gardens <p><i>Use of Planning Gain money</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No actual gain for the community, the money will be spent on repairing the disruption of moving two schools, a newish sports centre, a rubbish dump and a care home in order to free up the most saleable land. • Brent council are worried about the strain on their schools 	<p>in relation to traffic emissions or the operation of the CHP Plant.</p> <p>A Combined Heat and Power (CHP) Plant is proposed in the Station Quarter Zone. This element of the Scheme has not been changed as part of the Section 73 application. Best available technology will be used, which will improve energy efficiency and significantly reduce CO2 emissions. The operation of the CHP plant is not predicted to result in a substantial impact to air quality in terms of NO₂ or PM₁₀ emissions and will achieve the emissions performance standards required through European legislation.</p> <p>The approach is consistent with Planning Policy. Reserved Matter applications will be expected to conform to current London Plan standards.</p> <p>The affordable housing position was fully tested as part of the 2010 Permission, and includes the provision of a review mechanism to ensure maximum possible levels of affordable housing are provided.</p> <p>The application is consistent with the Development Framework and the 2010 Permission.</p> <p>The masterplan for the site has evolved over many years and is considered to represent the most efficient and effective use of the site. The proposals would result in the re-provision of several existing community facilities including a number of schools and the sports centre. The proposals would also bring forward new</p>

Ref	Consultee	Comments	Officer Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="464 352 1451 451">• The residents of 7,500 new flats will put a huge strain on the schools so increasing places is a necessity. Whitefield school was only rebuilt about 15 years ago and the grounds of this sports specialist school will be replaced with blocks of flats, and its dedicated playing field will be replaced by a shared space. <p data-bbox="422 1019 625 1044"><i>Loss of green space</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="464 1062 1451 1161">• The replacement schools have little dedicated playing field as these which are reprovided as shared facilities on Clitterhouse Playing fields. This is a net loss of playing field in order to intensify use of the open grounds landscaping. In order to squeeze in all the pitches the layout is geometric and not conducive to activities other than organised sport. <li data-bbox="464 1179 1451 1278">• These additional acres are cleverly conjured up. Not all the existing open spaces were accounted for in the analysis. E.g. the open space in front of B&Q was omitted and this is crucial visual respite to the urban scene. Brent Terrace triangles are much used by children for play but will be replaced by replaced by a wide verge on a busy road. <li data-bbox="464 1295 1451 1320">• Clarefield Park will be lost and not replaced with temporary amenities until Whitefield estate 	<p data-bbox="1480 352 1990 475">community facilities. The re-provision of schools and the sports centre are expected to be phased in order to minimise disruption to the community. Existing facilities will not be closed until the new facilities are ready and available for use.</p> <p data-bbox="1480 480 1990 732">The application documentation acknowledges that there is limited surplus capacity at primary school level and therefore the proposals would result in the expansion of Claremont Primary School to provide additional places and a financial contribution to ensure places can be delivered to accommodate demand arising from the earliest stages of the development. This physical provision and financial contributions will be secured through the S106.</p> <p data-bbox="1480 760 1990 862">Whitefield School currently has surplus capacity. The re-provision of the school would provide the flexibility for additional places to be added should it be required.</p> <p data-bbox="1480 889 1990 992">The shared open space for the school and the local community would enable a wider range of high quality facilities to be provided and ensure these facilities are sustainable in the long term.</p> <p data-bbox="1480 1019 1990 1094">Please see the Open space section of the main committee report for an analysis of quantum and the approach to temporary open space provision.</p> <p data-bbox="1480 1122 1990 1224">The Scheme will deliver improved public open space, and importantly will establish a maintenance regime to ensure the spaces remain of a high quality in the future.</p> <p data-bbox="1480 1252 1990 1302">The detail of the Clitterhouse Playing fields improvements will be subject to public consultation</p>

Ref	Consultee	Comments	Officer Response
		<p>relocated. Compensation is required.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Whitefield school will take 1/5 of the Clitterhouse Playing Fields from public use. • The open spaces provided are not necessarily green and there is lack of clarity over open green space/ public realm and private communal open space. • The quality of spaces is poor - often no more than wide verges bordering busy roads. replacing the green spaces on Brent Terrace that children play on with a rectangular recreational strip beside the A5 ('Brooklynising' of children's recreational space). <p><i>Loss of public realm</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ownership will pass from public to private, • police replaced by security guards, and bouncers • council gym to private health club • and no doubt NHS doctor to private walk-in surgery <p><i>Maladministration</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No competitive tenders sought • Public land sold to developers in backroom deals not openly and transparently • The land outside B&Q Cricklewood Lane is designated as open space and Martin Cowie misled Cllr Jack Cohen • Martin Cowie stated at the 2010 planning meeting that Brent had dropped their objections, which was and still is manifestly not the case. Cllrs voted on the basis of this misinformation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The terms are insufficiently stringent, they allow developers to cherry-pick the profitable parts such as the shopping centre whilst housing and the train station follow only when economically 	<p>at the reserved matters stage.</p> <p>These are issues that will need to be resolved as part of the implementation and delivery of the proposal, including the approval of the Estate Management Framework.</p> <p>These are not planning considerations. For discussion on the B & Q site please see the open space section of the committee report.</p> <p>The report to the November 2009 Planning Committee that resolved to grant planning consent clearly stated that Brent maintained their objection and Brent have acknowledge that this was the case. LB Brent has been consulted as part of this Section 73 application and their continued objection to this proposal on traffic ground is reported.</p> <p>Please see discussion of the 'cherry picking' issue in the main report. The phasing of the scheme</p>

Ref	Consultee	Comments	Officer Response
		<p>viable</p> <p><i>Impact on Cricklewood Broadway</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • When Brent Cross was first built it rang the death knell for businesses on the Broadway. What had historically been a quality shopping area quickly became a road of poor quality shops and fast food outlets. Crime levels also rose and remain high. • The Broadway is a border between 3 London boroughs: Barnet; Brent and Camden. An overview of those parts of the Broadway falling within each borough gives rise to a single conclusion that there is no cohesive policy for maintaining the Broadway or tackling the various problems associated with it. Barnet and Camden are noticeably least interested in applying time or resources the Broadway leaving Brent with a hopeless task of trying to maintain its side as well as it can. Frankly, the Barnet and Camden sides of the Broadway are a disgrace! • The new development will serve to take away business from the Broadway. No or no adequate proposals to compensate for this inevitable outcome have been put forward by the developers. Barnet does not appear to have required of the developers that they do so. Why not? Real thought should be given to substantial statutory compensation being made available not just to Barnet (who needs it least) but to a joint committee of the 3 councils to ensure that the new development includes and regenerates the Broadway. • We wish to see regeneration funds spent by Barnet on Cricklewood, in order to compensate for the considerable inconvenience of the additional traffic, rat runs, noise, pollution, loss of business. The community will fall apart without some investment. • We still need our own high street shops for everyday items • Additionally, the Cricklewood Town Team formed three years ago has done great work. Cricklewood is a different place now, with a vibrant community and improving shops. It will be even better when the £2.1m OLF makeover is complete. It is no longer appropriate to write off Cricklewood - it matters now. 	<p>provides a significant amount of necessary infrastructure early in the delivery process, which is designed for capacity at the end of the scheme. The need for the train station is primarily borne out of the office development, which is not delivered until the latter stages.</p> <p>The London Plan, Core Strategy and Development Framework seek to create a new metropolitan town centre at BXC. Full details of the retail component of the scheme are set out on the Retail report Addendum (BXC06) and in the Retail Section of the Committee Report.</p> <p>It is considered that the retail proposals for the Brent Cross East Development Zone are not in direct conflict with the more local shopping provision at Cricklewood Broadway. It is hoped that the substantial increase in population delivered through the BXC proposals will help support surrounding local shopping centre</p>

Ref	Consultee	Comments	Officer Response
		<p><i>General</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The 1996 proposal for a car-based Brent Cross expansion was eventually after judicial review rejected in 2002 in the high court, because of traffic generation, and its effect on local high streets. • Any new plan was required to include the area south of the North Circular and should include housing • The announced alternative, a "new Brent Cross town centre" has now been largely abandoned, with Barnet Cabinet accepting last April that the developers were selling up, except for still enlarging the shopping centre, rather like the rejected 1996 plan. <p><i>Clitterhouse Farm</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I do not support the demolition of the historic Clitterhouse Farm Buildings as outlined in the plans. I want the buildings to be conserved, renovated and transformed into a multi-use community hub. <p><i>Cricklewood Lane</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The BXC scheme includes plans to concrete over the only piece of green space in central Cricklewood, used by Barnet, Brent and Camden residents...Even worse, this proposed sale of public land is in the SAME planning application as the Brent Cross Shopping Centre expansion, even though that is a mile away. • Furthermore I object to this being brought forward into phase one; there are many parcels of land which could be used instead for displaced Whitefield residents. • It was stated (erroneously, the BXC coalition has counted them)) that there were few objections in 2009. This is hardly surprising given that most maps and plans of the scheme end at the new station and do not show Cricklewood Lane. This act of vandalism is well hidden in the documentation • Cllr Jack Cohen has correspondence showing that in 1987 the area was designated as open 	<p>The 1996 proposal was for the expansion of the out of town Brent Cross shopping centre alone. The 2010 permission was for the comprehensive regeneration of 151 hectares on both sides of the A406 and the Section 73 application is consistent with this approach as set out in the London Plan, Core Strategy and Development Framework. The proposals continue to seek planning permission for the complete regeneration of Brent Cross, Cricklewood. The revised phasing introduces additional infrastructure in the early phase which will assist facilitate subsequent phases.</p> <p>Please see earlier comments in response to this issue and the open space section of the committee report.</p> <p>Development of this site was approved in the 2010 consent. These issues are discussed further in the open space section of the committee report. The proposals remain unchanged from the 2010 Permission for the uses and for the maximum and minimum heights for this site.</p> <p>In the 2010 Permission this site (Plot 58) was granted outline consent for retail or health uses on the ground floor and residential uses on the on the upper floors. It was programmed for delivery in Phase 2 of the development. This site had historically been subject to anti-social behaviour and a building was approved in this location under the outline consent as it was felt that there were</p>

Ref	Consultee	Comments	Officer Response
		<p>space – not the smaller area but the main grassed area</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The S52 Agreement dated 30th January 1987 between Mayor of Barnet, Mayor of Brent, Charterhall Properties (Cricklewood) Ltd, and Erith Plc states: • The description of development refers to provision of “new public conveniences public footpaths and area of public open space”. • Public Open Space is defined as “the creation of a public open space on that part of the site show coloured yellow on the Plan, such open space to make substantial provision for tree and shrub planting within it and to be attractively landscaped and laid out to the satisfaction of the Council”. • Paragraph 4 b(iv) refers to the Council adopting the public open space after a defects period of 12 months, “and thereupon the Public Open Space shall become a public open space maintainable at the public expense” • The Mayor of Brent was party to this agreement and I believe the leader of Brent Council is looking into this matter • The single BXC plan can only be accepted or rejected in its entirety, so there is absolutely no democracy regarding this site - it has no connection whatsoever with the shopping centre! • The same applies to two pieces of children's play areas on a local road, Brent Terrace... No-one would get away with destroying those green triangles in many other parts of Barnet <p>It was often repeated Cricklewood Lane has no substantive changes, yet there is a significant change to length parameter of the proposed building .The Cricklewood Lane development now has 26 units not 25 as consented. All units are serviced from the street with no parking. Servicing is inadequate. Retail development is not appropriate.</p>	<p>urban design reasons for continuing the built frontage to this side of Cricklewood Lane. The building approved in outline under the 2010 Permission would provide a continuous active frontage to an area dominated at present by the blank side of the B & Q building.</p> <p>This area was provided as open space at the time of the construction of the present B & Q store under the terms of a S52 agreement dated 30 January 1987 and was acquired from the Crown Commissioners by the Council in September 2004 with a restrictive covenant requiring it to be used as open space. Both of these restrictions are not unusual situations when comprehensively developing sites in existing urban areas such as town centres. Statutory powers under Section 237 of the Town and Country Planning Act would be used to override these restrictions at the development stage, if appropriate in order to allow this part of the BXC development to be delivered.</p> <p>Although it is noted that this space provides a level of local amenity space it is considered that the qualitative and quantitative improvement to local open spaces provided early in the wider BXC scheme delivery programme will sufficiently mitigate the loss of this space. In addition, it is likely that some area of public realm will be provided and retained as part of the Outer London Fund proposals.</p> <p>Unit nos. for illustrative plots 30 and 58 are indicative and will be confirmed within detailed design proposals to be brought forward within Reserved Matters Applications (RMAs).</p>

