

London Borough of Barnet

North London Business Park Planning Brief

Consultation Report

March 2016

Contents

The main issues raised were:

Summary of Consultation Activity	2
Main issues raised & what changes we are making.....	3
Appendix A: Full list of Reps and Council Responses	5
Opposition to creating a new access route to/from the north site from Weirdale/ Ashbourne Avenues (all from local residents)	5
Concern over construction traffic	18
Support for retention of the existing pond on the site	19
Concern over the impact of the development on local infrastructure (including traffic congestion)	21
Impact on local amenity/ Height/ Quantum of development concerns	28
Landowner Response	33
Other Issues.....	40

Summary of Consultation Activity

Consultation on the North London Business Park Planning Brief took place over a period of 6 weeks extending from 7th January until February 17th 2016. Consultation involved letters that were e-mailed to stakeholders on the Local Plan consultation database as well as posted to residents living next to NLBP. A Public Notice was published in the Barnet Press to publicise the consultation. Further publicity included a drop-in session at Building 2 of the North London Business Park on 9th February.

Responses were received from a mix of statutory stakeholders including Historic England, Highways for England, Natural England and the Environment Agency. Local residents made up the majority of respondents to this consultation, particularly those in the Weirdale/Ashbourne Avenue area. A response was also received from Comer Group, the owner of the site.

Below is a summary of the issues raised, with a full set of summarised comments, alongside the Council's response to each, and what action was taken to amend the Planning Brief.

Main issues raised & what changes we are making.

Opposition to creating a new access route at Weirdale and Ashbourne Avenues, and construction traffic

Local residents expressed concerns about the proposal to re-open an access route between the north of the NLBP site and Russell Lane through Ashbourne Avenue and Weirdale Avenue. Objections focused on increased traffic (including construction traffic), increased fear of crime and pressures on car parking arising from the re-opened access.

The Council considers that this re-opened access route makes a link with bus services and shops at Russell Lane as well as with Oakleigh Park station. This access to services and public transport reduces the need to travel and supports the use of sustainable transport modes. The prospective developer Comer Homes has confirmed that access to Russell Lane by car from the NLBP site is not necessary. The Planning Brief has been revised to clarify that the re-opened access at Ashbourne Avenue is restricted to pedestrians, cyclists and emergency vehicles.

In terms of the fear of crime issue, the Council will require the development to be appropriately designed so that it can positively affect perceptions of safety. A "Secured by Design" statement will be required to accompany the planning application, reviewed by the Metropolitan Police, to ensure that development is suitably designed to address this issue.

In terms of the increased pressure on car parking spaces the Council considers that with redevelopment the nature of the site will change. The site will change from an employment use to a residential led mixed use scheme including employment uses and a secondary school. The Transport Assessment that is required as part of the planning application will consider that journeys to and from the site will be different, and what provisions are required to mitigate the new trip pattern. Regarding construction traffic, the Council agrees that of the three potential routes into the site, this is the least suitable for construction traffic to access/egress, and as such we will ensure that the construction management plan excludes this route from accommodating construction traffic.

Support for retention of the existing pond on the site

There was support for the retention of the pond on the site, both from wildlife, and a perception that it acted as a balancing flood mitigation measure. The Council agree that it is a positive feature of the site, and that in some way it should be incorporated into the design of the new site.

Concern over the impact of the development on local infrastructure (including traffic congestion)

The issue of infrastructural needs for schools, access to healthcare, and impact on highways was raised.

School Place Planning benchmarking shows that the development has the potential to create a need for 1.1 - 1.8 forms of primary school entry, and 0.3 - 0.8 forms of secondary entry. The expansion of the secondary school on the NLBP site will accommodate the additional secondary need arising.

The impacts of traffic generated by the new homes and expanded school at the NLBP site will be fully examined within the Transport Assessment (TA) that will need to accompany any planning application for re-development of the site. The assessment will take account of the net impact associated with the loss of trips related to the existing site, against those added by the proposed development. The applicants TA will need to demonstrate that the travel impacts of the new land uses can be accommodated by the local transport system, and where any improvements are shown to be necessary, then either the developer will be obliged to deliver these mitigation measures under the supervision of the Council if adjacent to the North London Business Park, or if in the surrounding area, contribute suitable sums to the Council and / or Transport for London to ensure delivery by them.

Concerns about impact on local amenity, height and quantum of development

Concerns were raised about the changing nature of the area, increasing densities; and the potential impact of new development on adjoining properties and views across the site.

With regard to the character of the existing site, it is fairly distinctive, with the landscaping of the NLBP site creating a neutral relationship with adjoining properties. Given the pressures for new housing any redevelopment of the site is expected to generate new homes. Given the size of the site there are opportunities for higher densities in those parts furthest from existing residential properties.

Regarding how density varies across the site, the principle of requiring the edges of the site abounding neighbouring residential properties to be built at lower heights and densities is broadly supported by all parties with the exception of the developer seeking a “transitional zone” in the area adjacent to the residential properties on Howard Close. It is unclear why this is appropriate compared to other edges of the site, and accordingly the Planning Brief will not be amended to incorporate this principle.

Regarding the maximum height permissible on the site, the Local Plan Policy DM5 is clear that development classified as “tall” (8 storeys or more) will only be permissible in strategic locations as set out in the Core Strategy. As the NLBP site is not a strategic location, development of 8 storeys or more will be in conflict with the Local Plan.

Other Issues

There is concern locally that the development could disrupt the land on the site which could be contaminated due to the historic industrial use. This will be mitigated through the development, as required by national standards on contaminated land.

At the time of preparing the Planning Brief the Council expected that the Comer Group would submit a planning application following the adoption of the Brief. The Comer Group has submitted a planning application which is subject to statutory consultation must take place. Consultation on the application and the Planning Brief overlapped and the Council has ensured that all comments received are considered with regard to the planning application.

Appendix A: Full list of Representations and Council Responses

Opposition to creating a new access route to/from the north site from Weirdale/ Ashbourne Avenues (all from local residents)

Summary of Response	Council Reply	Action
Weirdale Avenue / Ashbourne Avenue - The existing plan refers to the high level of objections raised on the subject of access to/from the site from Weirdale Avenue and Ashbourne Avenue (Paragraph 3.5 / p19). I understand these concerns remain current and would support the retention of the requirement for a Transport Assessment to be conducted for any change of access through this route.	A Transport Assessment is required for a development of this size.	Planning Brief highlights that a Transport Assessment is required to accompany a planning application for this

Summary of Response	Council Reply	Action
<p>Section 3.23: Re opening Weirdale Avenue may benefit the new residents of this development but fails to address the concerns of those who live in Weirdale Avenue and chose to live there because it does not go anywhere and is therefore a quiet road especially regarding vehicles.</p>	<p>The Council, as the Local Planning Authority, have a responsibility to determine any future planning application in line with the adopted Local Plan. DM3 of the Local Plan states that new developments should exhibit the highest standards of accessible and inclusive design. In relation to the NLBP site, it is considered that providing access to the facilities of Russell Lane, and to Oakleigh Park station beyond is essential to meeting the aims of this policy.</p> <p>DM3 also recognises that solutions need to be flexible, recognising what different people say they need and want. It is recognised that Ashbourne and Weirdale Avenues are suburban residential streets, and that adding new traffic is not desirable.</p>	<p>site.</p> <p>Brief clarifies at paras 3.18, 3.22, 5.18 and 5.19 that the northern access point should be for cycling and pedestrian access only.</p>
<p>As a resident of Weirdale Avenue who chose to live there because it provided the life style I wanted I object to any opening up of the access road to Weirdale Avenue. I could possible tolerate pedestrian and cycle access. However it is my firm belief that unless written guarantees were provided that the Weirdale Avenue access road would never be opened for vehicles then any planning application submitted would be vigorously objected to by the residents of Weirdale Avenue. The council has obligations to all its residents and not just those from business with the deepest pockets who have no interest in the borough apart from how much they can profit from it.</p>		
<p>Objects to the opening up of access from the site to Weirdale Avenue, which currently is in effect a crescent which attracts no traffic or footfall.</p>		
<p>Objects to opening up access to the site, considers it will lead to increased risk of accidents, even for cycle/pedestrian access only.</p>		

Summary of Response	Council Reply	Action
	As such it is considered that a pedestrian and cycling route from/to the site is the best way of meeting these objectives.	
Do not believe it is feasible that this route is suitable for emergency access/ fire engines, or construction traffic It is noted it is not the ideal route, compared to the other two, however the brief will ensure the requirements of the emergency services are considered in any planning application.	The emergency services will be consulted on the planning application, and access as required by them will be included in the final design.	Brief clarifies at paras 3.18 and 5.19 that access requirements of the emergency services are considered in any planning application.
Weirdale Ave & Ashbourne Ave not being wide enough or robust enough to take an increase in heavy vehicles e.g. fire service vehicles etc. potentially leading parking restrictions to alleviate this		
Potential impact on entrance to Russell Lane.	The Council, as the Local Planning Authority, have a responsibility to determine any future planning application in line with the adopted Local Plan. DM3 of the Local Plan states that new developments should exhibit the highest standards of accessible and inclusive design. In relation to the NLBP site, it is considered that providing access to the facilities of Russell Lane,	As highlighted above the Brief makes several references to restricting the northern access point to cyclists and pedestrians.
Objects to increasing number of trips entering/egressing Russell Lane at this point.		
The opening up of a through road to Russell Lane and the north will only serve up more congestion		
Russell Rd currently exhibits tailbacks from the junction with Oakleigh Rd, and often past Dene Rd. More cars would worsen this effect, impeding, amongst others, emergency vehicles, and refuse lorries.		
Greater traffic congestion on Russell Lane also increasing pollution levels in area		
Objects to Opening of any kind of access to and from the proposed development site into Weirdale Avenue and Ashbourne Avenue. Ashbourne Avenue is a narrow residential road barely suitable for its current population. To extend its use to a large housing development which includes a school and recreational area would be highly detrimental to the current residence. The road is simply not suitable for the planed purposes and I object in the strongest possible terms. My		

