

**Barnet Local Plan examination week 2 – actions arising during the course of examination**

Date	Action	Deadline
4.10.22	Barnet to produce a note covering: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Any justification for the “up to” 67,000 m2 office space wording in BSS01(iii);</li> <li>• Consideration whether that figure should alternatively be expressed as a range;</li> <li>• Update and reflect on policy ECY01(a), in particular whether a prefix of “where possible” is needed in light of changes made to the UCO;</li> <li>• Considering consistency between ECY01(a) and (h);</li> <li>• The time period set out in policy ECY01(i).</li> <li>• Review the approach to office safeguarding generally following the expiry of the Article 4 direction and UCO changes.</li> </ul>	14.10.22
4.10.22	Reflect on wording of BSS01 in relation to industrial land and set out Council’s proposed strategic approach in a suggested modification with associated justification.	21.10.22
4.10.22	Produce a note revisiting the approach taken in GSS01 and MM19 in relation to office demand, specifically in the event that Brent Cross development does not come forward.	28.10.22
4.10.22	Note covering retail to encompass the following and including any resultant proposed modifications: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Table 13 <b>Barnet’s Town Centre Hierarchy</b> modification and explanation of change in numbers including addition of Colindale Gardens as a local centre</li> <li>• Policy GSS08 supporting text modifications around Class E and removal of third para. Ensure it is covered in supporting text.</li> <li>• Permeability and design issues regarding GSS08 incorporating cross-reference to Policy CDH03 on Public Realm.</li> <li>• Impact Assessment, sequential assessment and whether a starting point could be established as to how the sequential assessment would be applied.</li> </ul>	31.10.22

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Justification for setting impact assessment at 500m2 going back to DM Policies DPD and reasoning / evidence of effectiveness.</li> <li>• Local levels of retail and small scales to be defined, including setting out any modifications required to assist applicants and decision makers</li> <li>• TOW02 policy future potential role of Article 4, references to retail. Being clearer about Class E uses. Broader criteria and use of retail terminology rather than main town centre uses (falling under Class E) throughout this policy and elsewhere in the Plan.</li> <li>• Clarification on criteria i and d as they seem similar. Need to separate out criteria k, m and n</li> </ul> <p>Flip TOW03 to be more positive. Rewording some areas, positive preparation and possibility of use definitions. Extending justification for approaches in TOW03 beyond shisha bars and hot foot takeaways. More focus on clustering and effectiveness for other uses. Extent to which legislation and licensing arrangements exert control, justification for policy approach, including review of similar policies in London Borough local plans.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> <li>• TOW04 requires linkage to London Plan policy HC6(B). Double negative needs looking at.</li> <li>• Plan not being silent on retail needs/requirements in BSS01 – the Council should set out a defined approach with associated justification for such a modification</li> <li>• Small narrative on night-time economy. Clarity on implications of Class E of the UCO.</li> <li>• Revisions to the Glossary to set out precise use definitions for TOW policies.</li> </ul>	
4.10.22	Revisions to Table 24 Monitoring Framework in terms of ECY03 requirements on skills and training	7.11.22
4.10.22	<p>Revisions to Table 14 – LSIS. Check consistency with Section 6.1 of the ELR. Pick up any variations needed to the figures and provide the calculation of the site size of each LSIS in the Plan, together with associated justification for the boundaries identified.</p> <p>Provide an explanation as to whether any changes arising would have any influence on the Plan approach relating to LSIS or employment generally</p>	7.11.22

4.10.22	<p>Employment land note to cover/consider the following and including any resultant proposed modifications:</p> <p>GSS01:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Rationale behind the 27,000 employment figure covering any inputs, job density, job ratios in that context.</li> <li>• The wording in relation to Brent Cross, the location-based requirement and tightening in terms of sequential assessment.</li> </ul> <p>ECY01:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The monitoring of industrial land in context of E4, E6 and E7 of London Plan.</li> <li>• Reflecting on the consistency of the Plan with respect to “no net loss” requirement and employment led approaches in terms of co-location, and the master planning requirements in the London Plan.</li> <li>• Policy ECY01(I) on transport assessments and the major development threshold as compared to the “significant movements” test in the NPPF.</li> <li>• Suggest potential modification(s) to clarify where tier one and tier two roads are identified in the Plan or on the Policies Map.</li> <li>• Modification to (c), waste plan and inconsistency with types of uses. Clarity in supporting text.</li> </ul> <p>ECY02</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Amending for flexibility, site-specific viability.</li> <li>• The formula for calculation of affordable workspace and associated contributions. Comparing the approaches taken by other local authorities and mechanisms for monitoring.</li> <li>• Whether the detail of any policy asks and/or developer contributions should be dealt with in the Plan, rather than an SPD.</li> <li>• Cat A fitout, ensure consistency with ECY01.</li> <li>• Modifications to elaborate in the plan, extension and expansion of new workspace.</li> <li>• Explanation of the terminology used in terms of ‘touch down working’ and ‘accelerator space’ together with any modifications necessary to</li> </ul>	7.11.22