Ref	Consultee	Comments	Officer Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="464 548 1430 623">• B&Q space was omitted from the calculation of open space which is in an area of deficiency. Public open space of a useful quantum should be retained in this location and the overall readjusted so that no loss results in Cricklewood town centre. <li data-bbox="464 643 1455 743">• Throughout the development the open space that is provided is too noisy to meet the criteria of the quiet spaces only 20% are quiet enough. The living bridge cannot be considered amenity space on this basis. Quieter open space should be provided particularly as this is being relied upon to service the new housing. <li data-bbox="464 1133 1451 1230">• Cricklewood station is described as having step free access, amended road junction and a 'drop off' for the RTS. Elsewhere it is a green space, no step free access & a building plot with no vehicular access or parking. It can't be both. The documentation is full of discrepancies and the offer is unclear. 	<p data-bbox="1478 352 1992 505">Proposals submitted within RMAs will be subject to maximum quantum and other planning parameters. The servicing strategy will be confirmed at the same time. Some retail development is permitted within both of these plots within the 2010 Planning Permission.</p> <p data-bbox="1478 548 1829 570">Please refer to previous responses</p> <p data-bbox="1478 643 1992 1101">The preferred ambient noise level for parks and recreational areas is no higher than LAeq, daytime 50-55 dB. None of the open spaces (with the dominant noise contours) within the site currently achieve a noise level of 55dB or less. However around 24% of overall open/amenity spaces within the proposed Scheme (as amended by the s. 73 application) achieve a noise level of below 55dB or less, and noise levels in some of the existing open space are predicted to improve with the Scheme in place - in Clitterhouse Playing Fields the addition of new buildings and low noise surface on the A406 will reduce noise levels in the central part of the park such that approximately half of the recreational area would experience noise levels below LAeq, daytime 55dB. Furthermore, it is recognised that higher levels of noise may be acceptable in urban areas.</p> <p data-bbox="1478 1133 1992 1230">The Parameter Plans and the Revised Development Specification Framework (BXC01) provide the relevant controls for this area. This shows that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="1524 1239 1992 1310">• the Cricklewood station forecourt may be upgraded, which will include public realm enhancements although this is not

Ref	Consultee	Comments	Officer Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="464 792 1446 894">• The proposed depths of basements have increased from 7m to 9m. The increased soil disposal and risk of flooding has not been addressed. Additional storage would be intensification of use with consequent increase in traffic. It may also be used as parking in due course. <li data-bbox="464 1279 1446 1307">• Substandard housing is proposed with insufficient private amenity space. The bespoke criteria 	<p data-bbox="1570 350 1854 375">currently funded in the CTF;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="1524 402 1990 480">• The station may be provided with step free access enhancements, although this is not currently funded in the CTF; <li data-bbox="1524 508 1990 557">• The A407/Claremont Road junction will be enhanced; <li data-bbox="1524 584 1990 686">• The station forecourt area may potentially accommodate a small development plot, as shown illustratively on the illustrative masterplan. <p data-bbox="1478 711 1990 760">The details will be provided as part of the reserved matters applications.</p> <p data-bbox="1478 792 1990 1255">The depth of the Basements will have no impact on the number of car parking spaces which are controlled by the planning conditions. Basements are regularly below the water table and the issues are addressed by engineers in the detailed designs. The proposed basements have been assessed in the ES, as the numbers of construction vehicle movements used in the assessment have been based on these basements. It is noted, however, that further investigation should be made to confirm the risks of groundwater levels to basements proposed in the Section 73 Scheme's designs. Such investigations will take account of the future effects of climate change, comparing the final development layout and excavation parameters against maximum groundwater levels to assess the potential impacts from, and to, groundwater</p> <p data-bbox="1478 1279 1990 1307">Please see the appraisal section of the report for</p>

Ref	Consultee	Comments	Officer Response
		<p>for 1 and 2 bedroom flats are insufficient to meet GLA guidelines something the developers assert they meet.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Additional comments on failure to consider changes to UK Climate Change law, lack of detail on CCHP, maximise recycling rather than incineration of waste, health implications of the compounds produced by incineration, disposal of toxic ash/residues. • Additional comments on the traffic and transport implications of climate change including criticism of the car based nature of the proposal, lack of facilities for cyclists and lack of support for a light rail proposal. 	<p>discussion on this issue. All reserved matter applications will be expected to comply with the current London Plan standards in this respect.</p> <p>The WHF/CCHP elements of the scheme are discussed elsewhere in these comments and this aspect of the scheme is unchanged from the 2010 Permission</p> <p>Please see response to earlier comments.</p>
31	Resident 2 – OBJECT	<p>EMAIL 1</p> <p><i>Objection 1</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The LPA is seen by many people as notorious for unreasonably ‘over-summarising’ objectors’ comments, in its reports to committee. It equally easily overdoes “Noted” as effectively the only officers’ responses to comments. (This subject is a comment on C/17559/08 in itself, so please include it!). Officers clearly have to abbreviate comments received, but I request the LPA responds to this comment with an assurance to committee that reasonable and proportionate steps will be taken with C/17559/08 this time around, to ensure that all comments are comprehensively handled and responded to. <p><i>Objection 2</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I ask the LPA to tell committee that it accepts that comments outside the narrow list of applicant’s Section 73 changes are (or at least, may well be) completely valid, and should not be ruled ‘out of the scope of the current application’. One reason is that the current application documents include some are unchanged. However, in validating this application, it is also inconceivable that the LPA has already considered and accepted in detail all of the applicant’s decisions about what to leave out this time, because it considers they are “settled”. The LPA can take a different view. The Section 73 application on such a large and interconnected project opens up the reasonable conclusion that they are not “settled” at all. 	<p>Officers consider and respond to all comments either directly or in the appraisal sections of the report.</p> <p>Whilst the 2010 permission remains extant the present application must be considered on its merits. The terms of the 2010 permission are material considerations in considering the Section 73 application. Please see the summary for discussion on this issue</p>

Ref	Consultee	Comments	Officer Response
		<p><i>Objection 3</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I ask the LPA to inform the committee that it grossly-undercharged the applicant for consideration of the original application. The LPA may wish to assert that this did not affect the diligence it used in taking it to committee in 2009 and 2010, but I wish to assert that it did. I wish the amount charged last time, and what it actually cost the LPA, to put into its report to committee, because it is relevant to how decisions were made then. • Please separate costs incurred by the LPA directly, and those charged to the LPA by outside consultants, particularly, but not limited to, the negotiation of Section 106 agreements. (A nice little earner, though no doubt entirely justified.) • I wish the committee to be told full details of the calculation of charges this time, in order to consider the application and put into its report to committee, because it is relevant to how decisions are being made now. Again, please separate out the LPA's Section 106 agreement costs. (Please give assurances that Section 106 negotiation records are public documents [perhaps redacted in parts].) • I also wish the committee to be told full details of the LPA's costs between the conclusion of that earlier 2009/2010 process and the receipt of the current Section 73 application. <p><i>Objection 4</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I wish the LPA to tell the committee of distress to affected parties, regarding the long-term consideration of the application. The LPA should say that such parties felt aggrieved that committee rules in 2009 and 2010 not only banned independent electronic recording of proceedings, but that even taking notes was banned. (On that basis, short-hand secretarial resources that were organised by objectors - and I believe also by the applicant! - could not be used.) The LPA should seek to justify that stance, since it was the anti-democratic, plutocratic attitude of the ruling regime at the time. <p><i>Objection 5</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The LPA should report to committee that the London Borough of Brent, in now-published correspondence with the Barnet LPA after its 2009 BXC committee meetings, insisted - and still insists - that it had not withdrawn objections to the 2008 application, yet the committee was 	<p>Planning application fees are set at the national level. The application fee for C/17559/08 was £25,000 and for the current application F/04687/13 was £195.</p> <p>The Councils costs for planning, transport and regeneration officer time and for the costs of specialist planning, transport, retail and legal consultants are covered by the applicant through a Planning Performance Agreement. The exact charge to the applicant is not known at the time of writing as the process is not complete.</p> <p>The Council procedures in relation to these matters are followed in reporting to the Planning and Environment Committee.</p> <p>The written report to the November 2009 Planning Committee that resolved to grant planning consent clearly stated that Brent maintained their objection and Brent have acknowledge that this was the</p>

Ref	Consultee	Comments	Officer Response
		<p>told by the LPA that it had.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The LPA should seek to explain how that happened, and what effect it considers that this ‘mis-speak ‘ by the LPA had on the lawful and due consideration of the application by Barnet councillors at that time (because that is relevant now) <p><i>Objection 6</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The LPA should remind the committee that the Leader of the Council spoke to the committee last time that he acknowledged what he admitted were "shortcomings in the application", and that he said "this is the best we can get". The LPA should indicate if the Leader had expressed that view directly to the LPA in advance of the 2009 meetings, and if so, whether it influenced the LPA outside consideration of purely planning matters relating to the application. <p><i>Objection 7</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> I wish the LPA to supply the committee with a description of the 1996 proposals, and include supplying, in large size, this image: http://2.bp.blogspot.com/-NG45Q8A0kTc/T9i96hScDII/AAAAAAAAIDI/2lrRLTz1U5I/s1600/Brent+Cross+plan+1996.jpg The LPA should explain the location of extra multi-story car parks, by reference to its own original records. <p><i>Objection 8</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> I wish the LPA to document, in detail, the reasons why that plan was rejected, eventually in an appeal to the high court. This will be a somewhat lengthy description by the LPA to the committee of all the major shortcomings that were mentioned by statutory bodies regarding that application (many of which, incidentally, still apply). <p><i>Objection 9</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> I wish the LPA to tell the committee that the post-2002 scheme is supposedly different from the 1996 proposal, in that it is the invention of a new, integrated, balanced, sustainable, robust 	<p>case. LB Brent has been consulted as part of this Section 73 application and their continued objection to this proposal on traffic ground is reported.</p> <p>This comment refers to C/17559/08. Planning consent has been issued for this application.</p> <p>The 1996 application was for the standalone expansion of the Brent Cross Shopping Centre. The 2010 consent was for the comprehensive development of a new town centre on both sides of the A406. The current Section 73 application is in accordance with the 2010 permission in this respect. Officers do not consider that the detail of the 1996 proposal is relevant to consideration of the Section 73 permission currently before the committee.</p>

Ref	Consultee	Comments	Officer Response
		<p>'town centre'.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The LPA should be expansive to the committee on the detail of that aspiration, as expressed down the years. <p><i>Objection 10</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> I submit that the current Section 73 application, and the report accepted by Barnet Cabinet in April 2013, destroy the credibility of that aspiration, and that this should be reported as being the PLA's view, leading to a recommendation for rejection. Certain items are now cherry-picked by the developers – particularly and obviously, the lucrative expansion of the shopping centre - and the developers then intend leaving the project high and dry. The LPA should remind the committee that the developers strongly asserted at the 2009 committee that they were 'in it for the long-term', and the phasing was agreed on that basis. It seems they are now cutting and running. The changes made to phasing make it easier for the developers to cut and run, but harder for another master-planner to revive this discredited scheme. The LPA needs to argue in detail why that is not the case, if it disagrees. 	<p>Please see the summary, main committee report and summary of the S106 for discussion on the 'cherry picking' issue. Officers consider that the S73 permission and the revised Section 106 agreement will provide a robust legal framework to ensure that comprehensive development is delivered.</p>
		<p>EMAIL 2</p> <p>The LPA should consider <u>all</u> the London Plan information above in its report to committee. Nevertheless, let me draw the LPA's attention particularly, but not exclusively, to:</p> <p>London Plan Comments:</p> <p><i>Comment 1:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>"The Government has indicated its intention to change the planning system radically, to give neighbourhoods far more ability to decide the shape of the places where people live. The Localism Act 2011 also includes provisions to move responsibility for the planning of large infrastructure projects from the Infrastructure Planning Commission to the Planning Inspectorate, introduces neighbourhood planning and gives all planning authorities a duty to co-operate in relation to planning of sustainable development. This duty requires planning authorities to work together constructively on planning for strategic matters affecting at least two planning areas, particularly sustainable development or use of land in connection with</i> 	<p>Please see Appendix 2 to the committee report. The application continues to seek the comprehensive regeneration of Brent Cross, Cricklewood consistent with Planning Policy. The revised phasing includes additional infrastructure in the early phases which will assist the delivery of the latter phases.</p> <p>The scheme has been subject to full public consultation.</p> <p>LB Camden/Brent (and other neighbouring authorities) have been fully consulted on the proposals consistent with Government guidance.</p>