Summary of Response	Council Reply	Action
<p>specific objections are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1, Construction lorries would very quickly cause severe surface damage to the road. 2, The school would attract a rat run for parents dropping off their offspring. 3, Larger volumes of traffic would be using the road changing the areas entire character. 4, Parking problems would increase to an unacceptable level. 	<p>and to Oakleigh Park station beyond is essential to meeting the aims of this policy.</p>	
<p>There is a proposal to "re-open" an access onto Weirdale Avenue. There has never been a public access to the site at this point. There was a former pedestrian access for STC workers that was only open at the beginning and end of the working day - access was only for STC employees and there was a security guard controlling access when the gate was open. Local roads were not built with through traffic in mind and rush hour access to/from Russell Lane will produce grid-lock as Russell Lane is often already tailed back from the Oakleigh Road roundabout past the eastern end of Weirdale Avenue. Residents of Weirdale Avenue and Ashbourne Avenue already have difficulty joining Russell Lane during rush hours and the proposed new access to the development will make a difficult situation impossible. The council is therefore misguided in suggesting that a northern access to the site would result in shortened journey times to Whetstone and Oakleigh Park. There is no capacity on either Weirdale Avenue or Ashbourne Avenue for two way traffic and proposed access for emergency vehicles could be impeded by parking by local residents, particularly at night and weekends. The council should reject the current plans in favour of a lower density development and it should not pursue a new access of any sort onto Weirdale Avenue, as there is no historic precedent for one and it would be detrimental to the interests of the existing residents.</p>	<p>DM3 also recognises that solutions need to be flexible, recognising what different people say they need and want. It is recognised that Ashbourne and Weirdale Avenues are suburban residential streets, and that adding new traffic is not desirable.</p> <p>As such it is considered that a pedestrian and cycling route from/to the site is the best way of meeting these objectives.</p>	
<p>Historically there has never been vehicular access from Weirdale Avenue, only limited pedestrian access. To create an access for pedestrian, cycle or vehicle traffic would have a detrimental effect on residents in Weirdale Avenue,</p>		

Summary of Response	Council Reply	Action
Ashbourne Rd and Russell Lane. This would create increased parking issues, increased congestion, increased pollution, possibility of increased crime. These roads are narrow and are not robust enough to take increased traffic.		
I am very concerned about the proposal to open this development to Weirdale Avenue and Ashbourne Avenue.		
Weirdale and Ashbourne Avenues are small residential roads. They are both quite narrow. Weirdale has two bends at the NLBP end. It is very difficult to get cars, let alone emergency vehicles around them. This would mean Ashbourne Avenue would be the straight path through which would be of great danger to the residents. The residents of both roads comprise manly of young families and elderly, which the type of housing is most suited to.		
In order to prevent the noise, pollution, parking, and safety issue, there was a (successful) local campaign to close this access. With this opened, can foresee school parents using the area as parking.		
Never been a “public access” route, only as security-controlled work entrance.		
When historic pedestrian access was open, parking from employees created congestion and associated safety for children due to narrow surrounding roads.	The Council, as the Local Planning Authority, have a responsibility to determine any future planning application in line with the adopted Local Plan. DM3 of the Local Plan states that new developments should exhibit the highest standards of accessible and inclusive design. In relation to the NLBP site, it is considered that providing access to the facilities of Russell Lane, and to Oakleigh Park station beyond is essential	As highlighted above the Brief makes several references to restricting the northern access point to cyclists and pedestrians.
Ashbourne & Weirdale Avenues are not wide enough for larger vehicles, and introducing these trips could require parking restrictions.		
Section 3.22: Does not provide the guarantee that access from Weirdale Avenue will not at a later date allow vehicle access. Also that this proposed access will not be used during the construction phase of this development.		
Section 5.10: This section has now moved from 2 entry roads and 1 pedestrian entrance to 3 entry roads. If the Weirdale Avenue access is open to vehicles it will become a through route to both Oakleigh Road North and Brunswick Park Road and turning Weirdale Avenue into a Rat Run, but not taking into account the views of those whose lives will be blighted by this.		
Section 5.15: Your brief has now changed to discussing vehicle access from Weirdale Avenue when previously it talked about pedestrian and cycles. Should you not be striving for consistency and clarity in your planning brief so that we all know where we stand.		

Summary of Response	Council Reply	Action
Previous development on Russell Lane has restricted access/egress from Weirdale/Ashbourne Aves, creating safety concerns.	to meeting the aims of this policy.	
Confusion over the purpose for the Weirdale Ave access: as a pedestrian only access, or as an emergency services access, or as a way of connecting the new development with Russell Lane and Oakleigh Park station	DM3 also recognises that solutions need to be flexible, recognising what different people say they need and want. It is recognised that Ashbourne and Weirdale Avenues are suburban residential streets, and that adding new traffic is not desirable.	
Objects to allowing access from Weirdale/Ashbourne Aves as it will exacerbate existing parking and congestion issues.		
Possible greater risk to pedestrians from additional traffic.		
Consider that the site is already well served by the existing two access roads.		
Is concerned that the brief identifies the Ashbourne Ave entrance as historically open to the public, which it has never been.		
Tight bends on Weirdale Avenue make it unsuitable for large vehicles to pass parked cars.		
Any access through Weirdale/Ashbourne Avenue (emergency, pedestrian or otherwise) is strongly opposed due to the inevitable congestion and impact on the area.	As such it is considered that a pedestrian and cycling route from/to the site is the best way of meeting these objectives.	
In the forty five years that I have lived here, this has never been a public access. It was only ever used as a foot access by employees of The Standard Telephone and later Nortel. There was a security guard placed at the gate and even then, it caused great problems, litter, noise, parking, driveways being parked over, people being blocked in. Later when Barnet Council occupied the buildings staff that used this entrance were given a key. It has never been open as a public right of way and there has never been a road through, even as emergency access, the road stops at the fence, this is the boundary of the old sports field.		
Restricted vehicular access for emergency vehicles is impractical given the narrow streets when parked cars are taken into account. Potential parking restrictions to counter this are also a concern given street parking is already challenging.		
General vehicular access via Weirdale / Ashbourne would lead to increased traffic, increased noise and an increase in vehicle generated pollution.		

Summary of Response	Council Reply	Action
<p>We strongly object to any type of access to/from the NLBP development into Weirdale and Ashbourne Avenues. Both avenues are unsuitable for increased traffic - especially larger vehicles - due to the width of the roads, on-street parking and road curvatures. Dust carts, delivery vans and disabled transport vehicles are frequently wedged at keys points and have to reverse. Allowing emergency vehicle access could restrict the very nature of their purpose, to quickly attend emergency situations.</p>		
<p>Based upon residents having an unrealistic one vehicle per household, and excluding visitors, trades, business and school parking, the development would require a minimum of 1200 parking spaces. Both avenues already have insufficient on-road parking and opening even pedestrian access would cause disruption and safety concerns, we want our children to continue to play out safely in the Avenues with ours neighbours children.</p>		
<p>Planning Brief documentation describes the opening of access to/from Weirdale as: 'disused pedestrian access, former access, and 'Reopening the Weirdale Avenue access to pedestrians and cyclists'. It must be noted that the access has never been a public pedestrian or cycle access route. When the site was home to a previous commercial business (STC/Nortel) it was only ever a security guarded access point for walking employees only, never vehicles.</p>		
<p>In the 1960's there was a proposal by STC to widen their entrance to enable access for vehicle traffic, but this was rejected by East Barnet Urban District Council, primarily on the grounds of increased traffic in Ashbourne Avenue and Weirdale Avenue, together with problems in turning into and out of Russell Lane. However, in the 1960's there was far less traffic and most vehicles were considerably smaller</p>		
<p>The access has never been open a 'public access' route.</p>		
<p>I have lived in Weirdale Avenue all of my life, some 36 years, with my parents buying this home 4 years prior to my birth. The great appeal for my parents moving to Weirdale Avenue was peace, quiet and tranquillity that came with the no through traffic road. Even today, these great attributes appeal to new neighbours wanting the great character on offer. The new housing proposal is</p>		

Summary of Response	Council Reply	Action
<p>unfortunately, in my view, inevitable as new housing is required for many. However, I feel that access to this new estate via Weirdale / Ashbourne Avenue would be a mistake. It would completely ruin the quality of life for the current residence. The extra traffic would cause issues, not to mention parking problems.</p>		
<p>I am concerned about the proposed Emergency and Pedestrian access from the North of the site through Weirdale and Ashbourne Ave. This would create significant issues for local residents in relation to parking and noise as people will park in the said roads and walk in to the development. The small Roads cannot take any further traffic and it is already impossible to access Russell Lane in Rush hour for scale of traffic.</p>		
<p>I would like to state our objection to having Weirdale & Ashbourne Avenue changed from a residential area to a main thoroughfare</p>		
<p>Objects to the Opening of any kind of access to and from the proposed development site into Weirdale Avenue and Ashbourne Avenue.</p>		
<p>This will not benefit the existing community in any way, rather it will very much not be to our benefit as indicated in my previous comments re the possibility of a useful route for burglars. Should residents of Weirdale or Ashbourne wish to gain access to the NLBP development this can be done via the Brunswick park or Oakleigh road south entrances. People who purchase properties in new developments usually do so with a view to the actual "estate" they will be living on, not because of "connection" to the rest of the community. This plan is very heavily recommending access from Weirdale but it is not in current residents best interests.</p>		
<p>I live directly opposite to the proposed new access. Whilst there was an access here to the STC factory for many years, it was a private works entrance, for pedestrians only, open for just a few hours on weekdays in the morning, lunchtime and evening, and always manned by security personnel. It closed around 25 years ago. To reopen it now, even if only for pedestrians and cyclists, would inevitably result in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Significant increased traffic in Ashbourne Avenue and Weirdale Avenue. - Greater traffic congestion in Russell Lane. 		

Summary of Response	Council Reply	Action
<p>- Residents from the new housing using Ashbourne Avenue and Weirdale Avenue for parking.</p> <p>- Potential "rat-runs" being created between Ashbourne Avenue and Oakleigh Road South / Brunswick Park Road if there was access for "emergency" vehicles, because the restricting bollards would soon get damaged / disappear, which would allow general vehicular access.</p> <p>For comparison, the relatively recent re-development of the former Southaw School site at the bottom of Russell Lane has resulted in a significant increase in on-street parking, which means that the road is reduced to a single lane when a large vehicle (example the route 125 bus) needs to come past. Both Ashbourne Avenue and Weirdale Avenue are narrower than Russell Lane and cannot accommodate regular heavy traffic and large vehicles. I therefore consider that there should not be any means of access from Ashbourne Avenue to the new development, not even for pedestrians and cyclists.</p>		
<p>Cites increase in burglaries when pedestrian entrance as open.</p>	<p>Upon receipt of a planning application the Council will consult the Metropolitan Police who will consider the merits of the application and offer guidance as to how the scheme can be designed to best meet "secured by design" principles.</p> <p>It is considered that the transfer of the site from a commercial to a (predominantly) residential use could offer greater levels of passive</p>	<p>Para 5.19 highlights that new entrance will need to be consistent with Secured by Design principles</p>
<p>There was a recent (Nov 2015) burglary, therefore against more unknown people walking through our streets.</p>		
<p>Concern over pedestrian and cycle access offering opportunity for an escape route for criminals to and from the site.</p>		
<p>3.18 i am absolutely opposed to the opening of this access. I do not think it will be only pedestrians who use such an access route but people who will leave their cars in Weirdale/Ashbourne to gain access for work or visiting. I feel too that this could prove to be a viable "escape route" for burglars, either from the new residential NLBP or into that area from Weirdale/Ashbourne.</p>		
<p>Crime rate in the area is high, in fact we have recently been informed by our local Neighbourhood team, Barnet and N20 is one of the highest burglary areas. The service roads at the rear of the houses in both Weirdale and Ashbourne are a very vulnerable point to the houses and many burglaries have been committed from this point of entry. Adding an escape route would be detrimental, having foot and cycle access would be a burglar's paradise giving quick and easy access to and from the new development.</p>		

