

## London Borough of Barnet Local Plan – Examination

### Inspectors' Matters, Issues and Questions for Hearing Sessions - Autumn 2022

#### Matter 6: Transport, Communications and Infrastructure

##### Issue:

Whether the Plan is positively prepared, justified, effective, consistent with national policy and in general conformity with the London Plan in relation to transport, communications and infrastructure?

##### Questions:

- 1) Is Policy GSS11; positively prepared, justified, effective, consistent with national policy and in general conformity with the London Plan?

***Although the Mayor has made no specific comment on Policy GSS11 the Council has the support of Transport for London (TfL) on implementing the Mayor's Healthy Streets Approach. This is set out at para 2.2 of the Statement of Common Ground with TfL (EB\_SoCG\_12).***

Responses should specifically address the following:

- a) Whether the identification of Major Thoroughfares in the Plan and its Key Diagram are effective and justified, or alternatively if changes are required and/or if the identified locations subject of Policy GSS11 should alternatively be included in the policy wording for certainty?

***The Council consider that GSS11 sets out clear requirements for these major transport corridors and the contribution that development can make to delivering the Healthy Streets Approach. It considers that the identification of Major Thoroughfares in the Plan and as shown on the Key Diagram are (in soundness test terms) effective and justified. Therefore no changes are considered necessary. The Council considers that it is not necessary for identified locations to be included in GSS11 policy wording – especially given that the policy already cross refers the reader to the key diagram. GSS11 prioritises the A5 and A1000 corridors as historic routes as well as Major Thoroughfares which have been the subject for continual renewal and intensification over time. The A5 and A1000 are distinctive in that they are the most radial of the Major Thoroughfares, benefitting from good PTAL and access to the town centres they go through. The other routes (the A598, A504***

**and A110) shown in the Key Diagram and referenced at para 4.26.1 have a more orbital context.**

- b) Is the policy sufficiently clear in terms of the location and type of development proposals which will be supported and whether such an approach is sufficiently flexible to account for site specific influences on suitable densities for development?

**Yes. A principal aim of GSS11 is to make the Major Thoroughfares and surrounding streets a more attractive environment to live in for new as well as existing residents. This is sufficiently expressed for development proposals in the criteria listed in Policy GSS11. Further detail and guidance will be provided by the forthcoming Designing for Density SPD.**

- c) Is the intended reliance upon an emerging Height Strategy SPD to set out potential for residential led tall building development in certain locations along the A5/Edgware Road and A1000/Great North Road; justified and consistent with national policy?

**Yes. NPPF (Annex 2) states that SPDs can be used to provide further guidance for development on specific sites, or on particular issues, such as design. The former Building Heights SPD has been renamed as the Designing for Density SPD as set out in the LDS (Core\_02). Reference is made to the corrections provided by MM105 and MM107 which remove any mention of the misnamed Height Strategy SPD. The forthcoming Designing for Density SPD will provide a well-considered response to achieving higher density development that takes account of best practice and guidance in optimising land use and development capacity.**

- d) Are the requirements of development proposals, such as those in terms of access, design and healthy streets, justified, effective and have they been viability tested?

**Yes. The Council refers to the Viability Assessment (Core\_Gen\_01) of the Local Plan which concluded for GSS11 that the cost implications for development were land use matters only. Owners of highways land, or sites adjacent to highways, will need to accept that the measures required by Policy GSS11 to make development acceptable will need to be reflected in land prices, in accordance with para 012 of the Planning Practice Guidance.**

- e) Are there any requirements set out in the supporting text that are not reflected in the policy wording, are they justified and if so, should they be added to Policy GSS11 (or other related policies of the Plan) to be effective?

**No. The Council consider that the requirements of Policy GSS11 are a clear expression of the supporting text and therefore that nothing needs adding to the policy wording.**

- f) Would any changes be required, including the proposed modifications suggested by the Council, to ensure the effectiveness of Policy GSS11 or consistency of identification of Major Thoroughfares?