Ref	Consultee	Comments	Officer Response
		<p><i>strategic infrastructure.</i>"</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> I submit the LPA should explain to committee how the LB of Brent and the LB of Camden in particular are being given greater prominence in the consideration of this Section 73 application, than they were in the original application (when they were effectively dismissed as unimportant irritants). <p><i>Comment 2:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>"The Government is also moving towards new development making 'zero carbon' contribution."</i> This Section 73 application does not measure up to that aspiration. It should be rejected. <p><i>Comment 3:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The LPA will also be aware that the London Plan mentions <i>"the London-Luton-Bedford strategic coordination corridor"</i>. The report to committee should explain how all the LPA's car-orientated developments along the A5 corridor contribute to sustainable development. They don't! In relation to that, the LPA is obliged, I believe, to spell out to committee the chronology regarding how the LPA's 'Supplementary Planning Guidance for Brent Cross, Cricklewood and West Hendon' was produced with the assistance of a world-class planning consultancy that predicted <u>over 29,000 extra car journeys per day</u> in the area (plus other vehicles). The LPA should clearly state that the original planning application was supposedly produced to meet the LPA's SPG specifications, expectations and requirements. No wonder it is an unsustainable car-based development. Despite meeting the SPG, it should be rejected now. 	<p>The proposals have been prepared to current respond to planning policy requirements in this respect.</p> <p>The new railway Station addresses the London-Luton-Bedford corridor strategy.</p> <p>The source of the 29,000 cars figure is from the Regeneration Area Development Framework, which was prepared in 2003 and 2004 and was based on a simple spreadsheet form of assessments and there had been no comprehensive modelling of new journeys which has now been undertaken to support the current planning application. For example, the 29,000 figure includes traffic generated by the West Hendon regeneration scheme which is not part of BXC and that the figure does not account for road trips that will be removed as a result of the change of uses of the site through the regeneration – for example the removal of a number of existing industrial premises. Nor does it properly account for the future choice of travel mode when all the proposed public transport improvements come forward when it is predicted that there will be less use of the private car and a shift to use of public</p>

Ref	Consultee	Comments	Officer Response
		<p data-bbox="422 805 548 824"><i>Comment 4:</i></p> <ul data-bbox="464 857 1457 1292" style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="464 857 1367 906">• POLICY 2.18 GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE: THE NETWORK OF OPEN AND GREEN SPACES says: <li data-bbox="464 927 1409 1105">• <i>“The Mayor will work with all relevant strategic partners to protect, promote, expand and manage the extent and quality of, and access to, London’s network of green infrastructure. This multifunctional network will secure benefits including, but not limited to, biodiversity; natural and historic landscapes; culture; building a sense of place; the economy; sport; recreation; local food production; mitigating and adapting to climate change; water management; and the social benefits that promote individual and community health and well-being.”</i> <li data-bbox="464 1127 1457 1224">• The LPA should inform the committee how the Cricklewood Lane Green Space and the Brent Terrace Green Triangles have been included in a planning application based around the regeneration of the Brent Cross Shopping Centre and the North Circular Road, <u>when they have absolutely no connection with that area.</u> <li data-bbox="464 1245 1373 1292">• They are fulfilling <u>current</u> functions of leisure, amenity, street-scene enhancement, and children’s play that are not capable of being replicated elsewhere. 	<p data-bbox="1482 354 1787 373">transport, walking and cycling.</p> <p data-bbox="1482 394 1990 597">The Development Framework figure was generated using basic assessment methods that were inappropriate for a mixed use scheme on the scale of BXC where the existing traffic patterns will change significantly and that since then, much more precise modelling has been done and these latest more accurate assessments and predictions have been accepted by both Barnet and TfL.</p> <p data-bbox="1482 626 1990 776">The 29,000 figure quoted in the Development Framework is over a whole 12 hour day and the equivalent 12 hour period traffic flow for the BXC development is 9000, but it is the peak hour traffic flow that is the concern when considering traffic congestion.</p> <p data-bbox="1482 857 1990 930">The scheme includes a comprehensive public realm and open space strategy, which has been subject to discussions with the GLA.</p> <p data-bbox="1482 987 1990 1036">Please refer to previous responses and the open space section of the committee report.</p> <p data-bbox="1482 1117 1990 1190">Councillors will undertake a site visit which will include the Brent Terrace area and the area adjacent to B & Q.</p>

Ref	Consultee	Comments	Officer Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="464 354 1398 496">• In regard to the Cricklewood Green Space, please include a large version of the following image of its current use in your written report to committee: http://1.bp.blogspot.com/-NIBacAKBzPA/UpezWqq5dDI/AAAAAAAAhB0/0K2iArQ19rI/s1600/Cricklewood+green+space+-+copyright.jpg <li data-bbox="464 540 1451 768">• In regard to the Brent Terrace Green Triangles, please include the following image, which shows how children's play there is currently able to be supervised by parents and adults in the surrounding housing, in your report to committee:http://3.bp.blogspot.com/_mHWLiJNwX18/TJj6D23eFtI/AAAAAAAAABNM/Y8I8VmXSv0U/s1600/Brent+Terrace.jpg, and, by including both areas in the single Shopping Centre planning application, the LPA is corrupting acceptable planning due process, outside a reasonable interpretation of the rule of law. It is, further, in breach the European Convention on Human Rights, in that the actions arising out of the policy decisions of the LPA amount to the imposition of an uncertain and arbitrary form of government. <li data-bbox="464 829 1404 878">• If the LPA chooses to report to the committee that it disagrees with that accusation, then it must document why to committee. <li data-bbox="464 898 1436 946">• It is not good enough to refer to the land scoped out in the SPG as being somehow 'linked' or 'integral'. Don't mention 'synergy' either. <li data-bbox="464 966 1451 1063">• The SPG was planning guidance only. The LPA must acknowledge to committee that, in any case, the West Hendon area was separated out of the original area because it was convenient for the LPA to do so, so the boundary of the SPG is most certainly not sacrosanct in any way. Divide it up some more! <li data-bbox="464 1083 1423 1180">• The LPA must also document to committee, in detail, how building on the Cricklewood Lane Green Space is more closely related in some nebulous way to the Brent Cross Shopping Centre than a similar piece of green space in, say, Totteridge Ponds, Mill Hill Ridgeway or Hampstead Garden Suburb. I submit that the LPA cannot credibly do that. <li data-bbox="464 1287 1451 1308">• The move from, firstly having an SPG for an area, to secondly, encouraging a <i>single</i> 'take-it-or- 	

Ref	Consultee	Comments	Officer Response
		<p>leave-it' planning application for that area is unreasonable and unlawful.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The LPA has always said that it was a single choice, of approval or rejection, of the whole single planning application. • The LPA is repeating that behaviour in the assumptions behind the Section 73 application, that the rest of the plan is "settled already". <p><i>Comment 5:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Amend[ed] paragraph 6.12 supporting Policy 6.2 PROVIDING PUBLIC TRANSPORT CAPACITY AND SAFEGUARDING LAND FOR TRANSPORT says: • <i>"Travel by public transport needs to be improved to increase its appeal relative to the car, and the objectives set out in Policy 6.2 need to be addressed to improve the attractiveness of the current and future network for passengers. Boroughs need to safeguard the current range of land in transport uses and allocate land in their relevant development plan documents so that the schemes in Table 6.1 can be implemented. Paragraph 41 of the NPPF is clear that boroughs should identify and protect, where there is robust evidence, sites and routes which could be critical in developing infrastructure to widen transport choice..."</i> • The LPA should oppose the Section 73 application, because it still falls short of reasonable expectations of the required modal shift from cars in the years ahead, and lacks passive provision for light-rail at Brent Cross, <i>in line with the Mayor's new policy</i>: • <i>"Deputy Mayor for Transport Isabel Dedring said light rail and tram services are under consideration for outer areas ... as the population soared to 10 million over the next 20 years."</i> • Sources on that new policy include: http://www.standard.co.uk/news/transport/mayors-aide-build-outer-london-rail-and-tram-links-to-beat-jams-8751932.html • How has the LPA responded to that new policy? Up until now, the LPA has had a road-first policy, in some form, since the Royal Commission on London Traffic in 1905, the General Road Plan in 1913, and the Highway Development Survey of 1937. The LPA should tell the committee if it has changed. 	<p>The mode share of 70 % of all person trips by modes other than the private car is well within the London Plan policies.</p> <p>The DP's have long expressed the view that they welcome any additional connectivity that may be created, linking the BXC area with other areas in London, but that the transport package evolved with the Highways Agency, TfL and the Local Authority is totally focussed on the current transport issues and how these are to be dealt with together with a reasonable prognosis of how the demands on the system will grow over time</p> <p>The issue of an additional orbital railway/light railway has always been recognised positively, but the DPs maintain that any light railway idea has to be the subject of a major demand and feasibility study, probably by TfL, to establish the best practical and cost-effective route for that railway. It is by no means certain that a route via Brent Cross will be the correct choice when it is studied (if it is studied). The area is well served and will be better served by bus routes.</p> <p>In the meantime, there is no possible reason for the current plans to be held up or compromised by a</p>

Ref	Consultee	Comments	Officer Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In particular, the enlargement of the A406/A41 roundabout imposes support columns on the east-to-south corner widening that block the current ability to fit a single-track light-rail track or personal rapid transit such as the current Heathrow system http://www.ultraglobalprt.com to the Brent Cross Northern Line station, sometime in the future. It should not be allowed to be built in that form. • The existing Templehof Avenue bridge is structurally-sound, and should be retained for off-road light-rail or PRT, alongside a new one. It should not be demolished. • An east-west route, on the south side of the A406 should be safeguarded for light-rail or PRT (even if it is on-road, which would limit the possible systems). The Section 73 application's design for south of the A406 should therefore be rejected. • The LPA should justify its lack of interest in orbital new transport systems across the borough, interchanging with the existing radial services. It should note to committee that London's population is rising by 100,000 a year, and more transport infrastructure, including rail-based, is essential. • Why is the LPA dismissive of Crossrail 2 being introduced as far as Alexandra Palace station and perhaps beyond? That is the gist of the email response back from the LPA that I received. That would make an eastern interchange point for new Barnet infrastructure. • Why is the LPA so dysfunctional that I had to inform it of the Mayor's intention to introduce a London Overground passenger service on the Dudding Hill Freight Line across Brent (dismissed by Barnet planners in their BXC consultation in 2002 or so)? • Such a service would have a station on the Midland Main Line freight tracks at Brent Cross (rather more likely than a Thameslink station there, I think), new platforms at Hendon Thameslink, and maybe a terminus platform at the RAF Museum. • Instead, the LPA is unacceptably comfortable with more and more cars in the Brent Cross area, as at other development sites in the borough, and believes the tall stories of dramatic modal shifts away from cars that the developers peddle all the time. We now know the 	<p>proposal.</p> <p>The improvements to the A406 / A41 junction comprises new slip roads which are alongside and at the same level as the existing slip roads. Hence there is no new obstruction to the provision of a light rail route other than the need for an extension of approximately 15m to the existing underpass below the A41.</p> <p>TfL agree that the existing bridge is nearing the end of its economic life.</p> <p>The suggestion of a new orbital railway of some form would no doubt benefit North London as a whole, and may be promoted by TfL, but there is no need for such a facility identified in regard to the Brent Cross Cricklewood Development alone</p> <p>This is not relevant to the BXC application</p> <p>The idea of a train service on the Dudding Hill line has been around for a long time but Officers are not aware of the Mayor having said anything about definitely introducing an Overground service to BXC. A link to Brent Cross via the Overground is not part of TfL's current proposals, and there is no station on the Dudding Hill line within plans to serve this corridor. Whilst TfL is keeping this as one of the options for linking in other destinations to Old Oak Common, it would be subject to further assessment. Furthermore there has been no cost</p>

Ref	Consultee	Comments	Officer Response
		<p>developers are quitting after Phase One anyway.</p> <p><i>Comment 6:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Amend[ed] paragraphs 6.35 and 6.36 supporting Policy 6.9 CYCLING says: • <i>“New developments should provide cycling parking and cycle changing facilities to encourage more cycling. Planning briefs and masterplans should include principles to encourage a high quality, connected environment for cyclists.”</i> • This is not being done. The road designs in the BXC plan to supposedly allow casual cycling (as Boris says: “without having to wear lycra”) are a decade out of date. The engineers involved do not have a clue, regarding good and safe design for cycling. And the LPA needs outside help to evaluate what is proposed, instead of only being interested in outside help with Section 106 negotiations. • There should only be cycling routes <i>that are completely segregated from both motorists and pedestrians</i> (apart from cross-overs at right-angles to the other street users). Only that meets the Mayor’s new policies. The Section 73 application is inadequate. • The path alongside the River Brent must be properly segregated for cyclists and pedestrians, and by hard infrastructure, not just paint. Both should be wide enough for their users, not like as at present. Ask Andrew Gilligan at City Hall. 	<p>benefit analysis of a passenger service on the Dudding Hill Line. So at this stage it is far from being a committed scheme</p> <p>The overall Regeneration scheme is promulgated on providing sufficient capacity across all modes of transport and in accordance with the mode split targets contained in the Framework Travel Plan.</p> <p>The new cycle facilities to be provided throughout the site address all the movement routes both internal to the Development and the longer distance routes. These facilities will be of a high standard, including for example cycle lanes and cycle advanced stop lines (ASLs), and entirely consistent with the Policies and approach of LBB and the Mayor’s current vision and Standards. The routes will utilize the local road network and enable cyclists to avoid the strategic road network for longer distance journeys. The framework of controls in the S106 and the Conditions ensures that the Developers will continue to progress the detailed designs of these facilities in close liaison with the relevant highway authorities, TfL and the Mayor’s advisors. Road Safety Audits will be undertaken to ensure that all cycle facilities provided are safe. The cycle, and pedestrian, facilities are being designed in close co-operation with TfL and their emerging standards are being complied with. The developers have liaised with Andrew Gilligan in regard to the design of the cycle facilities</p> <p>There will be no permitted access to the pedestrian and cycle path alongside the River</p>