Summary of Response	Council Reply	Action
<p>A pedestrian 'cut through' into Weirdale and Ashbourne Avenues would increase crime opportunity by creating a quick escape route, noise, litter, disturbance, anti-social behaviour. We selected to live in a location with no through vehicle or pedestrian traffic; reversing this will have a detrimental effect on our privacy and quality of life.</p>	<p>surveillance and activity by virtue of providing activity over a longer time period throughout the day and night.</p>	
<p>It would at the same time provide a quick exit from either area to those of criminal intent. Have the views of the police been sought regarding this aspect and will the development be designed to incorporate the present "Secure by Design" standards.</p>		
<p>Further, following a spate of burglaries in both Ashbourne Avenue and Weirdale Avenue (including my own property), I am concerned that creation of a new access point will provide greater opportunities for criminals to operate and escape.</p>		
<p>The possibility that this 'foot and cycle' access will offer better escape route for criminals to and from the site</p>		
<p>Finally, I think criminals would thrive with a Weirdale Avenue link, creating a get away route.</p>		
<p>Approach to re-development: routes and access hierarchy 5.15 The Weirdale Avenue route should be designed to restrict its use so it does not become a through route. Whatever happens if you open any kind of access from this side it will cause an increase in vehicular traffic as "pedestrians" are more than likely to arrive in their cars and park in Weirdale/Ashbourne.</p>	<p>The development proposed on this site is predominantly residential. As such it is considered that the site in the future will be a creator, rather than an attractor of car parking/visitation.</p>	<p>As highlighted above the Brief makes several references to restricting the northern access point to cyclists and pedestrians.</p>
<p>If access is created, this would encourage residents to pave their front gardens and park there.</p>	<p>There are separate planning regulations governing the issue of paving front gardens. This is not within the remit of a Planning Brief</p>	<p>No change.</p>

Summary of Response	Council Reply	Action
<p>The composition of the road would not take any additional traffic, it is not strong enough. We have already had a large area that collapsed close by the proposed new opening.</p>	<p>Issues of wear and tear on the existing road are not within the remit of a Planning Brief</p>	<p>No change.</p>
<p>Roads are untreated in cold weather.</p>		
<p>Fears that opening up for pedestrians will create a precedent for cars later on.</p>		<p>No change.</p>
<p>Foresee in future the residents of the NLBP site seeking for this to be opened up for their own use, effectively turning Ashbourne Ave into a through-route.</p>	<p>In order for the access to change in the future, a new planning application would be required. This Planning Brief or any successor document will be an important consideration in making a decision.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
<p>Due to high levels of elderly residents, there is a greater than normal risk to health due to elevated vulnerability.</p>	<p>DM3 of the Local Plan states that new developments should exhibit the highest standards of accessible and inclusive design</p>	<p>No change.</p>
<p>The planning brief refers in several places to access from Weirdale Avenue. This access was ceased in 1983 and was for pedestrians only. Weirdale Avenue and Ashbourne Avenue are narrow residential roads with the added bonus of two sharp bends. There are a number of disabled young people who live in Weirdale who are collected by Barnet transport the present level of traffic because it effectively a cul-de-sac means that it is safe environment for them to be to develop their independent roads skills with minimum risk any attempt to use the access on the northern boundary for access is likely to increase traffic considerably, particularly as cut through to avoid the congestion that occurs in the morning at the junction of Oakleigh Road North and Russell lane, and in the evening at Brunswick Park Road and Russell Lane, where traffic has already been severely impeded by parking from the development of 188 homes on the former college site. Further problems are envisaged in these roads if the parking of commercial vehicles are prohibited on the new development. The term</p>		

Summary of Response	Council Reply	Action
<p>“permeability” is used several times referring to movement from the outside onto the estate and vice versa.</p>		
<p>Equally the steep incline from the lower part of the site to Weirdale Avenue will provide a severe physical barrier for access to those in wheelchairs, mothers with pushchairs and the elderly.</p>		
<p>Access onto Weirdale/Ashbourne Avenue would negatively impact on traffic. Pedestrian / cyclist access has the potential to lead to increased traffic associated with school drop off and residents from the new development utilising already crowded street parking in Weirdale/Ashbourne Avenues.</p>	<p>The expanded school will require a school travel plan, which will be required to demonstrate how journeys will minimise their effect on the local area.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
<p>Greater burden on already limited parking and increased traffic if the access is used for dropping off and picking up students</p>		
<p>Opening up access will turn Ashbourne Avenue into a drop-off point for schools and quick visits to the development.</p>		
<p>Opening Ashbourne Avenue will increase local parking pressure due to the numbers of people who wish to use the facilities on the site.</p>		
<p>The possibility of residents of new development using Ashbourne Ave & Weirdale Ave to park as this is the furthest point from existing access roads</p>		
<p>Even if the access was for pedestrians only, there would more than likely be parents dropping off their children at this point to save driving around to the main access points for the school, creating a cut through for the children. This would result in traffic chaos in both Ashbourne and Weirdale Avenues. These small roads are simply not able to cope with the increase in traffic.</p>		
<p>How long will it take parents of pupils attending the school to discover that they could drop them off at this proposed entrance for them to walk through when there is congestion on Brunswick Park Road? Thus causing chaos in small and narrow residential roads.</p>		
<p>Could lead to parking permits being required to park outside our own homes.</p>	<p>The new development will be subject to parking standards as set out in the Council’s Local Plan.</p>	
<p>Another issue I can foresee is parking. Parking is already showing signs of strain in Ashbourne and Weirdale Avenues. Having such a high amount of residence in this new estate will create parking problems that will overspill into both Avenues.</p>		

Summary of Response	Council Reply	Action
	<p>Additionally a Transport Assessment demonstrating what effect the development will have on its neighbouring area, and how any effects will be mitigated.</p>	

Concern over construction traffic (all local residents)

Summary of Response	Council Reply	Action
A proposed development of this size, together with the re-siting of the refuse lorries and recycling centre in Oakleigh Road South, which again is not a big road for the amount of traffic, is a recipe for chaos.	Construction traffic is an issue with any type of large-scale development, and the Council will require a construction statement to accompany any planning application to ensure adverse effects are managed and mitigated appropriately.	Para 5.17 makes reference to managing the impact of construction
No mention is made of whether construction traffic would be permitted to utilise vehicular access. The noise, associated dust and dirt and vehicular would be intolerable.		
Ashbourne and Weirdale Aves are not designed in such a way that make them suitable for construction traffic.		
Additionally, I fear that the developer could use this entrance in connection with building activities, with resultant noise and general pollution.		
The possibility that Comer will allow the use of access for heavy building traffic		
Concern over use of Weirdale Ave access for heavy building traffic.		

Support for retention of the existing pond on the site

Respondent	Summary of Response	Council Reply	Action
local resident	Would like to see retention of the pond.	The biodiversity value of the pond has been assessed, and is not sufficient to justify retention on this basis. It is recognised as being a significant landscaping asset, and that it may have value as part of flood management on the site, and will be retained for these purposes.	Paras 4.3 and 5.14 support retention of the pond.
local resident	Wishes to ensure that there is adequate consideration of the impacts on local wildfowl.		
local resident	Proposal to lessen the footprint of the pond/lake which will have a Negative impact on wildlife, pond is a breeding site for Geese. Bats nesting on land to the northern edge of site.		
Herts and Middx Wildlife Trust	Of particular concern is the proposal to remove or reduce the size of the balancing pond on this site. This is likely to qualify as UK priority habitat, i.e. eutrophic open water or pond. There is an obligation to protect and enhance UK priority habitats through the planning process. NPPF states that planning policy and decisions; 'promote the preservation, restoration and re-creation of priority habitats, ecological networks and the protection and recovery of priority species populations, linked to national and local targets' and 'if significant harm resulting from a development cannot be avoided (through locating on an alternative site with less harmful impacts), adequately mitigated, or, as a last resort, compensated for, then planning permission should be refused'. Removal of the pond - and any other priority habitats identified - must either be avoided or adequately mitigated or compensated if planning permission is to be given. All proposals should be fully informed by ecological survey.		
local resident	The development will have a detrimental impact on the ecological environment and all the wildlife that inhabits the development site, such as the large flock of Canada geese. I have also seen on the site vixens with cubs, deer, bats, rabbits, slow worms and a wide range of birds that live on the lake and around the site. We can see no justifiable reason for any kind of disturbance to the lake and the bird/wildlife habitat by reducing its size; any such action we are sure would intend to cram in yet more properties for financial gain rather than for the good of the environment.		
local resident	Our garden provides a unique habitat for wildlife. Our ponds are home to all three species of newt including the Great Crested Newt that is currently		

Respondent	Summary of Response	Council Reply	Action
	protected in this country under British and European law. We are certain that the lake in the business park, due to the proximity of our garden, also provides a habitat for Great Crested Newts and it is essential that this water be retained.		
local resident	The Canada Geese resident in the Business Park are also a valuable asset to our local wildlife eco system. They greatly enhance the ambient sounds of our community and would be sadly missed, should the lake be removed.		
local resident	Objects to the proposal will lessen the footprint of the pond/lake The negative impact on wildlife, pond is a breeding site for Geese. Bats nesting on land to the northern edge of site		
local resident	How much green space will be retained? Will the lake be retained?		
Environment Agency	A small part of the south of the site sits on a Secondary A Aquifer and we would therefore like to provide the following comments and recommendations. The proposed development site appears to have been the subject of past industrial activity which poses a medium risk of pollution to controlled waters. We are however unable to provide detailed site-specific advice relating to land contamination issues at this site and recommend that you consult with your Environmental Health / Environmental Protection Department for further advice. Where necessary we would advise that you seek appropriate planning conditions to manage both the risks to human health and controlled waters from contamination at the site. This approach is supported by NPPF para 109	Noted.	Para 6.3 refers to the pond being a Secondary A Aquifer, and highlights that developers should consult the EA
Environment Agency	We recommend that developers should: 1. Follow the risk management framework provided in CLR11, Model Procedures for the Management of Land Contamination, when dealing with land affected by contamination. 2. Refer to the Environment Agency Guiding principles for land contamination for the type of information that is required in order to assess risks to controlled waters from the site. The Local Authority can advise on risk to other receptors, such as human health. 3. Refer to the contaminated land pages on GOV.UK for more information.	Noted.	Incorporated at para 6.5