***The Council considers that the proposed modifications (MM104 to MM107) improve the soundness and effectiveness of Policy GSS11.***

2) Is Policy GSS12; positively prepared, justified, effective, consistent with national policy and in general conformity with the London Plan? Responses should specifically address the following:

- a) For effectiveness, should the policy refer to the number of homes and specific locations where the 2800 homes identified in Policy GSS01 would be accommodated?

***No, it is not necessary for part f) of Policy GSS01 to refer to specific location of other large sites including the redevelopment of car parks. The Plan does not set out a specific capacity figure for the re-development of car parks. The Council would not expect public car park redevelopment to deliver as much as 2,800 new homes. The figure in GSS01 is an estimate of capacity for 'other large sites', not just the redevelopment of publicly accessible car parks. Table 5A as proposed to be modified (MM37) shows how Annex 1 is contributing to the delivery of 1,850 new homes for 'other large sites'. A number of specific car park sites are set out in Annex 1 such as Manor Park Road Car Park (site 32) and Bunns Lane Car Park (site 33). The remainder of the 2,800 figure is largely made up of consented sites as set out in the Housing Trajectory with a small component reflecting estimated capacity from car park redevelopment.***

- b) Is there sufficient evidence to justify the loss of parking in town centres or other locations such as public transport hubs whilst ensuring an appropriate level of provision necessary to support their vitality and function, and is the overall approach consistent with Policy TRC01?

***Yes. GSS12 is sufficiently clear in its requirements for proposals that involve the redevelopment of surface level car parks. The Council considers that it has set out the right requirements and explained the strategic considerations of future proposals involving the loss of car parking spaces. GSS11 is consistent with TRC01 – Sustainable and Active Travel in that it reflects that the car remains an important mode of travel in Barnet and that car parking availability remains an important component of town centre vitality and viability.***

- c) Are the requirements of development proposals sufficiently clear and effective, so it is evident how a decision maker should react to development proposals?

***Yes, the Council considers that the requirements of proposals involving loss of car parking spaces is sufficiently clear and effective.***

- d) Have the requirements of development proposals been subject to viability testing where relevant?

**Yes. The Council refers to the Viability Assessment (Core\_Gen\_01) of the Local Plan which concluded for GSS12 the cost implications for development were land use matters only. Car parks that are evidenced as being surplus to requirements (as required by Policy GSS12 for their release) will have very low existing use values, likely to fall well below the lowest benchmark land value tested in the Viability Assessment. Therefore, there is no reason to consider that car park redevelopments would be less viable than other sites. Furthermore, given their low benchmark land value, there is also no reason to consider that car park sites could not deliver affordable housing provision at the target level, alongside all other Local Plan policies and the particular requirements of GSS12.**

- e) Are the Council's proposed modifications necessary for soundness to clarify expectations of development proposals, to demonstrate when parking spaces are surplus to requirements or should be replaced, and in terms of assessing amenity impacts?

**Yes. The Council considers that the proposed modifications (EXAM 4 – MM108 - 109) to supporting text to Policy GSS12 improve the soundness and effectiveness of Policy GSS12.**

- f) Would any further changes to the policy be necessary to achieve soundness?

**No.**

- 3) Policy TRC01 seeks to encourage sustainable and active travel to support a growing population and prosperous economy, in that regard:

- a) Are the Council's proposed modifications in terms of its role in enabling active travel, referencing the Mayor of London's Vision Zero ambition and to ensure consistency with national policy in terms of circumstances where development will be prevented or refused, required for soundness?

**Yes. The proposed modifications (EXAM 4) (MM288 to MM294) to TRC01 help improve soundness in that they clarify the Council commitment to providing improved active travel opportunities across the Borough and working with the Mayor of London to make the transport network safer. The proposed modifications to TRC01Bii (MM291) ensure consistency of wording with NPPF para 111.**

- b) Would any further changes be required in terms of the effectiveness and consistency with national policy in respect of the approach to promoting active travel in part a), particularly in terms of pursuing opportunities for walking and cycling as part of development proposals or how walking and cycling networks will be identified?