Ref	Consultee	Comments	Officer Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • That river path is alongside a dangerous and frightening-to-children raging torrent when the river is in spate, and I do not think anyone has been bothered about that, ever. (The Environment Agency doesn't really concern itself with such matters, just water through-put and flooding issues.) • The Section 73 application should be rejected. Multiple, segregated cycle routes are necessary across the BXC site, even if that means that building lines have to be taken back, to allow wider thoroughfares. The LPA has been deficient in such matters, and must not continue to be so with this Section 73 application, which is totally out-of-line with the Mayor's 'Go-Dutch' design standards. <p><i>Comment 7:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Amend[ed] paragraph 7.51 supporting Policy 7.14 IMPROVING AIR QUALITY says: • <i>"Increased exposure to existing poor air quality should be minimised by avoiding introduction of potentially new sensitive receptors in locations where they will be affected by existing sources of air pollution (such as road traffic and industrial processes)."</i> • The LPA should supply the committee with a large image of this 2011 <i>public-domain</i> proposal by the developers: http://2.bp.blogspot.com/NsOuwphPqWq/UFm7lDbRNhI/AAAAAAAAO2w/mnoYrVGjDRo/s1600/2iujgg%255B1%255D.jpg • The LPA should explain to the committee that for many years there has been a proposal to build a bridge over the A406 that had buildings on both sides, so that people would be unaware they were crossing the 10-lane motorway (which was built as part of the M15 Motorway originally). Those buildings are shown on this image, which separates that 'living bridge' from the Templehof Avenue bridge for the first time in a published image. • That plan has been abandoned, the LPA needs to tell the committee. Instead, the living bridge is spun as a pedestrian and cycling bridge. It is also now over sixteen lanes of traffic. • the new living bridge will be unacceptably open to the diesel particulates, nitrogen oxides, dirt and noise of the A406. • The LPA should comment on what it thinks about that, to the committee. Will the pollution 	<p>Brent when the river in flood.</p> <p>The relevant parties are being consulted in the preparation of the proposals and TfL will be part of the team approving the detailed designs.</p> <p>Concentrations of the two key pollutants and for the averaging periods of concern have been assessed. These were the annual and hourly average concentrations of nitrogen dioxide and particulates. For both pollutants, and for those averaging periods, AQMAs have been declared by the relevant local authorities on the basis of widespread exceedences of the annual mean nitrogen dioxide and particulates objectives at roadside and kerbside locations.</p> <p>Emissions from trains associated with the site have been assessed in a qualitative manner consistent with local authority guidance. The likely impact has been found to be negligible.</p> <p>Emissions of dust have been assessed in accordance with guidance issued by the IAQM and the Greater London Authority. Assuming the successful implementation of the mitigation measures required by the guidance, the impact of dust to nearby receptors will be negligible or at worst slight adverse.</p> <p>The operation of the proposed development is not predicted to result in a substantial impact to air</p>

Ref	Consultee	Comments	Officer Response
		<p>levels be measured? What pollution levels are acceptable on the bridge? Will the LPA ban any retail stalls ever being set up on the bridge, due to the health risks, and the possibility of legal action against public authorities by those affected?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What noise levels are acceptable to the LPA on the bridge (in dB terms)? <p><i>Conclusion:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The LPA has been woefully inadequate in specifying how a permeable new town centre should be designed, with publicly-adopted highways. • The LPA considers this only as an afterthought. Yet the street structure on the north side of the A406 that was approved in the 2008 plan has been scrapped, and we have copies of Hammerson's Bristol and Leeds's shopping centres, of bog-standard privatised glazed shopping malls. • That is not what the SPG specified. The LPA should explain that to committee, and recommend rejection of the changed plan. It is not good enough to back George Osborne's appeal for growth at any price. If something was unacceptable from 2002 to 2010, it must remain unacceptable now. • The developers could reduce their changes, and submit a new Section 73 application. • In terms of what are private and what are council-adopted highways, the LPA also needs to identify what it actually believes, because it has clearly never done so. • A '24-hour access' assurance from this lot is not adequate. Anything '24-hour' should be council-adopted, perhaps with a privately-funded enhanced cleaning and maintenance regime. Permissive arrangements, falling short of proper adoption, are not good enough, and are now discouraged by the Mayor. • The Section 73 application so fundamentally rejects the decade-old process of tightly integrating the many and varied functions of this new town centre, and firmly based around a proper street structure, not a shopping experience, that it should be rejected. • A single Hammerson-ville will all date badly at the same rate. We need multiple ownership (of leases at least) with buildings being replaced randomly over the years, as in a proper town centre, not a single fairy kingdom. 	<p>quality in terms of nitrogen dioxide or particulate emissions, either in relation to traffic emissions or the operation of the CHP Plant.</p> <p>The operation of the proposed development is not predicted to result in a substantial impact to air quality in terms of nitrogen dioxide or particulate matter, either in relation to traffic emissions or the operation of the CHP Plant. The low noise surface on the A406 will serve to minimise noise levels from this source.</p> <p>Many of the issues raised here are not relevant to an outline application but will be fully considered at the reserved matters stage when the design of the Living Bridge has been developed to a level of detail that will allow these matters to be fully assessed.</p>

Ref	Consultee	Comments	Officer Response
		<p>EMAIL3 (7 December)</p> <p>The Committee only have a binary choice to approve or reject the application. It should be rejected because of the unacceptable tower blocks at the end of Templehof Avenue.</p> <p>The developers are trying it on and are including them because they can (like the Cricklewood Land Green space) because the blocks are included in a single planning application which is really for the enlargement of the Shopping Centre</p> <p>These blocks can be marketed in the Far East and are a scam</p>	<p>Please see the appropriate sections of the main committee report for discussion of these issues. Permeability and connectivity through the development are important issues that have been fully considered by officers. 24 hour routes will be secured through the S106 agreement.</p>
		<p>EMAIL 4 (dated 15th December)</p> <p><i>Comment 1</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Regarding this application, there appear to be many more substantive changes in the Section 73 application than were consulted on by the applicant in its public exhibitions during the summer. • Would your report to committee acknowledge that fact, please, when you come to comment on the application documents provided to you regarding 'community involvement', if you come to that same and independent conclusion? <p><i>Comment 2</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Given the complexity of submissions made to you by the public, are you able to say what period of time is guaranteed by the LPA, between your report and recommendation to committee being published, and the date of any committee meeting? • Please clarify if the Section 73 application and the Section 106 agreement are separate issues, to be handled separately, and presumably voted on separately. 	<p>Please see the summary for discussion on what Councillors can consider and approve in relation to this application.</p> <p>The proposed tall residential towers adjacent to the Templehof bridge will be subject to reserved matter applications which will be subject to full consultation and will be required to conform to the London Plan standards and to create an acceptable residential environment for future residents</p> <p>The applicant's pre-application consultation is reported in the main committee report.</p> <p>Council procedures will be followed with regard to the time between publishing the report and the committee meeting.</p> <p>A summary of the S106 will be presented to the committee and the Assistant Director will be authorised to agree the full S106 in accordance with the principles set out in the summary before any planning consent is issued.</p>

Ref	Consultee	Comments	Officer Response
		<p><i>Comment 3</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • You may remember I mentioned the two-metre increase in basement heights in some buildings, when we talked at the LB of Barnet consultation. • I suggested that the applicant might be 'trying it on', and could add extra floors for parking at a later date, rather like mezzanine floors have been added into existing DIY stores across the UK with no additional planning permission being needed. • Please confirm that you are considering that matter, as part of your analysis. <p><i>Comment 4</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • You may like to see this week's local newspapers on the subject: http://brentcrosscoalition.blogspot.co.uk/2013/12/barnet-times-and-barnet-press.html • The complete web site is: http://brentcrosscoalition.blogspot.co.uk/ • And there is a photo of the well-used Green Space on Cricklewood Lane at: http://1.bp.blogspot.com/-NlBacAKBzPA/UpezWqq5dDI/AAAAAAAAhB0/0K2iArQ19rl/s1600/Cricklewood+green+space+-+copyright.jpg • Has the LPA reached any legal conclusions about the availability of the Green Space for development, please? 	<p>The additional basement depth will not facilitate additional mezzanine floors. The Permission is subject to a cap on floorspace per development zone, which includes any mezzanine floorspace. The depth of the Basements will have no impact on the number of car parking spaces which are controlled by the planning conditions.</p> <p>Please see the open space section of the committee report.</p>
		<p>Email 5 & 6 (19 December)</p> <p>All new roads should be designed to Dutch standards – this means strict separation from pedestrians and vehicle traffic. A painted line at the side of the road is not sufficient.</p> <p>The BXC report should deal with the issues raised in Mervyn Bartlett's letter to Network Rail in 2011. This should mention the rejection after public consultation in 2002/3 of the Dudding Hill freight line and this was carried through into the BXC transport analysis that became the SPG and formed the basis of the BXC application. This slewing away from sustainable planning is still reflected in the Section 73 application</p>	<p>All roads will be designed to meet the appropriate standards required by each highway authority. The design of cycle facilities is responded to in the London Cycling Campaign (LCC) section above.</p> <p>Barnet is seeking to promote the opportunity for the use of the Dudding Hill freight line in light of the evolving situation over recent years with the proposed and approved new station at Brent Cross and plans for High Speed 2 at Old Oak</p>

Ref	Consultee	Comments	Officer Response
		<p>Further emails dated 19 January</p> <p>Will the Draft Further Alterations to the London Plan January 2014 be considered?</p> <p>Request for clarification on the council's role in relation to car parking charges at Brent Cross</p>	<p>Common, and in the knowledge of the increased demand for orbital travel. However, this is not part of the required mitigation measures for the BXC development.</p> <p>Appendix 2 considers the January 2014 Draft Further Alterations to the London Plan</p> <p>Schedule 16 of the S106 Agreement, which has only minor changes proposed as part of the Section 73 application, sets out the car parking management principles, including off-street non-residential car parking, Brent Cross Shopping Centre (BXSC) and controlled on-street parking zones. Initial proposed minimum charges at the BXSC are set out in a table, and a periodic review mechanism, using suitable indexing, is specified, with changes being subject to approval by the LPA with cognisance taken of progression towards end-state mode-split targets contained in the Framework Travel Plan, the charging being intended to help encourage mode shift from car towards public transport, cycling and walking. The charges cannot be reduced without the written approval of the LPA. All charges for office, retail and leisure uses have to be agreed with the LPA. Any parking on LB Barnet adopted streets will be as set out in the council's published schedules</p> <p>LB Barnet looks forward to continuing to liaise with TfL over any opportunities to introduce a train service in the future between BXC and Old Oak Common</p> <p>LB Barnet is not yet aware of the detail of LB</p>

Ref	Consultee	Comments	Officer Response
		<p data-bbox="422 431 1430 483">Request to include Navin Shah's recent question to the Mayor of London concerning the Hounslow to Hendon Overground Service</p> <p data-bbox="422 621 1413 673">Please include this design in your illustrated BXC report to committee, which comes from the newly expanded TfL team, as the standard for some new road junctions at BXC:</p> <p data-bbox="422 699 961 724">https://pbs.twimg.com/media/BebLMJ8CIAA8Q6B.png</p> <p data-bbox="422 750 898 774">(This DOES open, but you may have to persist.)</p> <p data-bbox="422 829 940 854">Of course, the current plan is nothing like this. Why?</p>	<p data-bbox="1482 354 1990 399">Hounslow's work, but will liaise with them in due course</p> <p data-bbox="1482 431 1990 740">The design illustrates an interesting scheme for a particular location in another borough (in the London Borough of Richmond-upon-Thames along the A316, which is a TfL road), however it is not relevant as there is no similar situation along the new roads in BXC. Facilities proposed at BXC meet design standards and are considered to provide safe and acceptable facilities, but officers will ensure that there is close liaison with the TfL Cycling team during the detailed design process and we shall look to accommodate emerging best practice wherever appropriate</p>
32	Resident 3 - OBJECT	<p data-bbox="422 927 596 951"><i>Scale Thresholds</i></p> <ul data-bbox="443 967 1444 1084" style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="443 967 1444 1019">• Concern over the substantive increase in Scale Thresholds in the Cricklewood Lane (i.e. length increases from 99m to 165m and width increases from 9m to 12m). <li data-bbox="443 1036 1444 1084">• This will have a significant impact on the street scene and it is a concern that the documents are misleading. <p data-bbox="422 1198 537 1222"><i>Basements</i></p> <ul data-bbox="443 1239 1444 1291" style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="443 1239 1444 1291">• Parameter Plan 09 increases permitted basement depths from 7m to 9m. The increased soil disposal and risk of flooding has not been addressed. Additional storage would be intensification 	<p data-bbox="1482 935 1990 1036">The scale thresholds in Cricklewood Lane development zone are not changing. Any typographical errors were picked up in the Erratum Report consulted on in December 2013.</p> <p data-bbox="1482 1182 1990 1308">Please refer to previous responses The depth of the Basements will have no impact on the number of car parking spaces or the amount of retail floorspace which are controlled by the planning conditions. Basements are regularly below the</p>

