

LB Barnet Local Plan examination – actions arising during the course of examination - Week 4

Date	Action	Deadline
02.11.22	<p>Court of Appeal Judgment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Council to consider implications of Court of Appeal judgment (EXAM 37) with regards to Gypsy and Traveller sites. 	30.11.22
02.11.22	<p>Note on CDH01</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Council to check consistency between Tables 9 and 10 and supporting text and London Plan requirements – in particular minimum ceiling heights, habitable rooms 13sqm figure, noise requirements. Check all requirements in Tables 9 and 10 against London Plan. Any Barnet requirements require justification. • Check CDH01(v) and Tables 9 and 10 against London Plan requirements and clarify that only compliance with tables will be required. Avoid any issue with National Space Standards being updated. • Check compliance of CDH01(a) with NPPF and Policy D3 of London Plan which apply to all forms of development, not just residential schemes. Check compliance with London Plan requirement to optimise capacity. Reflect on wording in terms of how it relates to NPPF and London Plan, and set out any justification for the different wording. Consider modifications and review the rest of CDH01 and the supporting text for any consequential modifications, particularly the reference to residential. • . Set out any justification for highlighting the detailed matters in the last sentence of part (a) in context of London Plan policy D3. Wording would benefit from a more inclusive sentence (“including” rather than “should consider”). • Consider if final sentence of CDH01(b) is necessary or more appropriate in supporting text. Is it appropriate to state that design codes and SPDs will ensure that resulting homes are of a high standard. Proposed modification to provide clarity on SPDs. Should it say something like, “promote standards” rather than “ensure that” etc.. • Consider wording of CDH01 needing to reflect that SPD and Design Code has not yet been adopted. • Check final sentence at CDH01(vii) – should it be labelled part (c)? e.g. (“the Council will expect proposals to...). • Promoting vibrant streets where appropriate – consider in supporting text examples of where vibrant streets will be appropriate • Check at CDH01(vi) that acceptability threshold is consistent with other policies in the Plan? Eg HOU03 refers to “good standards of amenity”, ECC02 refers to 	30.11.22

	<p>“unacceptable noise levels”. “Adequate”, “good standards” and “unacceptable” are all potentially slightly different.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clarify amenity considerations applying to occupiers of a site. Instead should it seek to protect amenity beyond adjoining occupiers. Impacts on loss of daylight in case of tall buildings might be wider than immediately adjoining occupiers, for example. • CDH01(vii) should this refer to CDH07 not CDH05. CDH07 does not expressly refer to accessible outdoor space. Should word accessible be removed? • CDH01 (viii) why is noise singled out in particular, and not other pollution impacts (e.g. those addressed by ECC02). Provide cross ref to ECC02 in supporting text or elsewhere. • Para 6.5.1 - infill development, presumably not all small sites will involve infilling. Is a modification needed to account for that? • Para 6.7.3 impact on heritage value weighed against benefit from sustainable design and construction requirements. Consider that this be reflected in a policy, and should this cross reference with policy ECC01 and CDH08, instead of heritage requirements being introduced to CDH01? • Para 6.9.2 sets out standards in respect of general internal storage and claims these are in the London Plan. Council needs to identify source for these standards and provide justification if retained. • Para 6.10.2 details impacts of artificial lighting. Consider if this should be reflected in CDH01 in terms of residential amenity or through cross-reference to ECC02 and environmental considerations and management specifically. • MM137 should relate to CDH01B(iv) rather than (v). Consider if para 6.6.1 requires further amendment to make clear that conditions relating to “secured by design” might not be part of every planning consent. A key factor will be the local environment as to whether the police need to be brought in to discuss safety. • MM138 is inclusion of Building Safety Act within CDH01 necessary for soundness? Consider what is meant by clear lines of responsibility. Might be more appropriate to reference in CDH04. 	