**No. The Local Plan policies allow for the delivery of the active travel opportunities to come forward as part of developments, the Barnet Long Term Transport Strategy**

**(BLTTS) and subsequent strategic transport planning documents produced by the Barnet transport teams should provide the detail on the provision of active travel networks across the Borough that developments can contribute towards.**

- c) Is the policy sufficiently clear as to the development proposals to which each of the criteria under its part b) will be applied and how any required contributions to infrastructure would be secured?

**Yes. Policy TRC01 is sufficiently clear in respect of the application of the criteria listed under part b) of this policy and also how contributions will be secured.**

- d) Are the requirements for all major development proposals to provide transport assessments and travel plans, construction traffic management plans / construction logistics plans and delivery and servicing plans, and parking management plans, as set out under part c) and put forward in the Council's proposed modifications, consistent with national policy? Why does the approach indicated in paragraph 11.11.1 appear to be different and is there any specific justification for the respective approaches taken?

**The requirements set out in section c) of Policy TRC01 are consistent with NPPF (paras 104 and 113). The documents listed in part c) will enable the Council to assess the impacts of individual proposals on the Borough's transport network. The evidence requirements set out in para 11.11.1 relate to the strategic management of the transport network by the Council and how the documentation of individual proposals would assist in the investment and delivery of improvements to the transport network across Barnet. As the start of the last sentence of para 11.11.1 it is recognised that, as currently worded, there is some potential ambiguity and inconsistency with what is stipulated in part c of the policy. The Council therefore proposes a further modification deleting the words "outside these areas" and insertion of the word "Therefore" at the start of this sentence.**

- e) Would any further changes to the policy or its supporting text be necessary to achieve soundness?

**No. The Council considers that the proposed modifications (MM287 – MM294) help improve the soundness of Policy TRC01.**



4) Policy TRC02 of the Plan includes a list of key new transport infrastructure that it ‘in particular’ would support. In that regard:

a) What is the justification for the identification of those specific projects from the more comprehensive list in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (Core\_Gen\_19)?

***The Council recognises the importance of all infrastructure in delivering services to meet the Borough’s needs as demonstrated by Infrastructure Delivery Plan [Core\_Gen\_19]. However there are considerable merits in highlighting specific transport related infrastructure projects within TRC02 as these will assist in the delivery of a sustainable transport network that meets the needs of development proposed in the Local Plan. In some instances these projects are creating further development potential and economic benefits as is the case with West London Orbital (EB\_T\_04). It will also provide a more efficient, sustainable and attractive network for residents, helping to encourage a decrease in car use. This list will also assist the Council to access any future funding sources from TfL and the Department for Transport.***

b) Would the delivery of the objectives of the Plan and the growth identified be contingent upon the listed transport improvements being fully delivered within the Plan period?

***The Council refers to its responses at Matter 2 – Q7b with respect to Brent Cross Station, Q9a with respect to WLO and Q13b with respect to Crossrail 2. The Council considers that existing opportunities will be particularly enhanced by the delivery of the key new transport infrastructure listed in Policy TRC02. A good example of this is the new Brent Cross West station which, when open in 2023, will further strengthen Brent Cross Town as a location for commercial development.***

c) Are each of the projects committed, where is this evidence and where necessary does the Plan need to safeguard land to enable their implementation?

***All of the projects are at different stages of investigation with regards to design and funding. As highlighted by the Mayor’s Transport Strategy (EB\_T\_01) these are recognised projects by TfL but are not all committed for delivery. The Brent Cross West Station is under construction and the Brent Cross bus station will be delivered as part of the development programme; other projects are less progressed. Safeguarding of land is not currently required to ensure delivery of the projects listed.***

d) What is the source of the most up-to-date evidence in terms of funding arrangements and timescales for each of the listed projects?

***The Council publishes an Infrastructure Funding Statement (CS106\_04) on an annual basis. This sets out the types of infrastructure that the Charging***

**Authority considers should be funded by CIL. This is accompanied by an annual report about CIL and planning obligations for the past financial year. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan was last updated in 2021.**

**The Council has recently submitted applications as part of the Government's Levelling Up Fund (Round 2). The applications which cover bids for Colindale Station and Brent Cross junction work were submitted in Summer 2022 and the Council awaits notification that applications have passed the Stage 1 Gateway.**

- e) Would the Plan provide an effective approach to respond to circumstances if the delivery of one or more of the listed projects were to be delayed or otherwise not taken forward?

