

APPENDIX 6

RESIDENTIAL CONSULTATION RESPONSES

First Consultation Responses for Consultation Period Ending 10/07/2015

Resident Comments	Officer Response
<p data-bbox="185 411 792 547"><u>Resident 1 Comments:</u> Objection to the planning and rejuvenation of the Whitefield Estate based on the S73 Contamination Assessment Report.</p> <p data-bbox="185 592 871 727">(BXC 17 – Supplementary Section 73 Phase 1 Geo-Environmental Assessment & Geotechnical Development Report; Appendix F- Contamination Assessment Report and study.)</p>	<p data-bbox="900 448 1937 512">It is not clear from the letter of objection submitted what aspect of the Contamination Assessment is of concern in relation to the Whitefield Estate.</p> <p data-bbox="900 592 1928 762">A Contamination Assessment was submitted as part of the S73 Planning Permission Ref No: F/04687/13. Appendix F- Contamination Assessment Report forms part of the Supplementary Phase 1 Geo- Environmental Assessment, which was carried out to assess current ground investigations and summarises the contamination results obtained.</p> <p data-bbox="900 807 1933 943">Planning Conditions 31.1 – 31.7 of the Section 73 permission relate specifically to Remediation of Contamination, and are in place to protect human health, prevent any potential contamination and ensure necessary remediation at the site has been undertaken.</p> <p data-bbox="900 987 1933 1158">Condition 31.1 is a Pre reserved matters condition which was submitted and approved for Phase 1A North, prior to submission of any reserved matters application. An initial framework and breakdown of areas of land for remediation along with schedules of earthworks and soil treatment activities relevant to each of these Remediation Zones or Sub-Zones have been provided for Phase 1A north.</p> <p data-bbox="900 1203 1910 1410">The Brent Terrace Triangles RMA in relation to Plots 53 and 54 has been determined and it is intended that the accommodation provided through this application will provide accommodation for Whitefield Residents displaced within Phase 1a (North). Planning Condition 1.10 (Residential Relocation Strategy) is currently under consideration. The aim of this Condition is to ensure the satisfactory relocation of Whitefield residents.</p>

Resident 2 Comments:

The development will encourage vehicles to enter Oxgate Gardens in Dollis Hill and will increase the existing flow of traffic even further. Oxgate Gardens is a residential road with a primary school located nearby; It is already used as a cut through to avoid existing traffic lights and the proximity of the BXC development would increase noise and disturbances.

Parking is extremely tight and on daily basis the majority of spaces are used by the existing factory workers, leaving residents of Oxgate Gardens to park on surrounding residential streets. Residents of Oxgate Gardens are going to approach Brent Council to request parking permits or restrictions.

When the car parks are full or when people are unwilling or unable to pay for parking visitors will park on surrounding residential streets close to the development; this would have a further detrimental impact on parking conditions. The installation of the traffic lights on Oxgate Gardens has caused a loss of privacy, and the proposed development will have a further impact.

Lorries during construction will use Oxgate Gardens to access the waste dump

The traffic impacts on Oxgate Gardens due to phase 1A North have been assessed as part of the A5 Corridor Study, and the plots in Appendix E of the study report shows that only very small increases are forecast.

The current parking situation is a matter for Brent Council.

Parking impacts of the BXC development are going to be managed through the Section 106 and under various planning conditions. It may be desirable to introduce Controlled Parking Zones on local roads but this will be subject to public consultation and (in the case of Oxgate Gardens) will be led by the LB of Brent. Through the Transport Advisory Group funding can be made available from the Section 106 Consolidated Transport Fund Other Boroughs Fund (maximum £1.25m).

The movement of construction vehicles will be fully considered in the Construction Transport Management Plan (Condition 12.1) which is a pre-commencement condition. It is planned that deliveries to the site will be controlled through a web based ordering system to ensure that only materials required in the short term are delivered and stored on site, and this will not include the waste dump referred to. Moreover the Construction Impact Assessment (BXC21), already submitted and approved as part of the S73 is based on the use of the main roads in the area, with the vast majority of construction traffic expected to use the M1 and A406. Controls are expected to be in place to ensure no lorries use any local roads.

<p><u>Resident 3 Comments:</u> With reference to the newspaper article published in the Evening Standard on the 4th June 2015 titled ‘1300 people have died this year due to polluted air in the capital’; concerns have been raised whether the Brent Cross infrastructure development would create more pollution?</p> <p>Staples Corner and the surrounding areas currently suffer from large volumes of traffic. The proposed development would increase the traffic flows.</p>	<p>This matter was considered at the time of the outline application and is not a matter currently under consideration as part of this Reserved Matter Application. The applicant has committed to managing air quality and dust impacts during construction.</p> <p>There are a number of planning conditions proposed to control this aspect including the requirement to establish air quality monitoring stations before development commences.</p> <p>All traffic flow changes have been carefully considered as part of the development of the outline approved scheme, and have recently been re-examined through the BXC Detailed Design Model, as explained in the main report. The BXC development includes a comprehensive multi-modal package of phased mitigation measures, and a framework of control designed to ensure that traffic volumes are effectively managed and mode-shift away from cars encouraged as the scheme rolls out.</p>
<p><u>Resident 4 Comments:</u> Documentation submitted for the Reserved Matters Application has led to confusion and is not clear.</p>	<p>It is appreciated that this is a complicated Planning application for residents to comment on. The planning case officer is available (on the telephone) to discuss and explain the planning application and Reserved Matters Applications to local residents.</p>