02.11.22	<p>Note on Policy CDH02</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Council Note on ECC01 has relevance to CDH02 ie consideration of wording of ECC01 and para 20(d) of NPPF in respect of mitigation and adaptation to climate change. As Note not yet submitted it is opportune to make linkages. CDH02(a) refers to adopting sustainable technology and design principles in accordance with ECC01, as it stands there is no explicit reference to this in ECC01. Similarly, although MM144 has been proposed, CDH02(b) fails to match ECC01 in terms of energy masterplans and supply 	30.11.22

	<p>options. Merits in CDH02 (a) and (b) making appropriate cross-references to ECC01.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Better to say have due regard to instead of accordance with SPD in CDH02(c) and (d). • Clarification required in CDH02(e) about Inclusive design statements to ensure consistency with London Plan Policy D5 requirements. Design and Access Statements not required for all proposals. • Reflect on CDH02(f) and (g) and London Plan Policy D7, if inclusion in CDH02 is necessary, is reference to exceptional circumstances in MM148 needed given that they will be addressed by MM142 and 147.. Clarification required in bringing these all together 	
02.11.22	<p>Note on CDH03</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consider an opening purpose to clarify that development should contribute positively to public realm. • Reflect on signposting in CDH01 and CDH03 to healthy streets indicators. Important to ensure that requirements in this respect are consistent as wording slightly different between them. There may be merits in ensuring compliance with policy T2 of London Plan. • Reflect on CDH03(c) with regards to families and young people. More guidance, potentially in supporting text, required on intentions rather than just “appropriate uses”. • Clarify for CDH03(d) the justification for expecting proposals to use secured by resilient design tool specifically rather than secured by design more generally. Is the intention already reflected by (b)(iv) of CDH01. • CDH03(f) – merits in having a reference to London Plan D8H regarding Public London Charter. Council to clarify public realm and design frameworks to be relied upon. Merits in saying “due regard” rather than “accordance with”. Expansion on that, what these strategies and frameworks are, and where they should be found. • CDH03(g) – clarify what is meant by high quality public art. Consider merits of “consider opportunities to incorporate public art”. • CDH03(h) – clarify status of Legible London. Not referenced in supporting text. Merits in saying “due regard” rather than consistent with. 	30.11.22
02.11.22	<p>Building Regulation Note</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clarify justification for requirements of CDH02 (b) and (c), ie is reference to BREEAM necessary given updates to Building Regulations.. Reference to BREEAM could be considered in this Note or the one on Building Regulations required for Matter 5 	30.11.22
02.11.22	<p>Note on CDH04</p>	30.11.22

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Council to add High Court case R (London Borough of Hillingdon) v Mayor of London [2021] EWHC 3387 (Admin) to Examination webpages • Council to reflect on High Court case with regards to its intended restrictive approach to proposals in areas not identified as strategic locations • Council (subject to reflection on High Court case) to re-consider approach to tall buildings in other potential locations if all criteria of Policy D9C of London Plan and dev mgt requirements of CDH04 would be satisfied. • Representors have specifically highlighted 2 recently adopted Local Plans in London (Lambeth and Brent). Council to review the approaches to tall buildings outside supported locations in those plans. • MM153, MM162 – Further clarification may be merited about why references to Opportunity Areas to be removed. • Evidence required to support approach of MM162 with regards to Major Thoroughfares, North Finchley and Finchley Central • Clarification required on 16 site proposals in Annex 1 that cross-refer to CDH04 but are not within areas supported by CDH04, e.g. East Finchley, High Barnet, and A406. • Clarify Council's intention for those 16 sites and evidence to support that approach • Clarify implications for Matter 10 in terms of capacities and use of Density Matrix. Clarify influence of tall building locations on capacities in the Annex • Review implications of MM162 for GSS08 and GSS11 to ensure no consequential impacts arise. • Clarify what evidence exists in terms of analysis equivalent to that done for A5 and A1000 for other areas of the borough, including accessible locations identified in H1 of the London Plan and where there are existing tall buildings. • Clarify relationship between the Plan, the Tall Buildings Study Update and other evidence, and explain the justification for CDH04 differing from the evidence, including Tall Buildings Study Update outputs such as storey heights, especially pages 30, 31 and 39. • Helpful for Note to include reasoning for excluding broad areas including those identified by representors, e.g. Mill Hill, Hendon Station, North London Business Park, Whetstone and other town centres • Study doesn't provide definitive evidence on suitability of tall building development. It flags further work on visual impact. Clarify if this is to be done through individual proposals. • Clarify if evidence is sufficient to maintain restrictive approach in CDH04(a), particularly where criteria in D9(c) are met? • Clarify role of Characterisation Study from 2010 in supporting Council's approach to Tall Buildings and whether it remains relevant and accurate. 	