Concern over the impact of the development on local infrastructure (including traffic congestion) (all local residents)

Summary of Response	Council Reply	Action
Concern over impacts of new 1,200 homes on infrastructure including schools, health services.	It is important that new development is accompanied by new infrastructure. School Place Planning benchmarking shows that the development has the potential to create a need for 1.1 - 1.8 forms of primary school entry, and 0.3 - 0.8 forms of secondary entry. The expansion of the secondary school on the NLBP site will accommodate the additional secondary need arising. The NHS Clinical Commissioning Group were consulted and did not consider that the quantum of growth on a site of this size would directly create a	No change.
1,200 new homes including high and low-rise blocks represent a dramatic increase in population and impact on overstretched infrastructure.		
The around the NLBP site simply does not have the shops, primary schools, GP surgeries, or public transport capacity to cope with the sudden increase in local population, or with the establishment of a new 5-form entry secondary school. Overcrowded buses will become more overcrowded, traffic jams will become more frequent and more frustrating, and waiting times for GP appointment will be even longer than they are at present.		
No provision for additional surgeries, hospitals, primary schools in the plan, they are all oversubscribed.		
The size of this proposal constitutes a vast overdevelopment of the site in relation to the surrounding area. The number of homes between 1000-1200 is the size off a village. I don't believe that the current infrastructure, i.e. G P surgeries, other health services, social care services & primary schools can cope with a possible further 2,500 residents. This as well as the developments at Sweets Way and along the High Rd between Whetstone and Finchley is creating an overpopulated borough that cannot currently cope with the demand for services and educational provision.		
I strongly object to the proposals and have set out my concerns in relation to the planning application also. The suggestions for development are far too dense for the area and the local infrastructure cannot support such a proposal.		
1200 new dwelling are far too many for the area, there are already in excess of 700 new dwelling in the process of being developed in the Finchley /Whetstone area. Although we need housing, people also need a quality of life unless we intend to return to the days of slums!		

Summary of Response	Council Reply	Action
<p>There is no evidence of any infrastructure to support the additional population, i.e. Doctors Dentists, Primary schools. Local services are already stretched and Barnet General Hospital is just not big enough to cope, Finchley Memorial is often packed to capacity having to turn people away. I understand that the Community Infrastructure Levy is supposed to provide this and Barnet Council will receive many millions of pounds from this development. From past experience of previous local developments, it is not obvious that the money has been spent this way, and as this money is not “policed” I have grave concerns.</p>	<p>necessity for a new doctor’s surgery. Additionally there was not an identified shortfall in current provision in this area. The onus will therefore be on existing surgeries in the area will increase the number of doctors to meet the growing demand from the development.</p>	
<p>Objects to greater burden on local primary schools and local health services.</p>		
<p>I trust you have made some infrastructure agreements with the developers who seem to be quite happy to flood the area at any cost. I see there has been no mention of parking arrangements or extra doctors, schools etc. Waiting time at a doctors is two to three weeks.</p>		
<p>Locals cannot get children into local schools which is a disgrace in itself. This is without the new town of flats that you have and are building in Finchley High Road. Not very practical to keep swamping areas without the infrastructure backing.</p>		
<p>There also appears to be no provision for a medical centre/doctors' practice. Local doctors are already under severe pressure.</p>		
<p>Concern over creation of an increased burden on already limited parking by new residents/ visitors to the site.</p>	<p>The impacts of traffic generated by the new homes and expanded school at the NLBP site will be fully examined within the Transport Assessment (TA) that will need to accompany any planning application for</p>	<p>The applicants TA will need to demonstrate that the travel impacts of the new land uses can be accommodated by the local transport system,</p>
<p>Concern over increased congestion creating increased pollution.</p>		
<p>Concerned about impacts of additional traffic on Brunswick Park Rd</p>		
<p>Assuming that 85% of residents have up to 2 cars this will equate to a further 2400 cars on the local roads leading to more congestion and pollution.</p>		
<p>Local roads cannot handle the increase in traffic, will cause unacceptable congestion, and be dangerous for pedestrians.</p>		
<p>The development will put unacceptable pressure on local public transport.</p>		

Summary of Response	Council Reply	Action
<p>The surrounding roads would really struggle with the extra traffic at peak times. The residents in Weirdale and Ashbourne are worried about traffic overspill using the roads.</p>	<p>re-development of the site. The assessment will take account of the net impact associated with the loss of trips related to the existing site, against those added by the proposed development.</p> <p>The Council will apply its Local Plan residential parking standards to this development. residential uses will be applied in line with the London Plan</p>	<p>and where any improvements are shown to be necessary, then either the developer will be obliged to deliver these mitigation measures under the supervision of the Council if adjacent to the North London Business Park, or if in the surrounding area, contribute suitable sums to the Council and / or Transport for London to ensure delivery by them.</p>
<p>OF COURSE IT WOULD BE BENEFICIAL FOR ALL CONCERNED IF BUS SERVICES COULD BE IMPROVED. HOWEVER, I DO NOT SEE HOW INCREASING THE NUMBER OF RESIDENTIAL DWELLINGS IN THE AREA WILL ALLOW FOR A BETTER BUS SERVICE AS THE OBVIOUS IMPACT ON LOCAL TRAFFIC WILL BE EXTREMELY DETRIMENTAL TO THE WHOLE AREA.</p>		
<p>The traffic in the area often comes to a standstill, especially at peak times without all the extra vehicles from these new properties. Pollution and noise increase making our already dangerous roads even more deadly.</p>		
<p>The density of the development will result in increased traffic when local roads, particularly Russell Lane, Oakleigh Road North and Brunswick Park Road, are already seriously congested at busy times.</p>		
<p>The development is so large it will result in a substantial increase in traffic on local roads which are already over-congested, polluted and very unsafe for pedestrians and cyclists, in particular Russell Lane, Oakleigh Road (north/south), Brunswick Park Road and Osidge Lane, Church Hill. Local public transport could not accommodate such an increase in the local population. In order to travel to school, my child frequently has to wait longer than necessary as several buses arrive at the bus stop already full to capacity before she can board one. She has to leave home far earlier than she should reasonably need to, in order to ensure she is not late for school.</p>		
<p>The current proposal for a substantial residential development will place a very severe pressure on the local infrastructure. The main road network is already under considerable pressure at peak times, if as has been suggested 1200 homes are created even greater pressure will be placed on a finite resource that is already struggling. Reference is made to the lack of recent developments in the area, this is however ignoring the development at the bottom of Russell Lane and the development of the Sweets way site which is imminent. Furthermore Northway</p>		

Summary of Response	Council Reply	Action
<p>House on the High Road is currently undergoing conversion from offices to residential as are various properties down the High Road towards Tally Ho. This also ignores the substantial development that took place on the former STC Bowls Club site on the other side of the railway to the site under consideration.</p>		
<p>I am also concerned that a development of this magnitude will result in considerable increased traffic on the already crowded roads in this part of Barnet, with resultant worse congestion, noise and pollution.</p>		
<p>We are concerned that the local road infrastructure will be unable to cope with the increase in population and their vehicles. Currently parking in Brunswick Crescent has been detrimentally affected by Barnet Council vehicles being forced to park on local roads. It is sometimes impossible to park near to our own property and the increase in residential houses on the Business Park will only lead to further parking congestion along our small road. The local roads, in particular, Brunswick Park Road, leading north past the cemetery, are already difficult to drive on at peak times due to the narrowness of the road and congestion caused by vehicles. Adding even a small number of residential properties on the park, will only add to this congestion.</p>		
<p>Assuming that 85% of residents have up to 2 cars this will equate to a further 2400 cars on the local roads leading to more congestion and pollution. The possible greater risk to pedestrians</p>		
<p>Will there be substantial parking facilities on the site for all of the properties being built?</p>		
<p>I would ask that the maximum amount of parking possible be stipulated in the new plan. As a resident of Brunswick Park Gardens I note that there is a tendency at the moment for workers at the site to park in neighbouring roads - which, given that there are so many parking spaces currently on the site, is quite unfair. Any development which takes place in the Business Park must be self-sufficient in parking - indeed, I would ask that any development should in fact make a contribution to the parking needs of the area by providing public-accessible parking areas.</p>		
<p>1200 units and approx. 4,700 residents is equivalent to adding a new village in an</p>	<p>It is important that new</p>	<p>No change.</p>

Summary of Response	Council Reply	Action
<p>already densely built up area. This will place further strain on the local infrastructure in terms of healthcare, primary schooling, dental services, existing services supply and in particular, sewage and waste.</p>	<p>development is accompanied by new infrastructure.</p>	
<p>There is no evidence that proposed sports facilities for the school will be available to the local community.</p>		
<p>Amenities The development will have a detrimental impact upon local amenities. There are currently insufficient public services such as GP surgeries, nurseries, schools, dentists, health centres etc. There are no obvious plans in the development proposal for the provision of a vital public service and amenities infrastructure to support this increase local population, which also takes into consideration all the other developments in the area such as Sweets Way, Beresford Avenue, and many more across Barnet. Why is there nothing in this development that supports and enriches the lives of the current local residents such as open space, social, leisure, sport, and retail and community amenities? There is mention of sports and gym facilities but these are clearly to be used and managed by the proposed secondary school.</p>	<p>School Place Planning benchmarking shows that the development has the potential to create a need for 1.1 - 1.8 forms of primary school entry, and 0.3 - 0.8 forms of secondary entry. The expansion of the secondary school on the NLBP site will accommodate the additional secondary need arising.</p>	
<p>Presumably much of the accommodation will be appropriate for families, therefore it is reasonable to assume there will be a need for more school spaces. As a long term member of the Schools Forum I am fully aware of the pressures that have been placed on schools in the borough to accommodate normal child population growth and in particular the need for local primary places. Almost all schools have now been encouraged to create additional classes to absorb the growth in numbers over recent years to such an extent that there is very limited opportunity for further provision. The education proposals submitted with the outline planning application refers to children being placed in neighbouring boroughs of Enfield and Haringey. I am aware that the proposed primary school to be built at Ashmole Academy is already being claimed as providing much needed places for Enfield children since their school places are under as much pressure as Barnet's. Queenswell, and the other schools at the High Road end of Oakleigh Road will have the pressures of the new development at Sweets Way to deal with, and</p>	<p>The NHS Clinical Commissioning Group were consulted and did not consider that the quantum of growth on a site of this size would directly create a necessity for a new doctor's surgery. Additionally there was not an identified shortfall in current provision in this</p>	

Summary of Response	Council Reply	Action
Brunswick Park has already been expanded. Therefore to permit a development of this size without proper education provision for primary age children could be deemed irresponsible.	area. The onus will therefore be on existing surgeries in the area will increase the number of doctors to meet the growing demand from the development.	
The proposed scale of development is unrealistic given the current level of infrastructure. Roads, buses, shops, health services, parks and public transport are already overloaded, and will not be able to cope with the additional population.		
Whilst I understand that a new school is proposed, there is no mention in the plans for increased provision of health facilities. Considering that 1,200 dwellings are projected, so this will create an increased burden on existing services.		
The pressure on parents to find appropriate schooling for their children is intense in this area, as each year catchment areas grow ever smaller.		
An increase in families on the park, without equal and appropriate addition of both Primary and Secondary, nondenominational and nonselective school places, will only intensify the strain on the current local school provision. It is unrealistic to suggest providing up to 1600 new residential properties on the park, without the equivalent expenditure on Primary and Secondary school provision, would be a viable decision by the council.		
I also think that medical practices and schools would also become strained with this new development.		
What are the additional proposed educational facilities to be built? Will the additional local transport and healthcare needs be satisfied and how?	Development will not be permitted to commence unless the sewerage it creates can be demonstrated to be safely handled by the sewer network.	No change.
The development of the NLBP will also have a double impact on drainage and sewerage provision in the area, as not only will so many new homes create additional demand on the drains and sewers, but the loss of considerable areas of green space will prevent the natural absorption of rainwater and create even more run-off		
It will create more noise, light and dirt pollution	Local Plan policies will be used to ensure this	No change.
Object to the creation of more noise, light and dirt pollution.		