<p><u>Resident 5 Comments:</u> Referring to the Phase 1a (North) Illustrative Reconciliation Plan and the location of the Waste Handling Plant, concerns have been raised whether the Waste Transport Lorries will use the following roads: Dollis Hill Lane, Coles Green Road, Oxgate Lane and Humber Road.</p> <p>Is waste going to be incineration from the Waste disposal unit? And what method will be used to dispose the waste once it enters the Waste Handling Facility?</p> <p>Have any solutions been considered to prevent any potential or eliminate smells travelling beyond the facility and prevent travelling to neighbouring residents? How will the Waste Handling Facilities eliminate avoiding any potential rodents or bugs? And will residents living nearby be inconvenienced by the waste collection facility?</p>	<p>The location of the proposed Waste Handling Facility was established under the 2010 Outline Consent and remained unchanged in the Section 73 application. Details regarding the Waste Handling Facility are not part of this current Reserved Matters Planning Application and will be dealt under a future RMA submission for Phase 1B South. The location and the principles of the Waste Handling Facility have not changed since the 2010 Planning approval and this has been included in the Section 73 Planning Permission Ref No: F/04687/13.</p> <p>Planning condition 41.1 of the S73 planning permission establishes the information that will need to be submitted before the Waste Handling Facility is constructed to ensure high standards of urban design; landscaping, environmental. Details regarding highway access and heavy goods vehicle routing will also be dealt under this condition.</p> <p>The fuel source for the Waste Handling Facility has not been determined at this stage. The emissions from such plants will be tightly controlled and monitored by the Environment Agency;</p>
---	---

Second Consultation Responses for Consultation Period Ending 12/08/2015

<p><u>Resident 6 Comments:</u> The proposed plans fail to solve the main cycle route required for this area; in particular north-south on the A5 Corridor.</p> <p>The proposed routes through the development are not practical or safe for cyclists. Conditions would be worse after the development at Staples Corner.</p> <p>It is considered the best solution for the A5 is to demolish the existing A5 flyover. It is in a bad condition and only</p>	<p>The proposed sub-phase 1A North highway layout incorporates improvements for cyclists as set out in the approved Pedestrian and Cycle Strategy, including providing connections to existing cycle routes and local roads used as quiet routes by cyclists. There are currently few facilities for cyclists but the proposed facilities will provide a comprehensive network when the development is complete and key parts of the network are provided as part of sub-phase 1A North, including the route between the A41, Clitterhouse Playing Fields, Brent Cross shopping centre and local roads to the north, a route that is mostly segregated. The already approved Staples Corner scheme is considered to provide the best solution at this location and includes a new bridge (B6) for pedestrians and cyclists that together with other existing and modified</p>
---	---

<p>serves to move small volumes of traffic through Cricklewood to West Hendon. A new junction or crossroad at ground level with a cycle friendly roundabout would be practical. The space currently occupied by the A5 slip roads could therefore be used for segregated cycle paths, wide pavements for pedestrians and landscape which would provide urban realm benefits. This would also provide a pedestrian and cycle crossing from the new development to the Welsh Harp open spaces.</p> <p>Paths for cyclists and pedestrians need to be segregated; shared paths will only create potential conflicts and limit the uptake for cycling.</p>	<p>facilities will separate vulnerable road users from traffic. A cycle connection to the Welsh Harp is planned as part of the approved Area Wide Walking and Cycling Study, and will be via local roads to the north of the shopping centre and then West Hendon.</p>
<p><u>Resident 7 Response:</u> Have any designs or proposals been considered to include a pelican or zebra crossing on Highfield Avenue opposite the entrance of Brent Cross Underground Station?</p> <p>Highfield Avenue is notorious for speeding and there have been accidents; school children and adults cannot safely cross the road. Will speed cameras or road signs be introduced to slow down the traffic?</p>	<p>A crossing outside the station is being considered as part of the overall package of improvements to the station.</p> <p>Monitoring of traffic movements in the area will be undertaken as the development proceeds and if related traffic levels increase and are determined to be having local impacts funding will be available to introduce appropriate traffic calming measures.</p>
<p><u>Resident 8 Response:</u> Concerns have been raised regarding the development of the project and information provided to residents of the Whitefield Estate.</p>	<p>The detailed arrangements for residents of the Whitefield Estate are not the subject of this Reserved Matter Application for infrastructure necessary to deliver the first phase of the Brent Cross regeneration. However, the Brent Terrace Triangles RMA in relation to Plots 53 and 54 was approved earlier this year and it is intended that the accommodation provided through this application will provide accommodation for the Whitefield Estate Replacement Units (Part 1) displaced within Phase 1a (North) of the development. Planning Condition 1.10 (Residential Relocation Strategy) is currently under consideration. The aim of this Condition is to ensure the satisfactory</p>