Ref	Consultee	Comments	Officer Response
		<p data-bbox="485 350 1360 375">of use with consequent increase in traffic. It may also be used as parking in due course.</p> <p data-bbox="422 753 558 777"><i>Sustainability</i></p> <ul data-bbox="443 797 1451 846" style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="443 797 1451 846">• BX17 identifies there are large volumes of material to dispose of – this is not sustainable in terms of traffic generation and landfill. 	<p data-bbox="1478 350 1990 711">water table and the issues are addressed by Engineers in the detailed designs. The proposed basements have been assessed in the ES, as the numbers of construction vehicle movements used in the assessment have been based on these basements. It is noted, however, that further investigation should be made to confirm the risks of groundwater levels to basements proposed in the Section 73 Scheme's designs. Such investigations will take account of the future effects of climate change, comparing the final development layout and excavation parameters against maximum groundwater levels to assess the potential impacts from, and to, groundwater</p> <p data-bbox="1478 737 1990 865">The Materials Strategy in BXC8 outlines the measures to be taken that will minimise the materials to be disposed of, including the provision of space to treat various demolition arising to facilitate their reuse.</p> <p data-bbox="1478 891 1990 1279">The proposed waste management scheme comprises the preparation of refuse derived fuel at the Waste Handling Facility, which are planned to be transported to the CHP Plant via a conveyor in a tunnel beneath the railway (although the conveyor has not yet been committed to). Other related elements of the waste management scheme will include a materials recycling facility (MRF) to deal with source segregated dry recyclable materials, and a bulking facility for source segregated organic materials (for composting or anaerobic digestion off-site). The waste hierarchy will be followed and any waste arisings will be avoided or reduced as far as possible.</p>

Ref	Consultee	Comments	Officer Response
		<p data-bbox="422 932 611 956"><i>Noisy Open Space</i></p> <ul data-bbox="443 976 1444 1076" style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="443 976 1444 1076">• Throughout the development the open space that is provided is too noisy to meet the criteria. Of the quiet spaces only 20% are quiet enough. The living bridge cannot be considered amenity space on this basis. Quieter open space should be provided particularly as this is being relied upon to service the new housing. 	<p data-bbox="1482 350 1992 786">Whilst the Scheme is likely to generate significant additional quantities of waste, the ability to plan and implement an integrated waste management approach at an early stage will result in minimal quantities of additional waste requiring landfill disposal. Combined, source-segregated recycling and composting rates are anticipated to be close to 55%. Further management and recovery of waste through the proposed WHF and CHP facility could raise waste recovery levels to in excess of 85%. The combination of source segregated recycling/ composting and additional recycling at the WHF will ensure that the Scheme meets and indeed exceeds the recycling targets for municipal waste and commercial/industrial waste set out in national, regional and local waste strategies and waste development plans</p> <p data-bbox="1482 816 1992 914">The traffic assessment did not identify any significant traffic impacts as a result of the waste generated in association with the proposed development</p> <p data-bbox="1482 919 1992 1302">The preferred ambient noise levels for parks and recreational areas is no higher than LAeq, daytime 50-55 dB. None of the open spaces (with the minimum noise contours) within the site currently achieve a noise level of 55dB or less. However around 24% of overall open/amenity spaces within the proposed Scheme (as amended by the s. 73 application) achieve a noise level of below 55dB or less, and noise levels in some of the existing open space are predicted to improve with the Scheme in place - in Clitterhouse Playing Fields the addition of new buildings and low noise surface on the A406 will reduce noise levels in the central part of the park such that approximately half of the recreational area would experience</p>

Ref	Consultee	Comments	Officer Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some noise survey information is now included. This demonstrates that the noise from Freight transfer station will be 15dB (incl 5DB tonal/intermittent penalty) above background instead of 10dB below which is a more normal criteria (A MAJOR 25dB DETERIORATION). This does not enhance the conservation area and it will require substantial improvement to the properties to overcome. The acoustic screen is inadequate. 	<p>noise levels below LAeq, daytime 55dB. Furthermore, it is recognised that higher levels of noise may be acceptable in urban areas.</p> <p>Baseline noise levels in the railway cottages Conservation Area are low, and have been quantified in the ES. The proposed freight yard will introduce an additional noise source and a buffer has been provided within which a substantial landscaped noise bund will be constructed. Whilst noise levels in the Conservation Area will be increased at night, the future design of the bund will be developed to minimise this and to avoid significant noise disturbance to residents.</p> <p>Noise modelling indicates that it would not be possible to prevent any increase in noise levels at the closest properties, although it should be possible to control noise levels from the facility to within LAeq, 5 minutes 45 dB at the nearest property. Over a full 8 hour night LAeq, 2300-0700 hours levels would be lower than the 45 dB LAeq level predicted over 5 minutes. As such the operation of the freight facility is not expected to cause sleep disturbance, although the increase in noise will be noticeable during periods of lorry activity.</p> <p>The noise modelling should be updated as the design progresses to inform the design of the rail freight facility and the bund. It may be that better noise levels can be achieved, but the ES is based on an outline design at this stage.</p>

Ref	Consultee	Comments	Officer Response
		<p data-bbox="422 365 615 391"><i>Housing Standards</i></p> <ul data-bbox="464 407 1446 483" style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="464 407 1446 483">• Substandard housing is proposed with insufficient private amenity space. The bespoke criteria for 1 and 2 bedroom flats are insufficient to meet GLA guidelines something the developers assert they meet. <p data-bbox="422 573 781 599"><i>B+Q Green Space and Cricklewood</i></p> <ul data-bbox="443 615 1451 878" style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="443 615 1451 691">• The B&Q space was omitted from the calculation of open space which is in an area of deficiency. Public open space of a useful quantum should be retained in this location and the overall readjusted so that no loss results in Cricklewood town centre. <li data-bbox="443 708 1451 761">• The Cricklewood Lane development now has 26 units not 25 as consented. All units are serviced from the street with no parking. Servicing is inadequate. Retail development is not appropriate. <li data-bbox="443 777 1451 878">• Cricklewood station is described as having step free access, amended road junction and a 'drop off' for the RTS. Elsewhere it is a green space, no step free access & a building plot with no vehicular access or parking. It can't be both. The documentation is full of discrepancies and the offer is unclear. 	<p data-bbox="1482 352 1923 378">An additional planning condition is proposed</p> <p data-bbox="1482 430 1990 531">Please see the appraisal section of the report for discussion on this issue. All reserved matter applications will be expected to comply with the current London Plan standards in this respect.</p> <p data-bbox="1482 558 1990 634">Please refer to previous responses to this question and to the main committee report open space section.</p> <p data-bbox="1482 716 1990 816">The Parameter Plans and the Revised Development Specification Framework (BXC01) provide the relevant controls for this area. This shows that:</p> <ul data-bbox="1524 821 1990 1235" style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="1524 821 1990 922">• the Cricklewood station forecourt may be upgraded, which will include public realm enhancements although this is not currently funded in the CTF; <li data-bbox="1524 950 1990 1026">• The station may be provided with step free access enhancements, although this is not currently funded in the CTF; <li data-bbox="1524 1053 1990 1107">• The A407/Claremont Road junction will be enhanced; <li data-bbox="1524 1135 1990 1235">• The station forecourt area may potentially accommodate a small development plot, as shown illustratively on the illustrative masterplan. <p data-bbox="1482 1263 1990 1308">The details will be provided as part of the reserved matters applications.</p>

Ref	Consultee	Comments	Officer Response
		<p>The parking charges do not make sense? Why should the third hour be 50p but the first three hours be 66p? and the fourth hour £1? I can understand a linear progression but this????</p>	<p>Schedule 16 of the S106 Agreement sets out the car parking management principles and includes the proposed minimum charges at the BXSC in the table. This schedule of charges are unchanged from those in the 2010 Consented agreement. The charges generally seek to discourage parking over 6 hours, which is designed to address any commuter parking that may be taking place. The graduation of charges is considered to be a reasonable starting point.</p>
33	Resident 4 - OBJECT	<p><i>Introduction</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The BXC / Barnet scheme has failed to support local residents in forming and running Resident's Associations and other types of grass roots community organisations in the areas affected. Without these structures in place on the ground it is very difficult to properly represent the opinions of the people whose lives will be most affected and the democratic planning process is greatly weakened. With a scheme of this size I think this is a particular failing that has not been addressed despite the long gestation period of the scheme. • The size of the scheme is so large that I fear it is doomed to fail, or at least produce a compromised scheme of no distinction or particular note or quality. There is little sign that this scheme is addressing the issues of scale and complexity inherent to it in any innovative or progressive manner. Few local residents even know of its existence let alone understand the consequences or details and we have little reassurance that proper measures are in place to ensure that social benefits match the commercial benefits that are driving the scheme. • I appreciate that Brent Cross should be regenerated in conjunction with the wider local area but I am not confident that Barnet Council is properly prepared or equipped to ensure quality of delivery and design, or that the developers themselves are doing enough to assist to this end. <p><u>Main Objections</u></p>	<p>Public consultation both by the applicant and by the Council has been extensive over many years.</p> <p>Officers consider that the proposal presented to members – together with the extensive framework of control represented by the planning conditions and obligations – will deliver a mixed use town centre which will be of benefit to Barnet and to the surrounding areas of North West London.</p>

Ref	Consultee	Comments	Officer Response
		<p><i>Brent Terrace</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="443 407 1457 613">• Brent Terrace has a great deal to lose as a result of this scheme. Children currently play in the street here and regularly get together to play football on the Green Triangles. There is a good mix of generations and a sense of shared community. We currently enjoy no overlooking, greenery to both sides and low levels of traffic. The proposed scheme takes away the door step play currently available through building on the Green Triangles and by increasing traffic on the road. It will also fragment and damage the existing hedgerow. The proposed 'Brent Terrace Park' is too far away from the houses on Brent Terrace and will be flanked by a large road. It should be renamed (something the developers agreed to do at the last consultation). <li data-bbox="443 672 1457 850">• I appreciate that rehousing of Whitefield residents is important, however I do not understand why existing, established, (if under maintained), amenity spaces need to be lost to this cause when so much disused land surrounds the area. It seems lazy, short term and poorly thought out. Despite the lack of formally organised residents on Brent Terrace I am confident that the loss of both Green Triangles will be perceived as a step too far and could easily become a catalyst for protest if not mitigated through the appropriate reinstatement of suitably equipped play spaces on Brent Terrace. <li data-bbox="443 1114 1457 1292">• Brent Terrace is ideally suited to Home Zoning, with reduced speed limits and increased provision of planting, seating and pedestrian use. Given the proper attention there are certainly ways to improve Brent Terrace. This provision (as outlined above) seems minimal compensation when considering the impact that the development to the west of Brent Terrace will have on the peaceful enjoyment of our homes. The scale of development there is of great concern. The quality of which is questionable in principle when it will be sited so close to the Midland Mainline Railway. 	<p>The role and function of Brent Terrace is not proposed to change as a result of the development. Whilst the triangles are developed, there are proposed improvements in open space including enhancements to Claremont Park and Clitterhouse Playing Fields, as well as new Brent Terrace Park.</p> <p>The development for housing of the triangles at Brent Terrace is consistent with the Development Framework and the 2010 Permission. The scheme provides significant public open space enhancements as set out in the Public Realm and Open Space Strategy (BXC07).</p> <p>Regarding the concerns about the impact on Brent Terrace of development further west: The proposed new park will provide an appropriate buffer zone between the terrace and the development along the railway line. Care will need to be taken within the detailed design stage to ensure that the design for the park responds to the existing homes and provides the appropriate levels of privacy.</p> <p>Regarding the new homes proposed by the railway. This type of location is not uncommon in London. It is recognized that noise must be addressed in such locations. For this reason, dual aspect flats will be considered and the issue will continue to be addressed as detailed design progresses.</p>

