

**PUBLIC EXAMINATION OF THE  
BARNET CORE STRATEGY (CS) AND DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT  
POLICIES (DMP) DEVELOPMENT PLAN DOCUMENTS (DPDs)  
DRAFT HEARINGS PROGRAMME AND LIST OF MATTERS**

Website: <http://www.barnet.gov.uk/index/council-democracy/unitary-authorities/statutory-development-plans/local-development-framework/ldf-core-strategy-and-development-management-policies-dpds-examination.htm>

**Day 1                      10 am                      Tuesday 6 December 2011**

**Inspector's opening statement  
Council's opening statement**

**Matter 1 Spatial Strategy/ Vision and Sustainability**

1. Does the Core Strategy (CS) provide an appropriate spatial vision for Barnet over the plan period, consistent with national guidance and the Sustainable Community Strategy? Will it satisfactorily and sustainably deliver new development needed in the borough? Is it clear how the DMP DPD will help to implement the CS?
2. Have both DPDs emerged following consideration of all reasonable alternatives? Is there a clear audit trail to support the chosen/selected approach? Does the sustainability appraisal satisfactorily support the chosen/selected strategy?
3. Do the two DPDs take forward the policies of the London Plan, reflecting local issues and objectives? How do they relate to those of neighbouring authorities within and outside London?
4. Is there a local justification for the plans and policies in both documents supported by a robust and credible evidence base? Is it appropriate that so many policies in both plans and supporting text to policies should contain an element of flexibility and generality in their application?
5. Why does the CS seek to rely on Area Action Plans (AAPs) to guide new development in some areas where substantial change is anticipated (e.g., Mill Hill East and Colindale) and a non statutory framework for others (Brent Cross-Cricklewood (BXC))? Should the CS be used as an opportunity to initiate a review of AAP policies?

**Close                      1.15pm**

**Matter 2 – Housing**

1. Are the two plans based on sound evidence of demand and supply of housing? What evidence has the Council relied upon to arrive at the various housing figures in Table 2<sup>1</sup> of the CS? Should CS Policy CS4 state that the Council will seek to ensure housing supply at a rate necessary to meet or exceed the target of 28,000 new homes?
2. Should densities higher than those set out in CS Policy CS3 with reference to the London Plan be pursued on sites close to town centres and/or public transport or with other land remediation costs? What is implied in paragraph 8.3.2 of the CS when the Council states that it “will expect to optimise rather than maximise” housing densities on development sites?
3. What is the evidence base for CS Policy CS4 as it relates to the provision of housing for gypsies, travellers and travelling showpeople? How is this policy consistent with national guidance and the London Plan?
4. Are the targets and thresholds for new affordable housing soundly based and supported by a viability assessment? What is the merit of applying a threshold of 10 new homes and then referring to a “more realistic and flexible”<sup>2</sup> approach in assessing sites of between 10 to 15 homes? What is the logic of the second 0.4 ha threshold for the application of affordable housing contributions? Should this figure appear in the text of Policy CS4?
5. Do the dwelling size priorities in DMP Policy DM08 adequately represent the likely future demographic changes anticipated over the lifetime of both plans and other evidence? Should the policy be amended to indicate that housing mix will be considered on a site by site basis?
6. How is the policy for flat conversions in DMP Policy DM01 consistent with other statements in the CS and DMP DPDs relating to the need to provide for a more diverse range of households and high levels of demand? How is it consistent with the continued fall in mean household size forecast both locally and in the London Plan? Does the Council’s policy help achieve efficient and effective use of land on sites with good access to public transport and other facilities?
7. Barnet’s policies seek to protect the borough’s existing housing stock. Does the definition of the term “local facility” in DMP Policy DM07 need to be expanded to identify other potential activities (including other community or recreational uses) where a loss of housing might be justified?

---

<sup>1</sup> Refer page 39 of the CS Submission document. The Council proposes to renumber this table as Table 3.

<sup>2</sup> The Council acknowledged in September 2011 that it proposes to delete the words “more realistic”.