<p>Objection to residents being relocated, losing the right to buy and future rent and service charges.</p> <p>Object to becoming a Housing Association tenant.</p>	<p>relocation of Whitefield residents</p> <p>Planning Condition 1.10 (Residential Relocation Strategy) is currently under consideration. The aim of this Condition is to ensure the satisfactory relocation of Whitefield residents.</p> <p>In addition a Residents Advisor has been appointed by the developer and the officers from the Council's Regeneration Service are continuing to meet with residents of the Whitefield Estate.</p>
<p><u>Resident 9 Response:</u></p> <p><u>A5 Corridor Study:</u></p> <p>Concerns Regarding the A5 Corridor study has been raised. There is no clarity whether the traffic impacts of the surrounding regeneration developments (West Hendon and A2 Dominion) have been taken into consideration.</p> <p>Existing traffic saturations have not been taken into consideration. Only the calculated baseline traffic; presuming with all the surrounding developments has been predicted. A comparison of queue lengths and journey times is essential.</p> <p>The visual report does not correlate with actual experiences of travelling on the A5; including significant delays to buses in the PM peak.</p> <p>We are not certain where Kara road is where there is unused cycle provision.</p> <p>Increases of 2-3% in saturation are considered insignificant, but such in increase on a road 95% saturated increases the risk of melt down by 100%. The congestion on the network will impact the buses, and</p>	<p>Two Reserved Matters Applications and the A5 Corridor Study condition 2.7 of the Section 73 approved application (14/07402/CON) are before this Planning Committee for consideration; and this particular submission specially relates to the Infrastructure RMA. Whilst the objection letter refers to both the Infrastructure RMA and the A5 Corridor Study condition 2.7 planning references, officer comments can be found under Appendix 6 in the committee report for the A5 Corridor Study condition 2.7 (14/07402/CON).</p> <p>Please see response above.</p>

these journey times need improving.

The mitigations included in the outline approval seem to be renegotiable. The A5 Corridor study submitted states that there is some unresolved traffic jam which will have to be resolved at Barnet Councils expense. Can you clarify this?

It is proposed the New Railway Station was a planning gain and would only be built when the developer have sufficient revenue to justify. It is not proposed to bring new station works forward, which will be funded by the Central Government and not the developer.

What is the turnaround for each bus stop and how many buses need to stop at each location at one time? This information has not been provided and will this be available?

There is no drop off proposed for Cricklewood station and why has this been excluded? The outline application stated that there would be step free access for Cricklewood Station; has this been withdrawn?

Widths of pavements are a concern particularly if the bus stops are to cope with huge crowds of people

Servicing and delivery has not been adequately solved in this application.

Housing still being shown on the plans in front of B&Q where roadside servicing is indicated in the outline approval.

The A5 Corridor study should have outlined how traffic would be monitored through the development

Please see above

<p>programme; to confirm the level of modal shift that would occur and how it would be adjusted. These aspects have not been taken into consideration.</p>	
<p><u>Resident 10 Response:</u> The Junctions at Claremont, Cricklewood Lane and Lichfield Road are currently very busy and difficult to navigate. When this junction gets busy it impacts the junction of Chichele Road, Cricklewood Broadway and Cricklewood Lane. Are there any proposals to improve these junctions?</p>	<p>These junctions are both proposed to be improved as part of phase 1A North. The schemes themselves have already received planning approval as they are 2 of the key gateway junctions to the BXC development, approved as part of the outline permission.</p>
<p><u>Resident 11 Response:</u> The roads currently are already heavily congested and at certain times of the day the traffic is standstill causing dangerous levels of pollution. Any development designed will increase the pollution or attract higher number of visitors to Brent Cross; which will have a negative impact to the area.</p>	<p>The overall impacts of the BXC development were considered at the outline application stage. The development includes a new railway station and other major improvements to public transport and non-car modes, and the section 106 and Conditions contain a robust framework of control to help ensure the future mode split of trips in the local area is more heavily weighted towards these modes. Increases in vehicular traffic are expected to be catered for through the delivery of a new and more efficient road network, including several key junction improvements, and a significant part of the new road network is the subject of the sub-phase 1A North infrastructure Reserved Matters Application.</p>

<p><u>Resident 12 Response:</u> The Cricklewood part of the Edgware Road is already heavily congested and will be unable to cope with the massive increase in traffic generated by the proposed development. The results estimated does not give confidence that the A5 will be able to deal with the proposed changed in traffic.</p>	<p>Two Reserved Matters Applications and the A5 Corridor Study condition 2.7 of the Section 73 approved application (14/07402/CON) are before this Planning Committee for consideration; and this particular submission specially relates to the Infrastructure RMA. Whilst the objection letter refers to both the Infrastructure RMA and the A5 Corridor Study condition 2.7 planning references, officer comments can be found under Appendix 6 in the committee report for the A5 Corridor Study condition 2.7 (14/07402/CON).</p>
<p><u>Resident 13 Response:</u> To improve the traffic impacts in the area a priority bus route across the railway and running West to East through the middle of the development needs to be created. The road should be situated half way between the North Circular and Cricklewood Lane; this would create a more practical and circumferential route.</p> <p>The submitted documents states there is no space or capacity in the area for more road traffic and congestion is probably limiting traffic growth; the developers should think outside the box and consider other options to increase the comfortable movement and invest in long term needs.</p>	<p>The bus priority route referred to is part of the overall scheme and by the time the final phase is complete buses will be able to use the proposed Midland Mainline bridge to access an east-west route across the site via Spine Road North, High Street South, Market Square, School Lane and Whitefield Avenue. School Lane is proposed to be bus only, all roads will have bus stops and bus lanes are proposed on the railway bridge, spine road and high street. Only Market Square and the western end of School Lane is provided as part of sub-phase 1A North, the rest of the route will be provided as part of later phases.</p> <p>The BXC development includes a comprehensive multi-modal package of lasting and fully accessible transport schemes including a network of new and improved cycle routes, substantial public transport improvements including a new railway station and a commitment to a range of travel planning measures including car clubs, electric vehicle charging points, subsidised public transport vouchers and cycle purchase discounts.</p>
<p><u>Resident 14 Response:</u> <u>This resident is promoting the re-opening of the Dudding Hill Freight Line which could provide an orbital route across Brent to the 'new' Thameslink Station at Brent Cross</u> In the November 2009 planning committee it was stated that Brent Council had no objections to the Planning Application; this is in breach of the Human Rights Act 1998 Section 6 Paragraph 1.</p>	<p>The Dudding Hill Freight Line is not under consideration as part of this Reserved Matter Application.</p>