**If one or more of the projects listed in the Plan were to be delayed or otherwise not taken forward then this revision would need to be addressed in the first review of the Local Plan following its adoption. However, in the meantime the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (Core\_Gen\_19), which is considered to be a 'living document' would need to be amended to reflect any changes in infrastructure delivery.**

- 5) Are the following proposed modifications to Policy TRC02 necessary for soundness:
- a) Amended wording of part a) iii) to more accurately reflect the proposed improvements at Colindale Station?
  - b) Amended wording of part a) iv) to address Transport for London representations regarding 'a new London Overground Passenger line'?

Would any further changes to the policy or its supporting text be necessary to achieve soundness?

**The Council considers that the proposed modifications (EXAM 4) (MM295) help serve to more accurately describe the Council's role and the nature of the transport scheme improvements. They reflect Statements of Common Ground (EB\_SoCG\_12) and (EB\_SoCG\_14) with TfL Spatial Planning and TfL Commercial Development. The Council notes the Inspector's encouragement of SoCG to demonstrate commitment to delivery of infrastructure listed in TRC02.**

- 6) Policy TRC03 relates to parking management and associated expectations of development, in that regard:
- a) Is the approach of the policy justified and effective insofar as it seeks to depart from Policy T6.1 of the London Plan with respect to residential parking and to

alternatively provide maximum residential parking standards in accordance with Table 23?

**Yes, the approach is justified in the Barnet Car Parking Study (2019) [EB\_T\_07] and the Barnet Car Parking Review (2021) [EB\_T\_08]. Both these studies recognise that Barnet has specific need for a more nuanced parking regime than provided in the London Plan. Yes, justification for the approach taken is provided in the Barnet Car Parking Study (2019) [EB\_T\_07] and the Barnet Car Parking Review (2021) [EB\_T\_08]. Both of these studies recognise that Barnet has specific need for a more nuanced parking regime than is provided for in the London Plan. The Mayor is clear from his Statement of General Conformity (Core\_Gen\_06) that the parking standards in the Local Plan conform with the London Plan.**

- b) Is the policy effective in terms of setting out the specific circumstances when provision of car club vehicle parking and/or a Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) will be required to supplement the maximum residential parking standards in Table 23 and how and when they would be secured to support development in a justified and proportionate manner?

**The Council confirms that the policy is effective in terms of being deliverable and this is consistent with the Council's policy on CPZ which is considered to be an appropriate strategy based on proportionate evidence as set out on the Council's website [Controlled Parking Zones \(CPZ\) | Barnet Council](#) - (EB\_T\_17).**

- c) Is the definition of 'car free development' as referred to in part c) sufficiently clear in the Plan?

**The Council confirms that this is consistent with the London Plan (Core\_Gen\_16) definition of 'car free' (Table 10.3 page 426).**

- d) Is the approach of paragraph 11.12.6 justified in indicating that the Council would show flexibility in the assessment of parking requirements? If so, should the approach be reflected in the policy wording for effectiveness?

**Yes, the approach outlined in para 11.12.6 indicating scope for some flexibility in relation to parking requirements is justified. The majority of Town Centres in the Borough have a high PTAL rating and most developments in these locations are likely to be required to be car free, especially those that have an Underground or Rail Station in the vicinity. However, there will be instances where flexibility is required, for example if a higher than usual proportion of disabled units is being delivered.**



e) Are the following requirements justified and if so, should they each be included in the policy wording for effectiveness:

- i. Paragraph 11.12.3 seeking developers in PTALs 5 and 6 to establish the level of orbital access by public transport to determine car parking requirements;

***Yes, Barnet like much of outer London has disparities in public transport provision with differences in accessibility between locations on Radial Routes into the centre of London and those served predominantly by bus services broadly in the East – West Orbital direction. TfL’s public transport accessibility level (PTAL) based assessment, can mask significant differences in accessibility orbitally and radially and the Borough considers this should be taken into account in determining the levels of parking for developments.***