Ref	Consultee	Comments	Officer Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I am concerned that what the BXC scheme presents is the influx of transient populations of mainly younger people with little or no permanence or commitment to the community they live in. • Part of the appeal of the Brent Terrace, Clitterhouse, Prayle Grove and Golders Green Estate area is derived from the quality of housing provision here. Houses, not just flats. <p><i>Cricklewood Green Space</i></p> <p>Cricklewood suffers from lack of public space. The 'Green Isle' outside B&Q is the best available and to build in it as part of the development seems contrary to the expressed intention to also benefit Cricklewood (as well as Brent Cross). The Cricklewood Improvement Programme have done much to enhance the public realm in the area and the site has been found to be well suited and appropriately scaled for public events. This area is another sensitive 'touchstone' area for the scheme and should be handled with great care; i.e. not squeezed or compromised by the need to rehouse residents in the early stages of the scheme. To do so will compromise the integrity of the whole.</p> <p><i>Clitterhouse Farm</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At meetings with the developers (as represented by Jonathan Joseph) they are expressing support for the refurbishment of the Clitterhouse Farm buildings and their progressive community use as outlined by the Clitterhouse Farm Project (of which I am a part). I am encouraged by this and assume that Barnet, who own the property, will support this constructive proposal and refuse demolition of the site. • However, I remain bemused that within such a large development there appears to be no clear scheme for revenue support being made available to help such positive community led projects to establish themselves and help reinforce the existing community, which will be greatly affected by the changes the scheme brings. • I hope that despite the pressure to concur with the developers schedule and wishes, that Barnet Council will respect the wishes of local people such as myself and take the appropriate care to see that the peaceful character of Brent Terrace not be destroyed and that the somewhat neglected state of the amenities in the area not be used as an excuse for their loss or further degradation. 	<p>The detailed design of the proposals for the B+Q site (plot 58), will be subject to a reserved matters planning application and public consultation. Proposals will be fully discussed with Cricklewood Improvement Programme at the appropriate time</p> <p>Please see the open space section of the committee report for discussion on this issue.</p> <p>The scheme provides various community improvements including public transport, education, open space, health etc.</p>

Ref	Consultee	Comments	Officer Response
34	Resident 5 - OBJECT	<p><i>Objection 1: Consultation Process</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> My first objection is that rather than a genuine consultation I think the process has been confusing, the documents unclear and contradictory and I have found Jonathan Joseph statements of what is to happen unclear. The developers seem totally disinterested in meeting the legitimate concerns raised by the citizens of Cricklewood and I cannot see how what is proposed is a development /regeneration of Cricklewood rather a complete lack of care about the implications for us. It is often stated that Cricklewood Lane is 'to have no substantive changes' yet as Section 73 BXC indicates this is not the case. Is this a campaign of 'obfuscation' to distract us from the proposed negative developments for our local area or just lack of interest given Barnet so desperately wants the proposed development around Brent Cross that it cares little what happens to 'real' Cricklewood. At least that's how it seems to me. <p><i>Objection 2: The treatment of Cricklewood Green Space</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> I consider the treatment of the green space outside Cricklewood B&Q on Cricklewood Lane during the planning process completely shocking and I am sad to say in need of investigation and explanation. This green space is of HUGE importance to those of us who live in Cricklewood town centre yet it has not been shown in any of the documentation concerning the public realm and/or green space. Many of the documents make statements recognising there is an 'open space deficiency in the area and stating 'the Council will not support the loss of any existing public open space, and in the unlikely event that a loss cannot be avoided, the Council will expect a like for like replacement etc.' I want to know why the only green space in Central Cricklewood was not included and indeed not NOT COUNTED in any of the documentation and throughout the planning process? I want this question publicly addressed in the consultation process. I want an explanation of why the green space next to B&Q was omitted from the calculation of open space. This seems an extraordinary oversight. How can those of us who live in real Cricklewood be given a 'like for like' replacement for the loss of our only green space in central Cricklewood, a key and very important focus for our town centre if it has not been counted in the first place? The only reference to my local and much loved park, Cricklewood green where I see birds and can enjoy nature and the site of community events where I have socialised with my neighbours at the Silk Road Festival and Winterfest to name just two local events is as 'disused scrubland' (2.6.64). This is completely UNTRUE and I would like this consultation process to establish who 	<p>The Section 73 submission shows no changes to uses or quantum of development in the Cricklewood Lane zone. The site adjacent to B & Q is brought forward to Phase 1 from Phase 2.</p> <p>Please see previous comments and the open space section of the committee report. The land outside B&Q is not identified as open space in the UDP, Core Strategy or Development Framework. As a result the land was not included in the calculations. However, even if it were the proposal would show an increase in open space overall. This includes improvements to Millennium Green and Clitterhouse Playing Fields.</p> <p>The Silk Rd Festival and Winterfest are two recent events. The site has outline planning consent for residential accommodation and other mixed uses such as retail. In addition, it is likely that some area of public realm will be provided and retained as part of the Outer London Fund proposals.</p>

Ref	Consultee	Comments	Officer Response
		<p>is responsible for this blatant untruth.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I have lived in Elm Grove for 14 years and we repeatedly with the support of the Lib Dem councillors have lobbied for the ownership of this green to be clarified and for this green space to be cleaned and maintained as our local park. I understood we had established that the green space was given to Cricklewood community as compensation or section 106 planning gain when Food Giant (now B&Q) was built on the site. The only problem has been that although we had established that Barnet owned it, the Council has never cared enough about Cricklewood to provide us with a children's play area, park benches and maintain this as our local park. • We want to retain this green space as our 'City park', 'Urban square' or 'Threshold square' (terms used in the planning documents). Why are such public realm spaces only deemed necessary for the proposed development near to Brent Cross?. Why are those of us who live in real Cricklewood not judged to be entitled to such public realm spaces? Cricklewood is increasingly an area with lots of multi-occupancy and people here also need a green space to maintain the quality of our lives. The present open space should be improved and not removed. Otherwise you are creating a quarter/area of public realm 'haves' to the north of The Vale and a quarter/area of public realm 'have nots' to the south of it. There is no planning symmetry to what is being proposed*. • I want a small park with a children's playground and space for community events such as the Silk Road Festival, farmers' market and other community events. Otherwise all of the open space and public realm envisaged is up near Brent Cross. The offer of 'public realm' around Cricklewood station (0.16 Ha) on what will be an extremely busy intersection in no way compensates for the loss of our major green space and frankly is an insult to those of us who live in 'real' Cricklewood. <p><i>Objection 2: Further Retail Space on Cricklewood Lane</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The plans are at the moment unclear as to whether the proposal for the Cricklewood green space is to be retail space or sheltered accommodation for the Rosa Freemont Centre. I have looked for example at BX2 1a p62 and BXC03 p125 to try to make some sense of what is proposed. I object to the suggestion of using the green space for any retail development. Cricklewood is full of empty shops, betting shops, kebab and chicken shops we don't want more retail space on Cricklewood Lane. Instead we need to improve Cricklewood town centre as a place to be and to come to as a retail destination. An improved green with a children's playground, park benches, dustbins, farmers market and improved parking will assist in doing that. Any retail development 	<p>Please see responses to similar questions and the open space section of the Committee Report.</p> <p>The application is in outline and therefore the exact details of any plot in this location is not available. However, the application indicates that acceptable uses will include residential with other mixed uses such as retail and community at ground floor. Details will come forward as reserved matter applications, which will be subject to public consultation.</p>

Ref	Consultee	Comments	Officer Response
		<p>on the existing green space is not appropriate as it would lead to higher traffic density, parking problems, congestion and additional noise. We need to keep the existing green space and improve it.</p> <p><i>Objection 4: Proposed new housing to be built on the B& Q Green space</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The plans propose substandard housing (26 units) which will be lacking in private amenity space and which do not meet GLA guidelines. Any plans for residential and/or old-people's assisted/care-home housing is completely inappropriate as the housing will be built on a very busy road (which will become busier with the proposed Brent Cross expansion) with the resultant pollution and traffic noise. The space backs on to B&Q and overlooks the railway line - hardly an ideal spot for residential, assisted housing or a care-home. The proposed 5-storey building is disproportionately large and will have a very negative impact on the street scene as surrounding buildings are only 3 storeys high. Having tried to identify its proposed size from the documents, it seems to be 165 metres long and 12 metres wide so will dominate Cricklewood Lane and the surrounding area. Where are the residents and visitors to this proposed housing meant to park? This will add to the high density and congestion of the Groves where I live and is completely unacceptable unless you are determined to make the Groves an even more neglected 'have not' part of Barnet than you have done already. Please note my earlier comment on the need for planning symmetry* in what is proposed in what is meant to be the 'Brent Cross AND Cricklewood Regeneration Planning Application. You seem to be re-generating Brent Cross but 'dumping' on Cricklewood. <p><i>Objection 5: Plans to close/ re-site Cricklewood Station</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The present station is a very well-used station, used by people from large areas of Barnet, Brent and Camden. The plans, as they currently stand, are full of inconsistencies (the station is described in the plans as having step-free access and no step-free access, a green space and also a building plot etc. etc.). What will happen to the station is unclear in the plans and again this flawed planning process needs to be addressed. How can citizens make comments on plans that are so full of flaws (again shows the complete lack of interest of the developers in what will happen in Cricklewood). Given the lack of clarity in the plans and at meetings where questions on this topic have been answered unclearly, I want to make clear my objection to any plans to close Cricklewood station. It must remain where it is and not be folded into a new Brent Cross station 	<p>Proposals for development in this location will be subject to future reserved matters applications and associated public consultation. As with the 2010 Permission, any scheme will need to comply with all relevant policy standards and will be determined by LBB against appropriate policies proposals for this part of the site.</p> <p>Network Rail have informed the LPA that the existing services at Cricklewood Railway Station will be maintained after the new Railway station is brought into use.</p>

Ref	Consultee	Comments	Officer Response
		<p>which would be of no value to those of us who live, work and socialise in Cricklewood.</p> <p><i>Objection 6: Plans to bulldoze/remove Clitterhouse Farm</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> I understand that Barnet are proposing to demolish these historic farm buildings and to replace them with a park depot and car parking. These building are part of the much loved history of the area for those of us who live here and an invaluable resource to local schools. The farm buildings should be preserved and renovated and then put back into community and school use, which would be of great benefit to the surrounding area. We need our history as well as our connection to nature. In short, the plans as they stand are not in the interests of the residents of Cricklewood and Barnet Council should have no qualms in rejecting them if they are not amended. Sadly, the developers plans are not in any way about improving or re-generating my local area but rather dumping in Cricklewood what they don't want in the Brent Cross development. This is clear from the plans to build on the B& Q green space rather than retaining it as public realm and as integral to any sensible holistic plan to genuinely improve Cricklewood by establishing it as our 'city park/urban square'. 	<p>Please see response to previous similar comments and the open space section of the committee report.</p>
35	Local Residents – NO OBJECTION	<p>In support of regeneration</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cricklewood is in desperate need of regeneration – at the moment the area is a little tattered. The development of a new shopping centre and regeneration will be very important for the area – it is a significant opportunity to improve local economy and facilities. 	
36	Local Residents - OBJECT	<p>Cricklewood Station</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The plans for Cricklewood Station are full of inconsistencies (the station is described in the plans as having step-free access and no step-free access, a green space and also a building plot etc etc). The new Thameslink and new Brent Cross Station will lead to the closure of Cricklewood station despite reassurances – this has also been confirmed by First Capital Connect. It is vital that Cricklewood Station is retained, as the new station further north will be 	<p>The Parameter Plans and the Revised Development Specification Framework (BXC01) provide the relevant controls for this area. This shows that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the Cricklewood station forecourt may be upgraded, which will include public realm enhancements although this is not

Ref	Consultee	Comments	Officer Response
		<p>inadequate for the number of residents in the 'new' Cricklewood and will not be easily accessible for residents at the southern end of Cricklewood. It is important that it incorporates a 'drop-off/pull-in' point to avoid cars blocking Cricklewood Lane and crowding the junction with Claremont Road.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concerns over disruptions for all passengers on the Midland Main Line during the construction of the new station. 	<p>currently funded in the CTF;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The station may be provided with step free access enhancements, although this is not currently funded in the CTF; The A407/Claremont Road junction will be enhanced; The station forecourt area may potentially accommodate a small development plot, as shown illustratively on the illustrative masterplan. <p>The details will be provided as part of the reserved matters applications.</p>
37	Local Residents - OBJECT	<p>Brent Cross Station</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The new Thameslink station and pedestrian crossing over railway line should be bought forward in phasing to encourage more use of public transport. 	<p>The timing for the station has been agreed with the highway authorities and partially relates to the delivery of the new commercial floor space.</p>
38	Local Residents - OBJECT	<p>Traffic and congestion</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Traffic arrangements have not been given due consideration and seems to lack any consultation with neighbouring boroughs like Brent. Objection to the BXC SPG for an additional 29,000 cars per day – it is more appropriate to improve public transport services. The BXC scheme is still car-based and involves the construction of large roads and junctions but poor facilities for cycling. This is despite developer assurances that they aim to promote public transport, walking and cycling. Barnet refuses to even consider light-rail/tram alternatives to tackle road congestion – they show no interest in a new branch of the London Overground 	<p>Please refer to the transport section of the main committee report. In particular it should be noted that LB Brent are being fully consulted during the development of the proposals and are party to the working group on the A5 Corridor Study. The source of the 29,000 cars figure is from the Regeneration Area Development Framework, which was prepared in 2003 and 2004 and was based on a simple spreadsheet form of assessments and there had been no comprehensive modelling of new journeys which has now been undertaken to support the current planning application. For example, the 29,000</p>