Why was the A5 Corridor Study (14/07402/CON) open to public consultation but not the Phase Transport Report for Phase 1A (15/00812/CON)? And What are the current Transport- related Planning applications?

Concerns have been raised that the Living Bridge only goes to shopping centre; cyclists who use this bridge would have to carry their bikes down a flight of steps to access the River Brent footpath, or use the Tempelhof Bridge and the double- roundabout. This is in breach with the London Plan.

The Mayors guidance regarding cycling standards with segregated paths and Barents SPG predicting over 29,000 extra cars per day in the Brent Cross area are reasons for rejection. Advance stop lines and white line down a few roads should not be considered as cycling infrastructure.

The following comments are “questions to the Mayor of London” that have been raised separately through the

Brent Council did raise objections and these were recorded in the committee report presented at the 18 and 19 November 2009 Planning and Environment Committee.

The Phase Transport Report for Phase 1 was submitted for consideration under Condition 37.2. It was open to public consultation under reference: 15/03312/RMA. The Reserved Matters Transport Report for sub-phase 1A North is part of the Infrastructure Reserved Matters Application. More detail is set out in the main part of the report.

Cyclists wishing to access the river corridor will be signed via the Tempelhof bridge and then via a pedestrian and cycle ramp which provides direct access to the riverside pedestrian and cycle path. This facility is considered to comply with the London Plan and is supported by TfL. Notwithstanding this, there is a lift proposed from the Living Bridge down to the bus station that can be used by cyclists, or alternatively, slots for bicycle wheels to allow cyclists to use the alternative steps should they so wish. The consultation proposals did not provide a further lift from the bus station level to the river corridor, but following discussions with the Developers it has been agreed to now provide this which can be used by cyclists.

The issue of 29,000 extra cars per day was addressed at the outline application stage, when it was clarified that it is expected to be far fewer (some 11,000). A comprehensive network of cycle routes was provided as part of the outline application, and this was developed consistent with the design standards at the time (2009). Where facilities are being provided as part of Reserved Matters Applications the aim is to provide them, where practicable, consistent with current design standards. It should be noted that the key route between the A41 and the shopping centre is virtually all segregated, apart from a very short stretch in the southeast corner of Clitterhouse playing fields.

These questions have been responded to by the Mayor. Any new questions relevant to the RMA are underlined and a response provided.

GLA and considered to be brought to the attention of the planning committee. Concerns have been raised regarding the Brent Cross regeneration and it has been questioned whether this RMA Planning Application is fully compliant with the Mayor's Standards.

Brent Cross Highways Infrastructure (1)

Question to the Mayor of London from Navin Shah (21-May-2015):

You have stated that you have been in detailed discussions over highways design at Brent Cross. Can you confirm that Brent Cross Phase One now totally conforms to your London Cycle Design Guidance of 2014?

If not, in which locations is it deficient?

Response from the Mayor of London (21-May-2015):

The Brent Cross Cricklewood project received planning permission in 2010. Since this time, cycling aspirations and standards have evolved significantly and TfL is supporting the developer to improve current proposals to ensure they align with today's expectations and are compliant with the London Cycling Design Standards 2014. This work is still underway.

Brent Cross Highways Infrastructure (2)

Question to the Mayor of London from Navin Shah (21-May-2015):

Thanks to your insistence, can you confirm that there are now no non-segregated cycle paths, or highway unprotected cycle lanes or advance stop lines in the Brent Cross Phase One plan?

If not, in which locations have you failed?

Response from the Mayor of London (21-May-2015):

Please see my response to Brent Cross Highways Infrastructure (1).

Brent Cross Highways Infrastructure (3)

Question to the Mayor of London from Navin Shah (21-May-2015):

Having concluding your discussions, will every part of Brent Cross Phase One plan exceed the standards that you illustrate and promote in your Better Streets Delivered Case Studies of 2013?

If not, which parts of Brent Cross are deficient?

Response from the Mayor of London (21-May-2015):

TfL has prepared its transport and highway requirements for Brent Cross Phase One which includes the application of Better Streets design principles to the highway network and is working with the developer and the London Borough of Barnet to ensure these requirements are adopted through the planning process. Discussions are on-going.