--	--	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clarify why New Southgate Opportunity Area (NSOA) identified in CDH04 as not specifically covered in Tall Buildings Study Update. • Clarify within CDH04 rather than through a footnote the appropriateness of NSOA as a location for tall buildings. How should proposals in NSOA be considered in advance of a joint area planning framework • Explain purpose of MM149 and 169 in terms of tall buildings not being a preferred model. Need to clarify what is the Council's preferred method of delivery. If those statements are justified, should they be done in a more positively phrased manner and potentially be supporting text • Despite MM163, CDH04 still unclear on exceptional circumstances for Very Tall Buildings. Council to clarify/provide examples. • Change to para 6.18.5 5 to reflect MM165 required to remove reference to SPD setting out parameters. Needs more emphasis on how SPD would provide guidance, not set out parameters. Potential for more detail to be given to decision-makers on tall buildings outside the locations in CDH04(a). • Consider merits of cross-reference to CDH08 instead of heritage requirements at CDH04(e)(iii) and reference to Historic England guidance. • Clarify CDH04(e) differences with London Plan D9 and highlight these more clearly in policy • • Clarify "possible negative impact" on solar energy generation and is it appropriate to only consider adjoining buildings, or should wider impacts be included too. Re-check London Plan D9. • Para 6.18.2 views from the top of the tall building and intermediate views. Are modifications needed to change this to immediate / "top of". • Explain difference in approach between the Plan and Tall Buildings Update in terms of uses of corridors vs cones for Map 4. • Correct Map 4 discrepancies e.g. potentially exclude Mill Hill and include accurate boundaries of Growth Areas, Burnt Oak, Edgware, New Southgate Opp Area • Make clear whether Map 4 or policy is definitive regarding potentially acceptable locations for tall buildings. • Para 6.18.3 should it be changed to reflect D9 and "addressing", rather than complying with. 	
02.11.22	Add original Tall Buildings Study (published circa 2010) and any other relevant evidence relating to the Plan's tall buildings approach to examination library	30.11.22
02.11.22	<p>Note on CDH05 and CDH06</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clarify what is meant by an extension. Does CDH05 apply just to extensions to existing planning units (e.g. single-story extension), or is it also intended to 	30.11.22

	<p>apply where a building is added (e.g. new dwelling physically attached to a row of terraces).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does CDH06 only apply to basement additions. Considering renaming policy and the hearing at para 6.20. Is policy intended to apply to residential and non-residential development. • In CDH06, where there is no visual impact, is a subordinate approach required? Potentially modify to clarify that this is not always the case. • Reflect on merits of cross-references to CDH01, CDH07, ECC01 and ECC02 for both policies. • Review any overlap between CDH05 and CDH06, tests and thresholds. Ensure consistency with the supporting text (e.g. 6.19.3 “resists” significant adverse impacts on amenity, whereas policy says avoid “adverse impacts”). • Clarify if CDH05(e) is a necessary requirement for non-residential development? • Clarify if necessary for both CDH05(a) and (b) to refer to scale, and other parts to refer to materials. • Should CDH05(b) also refer to very tall buildings. Particular wording and regard to tall buildings, as would potentially involve several planning units being extended/new units being created. • CDH05(i), is this necessary having regard to other parts of the plan, and how will significant cumulative impacts be assessed. What does “environmental quality” mean? • Should CDH06 (h) be modified to ensure consistency with national policy position n.b. para 167 and footnote 55 of Framework. • Thames Water requirements. Is it more appropriate for CDH06 rather than SPD to set out a specific requirement for pumping devices? • As highlighted with CDH01 there is inconsistency with London Plan lower ceiling heights. Review CDH06(f). Clarification of minimum headroom. • CDH06(a) should refer to trees as well as tree roots. Modification to this effect. • Clarify CDH05(e) and CDH06 (b) on amenity space and justify 50% threshold for latter • Wider point for Local Plan MIQ 5(f), use of SPDs. Are modifications needed to say “have due regard”. Does the reference to SPDs at the beginning of each policy suggest that the SPDs have a greater purpose than guidance. 	