**Matter 3 – Planning for Barnet’s town centres**

1. Is there a sound framework for the development of the borough’s current and proposed network of town centres that reflects Government guidance? What is the logic for the hierarchy of centres set out in the CS? Does the Town Centre Framework provide a sound basis for managing future development in the borough’s centres?
2. What is the justification for the selection of priority town centres? Should New Barnet be identified as a priority centre for development and growth? If not, why not?
3. Does the CS provide an appropriate policy context to support additional mixed use retail and residential development in Edgware?
4. What is the logic for requiring significant new retail development to provide a mix of unit sizes? Is Policy DMP DM11 inappropriately ambiguous in its intent?
5. Should CS Policies CS6 and DM11 specifically support independent shops and social enterprises in town centres? If so, why?

**Matter 4 – Business and employment growth**

1. Do the two plans provide a policy framework that will encourage employment growth? Should the plans demonstrate greater flexibility in the use of vacant employment and business land? Should other uses be encouraged on business and employment land if they generate employment or deliver other local benefits such as housing?
2. Does and should business and employment land policies consider the BXC area differently to other parts of the borough? If so, what policy mechanisms are there in place to achieve this difference?
3. Does the land use designation for the North London Business Park reflect London Plan policy?
4. Should the DPDs make specific and detailed provision to the need to plan for live-work accommodation?

**Matter 5 – Addressing social, community needs and the arts**

1. Do the two DPDs provide an appropriate policy framework for considering the provision for and planning of social and community infrastructure to address the changing needs of the population and a growing population? How do the DPDs “enable integrated community facilities”? For the purposes of development management, is it necessary to broaden yet further the term “community use”? Is it specifically necessary to emphasise the role of the private and voluntary sectors in delivering community infrastructure?
2. Does the sequential test for the location of new community and educational activity serve as an overly restrictive way of identifying sites suitable for such uses? Should areas outside of town centres, e.g., industrial and business parks and housing estates, be appropriate for educational and other training-related activity?
3. What is the logic for requiring some developments to provide a Health Impact Assessment (HIA)?
4. Does the CS provide a satisfactory policy context for promoting the arts in the borough?

**Day 2****3.30pm****Matter 6 – Quality of Green Belt (GB) and Metropolitan Open Land (MOL) land**

1. Has there been a satisfactory evidence base (including a survey) to inform the development of GB/MOL policy in the CS? Are the GB and MOL boundaries appropriate?

**Matter 7 – Transport issues**

1. What is the justification for the Council's residential parking policies and their divergence from those in the London Plan? How are the proposed parking standards consistent with other environmental objectives in the CS and DMP DPD? Are the proposed parking policies for residential use too prescriptive?
2. Should the DMP DPD identify if and when a planning application should be accompanied by a transport assessment?
3. What measures do these DPDs contain that take appropriate account of the needs of sections of the population with lower levels of car ownership (e.g., the elderly) to access local health and other services by other means?
4. Should the two DPDs identify more clearly measures that will be promoted for safer and more convenient transport such as additional 20mph zones in residential areas, investment in cycling or other measures to provide alternatives to the carborne "school run"? Would such measures be consistent with the findings of the TfL Strategy for Transport (2010)? What other measures might be appropriate to address road safety in a suburban borough?

**Close****6pm**

**Matter 8 – Managing the built and natural environment**

1. Is the policy framework for considering tall buildings soundly based? What is the logic for picking an eight storey (or 26m) threshold for tall buildings?
2. Does CS Policy CS5 help secure the preservation and/ or enhancement of the borough's heritage assets? Is the approach to managing the borough's heritage assets sufficiently proactive? If not, what changes are needed?
3. Should DMP policies be altered to state specifically the minimum floorspace expected in new residential development? Should the DMP contain a policy with minimum areas for gardens associated with new development or should this matter be covered in a subsequent Supplementary Planning Document?
4. Are the measures to protect the Green Belt, Metropolitan Open Land, promote improvements and tackle public open space deficiency and under provision sufficiently clear and appropriate? Is it necessary to clarify the very special circumstances for development in the Green Belt and the exceptional circumstances for development on open spaces?
5. Should the CS or DMP DPDs contain a specific policy on measures required in new development to address climate change? Is it appropriate that such measures be considered in a Supplementary Planning Document instead?
6. What are the implications of DMP Policy DM04(d) for releasing more housing along busy streets, for example, above shops? Does it serve to restrict development opportunities for additional housing?
7. Is the Council's approach to the siting of advertisements and telecommunications unduly restrictive?
8. Should or can the CS or DMP DPDs identify other controls on vehicular crossovers as a means of protecting the quality of suburban front gardens?