Brent Cross Highways Infrastructure (4)

Question to the Mayor of London from Navin Shah (21-May-2015):

Following your discussions, will Brent Cross Phase One be fully compliant with all aspects of your 2013 Roads Task Force Report, including the London Streets Family document, for streets and spaces design to accommodate active frontages, street greening, walking and cycling, inset on-street parking / loading and vehicle movement?

If not, where does it fail?

Response from the Mayor of London (21-May-2015):

TfL continues to work productively with the developer and the London Borough of Barnet through the planning process to apply the principles of the Roads Task Force (RTF) to Brent Cross Phase One. This will also be the case for subsequent phases of the project.

This work includes the provision of TfL technical support to the developer and the London Borough of Barnet to

continue to improve the currently proposed highway designs, using the RTF toolbox of measures. This approach will further improve support for walking and cycling, while providing an appropriate highway network for vehicle movement and servicing activities at the expanded shopping centre.

With regards to the Major's responses above: Are you content that the following is accurate, including for pedestrians on the pavements of the North Circular Road, on the living bridge and at the "double roundabout" at the northern end of Tempelhof Avenue?

Major Brent Cross Roads (1)

Question to the Mayor of London from Navin Shah (21-May-2015):

You will be aware that on 29 April 2015, the government was ordered by the Supreme Court to take immediate action over its obligations under European law on air pollution limits. What action have you taken to ensure that proposed changes to all major Brent Cross Phase One roads help in the regard?

Response from the Mayor (21-May-2015):

The Brent Cross Cricklewood regeneration will create a new town centre, encouraging modal shift from highway to public transport. There will be good pedestrian and cycle access throughout the area and improved links to public transport services at Brent Cross Underground

The responses are a matter of public record and the work referred to by TfL has been on-going and, assuming approval of this Reserved Matters Application, will continue as part of the detailed technical highways approval. The sub-phase 1A North proposals include shared facilities for pedestrians with cyclists at Staples Corner (already approved) on the North Circular Road, otherwise provision along the A406 is unchanged. At the Prince Charles Drive western roundabout a footway is proposed on the western side to provide a pedestrian connection from the south west car park plot to the wider network, and on the north eastern corner there is a footway shared with cyclists that is part of the north – south route through the site. Otherwise, the western roundabout is not intended to be for vehicular traffic and has been designed accordingly. The Living Bridge is proposed to be for both pedestrians and cyclists.

station, the new main line station, the expanded bus station in the shopping centre and enhanced bus services. Under the terms of the planning consent, the developer is required to transform the road layout to provide more efficient movements, which will prevent traffic queues and reduce pollution.

The high levels of walking, cycling and public transport use, together with the changes to the highway network and London-wide measures such as the Low and Ultra Low Emission Zones, will minimise the contribution of traffic in the area to air pollution. This work is on-going.

Brent Cross contract (2)

Question to the Mayor of London from Darren Johnson (25-Mar-2015):

Who will have ownership and responsibility for the maintenance and repair of the Living Bridge which is being built as part of the Brent Cross development?

Response from the Mayor (25-Mar-2015):

The final ownership of the Living Bridge remains under discussion. As with any other third party structure over the TfL road network, there will be effective measures in place to ensure that the bridge will be properly maintained to protect road users' safety and the standards required by TfL on its road network.

With regards to Majors comments above, who will own the living bridge?

Major Brent Cross Roads (3)

Question to the Mayor of London from Navin Shah (21-May-2015):

The ownership of the Living Bridge has yet to be agreed. It will be owned by LBB, subject to commuted sums to cover future envisaged maintenance costs being agreed with the Developers. It should be noted that for the Reserved Matters Application ownership is not a material consideration.

Are you satisfied that technical expertise exists in UK engineering companies to build all the planned highway bridges over the North Circular Road in-situ, rather than elsewhere and then pushing them across? Are you content with building them all in-situ?

If not, what are your technical reasons to favour building one or more bridge to the south of the North Circular Road, rather than to the north? In choosing between the south and the north for a bridge-building site, what effect would each have on the Brent Cross Phase One number of London homes?

Response from the Mayor (21-May-2015):

Brent Cross Phase One, which includes the highways infrastructure, is still at the concept design stage. The delivery strategy and construction methodologies are currently being prepared by the developer for agreement with the highway authorities.

In developing this project, TfL will ensure that the construction methodologies used to construct new bridges are safe, minimise the impact on traffic, local residents and businesses, and, comply with the Traffic Management Act and New Roads and Street Works Act. No loss of homes is anticipated as a result of temporary bridge-building sites.

With regards to the Mayors comments above: "No loss of homes is anticipated as a result of temporary bridge-building sites?" And Does that mean that the bridges will not be built on ex-housing land, south of the North Circular Road?