02.11.22	<p>Note on CDH07</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review CDH07 for inconsistencies with London Plan, in particular Table 11 and para 6.21.3 as London Plan states that private outdoor space must achieve minimum depth/width, and that outdoor space does not contribute to minimum internal space. 	30.11.22

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Table 11 – justification needed for house outdoor amenity space standards • Clarify how CDH07(a) and Table 11 row 3 works with householder development. • London Plan para 3.6.2 states that amenity space standards are minimums. Council to clarify flexibility in para 6.21.3, provision of internal living space alternatives. Rationale for dropping standards below the minimum. • Council also needs to set out justification for making provision for contributions to outdoor space where minimum standards are not met. Not a clear justification for outdoor spaces other than play spaces. • Consider modification to CDH07(a)(ii) to refer to Policy S4 of London Plan instead of Shaping Neighbourhoods SPG • Council to reflect on cross-reference to future Planning Contributions SPD (MM173). Opportunity to clarify expected contributions within the Plan via detail in appendices including allowance for index linking. • Clarify preference for onsite contributions, make clear that this is the Council's preference in CDH07(a)(iii). • Distinguish in terms of the scale aspect to reflect that provision onsite is not always going to be the best solution, and that contributions in those circumstances might be better. • Consider a modification to ensure that the five criteria in CDH07(b) only apply where hard or soft landscaping is proposed. • Consider benefits of cross reference to ECC06 rather than reiterate biodiversity requirements • Similarly cross-refer to ECC02(a) with regards to sustainable drainage for CDH07(b)(v). • Consider CDH07b(iv) against G7 of the London Plan. Clarify that existing trees of value should be retained (not all trees), and specify what a suitable size and species will be (use G7(c) of London Plan). • Revise CDH07a(iii) to clarify that it only applies where a proposal has been found incapable of compliance with CDH07a(i) or a(ii). Should it not be sub-criterion (iii), but a separate criterion where (a) cannot be met. (iii) needs to be a separate part. • Clarify CDH07(b)(i) “effective amenity and access” and “particular regard to parking areas” Element on parking areas could be clarified in supporting text. Clarify usable space so that for instance parking areas would not be considered a usable space. Danger of focus on parking areas when there may be other areas of unusable space. • Clarify ‘wild gardens’ at CDH07b(ii). Clarity of wording. • Biodiversity Net Gain CDH07b(iii), possible cross-reference to ECC06. 	
--	--	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Follow up on Matter 8 Statement Q6d modification to CDH07(b) • Follow up on Matter 8 Statement Q6g modification on trees and treelined streets to ensure consistency with para.131 NPPF. 	