	<p>provide certainty for applicants and decision makers.</p> <p>ECY03</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Rationale for the 20 or more full-time end-use jobs threshold in para 9.11.4;</li> <li>• Question whether the detail of any policy asks and/or developer contributions should be dealt with in the Plan itself rather than the SPD;</li> <li>• Consider the modification to para 9.11.6 (MM229), should this be pre-app.</li> </ul> <p>BSS01</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reconsider silence of the plan on industrial land - set out a modification to the policy and the supporting text with associated justification for the approach taken (including the specific reasoning for any departure from the most up-to-date evidence).</li> </ul>	
5.10.22	<p>Barnet to produce a note on policy ECC01 to encompass the following and, including any resultant proposed modifications:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Review updates to Building Regs and links to GLA Energy Guidance. Changes to policy and supporting text.</li> <li>• Remove refs to Building Regs and signpost to London Plan where relevant.</li> <li>• Wording to reflect para 20(d) NPPF (mitigation and adaptation) in ECC01 and wider review (for example, linkages to Policy CDH02)</li> <li>• BSS01(c) wording to be reflected in ECC01(a)</li> <li>• Review ECC01(b) interactions with SPDs, including approaches taken by adopted Plans in other London Boroughs.</li> <li>• Explain meaning of “highest environmental standards for development” and “exemplary levels of sustainability throughout Barnet in order to mitigate and adapt to the effects of a changing climate” in ECC01(b)</li> <li>• Use Footnote 153 London Plan for definition of carbon.</li> <li>• Refer to para 9.2.2 of the London Plan for explanation of the Energy Hierarchy and ensure consistency of wording with Policy SI2( b) of the London Plan.</li> </ul>	31.10.22

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consistency with London Plan terminology on decentralised energy</li> <li>• Clarify the role of London Plan Policy SI3 in respect of the energy infrastructure context and energy strategies in ECC01(d)(i), together with references to Energy Statements, Energy Assessments</li> <li>• Justification for the 6% beyond Building Regs in Policy ECC01d (ii)</li> <li>• Explaining uplift between 2013 and 2021 Building Regs</li> <li>• Wording of ECC01(d) needs to be reviewed, particularly in terms of maximising ability to minimise carbon.</li> <li>• ECC01(e) justification for feasibility studies and breaking down the contributions to a study, contributions to decentralised energy itself.</li> <li>• Consistency required between Table 16 and ECC01</li> <li>• ECC01(f) tightening up “where feasible” to distinguish between different considerations such as viability, design, etc.</li> <li>• Reflecting Part O of Building Regs for (g), justification for approach in terms of overheating.</li> <li>• Review ECC01(h) in light of s.66 Listed Buildings Act and NPPF. Ensure consistency with tests for heritage assets. Revise SoCG with Historic England.</li> <li>• Review MM238</li> <li>• Embodied carbon, distinguish with retrofitting/refurbishment</li> <li>• Barnet carbon offsetting and carbon price, explain how it would work. Explain how other authorities approach this in terms of SPDs.</li> <li>• Ensure interaction between para 10.7.3 and CDH07 (and any other policies).</li> </ul>	
5.10.22	<p>Barnet to produce a note on policy ECC02 covering:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consistency with para 185 NPPF (light) and para 186 and London Plan (air quality)</li> <li>• Signpost the PPG on marginal abatement costs and link to 9.1.21 in London Plan</li> <li>• Review London Plan requirements for Air Quality Assessments in relation to minor development and explain Council position.</li> </ul>	31.10.22