There are no temporary road bridges proposed in this RMA. The Whitefield Estate is within the red line boundary of the 2014 S73 Consent for the BXC development. The Living Bridge, including the southern approach ramp, is a permanent bridge structure and will require land from the Whitfield Estate. The Living Bridge will be delivered in Phase 1A (North). A separate RMA for the Brent Terrace Triangles in relation to Plots 53 and 54 was approved earlier this year and it is intended that the accommodation provided through this application will provide accommodation for the Whitefield Estate Replacement Units (Part 1) displaced within Phase 1a (North) of the development. Different housing solutions will be required for Council tenants and residents who are long leaseholders or freeholders. Planning Condition 1.10

(Residential Relocation Strategy) is currently under consideration and will set out the options in more detail. The aim of this Condition is to ensure the satisfactory relocation of Whitefield residents. The Council has appointed an Independent Residents Advisor for the Whitefield Estate and has set up a Steering Group of representatives of the various tenure groups on the estate.

A41 segregated cycling

Question to the Mayor of London from Andrew Dismore (15-Jul-2015):

What progress is there concerning a segregated cycle lane for the A41 between Swiss Cottage and Hendon?

Response from the Mayor (15-Jul-2015):

TfL is working on designs for Cycle Superhighway 11, which is proposed to run from Brent Cross to the West End, via the A41 and Swiss Cottage. Proposals are currently at feasibility stage with a range of options under consideration in collaboration with local stakeholders. A public consultation is planned to take place later this year.

Does this cycle superhighway connect to both ends of the living bridge?

The connection to the proposed Cycle Superhighway 11 is where the Clitterhouse Playing Field pedestrian and cycle network links with the A41, adjacent to Ridge Hill. As set out in the approved sub-phase 1A North Pedestrian and Cycle Strategy there is then a (virtually all) segregated route provided to the base of the Living Bridge ramp on Claremont Avenue, and the Living Bridge itself is a shared use facility.

Brent Cross - through routes

Question to the Mayor of London from Darren Johnson (11-Jun-2014):

What through routes at the northern end of the proposed 'living bridge' do you suggest are available for cyclists use, rather than merely being able to get to and from the Brent Cross shopping centre?

Response from the Mayor (11-Jun-2014):

Please see my response to **[the following question]**.

Brent Cross - 'living bridge' and cyclists

Question to the Mayor of London from Darren Johnson (19-Mar-2014)

What routes at the northern end of the proposed 'living bridge' do you suggest that cyclists can use to get to and from the Brent Cross shopping centre?

Response from the Mayor (19-Mar-2014)

The indicative plans show that the Living Bridge proposed by the developers will be accessible to cyclists at the southern end along the bridge approach ramp leading up from the Market Square. Cycling will then be permitted on the Living Bridge as far as its northern side where 40 cycle parking racks are proposed. From there onwards, cyclists could use the proposed two-way shared 3.5m wide cycle and pedestrian route along the northern side of the diverted river Brent. This east-west route would connect to the Brent Park Road (extending under the M1 motorway) to the west and under the A41 flyover in the east to link with Prince Charles Drive and with TfL's proposed cycle superhighway route 11 along Hendon Way.

The general parameters for the development have been fixed as part of the outline planning permission recently granted by Barnet Council. TfL and the GLA are actively working with both the Council and the developer to maximise opportunities for walking and cycling in the detailed design, with a particular focus on links between Brent Cross and the wider area.

With regards to the Majors Response above what happens at the north end of the living bridge?

See detailed response above providing clarification on the latest position with connections for pedestrians and cyclists at the northern end of the Living Bridge. (It should be noted that the current proposals are for 19 cycle parking racks at the northern end of the Living Bridge and 8 at the southern end (although these can be

increased if insufficient), and that the proposed shared route along the river corridor is 6m wide. The connection to the proposed cycle superhighway is explained above and the connection at the western end of the river corridor is along the side of the M1 retaining wall.)

Brent Cross - new access roads

Question to the Mayor of London from Darren Johnson (19-Mar-2014):

Do you support the building of certain new minor access roads under Phase One of the Brent Cross development, to allow for the expansion of the shopping centre there? Will they have proper segregated cycle lanes, particularly given the expected lack of safe through-routes for casual cyclists through the site?

Response from the Mayor (19-Mar-2014):

The road layouts in Phase One of the Brent Cross Cricklewood development include changes to the local road network to improve access into the new shopping centre.

The general parameters for the development have been fixed as part of the outline planning permission recently granted by Barnet Council. TfL and the GLA are actively working with both the Council and the development partners to maximise opportunities for safe walking and cycling in the detailed design, with a particular focus on links between Brent Cross and the wider area.

*My response ... **[above]** gives more detail on proposed through routes for cyclists.*

With regards to the mayors response above, how many of the yet-to-be-built roads will not have segregated cycle paths?

Plan BXCR-URS-ZZ-11-CE-00002 revision P06, as contained within the approved sub-phase 1A North Pedestrian and Cycle Strategy clearly indicates the planned cycle facilities, and clarifies which facilities are shared, which are segregated, where cycle parking facilities are being provided etc.

Resident 10 Response:

Living Bridge:

In reference to Appendix M of the Phase 1 Transport Report, the Living Bridge has no cycle access from the North end of the Bridge. Why do Cyclists need to dismount in the middle of their journey? The Living Bridge is wide enough to provide a segregated route for pedestrians and cyclist.

The developers have only addressed access points to the shopping Centre and have not considered easy access around the shopping centre.

What is the purpose of the Living Bridge? And how is it useable green space when it spans across on one of the most polluted roads. People are unlikely to use this space.

Infrastructure:

The cycle and pedestrian route across the Tempelhof Bridge is segregated but there is a complex path when travelling to the east; is this path necessary?