02.11.22	<p>Note on CDH08</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Council to reflect on CDH08 overall as concern that policy and supporting text are inconsistent with national policy. Consider what it is seeking to achieve in addition to the Framework’s approach and focus on ‘added value’. • Council to be cautious in localising national policy approach. Pitfalls that sometimes wording matters, and a slight reinterpretation of something that is in national policy can have significant effects. Advice is to consider heritage in similar way to flood risk. • Examples given that tests are inconsistent and repetitive in places with CDH08 having separate sections for different types of designated heritage assets. NPPF adopts single approach to harm to designated heritage assets. CDH08 applies slightly different approaches for each type of asset ie listed buildings and registered parks and gardens all refer to para 200 NPPF. Wording differs between sections and there is no rationale for clear and convincing harm reference in this section on heritage assets. • Consider merits of having a structure that states “Proposals will be dealt with in accordance with national policy...”, then some further detail. • CDH08(vii) on conservation areas: unclear whether this is intended to apply just to conservation areas or all designated assets. Justification/clarification for approach needed. • Non Designated Heritage Assets states that Council may identify such assets as a consideration of development proposals. Needs cross-reference to NPPG (18A-040-20190723) to explain that they will be identified on basis of sound evidence. • Table 12 and sub-categories. Clarify inclusion of archaeological priority areas, local areas of special significance’ and areas of ‘special archaeological significant’ and their spatial extent.. Core_05 – Changes to the Policies Map indicates that areas of special archaeological significance are taken ahead without change. Check London Plan for clarification on terminology. • Update Table 12 to account for name changes to heritage assets and make clear that table is not comprehensive in respect of NDHA. 	30.11.22
02.11.22	Note on CDH09	30.11.22

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clarification required on scope Council has to control advertisements for amenity and public safety at start of policy. Reflect that control of advertisements is different from planning applications. • Modify CDH09(b) to make clear that conservation areas are heritage assets (i.e. say “including” instead of “and”, or omit it). • Ensure that tests are accurately recorded in the supporting text (e.g. different thresholds in paras 6.34.1, 6.34.3 and CDH09 (a)). • Should lighting and illumination aspects of (e)(ii) be separated from requirements related to obstructions. Clarify if all ny light pollution intended to be resisted, or unacceptable levels of harm / associated test. Justification needed if all illumination proposed to be resisted • Clarify justification for final para of CDH08 in terms of exceptional circumstances. • Clarify MM185 (as proposed by National Highways). This appears unnecessary. • Clarify MM182 (again as proposed by National Highways) This is inaccurate. Proximity to highway not a criterion, permission from landowner required in every circumstance. • Clarify MM183 as it refers to something that Council may attempt in future. Is it necessary/justified. • Clarify MM184 in terms of guidance provided by the SPD. Consider signposting in CDH09. • Clarify status in para 6.34.6 reference to Council’s Advertising Policy ie planning guidance or about Council land. Is reference merited in CDH09? • Clarify removal of Special Areas of Advertisement Control from Policies Map. 	
3.11.22	<p>Note on Open Spaces</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Para 8.19.1 and GSS13, ECC04 having a more prominent reference to district park and 13 parks needed. Presumably most effective with ECC04 • Provide explanation/methodology for proposed District and Local Park numbers – what evidence used • Plan Review – consider or alternatively touch upon how evidence renewal will be included in review process • Regional park in Barnet – clarify how the London Plan and All London Green Green and other supporting evidence is to be taken forwards in GSS13. Is a stronger commitment to deliver of the park in accordance with BSS01(a)(iv) required e.g. broad map location, commitment to masterplan within identified timeframe, allocation of resources • Justification re provision of indoor sports centres in town centres and reflect that hubs are not in town centres 	30.11.22