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Proposed changes to air quality neutral, which is currently just for major development.</li> <li>• Consistency between Table 17 and policy SI 2 London Plan</li> <li>• Table 17 and overlap with Policy ECC02 and supporting text</li> <li>• Remove or highlight in a different way construction elements of Table 17</li> <li>• Interactions of Table 18 with ECC02 and changing name to include vibration</li> <li>• Clarify part (e) in terms of environmental quality</li> <li>• Clarify approach to construction plans / demolition plans</li> <li>• Clarify approach to Notifiable Installations, make clear that the threat to environmental quality element is bespoke</li> <li>• Clarify approach to wording of ECC02H (MM262) suggested by National Highways in terms of development near to the Strategic Road Network and drainage arrangements.</li> </ul>	
5.10.22	<p>Barnet to produce a note on policy ECC02A to encompass the following and including any resultant proposed modifications:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• More comprehensive revisit of flooding in NPPF and recent updates to the PPG</li> <li>• Reflect on approach to flood defences, clarify contributions/improvements required where there is a risk of harm to flood defences and also any proximity where development would not be permitted.</li> <li>• Clarify that public amenity = public amenity space in ECC02A(b)(ii)</li> <li>• Review interactions and consistency of table 19, ECC02A and the supporting text, together with associated justification of the Plan approach to flood risk assessments.</li> <li>• Clarify Thames Water requests for planning contributions and also front-loading of s.106 in Table 19</li> <li>• Is approach to SuDS justified and proportionate for different scales of development in ECC02A(h)</li> <li>• Part (h) explain “where applicable” and criteria in second sentence</li> <li>• London Plan references to greenfield rate in ECC02(g)</li> </ul>	4.11.22

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Table 20: clarify link to Policy SI 5 London Plan</li> <li>• Justification for (d), (f), (i) and (n) in terms of how contributions would work, as well as clarifying the expected sources of funding and identification of specific projects</li> <li>• Consistency in part (m) and watercourses, reflect this in the supporting text</li> <li>• MM266 and ECC02A(k), direct connections and additional criteria</li> <li>• Should criteria in section 10.15 be reflected in the policy</li> </ul>	
5.10.22	<p>Barnet to produce a note on policy ECC03 to encompass the following and including any resultant proposed modifications:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cross-references to NLWP and London Plan Signposting to Council's waste standards</li> <li>• Updating text to reflect that NLWP has been adopted</li> <li>• Providing explanation and justification for the inclusion of Scratchwood Quarry in (f) given the relatively recent adoption of the NLWP, including signposting/summary of relevant evidence.</li> </ul>	4.11.22
5.10.22	<p>Barnet to produce a Green Belt note addressing the following matters and, including any resultant proposed modifications:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Potential mapping discrepancies, review policies map</li> <li>• Taking account of any corrections of mapping discrepancies, provide accurate individual calculations in terms of net loss or net gain of designated Green Belt and MOL arising from the Plan approach.</li> <li>• Explanation of ECC05(a)(ii) approach in terms of openness, whether development within the vicinity/setting of the Green Belt but outside of the designation can impact openness, and also confirm whether the intention is for openness to be protected more as a characteristic of land rather than Green Belt.</li> </ul>	4.11.22
5.10.22	<p>Barnet to produce a note on policy ECC06 to encompass the following and including any resultant proposed modifications:</p>	4.11.22

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pull together and signpost specific evidence which demonstrates compliance with paragraph 179 a) of the Framework, including explanation of mapping and stepping stones/prevention of habitat fragmentation.</li> <li>• Explanation of how All London Green Grid and Landscape Framework are reflected on the policy map.</li> <li>• Explanation of approach and phraseology in terms of wildlife networks and green corridors element of 10.26.5</li> <li>• Investigate Enfield approach to beelines and status of that Plan</li> <li>• Smart wording in terms of accounting for potential changes to the Environment Act 2021</li> <li>• Justification for 10% BNG in Barnet specifically and relationship to legislation.</li> <li>• Working through how contributions would work</li> <li>• How All London Green Grid contribution would be calculated and spent, together with the approach of signposting SPG</li> <li>• Effectiveness of ECC06(b) and wording</li> <li>• ECC06(e) and enhancement, links to London Plan</li> <li>• Consistency between ECC06 with para 180 of NPPF</li> <li>• Para 10.26.10 clarify status of Environment Act</li> </ul>	
6.10.22	Barnet to provide a summary transport infrastructure note and table setting out: the infrastructure projects identified in the Plan and supporting documents such as the Long Term Transport Strategy, Barnet’s Strategic Transport Assessment and the IDP; the Plan’s strategic sites and anticipated growth and any associated infrastructure dependencies; whether, when and how the infrastructure will be funded; and, if not currently funded, likely funding sources.	14.10.22
6.10.22	<p>Barnet to produce a note covering policies GSS11 (Major Thoroughfares) and GSS12 (Redevelopment of Car Parks), encompassing the following matters and any resultant proposed modifications:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensure internal consistency between policy GSS11 and its supporting text and the Key Diagram.</li> <li>• Clarify the policy approach to the A406, A1 and A141 and propose any necessary modifications.</li> </ul>	31.10.22