What do the pink paths on the submitted plans for the RMA demonstrate?

How wide are the shared paths around Staples Corner and why are these paths not segregated?

Currently cyclists can cycle over the bridge that forms the underpass for the A406 & A41; however, once the development is complete this will not be possible. This is a simple route for cyclist traveling from the North East.

The Proposed Living Bridge provides a connection to the shopping centre which will be the start or end point to any journey. As explained at the start of the response to resident 9 above, cyclists will be able to continue their journey via the river corridor but if making a trip through the area the route will be signed via Tempelhof Bridge and the proposed facilities to the western side of the shopping centre. The proposed layout of the Living Bridge is not configured for segregated provision as it is intended to be a shared space scheme. Please see the main report for further discussion on the Living Bridge. There is provision for pedestrian access through the shopping centre, as well as around the outside and details of the shopping centre proposals themselves are planned as part of sub-phase 1B North.

It is unclear which 'complex path' is being referred to, but once over Tempelhof bridge anyone wishing to walk or cycle to the east can do so via a nearby ramp that gives direct access to the river corridor, and then onwards via the A41 junction.

The pink paths represent shared pedestrian and cycle routes.

The off road shared paths are 4m wide across the new bridge (B6) and between 2.3m – 3.5m on the approaches from the A5 north and south and Brent Terrace North. The facilities were not required to be segregated when the scheme was designed and submitted, and then approved by the planning authority.

There is no change to provision for cyclists across the A406 at the A41 junction, where formally cyclists are required to dismount. The modified road layout and structures at the junction include a shared use facility as part of the A41 underpass for cyclists travelling to / from the east or north east. A new cycle connection is proposed via

<p>Why has this route been closed and not widened or developed?</p> <p>Footpaths and cycle routes do not meet at the north or south end of the shopping centre or to the south east side. This will result pedestrians walking on the road.</p> <p>The cycle superhighway stops in the middle of the A41 just south of the A406 Flyover; this route is unconnected to any BXC cycle route.</p> <p>With regards to consultation, not all residents received the notification. Two Reserved Matters Planning applications have been in public consultation, ending 5th and 7th August. Residents have previously requested that two planning applications should not be out to consultation simultaneously. There are several documents submitted and difficult to review.</p>	<p>Cooper Road to provide a link to the wider area via Shirehall Lane. There is also an improved connection to Brentfield Gardens as the A406 westbound off slip is closed and a new off road shared footway – cycleway will be provided. A new shared footway – cycleway is also provided on the western side connecting with Tilling Road. General refurbishment (lighting / signing / painting as appropriate) is also planned for the A406/A41 pedestrian and cycle links.</p> <p>There are a combination of footpaths and cycleways that provide direct connections to and from the shopping centre on its north, south and southeast sides. Moreover, north – south connections are made at the western side of the shopping centre. No pedestrians will have any reason to walk in a road.</p> <p>The proposals are for the A41 cycle superhighway to connect to BXC via the cycle route that extends from the A41 near Ridge Road to Tempelhof Bridge and beyond via Clitterhouse Playing Fields, Claremont Avenue, Market Square and New Tempelhof Avenue.</p> <p>Please see the main report for details of the number of residents consulted and re consulted. Consultation time periods comply with the statutory requirements and the consultation expiry dates are also available on the Councils website. The Central Brent Riverside Park RMA (15/03315/RMA) has been developed alongside the Infrastructure RMA (15/03312/RMA) and is part of Phase 1A North. Both RMA submissions were subsequently submitted and designed together. The planning case officer is available (on the telephone) to discuss and explain the planning application and documentation submitted.</p>
---	--

Statutory Consultees and other interest groups Consultation Responses

<p><u>Transport for London</u> Letter dated: 1st September 2015</p> <p>1. The planting of trees within TfL highway are subject to agreement with TfL and have provided specific advice direct to the developer, and will work the Council and developer to deliver trees and landscape improvements.</p> <p>2. TfL is responsible for bus stops that are altered by the proposed development. TfL will work with the developers and Council on the detail design and work to agree fixed position for the stops with reference to TfL's published guidance. TfL recommend that discussions regarding these aspects are discussed during the Transport Advisory Group (TAG); as they involve all local authorities.</p> <p>3. The Estate Management Framework has been updated to clarify any interfaces with TfL highway and infrastructure; including day-to-day arrangements to assist with compliance with any legal agreements, leases or licenses that TfL maybe party.</p> <p>4. With regards to the temporary bus restrictions, TfL should have unrestricted access to the existing bus station or replacement facility at all times for buses and passengers including step free access from the shopping centre over a reasonable walk distance with appropriate security and safety measures.</p> <p>5. TfL understands the reason for restricted hours on the temporary bus stops on Plot 113 having visited the site with your Environmental Health officer on 19th August 2015 and welcomes the review mechanism. These</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p>
--	---

restriction pose significant operational difficulties to TfL and potential inconvenience to our passengers – however, will work with the applicant to comply with this condition and expect them to help mitigate the impact on our passengers and operators including by providing facilities, pedestrian routes and where necessary additional bus subsidy during construction

6. TfL favours a straight move to the new bus station location rather than posing a temporary bus station and bus stops on Plot 113; subject to the developer being able to create safe and accessible routes for buses and passengers during construction of the shopping centre. The developers have indicated that as part of their Phase 1B application they would consider options for a straight move to the new permanent bus station. TfL requests that the developers engage with them in formal pre-application discussions in relation to Phase 1B.