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consider if similar approach to MM206 needed for provision of indoor sports and reflect on uses such a gyms • Clarify nature, scale and use of any new buildings in open spaces and make clear that GSS13/ECC04 development will be subject to Green Belt inappropriate development tests where relevant • Consider delivery of sports hubs within Green Belt. Is there a reasonable prospect that these schemes can be achieved (in particular King George V). Draw together committee report etc development to demonstrate that provision in GB is possible having regard to tests at para 149b of Framework • Clarify why 1 district and 13 local parks reflected in policy when EB_GI_01 suggests that 4 district and 29 local parks necessary for geographical coverage • Clarify role of Map 7 – consideration of how it will address quality of green space, in particular explanation of role of financial contributions towards green spaces, both existing and new • Consider signposting to CDH07 re children’s play facilities • Explain why standards in para 10.19.3 on playing pitches and childrens play have been excluded from ECC04(b)(ii) • Explain definition of natural greenspaces – use of 2009 study to be considered • Clarify any new playing pitch requirements • Modification of wording paragraph 10.19.1 and site 45 dev spec to tie into NPPF paras101 and 102. Rethink approach given designation of local green space should not predate grant of permission/creation of space. Consider potential wording with site promoter • Ensure consistency of wording between GSS13 and ECC04 	
3.11.22	<p>Note on CHW01:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Council to bring together evidential basis concerning timeframes and explain why certain strategies working to shorter timescales than the plan period • Clarify “multi-purpose community hubs” as per CHW01c and para 8.3.4 • MM208 – consider whether there is conflict between part C and D of CHW01 and if so address e.g. “support within town centres” • MM206 – wording of modification to refer to three types of locations to be reflected in policy. Consider adding wording to ensure consistency with London Plan S1 • Reflect on CHW01 being prohibitive and restrictive with regard to town centre locations. Look at CHW01c 2nd sentence. 	30.11.22

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clarification re IDP and whether community asset evidence (Implementation Plan 2015 and Strategy 2015) is valid and up to date given locations in the evidence are not necessarily in Growth Areas, district and local centres. Consider consistency with evidence and explain why that evidence not taken forwards in IDP/Plan • Clarification of approach to contributions towards community infrastructure. Opportunity to address this in Viability Note • Clarification of approach to “not suitable” and “not viable” within CHW01 to explain what “not suitable” means. Also consider “not suitable or viable” • Consider modification wording suggested by Avison Young in Hearing Statement for Matter 10 • Remove restriction on primary frontages in CHW01(i) • Reflect on wording and criteria of CHW01 concerning new community infrastructure. • Consider wording, sequencing and potential overlap between various criteria, in particular whether all criteria would need to be met in all circumstances or just (iv) and (v) and how: (i) fits in with (ii) and (iii); Consider whether clear how GSS01 and TOW02 relate to CDH01 for part (i); separation of (ii) with community hubs for consistency with part C; removal of reference to highway and amenity in (iii); consider whether MIM49 should be a main mod; use of “wider national policy requirements ” in (iv) • Consider inclusion of future proofing facilities. Following wording suggested “Having regard to experiences of Covid-19 pandemic, the location of provision of new community uses and facilities in terms of any potential role in deployment for public health purposes in the future should be taken into account”. Include wider review of Plan to be future proofed re Covid-19 • Consider changing CHW01(g) to “support” from “allocate” • Follow up on Matter 9 Statement Q2j and proposed modification on outdoor sports facilities associated with playing fields / pitches. Look at NPPF 99 and ECC04 	
3.11.22	<p>Note on CHW02:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Para 11.1.37 of London Plan – consider scales and types of proposals subject to HUDU model and approach of developer contributions to SPD/appendix to Plan. Following tall building discussions re standards • Health Impact Assessment – modification to confirm why approach justified, including clarification of “larger development proposals” and consistency of definitions of HIA with the London Plan 	30.11.22

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reconsider reference to regard to Sport England's Active Design Principles and whether "due regard" more appropriate than current wording • Review consistency of CHW02(e) and contents of TOW03 in terms of health commitment • Ensure (d) (e), (g) and (h) accurately reflect intentions of CDH03, TOW3, ECC02 and TRC01 – terminology and consistency check 	
3.11.22	<p>Note on CHW03:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consider separating out Council commitments and developer requirements • Parts (b), (c), (f) and (g); and parts (a), (b), (d) and (e) – how they fit together, avoid overlap and duplication • Secured by Design – cover circumstances where consultation will apply / be required. Reflect on relationship between CHW03 and pre-app • Building Safety Act 2022, Fire Safety Act 2021, Fire Safety (England) Regulations 2022, London Plan Policy D12 – consider wording for each 	30.11.22