	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide a justification for and explanation of the selection of roads included in GSS11 and any omissions, including (but not limited to) the A110, A502, A5109 and M1.</li> <li>• Explain and clarify what support is given by GSS11 to non-residential uses and alternative uses and consider whether the policy or others in the Plan provide adequate control/management of potential development.</li> <li>• Clarify what support is intended to be given by GSS11 to development not physically adjoining major thoroughfares (i.e. the relationship expected and any flexibility thereto)</li> <li>• Explain the role of the Designing for Density SPD, and clarify that it is not intended to allocate land.</li> <li>• Cross-reference between policies GSS11, ECC02 and TRC03 and open space policies in respect of air quality/parking/open space</li> <li>• Move references to supporting text or explain within Policy what are “wall like corridors” and “medium rise” buildings for clarity.</li> <li>• Consider whether further articulation of the “aim” in policy GSS12 is needed in the context Council’s/Mayor’s car reduction objectives and para 107 of the NPPF.</li> <li>• Clarify suitable (non-residential) uses for GSS12 and how a suitable mix will be achieved according to location.</li> <li>• Explain the approach across GSS11 and GSS12 in respect of parking strategies and MM109.</li> <li>• Consider potential overlaps between GSS12, CDH01 and ECC02 and look at opportunities for potential cross referencing to ensure consistency of approaches.</li> <li>• Explain the purpose of the second bullet point in GSS12 with regards to public transport and active modes of travel and reflect on its effectiveness and necessity in light of the third bullet point.</li> <li>• Clarify the position on car parking re-provision and how it works during the construction phase for the purposes of GSS12.</li> </ul>	
6.10.22	Barnet to produce a note on policy TRC04 (Digital Communication and Connectivity), addressing the following matters and proposing any modifications:	31.10.22

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensuring consistency of wording between CDH08 and TRC04(ii).</li> <li>• The references to “setting” in (v) and why it should be referred to twice.</li> <li>• Costings around CCTV contributions, whether any modifications are necessary to make those clear/clarify potential locations.</li> </ul>	
6.10.22	<p>Barnet to produce a note on Matter 7 (viability) setting out and explaining the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Infrastructure Payments Policy in addition to MM303, setting out modifications. Explaining any linkage with s.106 and CIL.</li> <li>• The planning policy requirements for obligations that are not identified in the viability assessment and requirements and the coverage of s.106 and CIL. Including but not limited to contributions for CCTV, flooding, Decentralised Energy.</li> <li>• How the figures in the viability assessment at para 4.31 (£1500 per residential unit and £20psqm for non-residential development) have been calculated and the policy requirements in the Plan that those figures cover. Categorise the policy requirements in terms of where they fit with viability calculations to ensure robustness.</li> <li>• Making sure Plan is clear in terms of how policy requirements will be funded by CIL and/or S106 contributions. Explain how the CIL Regulations have changed and might allow for double dipping, whether there is intention to do that. Not asking for the approach to be re-run, just clarification of what the likely effects on viability may be.</li> <li>• Clarification of the approach to SPDs, CIL and planning obligations. Is SPDs approach consistent with the NPPF.</li> <li>• Consider funding gaps, look at amending the text in para 12.5.1 in light of the regulations/double dipping. Is there a need to reiterate the identification of sources of funding. Set out details of track record in terms of funding infrastructure.</li> <li>• Consider circumstances where a proposal demonstrates that it is undeliverable or unviable with the full set of policy asks. Explain the hierarchy for the approach to viability in those circumstances and consider whether</li> </ul>	31.10.22