Summary of Response	Council Reply	Action
Concern over impacts of new 1,200 homes on light, noise and dirt pollution.	development is completed in a manner which mitigates these issues appropriately.	
What sporting facilities will be built to encourage healthy living amongst the community?	There will be a requirement for new facilities to be available for the community outside of school hours.	Para 2.10 highlights importance of reprovision of sports facilities
The sports/playing fields that border Weirdale Avenue are described as 'over grown / lack of management' in the planning brief. It must be noted that up until some years ago it was a fully functioning sports facility, until the land owners (Comer) withdrew the permission for the rugby club to use the facilities. Since then it has intentionally lain dormant and unmanaged. An older neighbour informed me that this area was historically bequeathed to the community to be kept as open public space to be used for play/sports activities. This should be fully investigated.	This area of land does not have an open space designation, and as such it is not exempt from being part of the redevelopment.	No change.

Impact on local amenity/ Height/ Quantum of development concerns

Summary of Response	Council Reply	Action
Gross overdevelopment in an already overpopulated area.	The Planning Brief seeks to establish what the policy framework for the development of the site should be.	No change
The proposed high-rise construction would be out of character with the existing area, and should not be allowed. Any development of the NLBP site should provide for natural environmental screening between any new housing and the existing surrounding residential streets by planting more trees.	Potential density of development will be in line with the London Plan's density assumptions. It is recognised that the density of new development is generally greater than that of existing housing, but the Council feel this is justified in order to help to meet housing need.	Brief highlights at para 5.12 that tall buildings not supported at this location.
Proposal to build to levels of 8-11 storeys is excessive, recent press coverage of research indicates that high rise blocks are not conducive to building cohesive communities. This will impact negatively on the outlook for homes bordering the northern border of the site	The Local Plan's tall buildings policy states that heights above 8 storeys will not be acceptable.	As above
High rise development is not appropriate in an area 2/3 storey high.	The Planning Brief clearly shows that the interfaces with nearby existing 2/3 storey residential areas should be designed in such a way that it protects neighbouring amenity. From there, density should be increased towards the railway line. The Local Plan's tall buildings policy states that heights above 8 storeys will not be acceptable.	As above
The proposed development is out of keeping with its immediate environment and the proposed properties are too high. The so-called low rise development adjacent to Weirdale Avenue will overlook and dominate the local two storey homes.	The Planning Brief clearly shows that the interfaces with nearby existing 2/3 storey residential areas should be designed in such a way that it protects neighbouring amenity. From there, density should be increased towards the railway line.	No change.
The proposed development is far too dense, most of the buildings are too high and near existing properties.	Potential density of development will be in line with the London Plan's density assumptions. It is recognised that the density of new development is generally greater than that of existing housing, but	No change.

	the Council feel this is justified in order to help to meet housing need.	
11 and 8 storey buildings are in effect high rise/ tower blocks! The government recently published research that states that high rise buildings do not encourage cohesive communities. Looking towards the site from the north at Hampden Sq. the current buildings already dominate the skyline and they are only 3 storeys high. 8-11 storeys will over shadow everything that surrounds the site!	The Local Plan's tall buildings policy suggests that heights above 8 storeys will not be acceptable.	Brief highlights at para 5.12 that tall buildings not supported at this location.
The height of the buildings proposed gives great concern and will destroy existing views and bring a sense of crowding.	Potential density of development will be in line with the London Plan's density assumptions. It is recognised that the density of new development is generally greater than that of existing housing, but the Council feel this is justified in order to help to meet housing need.	No change
I would also like to mention I am concerned with scale, height and number of units proposed together with number of parking spaces most households will have two cars. Are they planning to provide in excess of 2000 spaces?	Parking space levels will be determined in line with DM17 of the Local Plan.	No change
The height of the proposed flats surely goes against government recommendations. 11 stories high is completely out of character with the surrounding area there is nothing nearby that is comparable. Whetstone High Road is the nearest site of anything that high.	The Local Plan's tall buildings policy suggests that heights above 8 storeys will not be acceptable.	Brief highlights at para 5.12 that tall buildings not supported at this location.
The proposed 8-11 storey high rise buildings will impact on views, overlook existing / new lower rise properties and is out of character for the surrounding area.	As above	As above
The density of housing has yet to be determined, but from the planning information submitted by the current owners of the NLBP it would seem to be excessive and	Potential density of development will be in line with the London Plan's density assumptions. It is recognised that the density of new development is	No change

<p>not in keeping with the local area. The current development provides, and in the past provided an even greater floor area, with a low impact on the visual views of the site from all directions. To achieve the level of occupation currently being suggested in the contemporaneous Planning applications by the present owner substantial High rise blocks are being proposed. Were such proposals permitted this would be out of keeping with the surrounding low level housing that forms the majority of the north, east and southern borders. Any construction in excess of the height of the present buildings would be very out of scale and inappropriate.</p>	<p>generally greater than that of existing housing, but the Council feel this is justified in order to help to meet housing need.</p>	
<p>Currently enjoy an unspoiled view of London down Ashbourne Avenue, and believe this will be obliterated by the development.</p>	<p>While every attempt to ensure there is appropriate protection of amenity for neighbouring properties, there is no safeguarded right to a view in planning policy.</p>	<p>No change</p>
<p>Agree with the principle of only being low density along all neighbouring perimeters. Should be no higher than surrounding area.</p>	<p>Support is noted. The Brief highlights that height should transition from lower, where it interfaces with surrounding residences, to its highest point adjacent to the rail line.</p>	<p>Paras 5.7 and 5.11 address transition from low densities to higher densities</p>
<p>Object to the excessive size of the development in area, height and number of properties.</p>	<p>It is considered that the planning brief strikes an appropriate balance between enabling much needed new housing, and protecting the amenity of local residents.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
<p>The proposed height of the buildings adjacent to Weirdale Avenue also gives me cause for concern. Reference the development on the Southaw School site, which I have mentioned earlier, the new buildings there are totally out of character with the surrounding 1930's housing, particularly in their height, and I consider that</p>	<p>As above</p>	<p>No change.</p>

<p>this must not be repeated with the NLBP housing where it adjoins existing properties. Consequently, I consider that the overall height of the buildings on the north part of the site must not exceed those of the existing 1930's Weirdale Avenue properties.</p>		
<p>We are concerned that the proximity of so many residential properties will adversely affect the noise in our garden particularly in the evenings and at weekends. We are concerned about traffic noise and pollution as currently there is only a small access road adjacent to our boundary. The increase in residential traffic would be dramatic, and would lead to a huge increase in noise and pollution.</p>	<p>As above</p>	<p>No change.</p>
<p>Brunswick Park is a residential area with many properties dating from the beginning of the last Century. The character of the area with its Victorian and Edwardian properties, low level terraced houses and tree lined avenues, does not suit the proposed development for high rise properties on the park. We strongly believe that the proximity of 11 story flats to our house and our neighbours' homes, will adversely affect our and our neighbours' property value. Whilst we understand that provision of suitable and affordable housing should be provided in the area, all proposed development should be in keeping with the local character and not be detrimental to it. Low level and low density houses or flats, supported by improved infrastructure, including Primary and Secondary nondenominational school places, medical support and improved transport links would need to be included within any plan to make it a viable option.</p>	<p>Potential density of development will be in line with the London Plan's density assumptions. It is recognised that the density of new development is generally greater than that of existing housing, but the Council feel this is justified in order to help to meet housing need.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
<p>The proposal for 1200 dwellings represents a vast over</p>	<p>Potential density of development will be in line with</p>	<p>No change.</p>

development of the site.	the London Plan's density assumptions. It is recognised that the density of new development is generally greater than that of existing housing, but the Council feel this is justified in order to help to meet housing need.	
Our main concerns are with the height of the 11 storey blocks of flats which will overlook the surrounding houses. During the proposed building on such a scale will create a substantial upheaval with noise, road congestion, disturbance and dirt whilst the work is in progress. The current main road, Brunswick Park Road is a single lane in each direction and the additional traffic from the new developments will create chaos as many residents currently park on this road.	The Local Plan's tall buildings policy states that heights above 8 storeys will not be acceptable.	Brief highlights at para 5.12 that tall buildings not supported at this location.
Density and Building Height - s4.3 and Appendix 3 of the existing plan envisages 3 zones of housing in the current model * Zone 2 - predominantly Housing * Zone 3 - Lower Density Family Housing * Zone 5 - Mixed Use s4.3 of the existing plan envisages that in each of these Zones building height should not exceed 4 Storeys, 3 Storeys and 4 Storeys respectively. I would ask for these stipulations to be retained and enforced. There is also a stipulated maximum density of '50 Units a Hectare'. I am not sure how this applies to the existing plan but would consider this as a useful guidance point.	Potential density of development will be in line with the London Plan's density assumptions. It is recognised that the density of new development is generally greater than that of existing housing, but the Council feel this is justified in order to help to meet housing need.	No change.
Addressing Neighbour Impacts - s4.8 of the existing plan makes extensive reference to the impact of overshadowing on the residents of Weirdale Avenue, Linden Road, Pine Road and Brunswick Park Gardens and the need to 'particularly respect property that	It is considered that the planning brief strikes an appropriate balance between enabling much needed new housing, and protecting the amenity of local residents.	No change.

borders the site where there are small south-facing gardens, such as Howard Close'. This ties in with the designation of the areas bordering these houses as Zone 3 Lower Density Family Housing with a height limit, as mentioned above, of 3 storeys (which is one storey above the levels of the surrounding housing). I would request the retention of these measures.		
The density of the proposed development is in excess of what in my opinion is reasonable. Infrastructure in the area will not support the further 1200 dwellings. The height of the buildings in the middle of the proposed site are unacceptable and will become an eye sore.	As above	No change.
Proposal for 1200 dwellings constitutes the size of a village! This represents a vast over development of the site.	Potential density of development will be broadly in line with the London Plan's density assumptions. It is recognised that the density of new development is generally greater than that of existing housing, but the Council feel this is justified in order to help to meet housing need.	No change.