Ref	Consultee	Comments	Officer Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The increased traffic brought about by the proposals will result in increased noise, traffic congestion and air pollution. The provision of an additional rail station will not persuade residents to dispense with their cars and there will be a huge increase in the traffic movements on our roads which are already stretched to capacity. There seems to be nothing in the plans that aim to reduce traffic. • The A406 is already congested, particularly at Golders Green and A1 junctions. Congestion on the A5 and Cricklewood Lane will also be made significantly worse. • The re-design of roads and junctions (including road-widening) will not be sufficient to prevent severe congestion and pollution in Cricklewood. This is particularly apparent at the bottle neck under the railway bridge on Cricklewood Lane – traffic turning right into B&Q causes long tail backs especially during peak hours. Widening the junctions at Claremont Road and Cricklewood Broadway will not reduce this. • Access to get out of the Terraces is already very difficult. Allowing more traffic volume would cause the Brent Terrace residents severe problems. • The waste handling and freight handling access would put HGV traffic onto already congested section of the A5 where there is a bus garage. The increased volume of traffic would significantly affect Staples Corner roundabouts which are already congested at peak times. Increased traffic would cause 'rat runs' down quieter residential streets. 	<p>figure includes traffic generated by the West Hendon regeneration scheme which is not part of BXC and that the figure does not account for road trips that will be removed as a result of the change of uses of the site through the regeneration – for example the removal of a number of existing industrial premises. Nor does it properly account for the future choice of travel mode when all the proposed public transport improvements come forward when it is predicted that there will be less use of the private car and a shift to use of public transport, walking and cycling. The Development Framework figure was generated using basic assessment methods that were inappropriate for a mixed use scheme on the scale of BXC where the existing traffic patterns will change significantly and that since then, much more precise modelling has been done and these latest more accurate assessments and predictions have been accepted by both Barnet and TfL. The 29,000 figure quoted in the Development Framework is over a whole 12 hour day and the equivalent 12 hour period traffic flow for the BXC development is 9000, but it is the peak hour traffic flow that is the concern when considering traffic congestion. The suggestion of a new orbital railway of some form would no doubt benefit North London as a whole, and may be promoted by TfL, but there is no need for such a facility identified in regard to the Brent Cross Cricklewood Development alone. Generally, the TA predicts the transportation impacts of the scheme and proposes sufficient mitigation measures to ensure any</p>

Ref	Consultee	Comments	Officer Response
			<p>scheme-related congestion will not be unacceptable. The need to ensure rat running is not encouraged has been addressed in the proposals to date and is also the subject of the ongoing A5 Corridor Study which will address any issues along the corridor in Barnet, Brent and Camden.</p> <p>The overall Regeneration scheme is promulgated on providing sufficient capacity across all modes of transport and in accordance with the mode split targets contained in the Framework Travel Plan particularly as evidenced by the mode share of 70% of person trips being forecast to be by public transport at end state, including a significant increase in the use of buses. The new bus station will provide a good level of passenger comfort, including being partially covered. Bus priority measures including bus-only streets and bus lanes are planned to ensure buses can move around the site easily, and good bus connections will be provided between the new train station and the southern and northern parts of the town centre. The new cycle facilities to be provided throughout the site address all the movement routes both internal to the Development and the longer distance routes. These facilities will be of a high standard, including for example cycle lanes and cycle advanced stop lines (ASLs), and entirely consistent with the Policies and approach of LBB and the Mayor's current vision and Standards. Walking is being strongly supported through a new and comprehensive network of footways, footpaths and bridges, including the new Living Bridge</p>

Ref	Consultee	Comments	Officer Response
			<p>Generally, the TA and Section 73 Transport Report predicts the transportation impacts of the scheme and proposes sufficient mitigation measures to ensure any scheme-related congestion will not be unacceptable. The transport proposals have been developed to cater for the numbers of trips forecast to be using the various modes of travel that are forecast in the Transport Report. The new railway station is predicted to provide sufficient capacity for this mode of transport and will be key to delivering the mode split targets contained in the Framework Travel Plan. The traffic modelling in the TA has been audited and approved by the LB Barnet, TfL and the HA.</p> <p>The junction layouts for the key locations along the A406, A5 and A407 were approved in 2010 and are required in order to mitigate the impacts of the development.</p> <p>The transport proposals in Cricklewood have been developed as set out in the Transport Assessment and the southern junctions are expected to experience similar traffic conditions as they do currently, acting as network constraints in the future. Any traffic issues related to the existing B&Q car park do not form any part of the BXC scheme, however development-related traffic movements in Cricklewood are also being considered further as part of the A5 Corridor study. There will be a micro-simulation model (an accurate computer model showing the real time movement of vehicles) prepared for the A5 which will enable an optimum traffic movement solution to be agreed with TfL, LB Barnet, LB Camden and LB Brent , which will help minimize congestion and provide a balance between the needs all forms of</p>

Ref	Consultee	Comments	Officer Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="464 1049 1444 1227">• Concerns over the change to vehicular access routes into Prayle Grove and Wallcote Avenue. The plan suggest that the only vehicular access will be from a new junction on the A41, with a new road being constructed where there is currently a footpath from Marble Drive into Payle Grove. This road will pass closely between two properties on Payle Grove, entering the estate directly on a bend (concerns about safely here). It is assumed that this road will also provide access through Prayle Grove to the new Whitefield School - increasing traffic congestion and parking issues in a quiet residential area. . <li data-bbox="464 1247 1444 1295">• There is a loss of straightforward access onto all major local roads - if the only access route from Prayle Grove is going be to via the new A41 junction then this will make life difficult for 	<p data-bbox="1480 352 1577 375">transport.</p> <p data-bbox="1480 402 1990 553">The design of the junction with the Spine Road will be examined in detail as part of the relevant Reserved Matters Application, and through the subsequent highway approvals processes, to ensure that the optimal scheme is delivered which provides a satisfactory level of access and is safe.</p> <p data-bbox="1480 581 1990 1019">There are no changes to the proposals for the WHF from that permitted by the 2010 permission and the traffic assessment did not identify any significant traffic impacts as a result of the waste generated in association with the proposed development. The solution to the traffic congestion at Staples Corner has been modelled and developed in close liaison with both TfL and the Highways Agency. The surface road solution which is now proposed has been shown to operate satisfactorily in the peak traffic flow periods. The need to ensure rat running off the A5 is not encouraged has been addressed in the proposals to date and is also the subject of the ongoing A5 Corridor Study which will address any issues along the corridor in Barnet, Brent and Camden</p> <p data-bbox="1480 1047 1990 1279">Access to Prayle Grove and Wallcote Avenue is proposed to be via a new road to Whitefield Avenue, which leads to the A41 and Tilling Road, and also via a second new road, Orchard Road, which leads to a junction with Claremont Avenue / Claremont Road / Claremont Park Road. Therefore, there is a choice of access points to the wider road network. Main routes are not predicted to be over-capacity or gridlocked at peak times.</p>

Ref	Consultee	Comments	Officer Response
		residents, and the route is already gridlocked at peak times.	
39	Archdeacon of Hampstead	<p>The arrival of new residents is welcome. For existing residents there needs to be some way of supporting and maintaining community provision during the years of upheaval to come. Hope that the Council will continue to work with the London Diocesan board to provide schools in the area.</p> <p>Consider that the proposed provision of community floorspace is inadequate and would like to be involved in the planning for the many and varied community needs.</p> <p>The affordable housing provision is too low and needs to be a stronger element of the proposed mix as it is proven that mixed communities are more cohesive and sustainable.</p> <p>Need to think about care and fairness for the current residents who face years of disruption and the loss of their homes.</p> <p>Need for the needs of religions to be identified and taken into account in the context of the proposed multi use buildings</p> <p>Something needs to be done to correct planning errors of the past as the existing Shopping Centre has not led to the regeneration of this area.</p> <p>Offer the assistance of their Strategic Development Team and have copied the Bishop of Edmonton for information.</p>	<p>The amount and timing of social infrastructure provision has been carefully considered and has not changed from the 2010 consented scheme. Please see the social infrastructure section of the committee report.</p> <p>The affordable housing element of the proposal is subject to an affordable housing review mechanism. If more affordable housing is viable more will be required.</p> <p>Please see the housing section of the committee report for details of the arrangements proposed for the residents of the Whitefield Estate.</p> <p>This level of detail about future occupiers of community spaces is not known at this outline stage of the planning process.</p> <p>This outline application is for the comprehensive regeneration of the area north and south of the A406. Please see discussion on this issue in the main body of the committee report.</p>

Ref	Consultee	Comments	Officer Response
40	Local Residents - OBJECT	<p>Cycling Provision</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Plans do not include a cycle network of adequate quality, and will not encourage people to cycle. Some of the existing narrow footbridges over the roundabouts (e.g. the A406/A41 roundabout) will not be replaced, and some of the new bridges will not accommodate cycling. All these bridges should be built wide enough for cyclists, to maximize the cycling permeability of the area. • Proposed cycle infrastructure is poor – there are short sections of cycle path, shared footway, or advisory cycle lane, but much of the proposed network is simply cycling on carriageway with no specific provision. • This is contrary the Mayor's Cycling Vision to provide a cohesive, safe and pleasant cycle network that children and adults can use. • Cycle access diagonally across the BX flyover for riders going north on Hendon way is still unclear. Whatever is provided needs to be well signposted. 	<p>Please refer to comments earlier in the schedule, particularly in response to the London Cycling Campaign (LCC) in section 16, and to the transport section of the committee report.</p>
41	Local Residents - OBJECT	<p>Taxi Ranks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is a shortage of ranks in Barnet. Taxi drop offs need to be conveniently located at the shopping centre. • There appears to be no new taxi ranks in the BXC application. However, the scheme will require a 20-cab rank at the least, as well as new ranks in Finchley, East Finchley, West Finchley, and Whetstone. TfL should be paying for these ranks out of their budget. 	<p>The S73 amendments include a number of new taxi ranks provided near the Brent Cross shopping centre. A single taxi rank was originally proposed within the bus station as part of the 2010 Consent. This rank has now been removed as part of the S73 proposals, as requested during the design stage by TfL. Instead of a central taxi rank at the bus station, several smaller ranks are proposed in the vicinity of the shopping centre. Those will be located within easy walking distance from the shopping centre as well as the bus station. The number of taxi stands at those taxi ranks is currently subject to discussions and will be agreed with TfL at a relevant design stage. Their potential locations will also be reviewed as the design progresses.</p> <p>Additional taxi rank facilities are proposed to the south of the A406. Again, the exact location and size of the rank will be discussed and agreed upon</p>

Ref	Consultee	Comments	Officer Response
			<p>as part of relevant design stage discussions with TfL.</p> <p>The 2010 Consent also proposed taxi facilities at the new railway station. These are proposed to remain unchanged as part of the amended S73 masterplan. In addition to the rank proposed at the new railway station, a new taxi rank is also proposed at the existing Brent Cross LUL station.</p> <p>A taxi demand survey was undertaken in July 2013 to assess the level of current demand for taxis at the Brent Cross Shopping Centre. The survey shows that the present level of demand for taxis is being met by the present-day level of taxi provision.</p> <p>The proposed masterplan offers an improved access for taxi facilities, including several taxi ranks in close proximity to BXSC, with additional drop-off provision located to the south of the A406. It is anticipated that this improved provision will accommodate any rise in taxi usage generated by the increased shopping offer at BXSC.</p> <p>The provision of further taxi ranks outside the development area is beyond the scope of this application.</p>
42	Local Residents - OBJECT	<p>Cricklewood Green Space (B&Q)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The B&Q space is extremely valuable to the residents of Cricklewood, given that there is a severe lack of green and open space currently in the area. The space also holds important value for the community, holding a number of community events such as the Silk Road Festival. • The developers have plenty of land for the BXC development and they do not need to include this important space within the application site, particularly given that it is so far removed from 	<p>Please refer to comments earlier in the schedule and to the open space section of the committee report.</p>

Ref	Consultee	Comments	Officer Response
		<p>shopping centre.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Residents propose that the space should have a more imaginative community purpose – re-landscaped to create a well-designed small park/town square with children’s play area for future community events. There needs to be more for young people in the area and the space is ideal for this. • Concerns that the B&Q space was omitted from the BXC open space calculation and planning documents, given that the area is in an area of deficiency. Furthermore, the space is unfairly described as a ‘disused scrubland’. • It is viewed that by including the space with the BXC application, it avoids the need for a separate planning application and a proper assessment. <p><i>Comments regarding the proposed development for the Cricklewood Lane green:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overall, it is considered that the development will have an adverse impact on the whole area. • The space is too small for the proposed development - which would dominate Cricklewood Lane, taking away the feeling of space. • The development will make the traffic and congestion along Cricklewood Lane even worse, creating impossible access into and out of the new building. • Currently, the plans are unclear as to whether the proposal for the green space is to be retail space or sheltered accommodation for the Rosa Freemont Centre. • Objection to using the green space for any retail development - Cricklewood is full of empty shops, and there is no need for any more retail space on Cricklewood Lane. There is also concern that all units will be serviced from the street, and with no parking provision, this makes retail development and inappropriate use. Instead, the council should focus on making Cricklewood a retail destination by retaining and improving the green space. • Objections to the proposed 5 storeys. • Objection to the increase from the consented 25 units to 26 units. • There is no private amenity space for the residents of these new homes. Furthermore, the nature of this busy road is very inappropriate for assisted houses. 	