***For instance, although a site’s PTAL may be high this might be mainly comprised of radial connectivity / services with poor orbital connections where some trip generators / destinations may be located. This is considered a more holistic approach to parking provision that is influenced by multi directional accessibility.***

- ii. Paragraph 11.12.7 indicating that developments on the edge of a CPZ or within a CPZ with controlled hours, would need to be accompanied by a parking survey, and;

***Yes, it is not unusual for people whose area is managed by a CPZ to park their vehicles in non CPZ areas and then walk, so an understanding of the parking pressures for on-street parking in the wider area are required for officers to understand the potential impacts that a development proposal could have on parking pressure in an area.***

- iii. Paragraph 11.12.8 requiring a car parking design and management plan for all applications which include car parking.

***Yes, the Council needs to understand the potential parking issues every development could have and if the proposed parking is appropriate for the level of development proposed. The detail of parking design and management plan would be proportionate with the proposal. This is consistent with Policy T6 J Car Parking of the London Plan which states that a ‘Parking Design and Management Plan should be submitted alongside all applications which include car parking provision.’***

- f) Is the policy sufficiently clear and effective in part d) for decision making on development proposals seeking to reduce the availability of on-street parking?

***Yes, the policy along with requirements of paragraph 11.12.8 would provide the detail required for decision making on such development proposals.***

- g) Is the intended approach to motorcycle parking for residential development otherwise intended to accord with Policy T6 of the London Plan and if so, should the Plan provide more certainty in that respect?

***London Plan (Core\_Gen\_16) Policy T6 states 'where provided, each motorcycle parking space would count towards the maximum for car parking spaces at all use classes.' It is inferred in paragraph 11.12.4 of the draft Local Plan where it makes reference to the London Plan parking standards however the wording could be amended to mention motorcycles for the sake of clarity.***

- h) Are there any implications for the policy arising from recent updates to Building Regulations, with particular regard to the provision of electric vehicle charging points?

***As set out in response to Matter 5 Q1g the revisions to the Building Regulations require that 100% of the car parks provided for residential development should have an electric charging point installed and there are also requirements for renovated, non-residential and mixed use buildings. These changes need to be reflected in the policy and supporting text therefore the Council would support appropriate modifications being made.***

- i) Would any other changes to the policy or its supporting text be necessary to achieve soundness?

***No.***

- 7) In overall terms, is there convincing evidence to justify that, taking account of proposed infrastructure improvements, mitigation measures and associated requirements as set out in Policies TRC01, TRC02 and TRC03, that the development proposed in the Plan, in cumulative with projects elsewhere, will not give rise to severe impacts on the road network within and beyond the Borough?

***Yes, this is demonstrated in the Strategic Transport Assessment [EB\_T\_03].***

- 8) Is Policy TRC04 justified, effective and consistent with national policy, with particular regard to the following:

- a) In seeking that development facilitates high speed broadband and advancement in communication networks where possible and whether such an approach is in general conformity with Part B of Policy SI6 of the London Plan?

***Yes, the introduction of TRC04 supports the supply and improvement of high quality communications infrastructure and promotes inclusive communities.***

- b) Would criteria ii. and v. be sufficiently clear and effective for decision making on relevant development proposals?

***Yes, these criteria were requested by development management colleagues to assist them in making decisions on telecommunications infrastructure.***

- c) Is the approach of paragraph 11.13.4 justified insofar as it indicates that contributions from development may be required to deliver CCTV infrastructure and if so, should the approach be included in the policy wording for effectiveness?

***The Council's approach is justified as safety is an important issue for the residents of Barnet. CCTV is an important facility in assisting the Council to make streets and public spaces safer. The Council is working with residents and the police on a programme of 'Street Safe' audits to clean up public spaces and make them safer. New development therefore needs to form part of the wider network to ensure continuity of coverage.***

***The Council agrees that Policy TRC04 will be improved, and therefore would support a further modification being made to the policy with the addition of text on contributions from para 11.13.4.***

- d) Would any other changes to the policy or its supporting text be necessary to achieve soundness?

***No.***