	<p>viability/planning obligations policy necessary Consider exceptional circumstances relief and how that might operate.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Revisit para 12.6.4 in terms of priorities setting out the absolutes against the nice to haves and how that might work with the NPPF. Need to bring out where the flexibility is</li> </ul>	
6.10.22	<p>Barnet to produce a note covering the following matters related to policy TRC01 (Sustainable and Active Travel) and proposing any resulting modifications:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Providing an extra sentence to clarify the missing wording in TRC01 paragraph (b).</li> <li>• Reflecting on the consistency of MM291, TRC01(b)(i), (iii) and (iv) and para 11.7.6 with para 111 of the NPPF</li> <li>• Reflecting on the wording of TRC01 part b(iv) as it relates to orbital travel.</li> <li>• Ensuring consistency with para 57 of the NPPF in terms of planning contributions, signposting to TfL Guidance and any other guidance used to identify projects and associated contributions.</li> <li>• Clarifying the hook for non-major development in TRC01 (c).</li> <li>• Reflecting on the wording of TRC01(c) as it relates to transport assessments and statements, and the approach on MM293. The Council will continue to engage with TfL, but in this note will propose revised wording in the event that an SoCG has not yet been agreed.</li> <li>• Reflect on the potential to tweak TRC01(c)(iii) to afford some flexibility on a case-by-case basis. Explain how flexibility will be applied, including the wording “where appropriate”, and how minor development might be picked up.</li> <li>• Reflect on Part S of the Building Regulations and EV Charging.</li> </ul>	4.11.22
6.10.22	<p>Barnet to produce a note on policy TRC02 (Transport Infrastructure) covering the following and proposing any necessary modifications:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Providing an update on the National Highways SoCG and the Council’s view on how it wants to proceed, in the event that transport modelling is not agreed.</li> <li>• Explaining transport infrastructure contingencies and identifying infrastructure dependencies relating to growth. Drawing together funding</li> </ul>	4.11.22

	<p>sources and funding gaps with the Long-Term Transport Strategy and Strategic Transport Assessment.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Explaining and providing a narrative on the identification of and approach to projects in TRC02, the distinction between the (a) and (b) projects and whether there is any higher status for projects in (a), the rationale for the split, and whether any modifications are necessary.</li> <li>• Clarify that TRC02(a)(viii) is not part of the list of infrastructure projects and is intended to be a final para to TRC02a. Consider references to the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) and how updates to the IDP, which will not be tested through examination, might be addressed.</li> <li>• Clarify TRC02(v) in relation to safeguarding for Oakleigh Road South and Crossrail 2, and updates to the policy map.</li> </ul>	
6.10.22	<p>Barnet to produce a note on policy TRC03 (Parking Management) covering the following and proposing any necessary modifications:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reviewing the approach to orbital accessibility, explaining the current approach and moving away from the concept of “orbital PTAL”. Reflect on TfL’s objections and propose modifications. Work on resolving issue TfL and provide update on/reflect agreement in SoCG.</li> <li>• Whether modification is required to ensure that MM297 and the requirements in the footnote to Table 23 are reflected in the policy. Clarify the relationship with the London Plan, and make the footnote more Borough specific. Clarify the position on Opportunity Areas as well as PTAL levels below 5 and 6 in relation to the asterisk to Table 23.</li> <li>• Clarify the position on assessing parking requirements and para 11.12.4. Consider whether there needs to be a distinction between transport statements and/or assessments or introduction of separate parking statements</li> <li>• Clarify the position on parking requirements and supporting statements, making clear that the parking requirements are “maximum parking standards”.</li> <li>• Considering the position on CPZs in TRC03(b) and MM299, whether any further changes are</li> </ul>	4.11.22

	<p>needed. Explain the process for creating and extending CPZs together with costs and contributions, the approach to delivery and draw together any links to T6(C) of the London Plan.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Explain the approach to car-free development(s), including where the Council allows permits for applications, the approaches taken and whether they differ in terms of locations that are inside and outside of CPZs. Explain the extent of the use of legal agreements in the context of para 11.12.6.</li><li>• Explain the proposed scope for flexibility and then potential scenarios to be applied for the purposes of para 11.12.6.</li><li>• Modify TRC03 to include paras 11.12.3, 11.12.7 and 11.12.8 within the policy.</li><li>• Look again at on-street parking in TRC03(d) and ensure consistency with London Plan Policy T6(L).</li><li>• Explain the requirement for parking surveys for small developments and its proportionality.</li><li>• Explain the position on residential motorcycle parking and whether that counts towards maximum car parking levels.</li><li>• Explain how car clubs will work in respect of different types of development, whether existing car club provision is taken into account in terms of meeting demand/providing capacity. Explain the extent to which the scale of development is taken into account in that regard.</li><li>• Review Part S of the Building Regulations and any necessary modifications.</li></ul>	
--	---	--