**Close** **1pm**

**Matter 9 - Brent Cross-Cricklewood (BXC)**

1. Does the CS provide an appropriate framework for guiding development in the BXC area? Is it necessary to strengthen the links between the non statutory development framework and the CS? Which development standards will be applied when considering development within the BXC?
2. Is the CS the right plan to identify a site for a waste facility (Geron Way)? Is this more appropriately addressed in the emerging North London Waste Plan? What evidence has been provided to justify the identification of this site? Are there any constraints in delivering it? How will the proposals maps for the CS and North London Waste Plan fit together?
3. Should the Parcellforce Depot site on Edgware Road be included in Table 2<sup>3</sup> of the CS? If not, why not?
4. Does the Infrastructure Delivery Plan correctly identify the timeline for the delivery of infrastructure in the BXC area?

**4.30pm****Matter 10 - Land rear of Briarfield and Rosemary Avenue, London N3**

1. Should CS Map 11 identify this site as Open Space? If so, why? What would be the effect of this designation?
2. Is the Council's decision to exclude this site from CS Map 11 based on a robust and credible evidence base, or does this decision reflect inadequacies in its open space audit? Is the audit consistent with national policy set out in PPG17 or other supporting evidence behind the CS (e.g., the Characterisation Study of London Borough of Barnet, May 2010)?

**The Inspector will make arrangements for an accompanied site visit at this session.**

**Close 5.30 pm**

---

<sup>3</sup> Refer page 39 of the Submission draft version of the CS where it is identified as Table 2. The Council has indicated this will be renumbered Table 3.

**Matter 11 – Infrastructure, Implementation and Monitoring**

1. Is there a clear infrastructure delivery plan and funding arrangements to support the policies of both plans? Should the Council prioritise where it will seek to secure S106 contributions?
2. What is the policy base or evidence for requiring major development to make a contribution to decentralised energy? How is “major development” defined for the purposes of DMP Policy DM04?
3. Does the borough have adequate water supply to accommodate existing and planned development? Over and above CS Policy CS15, should the CS or DMP DPDs contain additional policies directing developers to demonstrate adequate water supply, surface water, foul drainage and sewerage treatment capacity? If not, why not?
4. Are delivery mechanisms and responsibilities clearly defined and arrangements for joint working promoted in the two plans? Are there any “show stoppers” that would place in jeopardy the vision and detailed policies set out in both plans? Are the dependencies and the implications of any potential delay understood and provided for?
5. Is the revised monitoring framework for the CS prepared on 19 September 2011 and contained in the Council’s response to INSP001 (see attached) fit for purpose?

**Close** **1.30 pm**

**The Inspector will conduct site visits between 9 December and 13 December. Most of them will be unsupervised. However, he will need to arrange an accompanied site visit to land rear of Briarfield and Rosemary Avenue, London N3**



**Day 5                      Wednesday 14 December 2011 morning session**

**Reserve session – this session will be kept free in the event that any of the other hearing sessions overrun.**

**Day 5                      2 pm                      Wednesday 14 December 2011**

**Matter 12 – Closing issues**

This session will provide an opportunity for the Council to confirm the format of any further proposed changes it might wish to make to either DPD as a result of the examination. It will also confirm the arrangements for consulting all respondents on any further proposed changes.

All respondents are welcome to attend this session.

**Council's Closing Statement**

**Close                      3.30 pm**