Landowner Response


Respondent	Summary of Response	Council Reply	Action
Comer Group	As a document, we support the principle of a major residential development on this site, alongside the provision of a secondary school, small scale retail facilities and some commercial and community floorspace. There are some elements of the Planning Brief however which we feel could restrict the development potential of the site, should the Brief be adopted in its current form, and therefore we request that amendments are made to reflect this.	Noted.	No change.
Comer	Para 1.3 – it is noted that the site was historically used by the	Para 1.3 highlights that there are	See para 1.3

Respondent	Summary of Response	Council Reply	Action
Group	Great Northern Cemetery Company and consisted of a rail head station where mourners walked down 'lime tree' walk to the cemetery entrance on Brunswick Park Road. The paragraph states that the rail head no longer exists, however this sentence should be extended to state that 'lime tree walk' is also now non-existent.	remaining lime trees.	
Comer Group	Para 2.2 (and generally) – the Brief regularly refers to the Strategic Employment Location which the site has previously been identified as through the London Plan. However, it has been demonstrated and agreed through pre-application discussions with LB Barnet and the GLA that this protection should be lifted, due to the site's unsuitability for such continued use. Therefore reference made throughout the Planning Brief to the scheme re-providing commercial floorspace to acknowledge the Strategic Employment designation is wholly inappropriate and contradicts the strategic aims of the redevelopment.	The site is currently designated as a Strategic Industrial Location (Industrial Business Park) in the Development Plan. It is under the assumption that the GLA will accept the de-designation of this site that the Planning Brief is being prepared. While the long-term retention of the existing use is not considered likely, it is important to the Council that an element of employment floorspace is returned to the site after development. This is considered to be in accordance with DM14, and required to meet the aims of Policy CS8.	No change
Comer Group	Para 2.5 – Employment Study – we can confirm that once LB Barnet / Capita vacate the premises in 2017, the occupancy levels will be less than 40%, a high proportion of which will be occupied by the St Andrew the Apostle School. The reasons why the site is no longer suitable for continued employment use have been clearly identified at pre-application stage, agreed by both LB Barnet and the GLA which has led to the Strategic Employment designation being lifted. Therefore to carry out this further study would be entirely unnecessary to	The Brief is clear at para 2.5 why an Employment Study is required. The sites employment designation within the Local Plan and London Plan has not changed. Evidence will be required to support the revision of the designation within the London Plan as it undergoes review.	No change.

Respondent	Summary of Response	Council Reply	Action
	demonstrate conclusions which have already been agreed upon. Reference to the requirement for an Employment Study should also be removed in Para. 4.4.		
Comer Group	Para 2.6 – Range of Unit Sizes – it is welcomed that the Brief acknowledges that smaller flats may help to meet a local need within the Borough, rather than solely focusing on family sized dwellings. There is a proven and growing demand for smaller sized housing in that it widens the market for younger people looking to purchase a property. By virtue of providing a higher number of smaller properties, properties naturally become more affordable and home ownership becomes more achievable for many people.	Noted.	No change.
Comer Group	Para 3.12 – Trees – There should be some reference here to the varying quality of trees which are to be retained, as this varies significantly across the site. Also, some trees fronting Brunswick Park Road (as well as elsewhere on the site) must be removed in order to facilitate the development; however there should be recognition that the overall quantum of trees on the site will be significantly increased.	Further tree assessments are awaited It is considered that there are a selection of positive trees along Brunswick Park Rd, and that while this is an important part of the site providing access to the expanded school, tree removal here should be kept to a minimum.	No change.
Comer Group	Map 3 –identifies boundaries of the railway line to the west and Brunswick Park Road to the east as having ‘severe noise issues’ suggesting in its wording that these may be a significant constraint to development. This wording needs to be softened and we would request that this is amended to say ‘noise sensitive development area’.	Development, while possible, should respond to this constraint through appropriate thickness of windows.	No change.
Comer Group	Map 4 indicates ‘lower density residential’ zones around the northern, eastern and southern edges of the site. Peter	It is agreed that height should transition from lower, where it	Paras 5.7 and 5.11

Respondent	Summary of Response	Council Reply	Action
	<p>Stewart Consultancy (PSC) have reviewed this and believe that a more nuanced approach is appropriate in the area located opposite the end of Howard Close – in their view, this should be identified as a ‘transitional density area’, in which a progressive increase from low to higher density development moving westwards into the site is appropriate. This area differs from others around the edge of the site for two principal reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) The edge condition is different – whereas existing surrounding development presents a consistent and continuous building line to most other edges of the site, there is a considerable gap at the end of Howard Close; and 2) The interface between the higher density, central part of the site and the lower density edge of the site is most keenly felt here; reacting only to one condition is likely to result in a proposal that is unsatisfactory in respect of the other. <p>In respect of point 1 above, the gap at the end of Howard Close in its current state results in a view which has an unplanned and incoherent quality. This presents an opportunity for improvement of the view through a formal visual response on the site.</p> <p>The approach taken in the recently submitted planning application, and illustrated within the Townscape and Visual Impact Assessment (TVIA) submitted with the planning application, is to arrange buildings around an open garden area continuing the line of Howard Close, and to step up</p>	<p>interfaces with surrounding residences, to its highest point adjacent to the rail line.</p> <p>It is noted that at the corner of the site closest to Howard Close there is a significant (assumed unnatural) rising of the land. How this is used is critical to the development parameters.</p> <p>The “zones” approach as set out in the draft Planning Brief is considered appropriate. After the low-density zone, there is generally opportunity to transition to higher building forms. The Council sees no reason to alter its proposed approach around Howard Close, compared to other local residential interfaces however.</p>	<p>address transition from low densities to higher densities</p>

Respondent	Summary of Response	Council Reply	Action
	<p>buildings from heights of three or four storeys adjacent to existing housing, to a maximum height of eight storeys further within the site. The TVIA demonstrates that this approach would introduce a coherent, planned quality to the view, and while the overall scale of the Development would be greater than that of the existing houses, it would not be overwhelming. The trees proposed as part of the landscape design would introduce a leafier quality to the view than exists at present, and would help ease the transition in scale. It is expected that these will be enforced through means of a condition.</p> <p>In respect of point 2 above, buildings in this area of the site will be required to address both the higher density area envisaged within the centre of the site, and the lower density surroundings external to the site. A purely low density solution would not provide buildings of an adequate scale to successfully address major internal routes and spaces within the site, and to relate well visually to the scale of other buildings within the high density area. A purely high density solution could potentially result in buildings of a scale which appear overwhelming in respect of surrounding housing.</p> <p>The approach therefore suggested – and which has been taken in the submitted planning application - is to locate lower scale elements adjacent to the surrounding housing, stepping up to larger scale elements towards the central part of the site. Such a ‘transitional density area’ would provide an appropriate solution to the issues identified above, and has been tested visually and found to be beneficial in its effect in the recently submitted TVIA.</p>		

Respondent	Summary of Response	Council Reply	Action
	<p>We therefore request that these ‘transitional areas’ are clearly identified on Map 4, as per the reproduced figure below, with those areas shaded orange to be identified as such.</p> 		
Comer Group	<p>Vehicular access at the northern entrance to Ashbourne Avenue and Weirdale Avenue is a matter which is being fiercely resisted by residents in this location and currently the biggest single reason for objections to the planning application. The potential for vehicular access at the north has been investigated with LB Barnet highways and it has been concluded that such a vehicular link would not add anything to the scheme. The easy exit via motorised vehicles to the north would be expected to lead to an increase in car use for short trips whereas limiting the access to pedestrian / cycle only would encourage smarter choices and use of sustainable</p>	Noted.	Brief clarifies at paras 3.18, 3.22, 5.18 and 5.19 that the northern access point should be for cycling and pedestrian access only.

Respondent	Summary of Response	Council Reply	Action
	modes.		
Comer Group	Additional traffic using the Ashbourne Avenue connection to the Russell Lane dual carriageway would also introduce additional U turn movements on Russell Lane to the detriment of highway safety.	Noted.	As above
Comer Group	The proposed Pedestrian / Cycle linkage at Ashbourne Avenue will be configured to allow emergency vehicle access and also to allow the opening up to all vehicles should that be desirable in the future.	Noted.	As above

Other Issues

Respondent	Summary of Response	Council Reply	Action
Local Resident	Concern over multiple consultations held by the Comer group, on the Planning Brief, and now on a Planning Application for the site. Confused around having to object twice.	The Comer Group decided to submit the planning application prior to the adoption of the Planning Brief.	No change.
Local Resident	No need for new industrial in the area, particularly in close proximity to residential use.	The Planning Brief is not proposing any industrial uses	No change.
Local Resident	Concern that only high value units will be provided/ fear that no affordable units will be provided.	Local Plan policy on affordable housing and dwelling mix will be applied to any residential proposals.	No change.
Local Resident	Objects to the area NLBP changed into residential land at the whim of Comer and the Council.	The principle of change of use has been considered, and both the GLA and the Council agree that there is potential to provide new homes	No change.
Local Resident	The density of your project leaves much to be desired and will no doubt have an effect on the forthcoming elections judging by the general opinion at this moment	Potential density of development will be in line with the London Plan's density assumptions. It is recognised that the density of new development is generally greater than that of existing housing, but the Council feel this is justified in order to help to meet housing need.	No change.
Natural England	Natural England does not consider that this Consultation on draft Planning Briefs North London Business Park poses any likely risk or opportunity in relation to our statutory purpose, and so does not wish to comment on this consultation.	Noted	No change.
Local Resident	I would like to know the proposed time frame.	This is dependent upon a number of issues including when consent is granted,	No change.