Any temporary or permanent bus station must meet TfL's operational needs and those of passengers.

7. TfL has proposed draft conditions to define more precisely the relocation of the taxi rank during construction phase.

Temporary Taxi facilities

Prior to any works to the designated Taxi rank on Prince Charles Drive adjacent to Brent Cross Bus station or any works that restrict access by the Taxi or passengers to this taxi rank provide details of alternative facility that is fully accessible for wheelchair users, sufficient capacity for at least 9 cabs to rank, and is clearly visible to customers exiting the shopping centre and appropriate sign posted within the shopping centre itself. The details of these

Noted. Permanent bus station location will be discussed part of Phase 1B.

<p><i>facilities should be agreed with TfL and submitted to the LPA for approval, and the facilities operated in accord with the approved plans.</i></p> <p><i>Reason: To ensure the shopping centre and nearby facilities are full accessible by Taxi during construction phases</i></p>	
<p><u>Greater London Authority</u></p> <p>No objection Raised - The Mayor supports TfL in overseeing the transport aspects of the Brent Cross Cricklewood project and ensuring the scheme remains in accord with the London Plan and Mayor's Transport Strategy at each phase of sub-phase of the development.</p>	<p>Noted</p>
<p><u>Consultative Access Forum (CAF):</u></p> <p>Letter dated: 28th August 2015:</p> <p><u>Tempelhof Bridge ramp leading the River Corridor:</u> Inserting a landing at the midpoint of each slope to provide space will improve the usability of the ramp. However, it is not possible from the drawings provided to assess the gradients and the handrails which are critical aspects of ramps.</p> <p><u>Lift to the Riverside Park:</u> A lift from the Living Bridge/ Bus station level to access the Riverside Park would enhance access from the Lower Riverside Walkway, and benefit those who require step free access.</p>	<p>Officers response: The gradient for the ramp from Tempelhof Bridge ramp leading to the Riverside Park is 1 in 21 with a short 'dog leg' landing. Details and specifications regarding handrails and other details aspects will be considered at the detailed design stage.</p> <p>Noted.</p>
<p><u>Environmental Agency</u></p> <p>Letter dated: 25th August 2015</p> <p>The Environmental Agency reviewed both Reserved Mattered Applications from the perspectives of potential</p>	<p>A financial contribution of £200,000 towards naturalisation works to an area of Mutton Brook upstream of the application site to compensate for the loss of 1217m² to The Brent River Corridor has been agreed with the Developers and will be secured through a Deed of Variation to the existing Section 106 agreement attached to the</p>

impacts on the ecological environment, the Water Framework Directive (WFD), flood risks and the risks of surface water pollution. It was considered that the current proposal results in a reduction in ecological buffer zone of 1217m² compared to the proposals approved under the Section 73 application.

Flood Risk:

The EA considered that the flood modeled will not cause any unacceptable increases in flood risk. However, noted that the modeling demonstrates high sensitivity to channel roughness, and if future design changes are made this would impact the modeled channel roughness; to prevent any potential flood risk they have proposed the following condition:

Condition 1

The river channel will be constructed in such a way that the roughness values used in the current flood model are representative of the physical channel. Any changes to channel attributes that would make the current modeled roughness values unrepresentative will not be permitted without the prior written permission of the local planning authority.

Reason

To prevent increased flood risk

At the detailed design stage, the EA have requested that the development should demonstrate that assets/ street furniture are fixed appropriately to the ground or walls; to prevent entering into the river during a flood event. To minimise this they have requested the following condition:

Condition 2

2014 Section 73 Consent as per the recommendations at the beginning of this report.

Under the terms of the 'Necessary Consents' the Developers are already required to obtain approval from the EA for Flood Defense consent which covers the issues described. An appropriately worded informative is proposed to ensure that the Developers are aware of this requirement.

<p><u>Thames Water</u> Letter dated: 2nd July 2015 No objections raised and does not affect Thames Water</p>	<p>Noted</p>
<p><u>London Borough of Harrow</u> Letter dated: 28th July 2015 No objection raised</p>	<p>Noted</p>
<p><u>Natural England</u> Email dated: 8th July 2015 No objection raised</p>	<p>Noted</p>
<p><u>Network Rail</u> Email dated: 12th August 2015 Network Rail is supportive of the proposed works but note is essential that operational railways and assets are protected.</p>	<p>Noted</p>
<p><u>Hertsmere Borough Council</u> Email dated: 6th August 2015 No objection raised</p>	<p>Noted</p>
<p><u>Sport England</u> Email dated: 24th July 2015 No objection raised</p>	<p>Noted</p>
<p><u>London Fire and Emergency Planning Authority</u> Letter dated: 14th August 2015 Satisfied with the proposal.</p>	<p>Noted</p>
<p><u>North London Waste Authority</u> No objection Raised with regards to this reserved matters application; however, noted proposals submitted part of the Section 73 planning application to build flats on the site of Hendon Rail Transfer (HRF) and would continue to be consulted.</p>	<p>Noted</p>