Ref	Consultee	Comments	Officer Response
43	Local Residents - OBJECT	<p>Development of the Green Triangles on Brent Terrace and Clarefield Park</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strong objection to development of Green Triangles – these spaces provide valuable green spaces that are well-used by the local community, particularly children, and dog-walkers. The linear Brent Terrace Park is not well located to provide this. • Clarefield Park will be lost and not replaced with temporary amenities until Whitefield estate is relocated. Compensation is required. 	Please refer to comments earlier in the schedule and to the open space section of the committee report.
44	Local Residents - OBJECT	<p>Clitterhouse Playing Fields</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The replacement schools have little dedicated playing field as these are re-provided as shared facilities on Clitterhouse Playing fields (Whitefield school will take 1/5 of the Clitterhouse Playing Fields from public use). • Furthermore, there is a net loss of playing field in order to intensify use of the open grounds landscaping. In order to squeeze in all the pitches the layout is geometric and not conducive to activities other than organised sport. • Hence, residents would like these fields to remain as Metropolitan Open Land and not be turned into mainly sports fields, as there will be nowhere to relax or walk. 	Please refer to comments earlier in the schedule and to the open space section of the committee report.
45	Local Residents - OBJECT	<p>Housing</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concerns that the proposed housing numbers do not meet GLA standards • Concerns that the amount of public open space and private amenity space is insufficient to meet GLA standards, especially given the large number of flats proposed. • Housing is only required to follow the minimum permitted Code for Sustainable Homes level 4. • Insufficient affordable housing is proposed. • Too many flats are proposed and not enough houses – this allows for very few family homes. • Objection to development of flats at the rear of properties on Marble Drive. Concerned with the height of the proposed buildings that will overshadow and overlook our property. 	Please refer to the main committee report for analysis on these issues.

Ref	Consultee	Comments	Officer Response
46	Local Residents - OBJECT	<p>Brent Terrace Residents</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is insufficient parking to accommodate more residences in the area. Furthermore, the increase in traffic during and following construction would be problematic, on both the Brent Terrace and Clitterhouse Crescent sides. • Concerns over an increase in noise, pollution, overlooking and privacy, particularly from the proposed tall 15 storey buildings behind Brent Terrace – this will completely change the nature of the street, destroy wildlife and remove green open space. Need clarity as to what will happen to the gardens in the front of houses as they are owned by the railways but used by residents. 	<p>Please refer to comments earlier in the schedule in relation to Brent Terrace.</p>
47	Local Residents - OBJECT	<p>Flooding</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concerns that the risk of flooding has not been addressed. • Regarding the re-routing of Brent River, resident wish to be assured that prior to consent the LPA will take the necessary steps to ensure that these works will not be detrimental in the future to properties next to the waterway on either side of the development. 	<p>A full FRA in line with NPPF has been undertaken. The Environment Agency has been fully consulted and has reviewed the FRA.</p> <p>The re-routing of the River Brent will cause no detrimental flood risk effects, either on or off-site. There will be no increase in flood risk to existing properties.</p>
48	Local Residents - OBJECT	<p>Pollution</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concerns over increase in pollution – particularly that caused by the extra congestion. 	<p>The impact to air quality as a result of emissions from the exhausts of vehicles associated with the base case and operational phases of the Scheme has been modelled and assessed. The operation of the proposed development is not predicted to result in a substantial impact to air quality in terms of nitrogen dioxide or particulate emissions, either in relation to traffic emissions or the operation of the CHP Plant.</p>
49	Local Residents - OBJECT	<p>Noise</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concerns about the increase in noise as a result of the BXC proposals. 	<p>The noise levels reported as part of the 2010 outline permission and therefore considered acceptable by the LPA at the time of granting</p>

Ref	Consultee	Comments	Officer Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="464 354 1451 428">• The noise from the freight transfer station is predicted to be greater than originally projected. It will seriously impact on the peace and tranquility of the Railway Terraces conservation area. The acoustic screen is inadequate. <li data-bbox="464 448 1451 522">• The proposed open spaces will not provide any areas for peacefulness and relaxation - the Living Bridge cannot be considered amenity space on this basis. Quieter open space should be provided particularly as this is being relied upon to service the new housing. 	<p data-bbox="1524 354 1995 581">the permission have not changed as part of the s. 73 amendments to the scheme. Suitable mitigation measures will be applied during construction to minimise noise levels, while for the operation phase, various mitigation measures have been included and specified in the Scheme and further measures will be pursued as the detail of the Scheme progresses.</p> <p data-bbox="1524 597 1995 880">Baseline noise levels in the railway cottages Conservation Area are low, and have been quantified in the ES. The proposed freight yard will introduce an additional noise source and a buffer has been provided within which a substantial landscaped noise bund will be constructed. Whilst noise levels in the Conservation Area will be increased at night, the future design of the bund will be developed to minimise this and to avoid significant noise disturbance to residents.</p> <p data-bbox="1524 896 1995 1230">Noise modelling indicates that it would not be possible to prevent any increase in noise levels at the closest properties, although it should be possible to control noise levels from the facility to within LAeq, 5 minutes 45 dB at the nearest property. Over a full 8 hour night LAeq, 2300-0700 hours levels would be lower than the 45 dB LAeq level predicted over 5 minutes. As such the operation of the freight facility is not expected to cause sleep disturbance, although the increase in noise will be noticeable during periods of lorry activity.</p> <p data-bbox="1524 1247 1995 1321">The noise modelling should be updated as the design progresses to inform the design of the rail freight facility and the bund. It may be</p>

Ref	Consultee	Comments	Officer Response
			<p>that better noise levels can be achieved, but the ES is based on an outline design at this stage.</p> <p>An additional planning condition is proposed in relation to this issue.</p> <p>The preferred ambient noise levels for parks and recreational areas is no higher than LAeq, daytime 50-55 dB. None of the open spaces (with the do-minimum noise contours) within the site currently achieve a noise level of 55dB or less. However around 24% of overall open/amenity spaces within the proposed Scheme (as amended by the s. 73 application) achieve a noise level of below 55dB or less, and noise levels in some of the existing open space are predicted to improve with the Scheme in place - in Clitterhouse Playing Fields the addition of new buildings and low noise surface on the A406 will reduce noise levels in the central part of the park such that approximately half of the recreational area would experience noise levels below LAeq, daytime 55dB..</p>
50	Local Residents - OBJECT	<p>Waste Handling Facility (WHF)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A number of concerns about the proposed WHF, especially given the density of the scheme and the proximity of homes and schools to the facility. This will bring serious health impacts to people living nearby. • This sort of facility should be located in an out-of-town location. • Bringing waste into the area will create dust and pollution to Cricklewood's roads. • What is the need for an incinerator or other type of waste treatment plant at Brent Cross? Would waste need to be brought in from elsewhere? 	<p>This aspect of the proposal has not changed from the 2010 permission.</p> <p>The emissions from such plants are tightly controlled and monitored by the Environment Agency with the data made available to the public.</p> <p>The waste to energy plant will provide the heat for the district heating scheme. By locating this plant in the proposed location the heat generated by the waste treatment process can be used to heat the buildings.</p>

Ref	Consultee	Comments	Officer Response
		<p>The Chimney</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The 140m high chimney will be visually intrusive and it is sited too close to housing and schools. • The developers say they have alternatives to burning refuse derived fuels and don't need the chimney. It should be rejected now. 	<p>This reduces the energy use and carbon impact.</p> <p>The TA has assessed the impact of lorry movements required to move waste around. Lorry movements to transport waste arising in the borough already occur and are not additional.</p> <p>Fuel for the waste to energy plant, will be a refuse derived fuel and can be sourced from a number of suppliers. The plant is not reliant on waste from the NLWA but could take this as a feedstock, subject to the necessary treatment to convert it into a refuse derived fuel.</p>
51	Local Residents - OBJECT	<p>Clitterhouse Farm Buildings</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is very short-sighted to make a car park in place of the historic farm buildings. These buildings are one of the few remaining structures in the local area that provide a physical link to the rich history of Cricklewood. • Although currently derelict, many residents care about the future of these buildings and do not want them demolished – they believe that the Farm Cottages offer great potential and could benefit the community in many ways. For example, the buildings currently function as an important centre, holding summer events. Many want the buildings Conserved and renovated for public enjoyment into a multi-use, flexible space and community hub. • There is strong support for the work of the 'Clitterhouse Farm Project' organization. The BXC scheme must support such local grassroots organisations. • Some objectors work for a charity call the London Orchard Project who helped to bring back this area into community use – providing training for local people in orchard skills and planting. • The founding member of the Creative Cricklewood and the Clitterhouse Farm Project proposes multi use community buildings with arts studios for local creative's, a café, crèche, education centre, growing space, changing rooms. He states that the organisation has realistic goals in bring the buildings back into use – working in partnership with Barnet, Hammersons. 	<p>Parameter Plan 016 shows the farm buildings to be demolished as part of the plans to enhance Clitterhouse Playing Fields. The improvements to Clitterhouse Playing Fields Part 1 (excluding the Nature Park) are proposed to be a direct Phase 1A (North) delivery obligation on the applicant, as part of the Revised S106 agreement. A specification will be agreed in accordance with the Revised S106 Agreement and the details will be approved under Condition 13.1 before the BXC Development commences. Initial discussions have been held between the promoters of the community use for the building and the applicant. The applicant has stated that they will consider this proposal as part of the detailed planning stage for Clitterhouse Playing Fields and is open to the retention of these buildings by means of either an amendment application under the proposed S73 Conditions or (if necessary) a new Section 73 application. It should also be noted that</p>

Ref	Consultee	Comments	Officer Response
			<p>renovation of these buildings is likely to be considerably more expensive than their demolition and replacement with the uses approved in the 2010 permission. Therefore it is likely that the community proposals will need to be further developed, including developing a viable business case. The detailed consideration of the area containing the farm buildings will be dealt with at the Reserved Matter Stage – probably in 2014.</p> <p>Detailed layouts for the improvement of the Playing Fields will be developed at the RMA stage of the project, and will be subject to further public consultation to establish the preferred uses for the various areas of the park, including car park locations etc. Proposals shown to date are indicative, and suggest possible uses within the park as a whole and not the exact location of various facilities which will be subject to further design consideration.</p>
52	Local Residents - OBJECT	<p>The Shopping Centre</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The shopping centre will have an adverse impact on surrounding retail spaces • Despite the large retail extension, the shopping centre will provide no extra parking and will therefore be unable to cope with the extra customers. Furthermore, given that parking will no longer be free, local people will not visit as often as they do now. 	Please see the Retail section of the committee report.
53	Local Residents - OBJECT	<p>Basements</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Parameter Plan 09 increases permitted basement depths from 7m to 9m. • The increased soil disposal and risk of flooding has not been addressed. Additional storage 	The depth of the Basements will have no impact on the number of car parking spaces or the amount of retail floorspace which are controlled by the planning conditions. Basements are regularly below the water table and the issues are addressed by engineers in the detailed designs.

Ref	Consultee	Comments	Officer Response
		<p>would be intensification of use with consequent increase in traffic.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> It may also be used as parking in due course. 	<p>The proposed basements have been assessed in the ES, as the numbers of construction vehicle movements used in the assessment have been based on these basements. It is noted, however, that further investigation should be made to confirm the risks of groundwater levels to basements proposed in the Section 73 Scheme's designs. Such investigations will take account of the future effects of climate change, comparing the final development layout and excavation parameters against maximum groundwater levels to assess the potential impacts from, and to, groundwater</p>
54	Local Residents - OBJECT	<p>Road Closures</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concerns over road closures during construction and the significant disruptions that will be caused. 	<p>There are planning conditions regarding construction management which will minimise any impact.</p>
55	Local Residents - OBJECT	<p>Office Development</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is no need for the high-rise office development in this location, given that there plenty of vacant office units in the area, particularly on North Finchley high street. 	<p>Office Development in this location is supported by the London Plan.</p>

Ref	Consultee	Comments	Officer Response
56	Local Residents Object	<p>Whitefield Residents</p> <p>Residents have raised issues about the lack of information about their future housing arrangements</p> <p>Concern has been expressed about the suitability of the site adjacent to B & Q for Rosa Freedman residents. Particularly as the current site has a scented garden with a pretty outlook with plenty of wild life. Also the current site is convenient for doctors, Tesco's and the 189 bus route.</p>	<p>Please see the ,main committee report for discussion on this issue</p> <p>No specific site has been allocated for the re-housing of any residents of the Whitefield Estate at this stage of the process.</p>