Respondent	Summary of Response	Council Reply	Action
		the developers financing, and hold ups in development. It is likely that development will not commence until 2018, and will take 5-10 years to complete.	
Local Resident	If the NLBP is to be developed into homes the road layout on Oakleigh road north must be addressed, currently it is dangerous at the narrow section between battery road bus stops and Oakleigh close, there are regular accidents there and if anyone parks on the southbound side of the road it forces cars into the middle of the road where there isn't room for two way traffic.	These are outside the remit of the Planning Brief but can be considered as part of the planning application	No change.
Local Resident	The shops near Oakleigh close on Oakleigh road north have terrible pavement and the area should be re-designed and tree planting should be introduced. The large walls on the entrance road to NLBP should be lowered and the new estate become part of the community that can share in the regeneration. Just creating a nice place to live down the road and leaving the end of ORN in its present shoddy condition must not be allowed to happen, this is a once in a lifetime opportunity to improve the area for residents and businesses alike.	As above	No change.
Herts and Middx Wildlife Trust	The plans must take appropriate account of the existing ecological value of the site. The development proposals must demonstrate how they will conserve and enhance biodiversity, in accordance with NPPF. This	Purpose of this Planning Brief is to establish the principals a development must be in accordance with in order to gain planning consent.	No change

Respondent	Summary of Response	Council Reply	Action
	<p>will entail ecological survey of the site and the specification of any avoidance, mitigation, compensation or enhancement measures required to achieve net biodiversity gain. The survey should be consistent with BS 42020 'Biodiversity code of practice for planning and development'. It should show; what is there, how it will be affected by the development proposals and how any adverse impacts can be avoided, mitigated or compensated in order to achieve net ecological gains. Ongoing management proposals to achieve net gain should be described, including the funding arrangements required to maintain ecological gains in perpetuity. NPPF also states that 'opportunities to incorporate biodiversity in and around developments should be encouraged'. The planning brief states that bat and bird boxes may be used to provide beneficial ecological features within the built environment. It is important that such features are positioned in the correct areas, i.e. next to productive feeding and commuting routes, orientated correctly for the species concerned i.e. bat tubes south facing birds north, as high as possible on the building, and most importantly integrated into the fabric of the building e.g. Habitat bat boxes. Free standing boxes are less effective and prone to vandalism or theft.</p>	<p>Further detailed studies should accompany a planning application.</p>	

Respondent	Summary of Response	Council Reply	Action
Hendon and District Archaeological Society (HADAS)	<p>The Draft Brief ought to deal with heritage, as it does with ecological matters. A paragraph parallel to 7.5 is required. Although there are no nationally or locally listed buildings on the site, the Archaeological Desk Study by AB Heritage (submitted with planning application 15/07932/OUT) identifies a high probability that there are buried remains of air raid shelters and of modern industrial activity, and a medium probability that there are remains of features associated with the cemetery that borders the site and the railway that was briefly in use for it, and perhaps also some human remains. The brief should make it clear that any planning permission for development on the site will almost certainly have archaeological conditions (imposed by the Council on the advice of Historic England) attached.</p>	New section added	Paras 6.6 and 6.7 address heritage and archaeology
Local Resident	<p>The area is on a fairly steep hill, and I know from experience that the local land can become very wet and boggy because of the water table. The Lake on site is a holding tank, and any mass development must have a knock on effect on the surrounding areas. The Roads off of Russell Lane from Beresford Avenue down all have watery names: - Weirdale, Ashbourne, Thornedene and Dean Road, indicating the high number of streams running deep under them. I</p>	Para 3.15 refers to the need to address ground stability issues	No change.

Respondent	Summary of Response	Council Reply	Action
	understand from the proposed development in 2006 the effect of a major development has a far greater knock on effect and this was a much smaller development.		
Local Resident	The disturbance of contaminated land and the effect to local residents The Standard Telephones was a big contributor to the efforts of World War Two. There needs to be great care and research as to exactly what remains there and what would happen if disturbed.	Contaminated land must be appropriately remediated prior to occupation of the site. Paras 3.16 and 6.5 address contamination	No change.
Local Resident	The effects on the wild life that have taken up residents in the overgrown and neglected part of the site as well as the large community of Canada Geese that reside there.	Para 7.4 addresses biodiversity and the opportunities to increase the site's ecological value.	No change.
Local Resident	The added pollution to the area and the likelihood of rat infestation to the nearby houses when the ground is disturbed.	Environmental Health can address any rat infestations	No change.
Local Resident	We are concerned about drainage and flooding due to the elevation variation of the site and how this would have a long term impact for development properties and surrounding properties in particular those on the other side of Brunswick Park Road.	Flood Risk and Surface Water Management are addressed at para 6.3.	No change.
Local Resident	We understand from neighbours who know the history of the site that there are underground bunkers and a large oil dump located on the site, which will have an impact on local amenities such as drainage and water supply, especially if contaminated. We	Para 3.15 refers to the need to address ground stability issues Paras 3.16 and 6.5 address contamination	No change.

Respondent	Summary of Response	Council Reply	Action
	also have concerns of the proximity to the development buildings in relation to the underground tube tunnels and if this has health and safety issues?		
Local Resident	Anyone who does not have access to a computer (many of my neighbours) and who cannot visit Barnet House is excluded from the Planning Brief Consultation Process, which is not inclusive. I phoned Planning Policy Team on the telephone number listed on the consultation hub / planning brief web page to ask how my neighbours without computers could submit their comments after being on hold for 9 minutes I was told the only option for my neighbours was to attend Barnet house.	The consultation was carried in line with the Council's Statement of Community Involvement. This involved making copies available in Osidge library, and holding a drop in session at the site, to enable people without access to a computer to attend.	No change
Local Resident	All the planning consultations and application information have not been widely publicised and we know some neighbours did not receive letters informing about consultations or the application submission.	The consultation on the Planning Brief was carried out in line with the Council's adopted Statement of Community Involvement.	No change.
Local Resident	An 'Environmental Impact Assessment - Scoping Opinion' was carried out during the Christmas period, which has to be the worst possible time for engagement with the community - unless it was intended to minimise comments and objections?	The EIA scoping process is a technical procedure carried out by the Council, in response to a request from a potential applicant. This is not a public engagement exercise.	No change.
Local Resident	This 'Planning Brief' is being consulted on at the same time that a planning application has been submitted. Both sets of information and processes for residents to comment on	At the time of preparation of the Planning Brief it was expected that the planning application would follow adoption of the Brief. Ultimately, a developer can apply for	No change.

Respondent	Summary of Response	Council Reply	Action
	are not found in the same location on Barnet's website and the response process is different. We know this has caused suspicion and confusion in that some neighbours have responded to the 'Planning Brief' thinking they were responding to the 'Planning Application' and vice versa.	planning consent whenever they like, and the Council has a responsibility to determine it within set timeframes.	
Local Resident	It is unclear what the role of 'Capita' is in relation to managing and decision making in the consultation and planning application process. We are sure that they do not have Barnet residents or their borough's welfare, interests and future as their concern or priority.	RE (Regional Enterprise) Limited is a joint venture between Capita plc and Barnet Council. RE is responsible for delivering planning services in Barnet.	No change.
Local Resident	The NLBP has been a centre for employment for the area for many years, the opportunities for employment will be considerably reduced if the proposed brief is adopted. Jobs will be created short term in the building industry but in the long term the opportunities will be severely diminished.	The quantum of replacement employment is considered appropriate, and will enable all firms who remain on the site to be accommodated in the new development.	No change.
Local Resident	The site is designated a brown field site following its use for a prolonged period for industrial uses. It is well known locally that various practices were adopted during the Second World when the site was used for secret military and wartime production. Radioactive materials, chemicals etc. were used on site, substantial quantities of waste oil (3 years of production) and other materials were dumped in areas - the oil was	Para 3.15 refers to the need to address ground stability issues Paras 3.16 and 6.5 address contamination	No change.

Respondent	Summary of Response	Council Reply	Action
	<p>dumped on the playing field area. Under the Playing field were substantial air raid shelters/ workshops able to accommodate the major part of the war time work force (figures vary but between 5000 - 13000 people at the peak). They still existed in 1979 when I first moved to the area and were visible on open days in the 1980's when my neighbour and his family worked at STC. The shelters under the playing field were referred to in the 2005 Planning Brief as requiring further investigation as to condition and extent and I note that information has still not been forthcoming. It would seem potentially negligent if permission were granted for development if the full extent and condition of the shelters and contamination were not identified as under recent legislation the owner of the land (future house purchasers) could responsible for historic contamination.</p>		
Local Resident	Family homes are what is required not more overpriced studio and one bed apartments.	Local Plan policy on affordable housing and dwelling mix will be applied to any residential proposals.	No change.
Local Resident	The other aspect of this is given the considerable technical requirements of the site, the open spaces, shared areas and roads there will of necessity have to be an "Estate Charge" or "service cost" to cover these expenses which is likely to be quite high which will impact upon the costs of	This is not within the remit of this planning brief.	No change.

Respondent	Summary of Response	Council Reply	Action
	occupation of the people living on the development.		
Local Resident	The playing field that forms the northern boundary provides a habitat for a variety of creatures. Slow worms have been established here for many years, and often appear in the gardens. Bats can be seen at twilight in the summer months. Both these are protected species and proper and extensive steps should be taken to avoid disturbing their habitats. Reference is made to the number of specimen trees that abound on the site. Could you confirm that a full inventory of trees subject to TPO has been carried out?	A biodiversity and tree assessment will be required alongside any future application.	No change.
Local Resident	The proposal make no reference to the assurances given some years ago to adjacent residents who were assured that there would be a “bund” constructed any development on the NLBP site and abutting properties to reduce noise, impact and privacy. It clear that the development will continue over a period of years and the noise, dust, and additional vehicle traffic will affect our lives considerably.	The interfaces with the existing neighbouring residential properties will be appropriately designed to ensure that their amenity is safeguarded. It is not appropriate in a context of there being limited developable land parcels, and significant housing need to implement “bunds”.	No change.
Local Resident	I am concerned that this consultation is being held at the same time as the Council is considering a full planning application for part of the site, and outline planning for the remainder. The Council itself is in discussions with the freeholder, the applicant	The Planning Brief is not a statutory document, and as such does not have specific consultation requirements. However the consultation was carried out in accordance with the Council’s Statement of Community Involvement.	No change.