3.11.22	<p>Note on CHW04:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consider consistency with London Plan HC7 and explain differences and make these clear in plan • Explain intentions behind locations where pubs supported, with reference Night-time economy locations (which supported by London Plan) and Growth Areas. Consider approach to mixed use development, in particular whether further flexibility required • Loss of public houses - clarification on justification and approach to 12 month vacancy period, including consideration of introducing reference to marketing to policy and supporting text (para 7.7.7 in London Plan), and reference to "at least" 24 months marketing, marketing as a pub and not any other use • CHW04(c) - consider how to ensure CHW04 allows for compliance if a community use does not come forward, currently appears to direct immediately to CHW01 • Explanation of which elements of CHW01 apply to CHW04 • Carry through modification to be provided similar to MM210 for Assets of Community Value 	30.11.22
3.11.22	Note setting out anticipated timetable for outstanding actions from Weeks 1, 2 and 3	7.11.22
4.11.22	<p>Note on Site Allocations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Any changes to numbers in site allocations should be reflected in housing trajectory 	30.11.22

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site 5 – consider modification looking at extent of land that is available outside of flood zone 2 and 3 and whether intensification beyond that permitted achievable. 129 units is starting position for the capacity of the site reflecting national approach to flood risk, unless otherwise justified. • Site 6 – investigate what consequential changes, if any, follow from proposed removal of site 6 (maps, figures etc.) • Site 7 – consider changing site name to reflect occupier and / or future proof • Site 7 – use 132 allocation rather than Exam 36 figure (Round down density matrix calculation). Consider whether a more cautious approach should be adopted with regards to current use of upper limit density matrix calculation figure applied to the site, taking account constraints that need to be overcome (including extant permission on opposite side of road and heritage) • Broader reflection on application of central density matrix to all Annex 1 sites (in particular sites 7, 8, 11, 12 and 13) • Site 8 – clarification of which figure for allocation is being put forward and why. Round down to 1009 • Site 8 – consider delivery trajectory for this site (Exam 10), in particular forecast provision of 400 dwellings in first 5 years, in light of no extant permissions at this site and inquiry scheduled for Feb 2023 • Site 9 – investigate what consequential changes, if any, follow from proposed removal of site 9 (same as site 6) • Site 10 – consider whether allocation still justified in light of grant of permission and site being U/C. Consequential changes to be reflected in housing trajectory • Site 11 – clarification of figure for allocation – is 160 units the correct figure ? • Site 13 – clarify why figure has gone down and to review extent of developable area having regard to factors, flood risk in particular • Site 14 – consideration of whether allocation is necessary / justified given permission implemented, and consequential changes reflected in housing trajectory • Include consideration of TfL request for further allocation at Colindale station. Consider delivery and implications of infrastructure delivery options for plan • Site 27 – update to trajectory and consider MM with regards to very tall buildings and consider removal of part in brackets for MM354 • Site 28 – consider revisions to trajectory on basis of developers supply figures. Round down units. • Site 32 – reference East Finchley ward 	
--	--	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Broader reflection within Plan on ward boundary changes • Site 32 – consider whether this should remain in plan or come forwards as windfall. Look at in context of changes made to ECC04 • Hendon Hub sites 35, 36, 38, 40, 41 –confined to information in the public domain, on planning application to be made for these sites / non-issue of planning permissions. Consider impact, if any, on proposed allocation and assumptions for housing numbers • Sites 34 and 39 – Reflect on capacities and consideration of whether developable rather than deliverable • Site 42 – address changes made to allocation in Exam 36. Reflect on whether assumptions of 1 dwelling to 2.5 or 3 student units correct and particularly if the former, whether site capacity realistic • Site 63 – reconsider proposed capacity for site (cf prior approval) in light of site constraints, in particular existing building 	
4.11.22	Provide copy of decision notice, approved site plan and elevation plan for Cricklewood Broadway planning permission (ASDA) (northwest of site 7) as exam document	7.11.22
4.11.22	Provide a map setting out ownership for site 27	30.11.22