Respondent	Summary of Response	Council Reply	Action
	<p>for the planning applications, for the termination of the existing Council leases. This is documented in the Accommodation Options Review - Outline Business Case prepared in June 2015 which clearly suggests that the Council vacate the NLBP in favour of new offices at Lanacre Road, Colindale. It would seem to the lay person that the Planning Brief is not therefore an “at arm’s length” or an “impartial” proposal. The Council stands to benefit considerably from the present situation. Financially an one off amount of £143.00 per square metre of development space e.g. potentially a sum in excess of £10 million, again a sum of in excess of £2 million on an annual basis in respect of Council Tax, and finally surrender of the leases at the NLBP for an undisclosed sum. I believe the Lease of Building 4 has already been surrendered. In view of the above matters I do not believe this consultation meets the necessary parameters for a Public Consultation. Before the general public have had an opportunity to consider the implications in detail the planning brief has evidently been passed to the freeholder in sufficient detail to enable them to prepare an application for full planning permission for a major part of the site, outline for the remainder and the Council has taken decisions based on it</p>	<p>The Comer Group decided to submit the planning application prior to the adoption of the Planning Brief.</p>	

Respondent	Summary of Response	Council Reply	Action
	<p>vacating the premises - decision to build the new offices at Colindale. Whenever a public authority undertakes a consultation exercise in order to discharge its Tameside duties and/or because it is obliged to do so by statute, it must comply with certain established public law principles. These were summarised in R v Brent London Borough Council ex. p. Gunning [1985] 84 LGR 168, at 189:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. That consultation must be at a time when the proposals are still at a formative stage. 2. That the proposer must give sufficient reasons for any proposal to permit of intelligent consideration and response. 3. that adequate time must be given for consideration and response, 4. And, finally, that the product of consultation must be conscientiously taken into account in finalising any statutory proposals. See also R v North and East Devon Health Authority ex. p. Coughlan [2001] QB 213 per Woolf LJ at §108. At §112 he added that the public authority's obligation was: <p>“to let those who have a potential interest in the subject matter know in clear terms what the proposal is and exactly why it is under positive consideration, telling them enough (which may be a good deal) to enable them to make an intelligent response.”</p>		

Respondent	Summary of Response	Council Reply	Action
	<p>Consultees' ability to make an intelligent, informed response will depend on them being given "Candid disclosure of the reasons for what is proposed"(R (Lloyd) v Dagenham London Borough Council [2001] EWCA Civ 533) and sufficient information to understand the impact on them.</p> <p>Whilst public authorities are entitled to be inclined towards one option, or a series of options, over others even when the decision making process is at a formative stage and consultation is occurring they are not entitled to alight on one or more so that other options become, in effect, academic. See R (Montpeliers and Trevors Association) v City of Westminster [2005] EWHC 16 (Admin) at §29 where Munby J stressed that fairness requires "that all the various options be put to the consultees" and, R (Partingdale Lane Residents Association) v the Barnet London Borough Council [2003] EWHC 947 (Admin), [2003] All ER (D) 29, at where Rabinder Singh QC sitting as a Deputy High Court Judge remarked at §47:</p> <p>"Consultation must take place at a stage when a policy is still at a formative stage ... a proposal cannot be at a formative stage if the decision maker does not have an open mind on the issue of principle involved."</p>		
Local Resident	The present consultation on the Planning Brief for the North London Business Park	The Planning Brief is not a statutory document, and as such does not have	No change.

Respondent	Summary of Response	Council Reply	Action
	<p>does not appear to meet the established legal criteria for such processes and places the Council at risk of additional expenditure if the matter is taken to Judicial Review. I set out my reasons below:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The consultation has commenced after the proposed planning brief has been communicated to the freeholder. 2. Insufficient consideration and detail has been provided regarding the local infrastructure, the existing facilities and services and how these needs will be met. 3. The details of the provision of current primary school places in the immediate area is not provided nor is there any indication as to how these will be met. 4. The consultation documents, although on the internet, are not widely available for people without access to the internet. The impact of this development reaches further than just the immediate vicinity. 5. There is an established specialist fauna bats and slow worms which are protected species which must be dealt with but the extent to which their environment extends is not recorded or identified. In the case of the latter I would suggest that the entire northern boundary and some of the top playing field provide their habitat. 6. There appears to be direct link between LBB vacation of the offices and the 	<p>specific consultation requirements. However the consultation was carried out in accordance with the Council's Statement of Community Involvement.</p> <p>The issue of school places is addressed at para 3.29</p> <p>Para 7.4 addresses biodiversity and the opportunities to increase the site's ecological value.</p> <p>The issues of attracting tenants to the site are highlighted in the Planning Brief. The Council is a major tenant which intends to vacate NLBP in 2017.</p> <p>The Comer Group decided to submit the planning application prior to the adoption of the Planning Brief.</p> <p>The planning application will be considered with regard to issues raised within representations. Documents such as this Planning Brief and our local policy framework – the Local Plan are important considerations. Barnet's Local Plan was adopted in 2012 and has been subject to extensive public consultation, scrutiny and examination.</p>	

Respondent	Summary of Response	Council Reply	Action
	<p>redevelopment of the site which is not referred to although documented in other Council papers.</p> <p>7. The proposals have been in the pipeline for a considerable number of months, but only now are the residents being consulted.</p> <p>8. The proposed use of the disused Northern access point to Weirdale Avenue does not have regard to the effect on these roads or the inhabitants.</p> <p>9. The scale of the proposed permitted development appears out of scale with the surrounding areas.</p> <p>10. This is a major site for redevelopment and as such the consideration should be for the long term needs of the immediate community and the borough as a whole not for the short term financial gains of the few who will move on, because insufficient time and effort was given to properly thinking through the needs.</p> <p>As a resident who will have to live with the development, noise and dirt for the next ten years and whatever is built for eternity I am feel that residents have been excluded from the decision process, the outcome has already been decided and that the consultation process is a sham; hence the Planning Applications currently being considered.</p>		

Respondent	Summary of Response	Council Reply	Action
Local Resident	Lack of detail to comment on what is proposed – no density – no heights – no distances.	The Planning Brief sets the guiding principles for development on this site; it therefore does not go into details.	No change.
Local Resident	When the Business Park was developed, for commercial use, our property suffered from subsidence due to land movement. This was caused directly by the building work on the park. Further building work could therefore undermine our property and cause further damage and destabilisation.	All future development will be required to be built in such a way as it does not affect the foundations of surrounding buildings.	No change.
Local Resident	The Comer Group do not maintain the boundary to our property effectively. There are many large gaps in the rotten fence that allow animals and people to enter our property from the business park. On at least two occasions the police have followed people onto our property, as they have been able gain easy access to our garden from the business park. We are concerned that the proposed creation of thousands of residential properties on the business park will further undermine the security of our land and residence. We do not wish for our garden to become a local escape route for North London criminals.	The Council consider that this is a civil issue to be taken up directly with the Comer Group as landowner.	No change.
Local Resident	We are also concerned that the proximity to our garden of the sports pitch for St Andrews' Secondary School will also lead to security issues if our boundaries are not properly reinforced.	This issue is not within the remit of the Planning Brief	No change.
Local Resident	The trees that form part of this boundary are	The Council consider that this is a civil	No change.

Respondent	Summary of Response	Council Reply	Action
	<p>also currently causing damage to the side of our house and the roof as these are not maintained by The Comer Group. Over hanging branches from the many trees and shrubs are also reducing the light in our garden. We appreciate the natural boundary and the habitat that these essential plants provide for the wildlife, but we have not seen any proper maintenance of these plants, in the seven years in which we have been in residence.</p>	<p>issue to be taken up directly with the Comer Group as landowner.</p>	
Local Resident	<p>I Oppose the Planning Brief This is a complete change of use for the site. Until now this site has been designated as a Business Park in line with London Planning Policy. The change of use will affect/stop future employment. This is the only Business Park of its kind within Barnet its loss to mainly residential use will prevent medium and large business from moving to the borough. The small business allocation, though welcome will only accommodate small business who will mainly be self-employed. The previous occupant of NLBP employed up to 2000 people. This will not be possible under these proposals and the conversion of the site to mainly residential will lock out all future opportunity.</p>	<p>The quantum of replacement employment is considered appropriate, and as a minimum will enable all firms who remain on the site to be accommodated in the new development.</p>	No change.
Local Resident	<p>Within the proposed Planning Brief the position of the school is only indicated in one place, whereas there are in fact three</p>	<p>In addition to congestion, a range of issues including access, townscape, impact on neighbours, noise and light</p>	No change.

Respondent	Summary of Response	Council Reply	Action
	possible sites. The proposed site is positioned closest to the most residents and where the most traffic congestion will be generated, and is the least favourable position.	were used in selecting this location for the school.	
Local Resident	The Proposed Planning Brief should be delayed while more meaningful Public Consultation takes place. Only one 2 hour public session was offered and this was not advertised except via the Barnet website. Most residents were completely unaware of this session.	The Planning Brief is not a statutory document, and as such does not have specific consultation requirements. However the consultation was carried out in accordance with the Council's Statement of Community Involvement.	No change.
Local Resident	The siting of the school should be part of a separate consultation and this should involve all parties. Most parents of children at the temporary school are unaware of the alternative sites.	This is not considered practical. The whole NLBP site needs to be considered so that the future impacts of the residential development and school on each other can be considered.	No change.
Local Resident	It has also not escaped my notice that the property developers are currently the landlord of the council the current tenants of part of the site and that in my opinion could result in a conflict of interest in relation to the planning permission. I think the application should go to an independent tribunal.	The Council has a responsibility to determine planning applications as the local planning authority. There is no known conflict regarding this site.	No change.
Historic England	Depending on the scale of development proposed, proposals on these sites may affect the setting of buildings and conservation areas further afield. We would therefore encourage you to include a reference in the North London Business Park Planning Brief to setting, as there is 1 Grade	Noted.	Paras 6.6 and 6.7 highlight heritage and archaeological issues

Respondent	Summary of Response	Council Reply	Action
	11 star and 12 Grade II listed buildings, as well as the Southgate Green Conservation Area in the London Borough of Enfield, within 1km of that site's boundary.		
Historic England	This proposed development site is already the subject of a planning application which was supported by an archaeological desk-based assessment. The site has local archaeological and historical interest related to its former uses as part of the Great Northern Cemetery then for the telecommunications industry. While little survives above-ground, there are likely to be substantial below ground remains most notably coal chute tunnels, air raid shelters and possibly 19th century burials. GLAAS has recommended a condition to secure further targeted investigation and recording and would support the draft planning brief's aspiration (paragraph 1.7) for new development to respect the history of the site and explore the potential for the retention of memorials. The archaeological investigations could assist with this objective identifying features that might be retained and/or interpretation provided for.	Noted.	As above
Local Resident	I have lived overlooking the "green field since 1979. From my rear window I can see Ally Pally, Canary Wharf and recently the Shard and Olympic Structure.	This is not a statutorily protected view. While every attempt to ensure there is appropriate protection of amenity for neighbouring properties, there is no safeguarded right to a view in planning policy.	No change.
Local Resident	I have enjoyed the playing of football and cricket on the field and feel that the	Alternative organised sports provision is being provided on the site. The value of	No change.

Respondent	Summary of Response	Council Reply	Action
	development will not only spoil this but also lower the value of my house.	the respondent's home is not a planning matter.	
Natural England	Natural England does not consider that this Consultation on draft Planning Briefs North London Business Park poses any likely risk or opportunity in relation to our statutory purpose, and so does not wish to comment on this consultation.	Noted.	No change.